MOTION FOB EXTENSION OF TIME FOR PRESENTATION OF THE REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSES ON VISVA-BHARATI (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1978

SHRI BISHAMBHAR NATH PANDE (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I beg to move the following motion:

"That the time appointed for the presentation of the Report of the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Visva-Bharati (Amendment) Bill, 1978, be further extended up to the last day of the Hundred and Twenty-first Session of the Rajya Sabha."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

MOTION RE. THE PRESENT INTERNATIONAL SITUATION AND THE POLICY OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA IN RELATION THERETO

MR. CHAIRMAN Now, Mr. Narasimha Rao.

श्री जे० के० जैन (मध्य प्रदेश) : श्रीमन्, एक मिनट . . . (व्यवधान)

MR. CHAIRMAN: One by one. (*Interruptions*)

श्री जे० के० जैन : श्रीमन्, प्रेस ट्रस्ट आफ इंडिया के दफ्तर में विरोधी-दलों के लोगों ने जो हमला किया है, उसकी ओर मैं सदन का ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूं कि प्रेस की स्वतंत्रता का इन लोगों ने कितना मजाक उड़ाया है । प्रेस ट्रस्ट आफ इंडिया के दफ्तर में कुछ गुंडों और शरारती तत्वों ने जाकर जो हमला किया है, उसकी सदन को भर्त्सना करनी चाहिए, यह मेरा आपसे निवेदन है ।

SHRI PILOO MODY (Gujarat): On this occasion we have the goondas from his party.

(Interruptions)

SHRI B. D. KHOBRAGADE (Maharashtra): Sir, my submission is, have you given him permission to say this thing?

MR. CHAIRMAN; No.

SHRI B. D. KHOBRAGADE: Yesterday whatever I said was not recorded. Why should there be such discrimination? It was a very important question yesterday. But a ruling was given that nothing would go on record. Today this will go on record, why. *(Interruptions).* Now what he has said, you have allowed it to go on record. Yesterday I raised an important question but it was ruled out. Why? Why such discrimination?

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI (Maharashtra): We do not know from where the goondas have come. As Mr. Piloo Mody has said, they might have been from their section. But the point is Mr. Khobragade should be allowed to make his point.

SHRI NAGESHWAR PRASAD SHAHI (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Chairman we want to know from you when the motion on corruption will be discussed in this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN; The Business . Advisory Committee is meeting at 2.30. It will decide. ..

SHRI NAGESHWAR PRASAD SHAHI; But the Government must say.

SHRI SYED SIBTE RAZI (Uttar Pradesh); Corrupt people have no right to ask that question. We know their history.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Sir, Sir. (___*(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have gone enough on useless things, debating

things which are not of such importance as the statement which is now to be made, which is positive. We can talk all other things after Mr. Nara-simha Rao is freed of what his obligations are. This is a very serious matter developing in the whole world.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Sir, please stay on for some time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am going to stay on. All these things can wait till after Mr. Narasimha Rao has finished his statement.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO): Mr. Chairman, I beg to move—

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

Sir, while moving this motion; I do not propose to make a general statement but on certain specific issues which have cropped up within the last few days I would like to take the House into confidence so that the ensuing debate could be more meaningful and honourable Members would be enabled to speak in the light of what I am going to state in a factual manner.

During the visit of the Chinese Foreign Minister to India, we had agreed that official level talks would be held in Beijing regarding both bilateral problems and bilateral exchanges. Talks were accordingly held in Beijing for five days from December 10 to 14. There were three sessions of plenary discussions, and several meetings of sub-groups on matters concerning the boundary, trade and economic cooperation, cultural exchanges and science and technology. Various members of the delegation also met senior officials of the concerned Ministries and visited a number of institutions. The delegation had a meeting with Vice-Premier and Foreign Minister Huang. Hua. The atmosphere was friendly and cordial throughout all the meetings and discussions.

Regarding the border it was not our anticipation that it would be possible to make substantive *progress in* the first round. The two sides have had a fairly detailed exchange of views, and although fairly wide differences persist, we hope that they could result in a better understanding of each other's positions. In the light of the report of our delegation, we are now considering how we should take this matter forward. We may, however, regard the fact of the meeting itself, the first on this subject in 20 years, as a positive step. This, I understand, is the Chinese view also.

The delegation reviewed the level of exchanges in various fields such as culture, trade, economic cooperation and science and technology, and tentative programmes for the future are now being considered by the various Ministries and agencies.

As I have repeatedly informed the House, it is the desire of the Government to normalise relations fully with China. This is only possible when we can bring about a complete resolution of our problems as well as a stable relationship in all fields.

Sir, may I now refer to a development that has taken place in the Middle East? I refer to the Israeli Government's decision to annex the occupied Syrian trritory of Golan Heights. The matter is already before the General Assembly of the United Nations and the Security Council has been specially convened to discuss this matter. In the General Assembly, India has co-sponsored a draft resolution which, while expressing its grave alarm at the Israeli decision to apply Israeli law to the occupied Syrian Arab Golan Heights, and reaffirming that acquisition of territory by force is inadmissible under the UN Charter, principles of International Law and relevant UN resolutions, asks, *inter alia,* that the General Assembly declare that the Israeli decision to pull and void and has no legal vsndity whatsoever strongly deplore the persistence of Israeli policy of annexa-

[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao]

tion which escalates tension in the re-tion; demand that Israel rescinds forthwith its decision; call upon all States, Specialized Agencies and other International Institutions not to recognise this decision; request the Security council, in the event of Israel's failure to implement this resolution, to invoke Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

While this matter is currently being debated and discussed in the UN in New York, it is clear that Israel continues to pursue a policy of expansionism by force. It is highly provocative and aggressive, being a policy of conquest and confrontation which will further aggravate the already tense and indeed volatile situation in West Asia.

Sir, I finally turn to the developments which have recently taken place in Poland. Hon'ble Members are aware that a state of emergency was declared in Poland from mid-might on 12/13 December and an Army Council of National Salvation was constituted. This was announced in a radio broadcast by Prime Minister Jaruzelski, who said that he was taking these measures "obeying the Polish Constitution."

We have been following these developments, under conditions of interrupted communications. The Polish Ambassador in New Delhi called on me yesterday, under instructions of his Government, and gave me an account of the recent development. He also conveyed to me a message from our Ambassador in Warsaw that the Polish authorities are giving the Indian Embassy the necessary protection and that all the members of the Indian community in Poland are safe.

What is happening in Poland is primarily the concern of its Government and people. We earnestly hope the present crisis will be overcome by them in the shortest possible time. We view such developments from the stand-point of our commitment to the principle of non-interference.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kalyana-sundaram and Mrs. Najma Heptulla to move their amendments.

SHRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM (Tamil Nadu): Sir, I beg to move:

"That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'and having considered the same this House —

(a) while appreciating that India is keen to normalise re lations with the neighbouring countries deplores the decision of US to supply most uptodate weapons, to Pakistan and China, which are dangerous to the cause of peace in the region;

(b) notes with regret the obs tructive attitude pursued by US against holding a conference for declaring Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace in accordance with the resolution of U.N. General Assem bly;

(c) expresses its grave concern over the U.S. Nuclear strategy and arms race, as a source of serious threat to the cause of world peace and peaceful development of developing countries;

(d) welcomes the appeal adopted on 23-6-1981 by the Supreme Soviet of the USSR against arms race, for negotiations on disarmament and to avert the risk of nuclear war, which is in conformity with India's approach to the cause of world-peace and the policy of peaceful co-existence;

(e) calls upon the Government to pursue more vigorously the time-tested policy of non-alignment and to strengthen India's relations with the forces opposed to imperialism and war;

(f) expresses its concern for the overseas Indians, harassed by forces of racism in countries like-

the U.K., Sri Lanka etc. and urges upon Government to take necessary steps for the protection of their legitimate rights."

DR. (SHRIMATI) NAJMA HEPTULLA (Maharashtra); Sir, I beg to move:

2. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely: —

'and having considered the . . . .same, this House approves of the said policy.' "

The questions were proposed.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shrimati Margaret Alva.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA (Karnataka): Mr. Chairman....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Yadav, please sit down. ...

श्री हुकुमदेव नारायण यादव (बिहार): मेरा प्वाइंट आफ-आर्डर है, श्रीमन्. . .

. MR.. CHAIRMAN: That is overruled. Yes, Mrs. Alva.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: Mr. Chairman. I am glad that we have an opportunity today to discuss the international situation.... *(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Yadav, please sit down.

श्री हुकुमदेव नारायण यादव : श्रीमन्, मेरा इसमें अमेंडमेंट दिया हुआ था ।

श्री सभापति : अमेंडमेंट कहां है ?

श्री हुकुमदेव नारायण यादव : यह मैं क्या जानूं ।

श्री सभापति : हमारे पास नहीं आया, मैं पता करता हूं । आप बैठ जाईये ।

SHRI PILOO MODY: You can allow him to move his amendment. It is in the rules.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am sorry...

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI (Gujarat): If there is a lapse somewhere, he should be allowed to move it formally even now.

MR, CHAIRMAN: He should give it in writing.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: He says he has given it. It is misplaced somewhere.

श्री सभापति : अभी तक तो आपका पहुंचा नहीं, कब किया है ।

You move your amendment.

THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE (SHRI PRANAB KUMAR MUKHERJEE) : " How can somebody come and move an amendment?

SHRI NAGESHWAR PRASAD SHAHI: Sir, he has already sent the amendment.

MR CHAIRMAN: Where?

SHRI NAGESHWAR PRASAD SHAHI: To the Office. *(Interruptions)* .

SHRI SYED SIBTE RAZI (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I am on a point of order.

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह (उत्तर प्रदेश) : उनका कहना है कि हमने भेजा है। श्रीमन्, इनको अब आप सुन लें. . . .

श्री सभापति : आप बाद में अपना अमेंडमेंट मूव कर लीजियेगा. . . (**व्यवधान**)

श्री हुकुमदेव नारायण यादव : मैंने नोटिस दिया है. . . .।

श्री बी० सत्यनारायण रेड्डी (आंध्र प्रदेश) : उन्होंने नोटिस दिया हुआ है ।

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: Sir, there is no rule to read out an amendment which has not been moved. *(Interruptions).* There is no such rule which allows this.

SHRI PRANAB KUMAR MUKHERJEE: Yes.

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: Mr. Yadav cannot move the amendment now. He should give his amendment. In the meantime, Sir, we can discuss. There is no rule. You have got to go by the conventions of the House and you cannot break the convention. *(Interruptions).*

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is a serious thing. You please sit down, Mr. Yaday. *(Interruptions).* Just a minute. The amendment has not been received and I think it is out of order for Mr. Hukmdeo Narayan Yadav to interrupt the proceedings of the House. Yes, Mrs. Alva.

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : श्रीमन्, उनको आप सुन लीजिए . . .

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: Sir, the international scene today_____ *(Interruptions).*

[Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair]

SHRI PILOO MODY: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir. Mr. Hukmdeo Narayan Yadav has sent his amendment two days *ago to* the Notice Office and there is something wrong somewhere. *(Interruptions).*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let Mr. Yadav explain it. He can explain as to when he sent it, to whom he has given it.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Perfectly all right You kindly hear him.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He should know it better. Let me hear from him. Yes, Mr. Yadav.

श्री हुकमदेव नारायण यादव : विदेश मंत्रालय के प्रस्ताव की सूचना जिस दिन कार्यवली पर प्रकाशित हो गयी थी उसी दिन मैंने इस पर अपना संशोधन लिखकर नोटिस आफिस में दिया था। इसलिए जब अपना वह संशोधन, मैंने नियमानुसार आर्डर पेपर में नहीं देखा क्योंकि मैंने उसको पहले दे दिया था।

तो इसीलिए मैंने शुरू में ही व्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठाना चाहा कि मेरे संशोधन का क्या हुआ, वह सर्कुलेट क्यों नहीं किया गया है ? लेकिन सभापति जी हमको बोलने ही नहीं देते थे ।

श्री उपसभापति : तो ठीक है, आपका अमैंडमैंट दफ्तर में मिला नहीं होगा ।...**(व्यवधान)** आप लिख कर दीजिए जो आपने दिया है ।

SHRI PILOO MODY: Let him move it. *(Interruptions).*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let me see the copy of the amendment, if he has. Later on he can move it. He can give it in writing now. He can move it later on. Or, if he has got a copy, he can give it. Let me see the copy of the amendment. (Interruptions).

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Sir, let him prepare it again.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Advani, I am not saying anything for which you have to stand up and say something. Let him prepare it; let him get a copy of the amendment and let him hand it over to me and then I will allow. If he has got a copy.

he can hand it over to me. *(Interruptions).*

All ri आप लिख कर दीजिए

Alva.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the international scene today presents a tense atmosphere. Local conflicts, war preparations, clashes of interests, even talk of limited nuclear war, make one wonder as to what we are heading for. India has naturally had to face many situations and perhaps react also to them in different forums. We have taken many initiatives and our voice has been heard in many international forums, particularly in Cancun and in the Commonwealth Conference. Besides, Sir, we have had our prime Minister, President, Foreign Minister and the Foreign Secretary, whom many of us have come to refer to as India's Kissinger, that is, Mr. Gonsalves, running around trying to see what we can do and what we can contribute at various places. But after all these things, Sir. I would like to ask this question: Where do we stand now?

Sir, I would begin with this region. This region has come into focus very much over the past few months. Perhaps, after the fall of the Shah of Iran, this whole region suddenly became a centre for many powers to start their game in this region again.

And so their focus had to shift gradually from Iran closer to us because a new regime had to proposed up in this region for safeguarding their own interests.

Developments in Afghanistan added a new dimension to the situation. And, then recently the assassination of
Sadat has perhaps created a certain amount of uncertainty for certain interested forces. The United States, therefore, has taken the initiative in
reasserting its presence in this region in order perhaps to safeguard its
own interests as well as to keep its domestic arms industry going. There has been an effort not only to pump arms into this region but also to encourage local conflicts to suit its own interests. We have, therefore as a result, seen so many things in Pakistan. About this I would like to give my reactions a little later. We have seen military and naval exercises in the Persian Gulf. Efforts are suddenly being made to build Diego Garcia into a nuclear war base. Efforts are on for creating new bases. There were recently questions in the Sri Lanka Parliament about maps published by the United States which have shown a base of the United States in Sri Lanka. This question came up earlier, and even their Minister which in Delhi denied it, and yet maps have appeared and published in the United States showing a military base of the United States in Sri Lanka. And, thus we have recently seen, in various parts of the region there have been efforts to create a destabilising situation.

Coming to the sub-continent itself, we have seen this new movement for "Khalistan" which has suddenly cropped up and which has got something more to do than just a cry of a few people somewhere for a homeland. We know that money and interests from abroad are behind it all. And it was rather strange that the Foreign Minister should have been asked to negotiate with these people. I think it was something which he should not have undertaken, considering this delicate situation. Many have been asking why you are asked to negotiate with these people, as far as the Khalistan question is concerned because it did give an impression that you were taking it to a different level than expected. *(Interruptions).*

AN HON. MEMBER: Already recognized it. *(Interruptions).*

AN HON. MEMBER: He followed the precedent of Nagaland. (*Interruptions).*

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: Anyway, I am asking you the question

DR. (SHRIMATI) RAJINDER KAUR (Punjab): Mr. Deputy Chair-man, Sir, I would like to make a point here that he is negotiating with the Akalis who have not supported the demand for Khalistan. She should not mix up the two issues. *(Interruptions)*

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: Sir, I come to the question of arms supply to Pakistan. We started by the Foreign Minister going to Pakistan, signing a joint declaration admitting the right of Pakistan to arm itself, acquire arms and to project itself as a sovereign power. And then we come back and we go round all over the world, literally panic-stricken, saying that because of these arms we are in trouble, because of these arms we are insecure. I do realise that it did create a certain problem for us in the sub-continent. But I would like to ask: Are we so unprepared that arms given to a neighbouring country create panic amongst us literally? *(Interruptions)* Madam, you can speak; it makes no difference to me. You can express your views.

AN HON. MEMBER: She has no views. *(Interruptions).*

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: Now we have to react in this man ner. *(Interruptions)* The Prime Minister herself has said that we are all prepared for any eventuality. We should be able to know that these things are bound to happen, that arms are going to be given to every body around us. And, therefore, having told them that they have the right initially, why do we react in the manner we did? This is what I would like to ask. Then comes the offer of the 'no-war pact'. I realise that we also made an offer earlier. But just because what we did in 1949 did not receive a positive response, does it mean that when they come forward today and say that they are prepared for it, we should say 'No' simply because when we made the offer, they had not accepted it? Should we say that now when you make the offer, we will not accept it? There is a certain amount of childishness to this reaction. After all, let us admit that basically we have more in common with Pakistan than we have with anybody else. We have a common history, a common cultural heritage and a lot of emotional attachments amongst families. Why do we not accept this offer today? Why don't we extend a hand of friendship and say: "Let us forget the past". After all, it is in our interest to come to terms with Pakistan and to keep everybody else out of the sub-continent. Therefore, I do feel that the Government should take a positive stand and even at this stage they should carry forward the Simla spirit and come to terms and see how far we can agree on this issue.

As far as Bangladesh is concerned, there have been elections and a new President. I think our old issue of Farakka is still hanging fire and I can only hope that the Foreign Ministry and the Government will find a mutually acceptable solution without permitting this issue to be internationalised. There are many who are interested in getting outside parties and-outside forces involved in this question. I think we should stick to our stand that it is an issue basically between the two of us and that we are quite capable of finding a solution ourselves.

Sir, we know that there is a strategy to create disunity, instability and confusion in the region. But what are you going to do about it? What is our response? These meeting of Foreign Secretaries of this region have been a positive move. We have had, I think, two or three meetings already. I would ask the Foreign Minister what positive results have come out of this exercise of Foreign Secretaries' meetings regularly and discussing mutual problems and mutual differences. After all, besides the political questions, there is a tremendous scope in this region for

economic co-operation. We speak so much about North-South dialogue, about the developed and the developing countries. But have we taken sufficient initiative to see that there is cooperation among the developing countries with a certain amount of sharing of resources, of technology and of whatever we can in our own region so that closer cooperation and ties could emerge?

It is a known fact that the new Administration in the United States is more anti-Indian than ever before. We have seen this on various fronts. In spite of all our efforts, we have failed on the nuclear fuel front. In fact, today's report in the Statesman says—I am just reading two or three lines from today's Statesman. It says:

> "Following the U.S. Government's refusal to honour its commitments to supply enriched uranium for the Tarapur plant and the negative U.S. attitude on the question of IMF loan_____ the U.S. Commerce Department has refused export licences for non-lethal equipment needed for this country's space programme, the aviation industry, some thermal plants and certain items needed for Tarapur and Narora plants."

Then they go on giving the list of equipments for which they have now refused licences and which are going to create serious problems on many other fronts. Yet, in spite of knowing the hostile attitude, we have, I would say, walked into the spider's web by making commitments for this IMF loan. I am sure that if there was somebody else in the Chair, he would probably say that the IMF loan has nothing to do with foreign policy. It is an economic issue. But I would like to say that it would strike basically at our basic principle of self-reliance and of national sovereignty on economic issues.

