

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI): The House now stands adjourned till 2-00 P.M.

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

The House reassembled after lunch at two minutes past two of the clock. **The Vice-Chairman (Shri Arvind Ganesh Kulkarni) in the Chair.**

DISCUSSION ON THE WORKING OF THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI): Now we go to the discussion on the working of the Ministry of External Affairs. Mr. Bipinpal Das.

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS (Assam): Mr. Vice-Chairman. Sir. at the outset . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI): Mr. Das, before you commence I may tell you that your party has given you 25 minutes.

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS: I shall try to finish within that time. Sir....

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO): Are we finishing this today?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI): Yes, I hope so.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I have to go to the airport to receive the Foreign Minister of Bhutan, in which case I will have to make some arrangement.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI): At what time?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: At 6.45.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI): I think by that time we will have finished.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENT AFFAIRS (SHRI SITA RAM KESRI): Today we will finish by 6 o'clock.

AN HON. MEMBER: If not, the Minister can reply on Monday.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I have no objection. I only wanted to know the position.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI): We shall discuss in such a way that we shall not embarrass you.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I only wanted to know whether before this I am supposed to reply and finish the debate, or, if the House so chooses I can reply on the next day also.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI): Let me know the progress, and then we shall decide.

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, at the outset, I would like to congratulate the hon. Foreign Minister and his Ministry for correctly and tactfully handling the affairs of the Ministry and conducting our foreign policy in a very difficult and complicated situation in the world today. I would also congratulate the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister for the successful conclusion of the last non-aligned Foreign Ministers' Conference held in Delhi particularly in succeeding to maintain the unity and solidarity of the non-alignment movement, in spite of so many pulls and pressures from outside to break this movement.

Sir, the international situation is passing through a great crisis, political as well as economic. There is no indication yet of an end of the Iran-Iraq war, the Afghanistan problem remains unresolved; the Palestinian problem, although not aggravated,

continues to burn; Namibian independence is nowhere in sight but the situation has become more critical, there is disquieting news from El Salvador, massive arms buildup is going on particularly in West Asia and Indian Ocean and has assumed dangerous proportions. Tension is growing in South-East Asia. Above all, efforts are being made to turn one non-aligned country against another and to weaken and break up the non-aligned movement. Detente has come to a halt and cold war winds are blowing in much more aggressive form than two decades ago. When bipolarism gave way to multi-polarism it heralded a healthy process and raised hopes for peace and detente in the hearts of humanity. But now that process appears to be halted, how temporarily I do not know, and the world power structure is once again tending to revolve around two super powers. This is a sign of regress and is against world peace and welfare of humanity.

Europe used to suffer a lot from wars and conflicts and we had sympathy for them. That is why we welcomed the Final Act signed at Helsinki. But detente and peace in Europe does not mean that conflicts and tensions should be transferred elsewhere. That is what precisely is happening today. The West-Asia, the Indian Ocean and the South East-Asia have become the new areas of conflict and tension threatening peace and tranquility of the entire region. The irony is that even Europe is not quiet and there is tension.

The acceleration of great power military activities in the Indian Ocean, establishment of a large number of military bases, the disturbed situation in West-East Asia have naturally caused serious concern to India and we cannot afford to be complacent or idle spectators.

Added to these, armament race in these regions and particularly the re-

ported American decision to render massive military supply to Pakistan, amounting to 2.5 billion dollars have aggravated the situation further. The entire security environment of India has come under a cloud and it appears as if there is an attempt to encircle India by forces not very friendly to India. There are even external attempts to encourage forces of destabilisation, forces of disintegration and even forces of secession within the country. If we take into account the Washington-Islamabad-Peking axis which has recently been extended to Tokyo, the picture before us becomes all the more serious causing serious concern to us.

I am not raising any alarm or trying to build up a war psychosis. I am only referring to the realities of the situation which we cannot afford to ignore. Only Morarjibhai, believing in the water of life, may live in the paradise of his own idiosyncracies, perhaps with the hope and belief that his water of life may find a solution to all international problems. I am confident that if any country is thinking of doing any mischief to us, our armed forces will give a fitting reply to them. While our Army and Air Force must be in trim, our Navy needs further strengthening and modernisation.

So far, the Government of India's policies towards Iran-Iraq war and Afghanistan have been quite correct, realistic and constructive and consistent with our basic policies. India's policy towards Afghanistan was at the beginning misunderstood by some. But now there is increasing appreciation of this policy. There cannot be a military or—flingoistic solution to this problem. There must be a political solution. We must not only disapprove Russian intervention in Afghanistan, but also disapprove all other kinds of external interference in the internal affairs of that country, particularly from Pakistan and Iran. Above all, the problem of Afghanistan has to be looked at in the context of the overall situation in that region.

Unless the escalation of military activities by the great powers in the entire region is halted and reversed, it will not be easy to bring about peace in the region or even to solve the problem of Afghanistan. We must continue our diplomatic efforts towards this end and also to build up world opinion in support of our moves. I welcome the proposal of the Afghan Government to have direct talks with Pakistan and Iran. In the beginning, it appeared that Pakistan was going to respond. I do not know why they relented later on. I am sorry for it. I still hope that Iran and Pakistan will respond to the proposal of the Government of Afghanistan. The most unfortunate thing is that two non-aligned countries, Iran and Iraq are at war today. There is no need to go into the causes. We want the war to come to an end and we want the two countries to solve the problem peacefully through bilateral negotiations. In this case also, India has been following a correct policy, and I hope that the efforts of the non-aligned Committee of which India is a member will ultimately bear fruit.

Sir, we have nothing but goodwill for Pakistan. We want Pakistan to be stable, to make progress and become strong. Pakistan should become strong. We want that it makes progress and becomes stable. We also recognise Pakistan's right to strengthen its defence. Nobody denies it. They have already raised the strength of their defence capacity by more than double during the last ten years. But to acquire arms highly disproportionate to their actual needs has to be looked at with suspicion. After all, our past experience in this matter was sad. Whenever Pakistan acquired arms from the West, they used the arms only against us. Moreover, the speed at which they are going ahead to manufacture nuclear bombs not only causes concern to us but may lead to grave consequences. I wonder if Pakistan, the so-called Western policeman in this region, is planning to leave the non-aligned movement and

once again play the role of an aligned nation in some kind of a new military alliance.

Sir, it is unfortunate that the big powers are not co-operating with the U.N. Ad Hoc Committee on Indian Ocean and the fate of the proposed Colombo Conference is still hanging in the balance. Without their co-operation, such a Conference cannot achieve anything. Sri Lanka pleaded in the last Non-aligned Ministerial Conference that if Diego Garcia was not mentioned in the Final Declaration, the USA might be persuaded to attend the Conference. It is now for Sri Lanka to discharge its responsibility. Once the USA agrees, I hope, Russia will not decline. In any case, a vigorous move has to be made by the non-aligned nations to bring them to the conference table.

India's recognition of Heng Samrin Government was absolutely correct. It is wholly wrong to equate the presence of Vietnamese troops in Kampuchea and the Russian troops in Afghanistan. The Vietnamese troops have saved the people of Kampuchea from the murderous policies of the tyrannical regime of Pol Pot. In any case, nobody has suggested an alternative to the recognition of Heng Samrin regime. If we do not recognise Heng Samrin, should we recognise Pol Pot? The choice is obvious. We should, however, launch a serious diplomatic move to make our ASEAN friends realise that we have made the correct choice and that it is in their own interest to co-operate with Heng Samrin and Vietnam. The critics within our country must also understand that recognition of the Heng Samrin Government is entirely in our own national interest.

Sir, we are happy that Zimbabwe has become independent. But South Africa is the last vestige of colonialism and the citadel of racialism. It is now preparing to go nuclear which adds to the dimension of dangers in that region. The final battle against colonialism and racialism will have to be fought on the soil of South Africa.

Our Government should continue to render all kinds of assistance including arms to the fighters of freedom in that country. There is little hope that South Africa will abide by the U.N. Resolution on Namibia's independence, and some Western powers are indirectly encouraging South Africa. The U.N. Resolution is the best solution under the circumstances, to the problem of Namibia, that is to create a demilitarised zone and to hold elections under the U.N. auspices. India and the non-aligned world must continue to stand by the people of Namibia and SWAPO in their hour of struggle and suffering and do everything possible to see that Namibia becomes independent within 1981.

Sir, China's attitude towards India is reported to have undergone some change. Their international postulates and world view are also reported to be under review. The concept of inevitability of war does not appear to be any more their guiding principle. We welcome the proposed visit of the Chinese Foreign Minister which was postponed a few months ago for unknown reasons. I hope our Foreign Minister will find him in a new frame of mind. I also hope some progress will be made towards normalisation of relations. But I would warn everybody against any kind of illusion or euphoria or to expect too much from this visit. The proverbial Chinese puzzle must not confuse anybody. I am in favour of complete normalisation of relations with China. But the basic problem is that of the border. Until that is also solved complete normalisation is not possible. Moreover, China will have to convince the people of India that they are no longer in collusion with Pakistan or U.S.A. or anybody else to encourage forces of destabilisation or disintegration in this country.

Sir, relations with other neighbours in South-Asian region are normal except for one, namely Bangladesh and that is in the matter of the Ganges waters. It is a matter of regret that

Bangladesh has not responded favourably to our proposals and, instead, has been trying to involve Nepal in the matter, which is essentially a bilateral problem. If we have any problem with Nepal even in the matter of water, we shall settle it with Nepal and in fact we have helped Nepal in executing some projects. But I do not see why Bangladesh is bent upon making it a trilateral issue. In any case, we must make it absolutely clear to Bangladesh that while we do not want Bangladesh to suffer during dry months, we cannot allow the port of Calcutta to suffer or dry up. They should see reason and agree to an equitable distribution of water. We should also consider and examine—I am suggesting to the Minister—whether the Ganga-Brahmaputra canal can be constructed entirely over our own territory if Bangladesh remains adamant in its attitude.

Our Government and the Ministry should also examine the possibility of bringing about close co-operation among the nations of South-Asian region in the Economic field like the ASEAN in the South East Asian region. There are several areas like shipping, aviation, tourism, agricultural research, communications, education, trade, transport and even power where close co-operation and collaboration is possible. Some people talk about the Asian identity. That may not be a practical proposition in the context of today, but South-Asian co-operation in the economic sphere among Bangladesh, Nepal, Bhutan, India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Afghanistan and Maldives may be a practical proposition. If that materialises we can march forward and establish a link with the ASEAN on the one hand and the Indo-Chinese group on the other. In course of time this may be thought of expanding to the West Asian region. The Foreign Minister should examine this and should take a lead in this matter.

Sir, recently we gave a hearty welcome to the Prime Minister of Great Britain and extended to her our utmost respect and cordiality. But I

have not understood and still do not understand the real purpose of her visit. If it was to strike an economic or commercial deal, I think a lower level delegation would have been sufficient. But if it was for creating a climate of goodwill between the two countries, I am afraid she has failed to remove the doubts and apprehensions from the minds of the people of India on two basic issues, namely, the Nationality Bill and her support for arms supplies to Pakistan. Sir, the Bill is a racist measure and discriminatory against Asians. But what is more surprising is her open support to the arms supplies to Pakistan even though she was told very clearly about our views in the matter. It appears that Mrs. Thatcher did not care for our interests. How could she then expect to create goodwill between the two countries, I do not know.

Sir, I am glad that a decision has been taken to terminate the Indo-U.S. Agreement on Tarapur plant. We shall now be free to re-process the spent fuel and all our obligations in this regard will be over. It is really strange that a big nation like the USA could pass a national law to have retrospective effect on the solemnly-signed agreement 18 years old. It is equally strange that only yesterday, U.S. officials admitted before the House Committee that they have not asked for similar assurances from Pakistan. This only shows how discriminatory is their policy. Friends of America in this country may now see that America has been pursuing a policy which has not only a tilt in favour of Pakistan but is also discriminatory against India.

We are committed to using nuclear energy only for peaceful purposes and nobody can question our intentions. None can prove that we have any other plan. But if Pakistan is encouraged to go ahead with its nuclear programmes for making bombs, India cannot but keep her options open. In any case we must

gear up our nuclear research programmes and be prepared for any eventuality.

I congratulate the Government for opening a Department of Ocean Development and for thinking even in terms of instituting a commission in this field. We have already established our capability in the matter of exploration of the sea bed and we should go ahead vigorously with that programme. There is going to be a fierce competition in this field and some of the western countries have gone far ahead in developing necessary technology. We must not lag behind. The Law of the Sea Conference, which has not made any progress, can be made to go forward only if India and some other developing countries also can develop the technology of exploring and exploiting the sea bed resources.

The basic problem before us and the world today is how to arrest the escalation of arms race and preparation for war, how to preserve world peace which is so vital for mankind and particularly for the developing countries. I would suggest that the non-aligned group should launch a vigorous peace offensive with a clear-cut programme . . . (Time bell rings). It is only 17 minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI):
No, 20 minutes.

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS: No, it is only 17 minutes. I would suggest that the non-aligned group should launch a vigorous peace offensive with a clear-cut programme. As regards the programme, I may also suggest a few points:

A world-wide propaganda among all nations from all available platforms and by all available means of communications for peace and against war and arms race;

To launch a campaign for disarmament and complete ban on nuclear armament;

To call upon all non-aligned countries to deny facilities for military base to any big power on their soil. Any country defying this appeal may even be expelled from the non-aligned group, because there is no sense when we talk about peace, against war, against arms build-up, against armament, that some of our friends provide facilities for maintaining bases to foreign powers. There is no sense in it, it must come to a stop. Either they belong to non-aligned group or they do not. And if they belong to non-aligned group, they must abide by its principles and deny facilities to any such big power for a military base.

Re-affirmation and re-commitment by all non-aligned countries to the five principles of peaceful co-existence and for resolving mutual disputes and problems through bilateral negotiations.

To uphold the U.N. principles and the authority of that organisation in maintaining peace.

To work out a realistic and practical programme for collective self-reliance among non-aligned countries in the light of Colombo and Havana Summit decisions.

I would say a few words about this collective self-reliance. The North-South dialogue has reached a deadlock because of the obstinate attitude of the industrialised countries. The question is how to make them move and proceed towards creation of a New World Economic Order.

I would suggest that the developing world should immediately start a South-South dialogue. There are enough natural resources, labour force, skilled and semi-skilled labour, trained manpower, and even technical knowhow within the developing world. The only thing they did not have was capital. But now even capital is available within the develop-

ing world in the form of petro-dollars. It is the task of countries like India and every country in the group of 77 to convince the oil-rich countries that in the long run, investment of their capital in the developing world would be more profitable from the point of view of their own socio-economic development than to invest and recycle in the developed world. The developed world does not give them anything substantial except arms only to fight among themselves. Hence, India should initiate a positive move in the non-aligned forums for mobilisation of natural as well as capital resources within the developing world together with trained manpower and technical knowhow in order to build up a movement for collective self-reliance. The only answer to protectionism is to expand trade among the developing nations. Once this programme gains momentum, the developed world will come to senses and start moving forward in the North-South dialogue. This is the only way to break the ice. This programme will help in achieving three major objectives. Firstly, it will strengthen and bring about greater solidarity in the non-aligned movement thereby giving a new dynamic direction to the movement as a whole. Secondly, it will make the North-South dialogue move forward in the direction of a new world economic order. Thirdly, it will advance the cause of peace in the world.

Sir, I would like to remind the advocates of genuine non-alignment that non-alignment is not passivism or neutralism. It is against imperialism and colonialism in all forms. It is a positive and the only movement for world peace. It is much more relevant today than ever before. The only point is that it has to be given a new dynamic direction and such a direction can be given only by collective self-reliance.

I will close by saying this that in the ultimate analysis, the success of the foreign policy of a country de-

pend upon political stability and the economic strength of the country. We should, therefore, exert all our nerves towards this end if we want to make a positive and lasting contribution towards the affairs of the world. Thank you very much.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI): Mr. Nanda. Your party has got twenty minutes.

SHRI NARASINGHA PRASAD NANDA (Orissa): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, dark clouds have appeared in the horizon and with the passing of days, the clouds are becoming darker and darker. Peace and detente are now in danger. Direct and indirect interference or intervention in the internal affairs of the Third World countries is becoming marked. The rivalry between the great powers has now shifted from Europe to Asia and Africa. The affluent countries have tried to frustrate all sincere efforts to evolve a new international economic order. The irritants have come very near our door and unless we are very careful about handling the international situation, even without our asking or without our desire, we may get involved in some kind of a confrontation or conflagration. I am not a pessimist. When I say all these things it is with a desire to keep our External Affairs Ministry in greater alert on this issue. But before I deal with some of the major irritants I would first mention some of the landmarks and achievements of the External Affairs Ministry in 1980-81.

Kudos to our External Affairs Minister; he has handled this most sophisticated Ministry in a very efficient manner. One of the landmarks is the declaration though it falls short of our expectation and some of us believe that there is some dilution of our declared policies in some respects, and the consensus arrived at in the Conference of Foreign Ministers of the non-aligned countries. We had a definite stand on Diego Garcia. With a view to arriving at a consensus, we had to accommodate the views of

countries which are apparently non-aligned, but have already got themselves aligned with one section or the other. In any case, our effort to see that these non-aligned countries remained united as a solid block met with success and the efforts of our Ministry in this respect must be given credit.

The other landmark, according to me, was recognition of Kampuchea, particularly at a time when all the non-socialist countries were raising their finger against us and creating all kinds of doubts about the wisdom of this step taken by us. But I can assure the hon. Minister that this step alone has helped to a very great extent in stabilising the situation in South East Asia. Let us not forget that we recognised the Peoples Republic of China when we were isolated and in the United Nations a large number of countries voted against us. But that did not deter us from taking a right decision and, in my opinion, recognition of Kampuchea was one of the right decisions taken by the External Affairs Ministry.

The other landmark, according to me, is according full diplomatic status to the PLO. What abundant goodwill we have earned in the Muslim world by this single act of according full diplomatic status to the PLO can be realised only if one goes through how favourably they reacted to this single act of our External Affairs Ministry.

One more important landmark which I would like to mention, Mr. Vice-Chairman, is the visit of the President of the Soviet Union to this country in December 1980 and signing of very important and major agreements with the Soviet Union. I am not elaborating them because I want to make some other points regarding the irritants. These are some of the major achievements of this Ministry. In addition, we did participate in several international conferences and these have been furnished to us in minute details in the Report, therefore, I do not want to repeat them. I

would only suggest that we should try to expand our relationship to a greater degree with the Latin American countries. I am aware, Mr. Minister, that you have gone to Mexico and you had a conference there. But I would like our diplomatic activity expanded and intensified in that region.

[The Vice Chairman, (Shri Dinesh Goswami) in the Chair]

What are the major irritants today? One major irritant is the conflict between Iran and Iraq. I have tried to understand the logic behind this conflict. The representatives of four countries representing the non-aligned bloc have visited both these countries. They have not yet been able to formulate any specific proposal to end this conflict. I believe, in the last round, probably all these Ministers only listened to what they had to say, and they have not formulated any particular proposal as yet. I believe, in the course of discussions and deliberations with these two countries, some proposal or some formula will emerge. So long as this conflict between Iran and Iraq continues, there is a great danger of that conflict spreading towards the East. If that is so, there may be involvement of this country as well.

