

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

pens. It is very essential. Don't rub the Manipur people. You are doing it all the time. This is what I say. I think, you should convey to the proper quarters because there is only one decision-making point under the Government of India. There is only one decision-making point. We have a Cabinet. But the Cabinet is not the decision-making body. It is concentrated in one person. And kindly tell that person to take the right decision in this matter and also in other matters that she is leaving behind during her foreign tour.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, we take up further discussion on the working of the Ministry of External Affairs. Shri Bhupesh Gupta, you have to make a speech.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Only five minutes are left. Let us start after lunch.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are seven minutes still. You just start and then we will continue after lunch.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Then why is this ritual? It is not good. Do you think it is good?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is some time left.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Then, you please ask somebody to speak now.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Would you like to speak?

PROF. RASHEEDUDDIN KHAN (Nominated): No, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Janardhanam is not here. All right, you start after lunch, Shri Bhupesh Gupta. There are three speakers only. I think, we can ask the Minister to reply at 2.45 P.M. That will be better.

अब सदन की कार्रवाई 2 बजे तक के लिये स्थगित की जाती है।

The House then adjourned for lunch at fifty-eight minutes past twelve of the clock

The House reassembled after lunch at three minutes past two of the clock, Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair.

### DISCUSSION ON THE WORKING OF THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—contd.

PROF. RASHEEDUDDIN KHAN (Nominated): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, our annual attempt to comprehend the broad dimensions of India's foreign policy is one of the most enchanting and rewarding exercise in democratic consciousness and deepening our own awareness of India's role in increasing the inter-dependent world affairs. Sir, I am happy that the national consensus aspect of India's foreign policy has not only been well-maintained, but, I may add that it has been deepened by the working of the Ministry in the last year and a half. I may be permitted to sound a personal note that the way the Foreign Minister, Mr. P. V. Narasimha Rao,...

SHRI DINESH SINGH (Uttar Pradesh): Another man from Hyderabad.

PROF. RASHEEDUDDIN KHAN: ...also a product of Hyderabad's diaspora, has functioned, it can be said that the diaspora from Hyderabad have manifested themselves in different ways.

‘सब कहां कुछ लालझा गुलमे तुमायां हो गई,  
खाक में क्या सूरतें होंगी जो चिन्हा हो गई।’

Some of them have manifested themselves in flowers among which I recognise our Foreign Minister also.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): If we are taken to Hyderabad culture, we shall be absolutely... (Interruptions).

PROF. RASHEEDUDDIN KHAN: I would also like to pay compliments to the civil service which normally comes for the negative reference in this

House. But I must say the way the Ministry of External Affairs, under the dynamic, suave and purposeful leadership of the Foreign Secretary, Mr. Sathe, has worked, it has brought credit to the image of India and it has to be mentioned by a non-party man like me who has no axe to grind. However, I would like to say that while India's foreign policy has rightly acquired the respect and endorsement of the broad masses of our people and has also achieved a high degree of appreciation by the decision-making elite in different parts of the world, we are face to face with one of the most dismal scenarios of the world politics in the last thirty years. It will be overlooking the fact if we say that our foreign policy today is moving on an even keel because the world situation is fairly normal; it is not so. It is an international situation which I would like to hypothesize, as marked on the one side by fluidity of a strange character and on the other side by increasing rigidities of posturing. This apparently contradictory approach of fluidity of circumstances and rigidity of approach, requires a most careful analysis on our part if we are to comprehend how world powers are moving. Several major issues of potential threat to peace and security in the world and the regions in the situation which I will call a twilight zone, where diplomatic persuasion, where building up of enlightened public opinion, might still tilt the balance in favour of reason, humanism, peace and detente. While it is true that the first hundred days of Reagan Administration have been marked by increasing bellicosity of proclamation, but maybe, that bellicosity of proclamation is an attempt to find out how the world responds. There is an in-built dichotomy of approach between the West-European powers and the United States of America itself on major problems like oil, like energy crisis, how to deal with the Middle East, how to deal with Indian Ocean, and so on, which have been reflected by the Foreign Minister this morning itself in the meeting of the Consultative Committee. Now,

this alteration of posturing between the western powers itself is a happy sign because monoliths of western powers are no more. In fact, dichotomies and altering posturing are very helpful and this should be taken care of, especially by middle powers like India which has a very important role to play. Here, Mr. Deputy Chairman, I would also like to mention that while from one angle we are categorised rightly as middle power because of our industrial development at technological level, on the other angle India has the most pivotal role to play in the shaping of regional and global policies of the contemporary world's situation. I would like to say this, particularly, because, sometimes, out of modesty of heart, sometimes, out of fear that we might appear to lord over a large number of Third World countries, we hesitate to take action. I would say that India's role is predicated at least on three major objective factors.

India is the largest, the oldest, the most consistent and the most dynamic non-aligned power in the world. After the demise of President Tito, and the removal from the scene of all the stalwarts of the non-aligned movement, India acquires the image and prominence which is realised and which has to be acted upon. The second factor is the geo-political strategic significance of India in the entire Indian Ocean region, starting from the eastern flanks of Africa, covering West Asia, the Gulf, South-West Asia, South Asia and reaching out to South-East Asia. I was happy the other day, when the Prime Minister said that India is not only a continental power, but India has also large islands; on the one side, you have the Maldives, the Andaman and Nicobar Islands and we are also reaching out to Indonesia, which is almost hundred miles away from our islands in the East. With India's position as such, it is impossible for world powers which are reasonable and intelligent not to take India as the only working participative system and as the only viable industrial society in the third world for its importance.

[Prof. Rasheeduddin Khan]

Thirdly, I would say that India, for its diplomatic skill, for its political credibility, for its authority to moderate between two extreme positions, is now well-recognised universally, by all the leaders of the First World, the Second World and the Third World. I am emphasising this, because, unless we take into account these factors, India will never be able to play the sort of role which India should play. I am happy that this role is being played. Quiet diplomacy is paying off in the Gulf, in the Iran-Iraq conflict, in trying to help the Soviet Union get itself away from the enmeshing interference in Afghanistan. I hope the word of caution which has been added to Washington will also have its reward. But it is there.

While the report of the Ministry this year is somewhat different from the format of last year—this has been mentioned by the Foreign Minister himself in the Lok Sabha—what I am more worried, however, is about its political introduction, which is good in large parts. But while it is good in large parts, I would like to say that all foreign policy processes, for that matter, any policy process, are based on four factors. Firstly, perception of issues, events and circumstances. Secondly, formulation of policy options. Thirdly, the articulation of this policy and fourthly, operationalisation. These are the four things. While our perception is fairly right, while our perception is not too bad, while our operationalisation is also fairly successful, formulation is somewhat weak, and that too in a country of Brahminic and Vedantic wisdom.

This report has started from a major hypothesis, which, if carefully examined, will not stand careful scrutiny. It says that the World is passing through an unhappy period and so on because of rivalry and competition between the great powers. Part of the formulation is right. But this equi-distant approach is unhelpful for India to understand as to which

are the powers which are nearer India and which are the powers which are not. It is a question of understanding of India's interests. Let us clearly judge the role and response of each country, big and small by a simple test and this simple test is the test of national interest. National interest, in three stages, is fundamental. Firstly, national integrity and stability, secondly national development process and thirdly, national security. Let us judge what is the policy of the U.S., the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, France, Britain, Zimbabwe, Indonesia, etc. in terms of India's integrity and stability, in terms of India's development process, in terms of India's national security. If this simple exercise is done, it is not possible any more to maintain either avowedly and openly or by surreptitious method this equidistance method. This equidistance approach is as unfair as when the world used to have this approach between India and Pakistan. I hope all of us remember that for a long time we used to say: please do not equate India and Pakistan all the time. It was one of the obsession with the world that whenever they talked of South Asia they used to equate India and Pakistan. How unfair this equation was, is equally true when we say it is not correct to equate the USA and the Soviet Union, or Warsaw Pact powers and the NATO Pact powers, or for that matter England, France, Germany on the one side and the USA on the other, or for that matter the Soviet Union on the one side and China on the other. Therefore, I plead that what is important is to understand. Within the context of evolving or understanding the world situation, how we should adjust our foreign policy. In the light of this it is important that the framework of peace, detente, disarmament on the one side, decolonialisation development and stability on the other side have remained six broad goals of world politics, but in the last one year 12 major events have happened which should make us think very carefully as to

how we should work out India's foreign policy. The first is, there is a basic shift in U.S. global approach and the premises of the United States foreign policy. There is no doubt about it, whatever the pundits might say. The last phase of the Carter administration coupled with the first phase of the Reagan administration is quantitatively different from the policy formulation of U.S. until 1978. Something happened after the NATO Summit of 1978. This is apparent in several ways. I would know it better than Mr. Deputy Chairman, quote the official records. The United States Defence Secretary on March 4 asked the U. S. Congress for a \$800 million dollar budgetary supplement for fiscal year 1981 and 25,800 million dollar amendment to the fiscal year 1982 budget. The Defence Secretary in a statement made to the Senate Armed Services Committee requested that these increases of 4 per cent and 13 per cent are over the budget of the Carter Administration's days. It is also mentioned at another place and this is very important, Mr. Caspar Weinberger says: We must not pursue a defence strategy that anticipates and permits us to take full advantage of Soviet vulnerabilities. Certain geopolitical realities, he says, should be kept in mind. The umbilical cord of the industrialised free world runs through the Strait of Hormuz into the Arabian Gulf and the nations which surround it. That area, Southwest Asia and the Gulf, is and I repeat, is and will be the fulcrum of contention for the foreseeable future. And when he adds—this is the major operation of the policy—that we cannot deter that effort from seven thousand miles away. We have to be there. We have to be there in a credible way. Then he says: We must have a presence in the region, and above all, our vital interests are involved there. And of course, the vital interests are of our Allies and we will confront by military force, if necessary, any Soviet or Soviet inspired threat to those combined interests. This is the statement coming from the U.S. Defence

Secretary, Caspar W. Weinberger. Mr. Caspar Weinberger then speaks about rebuilding of US military strength in the whole region. Speaking about the Middle East and the South West Asia, he says:—

"Yes, I think it is essential that we have a presence in the Middle East, or Southwest Asia, as it seems to be called more and more now... If we have some facilities and additional men and material either placed there or nearby, it will act as a deterrent to the Soviets..."