I am surprised that this Government, under the leadership of Mrs. Indira Gandhi, who has always stood 1555 RS—7.

up to everybody should have given in on this basic question. And here again, I do not want to go into the details of terms and so on. I am just reading again the newspaper report which says "IMF to be consulted on Budget, export policy." This is a Delhi Despatch from the 'Financial Express' of Wednesday, the 16th December. It is a front-page coverage. They say, "It is now evident that the Union Government will have to consult the International Monetary Fund on both budgetary and export policies for the next year." And then, they go on to say. "The team is arriving before the Budget is presented and it is believed to have Set out the schedule of consultations under which the first round is to take place before March next year". Then they go on to say—and I do not want to take much time on this because I will run out of time—and they pointed out here clearly that Mr. Venkataraman in September wrote and said "consistent with parliamentary approval and policy". And having said this, when there were objections to that letter, later We have written again. In this letter of September 26 to the Managing Director of the IMF, the Union Finance Minister has Said this.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN; That has been discussed already.

SHRI NARASINGHA PRASAD NANDA (Orissa): This is yesterday's write up, Sir.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: In the latest answer, Mr. Narasimhan, the Executive Director of India on the IMF has given an explanation again. And the explanation is that "the specific words in the Finance Minister's letter were meant to refer to actual adoption of measures and not intended to exclude from the consultations any policies that the Fund considers are and would be consistent with achieving the objectives of the Fund." So, we have again sent an explanation, literally apologising that we would be pre-

[Smt. Margaret Alva] pared to fall in with the whole scheme. And, Sir, I do not want to read any more because I am running out of time.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN; You have five minutes more.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: But, I think, this question has created a great deal of concern not only at home but also among our friends abroad.

Sir, as far as China is concerned. I welcome the initiative taken by the Government. The team has just come back and you have made a brief statement on it. Of course, none of us expected miracles to happen during this visit. But, I think, it is important that we move forward because if there can be friendship and understanding between these two really important countries of Asia, a lot of problems and a lot of other issues would fall in place. But I would like to ask the Minister: Have we agreed to disagree or have we agreed to meet again to find some common ground? That is the important question. And the way you are nodding it looks like that you are quite confident that we are moving forward. And it is certainly a welcome thing. And I do look forward also to the visit of the Prime Minister which has been announced. I suppose it is true that she is planning to go there, and we can only hope that something positive will happen very soon.

Sir, since you are already talking about time, there are a few p6ints which I would like to raise as far as this debate is concerned. There was a question recently at the United Nations about the new Secretary-General. And there had been a great deal of hope and expectation that an African or an Asian would be elected to the post. But after all the offorts, in the end we find that it has again gone out of the Afro-Asian group.

AN HON. MEMBER; It is the Third World.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: It might be the Third World. But there was a great deal of effort that somebody from Africa, if not from Asia, should come. I would like to know whether we did play any role or did take any initiative. I know that we have no veto by which we can block somebody else. But, I think, India has a great standing at the U.N. And a little bit more of positive involvement by us could have clinched the issue in finding somebody, I do not want to say more suitable, but somebody from this region.

Sir, there is the report which has appeared that you have refused to accept the Papal Mission which was coming to India. Now, I do not want to raise a controversy over this. Here was a mission which was being sent to many countries to create an atmosphere against nuclear weapons, to plead with the Governments and nations against this mad nuclear race. We talk in disarmament forums, we take initiatives in various fields but here you refuse to receive a mission which wanted to come here also while visiting many other countries. I do not know what prompted you or what you were worried about. After all, that is not a military power or anybody else. On the other hand, you would welcome a military mission from somewhere or arms selling mission from somewhere. But here was a mission coming, talking about disarmament and asking that India take the initiative in this field and you refuse to receive the mission. I do not know really what weighed with you, Sir. But I would say that this is not in keeping with the Indian tradition or the ethos of this country.

And, then we have the British Nationality Bill today. Of course.

it is a document, it has come to stay. But what after that? In fact, we did have many members of Indian associations in Britain who were here some time ago who bitterly pointed out that we were exceptionally silent even during the public hearings, that even as a Commonwealth country we did not take the opportunity provided to us to present our case or to present a formal document, and they said, they were present when it was asked whether India had made a formal statement and the reply from the secretariat was, "no." Under these circumstances I would like to ask the Foreign Minister today what he intends to do about the thousands of British passport holders stranded in India, who under the lift system, or the quota system are going to be here for many years before they are even allowed to see Britain again.

Sir, there are reports again that the policy planning—I do not know I am only quoting from the newspaper reports that the policy planning division, or what you call a 'cell,' is going to be reorganised and is going to be recast. I do not know whether the reports are true. But somehow or the other one is getting the impression that various little cells, the economic Ministry with its own cell of people, who are not responsible to Parliament, are advising on various issues and are literally running the Finance Ministry. Now, you have it in the External Affairs Ministry. I would like to know what role this cell is playing and how it is going to coordinate with the whole question of responsibility to Parliament. (Time bell rings).

Sir, finally I would only like to Say this, that we are a non-aligned country and we have been in the forefront of the movement. But, let Us, for God's sake, not give the impression now, as some others tried to interpret it earlier, that we are equally non-aligned, that we are equally distant, that we are equally non-committed. I want you to be very clear on this that non-alignment is not a negative policy. You yourself have been repeatedly saying it, that it springs from a positive commitment to certain principles. You cannot be with the exploiter and the exploited at the same time. You cannot be with the freedom movements and the colonialists at the same time. You have got to choose and you have got to stand where you believe you can stand. Therefore, this effort suddenly to say that we are here and we are there, that we will keep these happy and we will keep those happy, and we are non-aligned, that we are here and we are there and that we are everywhere, is something which does not bring credit either to the Government or to you. I would, therefore, request you to have a firm commitment, first of all, to finding a solution, for a certain amount of peace and stability in the sub-continent and also make an effort to see that our voice is boldly heard in places where it should be heard so that justice and equality does prevail all over the world. Thank you.

DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA (Maharashtra) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the world is indeed in turmoil and I am saying this not as a matter of cliche but keeping in view the real situation that prevails. In the last few months the situation has worsened and, I think, I would not be wrong in congratulating our External Affairs Minister on the deft handling of every crisis that we had to face. In this connection, the sagacity *and* the statesmanship that our Prime Minister has displayed is something remarkable. However, Sir, there are certain apprehensions in my mind which I would like to share with our Foreign Minister. And that is the position in which inevitably we seem to land ourselves in view of certain basic stands that we have justifiably taken, stands which have taken us away from those who share our common values, stands which we have been compelled to take in

[Dr. Rafiq Zakaria] order to safeguard our security. And in this context I would like to know as to what the situation will be if the crisis in Poland deepens, because the crisis is not confined to one country; it is not confined to one continent. It is a crisis which threatens to engulf all of us And when Sir, Poland comes to our mind I get a little more frightened because it was Poland which brought about the last world war. Therefore, Sir, while I welcome the statement of our External Affairs Minister, 1 think he should take us a little more in confidence to tell us as to where the human race stands today.

Sir, we have had this Afghanistan crisis, and the stand that our Government took, is increasingly being appreciated. But even in Afghanistan, as the Prime Minister and the External Affairs Minister have . explained so ably, it was not just a question of a local occurrence and the Soviet intrusion there. There were so many other factors. And. Sir, that is what is the cause of worry. The cause that worries us is that every situation, local or not local, is creating a crisis which threatens not only to engulf the bordering areas but also to engulf the whole lot of us and with nuclear confrontation in the air, it is necessary for us to go deeper into the matter and try to find out as to how, while adhering to our basic principles of non-alignment and close co-operation with countries in the region, we should be in a position to safeguard our independence and our security, because, Sir, stands are not being decided as a result of the action and reaction of one country and another. In this context when I think of Pakistan which has been, in a way, the pivotal centre of our foreign policy, I again want to know from the Foreign Minister as to what exactly is going to be our position, because, Sir, while Pakistan has undoubtedly been the greatest beneficiary of the Afghanistan situation and the results we have seen— the F-16s and even America's conni-vance at the nuclear preparations that are in the offing there—I would like to know whether Pakistan has not been the favourite friend of the United States right from the days of our partition. And if so, we have got to go into the history of it. In the context of this history, the question is, with Pakistan being a smaller country, being an Islamic State, being closer to the Arab countries, in particular, to Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Qatar, U.A.E. and so on, which are the oil-producing countries, and with which the United States has naturally the closest collaboration, whether in this global strategy of the two Super Powers, could there have been any other attitude on the part of America? In fact, the recent disclosures which have been made by Dr. Gopal of the various notings made by our late Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, show that he tried his level best to see that the equidistance between Russia and America, that India was trying to cultivate, was maintained at all costs. But he did not succeed. Pandit Nehru did not even favour a treaty with the USSR so that such a step may be misunderstood by America. But this has had no effection America. If Mrs. Gandhi had to enter into a treaty with the Soviet Union in 1971, the reasons for this are well-known. We have been compelled to take certain positions not so much because of our own volition, but because of these developments which are arising as a result of the super power rivalries which are going on. And Sir, India's position has naturally become much more difficult. In fact, I must congratulate the Government and the Prime Minister for having maintained, in the face of all these complexities, hurdles and difficulties that they have to face, a position which still is respected in most parts of the world—a position of non-alignment. But Sir, the price we have to pay as a result of it, the price we have to pay, is, misunderstanding in some sections of the House here misunderstanding in large parts of the Western world, and our increasing alignment with a sphere wherein we have been left with no choice but to maintain. Now, Sir, when America is arming Pakistan with F-16 what are we supposed to do?

SHRI PILOO MODY: Get an F-17.

DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA: The Defence Minister is here. I would like very much to know from the External Affairs Minister whether any counter measures against this terrible weapon are being taken. Of course, Mr. Shiv-raj Patil has assured us that we are very much alive as far as this threat is concerned. And I have no doubt that all precautions are being taken. But Sir, we are at a loss to understand as to what is this counter measure. We are talking of Mirages. We are talking of other steps. But from what I have been told, they are no answer to it. And America knows it. Still America is arming Pakistan. Why is it that America, which has been hesitant so far to go to this extent, as far as arming Pakistan is concerned, is today unashamedly going head arming Pakistan with the most sophisticated weapons they have, and even turning a blind eye as far as their nuclear capabilities are concerned? Sir, my reasoning—I do not know whether the External Affairs Minister agrees with me or not—is that while the American attitude towards Pakistan was a little less decisive and definite so far; it was not because they feared any adverse reactions in India— as far as their global strategy is concerned, they somehow or other feel that the choices have to be made between India and Pakistan and because of reasons I have already explained they have made that choice. In fact, Mr. Henri Kissenger, when he was the Secretary of State, admitted that their tilt was towards Pakistan and as far as President Reagan is concerned, that tilt has tilted much more. But, Sir, the tilt was there, as I said, not because America was concerned about adverse reaction, as far as that is concerned in India. They were concerned because of the adverse reaction in Israel. Israel was more concerned or more apprehensive that if Pakistan was so heavily armed by America, then there would be a danger to its security because of the closeness of Pakistan with Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, UAE and other Arab countries. There-fore, what has America now done? America has decided that Pakistan is to be heavily armed and at the same time Israel is to be made almost an American base with everything that America had, has been put there, so that in case there is any kind of a conflict between their friends, within their sphere, Israel would be able to have the upper hand. And the recent capture, 'conquest' as the Foreign Minister has said, of the Golan Heights of Syria by Israel is a pointer in that direction. Is it not amazing that all that America could say, as far as this shameful aggression and conquest in this 20th century by Israel is concerned, that they are surprised and disappointed? The Foreign Minister has told us of the resolution that is coming in the United Nations. But he also knows what the effect of that resolution will be. He has said that there would be a demand for the application of Chapter 7. Will that solve the problem? Will the world body not be justified in regard to an act like this— the most unprovoked, the most aggressive, the most shameless act on the part of any country—to expel Israel? But when we are talking of all these moralities, there again the question comes of the super power equations. And what exactly would happen, therefore, I am not quite sure.

But in this context what has India to do? India's problem will be very simple to my mind. If we agree to be a client state, a client state of either the Soviet Union or the United States of America, we have quite rightly decided against this position. We may have our friendship with the Soviet Union, we are appreciative of all that the Soviet Union has done in every crisis that we have had to face and, in fact, because of it we have been in a position to strengthen our own position but the question that I would like to know from the Foreign Minister is, when we are not agreeable to be a client State of either of the super powers and because of natural circumstances, whether we accept it Or not, we have become the dominant power again—to use the word of Mr. Henri Kissenger—in this region, how are we going

[Dr. Rafiq Zakaria] to go about strengthening our own defences? Sir, you are looking at me and, therefore, I will not dilate too much on it, but I have a few suggestions. I want that, while keeping our equation with the two Super Powers, and out tilt to the Soviet Union is inevia-ble because of the circumstances and situations not only of our own making but in the making of which the United States of America is equally responsible, we should also think of establishing more concrete relations with, for instance, France in Europe which has not come under the US hegemony as most of the Western European countries have. I am glad that talks about Mirage and other things are going on. But it is not only a question of taking the weapons; it is a question of establishing some kind of a link and I am happy that the recent visit of our Prime Minister to Paris has been a milestone in that direction. The impact that shee created will, I think, pay us rich dividends. But, Sir, in the economic field, which is equally important for strengthening our industrial base, without which no defence is possible, may I know from the Foreign Minister whether we cannot have more closer relations with Japan, for instance, because this is one independent economic power which is emerging as a challenge even to the United State of America?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI SITA RAM KESRI): No longer.

DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA: That is not correct. The facts and figures are there And, therefore, my only plea to the Foreign Minister is that, while I appreciate the basic stand that we have taken in every crisis, I also note the difficult situation in which we have been placed as a result of the Super Powers' rivalries and also as a result of our determination to see that we shall not be a client state of any Super Power, that we shall go on increasingly strengthening our dominant position in this region, apart from platitudes,, the principles, the values which we talk about and which I will not, for a moment, say that we have to discard, in concrete terms, looking to the nuclear threat that faces us, whether we shall not be taking some more concrete steps so as to see that the future of our country is more secure. Thank you, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Shahabuddin.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN (Bihar); It is already lunch time. *(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him say a few words. Still some time is left. Three minutes are there.

SHRI PILOO MODY: You can take 6 minutes afterwards.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: Sir, that will be difficult.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You start at least.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, thank you for calling me now. We are about to break for lunch and I would have rather liked to make my observations at a stretch.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Doesn't matter. You can start all over again after lunch.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, at the end of 1981, I think there are two questions that are predominant in my mind. The first is, is the world a better place to live in?

SHRI PILOO MODY: No.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN; We have no choice perhaps. We cannot escape this space vehicle called the earth. But we have the right to ask this question of ourselves at the end of each year. And the second question is, what contribution has our country made to make it a better place for the mankind to live in? It is to this global

Vision that I would like to address myself, apart from the several important issues of immediate interest that I would like to touch in my observations.

1 P.M.

When I take a global overview, it fills me with forebodings, alarms, even pessimism. I find that *detente* is showing signs of breakdown and destabilisa-tion, even of reversal.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We shall continue the debate after lunch.

सदन की कार्यवाही दो बजे तक के लिए स्थगित की जाती है।

The House adjourned for lunch at one minute past one of the clock.

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

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I had mentioned my global view and I had said that *detente* was showing signs of desta-blization and even of reversal. Sir, I And that the Super Powers continue to maintain a desire for military supremacy and their hunger to find foothold toehold for bases, for facilities, continues. Both are still wedded to the cult of nuclear weapons, to the strategy of global confrontation, to the tactics of brinkmenship. Both, therefore, in my view, constitute a threat to peace and to the future of mankind; both maintain troops on foreign soil; both maintain systems of military alliances. It is. therefore not surprising that the movement of disarmament has made no progress during this year under review. Indeed, the nuclear war has become even more probable with the lowering of the nuclear threshold, with the introduction of the neutron bomb. Some say that this nuclear war is now winable and, therefore, it has become more acceptable. I wonder who will win and who will lose in a nuclear con-irontation and who shall inherit the earth after, the nuclear holocaust. But this is how the strategists talk; and the strategists include the strategists of both the Super Powers. They seem to speak the same language, they seem to understand each other. But for the rest of mankind, it all poses a real and a grave danger. Sir, dominance is assuming new forms. What is dominance after all, if not the suppression of the free will of the people? Whether it is in Poland or in El Salvador, whether it is in Namibia or in Afghanistan, whether it is on the West Bank or in Kampuchea, it is the same story. And these super powers support subservient regimes and extend to them economic and military assistance, while the overall climate for transfer of resources for development is deteriorating. We find therefore, new tensions developing over the horizon. We have been living with the situation in Afghanistan, in the Gulf, in the Middle East, in Southern Africa and in Kampuchea. Now we have got military build up on an ever-increasing scale in the Indian Ocean and increasing tensions in South Asia. And now there is the situation in Poland.

Coming to the economic aspect, Sir. I find that the North-South dialogue has almost ground to a halt. Even the spirit of Cancun has not been able to revive it. I think that Cancun was a failure. It made no breakthrough. It broke no new ground. It did not give us any new point of departure, any new idea., any fresh initiative any step forward. It has nothing more than a restatement of the old positions—pious hopes, worn out phrases, old wine in new bottles. It was nothing more than a betrayal of the hopes and aspirations of the mankind.

The Foreign Minister has been talking about the concept of interdependence. We all love phrases. I think this inter dependence, as I review the last decade or two, has turned out to be a hoax. The world economy is ready a combination of two economies which touch each other but on a very few limited points. All the developed coun-

[Shri Syed Shahabuddin] tries need today raw materials for running their industrial machine and the developed countries also need new markets in order to find exchange with which to buy those raw materials. On the other hand, we find that there is an increasing gap in the living standard of the developing and the developed world, and there is an increasing debt burden to be borne by the Third World. The terms of trade, the terms of flow of technology the terms of flow of development resources are all hardening with every passing day. There was the hope that Cancun would lead to determination of the modalities of global negotiations. I And that the spirit of Cancun has evaporated and the global negotiations are as distant as ever before. And I must say, Sir, that even the concept of collective self-reliance has not produced anything. What has it really produced over the last ten years?, What extra percentage the trade among the developing countries, the economic co-operation among the developing countries, form today of the total world trade picture or the total picture of transfer of resources and transfer of technology.

Therefore, we are at a rather critical stage in human history. We always say that peace is indivisible, and yet all of us are vying with each other in building up armaments. We have said that prosperity is indivisible for mankind, and yet half of the world sleeps every night on hungry stomachs. We say that freedom is indivisible, and yet we And new violations of human freedom. We find many people groaning under illegitimate regimes, authoritarian, repressive, dictatorial regimes. But there is also some sign of hope. We saw the peace marches in Western Europe. I think this presages a new development, a new era of hope. It shows mankind's instinct for survival. And I also see today the situation in Poland, which fills me with forebodings but also with great hope. It is an assertion of the human spirit of freedom.

I think, Sir, I must also mention the recent hunger strike by Sakharov. We are all for human rights. How many of us have raised our voices in defence of human rights as Sakharov has done?