I appreciate the stand taken by the Ministry of External Affairs on Afghanistan. Some of our friends who hold a different political opinion, have criticised the policy of the Government of India on Afghanistan. They say: "Why doesn't Government of India unequivocally say that the Soviet troops should withdraw? Why should they not condemn the presence of the Soviet troops?" May I submit, Sir, that condemnation in this modern, complicated, sophisticated international relationship does not solve any problem. If mere condemnation could act as a diktat, then we could condemn it if we knew that it would bring us some solution. We have made our position absolutely clear on Afghanistan. We have said

that we do not believe in interference and intervention by any country or the presence of any foreign troops on the soil of any country, but there are certain situations, certain background, certain developments which make one country go to the other and remain present there for a temporary period; but that does not entitle another country to use that situation as a ruse for arms build-up, for concentration of arms and to go nuclear, if necessary, and make the entire Indian Ocean completely threatened with warships. All these are related issues. You cannot judge any one issue in isolation because now the world has become one; we have become close due to the development of science and technology. If you are talking about Afghanistan, you will also have to bear in mind what is happening in Iran, what is happening in Iraq and what is happening elsewhere, what is the position in Diego Garcia, what is the position in the Indian Ocean and, in the entire context, this whole issue has to be judged. Therefore, I personally believe that the stand taken by the Government of India on Afghanistan is the most appropriate stand. We could not just condemn a particular action in utter disregard of the other historical circumstances.

Now may I tell you, Sir, that only a few days back even Sihanouk, who was in China refused to condemn the Heng Samrin Government? He said that Heng Samrin's Government in Kampuchea is much better than the Government which was headed by Pol Pot.

SHRI BHOLA PASWAN SHASTRI (Bihar): Sihanouk,

SHRI NARASINGHA PRASAD NANDA: That is what I am saying. I am talking about Sihanouk's statement. The ASEAN countries are asking us why the Vietnamese soldiers should be there in Kampuchea. The history of Kampuchea shows that Vietnamese soldiers were there in

Kampuchea thrice before and withdrew in the past. So, if there is an external danger to the Kampuchean people and if there is a friendly agreement among the three Indo-Chinese countries—Laos, Kampuchea and Vietnam—for joint military action to protect themselves from external danger, particularly the danger that comes from China, then how can we say that the presence of Vietnamese troops alone should have deterred us from recognising Kampuchea?

Now the major irritant for us is the posture of the United States of America. Unfortunately, the more we try to befriend America, the more it tries to kick us. That has been our experience. The Secretary and Mr. Sethna went there—I am not elaborating it—but they returned back only with kicks. That was the only thing they got from the United States of America. While America deals with us in a particular way, it applies different standards to other countries. The same standard does not apply to us and yet there are friends in this country who would like us to be completely aligned with America, to be completely aligned with the NATO countries, to be aligned with warmongers, with imperialists, with those who are still supporting the South African Government against the people of Namibia who are engaged in their struggle for freedom. I would like to know from the External Affairs Minister, particularly, why the Namibian people have not achieved independence so far. The United Nations passed a Resolution. All the nations of the world were supporting Namibian independence. Then what has stood in the way of Namibia achieving its independence? The only thing is the attitude taken by the western powers and the approach of the American Government and its allies. Therefore, if in the context of history, in the context of experience, our perception differs from the perception of America and its allies, they should try to convince us of the rightness of

their stand, the correctness of their stand. But history has proved that they have failed everywhere. They followed a policy in Vietnam and they totally failed there. They followed a certain policy in Iran and they totally failed there. And they are trying to follow the same policy now with regard to Pakistan, by arming them up, giving them 2.5 billion dollars worth of arms, sophisticated arms. There is a saying in my language:

मानकोड़ हातरे राजे ग्राम

नौचाई डेराई नेला प्राण ।

If you leave the image of a deity in the hands of a monkey, it will break the image itself. With the type of Government in Pakistan—the people of Pakistan are our friends but certainly not the Government—if they are given arms, one does not know what will happen and how they will use the arms and against whom they will use those arms. (*time-bell rings*). Sir, I will just conclude. So one of the major irritants has been the arms supply and the new postures of the Reagan Administration after Mr. Reagan came to power.

Sir, I would request the Minister of External Affairs to deal with China a little more cautiously. China is a great country. It has also a great history and a great tradition. Some friends from this country got even an interview with the high-ups in that country and through them the Chinese Government sent messages and described us as the elder brothers and said that they would like us to discuss and settle matters with them. But may I say, why don't they act directly with the Government of India? What is the difficulty for them? They have an Embassy here. They can contact the Government of India on an official level. What is the communication gap, for which somebody else has to play the emissary's role and describe the posture of this country and the posture of the Chinese as it suits his own approach.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Deputy Foreign Minister on an unofficial deputation. Mr. Subramaniam Swamy.

SHRI NARASINGHA PRASAD NANDA: Therefore, I would suggest that the Government of India, while welcoming any gesture, welcoming if anybody wants to be our friend, welcoming that kind of gesture, should be careful because I do not know whether official intimation is there, whether officially the Government of India has at all been described as the elder brother. This private conversation, which has often proved to be erroneous, should not at all be trusted.

Sir, international affairs is a very wide subject. It is not possible to cover everything, but I would submit that, by and large, this is one area in which majority of the people of the country are with the Government. We have almost a consensus on the external affairs policy of the Government and, therefore, we have always extended our hand of co-operation to this Government.

Before I conclude, Sir, may I request Mr. Foreign Minister, to give an opportunity to one Dr. Mahabir Prasad Gupta, who is a social thinker, who has written a book, and who has been troubling me as he was troubled by the international situation, by granting him an interview? He seems to have some ready solution for all international problems. Could you give him an interview and listen to him? I have been listening to him for four or five years. Please listen to him for five minutes.

That is all. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): Mr. Nanda, you are also being given some status of a Foreign Minister, it appears, because people are approaching you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I believe you will give a little more time, five minutes more, to the Janata Party for having lent Mr. Subramaniam Swamy to Mr. Narasimha Rao to do

errands in Peking. I say that you borrowed Mr. Subramaniam Swamy, I think, on a short-term basis or on a long-term basis, I do not know, because your Ambassador accompanied him. He met Mr. Deng Xiao Ping. Mr. Subramaniam Swamy was pleased. He says he has never been so well treated by the Ambassador even during his own regime. Therefore, give them a little more time.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): Mr. Shahabuddin, your party has 17 minutes, and there are two speakers in the list. May I know how long you will take?

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN (Bihar): Only one. Mr. Manubhai Patel is not here.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This has become a farce.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): Mr. Shahabuddin, 17 minutes, you have.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, having listened to what I would consider to be two speeches from the two benches, I rather find it difficult to state my point of view, but I have to, because I have a different perception altogether.

Our foreign policy indeed developed a national consensus because ours is not an artificial State, it is not a mini-State, it cannot be a satellite and it cannot be a client State. Therefore, its foreign policy has not evolved in a short period of time, in a day or two or in a year or two; it has evolved over a period of time, taking into account all its traditions, aspirations and goals. And, that is why we did have in this country a broad national consensus on our national foreign policy. That was the heritage of Nehru.

Yet, I must confess, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that there are a few cracks increasingly visible on the edifice of that national consensus. These have arisen, to my mind, if I survey the last one year, because of three main developments:

The first was that during the election campaign it was made an election issue by the Government which is in power today.

Secondly, over the last one year I have seen an obvious tilt towards one of the super powers. It can no longer be hidden; it can be seen even by the blind.

Thirdly, recently we have seen the beginning of a deliberate campaign of creating a war psychosis in this country. Perhaps it is an alibi for the failures and for the incompetence of the present Government. And I do recall that the Foreign Minister, speaking in the Lok Sabha, said, and I think he was right, "if you create a particular psychosis, it is very difficult to get out of it." I think that is a very universal and truthful statement.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, we have been told time and again that India's prestige has risen to an all-time high, and we have also been told that we have never been as threatened as we are these days. I do not know which of these two statements are to be taken at its face value because I see that there is an obvious contradiction between the two perceptions. Mr. Vice-Chairman, the nation unfortunately, is somewhat perplexed and confused today about the nature of this threat, about the source of this threat and about what action we propose to take against this threat. And then in the long term, we want to know what is our national interest as a nation, as part of a region and as part of a global order. We might put ourselves on the back, and I know that the leaders of this Government have been very fond of doing that. But I would only like to quote Ghalib:

दिल को बहलाने को गालिब यह ख्याल

भ्रष्टा है ।

The foreign policy has to be operated at three levels and each of these levels has its own requirements. There is the bilateral level, where obviously our neighbours are extremely

important. There what counts is mutuality of interests. Then there is the regional level where we have to act as a trusted friend, as a philosopher and guide to our neighbours, as the head of a family which is in harmony with itself, and which has got certain common aspirations in a common cause. At the global level, the third level, obviously we can only count on some moral pressure that we are in a position to exert in concert with other like-minded countries. But the foreign policy must have a purpose and the purpose must be to keep us away from involvement in somebody else's conflicts and confrontations. Then as a developing country we would like to have disarmament, to have more resources for our development and even otherwise to arrange an orderly transfer of resources for development in terms of technology, in terms of improving the investment climate and in terms of access to markets and access to raw materials. But when I read Chapter I of the Annual Report which summarises the situation, I can only call it a litany of lament. The world is going to pieces. It is a value of tears. It is a sorry state of affairs. The super powers are again glaring at each other. They are flexing their muscles. A cold war is at our door-step. The spectre of war is peeping into our doors. The arms race is on in the sub-continent. Even a nuclear arms race is in the offing. The international economic climate has gone from bad to worse. The IDA is shrinking. The gap is widening. Trade terms are hardening, and what not? If this is the picture, I would like then to ask the present Government: where is the progress, where is the great success that this foreign policy is said to have made in the last one year? At the bilateral level, at the regional level, at the global level, which of our goals are we near the point of achieving?

In South Asia everybody will agree that the crux is our relationship with Pakistan. Pakistan is in a bad state. Pakistan once tried to opt out of history. Now it is trying to opt out of

geography. If it is having these trends, do we or do we not share some responsibility? We have in this sub-continent revived old fears and suspicions. I mentioned the war psychosis. I must mention also a certain amount of under hand interference that goes on. Perhaps they have seen something in Murtaza Bhutto's presence in Bombay. Somebody has seen something in Hasina Wajid's preparations for staging a come back while sitting here in Delhi. As far as Pakistan is concerned, we find that all through there is a deliberate campaign to instil the fear of Pakistan, to project Pakistan as a threat, a Pakistan which has practically no industrial infrastructure compared to ours, a Pakistan whose army strength is roughly of the order of one-third of ours, whose naval strength is roughly of the order of one-tenth of ours, whose air strength is roughly of the order of one-fifth of ours. I think there is some purpose behind it, and the people of India shall not accept it at face value. In Bangladesh the result has been that the Farakka agreement is virtually at a dead-end. The Minister spoke of a number of achievements while he was speaking in the Lok Sabha. I hope that we are indeed close to demarcation of our land frontiers which we have not yet ratified. I hope that this island problem does not cause further delay in the delineation of the maritime boundary. And regarding this regional co-operation idea, it was the initiative of Bangladesh. Our Foreign Secretary certainly went to Colombo. That was good. But the way we have gone about it, the way we have dragged our feet somehow diluted the entire project. All the time over the last 30 years we were thinking in terms of creation of a zone of peace in this area, and we were anxious that some small country, some small State should take the initiative. And the initiative was taken, and then we suddenly developed cold feet.

3 P.M.

As far as security environment is concerned, we have China massed on

our northern borders. Now we have the USSR entrenched firmly in Afghanistan. We have the USA in the Indian Ocean with Diego Garcia being expanded. We have the Gulf conflict at our doors. Our security environment has deteriorated. What have we done about it? The report here in a very plaintive sentence talks about Afghanistan. It says, "The independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and non-aligned status of Afghanistan, a country which is vital to the security, is a direct concern to India." Yes. But what have we done about preserving its sovereignty? What have we done about preserving its territorial integrity? It is not a case of intervention. It is a case of outright occupation. What have we done for preserving its non-aligned status? Today Afghanistan can speak only in His Master's Voice. There is a Government there which sits at the point of the Russian bayonet and has got virtually no control, no following among the people. And it is that Government that we wish to be recognised, if not directly, through the backdoors as the first stage in what is called a political solution. A political solution, if it means this sort of a recognition, will not be acceptable. What we ought to have done... (interruption) Please don't interrupt me. I have got very little time at my disposal. Your Minister is capable of replying to me...

SHRI RAMANAND YADAV (Bihar): I wanted to know...

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: I will tell you outside the House.

Let us promote a dialogue amongst all the political elements in Afghanistan for establishing a regime which is truly nationalist, which is truly patriotic, which is truly representative of all sections of political opinion in Afghanistan. Let us at the same time go out and make efforts building up opinion against this intervention, let us by all means aim at neutralisation of Afghanistan, because I can plainly see, unless Afghanistan is neu-

tral and non-aligned, its dignity and status will always be in danger. But Finlandisation will not be acceptable. No one should have an automatic right of intervention.

Then in the Indian Ocean we seem to have lost all leverage. Everybody is building up bases. We are told in this very report that even the Russians are now building up their naval presence there. Apart from Diego Garcia there are many more bases springing up and in a very short time we will be at a striking distance of these bases. We suffer from an increased naval burden today. We have to look after our security in these conditions.

Colombo Conference does not give me much hope. I think it is not likely to yield much results. I think it is a case of 'NISHISTAND GUFT-AND BARKHASTAND' a repetition of resolutions that we have already passed.

With China there appears to be a little thaw. But shall we cash on it? If the Russians have the encirclement complex, the Chinese have another encirclement complex, and somewhere in between there is a line of hope lying somewhere between our reluctance to be overdependent on one power and the Chinese reluctance to be encircled by a hostile power. Probably between the two, I hope the Foreign Minister can find a way out to improve our flexibility and improve our capacity of having independent options.

In West Asia I know that our Foreign Minister has been very much involved in trying to put an end to the crisis. It is of strategic importance to us. Unless the threat ceases, it is going to develop into a difficult situation. There is already many a thing happening in this part of the world. In this part of the world there is a fundamentalist wave. Do we really understand and appreciate its impact? What does it mean for our future? Does it portend an era of instability? There are a number of ambitious States and there are a number of arti-

ficial States in this part of the world. How do we see the future of this area? And, of course, despite our support to the PLO and to the United Nations on the question of Palestine we find that Israelies are not budging an inch. What are we going to do about it?

On the international economic scene when I look at it, I would only quote the Foreign Minister when he said in the Lok Sabha, "It was gloomy; very, very gloomy". The north-south dialogue is dying or is dead. It was perhaps forgotten after the petro-dollars were duly recycled among the contending States. Foreign aid as a percentage of GNP is going down. The terms, of transfer of technology terms, hardening. Investments in developing countries as a percentage of total investment of developed countries is going down. The terms of trade are also hardening. Our own trade is going down. It is 0.5 per cent of the total world trade. This is something which we should seriously ponder over. Are we making any impact on the conscience of the affluent? I find that protectionism is gaining ground. I find that on the Mexico meeting, it has been said, that they are absolutely certain that not a single step towards progress shall be taken when the leaders meet in Mexico. There shall be no positive results. Where do we go from here? I can only say that as far as the economic postulation is concerned, we have to adopt self-reliance even in matters technical, even in matters nuclear. And there I would like to quote Iqbal when he said:

ए ताईरे लाहुती उस रिजक से मौत अच्छी
जिस रिजक से आती हो परवाज़मे कोताही।

And I would translate it, Mr. Vice-Chairman. "Oh! Eternal bird it is better to die than to live on subsistence which clips your wings and curbs the style of your flight." Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the Foreign Minister must have learnt by now. He is an erudite person—that nonalignment as a policy has its limitations, the UN system has its limitations. The nation-state system has its limitations, and international diplomacy has its

[Shri Syed Shahabuddin]

limitations. Our own perceptions sometimes have to be changed with the change of circumstances. Power has an ideology of its own. It has a logic of its own. And there we should realise: Are we on somebody's priority list or are we not? The Nehru era of glory is behind us. I would sometimes ask myself: Why is it so? I make a general proposition. In the modern world, a diplomacy which is based on deception is bad and a diplomacy which is based on self-deception is still worse. We cannot adopt double standards. Words must mean the same thing. Our moralising posture, our sermonising, sometimes others' words of sycophancy about the great role that we play in the world peace, the pats that we receive from the world leaders, do not bestow any moral authority when we are silent in the face of aggression, when our freedom is being and hiliated, when sovereignty is being extinguished, when integrity of nation is being destroyed when the dignity of the people is being raped. This is a repudiation of the Nehruian heritage. Mr. Vice-Chairman, it is this double-standard which I would like to exemplify. We are against foreign troops on the soil of any country. And the Foreign Minister very truly emphasised the words 'any country'. And yet we accept the USSR's presence in Afghanistan, and we accept Vietnam's presence in Kampuchea, and we accept the Cuban presence in Angola and Ethiopia, and Iraq's presence in Iran. We are for non-alignment. And yet we base our whole perception, international perception on the theory that one of the super powers is a devil incarnate and the other is innocence born today. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, nobody is eternally damned and nobody is eternally innocent. I think, we should be able to take a more balanced view of the world in which we have got to live. We have got to find our place in this scheme of things which is dominated by the super powers which, to my mind, are equally ambitious, which are equally a threat to the dignity of

the third world. We are for the security of Pakistan. But we have offered no help, no assistance, no public guarantees, and yet we object to Pakistan looking after itself getting arms from foreign sources. Even though the supply may take another 2½ years to begin; we orchestrate a deliberate campaign. We are for a zone of peace in the South-East Asia, and we in South Asia in our own part of the world, we drag our feet and we go to Colombo as if we had been forced to the table. We are for co-operation with South-East Asia and yet we completely ignore the sensitivities of the ASEAN nations as far as Kampuchea is concerned. And our dialogue with the ASEAN has come to a full stop. It has not been revived in the last one year. We are for technical co-operation among developing countries and yet we devote a minuscule budget of something over Rs. 8 crores to this exercise. We are against the super power rivalry but we equate military intervention with interference. We equate massive regular presence with, even if one accepts it, clandestine support. We are against arms transfers and we are for disarmament. But we go on building up our own armed strength in relation to a threat as we perceive it. We are for peaceful application of nuclear energy. When we explode a nuclear device, it is peaceful. When somebody else does it, he must have evil intentions. It must be a nuclear bomb. We are for mutual trust and confidence, for creating a climate in which we shall trust each other. But we are not prepared

to trust anyone or put our faith in anybody else's words. This double standard, Mr. Vice-Chairman, explains why we have lost credibility, why our neighbours throughout the sub-continent, whatever they might tell us, whatever the public posture they might adopt, do not believe us. They do not wish to antagonise us but they look at us with suspicion and distrust. We have lost our standing in the U.N. and in the non-aligned world and we feel isolated sometimes and we do not know which way to

turn. I would like India to adopt a policy of trust and adopt moral standards, to adopt a code of ethical conduct, to have a frank and sincere approach. Charity begins at home and we must restore our relationship without neighbours.