The other thing that we can do and are doing is to acquire the capability to project American forces that long, 7,000 mile distance rapidly and effectively."

The involvement of United States in this whole region has been mentioned by the five-year project of American Pentagon of March 30, 1981. They say:—

"The United States has begun a five-year project to improve military facilities in Egypt, Oman, Kenya, Somalia and on the Indian Ocean island of Diego Garcia", U.S. Defence officials said on March 12.

"The 'great strategic value' of the Indian Ocean/Persian Gulf region has been stressed repeatedly by Secretary of Defence Caspar Weinberger."

Then they add:

"U.S. Defence officials said the five-year Plan would cost the United States well over 2,000 million dollars.

The Reagan Administration increased amounts already planned for improvements to facilities in the region by the Carter Administration...

One of the largest projects in the Plan is the improvement of the port and military facility at Ras Banas in Egypt. Ras Banas is situated on the Red Sea opposite a key oil terminal in Saudi Arabia.

[Prof. Rasheeduddin Khan]

The largest project for Oman will be reconstruction of an old British airfield on the Persian Gulf island of Marsirah, off Oman's coast. This is expected to cost some 75 million dollars."

"The Omani airfield at Seeb, which is situated near the entrance to the Strait of Hormuz in the Persian Gulf, will be enlarged to handle air transports, fighter planes and surveillance planes.

Other Omani facilities scheduled or improvement are the airfield at Thumrait and the ports of Mutrah and Salalah.

The project at the Somali port of Berbera will cost 24 million dollars and will include repair of oil storage and other facilities.

Also the airfield at Berbera on the Gulf of Aden will be improved and the port and airfield near the capital city of Mogadishu, on the Indian Ocean, will be used by U.S. air and naval forces.

Funds totalling 26 million dollars will go into improving the Kenyan port at Mombasa.

The Indian Ocean island of Diego Garcia is scheduled for 237.7 million dollars in improvements... so that it can handle large transport and cargo aircraft such as C-141 and C-55."

It is in this context that supply of arms to Pakistan comes in. Here Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Morris Draper supported by Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Jane Coon mentioned that "Pakistan is a frontline state facing 85,000 Soviet soldiers across its borders in Afghanistan. Then they said that the largest recipient under the American Administration aid programme is Israel, followed by Egypt. I do not know how they can support Israel and Egypt both. Then comes Pakistan, about which today's papers have mentioned that 2,500 million dollars have been agreed upon, although our

information is that it can go up to 8000 million dollars.

These are facts which are not unknown to our Foreign Minister or to the Prime Minister because the Foreign Minister himself in his speech in the Lok Sabha on the 31st March had mentioned that arming Pakistan to the teeth would create new tensions, start an arms race and cause a set back to Indo-Pak relations. I think the Prime Minister was more forthright, Mr. Deputy Chairman, in her speech in which she said that Pakistan developing nuclear weapons would have grave and irreversible consequences for the sub-continent. She further said:

"Now, Pakistan's defence seems to becoming part of a larger strategy alignment."

The "strategy alignment" about which the Prime Minister is talking is the same thing which the Pentagon has mentioned as a "strategic consensus getting built". That consensus is in the formative stage; it has not yet been built up. Once it gets built up, it will upset the entire equilibrium.

It is not that India is afraid of this situation. As has been mentioned again and again, what is important is that India just cannot take a silent view of the picture. We have to reactivate the non-alignment movement on the one side and our bilateral and multilateral relations on the other side and take a very forthright view. The thesis I would like to advance is this. At the contemporary stage of international developments, India's basic national and regional interests come in sharp conflict with the United States global perspective and interests. This is not to shy away from the USA. I am not saying that. USA is a major world power. We have to account cohesive bilateral relations with the USA. We have to work out relations which will help the USA also to open a reasonable line. Let us not equate them because on the one side you have this and on the other the speech by Brezhnev in the 26th Congress of the

CPSU—I am not going into that—where very constructive proposals have been made not only about the Gulf but also about Afghanistan. On one side they say that they are prepared to examine the political implications of Afghanistan either with reference to India or otherwise. India has a role to play...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: ...on the international side.

PROF. RASHEEDUDDIN KHAN: In so far as the international side is concerned, this matter is rather important. In fact, Sir, I have marked out the portions and if you permit I will read something.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You leave out that something. Mr. Gupta has also said it.

PROF. RASHEEDUDDIN KHAN: All right. What you have in mind is that Brezhnev's report must have been read by all the members of the party. The assumption being facile. I do not want to dispute it at this moment. I will end by saying that at the moment what required is to work out a policy in terms of bilateralism. One of the biggest errors of foreign policy formulations in the Janata period was—and I could mention it at that time to Mr. Vajpayee—undue emphasis on bilateralism almost to the exclusion of multilateralism. While it is not possible to emphasise one or the other, too much emphasis on bilateralism vitiates global concern. The momentum of foreign policy can only be maintained when bilateralism is taken as input into multilateralism and multilateralism is taken as part of a highly shrunken inter-dependent world. India has a historic role to play. The Foreign Minister is well poised; the country is with him. Initiatives are to be taken; and we do not have much time to go. While the attack on Reagan had, of course, upset some of the conclusions, is it possible to overlook that you have as Vice-President a man who was

head of the CIA, you have as Secretary of State a man who was head of NATO Command, you have Casper Weinberger, one of the most hawkish members of the team, and Reagan himself a member of the McCarthy period in American history where liberalism is hunted out? It is a very ugly situation in which you are working. If any reminder was called for, it was exhibited by Madam Thatcher who in her personality matches her physical charm with ugly orientation of a foreign policy. We also heard Brezhnev and we heard Mr. Thatcher. I do not know why Mrs. Thatcher was at all invited. Anyway, she was invited and she came and she helped us to understand her by her performance in the Central Hall. It was a beautiful performance, a true performance. It was like a Shakespearean act being performed by a skilled old witch actress standing with modulation of voice and tone; nothing beyond it. I am happy that our Prime Minister was very forthright in mentioning about it. Therefore, it is not possible to work out any of these things only by sweet talk. They are objective basic contradictions of interests. And India knows it very well and India must play its role as as creatively and as forcefully as it can.

Thank you very much.

SHRI A. P. JANARDHANAM (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the previous speaker with great erudition focused on the role India has to play. I am sorry India has no great role now because the Super Powers are heading on with very very superior weapons which they are piling at the rate of billions of dollars. We are helpless spectators to the sick, nauseating sabre-rattling by the Powers. We are of the poor South. We have empty bellies and full cradles. We have our own problems, Himalayan, and we have to tackle those things. But happily we have a Prime Minister who has all charm and grace, who is smiling, who has aplomb and is very glamour-

[Shri A. P. Janardhanam]

ous to the visiting dignitaries who is quite at home in entertaining the foreigners. Dignitary after dignitary descends on India. He is shown around. They go mightily pleased. They give torrents of words and spoonfuls of aids. What they give is just an aspirin to cure the appendicitis we have. We have to stand by ourselves. We have tonnes of things to offer to the world. We have Mahatma Gandhi, we have philosophy, we have godmen, we have the tigers, we have the elephants, we have the ex-maharajas and we have the whole gamut of things to present to them. They come, they get pleased and they go away.

But what is our state? We have to take lessons from many quarters. That is my humble stand. I am not interested in the august deliberations of the United Nations Assembly or other things. We have our own people who go there; we have our envoys. But the sheet-anchor of any foreign policy is enlightened self-interest. Have we projected our self-interest? Have we protected our national? Have we rescued them from the jaws of racism and other things? Have we projected our correct image abroad? I am sorry, many of us have failed. Many have mistaken cocktail drinking to projection of our good things. So many things happen. I do not want to wash all those things here.

Let us put our own house in order. We condemn Brixton. We condemn apartheid. We condemn this and that. But let us look at what we have done. Brixton and apartheid fall into insignificance before what we have done for the past 3,000 years to our own people. About Belchis, I need not elaborate. So, let us take the beam away from the eye before we go on pontificating lecture. We have to take leaves from other nations.

I am an Anglophile. I am proud to be a Master of English. I am a little master. The English language has given us the jet age spirit. English has given us other things. You

are presiding there, and the May's Parliamentary Practice is your Bible. We go by the British parliamentary practice. The House of Lords and the House of Commons are our big parallels. Whatever may be told of the British system and there may be even the snatchers of the rod in modern times, still the British conventions and their free institutions have all given us something. I rate the British as the best colonial power. Under the French or the Belgian or the Portuguese, Gandhiji would have been kept elsewhere not in the Agha Khan Palace. They left us smoothly. It was a smooth transfer of power. Mountbatten left us with all grace, with all happiness. And Attlee was a statesman with a good heart.

I salute the Soviet Union because it stands by us very thick in our crucial problems.

Let us have some dialogue with China. China was a sleeping giant. Now it has thundered and roared. It may be a super power in 2000 A.D. Let us try to have with it some talk, some dialogue, and at the same time let us tell them that our frontiers are inviolate.

I went to Japan last September. I saw Japan with my own eyes. Japan was in a shambles after the Hiroshima disaster. It has now risen. It beats even America in producing robots to produce robots.

Where are we? We had early start. We had 3,000, 4,000 years of godmen, rishis, vedantis, everybody, but our begging bowls is still in our hands. Even Singapore can be a teacher. I take my hat off to Lee Kuan Yew. He is a very good administrator. There you see eastern glamour and western technology combined. There are many small nations which have set their affairs in order. There is Switzerland, there is Norway, there is Sweden, there are so many examples in the world. There is Madam Theresa. We have Martin Luther King of America. We had Thoreau. So many persons I can quote. So let us be humble to learn from all of them.