Coming to specific situations, I am very happy that our relations with the USSR are as friendly as ever before, but can we afford to neglect our relations with the USA? Have they not sunk to an all-time low. I would like the hon. Minister to inform us in what way he is thinking of remedying this situation.

Coming to the Middle East, Sir. we know that Sadat took a very Srave and historic initiative. He went to Jerusalem. But this was exploited by Israel with no positive results. And, if I may say so, Sadat died a broken-hearted man; he died of Camp David. Israel, after annexing Jerusalem, after colonising the West Bank, has now annexed the Golan Heights. The "Fahed Plan" that was enunciated and which we had supported has been frozen because of the differences among the Arabs. There does not seem to be any way out. We may have another resolution from the United Nations, but what consolation is it to the people of Palestine? This intransigence, this obstinacy of Israel has only one reason; it is the collusion and support of the United States, the massive U.S. aid that has been poured into that country, both in military terms and financial terms, right from its very origin. We must assert, Sir, that there can be no peace in the Middle-East without the withdrawal of Israel from all occupied territories, whether it is the Golan Heights or it is that part of Palestine, the West Bank, which was awarded to the Arabs of Palestine, and without the national rights of the Palestinian people being recognised and being crystallised into a Palestinian State.

Sir, if I may mention South-East Asia, we find that Vietnamec, troops continue to remain on the soil of Kampuchea. The other day our Prime Minister mentioned to somebody that there were That troops in Kampuchea That was a revelation. I find that the

Thai Government has reacted in rather strong language. I do not recall another instance in which a foreign Government as a Government has reacted so strongly and used such hard words against a Prime Minister of India. I would like the hon. Minister to clarify that situation.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: That has been clarified long ago.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: Sir, in the meantime our dialogue with the ASEAN has been frozen. There has been no step forward and we seem to have lost all leverage in South-East Asia in our own part of the world.

On Afghanistan we seem to specialise in repetition of the abstract concept that we are against the presence of foreign troops of any country on any soil at any time. But, Sir, does this abstract philosophising help the people of Afghanistan? India is totally isolated in the United Nations and in the non-aligned world on this question. We seem to have been thought of now as camp followers of the Soviet Union in this regard. We also chant sometimes like a "mantra" "political solution" without ever defining what we mean by "political solution". I believe that India has the responsibility and the duty to enunciate a formula which would bring about not only the withdrawal of Russian troops from Afghanistan but also restore the sovereignty and integrity of the people of Afghanistan, their right to freedom and independence. I feel, Sir, that perhaps the non-aligned group can provide a peace-keeping force which can protect the territorial integrity of Afghanistan while a composite national authority can lead to the emergence of a national concensus about the form and shape of the Government that the Afghan people desire. In this the Afghan people need our help. Our Minister has a number of times spoken that the parties must talk to each other. Talk to whom? To the regime in Kabul which has no independent existence, which exists there merely on the point of Russian bayonets? It has no legitimacy whatsoever. Yes, a composite national authority in Afghanistan would have that legitimacy.

Sir, I would like to mention Sri Lanka. I think a solution now must urgently be found for the future of the people of Indian origin in Sri Lanka on the basis that those who are supposed to come to India should be given Indian nationality and Indian passport and those who are to remain there should be immediately given Sri lanka nationality so that everybody is sure and certain about his status, and they are no longer made to remain in a state of suspense, with, of course, the possibility of the repatriation in a period of time of those who are awarded Indian nationality, to their mother country.

With Bangladesh we have a number of outstanding problems. A new Government has come in. I hope that the Government would take the initiative to re-establish the process of negotiation over the Farakka dam, over the New Moore Island, over the maritime boundary, because unless these problems are sorted out I think the seeds of future confrontation will always remain in the soil. The honourable Minister went recently to Nepal. We are yet to have an enunciation of our stand on the zone of peace. It is not enough to say that South-Asia, the whole of South-Asia, should be a zone of peace. We must try to satisfy our Nepalese friends about what they want from us, and we should look into their grievances. We should not allow them to build up a source of confrontation.

Now I come to Pakistan. Of late there have been many developments in our relations with Pakistan. I think Zia's offer of consultations on a no-war pact was a very clever move. But I think our response has been confusing, halting, somtimes contradictory; it shows a sort of chaotic motion. We called it a bluff. We called it a gimmick, a trap; we called him insincere. But does that help us?

[Shri Syed Shahabuddin] In the outside world Pakistan had already won the P.R. battle much before the belated positive response given by the Foreign Minister. I think we should not suffer from any inferiority complex when we are dealing with Pakistan. I think we should state clearly before our people to what extent does Pakistan pose a credible threat to us as of now and in the years to come? I think we must also take into account to what extent do we pose a threat to Pakistan. If we are to say that Pakistan must not arm itself beyond its legitimate defence needs, shall we give the same right to Pakistan to ask us to what extent we should arm ourselves? If we are to ask Pakistan that we are not certain of their intentions, I think we must also take into account if we are moving towards constructive diplomacy, whether Pakistan is certain of our intentions. Unless this atmosphere, surcharged with emotions is dissipated there cannot be viable, there cannot be permanent, peace in the sub-continent. It is not only an aspiration of our people, but it is absolutely essential for the destiny of this part of the world, for this sub-continent, because I believe in the strategic unity of this area. We face a common hostile environment. We are being pressed by big powers, by super powers, from **all** sides, and unless the countries of the sub-continent face this threat together, unitedly, with a common consciousness nothing can happen. Therefore, my plea is that we must have negotiations with Pakistan to avoid an arms race, to eliminate the nuclear threat, for reaching a mutually acceptable balance, of course, towards non-aggression, towards a no-war pact, even towards joint defence.

I very much welcome the recent talks that have taken place in Beijing, and I hope that they will lead to good results.

I must submit that I find that somehow the national consensus is getting attenuated. It is primarily because of three factors. There is an increasing deterioration in our relations with our neighbours, something which we tried to build up during the two years that we were in power. There is a growing identification at least in the other people's minds about our purposes and the purposes of the Soviet Union. And finally there is a loss of moral quality. In the Nehru era—inevitably my mind goes back to it—we were not as powerful as we are today; we did not have as much experience in diplomacy as we have today. But we were a moral force to be contended with. We had just emerged into the sunshine of freedom. Our eyes were not used to the sunshine. And yet we played a remarkable role on the world stage. Is that era completely behind us? Cannot we harken back to the spirit of that great period in our history?

The Foreign Minister talked the other day in the other House about the inevitable linkage between development and disarmament. He also said that you cannot have both. Might I request him that he should pose this question to our own Government? After all, while security cannot be n2-gotiated, it cannot be compromised with, yet there are some definite limits that we must put to our defence spending, because there is also a linkage between economic bankruptcy and defence expenditure.

Many a time in the life of individuals as well as in the life of nations comes a movement of looking back, of introspection. Sometimes when we look back at the froth and fury, at the gestures and gesticulations, at the passions and prejudices, at the tactics and manoeuvres of yesterday, they appear so mealingless today. Some. times we tend of laugh at our-selves and, therefore, it is not the immediate which is important. It is the long-term strategy, the vision of peace and freedom and cooperation, the logic of cooperation among the third world countries, the logic of disarmament, and coupled with it the necessity of development, that must engage our attention. We must make South Asia, the area in which we live and

the area where we have the highest responsibility, one of the major poles of the emergent multipolar world . that is in front of us. This means common vision, common purpose and common approach and inner harmony within the area.

If Pakistan must give up the quest of parity, we must also convince Pakistan that we have given up the quest of dominance. India should become a great moral force. India should have message of reason to place before the World. All this euphoria that I hear about the Prime Minister having done a remarkable job daring her visits abroad, I do not think, takes us anywhere. The problems that we face, the hard core of our diplomatic problems, cannot be resolved in Sofia, they cannot be solved in Rome, nor can they be resolved even in Paris. They have to be resolved here in this part of the world which is the testing ground of our diplomacy, of our firmness of purpose and of our goodwill. Once we are able to carry our neighbours with us the goodwill of the entire sub-continent and when we translate into action all the aspirations and hopes of all the people in this part of the world, then we shall play once again a leading role in shaping the world of the future, in shaping the world tomorrow.

Today there seems to be a moral Bankruptcy in us. We cannot even stand up and call a spade a spade. Our limbs seem to be frozen and our voice seems to be silenced. We are no longer making history, as we did once. We have become just a spectator, just another State in the comity of nations, as if Buddha, Gandhi and Nehru were never born. Thank you very much.

[The Vice-Chairman (Shri Bisham-bhar Nath Pande in the Chair.]

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS (Assam : Mr. Vice-Chairman the current international situation is marked by several ominous developments. The Iraq-Iran war has not come to an end. Lebanon continues to be a battle field. The Afghanistan problem is yet to And a solution. And to add fuel to the fire, the Golan Heights have been illegally and immorally annexed by Israel. The arms build up continues unabated in the Gulf Region and in the Indian Ocean. Pakistan is gradually but surely being converted into an American base. The supply of AWACS-Air-brone Warning and Control Systems—to Saudi Arabia has only added a new dimension to the gravity of the situation in this region. The Namibian independence is not in sight. Israel, South Africa and Pakistan are fast moving towards attaining the nuclear power status. In fact Israel and South Africa are reported to be already in possession of nuclear bombs. There is tension in South East Asia. There is conflict between the Asean group and Vietnam. Parts of Latin America are also in trouble with tensions and conflicts.

When the Helsinki pact was signed, We welcomed it. At the same time we warned that *detente* in Europe must not mean transfer of conflicts and tensions to other parts of the world. One cannot create an island of peace in Europe by setting the rest of the world ablaze. It is not possible. Our warning has come true. Europe is in difficulty and is in trouble. *Detente* is being transformed into headlong confrontation. Western Europe or Europe as **a** whole is in trouble. And, in Europe itself there are controversies. There are peace marches, anti-nuclear-bomb marches, anti-neutron-bomb marches . and so on. This is a good sign. This is a good sign, but Europe is in trouble and all these indicate the dangers ahead.

Sir, the developments in Poland are naturally causing us concern. There is no doubt that these developments are the internal affairs of Poland. Although it is an internal affair of Poland, I must warn that these developments have all the potentialities of escalating into a serious international problem and, therefore, we must be on our guard. Cold war has been intensified

[Shri Bipinpal Das] and war clouds have gathered over the sky all over the world. We are passing through a period full of dangerous potentialities. The peace and tranquillity of the world have been seriously disturbed. I am not saying all these things in order to create panic or to raise an alarm. No. I am saying all this only to alert our people, only to alert our nation and to be prepared for the eventualities.

Sir, my friend, Shri Shahabuddin has raised a number of questions regarding our policies. I do not intend to answer all of them: the Foreign Minister will do it. But the impression that he has given me is that he has no faith in the basic policy of non-alignment itself, because he has criticised every aspect that emerges out of the basic policy of non-alignment, everything. Whether he talks of the Cancun Conference or whether he talks of interdependence or self-reliance, whether we can neglect the USA?, This is what he said and like this he went on. He has raised a number of questions and everything that he has said basically means that he has no abiding faith in the basic policy of non-alignment that this country has evolved. Sir, our basic policy remains valid even today, and this policy has to be pursued. What is this policy? It is the policy of peace, co-operation and friendship. What is the alternative? What is the alternative then? Even if we want to solve the problems in the South Asian region, let alone other regions of the world, we have to follow the policy of peace, friendship and co-operation. Can Shri Shahabuddin or anybody else suggest any other alternative policy? Are we not pursuing that policy?

Sir. he has criticised the Prime Minister's tour abroad and I am very sorry for that. When the Prime Minister goes abroad and does something, she does it for the good of the whole nation and no party can 'take credit for that and we are not taking any credit for that. After all, what has she done? she has very effectively projected our viewpoint everywhere in spite of opposition from the other side.

AN HON. MEMBER: Where?

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS: Everywhere. I will give the whole list. I can give you the whole list and that will speak for itself adequately. She carried the message of peace, co-operation, understanding and friendship with everybody. That task was not very easy and it was very difficult. Whether it was Melbourne or cancun, or whether it was Paris or Rome, the task was not easy and it was a very difficult task. But she carried out that task very well. Her tours have raised not only her own status, but indeed, Sir, the status of this country as a whole, if I may say so, and I say that very proudly.

Sir, she made significant contributions in the Commonwealth conference in Melbourne. My friend asked a question just now. He asked what were the significant contributions that our Prime Minister made at Melbourne. One should go through the Melbourne Declaration and analyse that and find out for oneself what the contributions are which she has made. The Melbourne Declaration endorses all the operational essentials of the Indian position on all vital issues. It amounts to a disapproval of the US policy of ulimited arms expansion, , either horizontally or vertically, and 1 can tell you that this is the point. which was made by the Prime Minister herself in her key-note speech. Then, Sir, the Declaration rejected the theory of limited muciear wars and called for a total nuclear disarmament. On the Indian Ocean issue also—I was myself surprised to see the Declaration—in spite of opposition from Australia, New Zealand and Great Britain who did not want Indian Ocean to be mentioned therein, the Prime Minister succeeded in getting the Indian Ocean mentioned in the Declaration as a zone of peace. She also succeeded in convincing the other members of the Commonwealth to call for the conference to be held in

Colombo under the UN auspices. It was held up because of the US attitude. These are the positive contributions made by the *Prime* Minister. Even on Namibia's independence question, a definite time-frame, has been worked out in the Declaration of Mel-bourne, which was not done before, in the presence of the British Prime Minister who did not want it. The Melbourne Declaration condemned Pretoria's action against Angola. The Melbourne Declaration also supported the inalienable rights of the Palestinians for their home-land. India's position relating to Afghanistan and Kampuchea was more or less endorsed by the Melbourne Declaration. What is our position? Our position is that there should not be foreign troops on the one hand, and on the other there should not be any interference or intervention from outside the borders. We want a comprehensive, political settlement in South-East Asia as against the Sino-US policy of helping the Kampuchea rebels. Our Prime Minister succeeded in getting our viewpoint endorsed in the Melbourne Declaration by asking for a negotiated settlement. Is it a very small achievement, Sir in a Conference like the Melbourne Conference?, Everybody knows the composition of the Melbourne Conference. I do not think It is a small achievement. On this platform an international platform, our Prime Minister successfully projected our policies on major international issues.

It was said that the Cancun Con ference was a failure. What did you expect? Nobody expected something extraordinary, remarkable from Cancun. There was not even an agenda. Nobody expected it. It was a meeting of some heads of Government to excange views, to come to mutual understanding about the North-South problems. As the Prime Minister herself said: It was not a leap forward but certainly a step forward. Mr. Shahabuddin tried to ridicule the idea of golbal negotiations. Sir, if the North-South dialogue, confined to certain limited of nations, did not make any more forward, certainly a call for global negotiations is a step forward. If Mr. Shahabuddin expected something more, 1 do not know, I did not expect it. Nobody expected it.

Sir, about her visit to France,

France is a very important country in Europe. Our relations with France are already very good. But this visit of the Prime Minister to France has brought her much closer to India than before. It will show in the long run... *(Interruptions)*

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you an astrolger? *(Interruptions-)*

SHRI BIPINLAL DAS: I do not want to be an astrogler to forecast something. But the very fact that India and France have come closer together on various issues is itself an achievement for India, whereas they say that India's achievement is nothing.

I agree with Mr. Shahabuddin that our immediate concern is our neighbourhood and our region. I agreed I have said before also and I think the Government of India has also said the same thing that our immediate concern is our neighbourhood and the region in which we live. Sir, what is the situation?. . With Bhutan our relations are good. With Nepal our relations are improving. With Bangladesh, after the new President was elected the whole tone has changed. There is a constant effort to improve our relations with Bangladesh. With. Sri Lanka our relations are good. Nothing wrong has happened. The only problem is Pakistan. To that I now come.

Sir, the massive arms supply • to Pakistan has vitiated the entire atmosphere and created a climate of tension and suspicion. What are the types of arms proposed to be supplied to Pakistan? F 16's. We all know about F 16's. Not only that. Modern tanks, latest models, armoured personnel carriers, guns, air defence system, air and naval missiles, radars and des-

[Shri Bipinpal Das] troyers etc. And these are all offen-sive equipments. There is no defensive equipment. And at what price? You will be surprised to know that these weapons are being supplied at subsidised price. All these arms are going to be given to Pakistan at a subsidised price. They are not secondhand. Now, this is a very important thing. All these equipments and weapons will take Pakistan one generation ahead of India, not only India, but ahead of the entire weaponry system in the entire region. Mr. Shahabuddin asked this question. If we tell Pakistan that they must not acquire arms more than their defence requirements, will Pakistan not have the right to ask India not to have arms beyond our needs?, Are we having arms more than our defence requirements. I am putting the question back to him. We have a very long border. We have a very long coastline. We are a huge country. Can it be compared with Pakistan? Are we really having arms more than our defence requirements? Indirectly he has given a propaganda point to Pakistan that India is also having arms in excess of its defence requirements. It is absolutely untrue. I can categorically say that.

Why are these arms going to be supplied?. The basic question is this. It is against Russia? I want to say that if Russia intends to invade Pakistan, all the arms of the U.S.A. supplied to Pakistan will not be able to help Pakistan to stand for a day. It is absolutely false, untrue and bogus to say that these arms are being given against Russia. And Russia, I know, has no intention at all to invade Pakistan as far as facts go to show. *(Interruptions)* General Zia himself has said that Russia has no such intentions against Pakistan. The Foreign Minister of Pakistan has also said that Russia has no intention of attacking Pakistan I do not believe that the arms are being given to Pakistan against Russia.

Are they being given against Afghanistan? It is very interesting that Pakistan is being armed by America ostensibly against Afghanistan, but the arms to be given to Pakistan will not be suitable at all for use in the Pak—Afghanistan border. They will be absolutely unsuitable. Secondly, if it is against Afghanistan or against Russia why should they supply naval equipments? Where does Navy come between Pakistan and Afghanistan? Therefore, all these arguments are bogus.

The truth is this. There may be two alternatives. One is that arms are being given to Pakistan to enable Gen. Zia to suppress his own people or secondly to fight India. These are the only two possible alternatives. What is our experience? Our experience for the last 34 years is that whenever arms were supplied by the U.S.A. and the western countries to Pakistan, the attack was on India and nobody else. This is our experience and because of this experience we become alarmed. We should not become alarmed. But should we not become alert? I do not want to create panic. But the truth must be faced. We must be on the alert. We cannot take any chances

Shri Shahabuddin said that during the Janata rule, they tried to improve relations with all the neighbouring countries and that they did a marvellous job. I would like to tell Mr. Shahabuddin that when he was not a Janata Member, I made my speech from that side and Mr. Vajpayee was not able to answer my points. During the Janata rule the entire Janata Government was taken for a ride by the Americans, by the Chinese, by the Pakistanis, by Bangladesh, by Nepalese and by everybody else. I can quote from my own speeches. I can quote how Janata Government was taken for a ride. What was the result? The result was the slap on the face of Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee in China.

Therefore, Sir, let us face facts. Let

us have good relations... *(Interruption)* .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BISHAMBHAR NATH PANDE): Mr. Mallick, if you want to say something, please go to your seat first.