I would suggest, as a programme of action, in a few words. A serious dialogue with Pakistan in which we must tell Pakistan frankly that it must abandon its guest of parity. But we must also be prepared to guarantee its right to exist as a nation. We must secure the sub-continent from a nuclear arms race. We should have a dialogue in the region, a serious dialogue for development and co-operation. We must have a dialogue with our Arab friends. It cannot simply be a unilateral traffic. We must find out from them what they are prepared to do for us, to what extent they are prepared to divert their trade and their investment policies to help us. We must have a dialogue with the ASEAN nations. Of course, apart from Japan and the EEC, which are important to us from the economic bilateral angle. We must also have a very clear-cut understanding with the two super powers, to set limits, to what their role in our region is and to what extent are we prepared to tolerate and accept their presence in our area.

Our Foreign Minister, Mr. Vice-Chairman, is a very intelligent and a very thoughtful person. He is subtle, articulate and eloquent. But he must know and I am sure he realises how foreign policy is being made in our country. It is not being made by intelligent, ruthless, dissection of objective reality. But it is being done by play of irrational likes and dislikes, by instinctive reactions and by application of the sixth sense and by a subjective approach. The foreign policy is not an exercise in public relations. It is not showmanship, it is not image projection, it is not a trick, a slight of hand, it is not even academic theorisation. It is what it must be, a process to separate the illusion from rea-

lity and to project the reality in order to build up our prestige. But what I find here is that illusion is being passed on as reality. As Iqbal has said:

खिरा का नाम जूनन रख दिया जूनन
को खिरत जो चाहे आपका हुस्ने करिश्मा
साज कर" ॥

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, as an instrument, the External Affairs Ministry needs to be geared up. It lacks today the sense of direction, sometimes the sense of guidance. It does not yet have a long-term policy frame in which day to day events can be judged, can be put in their place and a satisfactory more can be devised. It has little capacity to mould events or to foresee things. (*Time Bell rings*). It reacts to march of events. It does not make the events. I would like Mr. Vice-Chairman that the administration of the External Affairs Ministry should be strengthened. I would like the Foreign Minister to devote a little more of his time, when he is free from international wanderings, to house keeping jobs. The inter-cadre rivalries must cease. Discrimination against lower cadres must go. It must have an efficient system of training. It must have a policy about language specialisation, about regional specialisation, about the promotions. It must have cadres for various specialised services like interpretation or like research. And this dispersal of the External Affairs functions over a number of Ministries and the slow passage over a period of time of the responsibilities of the External Affairs Ministry to other Departments and Ministries must cease. I would request the hon. Minister about what he has already promised on the floor of the House a number of times, to give us a new Emigration Act and a new Haj Act. There should be a comprehensive view of the total administrative responsibility and the role of our Ministry vis-a-vis each country with which we are concerned and I have named some individually important countries. I would like, therefore, our fragmented Missions, our

ineffective, low-cost Missions should be replaced; if necessary, maybe, we should have lessened number of them but we should have well-staffed and well funded Missions for this purpose. I would, therefore, plead that there should be larger budget for the Ministry of External Affairs and I would expect the activities of the Ministry of External Affairs to be more result-oriented.

SHRI DINESH SINGH (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, having to speak after my friend, Shri Shahabuddin has, by his speeches, in trying to say what I would have normally liked to say or react to what he has already said. Now, resisting the temptation...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): The only thing I find is that so long, we have had *shairi* on the domestic front but Mr. Shahabuddin has, by his speeches, embedded *shairi* on the external front also.

SHRI DINESH SINGH: I shall try myself to keep away from the temptation and to begin what I have been wanting to say. Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, since this is the first occasion when we have an opportunity to discuss the Report of the Ministry of External Affairs, since I have been a Member of this House...

श्री रामानन्द यादव : भाई बैठिये,
बैठिये ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): Please don't interrupt, Mr. Yadav. Mr. Dinesh Singh is a senior Member.

SHRI RAMANAND YADAV: He is running away after making an important speech.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): Please don't interrupt.

SHRI DINESH SINGH: I was saying that since this is the first occasion when we have an opportunity to discuss the report of the Ministry of

External Affairs, at least since I have been a Member of this House, I should like to take this opportunity to compliment the Foreign Minister and through him the personnel of the Ministry of External Affairs for their excellent handling of India's foreign relations despite a very difficult external environment and our own difficulties that we face in the economic field.

Going through the report, I notice that the Policy, Planning and Review Section of the Ministry of External Affairs has been revitalised and is now planning to play an active role. I wholeheartedly welcome this. There has been some kind of reaction or rather resistance to the word 'Policy Planning' in certain quarters and, therefore, I think perhaps it might be more appropriate to name this division as Study and Review Division, rather than Policy Planning. It will take away any kind of adverse reactions that might have been there previously.

The report has also pointed out to the global inflation which has eaten away into the budget of the External Affairs Ministry and they have also mentioned about adjustments that have been made. May I take this opportunity to suggest to the Foreign Minister that, perhaps, time has come when it would be appropriate to have a review of the staff situation in our Missions abroad, keeping in view the role that has to be played by each of them specific objectives would justify the numbers in the Missions. It is the quality of the tool with which they are enabled to do their job which will finally produce results and not the numbers. Therefore, we have to look at the picture again, decide our priorities, decide the specific objectives within a time frame and then plan the staff in our Missions and give them necessary financial support that is required to conduct foreign relations. I would also say that in the economy measure, we should think more in terms of regional expertise, cutting out unnecessary and sometimes rather undesirable transfers that are

made today so that there should be greater saving and a more specific use of the limited money we have. One of the points on which I may agree with Shri Shahabuddin is that the Ministry of External Affairs does require a larger financial support to undertake the responsibilities that have now been entrusted to it with the growing number of independent countries and growing numbers of the non-aligned countries.

Now, coming to the world situation, the world is so large and the time at my disposal is so brief that I would wish to confine myself only to India's immediate environmental situation and try not to digress into the wide field since this has already been covered by my hon. friend, Mr. Bipinpal Das. Now, Sir, on the last occasion when we had discussed foreign relations in this House, I had, with due respect, pointed out that we were drifting into a very rapidly deteriorating international situation and also that a new cold war emerging. I emphasised the word 'new' as distinct from the former cold war which emerged at the end of the last World War. It is a matter of regret, Sir, that this cold war has now descended even into our backyard and we see that the entire surroundings around us is now in a new garb altogether. What are the noticeable features of this new situation? First of all, the two Super Powers are not likely to get into a direct confrontation with one another. Secondly, their confrontation in Europe is at a very low key. Even the difficulties which emerged in Poland were consciously kept within the bounds of tolerance by both the sides. Hence, we see that the new cold war has its centre in South Asia extending both to West Asia and to East Asia as well as to Africa, but primarily, this cold war is engulfing the Indian Ocean and South Asia. As such, it creates an entirely new strategic environment for us. We must grasp this reality and see what should be done. The

other day I happened to glance through a magazine called 'Asian Survey' in which I read an article by one Mr. Thomas Robinson on 'Soviet Union and Asia in 1980' and I would, with your permission, give a brief quotation from that. I quote:

"The issue with the Soviets in Asia during the 1965-1979 period was: would Moscow be able to mobilise on the potential provided by its ever growing military and economic strength to become an Asian power of consequence. By 1980, the Soviet Union had well-established itself in all regions of Asia and has thus become an indigenously Asian power of consequence."

Therefore, the United States, and its academicians look at the Soviet Union in a new situation in Asia—as a new Asian power—and it is this they are unwilling to accept. Now, their assessment of what the Soviet Union is likely to do is rather vague. They say:

"First, a number of trends will culminate in the next few years to require Kremlin to make difficult choices among competing domestic and foreign priorities. Asia will remain down the list of its foreign policy priorities constantly overshadowed by problems of ruling Eastern Europe, managing the military standoff with NATO, competing for influence and resources in the Middle-East and maintaining an uneasy and expansive strategic arms balance with the U.S.A."

[The Vice-Chairman (Shri Arvind Ganesh Kulkarani) in the Chair]

Then, they say:

"On the other hand, a second domestic trend will serve more and more to involve the Soviet Union in Asian affairs as a matter of national interest and right."

Now, their own assessment, by Mr. Fred Green, of 'U.S. in Asia in 1980' is not very complimentary. Accord-

ing to them, the United States has been unable to follow a coherent overall strategy for Asia in 1980. Therefore, they are now trying to evolve, as could be said according to them, a new coherent policy for the United States in Asia. Now this would be built firstly around a ring of strategic alliances; secondly, to develop superior military capability in the Indian Ocean and, thirdly, on a triangular U.S., China and Japan relationship against heightened Soviet threat. Therefore, you will see, Mr. Vice-Chairman, the entire confrontation for the time being has shifted into this theatre. It would be wrong, as is being tried to point out that it is the Soviet entry into Afghanistan which has brought the U.S. fleet into the Indian Ocean. The U.S. had interest in the Indian Ocean much before the Soviet troops went into Afghanistan. The Diego Garcia base and the entire movement of the U.S. fleet had taken place before the Soviet Union took any action in this part of the world. So, there is now an attempt to evolve a new strategy in which the U.S. must play a dominant role here. Now, Sir, all this poses a great danger to our own way of thinking in this part of the world. What we have been planning was to have this area covered by all the countries joining the non-aligned movement. Our idea was that we would have a peaceful cooperation in this area amongst all the countries of this region. Then we were hoping that the Indian Ocean would develop as a zone of peace and that, eventually, an Asian personality would emerge. Unfortunately, all these ideas now are at stake and there is a danger that all our hopes in this direction may be lost, unless we can play a role to bring about some kind of an understanding between the super powers to give up confrontation in this area and to attempt some kind of a understanding and balance which could be guaranteed only by making this area a zone of peace and not an area of confrontations. Now from our point

of view it is necessary that we must attempt to restore peace and peaceful development in this area. And that can be done in my view (a) by encouraging South-Asian cooperation. This is necessary for us not only because it demilitarises this area, that it builds up as a area of peace, but also because we have far-flung frontiers bordering several countries and it would be in our interest, as in their interest, to promote peaceful cooperation so that any suspicions that may have been there in the past are totally removed and that we build up new areas of active cooperation. Now my idea of South Asian cooperation is not limited merely to Nepal and the former British Empire. I would say that the South-Asian cooperation should extend also to Iran and to Afghanistan so that this Organisation becomes a link between the Arab League in the West and ASEAN in the east, so that this entire region is then in a position to seek closer cooperation with other regions, with other countries.

I would wish to take this opportunity to congratulate President Ziaur-Rehman of Bangladesh for taking the initiative in suggesting South-Asian cooperation, the King of Nepal who has taken active interest in it and, of course, the Government of Sri Lanka which has held the first meeting at the level of Foreign Secretaries in Colombo only the other day. I hope that this cooperation will lead to close identity of interest amongst the countries in this region and that it will lead to active cooperation, both economic, cultural and even political. It will help to lessen the tension that may otherwise be sought to be built up in this area.

The situation in West Asia is something which affects us directly because it has an over-flow into the South Asian region. It is well recognised now that the interest of certain countries outside the region in oil is so great that they would be

willing and are prepared to intervene in this area not only politically but also militarily. It is, therefore, in our interest and in the interest of peace as a whole that we try to defuse the situation that is building up there and also see whether some kind of a negotiated arrangement could emerge on oil. The whole problem today is linked with oil. Oil is the wealth of the West Asian countries and yet it is also their course. Therefore, if we could think of some way in which the oil is equitably shared by an international agreement, perhaps under the auspices of the United Nations, we could think in terms of lessening tension in this area.

The survey of South Asia would not be complete, nor would our approach towards it be complete without discussing our relations with China and Pakistan which form an integral part of our external relations. The course of India-China relations is well known to the Members of the House and I need not go into its history. What is encouraging is to see that the Chinese Government is willing to send its Foreign Minister to India and that he is likely to come here in June. I hope that this opportunity will be taken—and I have no doubt that it will be taken by the Foreign Minister to have a frank and detailed discussion with the Foreign Minister of China and to thrash out all the problems that may exist between the two countries. I would only suggest that we should not shy away from discussing even the most difficult problem that may exist between the two countries. I would, therefore, say that although there is no dispute on the border between China and India—it is well recognised, it is historically known and it is understood over centuries—yet if the Chinese wish to discuss this issue, we should have no objection. My suggestion would be that we discuss this question with them informally—may be in due course formally if they so wish—stating our position that so far as we are

concerned the border is perfectly delineated, understood and known and we would be willing to discuss it in three parts—border in the north-west, border in the centre and border in the east—so that the Chinese have no excuse to say that we have been avoiding discussing any matter. I have no doubt that the Chinese too now realise that it is to their advantage, as in our advantage, to try to defuse the situation which, unfortunately, they had built up themselves and if one could give credence to what has appeared in the newspapers on the rather controvertial visit of Mr. Subramaniam Swamy, to which references have been made, I think that the Chinese feel that one could think of making a new beginning and, therefore, we could make a new beginning without any reservation. After all our position is strong and well-known. We need have no fear in discussing it again, as we have discussed it in the past.

Coming to Pakistan, Mr. Vice-Chairman, history is a record that we have harboured no ill-will towards Pakistan. Pakistan was established by a division of this country and yet we cheerfully accepted it, despite the hardships and sufferings it brought to millions of people who had to be uprooted and had to come here. Again, despite several wars and differences on many issues, the Prime Minister has extended a hand of friendship to Pakistan. The Simla Agreement itself is concrete proof of India's willingness and India's desire to strengthen relations with Pakistan and to work out a co-operative attitude between the two countries. (*Time-bell rings*).

Now I also accept, Sir, that every country has a right to make an assessment of its defence requirements and also to seek arms from wherever it can obtain, but I would say that in a situation in which certain suspicion exists—and there has been a past record, not too happy nor very appropriate in terms of military

(Shri Dinesh Singh)

build-up—it would be desirable to try to have some kind of an understanding before Pakistan acquires large military supplies, particularly because there is some doubt about its requirements. I do not know, Mr. Vice-Chairman, whether you had an opportunity to go through an interview given by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan to our newspaper, *The Hindu*, but in this he has made certain rather interesting revelations. You are pressing the bell all the time and therefore I am hesitant to make any quotations from it. But I would wish to point out that he has said very clearly in this—and I quote:

“Because we have no intention of going to war with India under any circumstances. Use of force is ruled out by the Simla agreement. Even the status quo in Kashmir is not to be disturbed by military means. We have eschewed the use of force.”

If that is the situation, one wonders what this arms build up is necessary for. What does it really mean? Then one may say, all right, may be it is in relation to the Soviet Union, and here again the Foreign Minister, to a very specific question that was asked—and the question was—“Do you seriously believe you would be able to counter the overwhelming military capability, the power, the deployment of the Soviet Union?” replied “We don’t believe that the Soviet Union will launch a massive military attack against Pakistan.” Therefore, what is all this build up for?

Then we look at the international situation. The United States is wanting to have a ring of strategic arrangements in south-west and south-east Asia. Is Pakistan to be a part of it? The statement given by the President of Pakistan was also rather dubious when he said, before we can pass on arms to Afghanistan, Pakistan must be built up militarily.

Is it the case of Pakistan that it wishes to be a client state of the United States? Would the freedom-loving people of Pakistan accept such a position? Would they wish again to be in a position in which the United States becomes the prime mover in Pakistan? What would it lead to? Why are we showing concern? The Prime Minister has very rightly pointed out in a statement that she has made to the press or said in a press interview, “Arms aid is far more dangerous to Pakistan itself than it is to us.” What does it mean? Large supplies of arms unrelated to one’s defence requirements will only destabilise the State. We have seen it in Iran; we have seen it in other countries where the United States has given arms.

Then, Sir, we had a visitor, the very charming and distinguished lady from the United Kingdom. She came all the way here, we had hoped, to strengthen bilateral relations between the United Kingdom and India, particularly in view of the deteriorating situation in the wake of the new Nationality Act they are bringing on citizenship. Instead of that, she supports, here, the United States’ arms supply to Pakistan. Where was the necessity to do so? It was not a bilateral issue. Britain was not supplying arms to Pakistan. Why did she have to bring it in? And then, one’s mind goes back to the past, even before partition, to the British playing the role of divide and rule. Is that a continuing role? Do they wish to divide India and Pakistan again from trying to come closer together? Is that a joint effort between the United States and the United Kingdom?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI): May I request you to conclude?

SHRI DINESH SINGH: Sir, I appreciate your difficulty. I am trying

to save time so that you and I don't discuss about the time allotted to me. Now I shall finish very quickly.

All I would say is that the strategic environment as well as the build-up around us is rather unfortunate. It is, to a large degree, going to affect our own development, our own efforts for building up co-operation in this area. And I would, therefore, urge the Foreign Minister to face this situation with renewed vigour. We have to pursue our policy firmly. We must work for the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. We must work for strengthening the non-alignment movement. We must work towards dismantling of any kind of bases that may be sought to be built up in this area. And in this situation I would say that what is of paramount importance is our relations with the two Super Powers. Our relations with the Soviet Union have historically been proved in difficult times. There is no question of a doubt. I do not think anybody in the House could question the need to further strengthening our relations with the Soviet Union and to use those relations for peace and for trying to de-escalate the build-up in this area. To that extent, it is necessary to acquire a new understanding with the new Administration in the United States so that there would be no suspicion about our desire for friendship with them as well as about our desire to try to build this area as an area of peace and co-operation.

Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman.