Another thing we want is dedication. We should be sincere. We should treat our own people very well and take lessons from all. India can give so many things. It has very good traditions. It has hoary civilisations. It has languages which can boast of a fine grammar. Our Tamil "Tholkappiam" is 3000 years old. We had boary civilisations and everything.

Our goods are spurious. We send one sample but send other goods, not the real goods. It is sickening. The developing countries beat us in the game. We lose year after year in the foreign countries. We should stand by good things. We should produce good things. We should send sterling ambassadors. We should stand by our genuine scientists. But they are driven to suicide before you give them patents. Excuse me for saying all these things. You should think of these things before giving lectures to the outside world.

As far as the AI-ADMK is concerned, we are second to none in defending the integrity of the country. Our great leader, MGR, gave to the country the golden sword he had been presented with. And the moment the Chinese set foot on our soil, our greater leader Anna, buried the hatchet and from the Vellore prison gave a stentorian call to come to the defence of the country and we rallied to the defence of the land. We are second to none in patriotism. We had our Fifth World Tamil Conference at Madurai in which over 30 lakhs of people participated. Our Prime Minister very graciously came there and addressed the gathering. It was not a gathering which was brought in special trains. All came of their own accord. Tamil scholars, Tamil ladies, Tamil gentlemen, all steeped in Sangam literature, in a very boary civilisation, came and listened with rapt attention to the very fine discourses there. We were at the summit of the world. They heard it and they dispersed very peacefully. In that conference Tamils from many

nations had come, from Mauritius, from Fiji, from Malaysia, from Ceylon. They had their own rigma-role and their own harrowing tales, especially from Sri Lanka. Please send envoys who know the particular conditions of the people there. In my first speech, in my maiden speech in the Rajya Sabha, I said, to Canada you should send a Punjabi, to Ceylon you should send a Tamilian and to East Africa you should send a Gujarati. So you should send envoys who are well versed. I am all admiration for our External Affairs Minister who carries on his broad shoulders these things. Our envoys are not diplomats in the conventional sense who are sent out to lie for their country. They are envoys who take abroad our civilisation, our image, our message. Let them do something for our country. Then we will take off our hats for them.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, before I start, I may bring a small matter to the notice of the Government, lest I should forget it at the end of my speech. I understand, Sir, that Mr. George B. Griffin is coming to India to be posted as Number Two or Number Three in the U.S. Embassy. His wife is already here for several months. Mr. Griffin is now in Afghanistan, I think, as Charge d'Affaires of the U.S. Embassy organising the rebels, training them and helping them to subvert the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and to carry on the attack. This gentleman, I must remind you, was in Calcutta during the time of the Bangladesh liberation struggle and by sitting in Calcutta he wanted to do everything to destroy the struggle and to bring about a deal between the Pakistani regime and the Bangladesh liberation movement or whatever you call it, at that time. Now, Sir, I do not know what say the Foreign Ministry has in the matter of such people being permitted to come to our country. But I think, Sir, Mr. Griffin's coming here is not an ordinary event. Here I have got the book "Who's Who in the CIA" published many years ago.



SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN:  
(Bihar): Published where?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Published somewhere on this planet; surely it was not published in Washington. At page 210 you find the name of Mr. George B. Griffin, Department of State, and all that kind of antecedents about him. I hope this gentleman will not be allowed to come to this country, and you can very well ask his wife to go and meet her husband somewhere else.

As far as foreign affairs are concerned, I do not know what to say. Shall I discuss the Ministry's work or the international situation? Perhaps he will say, discuss it in relation to the international situation—the work of the Ministry. At the outset, by and large, it is well known we support the probably nationally accepted foreign policy of our country. That does not mean that we are not vigilant about its weaknesses, its vacillation, its inconsistencies and other weaknesses which do find expression now and then. But broadly we support it, as you know. First of all, before we come to assess the nature of the danger that we face—the war danger as it is called now—which is much worse and more serious than it has ever been, I think the international situation demands that India's foreign policy be based not only on correct perceptions and assessment, but also given the necessary dynamism and direction. I don't say Indian foreign policy is wrong on this account absolutely. By and large, we have had a tolerably good assessment. But it has very many failures and lapses. By and large, we went to be active nowadays compared to the days of the Janata, in the proper direction which is yet to be given dynamism and vision, correct vision. When I say this, I mean that first and foremost our foreign policy must be based on firm anti-imperialism and its anti-imperialism content must be further strengthened. And it naturally means

that we must seek the maximum possible cooperation with all other anti-imperialist forces, whether they be States or people in different countries. Obviously in this context our relations with the Soviet Union and the community of socialist countries acquires special significance and importance even from the point of view of implementation of our foreign policy. The tendency to equate between the Soviet Union and the USA must be given up. The so-called theory of super-power rivalry is not only confusing but actually helps the USA in justifying aggressive actions and moves, especially arms race, by playing up the non-existent Soviet threat to American security. What the source of that danger and the war that we talk is, we must clearly assess. I don't think the Government of India has assessed it. The main source today is arms race, and the arms race, on a global scale imposed by the United States of America. This again is giving rise to tensions and conflicts in different regions of the world which may, if not properly tackled and checked by the peace-loving and anti-imperialist forces in a concerted and united action, trigger up a conflagration without perhaps many people knowing in time that it is going to be so. Here, now I should like to say that the threat arises, as I said, from the arms race. We should concentrate on fighting arms race today. If you cut down the arms race, I will say you will have taken a step for relaxing international tension on the one hand and on the other, bringing about better understanding and cooperation among the peace-loving forces in order to safeguard international peace and international security and principles of peaceful cooperation among nations.

Coming to the threat to India, well the U.S. arms build-up in Pakistan is well-known today. It is much more serious than ever before in the past. It was almost twenty years ago—in

1954—that the U.S.-Pak Military pact was signed. Compared to those days the situation today is far more serious. I remember from these benches Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru reminding us that it was not only a danger, broadly, to the cause of peace and security, but one objective of that pact was to create tension here and now between India and Pakistan, and later on he said that had it not been for the U.S.-Pak Military Pact, the Indo-Pakistan relations would not have been so bad, but there would have been friendship between these two countries. These words are valid even today. The Americans are making it a point only to embroil our two countries to intensify tensions and conflict or cold-war politics, whatever you like to call it, but also to create a situation in which the Simla spirit, which we stand by, is destroyed. The Simla spirit must not be there. This is what they want. Therefore, we have to try to maintain and preserve Indo-Pak relations and friendship between our two countries. Whatever the provocation, from whichever quarter it comes, this must be an article of faith in our foreign policy. No matter who at the moment now in Pakistan at the behest of American imperialism is colluding with the Chinese.

This arms build-up in Pakistan is part of the global strategy of the United States of America and today Americans are openly saying that in Pakistan their security interests are involved. A dangerous statement. The moment Americans start saying that, it only means that that particular country is being drawn deeply into the war preparations and war plans. After the Americans have lost Iran, they want now Pakistan to fill up that gap. Pakistan becomes something in the nature of Iran under the Shah of Iran. This is the role Pakistan has been assigned today. And that spells great danger not only to our security, but to the security of the whole region and the world peace and, if I may say so, of course

threat to our country is considerably intensified.

Americans are now spending or will be spending 173 billion dollars or one hundred seventy-three thousand million dollars. This will go up to 200 billion dollars or two hundred thousand million dollars. The third-world countries—this is very important for us to take note of—are being systematically and in a planned manner drawn into the arms race. They have their own chosen horses and they have their own satellites there. But they are being drawn into it. Some are directly drawn in and others are forced to join the arms race. Sir, it has been found that in 1970, the direct military spending by the US in the third-world countries was 40,000 million dollars and in 1979, it had risen to 90,000 million dollars. It must now be more than a hundred thousand million dollars, the direct military spending in the third-world countries. The Americans are now, well, interested in getting more and more third-world countries drawn into the arms race. Why? Because, first of all, it helps their war plans; secondly, it stops or at least restricts the economic development of these countries; and, thirdly, it creates tensions and conflicts in the third-world countries themselves. This is a dangerous strategy and I think our foreign policy direction should be such as to get as many countries as possible in the third world disengaged from the arms race, ourselves naturally, setting, if I may say so, with all respect to my atom bomb lobby here, an example in this matter.

Now, Sir, I should say that we have found that the US has 429 major military bases and 2,297 minor facilities in different parts of the world. Out of every four Americans, four American soldiers, one is stationed abroad. Now, the entire region is being covered by this kind of American military terrorism. Why? Because they want to continue their exploitation and plunder of the resources of

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

the third-world countries which come to about 50 to 100 billion dollars as profits per year. This is what they want to continue to get. Even the American strategists are saying that they want a hood of military power over the Gulf area, over that region, and they are spreading the theory of military hood. What does it mean? What do they mean by military hood? Sir, they want to change the balance of military forces, the balance of power in that region, and they want to retain this kind of their superiority in such a decisive way, militarily in this region, that they candidate to us and to the other countries and have their way. They must be prevented and stopped by political and diplomatic actions by all the peace-loving forces. Sir, these facts I have given because herein comes the danger. Today, Sir, can you say such things about the Soviet Union? I say this because even in the Ministry of External Affairs, sometimes they mention "super-power rivalry", as if it is a *mantram* which they must pronounce in order to please some of their rightist friends or perhaps the West. Sir, I was a little surprised when I read a statement by the Secretary in the Ministry, Mr. Eric Gonsalves, before going to Washington, made to the Press. He made a statement on the 12th of April, and I would like to quote it here. He said:

"We are prepared to be as pro-West and pro-Western as you will permit us to be. Everytime we try to make an opening, you kick us. It is too difficult."