SHRI HAREKRUSHNA MALLICK (Orissa): Sir, Government is Govern. ment. He said that it is a slap on the Government. It is derogatory and it should be off the record. Government is Government. Men may come and men may go but the country remains. Therefore, these words should be deleted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BISHAMBHAR NATH PANDE): Please take your seat.

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS: Sir, I am a little amused by the statements being made by great leaders like Mr. Morarji Desai and Mr. Atal Behari Vajpayee these days. Suddenly they have become so pro-Pakistan, so much in love Pakistan as if what we are doing, what we are trying to do through peaceful means is all wrong, and they are taking a posture as if they are all pro-Pakishtan, pro-Bangladesh, pro-Nepal and pro-everybody, and we are not. This is not true. This is not the way. The real intentions of Pakistan must be understood. What is happening in Pakistan must also be understood. We cannot keep our eyes shut against them and plead from the rostrum very goodygoody things. That will not serve the purpose of India. We must on one hand not take an alarmist view of the situation and on the other —I repeat—we must be on the alert and be prepared for any eventuality. *(Time bell rings)* I am coming to a close.

Sir, there is a proposal for a no-war pact. Now, may I ask everybody those who are supporting this, one thing? Mr. Atal Behari Vajpayee is supporting this no-war pact. He said that we should respond. What happened when we proposed non-war pact? Will he remember it? All the three Prime Ministers of this country, except Mr. Morarji Desai, all the three Prime Ministers of my party proposed no-war pact with Pakistan, and it was turned down. Why was it turned down? . . *(Interruption)* I stand corrected. Mr. Morarji Desai also proposed a no-war pact. But it was all rejected. So the question is: Why is this no-war pact proposal today? That must be understood. No-war pact proposal on one hand and on the other acquisition of most sophisticated arms at a huge cost. We cannot shut our eyes. We cannot see in only one direction. We must see in both the directions.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is all repetition.

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS: Well, if it is repetition, please hear it. If you are tired of hearing, you can choose your way. We cannot shut our eyes to the other side. He says that we are suspicious of something. Well, there must be something why suddenly this no-war pact proposal has come while they are acquiring sophisticated arms, while they are arming themselves. There must be something and, therefore, we must be on the guard. But it does not mean that we have no answer. We have the answer. Our answer is Simla Agreement. Our answer is Non-alignment itself. The policy of Non-alignment itself is a policy of peace, a policy of no-war pact. And Simla Agreement itself is a no-war pact. It is documented. What more do you want? If they really mean no war business, then they should respond. We shall not lag behind. But I would like to say that this is nothing but a propaganda stuff. And we must not be taken for a ride by such propagandist stuff from Pakistan. *(Time bell* rings) Sir, I am coming to a close.

Sir, on the Pakistan bomb I will say only one word. Preparations are going on very fast to explode the bomb by adopting two methods— one, plutonium re-processing technique, and the other called the enriched

[Shri Bipinpal Das]

uranium technique. They are pursuing both the techniques. Whichever succeeds will be used and they will produce the bomb. Sir, I am not in favour of India producing the bomb. I am in favour of pursuing the present policy of peaceful use of nuclear energy. But I must say this .to the Government that options must be kept open. If Pakistan really wants to explode the bomb, we cannot sit idle. We should be prepared to meet the situation. I need not say anything about Tarapur. I do not know why we have allowed the USA to drag on on this subject. I would appeal to the Prime Minister to close it for ever, for good, they are not going to supply enriched uranium. So terminate it, abrogate it, so that we can make use of the spent fuel. We should not take any more time.

On China, I am happy and I shall not say much, because recent negotiations appear to have gone quite well. I hope further negotiations will lead to better relationship, more normalisation, leading to the resolution of the problems between China and India. But I must refer to two points to which Shri Shahabuddin referred.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: Sir, you must give me some time to reply to his points. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS: That is the advantage of speaking after. Sir, I said last time in my speech that I had almost lost faith in North-South dialogue. If the new global negotiations could achieve something good, I would welcome it. But that is not my point. I suggest to the Government, not only to our Government but to the entire non-aligned movement, why Should we continue to make efforts for the North-South dialogue alone? It is difficult to move forward there, I know. We should simultaneously start the South-South dialogue on one point which Shri Shahabuddin made, he is correct, namely, that we have not made muck headway regarding collective self •reliance, and this is my grievance also. Therefore, the South-South dialogue on the basis of collective self-reliance must be taken very seriously by the Government. India is in a position to do that and will do very well If it comes forward and gives a push to the South-South dialogue it will have some impact on the North-South dialogue also and that will also move forward. That is my opinion.

The last point to which he referred is about the USSR and the USA. Sir, we want to make friendship with everybody. Our basic policy is, wherever there is friendship, strengthen it further, consolidate it further; where there is no friendship, build the bridges of friendship; and where there is hostility, curtail the hostility. This is our policy. We have never ceased our efforts to make friendship with the USA. We want to make friendship with the USA. But, what is USA's response? What is their attitude? Has Mr. Shahabuddin or friends like him forgotten what USA has done to us for the last 34 years? Can they be compared to what the USSR has done to us or for this country? The USSR has stood by us at all critical moments. On the questions Goa, Kashmir, Bangladesh and what not the USSR has stood by us, and so also in the matter of buildings a strong foundation for industrial development. *(Interruptions).* What is the record of the USA compared to what the USSR has done to us as friends? Therefore, where as we want to make friendship with everybody, we cannot unfortunately equate them after looking at the history of our relationship with these countries for the last 34 years. *(Time bell rings).*

On Afghanistan, we have not kept quite. We have certainly spoken not to the Ambassador here, but we have said in Moscow also that your going into Afghanistan or sending a large num-

ber of troops to Afghanistan was wrong, we cannot support it, this is against our policy of non-alignment. But merely condemning Russia on the issue of sending their troops will not help us to solve the problem. What about the infiltrators going from Pakistan, trained by China? Therefore, we have been pleading for a political settlement. If Mr. Shahabuddin does not know what political settlement means I cannot help it; he will have to go through the entire course of political science. Thank you.

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

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): Sir, may I please speak from this seat?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BISHAMBHAR NATH PANDE): All right.

SHRI J. K. JAIN: You can come to the front bench.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: No, this is all right. Sir, I thought today's debate was on a motion by the hon. Minister of External Affairs—sometimes called External Affairs. The Treasury Benches speeches seemed *to* be a recital of the Prime Minister's success. I could not understand this differentiation.

SHRIMATI HAMIDA HABIBULLAH (Uttar Pradesh): She is the Prime Minister of India.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BISHAMBHAR NATH PANDE): Let him continue, please.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Why are they so susceptible to a mere mention of the Prime Minister? 1555 RS—8.

SHRIMATI HAMIDA HABIBULLAH: It is not the Prime Minister under discussion. *(Interruptions)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BISHAMBHAR NATH PANDE): Let him continue.

SHRIMATI HAMIDA HABIBULLAH: Are you talking on international affairs or about the Prime Minister?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH; There were three issues which the hon. Minister's statement brought out; related to Israel, related to Poland and related to the recently concluded— I do not know whether it would be right to say 'concluded'—talks in Beijing.

With your permission, I have to start with this word 'success', It is quite and old Ministry joke that Indian diplomacy is somewhat like the love-making of elephants. It is carrier out at an extremely high level it is accompanied by much bellowing and the result is not known until after two years. Now,' I listened to the hon. Minister's statement with great care. It had a lot of words in it, but, sadly it had very little content, I do apologize for this criticism. The criticism is not personal; the criticism is institutional. I think the Minister of External Affairs is staffed by some of the finest individual talent that is available in the world, but I do think, at the same time, that there is a great separation between the place where the policy is conceived and the place where it is conducted. I do not think I can criticise the hon. Minister of External Affairs for what is happening to India's foreign policy because, I think, in an essential sense, he is responsible only for its conduct, he is not responsible for its conception. He is not responsible, his Ministry is not responsible, which is what leads me to the crucial point, the crucial absence in the Ministry of External Affairs; and that is the absense of institu-tionalisation of Policy. Whatever

[SHRI JASWANT SINGH]

foreign policy we have been adopting in independent India has been a policy of prejudice and predilictions of individuals. The original founding father's one great love was his one great failure. Now that prejudice, Prediliction, that kind of individualising of policy formulation continues. The Ministry of External Affairs is merely a spokesman; the Ministry of External Affairs does not formulate the policy. Between the Ministry of External Affairs and those who are responsible for the formulation of the policy, there is no coordination. There is no co-ordination between them and those who are entrusted with the responsibility for its conduct.

Sir, I have to come back. There are two key points which keep on re-emerging whenever the Members from the Treasury Benches talk here. The hon. Minister had made a reference to it on an earlier occasion. The key word is the 'success' of our foreign policy; and the second key word about which the hon. Foreign Minister made a reference on the last occasion when we discussed the subject was 'consensus'. Now, because the time at my disposal is limited, I too hare to limit what I have to say. Let us analyse this business of 'success' and 'consensus'. What is the requirement of India's foreign policy? I think it should be evolutionary. It is not evolutionary because it has not been institutionalised, there is no agency which can say what we have evolved from. Possibly, development is a tendentious word, as denotative of developing from something inferior to superior; but the policy must evolve. I do not see any evolution in India's foreign policy. There is an impasse, a stasis. Let us take National interest. We all talk about national interest; enlightened national interest. I think, there is total confusion in this field because we confuse between national principles, national goals and national interests. Is there a clear definition formulated by the Ministry? I have gone through the records, the earlier speeches; I have read through them in an attempt to find out a definition, where and what our national interests are? We cloak it in a lot of pillows of wool that this is the principle, peace friendship, brotherhood and so on. This is crass hypocrisy. Please define 'national interests' before we can proceed further. There is the third thing; it is about 'consensus'. If the hon. Minister would for give me, and the Treasury Benches also, please da not mistake consensus for conformism. The very nature of your political organisation and your political party is conformist. You reject dissent as disloyalty. When you are rejecting dissent as disloyalty, 'consensus' you will never be able to build up. Therefore, if you say that some of us are outside the 'consensus' and some are within the 'consensus', you are talking of conformism. You are not talking of an intellectually honest dissent distilled to a consensus.

We have a reactive foreign policy, because of the institutional lack, as I said. Then there are thematic blind spots in our foreign policy. I have no time to go into each of these thematic blind spots. I leave this point for the hon. Minister's consideration. Then we have the situation of two foreign policies. We have a foreign political policy and we have a foreign economic policy. Sometimes, I am at sea, because not only do these two policies work in conflict with one another, but they seldom seem to co-ordinate and I do not know who attempts to co-ordinate them. But if an example were really needed of our non-alignment possibly, the hon. Minister's functioning, in attempting to get these two policies to move together is the only example of non-alignment.

There was the Hon. Mr. Bipinpal Das who objected to my esteemed colleague, the Hon. Shri Syed Shaha-buddin's remarks about non-alignment. I would like to repeat. Our dispute is not with non-alignment as such. Our dispute is with the conduct

of non-alignment. The dispute is not with the concept. It is with the conduct. We have reduced; the present Government has reduced, non-alignment as an euphemism for a policy of dependence. I shall come to this in a little while.

Sir, 'success' was the third key word which the Treasury Benches were so very keen on talking about. Let me quickly analyse the so-called 'success of our foreign policy on three or four criteria; our Asian policy, national security, Indo-Soviet relations, indo-US relations, West Asia. As far as our Asian policy is concerned, I think, India's policy has been a policy of singular failure. Verbally we mouth our Asian identity. But if there is a Region in which India stands isolated. it is Asia. Then, national security. I think, if defence and diplomacy be the two sides of the same coin, then, independent India's history of diplomacy is certainly a history of the failure of our foreign policy. 1962: This was the failure of independent India's diplomacy. 1965: absence of diplomacy. It was in 1965 that we permitted, it was I think, a kind of a diplomatic watershed, the dishonest brokerage of Soviet Union in attempting to sit on a dispute between two neighbours and we acceded to going to Tashkent and to ask them to arbitrate between the two of us. That was the beginning of the failure of our diplomacy. I think, there was a major failure of our diplomacy in 1971. I leave it as a thought with you. Where statesmanship was called for we failed. Was the creation of Bangladesh in India's national interest? Now, in retrospect, attempt to answer

3 P.M. that question. Post-1971—the — failure of diplomacy was demonstrated in Simla and it continues to toe demonstrated to this day because we now find the curious spectacle of both the Government of India and the Gov. ernment of Pakistan putting across the Simla Agreement of all things as an impediment to peace. It is an incredible situation. Take Nuclear—I admit. I accept that there ought to be a rejection of the super power hypocrisy of wanting to disarm the unarmed, but what about our own hypocrisy? In the same breath the hon. Minister read a statement of disarmament about nuclear free zones and Pak threat. We either accept the practical reality of the subcontinent and go in for a bomb or we reject it. Have we the political courage to reject it and say, no, we will not, but we cannot have it both ways.

Coming to Indo-Soviet relations, I talk earlier about dependence. I would just like to read out some figures because they speak for themselves. We cannot reduce relations between countries to criteria like 'friendship" stood by us," etc. If there is anything which marks our relationship with Soviet Union, to my perception and reckoning it is marked, firstly by dependence; secondly by a seemingly abjectbacking of whatever the soviet Union says; and thirdly I think we are the only country in the world of this size who have become the interpreters of the strategic perceptions of a super power. I do not know how, but that in any case is the substance of our relationship on the basis of dependence. Let me now quote some figures. Our defence dependence on the Soviet Union for defence equipment, quality and quantitatively, is to the extent of 70 per cent. Let the Minister rebut that. With that kind of dependence no country is independent. Let me quote a few other figures. Our dependence for steel is 30 per cent. Our dependence for oil is 35 per cent. Our dependence for diesel and kerosene is 55 per cent. Our dependence for heavy machinery is 85 per cent. Hon. Bipinpal Das here mentioned about the arms assistance from USA to Pakistan. USSR has given a 1.7 billion dollar loan to India for 17 years on 2 per cent. When, therefore, that kind of loan is available to India we havent any standing to criticise what Pakistan does. With that kind of dependence, may I remind this House and the hon.

[Shri Jaswant Singh] Minister of the first two months of 1979, when two Soviet vessels carrying kerosene and diesel did not dock in Bombay, leading to a scare and shortage in the diesel and kerosene markets in India? That kind of a situation exists please bear it in mind. It is not a question of rhetoric. I have the highest regard for the hon. Minister of External Affaris.

SHRI J. K. JAIN: My friend. that is the only sign of the failure of diplomacy of the Janata regime which my hon. friend has mentioned just now that in 1979 those too vessels did not come to the dock.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BISHAMBHAR NATH PANDE): Let him complete. He has got the limited time.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I would again say what I was going to say that I have the highest regard for the Minister of External Affairs. I think he is a man of great learning, deep sensibilities. It is a quality which is particularly noticeable by its absence in the rest of the Treasury Benches and I would appeal to the hon. Minister of External Affairs, please have a sense of history in this, because you are a student of history and history will never forgive you on the limited aspect of non-align-ment. Do not reduce non-alignment to an euphemism. Sir, I shall be brief. If you would be so indulgent as to give me two or three minutes, I will conclude,

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BISHAMBHAR NATH PANDE): You can have three minutes.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: On our West Asia policy—because the hon. Minister mentioned about the present situation in Israel—I submit to you that other than India saying or trying to assert to the rest of the Arab world that we are also good Muslims, what else has been India's policy?. It is all very well to say that we are also good Muslims; so, Arabs, please accept us. But was that a good criteria? Or was it the criteria that our policy towards West Asia should be governed by foreign economic policy? Who governed it? Who formulated it? Or was it our policy that it should lead to West Asia's support to us on Kashmir and to a reduction of the obvious support to Pakistan? In either of these criteria has our foreign policy in West Asia succeeded?

There is a mention hers of the totally illegal, and totally unacceptable to me, act by Israel on the question of Golan Heights. I would have been happy if the hon. Minister had gone into the background of the recent attempt by Prince Fahd and the failure at Fez and what was India's initiative at Fez. What did we do? Could we not—after all when it was a question of—let me explain—I understand your problem—it was Syria's abstention from Fez which lead to the failure of the talks. There is an established and direct nexus between Syria and the Soviet Union. We acclaim and we say that we are friends of the Soviet Union and we are able to influence them. If we were convinced about the fact that Fahd Plan was a good plan, that it was a plan which was going to help that it was a plan which USSR cautiously accepted could not influence the Soviet Union to influence Syria?

Sir, the question of talks in Beijing has come up. It was the other factor in the Minister's statement. I welcome the initiative. I welcome the breaking of the impasse. But I am sorry that the conceptualisation is limited. There is a possibility of making a starting point in the acceptance of the *status quo* of where we stand on the high Himalayas. May I submit to you. please work, recreate, you have the ability, recreate some of the original impulse of our foreign policy which the great man, with

whom in other fields I may hold very serious difference of opinion, but whom, otherwise, I hold in high esteem—Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru—had recreated. Recreate some of that impulse. One of the mythologies of our approach with China, with which we continue to be afflicted, was the rubbish of "Hindi-Chini Bhai Bhai". We have to move away from that. Try and assert, try and work for a workable autonomy for Tibet. Work with China and say, "we will work with you to achieve autonomy for Tibet". Try and work for a return of the Dalai Lama. Try and work on the existing lines as the beginning of our talks with China.

Indo-US relations are best exemplified by a short quote: "Frustrated incomprehension within a framework of compatible objectives". That is the question which I will be posing to the hon. Minister on Indo-US relations. I will ask three questions and I will conclude. What will the hon. Minister do to institutionalise policy foundations within the Ministry of External Affairs?, What initiative are we going to take on the question of peace with Pakistan? Let us not appear to be running away from an alive branch. Let. us not appear as if we have lost strategic military and diplomatic initiative on three separate occasions on the question of disengagement of troops; and on the question of No-War Pact. The appearance in the rest of the world, which has led to a loss of credibility for India, is that we are running away from this olive branch. Let that not be so. What is the initiative which we are going to take as far as re-asserting in practical terms our Asian identity is concerned? What are we going to do as far as stopping the rot in our relations with the United States is concerned? I do believe that beyond the immediate troubles that compound the difficulties, there is a long-term and sustaining relationship between the peoples of America and the peoples of India, which is where I am trying to reach you to. If the present Government of the United States is incomprehensible in its utterances, that is not the United States. Sir, I will appeal to the hon. Minister to rise to the occasion. These are difficult times that we live through. We have to move from bureaucratic pettifoggery to statesmanship. Let him impart to our foreign policy a new dimension in thought, concept and conduct which I think he has the capacity to do. That was the point that I was trying to make to the treasury benches when I said that we are discussing foreign policy, the Ministry of External Affairs, his Ministry, not the Prime Minister. I do emphasise that point. It is not the Prime Ministers success or failure with which I am concerned today. I am concerned otherwise. But today I am concerned with the hon. Minister's Ministry. I appeal to his sense of history to reach across to the people of Pakistan and impart to the events on the sub-continent a new dimension, a new thrust, a new direction, that is badly needed. I am grateful for your indulgence. Thank you very much.

SHRI SHYAM SUNDAR MOHAPATRA (Orissa): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, indeed I mast compliment the Foreign Minister on the way he has conducted the foreign policy of our Government under the leadership of the Prime Minister. The speaker who preceded me said that he should add a new dimension to our foreign policy. I must say that Mr. Narasimha Rao has already added a new dimension to the foreign policy of the country and he is one of the best in the galaxy of Foreign Ministers who have adorned this Ministry.