श्री प्रकाश मेहरोत्रा (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, पिछले एक डेढ़ वर्ष से अन्तराष्ट्रीय स्थिति दिन-प्रति-दिन बिगड़ती जा रही है। देशों की नीति समाप्त कर सुपर पावरज आर्म्स रेस की 'तरफ अग्रसर' हो रही हैं। पोस थ्र स्ट्रेन्थ' फिर यहीं स्लोली वापिस आ गया है। ताकत का मद और भूत सिर पर चढ़ कर खोजने लगा है। मान्यवर सुपर पावरज

की नीति हो गई है कि लड़ाई अपनी जमीन पर नहीं बल्कि डेवलपिंग कंट्रीज की जमीन पर लड़नी चाहिए। ग्लोब डेवलपिंग मुल्क शतरंज के खेल के प्यादे हो रहे हैं। इस कोल्ड वार के काले बादल हमारे रोजन में आ गए हैं। मान्यवर, वास्तविकता यह है कि इस रोजन में तनाव का विशेष कारण मिडल ईस्ट में आयल है। अमरीका ऐसा समझता है कि सोवियत यूनियन शनैः शनैः उस तरफ बढ़ रहा है और आगे चल कर गल्फों का आयल रूट जो है वह वेस्ट के लिए बन्द हो जाएगा इसलिए वे समझते हैं कि आर्म्स रेस उनके लिए हितकर है। उनकी नीति है कि सोवियत यूनियन को चारों तरफ से घेर लेना चाहिए। निक्सन की यही पालिसी थी और इसीलिए उन्होंने यू० एस० ए०, जापान और चाइना का अलायंस बनाया हुआ था। वेल्टर्न यूरोप की यही चाहता है कि हमको वह रशिया से आइसोलेट कर दे। मान्यवर दुर्भाग्य से हमारे यहां भी कई ऐसे तत्व हैं जो इस नीति का समर्थन करते हैं और अगर आप गहराई से देखें तो शुब्रामणियम स्वामी जो पहले पीकिंग उसके बाद जापान और उसके बाद वाशिंगटन गए तो वे भी इस नीति के समर्थक हैं। इसलिए उनका यह ट्रिप हुआ। मान्यवर इस नीति के आधार पर आज पाकिस्तान को सोफिस्टिकेटेड वेपन्स से लैस करने का काम शुरू किया गया है। आज वस्तुतः स्थित यह है कि पाकिस्तान की मिलिटरी सरकार को वहां की जनता का समर्थन प्राप्त नहीं है। और एक बात यह साफ है कि कोई भी देश हो वह यह समझे कि पाकिस्तान को हथ हथियार देकर और इस लायक कर लेंगे कि वह पाकिस्तान रशिया से लड़ने के लिए समर्थ हो जायेगा तो वे भ्रम में हैं। मान्यवर बुनियादी चीज क्या है? बुनियादी चीज है कि पाकिस्तान को इकनामिकली जब तक वे डेवलप नहीं करेंगे तब तक

वहां इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर तैयार नहीं होगा। केवल आर्म्स सप्लाई कर देने से पाकिस्तान ताकतवर नहीं हो जायेगा और मुझे तो शंका है ऐसा लगता है कि ये आर्म्स जो हैं कहीं ऐसा न हो कि जब वहां पापूलर अपगर्डीजिंग हो तो उस देश के लोगों के खिलाफ उन आर्म्स का इस्तेमाल हो। वहां जैसे पहले भी हो चुका है कि ये आर्म्स हमारे खिलाफ इस्तेमाल किये जायें। मान्यवर इसीलिए हमारी सरकार ने शिमला एग्रीमेंट कर जो मैत्री की भावना शुरू की थी, और बुनियाद पाकिस्तान से डाली, थी मैं समझता हूं कि वही सही रास्ता है और उसी में हमारा और पाकिस्तान दोनों देशों का कल्याण है। मान्यवर, एक तरफ तो पाकिस्तान की यह स्थिति है और दूसरी तरफ चीन जिसने कि हजारों वर्ग मील की हमारी जमीन वर्षों से दबाई हुई है और पूरे बार्ड पर पक्की सड़क उसने बना ली है और आर्म्स का कन्सट्रक्शन पूरे हिस्से में ईस्ट से वेस्ट तक कर लिया है। दूसरे गुरिल्ला जो हैं वे चीन से ट्रेनिंग पाते हैं और हमारे नार्थ ईस्टर्न सेक्टर में भेजे जा रहे हैं। उसका पाकिस्तान से मिलिटरी तालमेल है और न केवल चीन पाकिस्तान को आर्म्स सप्लाई कर रहा है बल्कि वहां मिलिटरी परसोनेल को भी ट्रेन कर रहा है आज उस चाईना की तन्फ दोस्ती का हाथ बढ़ाया जा रहा है। मान्यवर हमें उसे ठुकराना नहीं है शांति का वातावरण तो हमको पैदा ही करना है किन्तु एक बात को ध्यान में अवश्य रखना चाहिए कि चाईना भी चाइना, यू० एस० ए० और पाकिस्तान के मिलिटरी एलायंस का एक मेम्बर है और उनका एक अभिप्राय यह भी हो सकता है कि इस कदम को उठाकर के हमको बे सोवियत यूनियन से आईसोलेट करना चाहते हैं। इसलिए चाइना से जो भी बात करें उसमें सोच समझकर इस चीज को ध्यान में रखकर बात करनी चाहिये।

मान्यवर, यह तस्वीर तो हमारे उत्तर भारत की है अब एक नजर हिन्द महासागर को देखें। हिन्द महासागर सुपर पावर राइक्लरी का एक अड़्डा बन गया है एक तरफ तो अमुरिका दो बिलियन डालर खर्च कर रहा है दियोगे रशिया के अड़्डे को मचबूत करने के लिए, वहां रनवे बढ़ाये जा रहे हैं वहां करीब एक लाख आदमो डिप्लाय करने की फैसिलिटी की जा रही है और साथ ही साथ वहां न्यूक्लीयर कैपी-बिलिटी जो है वह डेवलप की जा रही है और उन्ही के साथ ब्रिटेन, फ्रांस और आस्ट्रेलिया के फ्लीट्स भी इंडियन ओशन में काफी मात्रा में हैं और इस दौड़ में रशिया भी पीछे नहीं है। जापान से लेकर अफ्रीका तक हिन्द महासागर के हिस्से में रशिया के फ्लीट्स भी हैं। इसलिए जो अभी हाल में कोलम्बो कान्फ्रेंस इंडियन ओशन फार जोन आफ पीस के लिए होने वाली है उसका बहुत महत्व है और हम आपसे निवेदन करेंगे कि हमको इसमें पहल बरानी चाहिए। क्योंकि इसको सकसीड करना नितांत आवश्यक है।

मान्यवर, आज जो स्थिति है उस स्थिती में हमारी जो नान एलाईनमेंट की पालिसी है उसका बड़ा रिलेवेंस है। हम न तो कपिटलिस्ट आइडियालाजी को सक्सक्राईब करते हैं और न कम्युनिस्ट आइडियालाजी को, हमको इस कोल्ड वार से दूर रहना चाहिए, नान एलाइड मुल्कों को सुपर पावर्स का टूल नहीं बनाना चाहिए और आपस में झगड़ा नहीं करना चाहिए जिस तरीके से ईरान और ईरान का कान्फिलिट चल रहा है। इस संबंध में मान्यवर, हमारी प्रधान मंत्री और हमारे विदेश मंत्री का एक बहुत महत्वपूर्ण योगदान रहा है क्योंकि प्राफेड्स आफ द ड्रम का यह कहना है कि हमारी जोयन्तन एलाईन्मेंट कान्फ्रेंस दिल्ली में हुई वह सकसीड नहीं करेगी और नान एलाइड मूवमेंट यही टूट जायेगा। लेकिन जिस सूझ-

बूझ और समझदारी से हमारे विदेश मंत्री ने काम लिया, उसका नतीजा यह हुआ कि नान-एलाइंड नेशन टूटने की बात तो छोड़ दी जाए, एक अण्डरस्टैंडिंग बढ़ी है और न केवल ईरान और ईराक कनफ्लिक्ट में यह चार नान-एलाइंड नेशंस के देशों ने जो एक कमेटी बनाई और एक ठोस कदम उठाया, उससे काफी हद तक इस तरफ हम लोग पहुंचे हैं कि लड़ाई जो है, उसको खत्म किया जा सके और मेरा विश्वास है कि अगर चार नान-एलाइंड नेशंस लगे रहे, तो हाल ही में यह मसला हल हो जाएगा।

मान्यवर, नान-एलाइंड नेशन का जो मूवमेंट है, उसका अभिप्राय केवल यही नहीं है कि आप दो सुपर-पावरों से ईक्वी-डिस्टेंस रहे, बल्कि शांति की स्थापना के लिए आपका एकमात्रा टिव रोल होना चाहिए।

डिवेलपिंग कण्ट्रीज को एक नये इमरामिक आर्डर को कायम करने की आवश्यकता है क्योंकि—भूखे भजन न होए गोपाला। मान्यवर, एक वीक नान-एलाइंड मूवमेंट का कोई मीनिंग नहीं होता है। आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि हमें केवल एंड नहीं चाहिए, बल्कि आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि हमारे जो प्राइवेट्स हैं, उनकी हमको फेयर प्राइस मिलनी चाहिए। आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि डिवेलपिंग कण्ट्रीज टूटकर आफ टेंकालोजी होनी चाहिए। इसके लिए डिवेलपिंग कण्ट्रीज तैयार नहीं हैं। आज इसीलिए नार्थ-साउथ डायलाग जो है, वह फेल हो गया है। आज डिवेलपिंग मुल्कों को एक कलक्टिव सेल्फइं रिलास को डिवेलप करने की आवश्यकता है, जो हम कर सकते हैं। ओपेक कण्ट्रीज के पास पेट्रो-डालर्स हैं, अफ्रीकन कण्ट्रीज के पास इमन्स इण्डस्ट्रियल रिसोर्सिज हैं और हमारे पास टेक्नालोजी और मन-पावर है। (समय की घटी)

मुझे पूरा विश्वास है कि अगर हम सब डिवेलपिंग कण्ट्रीज मिल करके प्रयत्न करें, तो हम भी अपने को डिवेलप कर सकते हैं, और

उस हद तक आ सकते हैं जिस हद तक डिवेलपिंग कण्ट्रीज हैं।

मान्यवर, सुपर-पावरों को तो आर्म्स-रेस से उनकी इकानोमी को फायदा होता है, वहां एम्प्लायमेंट बढ़ती है, प्रोडक्शन बढ़ता है, एक्सपोर्ट बढ़ती है, लेकिन जो डिवेलपिंग कण्ट्रीज हैं, आर्म्स रेस से उनकी इकानोमी शटर हो जाती है क्योंकि जो डिवेलपमेंट में पैसा लगना चाहिए—लिमिटेड रिसोर्सिज हमारे पास हैं, उसको न लगा करके हमको आर्म्स-रेस में फंसना पड़ता है। उससे हमारी इकानोमी खराब होती है। इसलिए टोटल डिस्आर्म्मेंट जो है—अंडर दी सुपरविजन आफ यूनाइटेड नेशंस कौन्सिल हमको इनिशियेट करना चाहिए और यही कारण है कि 1962 में जो लिमिटेड नान-प्रालिक्नेशन ट्रीटी पास हुई, वह 1957 में हम लोगों ने जो इनिशिएटिव लिया था, उसी के फलस्वरूप यह ट्रीटी हुई थी। आज हमें फिर इस इनिशिएटिव और लीडरशिप को अपने हाथ में लेना चाहिए।

देश के हित को ध्यान में रखते हुए रीजनल कोऑपरेशन को बढ़ावा चाहिए, आस-पड़ोस के जो देश हैं, उनसे अपने संबंधों को अच्छा करना चाहिए, ऐसा नहीं जैसे कि जर्मनी पार्टी ने किया कि बंगला देश के साथ जो एग्रीमेंट हुआ, उसका नतीजा यह हुआ कि कलक्ता पोर्ट हमारा ड्राई अप हो गया। तो अपने इंटरेस्ट को ध्यान में रखते हुए, उसको सब से ऊपर रखते हुए हमको आसपास के मुल्कों से संबंध जोड़ने चाहिए।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI):
Please conclude now.

श्री प्रकाश मेहरोत्रा: मैं एक-दो मिनट और लूंगा। मान्यवर, शांति प्रयास के साथ ही साथ हमें अपनी डिफेंस को भी मजबूत करना चाहिए। हमको अपनी स्ट्राइकिंग पावर को भी बढ़ाना चाहिए।

मान्यवर, हमारे साथ जिसने पास्ट में हमारा साथ दिया, जो हमारे मित्र है, हम उसके आभारी हैं और उसकी मित्रता जो है, हम सदैव वेल्यू करेंगे। लेकिन हमको क्रैटामिक एनर्जी की तरफ भी प्रयास करना चाहिए।

एक तरफ तो पाकिस्तान में नए साफिस्टिकेटेड वेपन्स और प्लेन्स दिए जा रहे हैं दूसरी तरफ हम आऊट-डेटेड, आऊटमोडेड जगुआर प्लेन्स बनाने जा रहे हैं, और जिस वक्त मान्यवर, ये प्लेन्स बन कर तयार हो जाएंगे सऊदों-करोड़ रुपयों पर पानी फिर जाएगा क्योंकि ये प्लेन्स उस वक्त तक एक्सोलेट हो जाएंगे। तो मेरा निवेदन है—मैंने इस विषय को सदन में पहले भी उठाया था—कि जगुआर डील को हमें रद्द कर देना चाहिए।

इसी तरह से तारापुर के लिए जो एन-फ्युअल था उसके लिए एक तरफ तो अमरीका हमको एन-फ्युअल देने के लिए बात करता है, सेफगार्ड की नान् प्रालिफरेशन ट्रीटी की बात करता है और दूसरे तरफ पाकिस्तान को, जो एटम बम बनाने जा रहा है, उसके लिए नान् प्रालिफरेशन ला को अमेंड करना चाह रहा है और जो दो-तीन साल से आर्म्स एंड पाकिस्तान को देना बंद कर दिया था, फिर से उसको रिज्यूम करने जा रहा है। तो आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि हम अपने इंडिजिनिस् फ्युअल को डेवलप करें। हमें खुशी है कि अभी-अभी कल के अखबार में समाचार आया था कि हमने अपने आल्टरनेटिव्ह इंडिजिनिस् फ्युअल को सक्सेसफुली तयार कर लिया है और अब अमरीका हम को फ्युअल नहीं दे रहा है तो हम को भी अपने साधन से उसको

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री अरविन्द गणेश कुलकर्णी) : क्वेन्ड कीजिए।

श्री प्रकाश मेहरोत्रा : डेवलप करना चाहिए। मैं क्वेन्ड कर रहा हूँ।

मान्यवर, हमारी फारेन पालिसी जो होनी चाहिए उसकी दिशा सही है लेकिन उस में जो डाएनेमिज्म होना चाहिए वह लैगिंग है। मुझे आशा और विश्वास है कि हमारे माननीय विदेश मंत्री

के नेतृत्व और निर्देश में हम न केवल शांति की तरफ अग्रसित होंगे बल्कि फिर से इंटरनेशनल अफेयर्स में हमारी लीडरशिप ऊंची होगी।

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): Mr. Vice-Chairman, the task is a bit difficult because one has to ward against repetitions. A lot of things have been said by a number of my colleagues. We like to think, I personally like to think, that we specialise in the overview, the broad overall context of things. Before coming to that I would make two or three nuts and bolts kind of submissions to the honourable Minister....

The Vice Chairman (Shri Bishambhar Nath Pande) in the Chair.

because, once those are disposed of, then I can enter the realm of romanticism.

The first, in the Budget Estimates on page 16, against Indian Society of International Law there was a budgeted estimate of Rs. 2 lakhs. In the Revised Estimates that has gone up to Rs. 52 lakhs, an increase of Rs. 50 lakhs of non-Plan expenditure on an organisation which is mainly an assisted organisation. If honourable Minister could kindly inform me as to what this increase of Rs. 50 lakhs is about?

Secondly, I would like to make a submission about the appalling conditions in which our missions abroad are functioning. Periodically, there are 'letters to the editor'; periodically, when one has the good fortune to travel, one comes across the poor denizens of these organisations, who are extremely poorly paid, and therefore, as a consequence, are extremely inefficient and do not really represent us either effectively or efficiently. What is the Government's thinking as far as our missions abroad are concerned?

I do not know whether it is proper and just for me to bring up the third matter which I have written to the honourable Minister about. That re-

lates to the question of voting rights for overseas Indians. I hope the honourable Minister will forgive me. I wrote to the Minister some months ago on this subject and since then I have had the temerity to remind him about it. I haven't yet had a response from him. Perhaps the Minister would clarify the Government's thinking on that subject. That however, does not preclude my right to receive an answer.

Now coming to the overview of the international situation. Current history is moving with a terrifying velocity. In the last two years or go, we have seen some unique 4 p.m. situations developing—a unique kind of a revolution' which took place in Iran, we have had the Chinese adventure in Vietnam, the Vietnamese occupation of Kampuchea, the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan. I use these words on deliberate purpose. We have had the deterioration and turmoil in the Arab world, leading to the situation of Iran-Iraq conflict. Currently, we are witnessing the situation of enhanced arms assistance to Pakistan. And with all this, it is not unnatural to wonder as to where, in this complex international situation, do India's national interests fit in. I wrote a little something on this and now therefore, I choose to quote it. This is my own. "India's national interests transcend contending political ideology and transitory regimes in Delhi. Our national concerns cannot be limited in their vision. India is more than a country. We are a civilization. What has to be preserved is not merely our territorial integrity, it is our history, our culture, and our philosophy which have to be preserved. The preservation of the Indian ethos is a civilisational concept and concern". Normally there would not be any dispute on this; normally there would not be any worry on this particular aspect of India's national interest. There is, however, worry and there is concern. The time

available is the limiting factor." I cannot have a serious half-an-hour discussion on what I have to put across about all this. To continue however, in the realm of foreign policy, there ought not to be any such thing as a subjective perception. There can only be an objective, national perception. I think, the single biggest shortcoming, failing that I as a concerned citizen, feel is eminently put across by two diametrically opposed thinkers, both pre-eminent in their field, which is that of foreign policy, both architects of the foreign policies of their respective countries. I would name them, Sir, and with your permission, I would make two or three short quotations from—what they talk about the national interests and the structuring of foreign policy. One, Sir, is a quotation from George F. Kennan from 'the Clouds of Danger'. In his own fashion, George F. Kennan was the architect, at a certain period of the US history, of its foreign policy. Let me quote:

"One of the first requirements of clear thinking about our part in world affairs is the recognition that we cannot be more to others than we are to ourselves—that we cannot be a source of hope and inspiration to others against a background of resigned failure and deterioration of life here at home. And therein lies a lesson which many people in our country have been slow to learn; namely that foreign policy, like a great many other things, begins at home—that the first requirement of a successful foreign policy is that one places oneself in a favourable posture for its conduct. This means, of course, designing and shaping one's society consciously to this end. And this in turn means, bearing in mind, as one approaches domestic problems, the effect on foreign affairs of those decisions one has to make."

And diametrically opposed but equally important, nearer home—and I would make bold to quote—is from Mr. Haksar. He says:

These diametrically opposed but equally responsible and effective exponents of the foreign policy of their respective countries, are saying the same thing. Now to "non-aligned". The centre of gravity of our postures in the world, is non-alignment, as a perception, this concept of non-alignment. Time is a limiting factor again. The origins of non-alignment lay in an assertion of national independence. Most nations are by and large free to do what they wish to do within the country. It is largely in the field of external affairs foreign policy, that a nation is able to assert its independence. Much has been made about the recent Non-aligned Conference. I do not wish to sound pessimistic. I am appreciative of what the hon. Minister did and what the Ministry did and what the Government did to ensure the so-called success of the Non-Aligned Conference. Now, the success of the Non-Aligned Conference, to my mind, in my perception, was the reawakening of the 'soul' of non-alignment, was the correction of the Havana doctrine that the socialist block was a naturally of the non-alignment. This correction of that tilt, this re-awakening of the 'soul'.

was, to my mind, the true measure of the success of the Non-Aligned Conference that was recently held in Delhi. Now, if that be the true measure, then I think the Government singularly failed because in the original draft circulated by the Government substantial and substantive amendments carried out were subsequently. They are themselves indicators of how far removed as a nation, as a country, we are from the rest of the non-aligned. As a concerned citizen, one has to sit up and take note that the original draft circulated by the Government of India as the host country and asserted as a consensus draft was not so, because if it was a consensus draft then why were so many and such substantive amendments were carried to it? That in itself makes one think that our non-alignment has been eroded. We have eroded non-alignment. We have given it a tilt. The basis of non-alignment, as I started by saying, is the assertion of national independence, rejection there is any super-power exclusivity in the giving of direction to world events. I would willingly and wholly subscribe to it. There is no infallibility in the perceptions of the super powers as far as world events are concerned. With great deal of regret one has to observe that for the first time in 34 years the Government and the head of the Government have taken upon themselves the role of being the interpreters of the strategic perceptions of a super power. India is now appearing to be an spologist for what the Soviet Union does or does not do. It is not the Government of India's function to interpret for the rest of the world or for the non-aligned as to what the Soviet Union's strategic perceptions are. Rightly, Sir, there is a chapter on the USSR and a chapter on Afghanistan. Whereas, the report quite correctly observes that Afghanistan is vital to India's security, yet the whole chapter on Afghanistan is silent on Soviet intervention in Afghanistan. We tend to think that non-alignment is equal to drafting ability. We tend to think that non-alignment is obfuscation.