Sir, it may be a public school English here. But I do not like his statement at all. First of all, it is not proper, if I can tell you, Mr. Foreign Minister, and through you your officer, that such political statements should be made by them. He is the Secretary, maybe good, maybe bad; I do not know him very much. But I find from "The Times of India", wherein there was a three-column spread, about his statement in which

he was speaking as if he was the Foreign Minister of the country. I do not wish to mean any harm to him. But I expect him to control his tongue over such matters. They have to carry on talks and discussions and not to tell what we are doing or how India would behave and things like that. Now, Sir, when have we decided that we are pro-Western? We are pro-India. This is all. The matter ends there. We are pro-peace. We are pro-national-liberation. We never said that we are pro-Western. Why is this kind of atrocious language used? I do not know whether you have pulled him up. Then he said:

"Our assessment is that both are destabilizing.... Soviet Union is destabilising; America is destabilizing."

Everybody destabilises! Only we are the stabilising factor! Wonderful self-flattery! Since you say something against the Americans, you must attack the Soviet Union and other friendly countries. Is this the policy? Sir, this shows the temerity and the inconsistencies in the Ministry of External Affairs. This should stop. Shrimati Indira Gandhi does not maintain the same type of relationship with Reagon as she has with Brezhnev in relation to international life. Does she maintain the same relations? Then, why this utter nonsense by the Secretary? I cannot understand this. I am very sorry, as an elderly person I have to speak in such language against the younger man. Such people should be careful.

Now, coming to a few other points, I should like to make only some suggestions. You need to analyse the world situation. We have done it enough. Karl Marx used to say: Philosophers have interpreted the world; the point however is to change it. We can say, our external experts have interpreted the international situation; the point, however, is to change it. But how can you change it? That is very important. My



DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA: He is a very learned man.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Learned man, yes. Now, I make one or two suggestions with regard to these things. I think the Government's stand on Brezhnev's proposals should be very clear and categorical. I find today that the Prime Minister has reacted favourably to Brezhnev's proposal in regard to Gulf. Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, Mr. Brezhnev's proposal does not relate only to Gulf. It covers the Far-East, East, Near-East, Western Europe, Latin America, etc. He had made certain proposals on the occasion of 26th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. We have read that. Many of you have read them. Tell us which one is not acceptable to India. Tell us which of the proposals he has made or the measures he has suggested do not conform to your policy, basic principles and to what you would like to achieve. If that is so, then why are you not coming out in a forthright manner that you share those proposals? This should be discussed and considered by all those who are concerned with maintaining international peace and security or the affairs of international relations. This can be done. I say this thing because India is undoubtedly one of the friendliest countries outside the socialist community of the Soviet Union. Indo-Soviet friendship is a factor of great importance from the point of view of world peace and international security. How it works and operates is something which concerns not merely our two countries but all the peace-loving mankind. Such being the view, why should it not be possible for India and the Soviet Union to proceed together on the basis of certain proposals? Well, he has made one set of proposals. You can consider them. You can give your reactions to them. Then, if necessary, modify or add your proposals to them. They will consider them. All I say is that these proposals have a tremendous impetus on the peace-loving forces of the world.

India's support to them will strengthen the cause of peace and isolate the reactionary and war-mongering forces. Sir, this is very important.

As far as the Far-East is concerned, I think, India is on the correct lines, broadly speaking. Develop and strengthen new relationship with the socialist republics of Vietnam, Kampuchea and Laos. Indo-Vietnam relation is of paramount importance in that context when Japan and America, both are trying to make the ASEAN countries their servitors. In fact, America is trying to implement some of their policies through the ASEAN countries, and Japan, as the recent visit of the Japanese Prime Minister to this country would show, is trying to buy up and enlist those ASEAN countries on their side. India, therefore, must have its own policy in regard to those countries. Let us not entertain any illusions.

As far as our region is concerned, we stand for friendship with Pakistan. It is a good policy. We are not going to be deterred by the talk of nuclear weapons and other things. Let them make the bomb. We shall see how to face the situation in that way. But, at the moment, we should try all our best to prevent Pakistan from making the bomb. How? Of course, diplomatically and politically by mobilising world public opinion, by pointing out its grave consequences from the point of view of peace and international security not only of our region but also of the world. Diplomatic and political offensive against this arms race, nuclear arms race must be stepped up. Sir, this is one thing I wanted to say. As far as Bangladesh is concerned, you develop a relationship and all that. But when you develop relationship with Pakistan and Bangladesh, express yourself—Jawaharlal used to do it—that you are opposed to the suppression of the democratic rights and liberties, that you are opposed to the persecution of people who stand for friendship bet-

ween Indian and Pakistan and secular-minded forces. You should come out. The same applies to Bangladesh also. In Bangladesh, the persecution is not going on to that extent as it is going on in Pakistan. Take, for example, the Communist Party of Bangladesh which wants friendship between Bangladesh and India and between Bangladesh and Pakistan. Now, that General Secretary of the Communist Party of Bangladesh is in the prison on a sheer frame-up. Now, we should express our sympathy for them, and demand their release. And here I must congratulate the Government when Prime Minister Indira Gandhi showed concern for Mr. Sans who is in the Irish jail today. Now, it seems, his life is running out. I think, we should demand from his House and the Government should demand that the British Government, the Thatcher Government should take steps so that this hunger strike is given up and the life of that MP and those who are on a hunger strike in the Northern Ireland is saved. Sir finally, one word only about Mrs. Margaret Thatcher. What shall I say? My friend said, she is very beautiful. I hope he will not be taken in by her beauty. Now, Sir, I am not interested in a woman's beauty, at the moment. We are dealing with Mrs. Margaret Thatcher, not a film star, not a call girl. We are dealing with Mrs. Margaret Thatcher, the Prime Minister of the most aggressive NATO partner and ally of America, the most aggressive NATO country. Sir, ever since Mr. Churchill, there has not been a Tory Prime Minister who is so aggressive, so racist. „

DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA: Sir, is it fair to call the Prime Minister of another country a call girl?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I have not called her that. I am not interested in either. Sir, you understand what I have said. Would I be interested in a call girl (*Time Bell rings*)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is too late now for you, I think. (*Interruptions*).

DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA: You are not interested in Mrs. Margaret Thatcher, the call girl.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am not interested in Mrs. Margaret Thatcher at all, except that she has to be fought as the person who speaks in so racist terms. The British Nationality Bill, I have got information, has been guillotined now. She said, she will not change it. Sir, I have got a copy of the Bill. It has got about 69 pages or so at any rate more than 50 pages. So many things are written in it. (*Interruptions*).

Sir, the administration of that Bill would mean rivers of blood. The slogan of Mr. Enoch Powell is getting encouragement from Mrs. Margaret Thatcher's policy. And, Mrs. Margaret Thatcher came here to tout for American imperialism and to get some concessions, some economic concessions, for you. I am glad that the Government of India set its mind as far as politics is concerned, by and large. I wish the same stand was taken insofar as economic issues were concerned. Sir, it is no good trying to fight—you won't go very far economically—Mrs. Thatcher politically while allowing British based multinationals to come to this country, make further penetration into our economy, interfere in our political life and do all kinds of things. Sir, this is all I say.

As far as the Bill is concerned, I think the Government of India should demand, as the Labour Party is demanding, that the Nationality Bill should be withdrawn. It is not interference in the internal affairs of British Parliament. It is protecting two million Asians and others of other ethnic origin. It is defending human rights. Even the European Human Rights Commission has condemned the British Nationality Bill. I found the Churches have condemned it. The

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

Labour Party has condemned it and external opinion is against it. The Government of India should tell frankly that if this British Nationality Bill is not withdrawn, if the racist terror is not stopped, the attacks are not stopped, the Government of India would seriously consider whether this country should continue in the British Commonwealth or not. As far as we are concerned, long time back we should have come out of the British Commonwealth. Sir, this is my appeal. (*Time Bell rings*)

Sir, I know he sympathises with me on this matter but he does not like my language. If he had been here, he would have liked my language. Those Benches do not like my language, even though they agree with the spirit of it. But I hope some steps will be taken. The only thing that I want to say is that as far as your foreign policy is concerned, I do say that it is a policy which needs broad support, of course, but further strengthening also. To strengthen it is the duty of all of us and certainly of the Government in particular. Strengthening it means, its anti-imperialistic content, I repeat, must be strengthened. We repudiate Mr. Morarji Desai's suggestion....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Absolutely one line.

We repudiate Mr. Desai's suggestion that no danger comes from Pakistan. From the people of Pakistan, no danger comes. But danger comes from America and the Chinese collaboration with the Americans along with the arms build-up by Pakistan. That is where the danger comes from. I also do not support those who want to exploit this threat to security in order to silence the people's struggle. Threat to security must be fought. We must be ready to meet

this threat to security. But at the same time, there cannot be any question of giving up the popular struggle for a better life and social justice. On the contrary, if I may say so, to prepare the country for meeting the threat to its security is to make the people contented and to do so, is to mitigate their sufferings. Hence, some of the internal policies of the Government—not of your domain, Mr. Narasimha Rao—require radical change. The anti-working class and other policies which hit the people must go. Unemployment and price rise must be stopped so that the nation can brace itself up better in order to meet the challenges, whether they are from internal forces or external forces.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister please.

SHRI AMARPROSAD CHAKRABORTY (West Bengal): Sir, ... (*Interruptions*)

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Members from all the parties have spoken. I think, all the points have been covered.

SHRI AMARPROSAD CHAKRABORTY: Sir, on that day, it was decided that the debate will continue.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Everybody has spoken. All the points have been covered. Let us now hear the hon. Minister. (*Interruptions*) Members have taken so much time, out of proportion.

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा (बिहार) : उस दिन तब हुआ था कि इन लोगों को भी मौका मिलेगा ।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What can I do? Members have taken so much time, out of proportion. (*Interruptions*)

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE: Time could have been apportioned properly. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let us hear the hon. Minister now.