The Foreign Minister today spoke about three things—about our talks in China, about the attitude of Israel in annexing certain territories and about disturbances in Poland. Sir, while speaking about Poland. I must say that this zone, these countries of the Eastern Europe have always been a sore point to the Americans and the American policy of imperialism. It

[Shri Shyam Sundar Mohapatra]

has been always the policy of America to see that there is disturbance in this zone so that the Governments there with the socialist philosophy lose ground. Whether it was in the past in Czechoslovakia and Hungary or now in this country, I must make one point very clear and that these countries have a philosophy of their own—these socialist countries—and one should not think of them as satellite countries. This entire area has a special type of commitment to the people. Sir, we are definitely concerned about what is happening in Poland. We also appreciate the people there trying for more democracy in Poland. But at the same time, we should not lose sight of the fact that there may be various vested interests in Poland who are trying to crush the Polish political philosophy, that is, socialism.

Sir, about Israel, I must say that Israel has been committed to the cause of Zionism and during the last 30 years Israel has been the focal point of aggression against Palestine and a threat to the entire Arab world. Today unfortunately the whole Arab world is divided. Mr. Saddam Hussein of Iraq is going one way and Colonel Gaddafy of Libya is going another way, and the King of Jordan is going yet another way. The Arab world is totally divided. Let us make this point very clear that our commitment to the Arab cause has been proved and our commitment has been very specific. And Mahatma Gandhi, the Father of the Nation, from the platform of the Indian National Congress, had supported the cause of Palestinians. So, it has been a creed with the Government of India and our political party, that is, the Indian National Congress. And Zionism has been definitely against the Arab cause, the Arab culture, the Arab people, and our sympathies are with the Arab world.

About China, it is very good that the talks have started. In fact, India is the loser. India has suffered in the wars with China. Those were the days of Hindi-Chini Bhai-Bhai. Jawaharlal Nehru gave a big dimension to Indo-China friendship, the Panchsheel and all that. Those of us who are teachers and professors who have read from Edgar Snow's book. "The Red Star Over China", know what was happening in China. A new philosophy was emerging, a proletariat philosophy. China was a socialist country. But probably was stalled during the 60s and 70s because of the deviation from the path of socialism. And there was rupture in the Indo-Chinese friendship. India now has to claim an area of 10,000 square miles captured by China. With this background, with this post-war situation, we have to create a new history on the edifice of the present. We have to give a new dimension in the relationship between our two countries. The people in our country and in China want that there should he a new friendship evolved on the debris of the old, so that the two Asiatic powers which control most of the public opinion, these two great countries, could emerge on a new road to friendship. And I must compliment our Foreign Minister who has initiated the discussions under the guidance of our Prime Minister and let us all hope that we will reach a definite point.

The Prime Minister's visits abroad, the three consecutive tours, in a very short span of time, were spectacular indeed. After all, a country's foreign policy is one that gives a booster to the image of the country. Gladstone, while writing the foreign policy of England, said that policy at home reflects on the policy abroad. We have taken a definite progressive policy at home with the 20-point programme and enshrining the word "socialism" in our Constitution. So it is the duty of the Prime Minister of that Government to project its dimension, that we are seeing a new vision, to have fraternal relationship with friendly countries, fraternal relationship with socialist countries, to voice our pro-

test against imperialism, against neo-imperialism, to support the people of Africa who are fighting against im perialism, to support the Asian people who want to assert themselves in the comity of nations. India, as one of the biggest democracies or, maybe, the largest democracy of the world, should assert that it has something to give and something to take also. Our Prime Minister's utterances at Melbourne against war, to limiting the arms race, to stopping the arms race, all these have been appreciated by all, and that was in the presence of Mrs. Margaret Thatcher, the Prime Minister of the U.K. The Prime Minister's thought-provoking speech in Cancun that the smaller nations are not to be sidetrack ed, that the smaller nations are not beggars that they go with begging bowls to big nations, is an eye-opener to those who gathered at Cancun, at the North-South dialogue, and it gave confidence to the people and the re presentatives of the smaller nations at the Cancun conference. The Prime Minister's joint communique in Romania, her joint communique in Bulgaria, was in support of *detente* and against the arms race, against the arms build-up. The Prime Minister and the Romanian President, while speaking against the arms race and in favour of *detente,* had appealed to the people to strengthen the forces of peace against the forces of war. As the previous speakers have said, today the world which has seen revolutions, which has seen world wars, which has seen regional conflicts, limited wars, cold wars, cannot certainly go in for an arms build-up. Indians have witnessed a vivisection of this country. We see today arms coming from America to Pakistan. And that is the very thing for which India wants peace. *Detente* is a big problem today. We have got to achieve it somehow or other. Reagan President of the United States, three or four months back, on Television, speaking to about 250 million people in fifty countries, said that they want *detente.* He said that the NATO powers should withdraw all the conventional and nuclear weapons. That is a step towards *detente.* He said that Soviet Russia has 5,000 tanks, but they have only 1,100 tanks; Soviet Russia has 1,000 war-heads, but they have too little. It was falsified later by an article in the Times. What was his last appeal to the people? I am quoting him:

> 'Deterring war depends on the perceived ability of our forces to perform effectively. The more effective the forces are, the less likely it is that we will have to use them. So, we and our allies are proceeding to modernise NATO's nuclear forces of intermediate range to meet increased Soviet deployment.'

This is what President Reagan said. This argument visibly annoyed Mr. Brezhnev. Today Brezhnev's visit to Bonn has given us a new awakening because this shows that he wants the *detente* to be successful.

Some hon. friends on the other side have spoken about India's relation with the United States of America. Sometime back some US House Committee representatives came to me. I told them that if any country is is too well known popular in India and in every house here, it is the United States of America because they have given us food and they have given us powder, milk etc. in time of need. Unfortunately on each occasion whan India was in trouble, the United States of America betrayed us. They have always helped Pakistan against us right from 1954 till 1981. What did Jawaharlal Nehru say in Parliament on December 4, 1947? I quote:

> "If war comes, we are going to join the side which is to our interest. We shall be friends and we intend cooperating with America."

He said this in the first debate on foreign policy in Parliament. But what has been the attitude of America? On each occasion when crisis came America thought it proper not to stand by us. Whether it was Truman, whether it was John Foster Dalles or

[Shri Shyam Sundar Mohapatra] whether it was Eisenhover or Johnson or anybody, all of them wanted to sidetrack India. Therefore, their friendship has been a camouflague. They have always been supporting Pakistan. They have been arming Pakistan. The reason is that they can have their base there. They had in fact a base in Peshwar though later it had to be given up. This has been their cardinal policy, whether it was a Republican Government or a Government run by Democrats. In the U.K. whether it is the conservative or Labour Government the foreign policy seems to be same.

We in India believe in non-alignment. It is not that we are not aligned with anybody. We will align with the power which is just for us and which is right for us and which is in our national interest. Foreign policy emerges from national interests, national self-confidence and national prestige and national honour. It is the USSR which has stood by us in the last 20 years. When Bulganin came to Calcutta six million people greeted him. They supported India's policy on Kashmir and on Goa. And a friend indeed is a friend in need. When we were faced with Bangladesh crisis and when the Seventh Fleet was parading in the Indian Ocean and when our independence was in danger and when we were not knowing what to do it was only the Soviet Union which came to our side. The Indo-Soviet Treaty of Friendship is a magna carta fox us. It is in our interests. It is not Russia or America that matters to us. It is that which power will stand by us in times of crisis and in times of need? And, therefore, this Indo-Soviet Friendship Treaty is one on which we can call upon in times of distress. It is good for them and it is good for us.

When Bre2hnev came here and addressed Members of Parliament, what did he say? He said that the people of Soviet Union will stand by the people of India in days of crisis.

In contrast, what has been the role of America? Theirs has been a pathetic role, a tragic role. They have lost the friendship of about 650 million of people in this country, because they went to the help of a military junta in Pakistan which has been condemned by all people including the International body of human rights.

Some people have criticised our policy in Afghanistan and they said that there we are not following the Policy of non-alignment. I must say that this policy is out of national compulsion and it is also a policy of non-alignment. Our Prime Minister has said many times that we want the withdrawal of foreign troops from very country and that we do not want the Soviet troop in Afghanistan. Sir, if the Soviet troops are there in Afghanistan, we must also find out why they are there, who asked for the presence of the Soviet troops in Afghanistan and why they came. Sir, the Afghanistan Government have many times wanted the friendship with Pakistan also. Sir, Afghanistan has been used, if you read the history of the Indo-Afghan War, all the three famous volumes you will see that it has been a buffer zone between India and Russia. But that point apart, the question is whether the Soviet troops should be there or should not be there and our policy has been very categorical on this point that the Soviet troops should withdraw from Afghanistan.

Sir, all the diplomats who came to India from 1947 till today, all the foreign dignitaries who came to India, including the former UN Secretary-General, U Thant, have appreciated India's foreign policy. All the foreign dignitaries who have visited India recently, the Presidents of France, USSR, Romania, etc. and the Prime Minister of Vietnam Foreign Ministers, who came to India recently, have appreciated India's position *vis-a-vis* Afghanistan. So, it is no use criticising India's policy towards Afghanistan and one has only to appreciate it.

Then, Sir, what has been our policy in South-East Asia? Look at Kam-

puchea. There are many people who wanted the Pol. Pot Government there and they thought that Pol Pot Govern-ment was the legitimate Government of the people there. But, let me tell you, Sir, that the tyranny and brutality and the inhuman attitude with which the Pol Pot regime behaved towards the people of that country were so horrible that about a million people have been thrown into the ocean. Today, Sir, there is nobody to bother about these refugees there and in many European countries thousands of Kam-puchean children have been adopted by the Swedish people, by the Denmark people, by the English people, by the Irish people and so on and that was why our sympathy went to the Government of Heng Samrin and, so, Sir, Indias correct attitude towards Kampuchea has been perfectly all right passed beyond doubt.

Now about our attitude towards the Arab world. We have been very much justified in our policy of friendship with the Arab people and we have been all through with their cause and the cause of the Palestinians. As far as the people of Africa fighting against imperialism is concerned, we have always supported them in their fight against imperialism and our Prime Minister was in Zimbabwe when the new Government was formed there and there cannot be any better recognition of the views and the cause of the African people, their sentiments and their cause, than this. Sir, you know very well—you have been in politics for long and you know how Dewan Chaman Lal was sent by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru to Kenya and you also know how Jomo Kenyatta was dragged in the streets with chains and ropes and you know all this. This is how Jawaharlal Nehru stood for Indo-African solidarity and friendship. So, we appreciate the cause of the people of Africa, the people of Latin America also, and our Foreign Minister and our Prime Minister have shown genuine sympathy for the cause of the Latin American countries and **our** sympathies are with them.

Sir I do not want to take much time of the House. But I will only say that our foreign policy has been very genuine and it is completely non-align ed. I am sorry, I have forgotten to mention about the non-aligned nations' conference in Delhi. I know what role our Foreign Minister had played in that conference of the *Foreign* Mi nisters of non-aligned nations which was almost coming to a breaking point. What was the Delhi declara tion? The Delhi declaration is an im portant document in the hands of the non-aligner nations to fight against the forces of imperialism. Sir, our policy has been expedient and our policy has been just and our policy has been completly non-aligned, non-aligned not in the sense of remaining aloof, but, I can tell you under the leadership, of Shri mati Indira Gandhi who has the tra dition of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and Mahatma Gandhi, in the sense of not budging an inch from the spirit of non-alignment, but of fostering it project ing it for peace-cooperation and friend ship with all the people. Thank you Sir.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH (West Bengal): Sir, I share the anxiety expressed by the honourable Minister for External Affairs and the other distinguished Members on both sides of the House about the war clouds hovering in the sky of the world. Indeed, Sir, the danger of war is there and the armament race and the talk of nuclear war are threatening humanity. But we must understand where the root cause of this danger lies. Is it because some people are demanding war or is it because some States are wanting war, the danger has become so intense. No, Sir. The real cause, the root cause, of this danger lies in the economic crisis which the capitalist system has bred. Today the capitalist countries are in the midst of a serious economic crisis which is consi-dered *to* be the worst since the 1932 crisis and to overcome this crisis these capitalist, imperialist countries **are** spending almost the entire of their budget, a larger part of their budget

[Shri Dipen Ghosh]

even at the expense of the welfare of the common people to produce spohis-ticated war weapons, because it is profitable. So, Sir, we know who are the countries spending so much of money at the cost of their people's welfare for building up their war preparations, and who is the leader of these countries. Many of our friends here, including the Minister, by and large, have expressed that it is the USA. But, Sir here we have to find where our country stands in this situation. We want peace because we want to survive; we want peace for economic development. True, our Government talks of peace, cooperation, detente and everything about bringing peace. But I have also seen that in the same breath our Government talks of super-power ri-valries. I think it is a question of self-eontradiction we are suffering from, because when we talk of superpower rivalry, by it are we not equating friends with enemies, by it are we not putting the war-mongers and the defenders of peace on par? Sir, it is time that we Tell the truth to the people.

Many Members have stated that the "USA has been arming Pakistan to the teeth. The USA has converted the Indian Ocean into a hot-bed of war hysteria. The USA has been supporting the Israeli intransigence and even the annexation of the Golan Heights against the UN Resolution, so on and so forth. But if we look to the Soviet Union, we will find that the Soviet Union is strengthening the countries which are facing the war preparations of the US. It is time that we must tell the truth to the people that it is the Socialist blocled by the Soviet Union which is the defender of peace and which is a guarantee against the US wars preparations.

Sir, it is good and we welcome it that an effort has been made to normalise our relations with China. Everybody realises that these two big countries should live in an atmos-phere of cordiality, brotherhood and friendship. This effort needs to be pursued, and I hope this would succeed. But, in this connection may I ask the hon. Minister of External Affairs, what about our position regarding giving recognition to Poly Saharassian Front? It has been recognised by most of the African countries with whom we have good relations. I think our hon. Minister will look into this question.

About the Golan Heights, I appreciate the statement already given by our hon. Minister. But I want to see that our Government undertake efforts at the U.N. General Assembly in international forums to ensure that action is taken against Israel who has annexed the Golan Heights, which is Syrian territory, despite the U.N. General Assembly's Resolution to vacate that territory.

Sir, as regards Poland, some friends have stated certain things. Some fri ends on the other side have also sta ted certain things. But I want to say very categorically that it is the U.S.A. which is behind this design. We can not brush aside the issue by saying that it is an internal affairs of a parti cular country, surely, it is an internal affair of a particular country. But there are machin-ations and designs of the imperialist countries headed by the U.S.A. to destabilise the situation in some of the socialist countries of Eastern Europe. It has come in the newspapers how the U.S.A. Administration has been supporting these people. So, when there is counter-revolution, it is well within the competence of that socialist Government to put it down.

As regards the policy about foreign affairs, I want to point out two more points. Apparently, it does not come within the purview of the Minister of External Affairs. But I think it is well related and linked with this particular issue. We talk of non-alignment and we talk of the U.S. designs and imperialist designs and at the same time we go abegging to the IMF

headed by the U.S.A. Is it consistent with the foreign policy enunciated by our hon. Foreign Minister to accept IMF loan with such conditionally which would amount to bartering away of our economic sovereignty." Are we not aware of the experience which Brazil, Jamaica, Sri Lanka, Peru and Turkey had while drawing loans from the IMF? Could they keep their foreign policy independent of U.S. pressures? Is that not a conditionally that for drawing loan from the IMF we have to stop bilateral trade agreements and payments? Is it not in the newspapers already that the U.S. representative said that they would intervene if the Indian Government buys Mirage from France out of that fund? It is related to that question of our defence to the question of our foreign policy because a self-reliant economy is a pre-condition of a self-reliant foreign policy. So, I would appeal to the Government of India and to the Minister of External Affairs that in order to be consistent with the foreign policy enunciated by the hon. External Affairs Minister, our application for loan or agreement for loan from IMF should be withdrawn or cancelled. Sir, my second point is this. I appreciate the anxiety of our Government in normalising the relations with various foreign countries, including the U.S.A. I appreciate the anxiety of our Government in establishing ties with the various Governments. But at the same time, should we not try to establish a good tie with the people of our country, with the workers of our country, with the peasant of our country, with the toiling masses of our country? Who will defend our country when our country will be in danger. It is the workers who will protect our country, the peasants who will protect our country, the toiling masses who will protect our country. And can you protect your country by denuding the workers, the peasants, the toiling masses of their minimum basic rights to Jive? AN HON. MEMBER: No.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH; If you don't pay them the minimum wage, if you don't give them the minimum democratic right, how can you unite the people to resist any foreign aggression? We have got the experience — the people on the other side have also got the experience— that in our history, in the recent history, a very small country could successfully fight back the US with all its nuclear weapons. And that was Vietnam. And how could Vietnam fight back? By denuding the people of Vietnam of all their minimum basic rights? No. But by uniting the people and by taking them into confidence our Government talks of defence of our country. But how? By enforcing National Security Act? By enforcing Essential Services Maintenance Act? Is it not contradictory?

So, Sir, I would appeal to the Government through the hon. Minister of External Affairs that to be consistent with the foreign policy enunciated by him, his Government should see that the workers, the peasants, the employees, the toiling masses of our country are given the minimum basic democratic rights and to unite them to face the challenge. Thank you Sir.

SHRI DINESH SINGH (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, we hear a lot these days of the impending crisis the crisis of confrontation, the crisis of a military confrontation, the crisis of a nuclear war and the danger of the annhilation of the human race. Sir, if we look at the pages of history, We shall find that the world has always lived through crisis. And yet we have survived. Being an optimist I feel that whatever the crisis that we may feel today, there is 2 way to survive. To be able to assess that, we must be able to assess the present crisis. And I would submit, Sir, that the present crisis is not a military crisis it is not a crisis of a military confrontation between two blocks, but that it is essentially a crisis in the economic field.