This is a very well-prepared report. I do not wish to be rude to the officials of the Ministry of External Affairs; they have put in lot of efforts in it. But if one wanted an example of obfuscation, this report is an example. Soviet Union can intervene, Americans only interfere, by playing with words, by obfuscating.

The other day, the Right Hon'ble Callaghan comes and he makes a comment that India's role was 'conciliatory.' We feel as if a compliment has been paid to us. I do not think non-alignment is equal to conciliation, or non-alignment is obfuscation or non-alignment is merely drafting power, or that non-alignment is to be interpreted for the strategic perceptions of any super power, be it the Soviet Union, or the United States. There is the question of Soviet occupation of Afghanistan which to my mind is like a strategic watershed. I would submit to the hon. Minister to recognise the latent danger which exists. The Soviet Union now occupies the Wakhan corridor as if it was Soviet territory and by occupying Afghanistan and Wakhan corridor, we are creating a situation wherein Soviet Union has the potential in Afghanistan, to destabilise adjoining sensitive borders. There is currently a joke which goes around. Whenever one requires to know, as to what the initiative of the External Affairs Minister is in the international affairs, one is informed that the hon. Minister has gone to Iran and Iraq. This is not to belittle the hon. Minister's effort to settle their problem. However, in the overall picture, in the overall perceptions, what is important to us as a nation, is this question of re-emphasising the relevance of non-alignment. I think in the 1980's if non-alignment has to be re-emphasised, we have to do two things. Firstly, we have to work out and establish an intelligent and a viable regional detente; secondly, we have to, within the non-aligned, work out a system of settling bilateral disputes. One would be repetitious if one went to the

question of how we have damaged our own stance by doing what we did on the question of Kampuchea or Afghanistan. How much time have I left

मेरा और कितना वक्त है।

उत्तमाश्रय (श्री विश्वम्भर नाथ पांडे)

आपका समय तो पूरा हो गया।

श्री जसवंत सिंह: मुझे दो मिनट का वक्त दे दीजिये।

उत्तमाश्रय (श्री विश्वम्भर नाथ पांडे)

आप दो मिनट का समय जरूर ले लें।

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I am grateful to you. I think I will have to skip a lot of other things. So, we have to recognise that there is an ominous similarity between the Soviet occupation in Afghanistan and the Reagan doctrine of El Salvador and in that ominous similarity is the rejection of the theme of super powers' sphere of influences. If we have to give non-alignment a new relevance for 1980's along with what I submitted about regional detente, about bilateral arrangements for settling disputes, we have to recognise that we have to boldly assert that there is a similarity. I do not think Diego Garcia or the air bases alone matters we have to recognise that the Soviet Union attempted to purchase Diego Guarez; we have to recognise that thirty years ago, there was the Soviet treaty with Egypt and that Cuban troops are today present not only in Angola but in Ethiopia, so much nearer home This is another manifestation. The Cuban troops in Ethiopia and the Reagan doctrine for El Salvador are ominously similar. They are the same manifestations of a super powers mentality which feels that there is an exclusivity or infallibility in their control of

world events. We must reject this. We have rejected bipolarity. We have rejected spheres of influence. If we want to acquire relevance as a non-aligned country, we must not only be non-aligned. It is no good my asserting that I am non-aligned. I must be recognised as non-aligned and I shall be recognised so only if my conduct is such and this recognition of the relevance of non-alignment is without doubt there, but we have to stand up and say so courageously and effectively. It is this litmus paper test which gives an independent nation the ability to say what it wishes to say in international forums. I submit to you with all humility. I do not have the access to information that you have. Admittedly, my perceptions are subjective in the sense that I make them. But I try and give them objectivity. I submit to you, Sir. Grant this. Consider what I have said with seriousness. India, as I said, is not a small country. She is a civilisational concept. We are not apologists for one power or another. There is a role that this nation has to play. Transitory regimes in Delhi and subjective concerns should not stand in the way.

Sir, I feel I should not over extend your courtesy, any further. I am grateful to you.

श्री सदाशिव बागाईतकर : (महाराष्ट्र) :

उत्समाध्यक्ष महोदय, विदेश नीति के बारे में मित्रों ने जो कुछ कहा उसमें एक हिस्सा बिलकुल स्पष्टतः मैं कहना चाहता हूँ। मंत्री जी को मैं धन्यवाद इसलिए दूंगा और बधाई दूंगा कि उन्होंने अपने मंत्रालय को सुचारु रूप से चलाया लेकिन जहां तक नीति का मामला है मैं समझता हूँ कि आज धीरे धीरे हम ऐसी स्थिति में पहुंच गये हैं जब अगर चुनना की जाए तो आज से 30 साल पहले हिन्दुस्तान जब आजाद नहीं था तभी दुनिया में हिन्दुस्तान की जो तस्वीर थी,

हिन्दुस्तान के नेताओं की चाहे महत्मा गांधी हों, चाहे जवाहर लाल नेहरू हों, उनके बारे में दुनिया में जो केन्द्र थी जो इज्जत थी मैं नहीं समझता कि जिस ढंग से हमने विदेश नीति को चलाया है उससे आज वह स्थिति बरकरार रही। मैं इस चीज को भी कबूल करता हूँ कि सारी बातें चंद सालों में जो—चीजें हुई उससे बनी हैं यह मैं नहीं मानता। यह हकीकत है कि देश के बटवारे से जो स्थिति पैदा हुई आज कोई मेरे जैसा आदमी कहे कि देश के बटवारे को कबूल करना, वहां एक गलती हो चुकी है। इसी तरह इतिहास की अगर मिसाल देनी है तो मैं यह कहूँ कि 1950 में जब नेपाल में वहां के लोगों ने हिन्दुस्तान की मदद चाही और राजा त्रिभुवन ने यहां तक बताया कि हम हिन्दुस्तान का हिस्सा बन कर रहने के लिए तैयार हैं और जिसको ठुकराया गया। जवाहरलाल जी उस वक्त थे। उन्होंने इन्कार किया इस हकीकत को मानने से स्वीकार करने से इससे जो स्थिति उत्पन्न हुई है उसकी जिम्मेदारी आपकी है, यह मैं नहीं कह रहा हूँ लेकिन हम लोग जब तुलना करेंगे देश की विदेशनीति, उसकी कामयाबी की, हमने क्या हासिल किया, तो हमारे मन में यह सारी बातें जरूर रहेंगी। क्योंकि हम समझते हैं कि जैसे अभी कहा गया नान-अलाइनमेंट कोई 10 साल, 15 साल की देन नहीं है, इस भूल को हम न करें जब हमने देश की आजादी की लड़ाई लड़ी थी तब हम यह कहते थे और यह हम लोगों की तस्वीर रही कि दुनिया भर की लिब्रेशन के हम सपोर्टर रहे हैं और हमने देश की आजादी के साथ दुनिया के लिब्रेशन को जोड़ा था। यह जब स्थिति थी तब से हम लोग आगे चल कर दूसरे महायुद्ध के दरम्यान इस नीति पर आए कि हिन्दुस्तान जैसे देश को ये जो बड़ी ताकतें हैं उनके हाथ में खेले से बचना चाहिये और हम अपने बलबूत पर

खड़े हो जायें। यह जो इतिहास की परम्परा हम लोगों की रही, आजादी की लड़ाई के वक्त की देन रही उसकी जगह आज से तुलना करें तो मुझे खेद है कि कहने में कि हम लोग बहुत नाकामयाब रहे हैं और आज खतरनाक स्थिति का दौर इतना बढ़ गया है कि लगता है तेजो के साथ और खुद प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने अभी-अभी फरमाया है कि न जाने कब जंग भी छिड़ सकती है, लड़ाई का माहौल बन रहा है और इस दिशा में अगर हम जाएंगे तो मुझे लगता है कि देश एक बड़ी खतरनाक स्थिति में आ जायेगा।

आखिर विदेश नीति के हम लोगो के उस समय क्या मकसद थे, आज क्या हैं, इसके बारे में हमारी नीति, हमारा दृष्टि साफ होना चाहिये। मुझको ऐसा लग रहा है कि इसी में गड़बड़ है। लॉग टर्म ऑब्जेक्टिव्स और शार्ट टर्म ऑब्जेक्टिव्स इन दोनों के बीच का जड़ने वाला कड़ा क्या है, इसी के बारे में घपना हो रहा है और इसी के लिए आप नान एलाइनमेंट को ही लोजिए, दिल्ली की कॉन्फ्रेंस हुई, उसी को ले लोजिए, आपको पता चलेगा कि सन् 55 से लेकर आज तक की नान एलाइनमेंट की जो सारी कॉन्फ्रेंस हुई, इतिहास देखेंगे तो आपको पता चलेगा कि धीरे-धीरे उसका सारा कन्टेन्ट डाइल्यूट होता जा रहा है और नान-एलाइनमेंट कॉन्फ्रेंस में जो पूरी तरह से एलाइन्ड स्टेट्स हैं वे भी शिरकत करने लगे हैं, वे भी उसका हिस्सा, अंग बन रहे हैं। यह स्थिति आज बन चुकी है। तो नान एलाइन्ड अपने आपमें जो उद्देश्य है जो हमको आगे ले जा सकता है, या बचा सकता है सो मैं नहीं मानता हूँ। इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हम इस खतरनाक दौर को समझें और वार साईकोसिस अगर हमको देश में नहीं उभारना है और उससे देश को बचाना है तो हम पाकिस्तान के बारे में क्या कहें, पाकिस्तान की जो आर्थिक स्थिति है, उसके

बारे में हमारा सही असेसमेंट क्या है इसके बारे में बहुत गम्भीरता से हमें सोचना चाहिए। क्योंकि मैं नहीं समझता कि पाकिस्तान की आर्थिक स्थिति और उसकी हथियार की खोज इसमें कुछ असंतुलन है। हथियार सूना, पाकिस्तान को इस तरह के हथियार देना या पाकिस्तान को हथियारों से सूना करने की जो अमेरिका की नीति है उससे मैं सहमत हूँ वह बात नहीं है लेकिन बात यह है कि न्यूक्लीयर आर्ममेंट के बारे में हमारा अपना दिमाग भी फटा हुआ है, हमारी भी सही दिशा नहीं है। पाकिस्तान न्यूक्लीयर नहीं बने यह हमारी हिफाजत, हमारी सिक्योरिटी की दृष्टि से आवश्यक बनता है। लेकिन पाकिस्तान न्यूक्लीयर न बने अगर यह हमारी इच्छा है, भूमिका है तो हिन्दुस्तान का सोच इस बारे में क्या होगा। मुमकिन हो तो हम न्यूक्लीयर बन जायें और पाकिस्तान न्यूक्लीयर न हो यह कोई स्थिति नहीं हो सकती है। इसलिए मुझ ऐसा लगता है कि बुनियादी तौर पर जो यह सब कान्टीनेंट पोलिटिकली एक यूनिट था, इतिहास के दौर में इसके टुकड़े टुकड़े हो गये, वह एक नहीं रहा, अलग अलग ताकतें बन गयीं चाहे पाकिस्तान बना, श्रीलंका या नेपाल बना ये सारी चीजें हुई। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तानी यह सब कन्टीनेन्ट बेसिकली एक जोओ पोलिटिकल यूनिट है इस बात को नजर अन्दाज नहीं करना चाहिए और मुझे ऐसा लग रहा है कि इस दिशा में जो पहल हम लोगों को करनी चाहिये, हमारे देश को करनी चाहिये थी वह हम लोग नहीं कर रहे हैं और यह न होने से आपसी तनाव का वातावरण और माहौल बढ़ता जा रहा है।

दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहूंगा कि धीरे धीरे जो बर्फस थे, पुराना तिब्बत का

वफर था, टूटा, अफगानिस्तान दूसरा वफर था, टूटा। धीरे धीरे जो वफर्स थे वे चले जा रहे हैं और जो ताकतें हमारी तरफ दुश्मनों को निगाहों से देखती थीं उनके लिए एक सहूलियत बाती जा रही है इसको भी हमें नजरअन्दाज नहीं करना चाहिये और मुझे ऐसा लग रहा है कि जो विदेश मंत्री चाइना के आ रहे हैं, हमारे विदेश मंत्री उसे बार्तानाप करेंगे, सारे मामले मुकम्मिल जो हमारी सीमा के हैं, उस सबका समाधान तुरन्त होगा यह मैं नहीं मानता हूँ लेकिन हम कम से कम इस बात का खयाल रखें कि चीन के साथ अच्छा रिश्ता बनाना है तो उसके लिए कुछ अर्नेस्ट उसका है उसका सबूत हमका मिलना चाहिये। मैं इस अर्नेस्ट का एक हिस्सा वह भी मानता हूँ कि चीन कबूल करे, तिब्बत में उसका जो आक्रोश है, जो फौजो ताकत है उसको कुछ हद तक हटायें ताकि हमको इत्मीनान हो ज कि चीन सही माने में, कुछ नये दृष्टिकोण से हमारी तरफ देख रहा है, इस तरह की पहल अगर हम नहीं करेंगे, तो कोरे उनके आश्वासन, उनके कहने पर हम लोग विश्वास नहीं कर सकते और मैं खाली चीन के लिए यह बात नहीं कह रहा हूँ—मैं मंत्री जो से पूछता चाहूंगा कि पाकिस्तान पर या वह लागू नहीं होता है—क्या यह बात सच नहीं है कि पाकिस्तान के साथ शिमला एग्रीमेंट के बाद भी हमारे बाह्य-प्रिजनर्ज अभी भी पाकिस्तान की जलों में बंद हैं? 71 या 75 का जो किड़ा है फौहै मुझे पर्सनल जानकारी वह है कि जिस शहर पुणे से मैं आता हूँ, वहां का फ्लाईंग आर्फीसर अभी तक पाकिस्तान की जेल में है। यह 1971 को बार का किस्ता है। आपने तो 95,000 उसी फौज के अदमियों को लौटा दिया, लेकिन यह कैसा हुआ, हमारे 75 आदमी अभी भी उनको जलों में बंद है। उसका तो हमें उस वक्त पता नहीं था, हमारी लापरवाही की अगर पता था, तो उसके लिए कुछ करने में हम लोग नाकामलाब रहे।

मैं नहीं समझता कि कोई भी फारेन पालिसी को चलाने का यह सही तरीका होगा कि हम तो उद्धार बनों और एक युफोरिया खड़ा करके काम करें और जो हमारा सही इंस्ट्रुमेंट है, उसकी हम रक्षा न करें, तो यह बात नहीं हो सकती। तो तुह बात मैं आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। और यह बात सही है और जब हमारे विदेश मंत्री जो—क्योंकि 10 अप्रैल में पाकिस्तान जा रहे हैं और उनसे भी आप बात करेंगे और वह हकीकत है, तो क्या बाकि तान के और चीन के रवैये का यह सबूत होगा कि तिब्बत में वे चाहे चितनी फौज रखे, पाकिस्तान हमारे लोगों को जेलों के अंदर रखे और फिर भी हम समझे कि वह हमारे साथ ईमानदारी के रिश्ते निभाना चाहते हैं। इस बात को मैं स्वीकार नहीं करूंगा।

इसलिए मेरा खयाल है कि विदेश मंत्रालय की तरफ से अगर इन चीजों की तरफ ध्यान नहीं दिया जाएगा तो सही अर्सेसमेंट करके, आब्जेक्टिव अर्सेसमेंट करके फारेन पालिसी जो हम लोग चला रहे हैं, सो मैं नहीं मानता। इसलिए जो खतरे हैं, वे बढ़ते जा रहे हैं। तुह हम कह रहे हैं। लेकिन किसके तरफ से यह खतपा है कौन हमारे खिलाफ लड़ाई छेड़ेगा, इसके बारे में हमारे क्या अर्सेसमेंट है? क्या इस अर्सेसमेंट को मानें कि पाकिस्तान हमारे खिलाफ जंग छेड़ देगा? अगर यही है, तो यह अर्सेसमेंट आज की स्थिति में सही होगा, यह मेरी मान्यता नहीं है। पाकिस्तान जिस स्थिति में आज है, उस स्थिति को समझ कर अगर हमें उस स्थिति का सही जायजा लेना है, तो मैं नहीं मानता कि हम यह समझ कर के यह नीति बनाएं कि खतरा जो है, वह उस तरफ से आने वाला है।

यह सही है कि इन्टरनेशनल पैमाने पर पाकिस्तान किसी के हाथ में खेल रहा हो और कोई पाकिस्तान को अपनी विदेश नीति के लिए इस्तेमाल करने है कोशिश करता है, यह यह बात अपनी जगह। इससे मैं इन्कार नहीं

करता, यह नुमकिन हो सकता है। लेकिन उम्मीद रास्ता यह नहीं है कि हम पाकिस्तान के खिलाफ वार साईकोसिस बिल्ड-अप का। उसका रास्ता यह है कि दोनों के दरम्यान विश्वास के संबंध प्रस्तावित करने के लिए जो कुछ किया जा सकता है, जो मुमकिन है, उसको कोशिश हम लोगों को करना पड़ेगी।

तो मैं यह जानना चाहूंगा कि क्या विदेश मंत्रालय इस नीति पर चल रहा है कि पाकिस्तान के साथ जो हमारे रिश्ते हैं, वे ऐतिहासिक कारणों से नार्मल रिश्ते नहीं रह सकते, इसको समझ के जो रिश्ते आपके रूस और अमरीका के साथ रहते हैं वे रिश्ते पाकिस्तान के साथ कभी नहीं रहेंगे। देश का बंटवारा हुआ है, दस करोड़ हिन्दुस्तान में रहते हैं जो कि पाकिस्तान को पसंद नहीं है। ऐसे कई झगड़े हैं, लेकिन फिर भी जो रिश्ते पाकिस्तान के साथ हमारे हैं, उन रिश्तों का सही असैसमेंट करना है, तो यह मानकर चलना कि पाकिस्तान से हमारे देश को खतरा है तो मैंने भी समझता कि यह सही असैसमेंट होगा क्योंकि मैं मानता हूँ कि पाकिस्तान 1971 की लड़ाई के बाद जिस रह से रहा है, जो उसको आर्थिक स्थिति है, जो अन्दरूनी वहाँ को हकीकत है उससे पाकिस्तान हम पर हमला नहीं कर सकता है। इसलिए मैं चाहूंगा कि विश्वास का वातावरण बढ़ाने से काम बनेगा नहीं। उससे मदद नहीं होगी। पाकिस्तान न्यूक्लियर न बने, यह लेकिन साथ ही, क्या हम भी वैसा ही आश्वासन पाकिस्तान को नहीं देंगे कि हिन्दुस्तान कभी न्यूक्लियर अर्मामेंट नहीं बनाएगा, हम कभी न्यूक्लियर हथियार तैयार नहीं करेंगे यह विश्वास हम पाकिस्तान को दे तो स्थिति बदलेगी।