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE: It is better not to continue here.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We cannot allow all the parties.

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE: That is all right. (*Interruptions*) In protest against your attitude, we walk out.

SHRI AMARPROSAD CHAKRABORTY: All the parties should have been given a chance.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Every party cannot be given a chance.

SHRI AMARPROSAD CHAKRABORTY: The consensus was that all the parties would be given a chance.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: One man party cannot get time every time.

SHRI AMARPROSAD CHAKRABORTY: In protest, we walk out.

(*At this stage, some hon. Members left the Chamber*)

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : श्रीमन, उस दिन तय हुआ था...

श्री उपसभापति : आप इतना समय लेते हैं, आप बैठ जायें। यहां एक-एक पार्टी के आठ दस मेम्बर होंगे, उन पार्टियों का टाइम होता है 7 मिनट और वह ले लेते हैं 40 मिनट। तो फिर कैसे टाइम दिया जा सकता है औरों को। आप भी इसमें सहयोग करें।

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : आप देते क्यों हैं ?

श्री उपसभापति : क्यों देते हैं, आप सब जानते हैं।

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO): Sir, fourteen hon. Members have participated in the debate and I am grateful to them for their valuable contribution. Once again it has come out very vividly that the foreign policy of this country has been and is being run on the basis of a national consensus. The national consensus, according to some needs strengthening. I would only say that when I propose to strengthen it from one side, I should take care to see that it does not get weakened from another side. And that is the exercise which the Government incessantly has to do in order to keep the consensus on an even keel because that is the only way of keeping up the consensus, of maintaining the consensus. To do anything which will destroy the essential ingredients of the consensus, its essential nature, its timber would be very wrong, for, once it gets disturbed, it will not be possible to bring it back. That is why when we call it a consensus we appeal to all shades of opinion not to insist on the consensus being on their own side beyond a point. It cannot be so. If it is on one side beyond a point, it will go farther away from the other side beyond their point and then the focus will be disturbed, the consensus character will be destroyed. Whatever the differences—and there are bound to be differences—this consensus has to be maintained and in this maintenance of the consensus it is not only Government but all shades of opinion which will have to cooperate as they have indeed been doing.

Sir, I broadly classify the hon. Members who have participated in the debate into two categories—those who are with the consensus, with all their shades of difference; and those who are outside the purview of the consensus in the sense that they have certain basic differences with the consensus itself. It is they who stand between, as it were, consensus on the



[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao]

one hand and near-unanimity on the other. If they did not have these basic differences, consensus would have tended towards unanimity, towards a situation where essentially everybody thinks alike. Unanimity has not been the case in this country right from the beginning. We have had dissension of a basic character. There have been persons who were essentially against the basic concepts which made up the foreign policy of India. In spite of them, the consensus has continued, it has been sustained by Government, by Parliament and by the people. And that is why this consensus needs to be maintained and we are determined to maintain it, while at the same time taking note of those basic differences which have their own place. We would like to satisfy ourselves that we are always right, that the basic differences and the opinions based on these basic differences do not really hold good; we have to satisfy ourselves of this from time to time, and I assure the House that we are not brushing aside any opinion merely because it falls outside the consensus, merely because it does not have majority support, merely because it has been rejected time and again. Everytime at least I have made it a point to look into the pros and cons of the opinion expressed which are diametrically opposed to mine, which are diametrically opposed to those of the Government and satisfied myself that they are not only diametrically opposed but they are of no validity in the changing context. Since the context changes, their validity also has to be examined constantly, which I am doing, which the Government is doing. This is the assurance which I would like to give to those who have been dissenting, who have been expressing diametrically opposite views.

So I have to deal with these views in this broad frame-work. But Sir, on three major areas, I have to respectfully submit to the House that I have to deliberately deny myself the privilege of replying in detail to

the points raised. The reason is obvious. I cannot be too communicative.

I cannot be too plain-speaking on the question of Indo-Pak relations because less than a month from today, I am going to Pakistan I need not take with me an impression of having made up my mind, an atmosphere of bitterness, an atmosphere which comes in the way of friendly dialogue which I am going to have with the leaders of Pakistan. And in spite of the utmost provocation that has come from Members like Mr. Shahabuddin, I would like to assure him that I refuse to be provoked by him. That does not mean that I am not going to reply. Only after coming back from Pakistan, I shall have occasion to deal with every point raised by him and I will express my own opinion on what he has said. He will bear with me if this stage is to be deferred say, until after my return from Pakistan. (Interruptions) However both of us could have done with a little less of vituperation on his part. Particularly—I am sorry to say this—he is a good friend and in expression, he is quite explicit—at least the personal references to Murtza Bhutto and Hasina seem to me hitting below the belt. We do not do that. At least I do not deserve that. This Government does not deserve that kind of treatment because I do not believe in hitting back below the belt. I do not want to. Not that I have anything against the hon'ble Member. It is not that. I immediately changes and when the point is that the level of the debate changes, in this particular case something else also comes in—certain doubts, certain shadows, certain clouds come in—and they are not good. I know आपने अपनी रवानी

में कह दिया ।

श्री संयद शाहाबुद्दीन : मुझे याद नहीं.... ।

श्री पी० वी० नरसिंह राव : रवानी अच्छी नहीं होती । बहुत तेज रवानी अच्छी नहीं है ।

श्री सैयद शाहबुद्दीन : वक्ता कम मिला है इसलिये खानों तेज करनी पड़ती है ।

श्री जादीश असद साधुर : (उत्तर प्रदेश) : खानों और जवानों दोनों हैं ।

डा रफीक अकरिया : इनको खानों दिवानों हुई है ।

श्रीमती हामिदा हबीबल्लाह : (उत्तर प्रदेश) इनको खानों शिकुन बेसोंका थो ।

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I would only suggest that what he has said by way of these references, he himself agrees that he does not mean because it would be a very different scenario if he had meant what he said. I do hope that he did not mean them and I would like to go on record in hoping and I would like him also to go on record in agreeing that he did not mean them...

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: I did not make a deliberate mention..

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: That is enough.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: Secondly, I perhaps meant that this might create an impression.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: That is enough for me. Then, Sir, about relations with China, it is the other way round. The Chinese Foreign Minister is coming here. As it is, we have had to contend with the Chinese leaders talking to us through pressmen and through individual members. All these matters have been dealt with in both the Houses of Parliament. I have made any number of statements on all important matters between China and India. The only matter which has not been raised and answered is Dr. Subramaniam Swamy. All other matters have been dealt with. What they said about the borders, I have answered; what they said about normalisation, I have

answered; what they said about other matters being attended to, while the border question is kept aside, I have answered. So there is hardly anything which has not been raised and answered on Sino Indian relations during the last one year or more. But this time when he is coming here, while his coming here itself had become a very exciting matter of controversy and discussion—animated discussion—in this country, I do not want an artificially created atmosphere of excitement where it will be difficult for us to talk coolly, quietly and in a logical way. Therefore, because there is nothing new to say and because it is not proper to repeat at this time what has already been said—I would desist from dealing with that topic.

The third is the Iran-Iraq matter. It is again a matter in which India and personally I myself have been very very closely connected. In the next few days the four of us are likely to go again to Iran and Iraq. Now, again, while speaking, another hon. Member, Mr. Jaswant Singh, said that there is a joke going round in this country that when you ask anyone what is the initiative taken by the Foreign Minister, the reply is that he has gone to Iran or Iraq. I would like to respectfully point out to Mr. Jaswant Singh in the name of the great Indian civilization he was expounding in his speech, that there is no Indian civilization I know of in which blood-shed between two countries is taken as a matter of joke. I would like to assure him that we are going there not for entertainment, not as a part of any joke, but as small instruments, may be insignificantly small instruments—in order to stop the gory drama that is going on, which is getting a bad name to the entire movement of nonalignment; and in any case India has always been against war. The civilization he spoke of has never preferred war for solving any question. Not only today but for thousands of years we have been a peace-loving

[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao]

people, our civilization has been based on peace, and the concept of peace is not just the absence of war.

I wish I had some occasion to dwell on this a little more in detail. The concept of peace in Indian civilization is not just the absence of conflicts.

It is a peace which is universal, it is a peace wherein man is harmonised with the universe, it is a peace where every being is harmonised with the Creator. That is the kind of all pervading peace we stand for. An ordinary Foreign Minister, a humble Foreign Minister, is going to two different countries, two friendly countries, who are unfortunately locked in a conflict in order to tell this to them, because they cannot tell it to themselves, please do not think that in Iran and Iraq diplomacy is lacking and intelligence is lacking. They can do as well as we can, but no one can operate on his own back. Therefore, someone else has to do it. That is the small work we are doing, and I would very respectfully beg of Mr. Jaswant Singh not to use epithets like "joke." You can make jokes of any other think, but not of the Iran-Iraq conflict, this I would like to repeat with all the emphasis at my command.

I have a concrete suggestion. I have been pestering the officers of my Ministry for the last 14 months to tell me specifically where there has been a departure in our policy with regard to neighbours, because certain claims have been made that this was done, that some Himalayan heights of friendship were scaled in the last three years before we came in and that we spoiled the same. I wanted them to tell me what those Himalayan heights of friendship were, that they had scaled and with which country they had built those impregnable bridges which we have blown up. They were not able to lay their hands on any, and, therefore, I will have to have this from the politicians them-

selves. So, let us have, Sir—I beg of you—a debate again—I am asking for it—on relations with our neighbours. Let us take each neighbour separately. I can assure Mr. Jaswant Singh that all the references to the articles that he has made, I have very avidly read. I very avidly read every word that is written against this Government. While I read it. I want to see something beyond the statement or beyond the impression that they are against the Government, that is known. Article after article after article, paragraph after paragraph after paragraph, I have read, and I am more and more convinced that the writer is against the Government, against the policy of the Government. Beyond that, if there is anything. I wanted to know. Well, I would like to know it from the politicians from our colleagues. So, let us have, Sir, a debate on Indo-Bangladesh relations, on Indo-Pakistan relations, on Indo-Nepal relations, on Indo-Bhutan relations. If all neighbours are put together, it will get diffused. So, inspite of the constraint of time, if we have to find out where the hitch lies or does not lie, we will have to have debates like this, maybe for two hours or maybe for one hour. We may talk in telegraphic language and we may not have any embellishments, but let us have it and let us know what this Government has done as it is alleged to have done. Only then it will be possible.