Sir, we had been talking about neo-colonialism in the 50s and the 60s. I

[Shri Dinesh Singh]

is this neocolonialism, which has come in its most naked form, which creates the crisis in the economic field. If one can try to date this crisis that we face, perhaps, the most convenient and the most graphic date would be the time from the oil crisis onwards. The oil crisis was a crisis more for the developing countries than the developed countries. Bulk of the developing countries, who were not producing their own oil, came under great economic pressure when the price of oil was raised. It was the time when they had to seek external assistance. That assistance could not come from the Soviet block because they themselves were under economic crisis. The bulk of the relief could on-ly come from the United States and the Western block and it was this position of superiority that the United States achieved during the oil crisis that has led to the present economic problems and the crisis which we talk of. It is the crisis of change, a change which we have not yet fully understood, and a change the course of which has not fully been charted and cannot be easily prophesised. Now, in this situation the entire economice of the world have been thrown out of gear and a fear psychosis has been built up, a fear of domination by the United States, particularly in combination with Western European countries and that is the fear that has come in the minds of the Soviet block as well as a large number of developing countries. On the other hand, the United States too is in the grip of fear, not appreciating where this new acquired power will lead them to, what will be the counter-vailing forces that will be built up to meet the United States own superiority that has been gained, what will the Soviet Union do, will it drive them to a war, will it lead to a nuclear war and the whole imbalance if one can use that word?. All this has arisen from the economic crisis that We face today. In this relation the obvious places of tension will be the countries of the areas that produce oil because it is the oil crisis that has led to the present economic difficulties and that is why we see the dangers of war in West Asia, the dangers of conflict, the dangers of confrontation and I would not say that Afghanistan is an isolated incident. It is a part of the developing confrontation in West Asia. Therefore, we have to see what is India's role in finding a solution. Much has been talked about limited national interests, limited thrust in limited areas that my friend, the hon. Shri Jaswant Singh, whom I listened with very great attention, talked of, the drive that has to be recreated, the drive that existed in the time of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. I am glad that after Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru people have begun to appreciate his policy. But those of us who had the fortune to be with him and work with him saw that his main thrust was towards peace and peaceful co-existence towards international cooperation because he could foresee at that time that the danger will come not in the military field but in the economic field. It was he who first talked of neo-colonialisin and the dangers that neo-colonialism will bring, not merely for the dependent territories at that time but for the entire world. It is this effort that Shrimati Indira Gandhi is making to try to find a solution of the economic problems that we face today. Her visit to Cancun was in pursuance of this idea, not in merely meeting a few people whom she could have met outside anyhow. But, unless India at-temps at this time to try to find a solution to the problem which is at the base of the international problem today, India cannot solve the difficulties merely by turning a kind face to one neighbour or the other. The problem is not with our neighbours but the problem is a global problem and unless we can take an initiative in finding a solution to that, or, at least, indicate directions in which we can move in improving relations with our neighbouring countries the solution will not be easy.

And here I would submit that the initiative that the Government of

India has taken and the Prime Minister has herself taken and that by the Foreign Minister is an initiative which is worthy of notice of this House. I am really sorry that in their attempt to play a role of party politics, no hon. Member has appreciated the basic effort that India's Foreign Minister and India's Government is making today in trying to move in the direction in which there could be hope for the humanity as a whole including those in the national borders of India.

Now, Sir, what is the solution to this problem? Much can be said about North-South dialogue. I can say that we have to get something from the North to try to build a new international economic order. My submission is that we are not going to get anything merely by asking. We will have to create conditions in which a new international order is built, not merely a new international economic order. There will have to be both an economic and the political order duly constructed in the context of the problems that we face today.

What is this new international order? First of all, it has to be based on national independence because national independence has yet not been replaced by any other independence. National independence is the essence of non-alignment. I am not talking of some kind of vague policy of non-alignment or a policy of equi-distance between all powers or policy of neutrality in not expressing a view. I am talking of positive dynamic policy which will create conditions in which equality will be restored at the level of national Governments. Then we have to find a way in which economic exploitation will be changed to economic co-operation. It is not that only the South have to gain from any kind of international economic order. It is the North as much which will gain if there is a co-operation rather than a confrontation between the North and South, because it must be borne in mind that bulk of the resources and even the bulk of the markets exist in the South But the Northern markets are saturated; the new markets could only be found in the South, and there. fore, a new co-operation, a new structure of the economic order based on the political order, that I talked of earlier, will be equally beneficial to the countries of North and South. And it is this attempt that we are making which I would commend to this House and I am very glad that the Government is now proposing to hold a conference in Delhi on a South-South co-operation. I think it will be a major milestone in our effort to restructure both the international economic and political order because we have already had a meeting of the non-aligned Foreign Ministers and a. meeting on the basis of South-South co-operation will be a major landmark in the direction of economic co-operation.

What is this South-South dialogue or co-operation? Here Sir, there has been an attempt made by India, not for the first time, in holding this conference but from early times and I recall particularly from the time that Mrs. Gandhi assumed the Prime Ministership in 1966 onwards; there has been an attempt to build a South-South economic co-operation. The first attempt if you may recall, Mr. Vice-Chairman, was in the tripartite meeting we had in New Delhi, a meeting between President Nasser. President Tito and Mrs. Gandhi which was held in New Delhi to forge a common economic programme not merely for these three countries, but for all non-aligned countries and all developing countries. And the cooperation that had been conceived between these three leaders was rather accepted even by the international organisation, GATT, as a basic co-operation between the developing countries. This was followed by our co-operation with Iran, where we were sharing each other's surpluses in the economic field, for the economic development of one another. It was followed by our agreement with Ceylon, now Sri Lanka, in which we were going to share the surpluses of both the countries in the

[Shri Dinesh Singh]

international market. Therefore these attempts had been made by India for a long time; some with success and some not with success because the structure was not under our control and we were heavily dominated by economic trends from outside. Yet, efforts had been initiated and I am glad that the world is talking more and more about them today and that we shall have a meeting here in New Delhi, in which we shall have an opportunity to give some concrete shape to these ideas. Now, particularly with large amount of wealth in the developing countries, in the OPEC countries, I think, it will be possible to persuade the OPEC countries to have larger investments in the developing countries, instead of their present investments in the developed countries. We have the resources, both monetary resources, as well as raw materials, resources of manpower and large markets in the South to build up a strong and stable economic relationship between the developing countries in which it will be imperative on the North to begin co-operation with us. We won't have to go and beg and' ask; they will come to. us. I hope, this beginning in self-reliance, as has been talked about, will be made in a concrete manner when this meeting takes place in New Delhi.

Therefore, as I was submitting, it is not that the Government has not initiated anything dynamic which will not attract attention. Perhaps, it takes time. Non-alignment, as hon. Member, Mr. Jaswant Singh, would remember, had been condemned by the world for a long time. It was called immoral and if I may recall correctly, even his Party at that time had opposed it. But over a period of time, it has acquired validity and it has now acquired acceptability. In the same manner, the effort that we are making in the economic field, will I hope, acquire not only validity but also acceptability.

Now, a few points which had been raised by some hon. Members, I think, deserve some consideration by thi3 House. The hon. Member, Shri Syed Shahabuddin, talked about a non-aligned multi-national peace force for Afghanistan. I find it somewhat difficult, Mr. Vice-Chairman, to accept how the replacement of troops of one country by troops of a number of countries is going to help Afghanistan. The idea is to move all troops outside Afghanistan, not to introduce new troops into Afghanistan and, therefore, ...

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: Peace-keeping force at the border.

SHRI DINESH SINGH; This peace-keeping force will have to be *on* the Pakistan-Afghanistan border. Once the Soviet Union withdraws, there will be no question of re-entry from that border. But if he is talking about a peace-keeping force on the Afghanistan-Pakistan border, it is an entirely different situation.

Now, hon. Member, Mr. Jaswant Singh, had talked about a reactive foreign policy. With due respect to to him, I think, he himself was only reacting.

4 P.M.

He did not produce any new ideas that the Government of India could work upon, to give any new thrust or new direction. But two things that he mentioned particularly, caught my attention. He talked of the moral force of India and he talked of India's isolation in Asia What is India's moral force? That is the ability of India to say in specific situation what is right and what is wrong. It is not a question of calling names, or putting blame on people but merely an analysis of a situation to distinguish between right and wrong and to accept an option that may be considered right. Now I ask, in Kampuchea should be have supported Pol Pot? If we did not support Pol Pot, should we have said that Kampuchea does not exist? Or should we have accepted a Government that was in power in Kampuchea? If in accepting that Government in his opinion we

have isolated ourselves from the so-called ASEAN nation, I think we would have only acted on moral force which he was advocating earlier. How does he estimate that we are isolated in Asia? I think our relations with the Asian countries, particularly with the ASEAN countries, that have been talked about, are excellent. Recently, our Prime Minister has paid a visit to some of those countries, the Foreign Minister has visited, their own leaders have come to this country and a large area of understanding and common agreement has been evolved and declared in the joint communiques. How are we isolated? Merely because they did not recognise Kampuchea and we recognised Kampuchea are we isolated? We recognised the Peoples Republic of China for a long time and no other country recognised it. Did we do something wrong or have we been proved wrong? It was Mr. Nixon who went to China, the Chinese leaders did not go to the United States. Therefore, Sir, if we act in a situation in which we are able to perceive the future perhaps slightly better than some others because we have a clear policy of non-alignment, it does not mean that we are isolated or that we have done something wrong. It only means that we shall have more friends joining us and a time will come, I can assure the hon. Member, when more and more of these count-Ties will recognise Kampuchea and will have greater cooperation with Vietnam. I must say that our consistent support to Vietnam is one of the basic factors of stability in our relations with the countries of South Asia. Here is a nation which has fought the world's largest military power almost single-handed and has established the validity of national independence and we are friendly with them in the hope that other countries will also begin to accept them as dependable friends, as a nation which is self-reliant, as a nation which has determination, which has worked for peace and dignity of man. Are we doing something wrong? I can only hope that more and more countries will come along and join hands with us in this. But there is one thing. I must say, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I entirely agree with all those Members not merely in the opposition, but also sitting on this side, when we say that we must forge a close relationship of all South-Asian countries, we must work for a South-Asian identity, we must work for close cooperation between South-East Asian countries. And I am glad that the two meetings that have taken place at the level of Foreign Secretaries in trying to evolve a South Asian cooperation have been very successful. I hope it will be possible to further strengthen this and give speed to it.

I would now conclude, Mr. Vice-Chairman, with just one remark on Pakistan. I am second to none in. advocating close relations between Pakistan and India, as I have been, and you have been a witness to it, of close relations between China and India. It is in our national interest, as in the larger interest of South Asian cooperation that we must have the closest possible relations with Pakistan. And I for one felt that our relations were improving vastly. We were moving that very close. People from Pakistan were visiting us here; our people were visiting Pakistan; those journalists and others who had an opportunity to meet with the Pakistan President came back very impressed with his desire to improve relations and a very healthy development was taken place.

SHRI U. R. KRISHNAN (Tamil Nadu): What about their treatment of our Ambassador?

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

SHRI DINESH SINGH: Now suddenly—I would say and emphasise the word "suddenly"—the day the United States declared that it was going to give large military assistance to Pakis-tan, the entire climate changed. We did not change the climate. Our Foreign Minister is on record having gone

[Shri Dinesh Singh] to Pakistan even after the USA declaration and saying that Pakistan has a right to defend itself and to have armed forces that it considers necessary for its defence. It was the Members on the other side who criticised him for having said that—those who now feel that Pakistan has a right to have a defence force that it considers necessary. We did not. The Foreign Minister went and said, "Yes, Pakistan has this right". But what is this right in relation to? I recall the time when the Pakistan President had told one of our journalists that he would *be* very happy if Pakistan's military leaders and Indian military leaders got together and told him what would be Pakistan's defence requirements. From that position, it went to suddenly accepting a large force that would come to Pakistan, not merely in relation to defence because the strategic situation had not changed, but in relation to Pakistan acquiring offensive weapons, and the entire climate changed. I do not know—I am not sure—I would not like to make a commitment—as to why this happened. What was the USA's interest in this? What was the interest of Pakistan in it? What were the internal problems that they were facing? What was their perception of external dangers because there was no danger from India at that time? India was not going to get any new weapons system. There was no new acquisition of arms at that time. What was the situation that necessitated offensive weapons that Pakistan suddenly realised, because at that time if you look back in the newspapers, the Pakistanis themselves said that they did not face a danger from the Soviet Union? What was this impending necessity to go in for offensive weapons system? And it is here that the difficulties have arisen. Even now at this stage I hope it will be possible to work out some kind of an understanding with Pakistan, because there is a larger interest not merely of what Government could have done at a particular time, but the relationships between the two peoples are of such paramount importance that I hope it will be possible to under-play this and to build new bridges which will tras-cend this and that a new relationship will emerge between Pakistan and India. I have no doubt that it is towards this end that the Government, and particularly the Foreign Minister is working. Thank you.

श्री सदाशिव बागाईतकर: (महाराष्ट्र): श्रीमन, अतंत में विदेश नीति का महत्व इतना ही है कि जो समस्याएं हम लोगों के सामने खड़ी होती हैं, उन पर उपाय के तौर पर वह हमें कहां तक ले जा सकती हैं । अभी अभी मेरे मित्र माननीय सदस्य श्री दिनेश सिंह जी ने अपना वक्तव्य किया । उन्होंने नान-एलाईनमेंट का सारा इतिहास थोड़े में हमको बताया ?

श्री दिनेश सिंह : आप मुझ से पहले से जानते हैं ।

श्री सदाशिव बागाईतकर : मैं आपसे दरख्वास्त करूंगा कि क्या आप अपने दिल पर हाथ रखकर आज यह कह सकते हैं कि नान-एलाईनमेंट का कन्सेप्ट या जो विचारधारा नेहरू जी के जमने में रही, आज वह कायम है ? शब्द भले ही कायम होंगे । अगर आप आज जो नान-एलाईण्ड मेम्बर कण्ट्रीज हैं, उनकी लिस्ट देखेंगे तो आपको पता चलेगा कि नान-एलाईनमेंट के तीसरे खेमे की हमारी जो संकल्पना रही थी वह आज बहुत डाइल्यूट हो गयी है । आज नान-एलाईनमेंट राष्ट्रों के खेमें में ऐसे राष्ट्र भी हैं जो हकीकत में नान-एलाईण्ड नहीं हैं । अब किसी देश के नाम के उल्लेख की जरूरत नहीं है । लेकिन हकीकत जानने के तौर पर इतना तो हम लोग जानें और समझें कि हमारा नान-एलाईनमेंट की तरफ देखने का जो नजरिया रहा है, उसका ताल्लुक हमारी आजादी की लड़ाई से है । आपको याद होगा कि इन लोगों ने यह कहा था: India freed means humanity liberated

यह हम लोगों का नजरिया था । हम लोगों का साम्राज्य विरोध, दुनिया भर के लोगों को आजादी की लड़ाई और उनके आजाद होने की सराहिश, इच्छा, ये सारी अतीत की जो बातें रहीं उसी से नान-एलाईनमेंट शुरू हुआ । सन् 1942 में दुनियां में जब दूसरा जंग छिड़ गया उस वक्त हमने इस भूमिका को लेकर अपनी आजादी की लड़ाई लड़ी । तो नान-एलाईनमेंट का वह इतिहास कहने मात्र से नान-एलाईनमेंट के बारे में हम कारगर ढंग से अमल कर रहे हैं, यह कहना सही नहीं है । इसलिए पहली बार आज हम ऐसी स्थिति में पहुंच गये हैं कि हम तीसरे खेमे की नीति को चलाना चाह रहे हैं लेकिन दुनिया में जो स्थिति आज बन रही है उसमें परिणाम प्राप्त करने की दृष्टि से, असर डालने की दृष्टि से, उसको नया मोड़ देने की दृष्टि से यह नीति कारगर है या नहीं, हो सकती है कि नहीं, इसके बारे में शंकाएं पैदा हो रही हैं और ये शंकाएं बाह्य परिस्थिति की वजह से पैदा नहीं हो रही हैं । हमारा अपना बर्ताव भी एक ऐसी स्थिति पैदा कर रहा है, इसके बारे में मैं विदेश मंत्री जी से जानना चाहता हूं; क्योंकि आज की दुनिया की जो स्थिति है वह यह है कि यह कगार पर खड़े हैं । ऐसा लग रहा है कि तीसरा विश्वयुद्ध होगा । लेकिन मैं नहीं मानता कि तीसरा विश्व-युद्ध इतनी जल्दी होगा । जब तक रूस और अमेरिका तय नहीं करते, तब तक तीसरे विश्वयुद्ध की कोई स्थिति दुनिया में बनेगी ऐसा मुझे नहीं लगता है । छिट-पुट लड़ाइयां होती रहती हैं । सन् 45 की लड़ाई खत्म होने के बाद हम देख रहे हैं कि दुनिया में कोई एक साल ऐसा नहीं होगा जब दुनिया के किसी न किसी कोने में, हिस्से में लड़ाई न छिड़ी हो, अलग अलग ढंग से अलग अलग रूप से लड़ाइयां चलती रही हैं । लेकिन विश्वयुद्ध की स्थिति तभी बन सकती है जब रूस और अमेरिका की अनबन पूरी हो जाय और जो स्थिति आज हम देख रहे हैं, रीगन के उस डिक्लेरेशन के बाद भी, जेनेवा में रूस के बीच में बैठकें हो रही हैं उनके बाद भी, वह यह है, इसका निष्कर्ष यही है कि कम से कम दुनिया की ये दो ताकतें जानती हैं कि अगर तीसरा विश्वयुद्ध हमारी तरफ से होगा, छिड़ जायेगा तो शायद दुनिया में कोई चीज बचेगी नहीं, जिसके लिए उनके मन में लालच हो ।

श्रीमन्, दिनेश सिंह जी ने उल्लेख किया कि आर्थिक स्थिति भी इसका एक पहलू है । यह सही बात है । आर्थिक स्थिति के दो रूप हैं जो मैं आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूं । एक रूप है कि दुनिया में शस्त्रास्त्रों का व्यापार बढ़ा है और थर्ड वर्ल्ड में, ईस्ट एशिया में हथियार आ रहा है । उसकी मात्रा, अगर आप देखेंगे, उसमें जो बढ़ोतरी हुई है, तो उससे आपको पता चलेगा कि वह खतरा है और उस खतरे का रूप क्या है ?

एक तो वह हिस्सा है और दूसरा हिस्सा जो है और जिसके बारे में नार्थ-साऊथ डायलाग और केनकुन की मीटिंग के बारे में जिक्र हो रहा है, उसके बारे में मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि दुनिया में जो पूरी आजादी है, उसमें जिस ढंग का डिविजन आफ इंडस्ट्रियली एडवांस्ड कण्ट्रीज और दूसरे देशों के बीच में जी० एन० पी० के बारे में इंडस्ट्रियलाइजेशन के बारे में, उनके जीवन-स्तर के बारे में, यहां तक कि दुनिया के जो प्राकृतिक साधन हैं, उस पर अधिकार के रूप में भी देखा जाए, तो जो खाई है, वह बहुत बड़ी है, वह बढ़ती जा रही है और

[श्री सदाशिव बागाईतकर]

एक अंश उसमें यह भी जोड़ना चाहिए कि आबादी का घनत्व पिछड़े इलाकों में जितना है, उसकी भी एक समस्या है। तो नार्थ-साउथ डायलाग की अगर बात करनी है, तो मामूली लच्छेदार बात से कुछ होना नहीं है।

श्रीमन्, जहां तक अमरीका का रुख है, मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि अमरीका में जितनी रिपब्लिकन एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन आई हैं, उनका सारा इतिहास अगर देखा जाए, तो हिन्दुस्तान के प्रति उन लोगों का एक विशिष्ट दृष्टिकोण हमेशा रहा है, चाहे रीगन साहब हों, चाहे निक्सन साहब, आइजनहावर साहब, रिपब्लिकन प्रजीडेंट जब-जब अमरीका में आए हैं, तब-तब हम लोगों के प्रति, हिन्दुस्तान के प्रति उन लोगों की कुछ एक खास विपरीत दृष्टि रही है। अगर दुश्मनी की दृष्टि नहीं कहनी है, तो मैं नहीं कहता। लेकिन विपरीत दृष्टि रही है।

इसलिए जब 11 मार्च को एलेक्जेंडर हेग साहब ने यह फ़रमाया,---

"Western industrialised societies are largely dependent on oil resources of Middle-East region and threat to access to oil would constitute a grave threat to the vital national interests. This must be dealt with and that does not exclude the use of force if that is necessary."