पुराने इतिहास में, चालीस सालों का इतिहास में हम लोगों का जो कुछ रहा है दुनिया में, उसका एक मारल एस्पेक्ट तो है। महात्मा गांधी का जो मान्यता दुनिया ने दी, वह इसलिए नहीं दी कि गांधी जी के पास कुछ था।

लेकिन एक मारल अर्थारिटी हम लोगों ने इस्टेबलिश की थी, देश की आजादी के लिए हम लोगों ने एक रास्ता अस्तित्व दिया, तैयार किया, जिससे लोगों को उम्मीद हुई कि इस रास्ते से और देश आजाद हो सकते हैं जो हम जैसे गुलाम हैं। यह मारल आस्पेक्ट जो है उसको हम नजरअन्दाज कर देंगे तो मैं समझता हूँ एक गलत रास्ते पर चलेंगे (समय की घंटी) मैं दो मिनट में खत्म कर रहा हूँ। आज हालत यह है कि हमारी पापुलरिटी इंटर-नेशनल रिलेशंस में जो है वह पब्लिक रिलेशन में रहती है और उस चीज को—फार्मेलिटी जिसे कहा जाता है—बहुत बढ़ा चढ़ा कर हम समझ रहे हैं कि हमारी प्राइम मिनिस्टर दुनिया में बहुत पापुलर हैं। खुशी की बात है, लेकिन यह पापुलरिटी किस हद तक दूसरे देशों की नीति मोड़ सकती है और हमको फायदेमन्द नीति बनाने में क्या मदद कर सकती है? इसका मूल्यांकन करें तो मुझे लगता है कि हम लोगों को इसमें यह कबूल करना पड़ेगा कि इस पापुलरिटी का कोई लाभ देश को नहीं हो रहा है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री विशम्भर नाथ पांडे) :

15 मिनट हो गये।

श्री सदाशिव बगाईतकर : और इसका कारण है, हमारे फ्रेट दिमाग में . . . मैं श्रीमन्, एक मिनट में खत्म करता हूँ, अभी अभी हमको मालूम हुआ भारत सरकार ने फैसला किया है—दो बातों को उठा कर समझा कहेंगे—भारत सरकार ने फैसला किया कि इजराइल युनिवर्सिटी की जो डिग्रीज हैं उसको भारत सरकार ने मान्यता दी।

[श्री सदाशिव बागाईकर]

दूसरा जो हम अखबारों में पढ़ रहे हैं दल के स्तर पर, पार्टी के स्तर पर, नये वर्ल्ड पीस आर्गेनाइजेशन, पुराने संगठन को ग्लेस करने का काम कांग्रेस पार्टी की तरफ से हो रहा है। इसलिए मुझे कोई एक कांग्रेसी पालिसी का आभास नहीं लग रहा है। अगर अरब कंट्रीज के साथ हम अपने ताल्लुकात को बढ़ा रहे हैं तो दूसरी, तरफ इजराइल की डिमंड को कबूल करने के, मान्यता करने का काम करने से कौन सा लाभ होने वाला है? यह उदाहरण मैं इसलिए दे रहा हूँ कि अगर हमारे पास एक मुकम्मल नीति है तो इस मुकम्मल नीति को चलाने का काम हो नहीं रहा है। यह एक सबूत है। इसलिए श्रीमान्, मैं यह कहूँगा कि जब हमारी विदेश नीति बुनियादी तौर पर कमजोर रहे तो हमारी रक्षा नीति भी कापगर रहे यह हो नहीं सकता। दुनिया के अन्दर जिन मूल्यों को लेकर देश को आगे रखने का प्रयास हमको करना चाहिये, उन मूल्यों की कद्र करनी चाहिए, और उसके साथ देश को बचाने की कोशिश करनी चाहिए, इस तरह से फारेन पालिसी को नहीं चलायेंगे तो देश बिखर जाएगा जैसे नार्थ ईस्टर्न एशिया में हो रहा है या गुजरात में विस्फोट हो रहा है। इस तरह से हम अपनी विदेश नीति को कामयाबी से नहीं चला सकते हैं। दो तरह की बातें चल नहीं सकती हैं इसलिए मैं चाहूँगा, विदेश मंत्रालय की जो कोशिश है उसमें नान एलायनमेंट का कांटेस्ट डायल्यूट हुआ है, वह रिस्टोर करने के लिए क्या काम हुआ है? क्या न्यूक्लियर आर्म्स के बारे में हम सोचने के लिए तैयार हैं और यह कहने के लिए तैयार हैं कि हर हालत में हिन्दुस्तान नान न्यूक्लियर बना रहेगा? अगर यह नहीं है तो सारे मामले पेचीदे हो जाते हैं। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ, विदेश मंत्री इसके बारे में

सोचे और खामिया दूर करने के उपाय करें और हमें बतायें मैं आभारी रहूँगा।

एक मिनट में मैं खत्म कर दूँगा, माफ कीजिए, एक बात रह गई है जो मैं बताना चाहता हूँ—इम्बेसी में जिस तरह से लोग काम करते हैं, विदेश में, पिछली बार ईरान-ईराक की लड़ाई के दौरान हमारी इम्बेसी के रोल के बारे में सवाल इस सदन में उठाये गये थे, कि जो हिन्दुस्तानी वहाँ रहते हैं उनकी हिफाजत का काम ठीक ढंग से हो रहा है कि नहीं? उन्होंने उनकी हिफाजत का काम ठीक ढंग से नहीं किया, इस तरह की बातें आई थीं। तो मैं चाहूँगा, इसकी भी सफाई करें और कम से कम यह विश्वास दिलाएं कि जो हिन्दुस्तानी वहाँ जाते हैं और रहते हैं उनकी खास तौर से मदद करें, उनके लिए मदद पहुंचाने की कोशिश करें। यही मेरी प्रार्थना है।

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRA-KANT BHANDARE (Maharashtra): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, this is one occasion in the year when we have an opportunity of having a look at the manner in which our various Ministries are functioning. So far as our House—Rajya Sabha—is concerned, we get an opportunity to discuss only four Ministries. I think that this number should be increased and, despite the lack of fiscal powers for us, since these discussion arise out of the budgetary provisions, I feel that if necessary we can sit a week longer—instead of three weeks we can sit for four weeks—to discuss a few more Ministries. Now, coming to the subject of discussion this evening, namely, the working of the External Affairs Ministry, one finds a Report, a fairly extensive one, which has been circulated; and I must say that, apart from being extensive, it can also claim the merit of being modest; that is like the Foreign Minister whom we see every day in the House when he replies to the questions or makes some statement. And it is our duty, it is our obligation, to the nation to have both

an objective and a critical view of the affairs of the External Affairs Ministry. I think we can formulate a few tests to find out whether in the year under consideration the Ministry has come up to our expectations, whether the Ministry has discharged its onerous duties as it ought to. And one or two tests are: What is the image of our country abroad? Has it been improved or has it been tarnished? Has it been on the ascendance or has it been shadowed by a period of gloom? Have we played an important role or a positive role in minimizing or lessening the conflicts elsewhere in the world? Have we made our presence felt true to our great heritage, true to our great culture and in the context of—I may happily repeat—what has been said by one of the hon. Members here, that India is not merely a country but also she has great civilization? I think if the answers to these questions have to be objective without a degree of exaggeration, without an element of bias, we have not performed badly. And whenever any performance has to be assessed, one must look at the circumstances which existed under which the Ministry and the Government had to operate. And it has been put in the forefront in the Report itself, that it has been a period of great tension in international affairs, a tension of almost unprecedented dimension in recent history. I will come to this a little later.

I want to deal with certain aspects which certain hon. Members of the Opposition have raised. My friend hon. Mr. Shahabuddin said that there are three levels at which the Ministry functions and that it has failed at all these three levels. He talked of the bilateral level; he talked of the regional level; and he talked of the global level. He said that we have failed at all levels. Now let us see the reasons why he says so. First of all, he says we have failed because Ronald Reagan was elected as the President in America. We have failed because Ronald Reagan decided upon a very ambitious nuclear and proliferation

of arms programme to prove that America is the greatest power in the world. We have failed because the Republicans have got elected and the Democrats were ousted. We have failed because there has been a war in Iran and Iraq. And we have failed because America has decided to increase the arms supply to Pakistan. He has given many other reasons, but they are all of this nature. But it must be remembered that in international affairs there are factors, there are conditions, there are elements over which we have no control. And the test to be applied is, despite these disturbing factors, have we or have we not maintained our position as the leader of the non-aligned countries, as the leader to whom even these Great Powers look because they know that we are a buffer State, whatever may be their inner surge for power. I am quite sure that India has acquitted herself, the Government has acquitted itself, as the foremost nation which loves peace, which is opposed to colonialism, which is opposed to imperialism and which truly stand for freedom and democratic conditions the world over. I am really amazed at the way we look at these democratic things. One of the greatest democracy is supposed to be America, and it is said to be democratic because in the world elsewhere it has never supported democracy, it has not supported the largest democracy in the world, which is India; it has consistently everywhere supported the military puppets, the anti-democratic governments of the countries in which there has been large scale suppression of human rights. And yet we say that it is a democratic government.

I am going to come to that point where it has been said that we are the interpreters of strategic interpretation of the super powers. I feel that we should better analyse the various positions. We must find out whether we have retained our position or whether we have become a tool. Most of the other nations have been made by the super powers their tools for their

[Shri Murlidhar Cannndrakant
Bhandare]

own ends, for their own personal gains. I think, looking at it from this angle, there is no doubt in my mind that either through the non-aligned conference or through many other things we have been making constantly efforts—they are all written in the pages of the report—to see that we maintain a balance in these difficult times, that we maintain peace in these difficult times and that we promote the real national urges of the various nations to be independent and not be servile to the super powers.

Now, I come specifically to a few points. Since the time is very short, the subject really very long and the canvas, indeed very wide, I must restrict myself to a few things.

Naturally, a reference has been made to Pakistan. I am not used to saying superlative things or complementary things. But I must say, and I would be failing in my duty if I do not say it, that the Foreign Minister and the Prime Minister have shown admirable skill, admirable patience and great tolerance in defusing the situation and maintaining a harmonious relation to the extent possible despite the most adverse circumstances and factors. Please remember that today Pakistan is being ruled by a military dictator, a dictator who was scrapped the Constitution of Pakistan, a dictator who has sacked the Judges of the Supreme Court of Pakistan, a dictator who is very willing to use diversionary tactics which will have a direct impact on its relations with us and a dictator who is a willing tool in the hands of the super power, America, to build even nuclear armaments. I must pay my compliments to the Foreign Minister and the Prime Minister for the patience and the fore bearance despite this fact, and we have not, for a moment, despite all these provocations in sensitive areas, withdrawn our hand of friendship even an inch from Pakistan. And the proof of it lies in the fact that the Foreign Minister will be making another visit to Pakistan next week. But I do want to warn the

House that, as I said, one has to be objective howsoever strong our feeling of friendship may be, howsoever strong our desires for a peaceful and cordial atmosphere in our relations with Pakistan may be. There are a few things which I must clarify. The hon. Member, Mr. Shahabuddin seems to suggest that many things happen because India takes a lead. I want to dispel this wrong impression that because India does something, Pakistan follows suit. I give you one illustration, Sir. It is not correct to say that India first exploded a nuclear device for peaceful purposes and Pakistan thereafter tried to follow suit. In fact, if one reads Bhutto's "Pages from the Death cell" one finds that the decision to turn nuclear was taken as early as in January 1971 by Pakistan whereas we took it much later in the year. Sir, you must know that Pakistan does not possess any reactor by which it can use all the nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. It is now well-known—in fact, we have all these years since the explosion of our nuclear device not deviated from what we have professed—that our nuclear devices are meant for peaceful purposes. But there is cogent and positive evidence that Pakistan is interested not merely in peaceful nuclear purposes, because it does not possess the wherewithal, if does not possess the equipment of peaceful purposes, but it is gathering all these only for building up a nuclear arsenal. I want the Government to be in a state of preparedness, in a state of readiness. I want to refer the House to the reply given by the Prime Minister on the 13th March in this very House that well, the realities are there and we cannot shut our eyes; and I do not think we are deviating from our principle of non-alignment just because we are going to be prepared for an eventuality which is written large on the walls. I personally believe that if we have to hold our place as a country with 650 million people, as the largest democracy, as a country loving peace, as a country believing in the liberty of all, then we must be prepared. We will be considered as great not only because of our civiliza-

tion, not only because of our culture, not only because of the leadership we have given to the world so far, but also because of the fact that we cannot be taken for a ride and that we are also in a state of preparedness. But our objectives are always for peace and not for war.

Sir, there are a few other things which I would like to say. There was a reference made to Afghanistan and it was said that we have not placed our policy as firmly as we should have done. It pains me to find a Member for whom I have great respect saying that we are interpreters of strategic perception, or whatever it is, of super powers, that we are apologists for what Soviet Russia does or does not do. I think it is a total distortion of the role we are playing. We had an occasion when President Brezhnev visited us and I think if one merely scans the newspapers of those days, one will see that in most categorical terms, in no unmistakeable terms, we had indicated our disapproval of the presence of Russian troops on the Afghan soil. The three guidelines which are contained in this report form the basis of our policy. But despite this clear enunciation of our policy, despite our telling in a forthright manner what we feel about the occupation by the Russian army of Afghanistan, if the Members feel that we are apologists for Soviet Russia, I think that somebody else is playing the tune. The voice is somewhere else, and that voice unfortunately after the exit of the last Government has failed to hold its influence in our country. We are once again an independent country. We are once again the leader in the world for peace. We are once again the leader in the world for liberty. We are against imperialism. We are against colonialism. And I think it would not be an exaggeration for me to say because it is only the Congress which has this ideology. It is our Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, as the daughter of Jawaharlal Nehru, who is promoting further, advancing ahead, the principles for which our country has now taken a place of pride in the world.

SHRI KHUSHWANT SINGH (Nominated): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I rise to support the Demands of the Ministry of External Affairs. Before doing that I would also like to join my fellow Members in complimenting the Ministry of External Affairs on the excellent job they are doing in very difficult circumstances. Particularly I would like to compliment the Foreign Minister for his urbane, erudite, skilful handling of this Ministry. I have no doubt that he will go down in the history of this country as one of the most successful Foreign Ministers that we have had. However, there is one subject on which I feel, on which I question the wisdom of the policy pursued by the Government. I assure you, Mr. Foreign Minister, it is not in a spirit of casting a criticism, but I feel that in matters like foreign affairs one false step can create so much damage to the image of this country, that it takes us years to recover from that. Just take a lesson from history. The halcyon period of our foreign policy was immediately after independence during the prime-ministership of Jawaharlal Nehru. This was the time when India played a significant role as a peace-maker in Korea, in the recognition of China, in later years in Indo-China, in condemning the Anglo-French-Israeli invasion of the Suez Canal. We were the good honest brokers of peace in the world. That came to an end abruptly with one false step that the Government took at that time, and that was in 1956 when the Soviets invaded Hungary and our delegation, contrary to the instructions given by the Prime Minister, did not go to condemn that. I fear that we may be about to take similar steps in a different direction. I refer specifically to one item, that is, the Soviet presence in Afghanistan. They arrived there in December, 1979, 1½ years ago. We are not quite clear what exactly induced the Soviets to go and invade Afghanistan. Probably the situation in the country was very unstable after the assassination of Daud with quarrels and internecine civil war which had come up between the Parcham

(Shri Khushwant Singh)

and Khalq factions. But it is quite clear, whatever else may be the reason for them, there is no evidence whatsoever that the United States had increased its presence either in the region or in the Indian Ocean; that could not have been the excuse for the Soviet move into Afghanistan. It is equally clear that at that time there was not an iota of evidence that Pakistan had anything to do with the events that precipitated the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. The point they made is that they were invited to Afghanistan. Perhaps that may be so. They also said they would stay there as short a time as possible. That has now been 1½ years, and there is no sign whatsoever of the Soviets withdrawing from Afghanistan today. On the contrary, the strength of 80,000 troops is sought to be steadily augmented with sophisticated armours and more troops. There is no sign whatsoever of the Afghan Government gaining any popularity amongst the people. On the contrary, there are reports of large scale desertions of their own troops, their diplomats abroad and of uprisings within the country. Many correspondents including those of my paper have been to that country and have got the facts that over 90 per cent of that country is in the hands of the freedom fighters and not in the hands of the Afghan Government. There are two million refugees in Pakistan. That shows the popularity of the regime. There are half a million refugees in Iran. The resistance of the freedom fighters has assumed the proportion of a national rising. I think we as people who have supported freedom-loving people, would see the parallel between what is happening in Afghanistan and what the 'Mukti Vahini' did in Bangladesh. It is a resistance of a people against heavy odds. It is our duty as freedom-loving people to raise our voice in support of the Afghan freedom fighters and not approve of what is going on there, whatever may be the consequences.

What has been the world reaction to the Afghanistan situation. The

United Nations General Assembly and the United Nations Human Rights Commission have condemned it with a massive 111 votes to 22 with only 12 abstentions. The Islamic Meet at the Mecca Conference condemned it and 38 Muslim nations have condemned the occupation of this country and declared *jehad*. The non-aligned conference itself, which took place at New Delhi, in no uncertain terms, criticised the Soviet presence in Afghanistan. In a symbolic thing like the Olympic Games, 80 countries refused to participate. It is a matter of shame that we took the liberty of sending our teams there. Sir, our President and our Prime Minister have expressed deep sorrow at the situation in Afghanistan. I am afraid I do not think that is good enough. Here is a situation in which we find ourselves out of step with the world opinion and with the non-alignment movement. Unless we make a clear and categorical statement to the effect that we do not approve of the Soviet presence in that country and that our sympathies lie with the freedom fighters of Afghanistan, we will not recover the prestige that our country once had.

Now, Sir, I would briefly say a few words about Pakistan. Pakistan had done absolutely nothing to provoke them. Pakistan's hands in this matter are absolutely clean. They are now loaded with 2 million refugees on their hands and it is quite clear that whatever aid the United States may give them—and I thoroughly disapprove of that aid—they will never be in a position to resist any attempt or any move by the Soviets. Whatever aid the United States may give them, they will never be able to match up in arms strength. What they can do is to turn that very armour against any popular uprising in their own country because theirs is not a democratic regime. Or they may indulge in some form of military adventurism against India and may be able to do some kind of limited damage to us. That is something which we must resent at all means. But we need not enter into an arms race against the

Pakistanis. If I may humbly suggest, when our Foreign Minister who is due to visit Pakistan in a month or so, goes there, let him categorically assure the Pakistanis that we mean absolutely no harm to them. Let us try to discourage them from accepting any arms from the Americans and not allow those arms to be dumped in this part of the world. Extend to them the hand of friendship again; the first and foremost part of the policy of any Government must be the closest friendship with their neighbours.