कहते हैं न धोडा मैदान सामने है ।

It is just like that.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): If the hon. Minister . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We have had this discussion on the other day and today.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: He was for a debate. Why not set a date? (Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right, it may be. (Interruptions).

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: This is my suggestion because this thing has gone on for too long, this kind of impression being created. A charge has been thrown . . .

DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA: Have it in the next session.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: After the reply, if anything is left out, then we can take it up. Otherwise we cannot go on with discussion for the sake of discussion.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: So this is the only way of really coming to brass-tacks. No one is infallible, but let us understand where this has gone wrong.

Then, Sir, I would like to refer to one very interesting, if not amusing, development that has taken place. Today everyone in every section of this House says that Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru's policy was impeccable. I wonder what was said when he was alive. I have gone through the old debates. Those debates do not unfortunately bear out this kind of posthumous admiration. In those halcyon days, as Mr. Khushwant Singh put it, when India was the honest broker of peace for the world, we had the height of our foreign policy, a most resplendent foreign policy, and now everything has gone down. So I would like to refer to those halcyon days, to a very specific episode which Mr. Khushwant Singh himself referred to—he is right in referring to that—namely, the Korean war and our role in it. I would only beg of you, Sir, to give me a few minutes because that was a very difficult question for Nehru to answer, a very difficult problem to solve. On the one side, China was the outcast of the world and we were carrying China on our shoulders. We wanted China to come in; others did not want China to come in. Everybody wanted us to condemn someone. The question was a resolution condemning so and so, more or less on the same lines as we face in Afghanistan

today, not, of course, on all fours, but the essential ingredients being the same. Sir, he says:

"Subsequently the aggression by North Korea was checked and the North Korean armies pushed back till they seemed to be completely broken. The forces of the United Nations appeared to have won a total victory, as indeed they had. This victory inevitably gave rise to certain fundamental questions. Should the forces of the United Nations continue to advance? If so, how far they should go? We consulted our Ambassador in Peking and our representatives in other countries about how the various Governments were viewing the scene. We had perhaps a rather special responsibility in regard to China . . ."

This is what I was referring to.

"...because we were one of the very few countries represented there. Furthermore, we were the only country besides the countries of the Soviet group which was in a position to find out through its Ambassador what the reactions of the Chinese Government to the developing events were. Since we were anxious that the other countries with whom we were co-operating should know these views . . ."

Now this is the honest broker's role.

"...we sent them on to the Governments of the United Kingdom and the United States. The Chinese Government clearly indicated that if the 38th Parallel was crossed, they would consider it a grave danger to their own security and they would not tolerate it. Whether their view was right or wrong is not the point. However, it was decided that the forces of United Nations should advance beyond the 38th Parallel. They did so and came into conflict with reorganised North Korean troops and at a later stage with the Chinese forces."

[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao]

Then, he goes on to say:

"We realise that it will be very harmful if this matter is considered in the United Nations at a purely formal level and if resolutions of condemnation are passed".

Sir, that is exactly what happened on Afghanistan.

"We realise that it will be very harmful if this matter is considered in the United Nations at a purely formal level and if resolutions of condemnation are passed. The House will remember that one of the first things suggested by the Chinese delegation was that a resolution of condemnation be passed against the United Nations or the USA. On the other hand resolutions condemning China and calling her aggressor have also been repeatedly suggested. The point is that we are on the very verge of a world war and obviously it does not help in the slightest to call each other names. If you want a war to come sooner rather than later and if the present situation is merely a manoeuvre to provide political justification for military action . . ."

Make these words, these are prophetic because this can be applied almost hundred per cent to the situation which we find ourselves in today.

"If we want a war to come sooner rather than later and if the present situation is merely a manoeuvre to provide political justification for military action, then, of course, no more need be said. But if we seek to avoid war, then we must avoid the kind of approach that creates bitterness. The only possible way is that of peaceful negotiations. The negotiations may fail, but there is no other way except war. If there is no negotiation, war is the only other way. It was clear to us that no negotiations would have any value unless China was associated with it."

If there was no negotiation, war was the only way. That was the Korean situation. Now, Sir, what negotiations could have any value unless the Government in Afghanistan which is in position is brought to the negotiating table? What is the point in anybody saying, "I do not want to talk because I do not want to recognise."? Then whom do you talk to? I quote further—"China, apart from being a great power, is most intimately concerned with the events happening next door to her. We suggested that there should be a ceasefire, and if possible, a demilitarized zone, where negotiations among the parties concerned including China, could take place, negotiations not merely about what is to follow the ceasefire but about the entire Korean problem as well." Sir, this is precisely what we have been saying. This is what we have been calling a political solution. So we have not very much deviated from the Nehruvian path although we are much smaller people. That is granted, that is conceded; but the path is the same. And in similar situations we are doing what he wanted to do. This is what I would like to submit. Afghanistan has been discussed times without number. I would not like to take much time of the House normally on a repetition of what has been said in both Houses and otherwise, but, Sir, I would like to take a few minutes on this, because there is another angle to Afghanistan, there is another phase, another facet.

Chronologically, there was a statement of the Ministry of External Affairs on the 31st of December, 1979 saying that the same day the then Prime Minister, Mr. Charan Singh, called the Soviet Ambassador, and this is what he is reported to have said:

"The Prime Minister pointed out that the presence of Soviet troops in Afghanistan would have far-reaching adverse consequences for this region and for this reason expressed the hope that the Soviet troops would withdraw from Afghanistan as soon as

possible in accordance with the message conveyed by the Soviet Union." This is what he said. In the next paragraph it is said that another officer, Mr. Gonsalves, saw the U.S. Ambassador and told him that India is against the induction of arms into Pakistan.

We were not the first to start this process. The protest against arms supply to Pakistan started on the same day on which the then Prime Minister said that he hoped that the Soviet troops would withdraw for such and such reasons. He made a pointed reference to a message conveyed by the Soviet Union. We have checked in the Ministry of External Affairs. There was no separate message conveyed. The message was what appeared in the whole world as the Soviet stand. Their stand was that the Soviet Union offered to pull out its limited military contingent from Afghanistan when the reasons for sending it no longer existed. It is the same story. There was nothing new after this Government came to power the same hope was expressed by the Prime Minister and the same stand taken by the Soviet Union.

Despite this, Sir, we are told that this Government has taken a 'U' turn. This has been very much splashed in every newspaper particularly in the West and those who take the cue from the West in India. What was the 'U' turn? If it was Mr. Brajesh Mishra's statement in the United Nations, what was in it? Taking out all the rhetoric, this is what he said: "India hopes that the Soviet Union will not violate the independence of Afghanistan and that Soviet troops will not remain there a day longer than necessary." What a 'U' turn from what the Prime Minister said to what our permanent representative in the United Nations said: This is supposed to be 'U' turn—a complete reversal.

We were sworn in on the 14th or the 15th. On the 17th January the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi said that no country is justi-

fied in entering another country. On the 24th January in Parliament, I made a statement very clearly stating that it is our hope that the people of Afghanistan will be able to resolve their internal problems without any outside interference. As the Prime Minister has clearly indicated, we are against the presence of foreign troops or any base in any country. We expressed our hope that the Soviet forces will withdraw from Afghanistan. Yet, Sir, this is also said to be a 'U' turn. Whatever we have said is taken as 'U' turn. I really do not know why this Government has been given the epithet—'U' turner.' We have not 'U' turned anywhere. The line has been there for anyone to see. But, of course, in the 4 P.M. din of propaganda, interested propaganda, sometimes truth can be left out, can be camouflaged can be missed and that is why I have taken these few minutes to show that there is no U-turn anywhere. I shall now explain where the turn actually is.

Sir, I have quoted Pandit Nehru on the Korean issue. In the same manner, in May, 1980 some proposals came from the Afghan Government with the blessings of the Soviet Union, with the support of the Soviet Union. They may be right, they may be wrong, as Nehru had said then. But how were they treated? Were they ever looked into? They were dismissed out of hand. It was said, "You first get out of Afghanistan and then we shall see." And, Sir, what was the resolution of the United Nations? "Unconditional, immediate, full withdrawal of the Soviet troops. Now, anyone can understand that this is mere rhetoric and this is not a practical solution to any problem. This has never been done and it is never possible. It does not require much perspicacity or experience to know that this is something which involves the matter more rather than resolves it and this is what exactly happened. We told everybody: "Here are some proposals. I am not saying that they are perfect; I am not standing by the

[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao]

proposals; I am not supporting them; and I am not endorsing them. But what I am saying is—I am nobody to endorse them—that negotiations are not between me and Pakistan, they are to be between Afghanistan and Pakistan. The proposals have come; you consider them. You give them counter-proposals, if you choose. You say whether you agree or you don't agree. That will be the way and that is the path of negotiation. But to say, 'First let the Soviet Troops withdraw and then we will see.' is not the path of negotiation. Thus it is very clear as to who wanted the Soviet troops to withdraw, who did not want the Soviet troops to withdraw. And why they did not want the withdrawal is again very clear because, from the beginning the Afghanistan problem has been seen by India at three levels. at the local level, at the regional level and at the global level, but only by India, unfortunately. President Carter said, 'for instance—What better instance does one need?' he said.