हेग साहब ने जब यह फरमाया, 11 मार्च, 1981 का उनका यह वक्तव्य है। उसी से पता चलता है कि उनकी दृष्टि और नजरिया क्या है। हिन्दुस्तान के बारे में सारी रिपब्लिकन एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन की दृष्टि और आज की दुनिया में जिस विशेष परिस्थिति का उल्लेख हम लोग बार-बार कर रहे हैं, एनर्जी क्राइसेस को लेकर, उसका यह जो जिक्र उनके बयान में आया है, उससे अमरीकन दृष्टि साफ है। यह पुरानी साम्राज्यवादी दृष्टि है। इसकी कोई और व्याख्या नहीं की जा सकती और चूंकि वह सुपर-पावर है, उनकी अपनी स्थिति है और उस स्थिति को बरकरार रखने के लिए वह यह समझते हैं कि हमको यह अधिकार प्राप्त है कि दुनिया की जिस जगह से, जिस स्थान से जो कुछ हमको प्राप्त होता रहा है, वह हमेशा के लिए हमको मिलता रहे। इसके लिए अगर लड़ाई करनी पड़े, तो हम लड़ाई करेंगे, किसी देश पर आधिपत्य जमाना पड़े, वह भी हम जमायेंगे। यह उनकी दृष्टि रही है।

तो हमको तो इसकी चेतावनी पहले से ही मिली है। तो इससे हमको आश्चर्य करने का कोई जरूरत नहीं है। जो इतिहास रिपब्लिकन एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन का रहा, रीगन साहब और उनके सारे मददगार जो हैं, उनकी जो दृष्टि रही, इसकी तो पूरी जानकारी एक तरह से हम लोगों के पास है। सवाल यह नहीं है, उन्होंने जो कुछ दृष्टि रखी है, उससे हमको आश्चर्य नहीं होता है। असल में एक तरह से, हम एक डिलेमा में जा रहे हैं और वह यह है कि पाकिस्तान की उन लोगों के साथ जो कुछ सांठगांठ है--और उसका परिणाम जो हो रहा है, एफ---16 की चर्चा और बढ़ते हुए शस्त्रास्त्र पाकिस्तान में---एक तरफ यह है और दूसरी तरफ हम लोगों की वह स्थिति है कि जिसमें हम अपना मन बना नहीं सक रहे हैं, पक्का इरादा नहीं कर रहे हैं कि हमको किस दिशा में जाना है। हम पाकिस्तान की जिस किसी कारण से टीका-टिप्पणी करें या गलत बतायें उसी चीज को हम करें, यह तो हो नहीं सकता। इसलिए मैं समझता हूं कि जो डिलेमा हम लोगों के सामने

हैं, जो दुविधा है वह यह दुविधा है । इस दुविधा का माहौल बढ़ता जा रहा है। इसका बुनियादी कारण है कि शस्त्रास्त्रों का व्यापार थर्ड वर्ल्ड में बढ़ रहा है। श्रीमन्, मेरे पास कुछ आंकड़े हैं । गये साल में शस्त्रास्त्रों पर 1200 करोड़ डालर खर्च हुए हैं ।

Weapon transfer last year amounted to 120 milion.

सारे शस्त्रास्त्रों का मार्केट जो है वह थर्ड वर्ल्ड का मार्केट है । इस में गये साल अकेले agreement with the third world countries is almost equal to the world's transfer of food.

अन्न के व्यापार पर दुनिया में जितना पैसा लग रहा है उससे ज्यादा पैसा दुनिया के इस हिस्से में शस्त्रास्त्र को ले कर लग रहा है । श्रीमन्, तो मेरी दृष्टि से सब से खतरनाक चीज यह है कि यह जो ईस्ट-एशिया, मिडिल-ईस्ट या मध्य एशिया जिसे कहते हैं वहां शस्त्रास्त्रों को जो भरमार चल रही है उससे स्थिति नाजुक और खतरनाक बनती जा रही है । किसी भी कामयाब विदेश नीति को इन चीजों के उपाय के तौर पर क्या करना है, यह समस्या हम लोगों के सामने है । जो शस्त्रास्त्र खरीद रहे हैं उनके पास पैसा नहीं है, यही बात नहीं है बल्कि जिस वातावरण में यह हो रहा है, उस को भी देखिए । 1975 में 8 बिलियन डालर जहां इस इलाके में शस्त्रास्त्रों पर खर्च हुए, वहां 1980 में आज 18.3 बिलियन डालर खर्च हुए हैं । **(समय की घंटी)** आपने घंटी बजाई मैं ज्यादा डिटेल नहीं देता। शस्त्रास्त्रों का अम्बार इस इलाके में बढ़ रहा है। मैं समझता हूं कि किसी भी कामयाब विदेश नीति के सामने अगर कोई उद्देश्य होंगे तो पहला उद्देश्य यही होगा कि यह जो स्थिति बन रही है और जो उससे संकट पैदा हो रहा है, उससे बच निकलने के लिए क्या उपाय हम करें । अगर इन उपायों की बात करनी है तो मैं समझता हूं कि नान एलाइनमेंट की जो हमारी पोलिसी है उसमें हम संसार बढ़ते रहें, क्वालिटी कम होती जाय तो यह जो आज की स्थिति है उससे इसका जवाब नहीं मिलेगा ।

श्रीमन्, वियतनाम और चीन की चर्चा हुई । लेकिन मैं विदेश मंत्री जी से पूछना चाहता हूं कि क्या हम लोगों में वह संकल्प शक्ति है जो वियतनाम और चीन में देखी ? उनकी नीतियों से हमारा मतभेद हो सकता है, लेकिन राष्ट्रीयता के नाते जो संकल्प इन लोगों ने किये और जिस तगड़े दिल से उस पर कायम रहे क्या वह हम लोगों का इरादा है ? मैं एक ही उदाहरण देता हूं । विदेश मंत्री जी, अभी-अभी आपके यहां क्रिकेट के मैच हो रहे हैं, कल-परसों दिल्ली में होगा । यूनाइटेड नेशंस के ह्यूमेन राइट्स कमीशन ने जिन खिलाड़ियों को ब्लैक-लिस्ट किया था उनमें से दो बायकाट और कुक इसमें हैं । यूनाइटेड नेशंस के ह्यूमेन राइट्स कमीशन में आपने हाथ उठाया ।

They should be blacklisted because they have played in South Africa.

फिर हम लोगों ने क्यों एलाउ किया है, मैं विदेश मंत्री जी से पूछना चाहूंगा । यह तो मामूली चीज थी । अगर हम उसूल के पक्के हैं और अफ्रीकन कंट्रीज से मैत्री निभाना चाहते हैं तो मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि हमको ऐसा नहीं करना चाहिये था । अफ्रीकन कंट्रीज ने इस पर आश्चर्य प्रकट किया है । नाइजीरिया का स्टेटमेंट है, उन्होंने इस पर अफसोस प्रकट किया है कि हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार ने इन खिलाड़ियों को आने दिया । मैं आपको उदाहरण दे रहा हूं । स्पोर्टस से मुझे दुश्मनी नहीं है, लेकिन जहां देश के संकल्प की बात है, यह जो

[श्री सदाशिव वाघाईतकर]

समझौते आज किये जा रहे हैं ऐसे कई समझौते आपने विदेश नीति में गये कई सालों में किये हैं । नतीजा यह हुआ है कि विदेश नीति का आपका कंटेंट धुंधला होता चला जा रहा है और उसमें वह ताकत नहीं रही जो कि जब हम आजाद नहीं थे और दुनिया के गुलाम देशों को ललकारते थे, उस समय जो ताकत हमारे शब्दों में थी वह आज हमारे शब्दों में नहीं रही और यह इसलिए कि हम कंप्रोमाइज करते रहे हैं ।

एक और बात का मैं उल्लेख करना चाहता हूं । अभी अभी अखबार में दो-चार दिन पहले एक बात आयी है कि 150 हिन्दुस्तानी पी० एल० ओ० में भर्ती हुये हैं । उसके बाद उसका खुलासा भी आया कि वह कमांडों ट्रेनिंग लेकर नौकरी नहीं कर रहे हैं लेकिन वह ह्यूमैनिटेरियन काम कर रहे हैं । मैं यह सवाल उठाना चाहता हूं कि क्या हमारे नागरिकों की भर्ती इस प्रकार के संगठनों में हमारे यहां से हो हो और अगर हमारे नागरिक किसी दूसरे देश की फौज में भर्ती हों तो वे हमारी अनुमति से हो रही है । अगर वे नागरिक आपकी अनुमति से वहां भर्ती नहीं हुये हैं तो वे ऐसे देशों में जा कर लड़ सकते हैं या काम कर सकते हैं कि जिनसे हमारी दोस्ती है या जिनसे हमारे ताल्लुकात अच्छे हैं और उसमें बाधा आ सकती है । तो इसलिए इन बातों की तरफ भी आपको ध्यान देना चाहिये ।

अब आखिरी बात कह कर मैं समाप्त करता हूं । आज पाकिस्तान के खिलाफ हिन्दुस्तान में ऐतिहासिक दृष्टि से एक माहौल पैदा हो रहा है । पार्टिशन की जो कहानी है उससे हम उसको अलग नहीं कर सकते और पाकिस्तान चाहे जितने भी हथियार आज इकट्ठा कर ले, लेकिन यह बहाना बनाना कि पाकिस्तान हिन्दुस्तान पर हमला करेगा, इसलिए हमको तैयार रहना है यह बात मैं सरासर गलत समझता हूं । आज किसी भी दृष्टि से भी वह हम पर हमला करने की स्थिति में नहीं है । अफगानिस्तान में रूस बैठा हुआ है । पाकिस्तान के सामने टू-फ्रन्ट सिचुएशन है और ऐसी स्थिति में हमारा यह प्रचार करना कि वह हम पर हमला कर सकता है या इस तरह की भावना को दृढ़ बनाना कि पाकिस्तान पर हमला करने जा रहा है यह मैं सही नहीं समझता और इस बात को मैं राष्ट्र-हित में नहीं समझता । इसलिए मैं चाहूंगा कि पाकिस्तान, बंगलादेश और नेपाल, और इस इलाके के जो हमारे दूसरे पड़ोसी देश हैं उनके साथ हमारे ताल्लुकात और अच्छे हों यह हमारा पाविटल होना चाहिये और अगर हमारी परंपरायें अच्छी न हों तो उनमें तब्दीली लानी चाहिये । यह तब्दीली जब तक हम नहीं लायेंगे तब तक अन्तरराष्ट्रीय शिकंजे में हम घुसे पड़े रहेंगे और हम बिना चाहे उसमें फंसे हुये हैं और उससे निकलने का कोई रास्ता आपको नहीं मिलेगा । इसलिए इस लाजिक में हम न फंसें कि पाकिस्तान चूंकि अमरीका से न्यूक्लियर आर्मामेंट या दूसरे शस्त्र ले रहा है तो इसलिए उसके रिऐक्शन में आपको भी कुछ करना है और इसलिए हम कहीं से भी अपने देश में हथियार लाते रहें । यह स्थिति सबसे अधिक खतरनाक स्थिति होगी और इससे आपको बचना है । इसलिए मैं चाहूंगा कि विदेश नीति के जो पहलू जिनमें यूनानिमिटी है देश में उसको बचाने के लिए आप पहले कदम उठायें और उसके लिए बात करें और नान-एलाइनमेंट का कंटेंट जो बीक हो गया है उसको संकल्प शक्ति दे कर ठीक करें । फिर हमारी विदेश नीति राष्ट्र और पूरे समाज को साथ ले कर चलने वाली नीति बनेगी जो कि अतीत में रही और वही आगे भी रहेगी । लेकिन ऐसा न हो कि उस में मतभेद हो जायें क्योंकि ऐसा होना राष्ट्र के हित में न होगा इतना कह कर मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूं ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): Yes, Mr. U. R. Krishnan. You have got nine minutes and I hope you will finish within that time.

SHRI U. R. KRISHNAN: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the international situation has become alarming that every nation in the world is very much concerned about the peace, tranquillity and safety of itself as well as of the world as a whole. No day passes without a nation declaring war against another nation or without a nation provoking another nation to start a war. Except India, Sir, which is following the policy of non-alignment, every nation, whether it is a small nation or a big nation, whether it is a powerful nation or a weak nation, whether it is a developed nation or an undeveloped nation or an under-devloped nation or developing nation, is manufacturing sophisticated arms and some of the nations, except a very few. are supplying arms to the other nations, so that they can be at their mercy. For example, we know that the USA is supplying arms to Pakistan much against the wishes of the people of India and now India is facing a great danger of war being declared by the Pakistan Government.

Sir, even though we are following the policy of non-alignment we should be very careful about the defence and safety of India and India should also produce sophisticated weapons and nuclear weapons also for the purpose of defence of India. We should not think over this, but we should immediately go in for this. Sir, in the initial stage itself, our Foreign Minister has said about India's stand regarding Poland. Of course, it is quite true that whatever has been happening for a couple of days in Poland is only an internal issue of the Polish Government and nobody else is concerned about it, but even then it is our duty also to say something about other activists which are instigating the strike and all those things. I think the Government of India will also look into it very carefully and do the needful regarding the Polish strike which is going on now.

Sir, much talks were going on during the Cancun meeting about India's participation. I say, Sir, that whatever mark India has made during the meeting will boost India's image in the world. Roughly 25 countries which participated in the Cancun meeting were apprised of India's position and we have gained a good reputation.

Sir, the US supply of arms to Pakistan is to be condemned outright, as it adds to the tension in the region. I feel, Sir, that in the footsteps of Pt. Nehru, the Non-alignment should be pursued on proper lines. We should have cordial relations with USA also, and we should not have any hesitation in having friendly relations with the USSR at the same time. We should and out the real cause why the USA is somewhat inimical towards India.

Sir, after this House debate we do not know what has happened to the progress made in regard to racial discrimination in the U.K. It is really seen that the Indians in Britain are not the second class but the fourth class citizens of that country. It is necessary that we take some effective steps in this regard.

Sir, I would like to mention one of the very important facts regarding the Tamilians residing in Sri Lanka. About two months before, some Tamilians" properties were looted and women raped, and even the library at Jafna was set on fire. We should immediately go and see how much we can help the Tamilians there. The Srimovo-Shastri Pact, ■ was entered into in the year 1964, but so far more than half-a-million Tamilians are there who are Stateless, and those half-a-million people are responsible for Ceylon's progress from economic point of view.

Sir, in this connection I would like to state that immediately after the elections our Chief Minister, met a delegation comprising of all the parties, including Congress *(T),* barring DMK, and they presented a petition. Mr. Karunanidhi is shedding crocodile tears for the cause of the Tamilians. . .. *(Interruptions).*

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY (Tamil Nadu): Sir, is it ...*(Interruptions).*

SHRI U. R. KRISHNAN: Why are. you interrupting? *(Interruptions).*

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY; Sir, this debate has been going on a very high standard. *(Interruptions).*

SHRI U. R. KRISHNAN: What is it, Sir? *(Interruptions).*

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: He has not shown any understanding of the problem. *(Interruptions).* You say something about foreign relations.

SHRI U. R. KRISHNAN: I know. You need not teach me. *(Interruptions),*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): Mr. Gopal-samy, please. I do not know why you are interrupting? I do not think you should be so touchy. Please continue, Mr. Krishnan.

SHRI U. R. KRISHNAN: Mr. Karunanidhi is shedding crocodile tears for the Tamilians. *(Interruptions).*

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Is it correct, Sir? *(Interruptions).* I do not know why this international debate is being made into a debate of... *(Interruptions).* I am sorry. *(Interruptions).*

SHRI U. R. KRISHNAN: Please ask him to resume.

(Interruptions).

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: He is igno rant of foreign relations _____*(Interrup tions)* .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): I do not think it is proper for a Member to say that another Member is ignorant of foreign relations. It will not be. . . .. *(Interruptions)* .

SHRI U. R. KRISHNAN:.. .He said that Mr. Karunanidhi.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Sir, we are participating in a debate on inter- I national situation and he is making remarks which are not relevant. He is ridiculing the whole people of Tamil Nadu.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI); Let him conclude.

SHRI U. R. KRISHNAN: Sir, he did not participate in presenting the memorandum.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: We are not a party to that delegation and we will not be a party to that delegation.

SHRI U. R. KRISHNAN: That is what I am saying.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Yet we have expressed our views.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): We are talking about international affairs. During this discussion these disputes need not come in. I will request Mr. Krishnan to continue. *(Interruptions),* please avoid your own internal matters for the time being. Don't put the Chair into difficulty.

SHRI U. R. KRISHNAN: Sir, instead of appreciating the efforts made by the Government of Tamil Nadu...

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Sir, on a point of order.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): Mr. Krishnan, he is on a point of order. Please take your seat.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY; Sir. we are discussing the international situation and the attitude of our Government. He has made some irrelevant remarks about our leader. We have expressed our views on behalf of the D. M. K. to the Government on so many occasions. Not only that, we have taken keen interest in the problems of Sri Lanka Tamilians. But when people were being butchered in Sri Lanka, his Chief Minister made a statement ... *(Interruptions).*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): It is not a point of order. This is no point of order. You are converting the debate into a DMK and AIDMK dispute or debate. If you feel that some remarks made by Mr. Krishnan are incorrect, you are entitled to rebut them when you participate in the debate. The difficulty is that you want the Chair to rule on relevancy. If you give that power to the Chair, in that case two-thirds of the debate may have to be expunged. The Members are wary of expunction. I will request Mr. Krishnan not to provoke Mr. Gopal-samy and to kindly see that the debate goes on on a higher plane.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: One minute, Sir. Even if I am called, I am not going to make any remark about the Tamil Nadu Government or anything else. I will confine myself only to the subject.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): Thank you, Mr. Gopalsamy. *(Interruptions).* I do not know how do you come in between, Mr. Mallick.

SHRI U. R. KRISHNAN: Instead of appreciating the efforts made by the Government of Tamil Nadu .....

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: We cannot follow a fraud and a cheat.

SHRI U. R. KRISHNAN: Mr. Karunanidhi even went to the extent of condemning the all party leaders in meeting the Prime Minister and presenting a memorandum regarding Sri Lanka Tamilians.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: He is misleading the House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): Please conclude, Mr. Krishnan.

SHRI U. R. KRISHNAN: In this connection, Sir, I would like to bring to the notice of the External Affairs Minister that on the pretext of Sri Lanka Tamils, one of the parties in Tamil Nadu is again resorting to the separatist movement as is being carried on about Khalistan.