We all know that the most important neighbour to us today is Pakistan. Ultimately, Sir, I appeal to the Foreign Minister again. There are many clever arguments for and against many points of view. But the only one principle that I think a country like India must follow is this that what is morally wrong can never be politically right. If you stick to that principle, you will never go wrong in your foreign policy. It is quite abundantly clear to me as it is to most of our countrymen that the Soviet presence in Afghanistan is morally wrong and any condonation of this would be politically and morally disastrous. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI M. R. KRISHNA (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, in the first place, I am not prepared to agree with some of the hon. Members who said that our foreign policy is not effective and not dynamic. Sir, the Government of India has never deviated in its foreign policy. And the foreign policy of this country was designed by the greatest man, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, and our association or our interests with all our neighbouring countries and also with those countries which were under the colonial domination are very well known in the world. Even when India was fighting for its freedom, our leaders never hesitated to say that it was not enough if India secured freedom. They wanted that every country which was under the foreign domination should be freed. That was the attitude, that was the struggle and that

was the fight which our leaders waged in those days. Even today, I don't think anybody can say that the Prime Minister of this country has ever hesitated to condemn a foreign domination or condemn a foreign power occupying any other country. Many of my friends have made a big story about the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan. Sir, it was the Indian Prime Minister who said very categorically that she would not like even the Soviet troops to be in Afghanistan. She did not make any secret of it and she did not talk of it in closed quarters. But she spoke that thing to the world governments, including the Soviet Government. Therefore, Sir, in the Non-aligned Conference, if the word 'condemn' was not used and thereby if our friends attribute that the Indian Government or the Indian Prime Minister or the Indian Foreign Minister was playing the role of a stooge of a big power, it is a most unreasonable approach to this problem.

Sir, our attitude towards Pakistan or towards China was never questioned. If at all Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru failed, according to the Members of Parliament in those days, it was because he wanted to be too friendly towards China. And by trying to be friendly towards China, he wanted China to come to the world comity of nations. And he advocated a place for China within the United Nations. The contribution which Jawaharlal Nehru made for the entry of China into the United Nations is not to be assessed in a small measure. Even the Chinese leaders have understood it. At the cost of even annoying many world powers, including the Americans, the Indian Government, the Indian representatives and the Indian Prime Ministers from time to time contributed richly towards the entry of China into the United Nations. But China was not kind to India and the way in which China treated India is known the world over. It is only when we are in difficulties that we understand who our friends are. When China

(Shri M. R. Krishna)

attacked India, well, the Prime Minister of this country made an appeal to the whole world, including the Americans and the British. But what was the attitude of Britain and America at that time? They wanted the Indian Prime Minister to surrender Kashmir to Pakistan. Only then they wanted to help India or to step in at that time. The second thing which the Americans wanted to do is this. They sent their American military experts to India and they wanted to know the Indian defence secrets and they wanted the Indian defence arrangements to be completely exposed to the American Generals and American Armymen. Even after doing that what was the treatment that we got from America? Did we get anything from America even to equip one complete Division of our Army? They did not give anything. It was at that time that we discovered a friend and that friend was the Soviet Union.

Sir, when we were fighting for freedom, we knew that America was our friend and they wanted us to get freedom from the British. We thought that America is going to be our friend for all times. At that time we were not very friendly with the Soviet Union. But soon after we got Independence in every step that the United States has taken, the result has been that it has gone farther and farther away from India. Whereas the steps which the Soviet Union has taken every-time the Soviet Union has come nearer and it has strengthened the bonds of friendship. This is what we have learnt in these few years of time. Therefore, we cannot easily forget what has happened and what is happening.

Sir, what are the countries which are nearer to us and what were their attitudes towards India earlier? India is a friend of Sri Lanka. India is a friend of Pakistan. India is a friend of Nepal. India is a friend of Burma. India is a friend of the Maldives. But today the whole picture is being completely changed. Even a small island

like the Maldives may become tomorrow because, geographically, population—row a nuclear centre for an American base. Why was it created? Why? Now, Japan was all the time opposed to China. Today Japan and China together are allies of America and there is a treaty between all these countries. Japan, China, Pakistan, all these countries are equipping themselves with sophisticated military hardware to fight against whom? Afghanistan or the Soviet Union?

Sir, I would like our Foreign Minister to tell us the equipment which Pakistan has now procured with the help of Saudi Arabia, who have paid nearly \$8 billion to the United States to supply arms to Pakistan, in addition to what the United States has given to Pakistan as a free gift. Can all that sophisticated equipment be used against the Soviet Union? Can the sophisticated material and tanks with guided missiles, etc. be used in the terrain which the Soviet Union has? No. They all are meant for India. If that is not so, if they are not honestly meant to be used against India, why don't the Americans or Pakistanis take India into confidence, which is a neutral country in every respect, is not a stooge of any power, and tell what they are having and what they are aiming.

Today, Sir, Shri Shahabuddin said that Pakistan is still very lightly equipped. He does not know what Pakistan has got today. There is a treaty between America and Pakistan. Within 3—5 years' time, Pakistan will be equipped militarily which would become more powerful than India, under the pretext that that is the country which has come forward to save United States from the Soviet Union. The Foreign Minister can tell us whether this treaty is there or not; and this treaty is very effectively being encouraged and an enormous amount is being spent.

Sir, the U.S.A. has not yet learnt a lesson. They did havoc in Korea. In Vietnam, after spending nearly 150

Billion dollars, nearly 45,000 Americans were killed and 400,000 wounded. Only after that, they had to leave Vietnam. Now they want to create another theatre in the Indian Ocean and amongst the South-Asian countries. Sir, if India is going to have some nuclear programme for peaceful purposes, all kinds of difficulties have been created by America. Even though every programme and everything that has been done in the nuclear field are very well known to Canada and America, yet they wanted the world to feel that India is doing something very secret about which America is so much concerned. But when Pakistan is doing much worse thing, America has nothing to say against it. They asked France to help Pakistan and they themselves helped it. Therefore we have to be more careful about the United States of America, then even Britain. Sir, the British Prime Minister came to India. She really helped India in knowing the mind of Britain and America; whereas America would be always trying to defend that the equipments or the hardware supplied to Pakistan will not be used against India. This is what was said to India even during the time of Eisenhower and this is what was told to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. But that promise was never kept in mind and they never practised it, whereas India which was really moving forward when there was a war between India and Pakistan, did not hesitate and the Prime Minister stopped the Indian forces from moving further into Pakistan.

Sir, even the United Nations has been strengthened because of the contribution made by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. India has always been in the forefront to support the cause which is really useful to countries and which is directed towards peace.

Sir, for our country, the most ideal-suiting thing is to advocate for disarmament. Disarmament conference for which India played a very important part, has been completely sabotaged by the U.S. Even in the international sphere, it is because of American design as it wants to sell its hard-

ware both to Israel and to the Arab countries which are opposed to Israel. America wants to sell military hardware to India as well as to Pakistan. That means, America wants to thrive on only dividing the countries and creating disputes amongst themselves. Sir, our Foreign Minister and the Prime Minister have been consistently saying and trying to see that our relationship with Pakistan improves and every step that they are taking is directed towards that. But peace or the cordial relationship does not depend upon one country alone; it is mutual. Whatever efforts we make towards peace, normalcy and friendship, there should be reciprocity from the other side also. If it is not forthcoming, any country, any sane country, any intelligent country, will have to be prepared against it. Hence, whatever may be our negotiations in the international field to gain friendship, we should not forget to equip ourselves properly and if it comes to that, even to openly work and progress in the field of nuclear armaments, we should not hesitate, because, the tendency in the whole world today is to become nuclear. India is advocating nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. But it seems, we may be forced to do otherwise. From the speeches of the Prime Minister, it appears that things are not happy, the situation is not very happy in the world and, hence, we will have to be over-careful to see that we do not become a prey to these countries, especially to America, which has completely lost all kinds of considerations to win the friendship of India and every attempt of the U.S.A. is to annoy, is to create some kind of a complication and thereby they want to diminish the importance of India. Sir, India can never become small, because, geographically, population-wise and ideologically, India is known as a great country in the world (*Time-bell rings*).

Lastly, I would say, we should always be allowed to discuss three or four important subjects. One is the External Affairs Ministry, the second is the Defence Ministry and third is

[Shri M. R. Krishna]

the Home Ministry, because, everything which is happening in the international field has got some bearing on the internal affairs also. Today, the U.S.A. is thinking that India has become very weak because of the internal disorder. There are reports of our intelligence failing or some kind of reports being taken away from the military offices and so on. These are certain things which are also creating some kind of feeling in the international world, particularly, in the minds of the friends of U.S.A. that India internally is very weak. Hence, we will have to see that even internally, we are very strong and this House should be given the opportunity to discuss the Home Ministry also next time.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BISHAMBHAR NATH PANDE): Mr. Bhattacharya.

SHRI HARKISHAN SINGH SURJEET (Punjab): Sir, how is it that my name is not there?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BISHAMBHAR NATH PANDE): Your name is there.

SHRI HARKISHAN SINGH SURJEET: The party-wise position is there. I could have got a chance much earlier. I do not understand. My name was second in the list. I was told it is party-wise.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BISHAMBHAR NATH PANDE): My predecessor has given me this list.

SHRI HARKISHAN SINGH SURJEET: I was told it is party-wise. I do not know why I have not been called.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BISHAMBHAR NATH PANDE): Mr. Bhattacharya.

SHRI G. C. BHATTACHARYA (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I totally agree with my friend, Mr. Krishna, that some more important ⁷ priorities should be discussed. I

am quite at a loss to convince myself as to why the Defence Ministry which was included for discussion has been excluded. The only thing is that, unfortunately, my name came in the ballot for initiating the discussion. I asked the Leader of the House, 'After all, what is the priority? I asked 'Priority is Defence or it is Agriculture and Commerce?'. He had no answer. Let us leave it at that. I only regret that on such important matters like Defence, decisions are taken on the basis of personal likes and dislikes and prejudices.

Sir, after going through the Report of the Ministry of External Affairs, I find that it is really superficial and it has no perspective. What is the present-day international situation? I can only say that in spite of the brilliant personnel who are manning the External Affairs Ministry we have not been able to get the proper perspective of the present international situation. The present international situation is a dominance of the powerful multi-nationals who are super governments. Sir, these multi-nationals have come to the conclusion that a war is necessary for two reasons, to minimise population and to remove communist system from the globe. Therefore, the entire emphasis by America and England is on cold war. Apparently, it appears to be cold war now, but actually preparations are being made for starting a hot war and that will be a nuclear war. If that is the present situation, then we will have to choose our side. In that struggle scores will be settled finally. You cannot take superficial things and present them in your Report, as you have done. You will have to take a side and if you do not take a side, if you just say something and do something else, I can tell you that we will ultimately become friendless. Nobody will care for us and you know, what the consequence will be. Apparently, Sir, it appears to be so. To some extent I am inclined to give general support, but I regret to say that there are certain hidden desires and acts to change our time-tested

foreign policy. I am mentioning certain event which will prove my contention. I would like to know from the hon. External Affairs Minister what we have done about El Salvador. I know what you have done, but do you sincerely feel that what you have done is sufficient? What is happening there? About 18000 El Salvador freedom fighters have been done away with brutally with American arms. All sorts of brutalities are being carried on against these freedom loving El Salvador people, but you have nothing to say about it.

Then, you were persuaded not to make a mention about Diego Garcia in the non-aligned Conference because somebody told you that in Colombo Conference America would not come. May I know from this External Affairs Minister whether he had no prior knowledge that America was not coming? At that time also it was known to them. So, this explanation which you gave is not valid. Even one of our very respectable diplomats, Shri T. N. Kaul, went on the Air and talked about certain compromises, but compromises on basic principles are wrong. You do not allow anybody to go on Air and say something about the policies to which you are opposed.

Apart from that, you invited the British Prime Minister, Mrs. Margaret Thatcher. Knowing full well her views and the third world, even the western world, knew of the reputation she was having what persuaded you to invite her? I would like to know that. Have you ever thought of inviting any other Prime Minister having less rigid views than Mrs. Margaret Thatcher? You should clarify in the House whether you invited her and, if so, why? She came to pressurise our country to join Western block. If it is incorrect, you say so. We will all be convinced; otherwise we have some suspicion lurking in our minds that there was no other purpose of her coming, but to denounce us on all aspects. On every aspect she denounced you. What a wonderful guest you had! And you

are going to have another wonderful guest in the month of June from China. Sir, I have written to the Foreign Minister on this subject; but he has not replied. I am saying that one of our friends was sent to China and he was given such an honour that the Indian Ambassador in China was sent to his house, the External Affairs' Secretary went to his house and our Foreign Minister gave him an interview at 9 o'clock in the night in his office. Thereafter he went to China.

SHRI M. R. KRISHNA: For any Member of Parliament, he will do it.

SHRI G. C. BHATTACHARYA: I know. You try it. Don't try to say all this. These are serious matters, Mr. Krishna. I appreciate what you have said, but please don't interrupt me.

I am saying that this is not conducive to the policy which you are following. Before that also he was sent with the condition that India will not recognise Kampuchea. When he came back, he said: "I was let down". Then I asked him, if you were let down, why you are going again. He said: "I will go on doing my job because my aim is to create suspicion and differences between India and the Soviet Union." I have gone on record and written all this in my letter to the Foreign Minister. May I know what preparations have been made before inviting the Foreign Minister of China? Our former Foreign Minister, Mr. Vajpayee, went there and he was given a good slap while he was there. And in this return visit, we are not going to do that. But what preparations have we made, except that we will allow the Foreign Minister of China to do all sorts of anti-Soviet propaganda here in this country? If these are not hidden desires to change the policy, then what else it is? What are we going to do? What is the policy? They say: "Forget about it; don't discuss it". Their economy is in shambles. What are we going to have from China except that you show the red rag to

[Shri G. C. Bhattacharya]

the bull or blackmail somebody who is your friend?

There is a nexus between China, Pakistan, Japan and America. I do not understand my friend, Shri Khushwant Singh, saying many things. Do you think they are babies, our Foreign Minister will go and persuade them, "don't do this, don't do that", and they will agree to it? These are hard facts in view of the international situation which is developing. Is China going to mend her ways? They have chosen their side. And in spite of our choosing our side, what are we doing? We are trying to annoy those persons who are friendly to us. This is the foreign policy achievement for which he tries to take credit.

Another thing I do not understand is this. Mr. Vice-Chairman, you have also been associated with many important causes. But I do not understand why a ruling party should divide anti-imperialist forces and organise parallel organisations. For example, there is the Friends of Soviet Union and the Committee for World Peace. The ruling party is organising this for what purpose? I want to know that. By dividing the anti-imperialist forces, are you strengthening non-alignment? Do you think that the world is foolish enough not to understand what you are doing? Then, Sir, what has happened to our support for Mrs. Bhutto. So much was said when this party was not in power. You were shedding tears. What is happening today? Today the people of Pakistan are fighting for the establishment of democracy there, facing bullets and repression with Mrs. Bhutto and Miss Bhutto leading them. You have no words for them. You have forgotten them. What has this Government said? They are going out to please Zia. On the one hand you raise the cry of war and, on the other, you try to do some impossible things. Whom are you deceiving except yourself?

Sir, today some of our friends were very much vocal about Angola, Afghanistan and others. I would like to

know why they have no concern about American and other imperialist powers occupying 136 bases outside their own countries. How are they different? Defending a revolution is not occupation. Mr. Bhandare has said "equivocal" or "unequivocal", I do not know. There, at least, I can say it is equivocal. But I would like to know whether defending a revolution is occupation or setting up a counter-revolution is occupation. Then, why did you send your army to Bangladesh? At that time we were alone in the United Nations. How many nations supported you in the United Nations when you sent your army to Bangladesh? While Muktibahini was fighting a foreign power, they were saying they were bandits who were being financed by America, China and other foreign powers to destabilise a revolution. (*Time-bell rings*). Therefore, Sir, it is very well saying something and equating a socialist country with an imperialist country and thereafter condemning both. These things will not help this country. The time has come when you have to take sides. I say, the Soviet Union, the socialist countries and liberation movements are our national allies. We should give up the habit of accusing certain imperialist powers only to show that we are non-aligned or genuinely non-aligned.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BISHAMBHAR NATH PANDE): Please conclude.

SHRI G. C. BHATTACHARYA: I am finishing, Sir. Ultimately, when you have to choose sides, go by the side which has stood by you in your independence struggle, who will stand by you in your struggle for socialism and who will stand by you in containing world peace. But this is not there of late. From about the last one year, there is some hidden desire to go away from these forces and to join the axis, which will be detrimental to our national interests and, in that process, not only will the country be disintegrated but we will also be losing freedom and remain all alone.

SHRI HARKISHAN SINGH SURJEET: Sir, we are discussing the foreign policy at a time when the international situation has become very tense, endangering world peace and bringing the danger of war on our borders. Some of those who have participated in the debate have tried to bypass the main areas of tension and tried to concentrate on poor Afghanistan. Really if we look at the whole world, we will find that Europe is being armed with a new medium-range nuclear missiles. Then, Arab unity has been disrupted because of the Camp David agreement and they are making Arab fight Arab. Then there is the war between Iran and Iraq. The UN Resolution on Namibia is being sabotaged by the imperialists, specially by the American imperialists who have the courage to openly come out in support of South Africa. Then, Sir, a permanent force is being established in the Persian Gulf. And we find that in South-East Asia peace is in danger and with the arming of Pakistan, the danger has been brought to our door. It is this which the American imperialists want us to ignore—all these facts of world tension—and they are concentrating the world over on Afghanistan, and that too isolated from all the events which are happening in that area. That is why, Sir, those who talk of a tilt in our foreign policy in fact want the tilt to the West. My criticism would be different. It is a question of motives. They have nothing to say on the events that are taking place. Imperialism has always endangered world peace. Now that Reagan has come to power, the threat has become much more serious because the USA is arming its allies and threatening the peace loving countries throughout the world. India, Sir, has a very important role to play in this situation, true to the traditions of our national movement and according to the commitment of the struggle against imperialism and for world peace. Even if we look purely from the point of view of the security of the region, our interests, the danger to our country, it is not difficult to understand. Who

has rejected the proposal of the littoral States to make the Indian Ocean a zone of peace? Who is strengthening the bases in Diego Garcia? Who is arming Pakistan to endanger peace in our sub-continent? The answer is very clear. It is the US imperialism and nobody else. It is not the Soviet Union. It is the British imperialists. Mrs. Thatcher visited India and on all these issues took a firm position in support of Reagan and supported the US policy. Sir, that is why even if you go into the past experience, you find in the conflicts with Pakistan on the Kashmir issue, during the Bangladesh struggle, who stood by whom. We cannot forget that it was the US imperialism which tried to instigate trouble in this region and got a setback during the period of Bangladesh liberation. It was the Soviet Union which stood by us and came to our support. I want to remind that even during the Janata Government, when many people talked about a secret clause in the Indo-Soviet Treaty, when Morarji Desai the then Prime Minister went to the Soviet Union, when there was no danger from Pakistan, he had also to talk about the importance of the Indo-Soviet Treaty. There is a joint declaration signed by our Prime Minister and the leader of the Soviet Union at that time.