"The Soviet Union is now attempting to consolidate its strategic position which poses a grave threat to the free world and movement of West Asian oil. Any attempt by any outside forces to gain control of the Persian Gulf region will be regarded as an assault on the vital interests of the United States. It will be repelled by using any means necessary including military force."

Now what is the problem and what is the response? So, right from the beginning—and this is on January 23, not very late—the first reaction, almost the first, was that this is for the Gulf, this is for the warm waters, and it is not merely Afghanistan. Then, no less a person than Mr. Kissinger says:

"The main issue really is not Afghanistan." See, we are all talking of Afghanistan and the first sentence of Mr. Kissinger is:

"The main issue is not really Afghanistan."

He says:

"The issue is what the countries who rely on us can expect of us and what we can expect from them and what countries have a right or reasonable expectation to rely on us. These are the issues."

Now, if these are the issues, I fail to see how one can really solve the Afghanistan problem, how one can solve the problem of the Soviet troops remaining in Afghanistan. So, this is how right from the beginning...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Send Mr. Subramaniam Swamy.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I am coming to that, please. That is the only new issue you have raised.

Right from the beginning, the tendency has been to treat Afghanistan not as a local problem, not as a problem to be solved between two countries, but to globalise it or to regionalise it, in order to have certain other advantages mean while. This is the scenario which no one can deny. Sir, after the May 14 proposals, India made an effort like a simple peacemaker. We tried our best and did a lot of shuttling in New York, between one delegation and another and we almost succeeded in bringing them to the negotiating table—if not to the negotiating table at least to the breakfast table. But, at the last moment—I do not want to go into details; but I am telling the House with all the responsibility at my command—the parties shied away, not because they did not see the reasonableness of coming to the table and talking, but because they did not find themselves in a position to approach the table and sit there. They came right up to the door and went away. How does such a thing happen? It is for us to understand. It is for us to understand that once the problem is globalised or regionalised, it is not Mr. Agha Shahi, and Mr. Dost; they are no longer there, just the two of them; they are no longer the only parties; and this is exactly what happened. Then, Sir,

the matter was once again taken to the United Nations. At this stage, Sir, I will refer to this honest broker's position of ours. Within two months—although no one on the face of the earth can possibly convince Mr. Shahabuddin—everybody was convinced, of our role as was stated in "The Statesman" of the 19th March 1980. It says:—

"Mr. Narasimha Rao's just concluded first foreign visit as India's External Affairs Minister has coincided with the emergence of this country as a credible catalyst for efforts to secure peace in the region. In concert with some other countries, India has, in the past two months, been able to establish its credentials as an honest broker among the principals involved in the conflict in the region, particularly in Afghanistan. The two superpowers have come a long way from the positions they took at one time or the other in the past ten weeks regarding India's role in the Afghan crisis. They have obviously come to accept the validity of the Indian approach of defusing the crisis even though they may not share India's perceptions of the crisis. That India does not want the problem in Afghanistan to be just frozen is widely understood; that it wants a solution satisfies the superpowers or at least lessens the chances of superpower confrontation is now accepted."

Now, this happened within these two months, and still the matter is being raised today and I am sure it will be raised until some other matter worth raising comes along.

Sir, the matter as I said, went up a second time to the United Nations. I said, "For heavens sake, why are you taking this matter to the United Nations? You know how many votes it got last time. Two or three votes more or two or three less, how are they going to make any difference? Why do you say that it should go

again to the United Nations and there should be no initiative allowed outside the United Nations? I am taking this House into confidence and I say that there was a stage when India was almost threatening to solve the problem as a peace-maker. This threat was very successfully warded off by recourse to the United Nations. In the United Nations, there was the same resolution, in addition asking the Secretary-General to appoint someone to carry on the negotiations. The Resolution was voted upon. It was not unanimous. It is clear that the Secretary-General cannot act on the basis of this Resolution. Knowing full-well that he is not going to act on this Resolution, the Resolution was tabled. When it was passed with a divided vote, the Secretary-General found himself completely immobilised. He cannot act on that Resolution. Then privately he was told: You can act on your own as you have been doing in Kampuchea. Now, if he had to act on his own, what was the earthly need of a Resolution and a rigma-role? It had to be done because all the other endeavours had to be blocked. That is the strategy. Now, we wish well to the Secretary-General and his personal representative. He appointed his personal representative in Delhi. At the Non-aligned Foreign Minister's Conference, when he was speaking, he made the announcement. His personal representative is still called by one party as 'official representative'. Now look at this play of words. Look at this hair-splitting. Look at this super technicality which is being indulged in while the people of Afghanistan are undergoing we know what. So, one party says he is the official representative. The man appointing him says he is the personal representative. The man shuttles between the two capitals, goes back to New York and draws a blank. Now this is the exercise that is going on to solve the Afghanistan tangle. Sir, I am not generally given to bitterness; but on this sometimes I feel bitter. I feel like asking myself as to who wants the Soviet troops to leave



[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao]

Afghanistan. Maybe India. But that is it. That seems to be the unfortunate position today. So, we have done our best. When Mr. Shahbuddin asks us what we have done, I have to tell him that this is all we have done. If there is anything more that we could have done, he is welcome to tell me. I am not saying that I am infallible. I am always subject to addition. There is nothing to correct at the moment. But addition is possible. Let me tell him or any other Member that if there is anything more that India can do, we are prepared to do it.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: I have given you a concrete suggestion.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: We will certainly look into the suggestion. He said something about regional cooperation. Sir, he was again hitting a little below the belt, not exactly on the belt where he was entitled to hit. He hit a little below the belt when he said that India was dragging its feet on regional cooperation. Nothing can be farther from the truth. When the idea was mooted first, it was mooted like this. Let there be a meeting of all the Heads of States or Heads of Government and let them decide on regional cooperation. We respectfully told them that this is not done this way. It is not a club of the Heads of State who can talk about regional cooperation and then disperse while the countries are still struggling with bilateral problems day in and day out. It will not be realistic because if we call all the Heads together, hopes will be raised and people will expect something. If that does not materialise, there will be, to that extent, an anti-climax and disillusion. We do not want that. So, let us do our home work first. I am sorry, Mr. V. B. Raju is not here. He was one of those who through the University of Hyderabad, the Osmania University, and another institution tried to organise a seminar on regional co-operation. I would have requested

him, if he had been here, to stand for one minute and tell me and tell the House if there was any feet-dragging on the part of the Ministry of External Affairs, when he as an individual started this. It was a successful seminar. I want more seminars because all the ramifications of regional co-operation have to come out. If I am able to produce one paper and think that it contains everything, I am not doing the right thing. We got one paper from Bangladesh. I am not criticising the paper. As a first attempt, it was good. But why do we have to go on first attempts? As mature nations, are we not to have the patience to have a second attempt, a third attempt made so that nothing goes wrong anywhere? And this is what we wanted them to do. This is what we did. Our Foreign Secretary went there. Sir, the Foreign Minister of Bhutan was here. He left only today. Yesterday, he told me something about the report which he received from his representative who had attended that Colombo meeting. He told me and I am glad to quote him without his permission, that it was India whose role was most constructive and, perhaps, saved the meeting from something which would have happened. This is not my report. I do not know what happened to my Secretary; he never told me this. It was the Foreign Minister of Bhutan who told me this. Therefore, we are not dragging our feet. But we are not rushing into something which we will later repent for having rushed in. If you go through the records of the debate of the Lok Sabha on this subject the senior leaders said, "Yes, it is a good thing. But, Mr. Foreign Minister, be careful about it." And that is what I am trying to be. And, therefore, there is trying to be. And, therefore, there is going to take a long time. Our political perceptions do not happen to be the same. Our interests do not happen to be the same. There can be a clash of interests and that is why, while inaugurating this seminar *in absentia*, I summed up my thoughts

and, perhaps, I can claim as the thoughts of the Government of India. I said this:

"Finally I would like to refer quite candidly to one extremely important aspect. We find ourselves at a rather crucial stage in the indispensable process of confidence-building. We have to set in motion, what I may call, a "virtuous circle" wherein co-operation strengthens confidence, which in turn makes for still closer co-operation. To my mind, this involves two distinct processes. The first consists in looking ahead instead of looking back too much. By doing so, we shall respond appropriately to the inexorable demands of fast-changing times. This is a matter more of understanding than of exhortation which in the context of equal sovereign states would be superfluous anyway. I am mentioning it merely because it is always desirable to remind oneself even of self-evident truths from time to time. The second process which again is nothing spectacular but nevertheless deserves reiteration is to take ourselves as we really are. In all our heterogeneity and diversity, the common factor being the determination to forge co-operation. It is time to put an end to the endless commentary of big and small, rich and poor, forward and backward, a commentary which has tended often unwittingly to create psychological barriers in the past. I do hope, therefore, that a new realism and mutual trust will inform the discussions of this seminar."

This is precisely what has been happening. India is big. Therefore, every other country feels worried. I would like to submit to the House, Sir, that it is not only a small country that is worried; it is a big country also that has its own worries. It is inherent that if you talk of worries, you will have to talk of the worry of the small country as well as the worry of the big country. There can be no big country, howsoever big without a worry. In fact big without a worry. In fact big countries have bigger worries. So, we do not count wor-

rise. And then, we do not necessarily measure the strength of a country on its size. Any number of examples can be shown where very small countries have become so powerful that they are causing sleepless nights even to big powers. There is no need of name-dropping. It is self-evident. So, let us not start with the assumption that because India is big, and the others are small, therefore India has to be magnanimous, therefore India has to remove their doubts. Their doubt is caused by India being big. Now, how can I remove that doubt? If there is any other doubt or fear, I can remove it. But the fear which is inherent, a fear which stems out of an unalterable fact of India being big, how can I remove that? Therefore the best way is not to entertain that doubt. I am not entertaining any doubt in spite of being big. Our neighbours need not entertain any doubts merely because they are small. This is the kind of co-operation we want. Whatever is the advantage of bigness, we are prepared to share with our small neighbours and whatever is the advantage of smallness—and do not forget that there is an advantage in smallness also—we are prepared to share that but they should be prepared to share that with us. This is how co-operation grows and this is how we propose to foster this co-operation. So we are not dithering on that. It will take its own time. I must remind the House once again that everything cannot be done over-night. But the inexorable logic of facts of geography and today's economic factors will make it possible if it had not been made possible so far, it is going to make it possible now. And, I have no doubt that this is going to be a fact in the near future.

Sir, I now come to the new point of Dr. Subramaniam Swamy. It is very odd that I should take up this matter in response to what has been raised by Shri Bhupesh da. If only he tells me that he raised it without meaning it, I shall drop it. Shall I drop it?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What is it?

[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao]

**SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO:** Sir, Mr. Subramaniam Swamy has not visited China or Pakistan or the United States for the first time. The recent visit was one of his re-visits. And, at least during the last one year or 14 months, whenever he visited, on occasions... (*Interruptions*).

**SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI (Maharashtra):** Why should Dr. Subramaniam Swamy be taken so seriously by the Government? He is just like a joker.

**SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN:** Most unparliamentary.

**SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO:** Because my Ambassador is involved, that is why I am referring to it. The point was raised by my Ambassador, not by Dr. Swamy. He came to me to be briefed on our policy on China, not that he does not know, but we briefed him. We sent him to the territorial division. He held discussions (*Interruptions*) and he came to me and said, I am going to meet Mr. Deng Xiaoping, will you kindly instruct your Ambassador to be present? I pondered over it and I said, yes So, I take full responsibility for the presence of my Ambassador along with Dr. Subramaniam Swami at that interview. I find many benefits flowing out of it. I do not have to elaborate. He also went to Pakistan. So many others went to Pakistan. So many others went to China. So many others went to other countries and whenever a Member of Parliament goes anywhere, and comes to us, we give him whatever we have on the question of relationship between that country and India. This has been going on regularly. In this connection, I am glad to say, Mr Deputy Chairman, Sir, that during these past fourteen or fifteen months, we have had more bouquets than brickbats in regard to the manner in which Members of Parliament have been treated at the embassies, at the missions abroad I do not know whether it had been so before. If it had been so, I am glad about it. But since I do not know, I

cannot say. But during the last one year or more. I have had more and more reports of good behaviour, being well taken care of, not only from Members of Parliament, but even from those outside Parliament who have had occasion to visit, the only condition being that they tell us in advance and we send a telex message that so and so is coming. I have not come across any case of any serious complaint having been made against any embassy. Hence, this is our normal public relations work, the normal courtesies which embassies extend to people of India going abroad. And if a person happens to be a Member of Parliament, then, to that extent, his importance is enhanced and, therefore, may be, to that extent, the Ambassador and the mission people also go a little out of the way to dance attendance on him. What is wrong about it? I do not see any wrong about it. If a Member of Parliament says that my ambassador has treated him well, I would be happy. But if he says otherwise, I would be unhappy. Hence I would be rather happy than unhappy.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Now, you are happy?

**SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO:** I am quite happy, because at my instance...

**श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : (उत्तर प्रदेश) :**  
श्रीमान, मैं एक क्लेयरीफिकेशन चाहता हूँ ।

**श्री उपसभापति :** क्लेयरीफिकेशन नहीं । बहुत समय हो गया है ।

**श्री रामेश्वर सिंह :** बहुत महत्वपूर्ण सवाल है ।

**श्री उपसभापति :** नहीं आप बैठ जाइये । दो दिन बड़ी महत्वपूर्ण इस पर बहस हो चुकी है ।

**श्री रामेश्वर सिंह :** आपने पहले ही (व्यवधान) यह बहुत महत्वपूर्ण सवाल है ।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am not allowing. Let him complete his reply.

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : यह बहुत महत्वपूर्ण सवाल है इसलिये मैं इस बारे में क्लेरिफिकेशन चाहता हूँ ।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am not allowing. Let him complete his reply. Please restrain yourself. He is not yielding to you.

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : श्री सुब्रमण्यम स्वामी जब वहाँ गये... (व्यवधान)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please do not reply to him, Mr. Minister.

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : आप एक मिनट का समय भी नहीं देते । उन्होंने वहाँ अखबारों को बयान दिया कि...

श्री पी० वी० नरसिंह राव : आप बाद में पूछ लीजिये । मैं आपको मुतमईन करूँगा । परन्तु मैं देखता हूँ कि आपको इजाजत नहीं दी जा रही है ।

श्री उपसभापति : इतने ज्यादा प्वाइंट उठाये गये हैं दो दिन को बहस में, उतना जराब तो पूरा हो नहीं पाया और आप यह बोन में शर्फा छोड़ रहे हैं ।.. (व्यवधान)

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : मैं व्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठा रहा हूँ । मैं मंत्री जी से यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि...

श्री उपसभापति : मंत्री जी से जानना चाहता हूँ यह तो आप प्रश्न पूछ रहे हैं ।.. (व्यवधान).. आपको जिस पर व्यवस्था चाहिए वह मुझ से पूछिये ।

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : जो सदस्य बाहर गये हैं, सुब्रमण्यम स्वामी, उन्होंने अखबार को बयान दिया है कि भारत अपने प्राचीन इतिहास को भुलाकर, छोड़कर इस मुद्दे को हल करने के लिये पहल करे वह...

श्री उपसभापति : यह कोई व्यवस्था का प्रश्न नहीं है ।

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : यह जो...

श्री उपसभापति : आप दृष्टिये । यह कोई व्यवस्था का प्रश्न नहीं है । (व्यवधान)

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : आपको न मालूम क्यों चिढ़ हो जाती है । यह इतना बड़ा सवाल है, यह मुल्क का सवाल है...

श्री उपसभापति : आप बैठ जाइये ।.. (व्यवधान) इसमें अब बहस की गुंजाइश नहीं है । आपने मंत्री जी का बयान सुना नहीं और बोच में ही व्यवधान पैदा करने के लिये खड़े हो गये । आप आदत से लाचार हैं जो कि बहस के दोच में खड़े हो जाते हैं ।

श्री पी० वी० नरसिंह राव : मैं इतना ही निवेदन करूँगा कि सुब्रमण्यम स्वामी जी की जो राय है, उनकी अपनी है, हम पर उसकी कोई जिम्मेदारी नहीं है । वे संसद सदस्य के नाते जाते हैं । हम उनकी थोड़ा बहुत सहायता करते हैं, कुछ मदद करते हैं । उनकी राय बदलने को हमारी राय नहीं है । उनकी राय वही बनो रहे, अच्छा है क्योंकि सब लोग उनकी राय जानते हैं और उनको भी जानते हैं ।

Sir, I now come to an important, not very important, but nuts and bolts matter raised by Mr. Jaswant Singh. He found in the Budget, and it is really a matter to be clarified, that for the Indian Society of International Law there was a 50-fold increase in the allocation. Last year the allocation was Rs. 2 lakhs and this year it is something like Rs. 52 lakhs. That is what he has pointed out. I would like to tell him that after a long and protracted effort we

have now been able to allot that money for a building. So, it is not just a plot, now it is going to be a building and its construction is going to start soon. That is the reason why we have made this allocation and that explains the very steep increase in the budgetary provision.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Say something on Mr. Brezhnev's proposals.

**SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO:** We have already said about Mr. Brezhnev's proposals, I think more than once. Sir, these proposals essentially are not addressed to us, they are addressed to someone else and they are going unheeded by that someone else, that is also a fact, but so far as we are concerned, we have always said that these proposals merit consideration. But merit consideration by whom? What is the point in my giving testimonial to Mr. Brezhnev's proposals? It is the others to whom the proposals are addressed, who should consider, and we are saying that they should consider these proposals. As I said in regard to the May 14 proposals, yes, they are there. If you do not like them, give counter proposals, amend the proposals, say why you don't like them, but not to say anything is not the way of solving problems. And about Mr. Brezhnev's proposals the Prime Minister has said, I have also said. We have said what a country like India, which is not essentially concerned with the implementation of the proposals, has to say.

Then, Sir, about the voting rights to Overseas Indians, I made enquiries. I understand that the matter has been referred to the Chief Election Commissioner and it is being considered by them. I must, however, add from the information which I have gathered within the last two days, that the matter presents a number of operational difficulties which the Election Commission apparently does not seem to have got over or does not seem to have seen

its way to get over. So, the matter is still, more or less, pending; they are struggling with it. Not that they have anything against it in principle, as far as I know, but just to implement it is a very difficult and complicated matter. We shall look into it. But I would like to tell Mr. Jaswant Singh that it is receiving attention at the proper quarters.

Sir, I have taken a long time on some important aspects which I thought I should deal with. Once again I wish to assure the House that whenever a debate takes place, we shall meticulously take note of any suggestions that may come from any quarter, any side of the House, with an open mind and will examine them. We do not claim omniscience. After all, any policy needs to be elaborated, it needs to be refined all the time and refinement coming from any quarter is welcome. And since this particular policy namely the foreign policy is based on consensus, every quarter, every Member, has a right to take part in it, in the refinement of it. And, therefore, I am not doing any favour to any one by saying that I am going to listen to him; it is his right because it is a matter of consensus. That is all I would like to say, Sir. Thank you very much.

#### .. STATEMENT BY MINISTER

**Damage to the Air-India Aircraft earmarked for the use of the Prime Minister for her Foreign visit**

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** The hon. Home Minister to make a statement.

**श्री सत्यपाल मलिक (उत्तरप्रदेश) :**

मान्यवर मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है । जिस मामले पर माननीय गृह मंत्री जी बयान देने जा रहे हैं उस सिलसिले में देश में दो प्रकार का वातावरण बन रहा है, एक सरकारी सूत्रों का और एक दूसरा । इतना महत्वपूर्ण मामला है इसलिए मेरा कहना यह है कि बयान