Now, Sir, first I come to Pakistan because it is a very serious problem. Some persons want us to ignore this danger emanating from there. Moreover, because of the situation developing in the country, the danger has become more serious. After the overthrow of the Shah of Iran, Pakistan has acquired more importance in the US plans to destabilize peace in this region. The US imperialists seek to supply the military regime with conventional arms and help it to acquire its own atomic bomb. In this context, it may be recalled that the 1954 agreement between the United States and Pakistan was the beginning of an era of conflict in the Indian sub-continent. The moves made by the Reagan Administration now are calculated to multiply the dangers manifold.

[Shri Harkrishan Singh Surjeet]

Sir, some people argue that Pakistan is not strong enough to attack us. We have seen earlier too that it is not the strength but it is the situation which develops in a country that makes it to attack. The American imperialism wants to use Pakistan and instigate Pakistan. The military regime stands badly isolated. All the democratic rights have been suppressed. The political parties have been banned. Their leaders have been put into prison. The military regime is now ruling the country on the basis of the support from the military. There is no democratic right there. Even the Judges had to go. Most of them refused to take oath under the new Constitution which he has promulgated there. After that if somebody says that there is no danger, it is not correct. Zia-ul Haq can gamble any time and resort to diversionary tactics to save himself and plunge the region into danger. This cannot be ignored. There is public opinion inside Pakistan, which is also raising its voice. On the editorial page of the "DAWN" an article has appeared. I would quote from it. They also realise that it is a dangerous game which Pakistan is playing, arming itself with the support of the U.S. imperialism. It is written here, Sir:

"But excessive dependence upon Washington has serious disadvantages. As our experience of the fifties has shown, it can jeopardise our ties with other Third World states and unnecessarily provoke the USSR without any real strategic gain accruing to us. And this we can ill-afford at this juncture when Pakistan has just made its debut in the Non-Aligned Movement. Upgrading the 1959 agreement with the US into a regular treaty at a time when it would obviously be in the context of super-Power rivalry would not be well-received by other non-aligned members, especially those who doubt Pakistan's non-aligned credentials."

Then, Sir, it goes on to say:

"As for our case on Afghanistan,

it should be quite clear to us that any support Pakistan receives from the United States would be for reasons of realpolitik, not for reasons of altruism deriving from the moral correctness of Pakistan's stand or an unalloyed urge to strengthen Pakistan's security. America's aid would be motivated by its own strategic compulsions and global perception of international policies. The foremost strategic goal the US has at present in the region is the protection of the sealanes in the Gulf and in this context, it is significant that Mr. Haig and Mr. Weinberger have been speaking about the need of establishing a 'physical military presence' in the Gulf. It has also been reported that Mr. Reagan believes that Pakistan can play a positive role in the security of the Gulf region. He appears to be aiming at an arrangement of sorts in the area designed to secure American strategic and economic interests while deterring the Soviet Union from expanding any further."

Again, about Kabul, the article has advised this. Those who say that the Afghanistan regime is isolated... I will come to that point later. The article says:

"Talking to Kabul by no means implies compromising on principles. There are numerous instances of two parties who do not recognise each other having entered into negotiations to reach a settlement. The United States did not recognise the People's Republic of China until 1972, yet it talked with the Chinese for years in Warsaw."

So, these are the things. Even the people of Pakistan are realising the dangers that are ahead due to arming of Pakistan by the United States.

Then, coming to the question of Afghanistan, what is the position of Afghanistan? Some people say, "Yes, there is nobody there, no government, nothing is there, only the Soviet soldiers are there." People have seen that if America, without the popular support in Viet Nam, with all the armed forces at its command, could

not suppress the people of Viet Nam, nobody from outside can suppress and keep any country as a slave. Nobody can do it. What is the position there? Really those who are talking about Afghanistan now are doing so because the reality is that the social change which is taking place there is not to their liking. Otherwise, why do they not talk about Chile and El Salvador? Why don't you talk about Pakistan and other countries? They are not mentioning them. They do not mention the countries where American imperialism is directly intervening, nor do they mention why American armies are being kept in South Korea. Nobody is mentioning that. Nobody has done it. Babrak Karmal has stated clearly: "I am prepared to come to an understanding, to an agreement with Pakistan and Iran, and on the basis of that, I am prepared to ask the Soviet army to withdraw." It is a very clear thing. So that position is taken by Afghanistan. The Soviet Union is also taking the same position. I do not know why much is being made of it. It is because America wants to have a diversion and it wants to pursue its own policies endangering peace. So they want the whole attention to be drawn towards Afghanistan.

Similarly on the question of Indo-China, what is the position of Kampuchea? I was there in the Indo-Chinese countries in January and I have myself seen what damage the Pol Pot regime has done to the whole country. Three million people had been killed; one-third of the population was killed. Now if anybody goes there, he can see the situation for himself. They talk of reporters. Let them see that the Pol Pot forces are operating from Thai territory, not from inside. Now stability is coming to that country, and they want to destabilise their countries which have gone to war against American imperialism, first against the French and then against Americans, not for one year but for scores of years, 25 years, 30 years; and after that, they have shown that nobody on earth can enslave any people if they are determined to fight for freedom. That is what the Indo-

Chinese countries and especially Vietnam have shown. And that is why today the Government of India is recognising the reality because there is a Government established by law. If today you ask the Pol Pot forces to stop their activities, tomorrow the Vietnamese army will be out. This is in relation to Indo-China.

So far as China is concerned, I have nothing common so far as China's foreign policy is concerned. But when it comes to my country's relations with them, I am very much interested in normalising relations with them. Why should I not be? It is in our interest; it is in the interest of China. We are strong enough to stand against any pressure. But can anybody say that by normalising relations with China, our relations with other countries will get harmed? No. We should have confidence in ourselves in this respect, too.

Then I would only point out to the danger to our stability inside the country from the multi-nationals, from the dependence on foreign capital. If that continues, then foreign agents will operate and create a certain situation in the country. And they have plenty of money to bribe people, to corrupt people. So that also can be done. So self-reliance is necessary. You may get technology from wherever you can get. But, at the same time, try to see that you are moving in such a way that you have not to depend on anybody by which you surrender your own position.

Sir, coming to the report, I would only say that the Ministry should have made this report up-to-date. You see what is mentioned here. Perhaps the External Affairs Minister has not seen the report. When Pakistan is being armed by the United States, it is mentioned here, "Both India and the United States realise the importance of working together to reduce world tensions and to achieve peace and cooperation in South Asia." It is not mentioned what the danger is. It is mentioned in the report that he is

[Shri, Harkishan Singh Surjeet]

working with America to establish peace in South Asia.

Then I have some criticism to make on the foreign policy. The criticism is that with all this happening in the world, you cannot equate the two super powers. This equating of the two super powers will not stand at all. Who stands by you? I do not want India to follow the foreign policy of any other country, of the Soviet Union or of any other country. I want an independent policy. But you cannot equate. Who is endangering peace here? Is it the Soviet Union or America? You have to differentiate, you have to pinpoint that it is American imperialism which is endangering peace in South Asia and in South-East Asia. People equate the two super powers by talking of super power rivalry. Some people have tried to say that in the Indian Oceans so many Soviet naval vessels are there. Let them ask them to quit and see what happens to them. They have not been asking Americans to quit Diego Garcia. What happened during the Bangladesh war when the Seventh Fleet came here? Do you think without the entry of Soviet naval forces that threat could have been averted? Therefore, mention of it should have been there.

Thirdly I would say about the non-aligned conference. I have my criticism against it. We have tried to play our role in non-alignment. Some people say many countries were against us. What they do not understand is how imperialism was active throughout the world to see that this conference got disrupted. They do not understand how that game was to be defeated and to keep them united. This is an achievement. But at the same time India should have put it on record, we don't agree, we want Diego Garcia to be mentioned. Of course, it could not have formed part of the document, but we could have pressed about Diego Garcia that it must be mentioned, that these bases must be removed. It was no argument that the conference on Indian

ocean was to take place, the Americans would not come to that conference, and so on. That is very dangerous for the country's independence and independent policy. Similarly there is no mention in the report about the withdrawal of American forces from South Korea. If you say it might not be done, it is all right—withdrawal of American forces. They are staying there not today but since thirty years in South Korea. Why does not the report say that the Government of India has always demanded withdrawal of American forces from South Korea? If they have not come there to stay, why do they not go back? And you know what is happening in South Korea. Many people are being killed; many people are being hanged. You see how the leaders are being treated, how democracy is being suppressed. Therefore, we have to play a positive role through non-alignment, an anti-imperialist role; that will heighten the prestige of our country, not any compromises and other things.

Finally, about the discussions with Mrs. Thatcher. I want to say that it was a dangerous game. Of course, the Government of India stood its ground. They fought. But that is not enough. This racial discrimination is going on there where Indians are directly affected. Before Mrs. Thatcher came here, on 5th April, ten thousand Indians had demonstrated on the streets of London against this. And after that attacks have been intensified against Indians. So we have to stand firm and tell them that we cannot tolerate any attacks, and if you don't listen, we will also take necessary measures. That has got to be firmly stated to them. The Indian Workers' Association Great Britain also wrote a letter to the Prime Minister and they have stated their condition, so that she could play her role when the meeting took place. So that position should also be stated there.

Finally about officers of the Ministry concerned with passports. I am tell-

ing you how very dangerous things are happening in your passport offices. Do you know what happened in Punjab? The son of one MLA belonging to my party was indulging in a very bad practice of signing on behalf of his father passport forms and getting money, some Rs. 500 for each form, and things like that. The son was signing on behalf of his father and putting his father's stamp. There is another boy who was conniving at it. See how degeneration is setting in, how it starts. What happens to the country if such things are happening? The two boys quarrelled...

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Was your son there?

SHRI HARKISHAN SINGH SURJEET: No, not my son. If my son had been there, I would have turned him out. It was my party MLA's son.

Now, the two boys quarrelled and the thing reached the passport officer. What did the passport officer do? He passed on the information to the police who in turn passed it on to the Chief Minister. The Chief Minister called the father and the son. And the tragedy is this. What will happen to this country if such things are indulged in? Both of them were told, "Neither of you can escape. You cannot remain an MLA. You and your son, both, will be imprisoned." And then they were told, "If you become a Congressman, then the case is shelved." This is the tragedy. This happened five days ago. That man hailed from a Scheduled Caste family. See how degeneration starts. I feel no concern if such a man left my party. Let him go. One who does not adhere to my party's ideology and my party's principles, I don't bother about him and I don't run after him. But the tragedy is after getting the information this is what the passport officer did. The crime is gone. Now that man has become a Congressman and with it the crime is gone. He has become a congressman. I would finally say that so far as our foreign policy is concerned, there are lot of pressures on India to tilt to the

West. I would like to say that India should remain firm; otherwise in the present world situation we cannot play any important role. India is an important and huge country and it has to play an important role. Many countries look towards India. I have stated that the world situation is very tense and the Reagan Administration is out to help the war industry to save his country from the big crisis. That will endanger the economies of other western countries. It is being realised. There is a resistance to this development in the western countries. I would like India to stand firm and not vacillate. Don't bother about the pressures. India should stand on its own legs and stand firm to defend its independence.

SHRI NAGESHWAR PRASAD SHAHI (Uttar Pradesh): It is going to be 6.00 o'clock. This is a very important discussion. There can be nothing more important than this. It is my suggestion and request that this should be continued on Monday and there should be no Calling Attention or Special Mention on Monday. I think the Minister will agree to it.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: As far as the importance of the discussion is concerned and as far as having the pleasure of listening to the Minister's reply is concerned, I would be in agreement with Mr. Shahi. But I cannot tie down my party to not having any Special Mention or Calling Attention. I would look forward to hear the hon. Minister's reply. I cannot tie my party down.

SHRI HARKISHAN SINGH SURJEET: It is according to the decision in the Business Advisory Committee. You cannot completely exclude it. Some important event may take place. Something important may happen. You cannot completely exclude this thing.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI B'SHAMBHAR NATH PANDE): Let Shri Bhupesh Gupta complete his speech today.

SHRI NAGESHWAR PRASAD SHAHI: I want to be very clear.

The order of the Chairman cannot be over-ruled by the Vice-Chairman. The order of the Chairman is that at 6-00 P.M. the Half-an-Hour Discussion will start.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BISHAMBHAR NATH PANDE): It is not 6 P.M. Let Mr. Bhupesh Gupta start his speech.

SHRI NAGESHWAR PRASAD SHAH: What will he speak in two minutes?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: If I cannot complete my speech, I need not start it.

श्री सीताराम केसरी : उपप्राध्यापक जी, शाही जी के सुझाव को इस शर्त पर हम भी मानने को तैयार हैं, फिर चूंकि महत्वपूर्ण विषय पर बहस चल रही है— मुझे कोई एतराज नहीं है। मगर चूंकि स्पेशल पेंशन और कालअटेंशन में फर्क काफी लग जाता है और फाइनेंस बिल भी हमें उस दिन टेक-अप करना पड़ेगा कि बिजनेस एडवाइजरी कमेटी ने फैसला किया है... (व्यवधान) आप बैठिये हम आपकी भावना का सम्मान करते हैं, हम आपके भाव को जानते हैं। इसलिए मैं कह रहा हूँ... देखिए बात यह है कि जैसे श्री हरिकिशन सिंह सुरजीत ने कहा कि बिजनेस एडवाइजरी कमेटी में बातें हुई हैं कि जब बहुत इम्पोर्टेंट सबजेक्ट काल-अटेंशन में लिया या नहीं लिया जाएगा, उस शब्द में बड़ा भेद हो जाता है कभी-कभी। किस की बात इम्पोर्टेंट समझेंगे, किस की नहीं, यह मेरा कहना है।

इसलिए मैंने कहा कि चेयरमैन इस चीज का डिसेशन लेंगे, मगर आपसे निवेदन है कि स्पेशल मेंशन तो आप जानते हैं कि जब इम्पोर्टेंट होता है, तो काल-अटेंशन पर सोच सकते हैं... तो एक सौहार्दपूर्ण वातावरण में आपके सुझाव को, आपको भावना को मानता हूँ, मगर यह जो हाउस की भावना है कि स्पेशल

मेंशन, काल अटेंशन न लेकर
(व्यवधान)

[उपप्राध्यापक (श्री दिनेश गोस्वामी)
पीठासीन हुए]

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा (बिहार) : ना-ना। दोनों चलने चाहियें। मतलब है कार्लिंग अटेंशन भी हो, स्पेशल मेंशन भी हो। बहुत समय ऐसे में हो बर्बाद हो जाता है।

SHRI NAGESHWAR PRASAD SHAH: Sir, it is now 6 p.m.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): It is now 6 p.m. Therefore, we will now take up the Half-an-Hour Discussion. But so far as this discussion on the External Affairs Ministry is concerned, may I take it as a consensus that this discussion will continue on Monday?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes, yes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): But let us understand that unless there will be very exceptionally important subjects on that day Calling Attention and Special Mentions will not be taken up to facilitate the discussion. We are not preventing, of course, if certain exceptionally very important subjects come up.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, before Mr. Narasimha Rao goes, I would like to have a statement from him about one thing. In what capacity the Indian Ambassador in Peking accompanied Mr. Subramanian Swamy to go and meet Deng Xiaoping...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): I am not permitting any further discussion.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: For the first time, the External Affairs Ministry has been in the need of borrowing from Mr. Morarji Desai's camp in the opposition in order to...

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I will certainly reply to it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): Now, the Half-an-Hour Discussion.

**HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION ON
POINTS ARISING OUT OF ANSWERS
TO STARRED QUESTION
263 GIVEN ON 5TH DECEMBER,
1980 REGARDING SUB-STANDARD
MEDICINES PURCHASED BY THE
MALARIA ERADICATION DEPART-
MENT.**

श्री रामेश्वर प्रसाद शाही (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
यह प्रश्न संख्या 263 जिसका सम्बन्ध
मंत्री महोदय से है, और जिनके प्रति मुझे
बहुत ही आदर है, उनका ध्यान आकर्षित
करना हूँ कि उन्होंने अपने जवाब में यह
कहा था कि—

“During 1977, 1000 KGs of Primaquine-phosphate powder was imported through the State Trading Corporation of India and the World Health Organisation. The Medical Store Depot, Bombay, was asked to arrange for tableting of the powder. After due tender enquiry, the work for tableting was awarded to M/s. Eupharma Laboratories, Bombay. Some of the National Malaria Eradication Units complained regarding discolouring of the tablets. Since the firm agreed to replace discoloured malaria tablets at their own cost, no loss has been suffered by the Government in this regard and hence no responsibility has been fixed against anybody.”

मैं मंत्री महोदय से यह जानना चाहूँगा कि क्या कोई फर्म है, यह ड्रा की मल्टी नेशनल कंपनी और सब-स्टैंडर्ड या अडल्टरेटड ड्रग देती है आपके परकारी अस्पताल को, और जांच के बाद यह पकड़ा जाता है कि वह मेडिसिन सब-स्टैंडर्ड थी या वह ड्रा अडल्टरेटड था, तो उसकी मज्रा भुगतान है कि आप उस कंपनी से कह देंगे कि तुम इसको चेन्ज कर दो, इसको वापस ले लो और इसके बदले में दूसरी दवा दे दो, या ठीक दवा

दे दो। क्या आप का स्टैंडर्ड यही है, वह टेब्लेट डिस्कलर्ड हो गई आपको मालूम नहीं हुआ कि वह टेब्लेट सब-स्टैंडर्ड थे ?

श्री अमर प्रसाद चक्रवर्ती : (पश्चिमी बंगाल) : दवाई का नाम क्या है ?

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : क्विनेन टेब्लेट्स। मलेरिया के नहीं। क्या यह इस बात का सबूत नहीं है कि उसमें मिलावट थी ? और यह बात साबित हो जाने के बाद आपका अधिकारी यह उचित समझे कि उस दवा को कंपनी वापस ले ले और उसके बदले में ठीक दवा दे दे ?

मंत्री जी, आपके स्टैंडर्ड से यह बात ठीक हो सकती है, मगर जो हालत देश में एडल्टरेशन की है उसके अनुसार मुझे बड़े दुःख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि आप और आपका विभाग एडल्टरेटड मेडिसिन के बारे में इस तरह का रुख और रवैया अख्तियार करते हैं।

श्रीमन्, मैं दो उदाहरण दूँगा, लखनऊ मेडिकल कालेज में अभी दो साल पहले सब-स्टैंडर्ड ग्लूकोज वाटर चढ़ाने की वजह से एक दिन में 30 पेशेन्ट्स मर गये और सैकड़ों की हालत खराब हो गई। उसके बाद जब गवर्नमेंट ने जांच शुरू की तो मालूम हुआ कि कानपुर की एक कंपनी ने उसे सप्लाई किया था और उनकी ओवरशिप प्रभावशाली नेताओं के पास थी। मैं नाम नहीं लूँगा, आपके दल की वह महिला हैं। उस कंपनी की ओवरशिप कुछ प्रभावशाली लोगों के पास है। कंपनी के मालिक बड़े होते हैं। उसके बारे में जांच पड़ताल शुरू हुई, लेकिन उस पर ताला नहीं लगाया गया। उस कंपनी ने दूसरे नाम से दूसरे ही दिन से काम करना शुरू कर दिया।