Sir, here I would like to bring to the notice of the House that the Report of the international Committee of Jurists has accused Sri Lanka of repressing its Tamil minority and said that the situation could escalate into violence. The 88-page report drawn up by Prof. Virginia Leary of New York State University said that the police and army repression of the Tamil community appeared to be growing. Comparing, Sri Lanka's terrorism act with South African statutes, Prof. Leary said that it was not justified by 'political terrorism by a small group of Tamil youths. (Time *bell rings).* Sir, the Report added, 'The existing tension creates an extremely dangerous situation which may escalate into major violence and negate all development efforts.' Sir, it called on the Sri Lanka Government to scrap the Terrorism Act, investigate communal violence against Tamils earlier this year and prosecute those responsible. It also urged the appointment of more Tamil security forces in their own areas.

Sir, I would again urge upon the Government of India to see that half a million Tamils who are residing in Sri Lanka are given citizenship.

With these words, Sir, I conclude.

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA PANT (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, the foreign po licy of India as fashioned by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru stood the test of time and has enjoyed widespread sup port in the country. Its main ele ments, namely, Nan-alignment, soli darity with the Third World, quest for promotion of world peace, regional peace, friendship with neighbours, friendship with the Soviet Union, and support various causes round the world have all had national support. Its opposition to colonialism and im perialism in all its forms is a natural

[Shri Krishna Chandra Pant]

product of our own experience as a colony. Therefore, Sir, the debate is not on the basics of that policy but, perhaps, more on the application of the policy to specific situations. Now, even in today's debate—I was carefully listening to the various speakers—I did not find any criticism of the basic postulates of that policy. Now, we are wedded to world peace, and many things are happening in the world which cause grave anxiety. But I would like to concentrate, Sir, on the immediate threat to India's security, something that concerns us directly, and while examining this threat, I would like to take into account the fact that there are some persons who think that India is over-reacting to the threat it faces.

Sir, the backdrop against which we have to examine this question is the sharp deterioration in the international security environment. The entire process of *detente* has been halted. Indeed, there has been a side back from the high point of understanding reached at Helsinki, and once again all over the world, there is confrontation between the Super Powers. Now, in Europe, we have a situation in which once again both the Super Powers appeared to be preparing for a fresh induction of missiles, leading to further escalation of tensions. But the people of Europe who have been through two World Wars in this century do not want and will not permit Europe to become the theatre of a third World War. The peace movements there are growing and they are very vociferous. So, now in Geneva, talks are taking place between the USA and the USSR on the best way to see that Europe is free of nuclear missiles. But all the time, simultaneously, in Africa and Asia tensions are growing . And, it is seems that the confrontation will now take place not in Europe but in Africa and Asia.

This is the general backdrop. And, Sir, in this context, our immediate region is full of tensions. There is Afghanistan, there is Iran, the Iran-Iraq war, there is the Gulf region, to which Shri Dinesh Singh referred, which contains a very large deposit of the world's energy resources, oil resources, and it is likely to continue to be the focal point of confrontation for years to come. And, then, there is the situation in Israel. There is this Golan Heights annexation to which a reference has been made by the Foreign Minister and in this matter I entirely share the Government's approach to the problem. We all condemn what Israel has done. All this is leading to a heightening of tensions all round. And, in this kind of tense atmosphere we have got now Pakistan getting arms from the United States, arms at least one generation ahead of any other country in this sub-continent. It is like placing a match box in a room full of gun powder. This is the risk that these arms pose and even an accidental lighting of a match can set the whole thing aflame. This is why there is genuine concern in this country. And the process of normalisation 0! relations with Pakistan begun at Simla, which was progressing steadily, and was taking the right course, has received a definite setback, and there is now every danger that there will be an arms race in this region, Sir, nobody can suggest that if India faces a threat by the induction of arms by Pakistan, it should do nothing about it. I think, that is not possible. Therefore, we must prepare ourselves to face this new situation.

Now, Sir, as far as our broad approach to Pakistan is concerned, both the countries still have the problem of poverty to deal with. There are millions of people who do not have the necessities of life and I think that all sections of this House would very much prefer a continuation of the process which was leading to normalisation of relations with Pakistan. The Foreign Minister, when he went to Pakistan, I think, said that India has a vested interest in Pakistan's sepa-rateness, permanency and cohesion. I think these were the three words which he used; extremely important

words. I think they reflect the thinking in this country. We do not want a war with Pakistan. There are some people who think that a break-up "of Pakistan will be to India's interest. But, I think, no sensible section of public opinion in this country shares that view. We do not think that it will be in India's interest that Pakistan should break up. And, it is against that background that one feels distressed by this development.

Now, there are those who say that Pakistan also has legitimate security interests. I fully agree and I think India has made it clear that we do not object to Pakistan making proper arrangements to meet its legitimate security needs. I think the House knows that over the years, Pakistan has built up its military power, though at the time of partition Pakistan's military strength was about half of India's. Since 1971, in the last ten years, Pakistan has almost doubled its military power, has introduced modern weapons, newer weapons. This is perfectly legitimate and I do not think anybody can say that India has pro-tested against this. At not stage has India protested against this. But, now, the latest induction of arms is quite a different matter. It is as I said, a new generation of arms. It is said that the situation in Afghanistan warrants the introduction these arms into Pakistan. Sir, one has to examine this a little closely. It is true that the situation in Afghanistan, the presence of Soviet troops in Afghanistan, does pose a security problem for Pakistan. But this security problem is heightened by the fact that Pakistan is allowing its territory to be used by guerillas who go into Afghanistan. That is not of our making. That situation is entirely of their making, and many of the weapons which have been inducted into Pakistan, cannot, be used in the mountains. They cannot be used against Afghanistan. They can be used only on the plains and there can be no other country except India against which they can be used. Some of them are naval weapons, ships etc. Obviously. Afghanistan is not the country against which these can be used. Therefore, if you look closely at the kind of weapons that they are getting, we, can see that they do pose a threat to the stability and peace of this region and as such we have to keep in view the fact that a weak India would encourage adventurism. India must be strong and a strong India is the only guarantee for peace in situation of this kind.

Sir, as I said, we do not want war. Bur wars are sometimes caused by accident, sometime by miscalculation and sometimes by intention. We have been the victim of three wars with Pakistan. This history we cannot forget and in this context one can understand the uneasiness in the country. I personally think that in spite of the induction of these arms, India need not have been unnecessarily worried. The worry arises more because of the U.S. perception of the situation in this region and the place of Pakistan in its international security arrangements and of the effort to use—or, so it is said—Pakistan to contain the Soviet Union. How that it is going to be done by Pakistan, is not clear to me. In evaluating the U.S. perception we have got to take note of some very pertinent and important facts. One is that in the past also, United States has supplied weapons to Pakistan; but Eisenhower and Dulles both, gave an assurance to India that these weapons would not be used against India. Sir, in 1965 in April, if you recall, Pakistani Patton tanks moved into the Ran of Kutch. The United States did not do anything about it then; but later in August-September, when a full-fledged war broke out between India and Pakistan, then the United States did withhold its supplies of arms and ammunition and spares and this did have an effect on shortening the duration of war. So, they did keep that promise at that time. This time there is no assurance. Why is there no assurance this time? Does it mean a complete departure from the old concept of the United States of America? And I would like the House to know

[Shri Krishna Chandra Pant] that this is not merely a question of conjecture but the U.S. authorities have said in so many words that this lime these weapons can be used against India also. Therein lies a very big cause of concern for us and it is a challenge to our diplomacy as to how we should try to change the perception of the U.S. in his matter. I do not think we can write off the United States; it is a super-power; no matter how much we may not agree with their perception; we may disagree with their entire view of the region; but we cannot write them off. I think it is a challenge to our diplomacy that we should make them see these matters in the right perspective.

Sir, in Pakistan, Mr. Agha Shahi has recently made a statement seeking to reassure the USSR that Pakistan had no intentions of using its arms against the USSR. Coupled with the statement of the American position to which I referred to earlier one is led to the unfortunate conclusion that these arms could only be used against India and nobody else. So, this is one aspect.

The second is that in 1971 when the war took place between India and Pakistan, if you recall, the Enterprise task force was moved into the Bay of Bengal; but it come too late. Pakistani troops in Decca had already capitulated, and that is because it came all the way from the Tonkin Bay. This time, the ships are in the Indian Ocean and large segments of ships are there in full preparedness. They are close at hand and this alters the entire strategic situation in the Indian Ocean and there is the Rapid Deployment Force, which adds another dimension of anxiety to this.

Then, there is the background of the nuclear ambitions of Pakistan which now the U.S.A. is more or less power-less to do anything about. They have deliberately waived the Symington amendment, which had restrained Pakistan in this matter. They have chosen to waive it. Now, Pakistan is going ahead with acquiring nuclear weapons capability. I will not go into other aspects of the matter.' But certainly, whenever there is a nuclear explosion in Pakistan, there will be a strong reaction in India and no Government in India will be able to overlook the compulsions of the situation which will be created thereafter. We shall have to respond and this is another unfortunate aspect of this situation because it may drive us to a policy which we have resisted all these years.

Then, Sir, there is one crucial question in my mind. In regard to Pakistan, we have tried to befriend them and we should continue to try to do so. But there is a military rule there. Military rulers are more apt to military adventurism than civilian rulers. The second thing is that even Ayub and Yahya had some sanction behind them, some popular sanction. But in the four years that he has been in power, I think, President Zia has no popular sanction, either he gains popular sanction through elections—he does not seem to have any intention of doing that or, the other alternative is, it may look very tempting for him to go in for another military adventure which gives him at least popularity, if not popular sanction.

In this context, I would again focus attention on the lack of assurance to India by the U.S.A. on the use of its weapons against India and the fact that the American Navy is present in the Indian Ocean close to the sub-Continent. All these facts are bound to play upon the Pakistani mind and influence its assessment of the depth of U.S. commitment. Therefore, the real danger is, if Pakistan should miscalculate and thereby start a misadventure, there is bound to be a conflagration between the two countries. Thereafter, the Americans, against the background of the facts which I have mentioned, will be helpless to do anything in the matter. Therefore, this is the situation which will be created and India will have to defend itself.

It will have no choice. Therefore, we see the clouds of war gathering. I am not a fatalist. I am not a pessimist. I still think there is time to stop this. I think, one has to be very positive in one's approach to this problem and, therefore, having spelt out all these dangers, I would like to say that our initiative must be directed towards preventing this situation from deteriorating.

In this respect I would like to say that the offer of a no-war pact, about which much has been said, has not been handled well by us. The no-war pact offer was made by Pakistan. There is no doubt that even the Simla Pact is tantamount to a no-war pact. There is no doubt that we have made an offer of a no-war pact in 1949. But now that they have made an offer of a no-war pact, should we not have responded to it with some skill? If it was a propagandist effort, then, surely, we should have exposed that that propagandist effort. If it was a serious effort, we should have discussed it. Maybe, something would have come of it. But we reacted haltingly and it is still not clear exactly whether we want *to* respond to it, or, we do not want to respond to it. It is not, in my view, raising the prestige of the country. It is creating confusion. If it is a propagandist effort, then, I am afraid, that our halting response has given a success to Pakistan in this matter. I would rather take it as an opportunity of exploring, to what extent, on the basis which was spelt out in 1949 clearly by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, it is possible to arrive at a no-war pact. I see no reason why we should shy away from it. I have no illusions about it. I am inclined to agree that it is a propagandist effort. I am inclined to agree that it is a red-herring. Nevertheless the test of our diplomacy lies in its ability to get the best out of this situation.

5 P.M.

And may be if we tackle it right, may be if we are able to persuade Pakistan about the folly of continuing a course which leads to collusion with India, we can evolve a better understanding with them. In this respect I see further ahead, I see beyond the present seeds of conflict and I see the possibility of regional understanding in which Pakistan and India can participate as equals, but this is a crucial time for both the countries and this is the time when we have to show our statesmanship.

We have to recognise that an important element in the present situation is Afghanistan. The USSR are our friends and I do not think that there can be any other solution excepting a political solution of the Afghanistan problem. But as friends it is our duty to persuade the USSR also to hasten the working out of the political solution so that the USSR troops can withdraw from Afghanistan. Till they stay there, it is an element of tension. It gives the USA an excuse, an opportunity to increase the intensification of their military presence in the region. Therefore, it is neither in the interest of the USSR, nor in the interest of India that this state of affairs should continue and I think it is a challenge to our diplomacy that we should be able to persuade the USSR in this matter.

Finally, as I said earlier, we have to continue with our efforts to correct the perception of the U.S. Government. Apart from that being a democratic country there is a wide section of public opinion in the United States which tends to be at variance with official opinion. They are friendly with us. There is absolutely no reason why we should not go over the heads of the U.S. Government, go direct to the people; to the Senators, to the academicians, to the Congress people, to the media people and persuade them that this course is not in the interest of peace, not even in the interest of America in this region. Therefore, I would like to suggest that since our friendship with the USSR is not directed against any country, we should try to persuade public opinion in the USA about the folly

[Shri Krishna Chandra Pant] of their Government's approach to the sub-continent.

Sir, I will end with just one word and that is about Poland. I have a feeling of anguish about the events in Poland. I had an opportunity to go there as Chairman of the Indo-Polish Commission. The people of Poland have suffered grievously throughout history though they have not deserved it. I can only speak with great anguish and nope that there is no blood shed in that country and that they are left free to resolve their problems to the best of their lights.

SHRIMATI HAMIDA HABIBULLAH: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, to start with I would like to congratulate our Prime Minister and our Foreign Minister for India's foreign policy of peace and freindship, of non-alignment and one of uptiring efforts in the cause of disarmament. At a time when the world is standing on the brink of disaster and the danger of a nuclear holocaust, our role has made the people of the whole world look towards us and realise that the only way to survive is to follow the policy that is being reiterated by our Prime Minister Indira Gandhi.

In this context, Sir, I would like to present the following Urdu couplet:

"करने दो अगर कत्ल जहां तलवार
की बातें करते हैं,
औजां नहीं होता उनका कद जो
प्यार की बातें करते हैं।"

Our history is a witness to the fact that our country has always offered the hand of friendship to all, specially to the downtrodden. Mahatma Gandhi was the first person to rise in revolt against the cruel and inhuman policies of racial discrimination in South Africa. India raised this question afresh in the United Nations in 1946, and our country had all along been opposing and campaigning against aparthied.

Last year when our delegation had gone to Copenhagen to attend the World Conference of Women, when we spoke in the Conference against the inhuman behaviour of the minority government of South Africa, you should have heard the applause and the enthusiasm of the audience, and the loud expression of their admiration for the role of India and India's Prime Minister. It was very unfortunate that during the Janata Party rule, India suffered a serious setback and India's role in international affairs was totally diminished. Sir, I would like to remind two highly intelligent and well-informed Members of our House—Mr. Shahabuddin and Mr. Jaswant Singh—that it was during the Janata rule that the invitation to Moshe Dayan was given. The visit of Moshe Dayan was so damaging to our relationship with the Arab world. I am not gaing to repeat so many other things that happened during that time. Sir, tilting towards America was also one. Was it not damaging to our relationship with the Third World? Was it not against non-alignment that Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru had stood for? But India has again revived with greater vigour a greater understanding and a greater sense of urgency.

The Prime Minister's visit to Cancum Melbourne and European countries has again brought India very on the scene and India's contribution is being appreciated all over the world, specially in the developing countries. Of course, I cannot help but mention that this role of ours, which is supporting the progress and development of the developing Third World, does not suit a few very rich and so-called highly developed nations who are trying to destroy the Third World while they are talking about protecting human rights. I would like to remind such powers:

"कुछ बात है कि हस्ती मिटती नहीं
हमारी,
सदियों रहा है दुश्मन दौरे जमां
हमारा।"

Today when the whole world is being threatened with total destruction, when world peace is in danger, the voice of India, the voice of reason, of justice of truth prevails. This comes at a time when world public opinion is clamouring for peace, at a time when millions and millions of people in all European countries are coming on the streets and raising their voice against the manufacture of Neutron Bomb, against the forces of destruction. Who are these people? They are men, women and children from all the different sections of society who are raising their voices against the wrong and totally destructive policy of the present U.S. administration. I am not talking about the people of America. I am sure there are many many millions of people in America who think differently. I am talking about the U.S. administration which is talking about death and destruction all the time.

The U.S. administration, of course, talks about a limited nuclear war. They also talk about human rights. I suppose what they mean is that a Neutron Bomb will only destroy human beings, but all other commodities like buildings and furniture will remain intact. Of course, this type of nuclear war is limited. It kills only the most unimportant of all creations—the human beings. Therefore, the question of rights of human beings after death does not arise.

No, Sir, as the Soviet leadership has rightly remarked there cannot be a limited war. Once a nuclear war is unleashed, it cannot be a limited war. It will destroy not only those whom the enemies of mankind wish to destroy but it will destroy Europe and the whole of the human race.

Sir, there are some people, some Indian people who blame our foreign policy and criticise our Prime Minister for creating a situation against Pakistan. Has India at any time after Independence attacked any country. Has India in the whole of its history ever attacked any country. Therefore, why is Pakistan so suspicious about it that they must acquire such sophisticated weapons as F-16? What are they afraid of? However, just to gain a political point, to place events in a wrong perspective, to oppose for the sake of opposition is, in my opinion, totally unpatriotic.

There is *no* doubt that the people of Pakistan have now realised the folly of confrontation and the errors of their past leadership. In Pakistan, there is a tremendous amount of goodwill for India, at least amongst a very large majority of Pakistani people. But even they must be conscious of the fact that they have been led by a succession of power-hungry, infinitely small minority groups interested only in their own prosperity, very much at the expense of the common man. Therefore, e:.n anyone under such circumstances, blame India for hesitating and carefully examining offers like the No-War Pact? India has to consider to what extent acceptance of such policies will help towards our goal of peace and progress not only for our country but for Pakistan as well. Can mere words stop wars and confrontation? How can Pakistan talk about peace when it is preparing for war on such a big scale? It seems strange that a country which has suffered so much by accepting U.S. arms and armament in the past, should think of accepting P-16's. To use against whom? These weapons cannot be used against anyone except India. Has Pakistan learnt no lesson from 1965 when they waged war on us with American tanks, the tanks that failed them at the crucial moment?. Did the Seventh Fleet do them any good in 1971? Surely the people of Pakistan must realise the futility of fighting her close neighbours, killing her own dear friends, brothers and sisters. I am sure the people of Pakistan realise:

"दुश्मनी अपने पड़ौसी से पड़ेगी महंगी,
आग दामन में लगाओगे तो जल जाओगे।"

Sir, I am absolutely certain that the time is not very far when India and

[Shrimati Hamida Habibullah] Pakistan will resolve all their differences and come very close to each other, because both the countries realise that that is the only alternative to total annihilation of mankind because if a war starts, it is not going to stop till it destroys the whole world.

Therefore, we have to be conscious of the fact that the Indian Ocean is the main target of the U.S. Administration today. Strategically they want to dominate this region, not only petrol-bearing countries, but the raw material which lies within the old colonies and particularly in the Indian sub-continent and the Spice Islands.

Sir, as we all know, the Atlantic economy is getting into a tighter position every day. In America unemployment has gone up beyond 8 per cent and in England it has escalated even faster. Stagnation is going hand in hand with unemployment. Therefore, these countries are turning to an all out effort to make trade with the Third World countries as "one-way traffic" as possible, which is, to use these countries as good markets for finished goods, while extracting from them as cheaply as possible the products of their cheap labour. To add to this, it is important in the Western strategic plan to keep neighbour armed against neighbour and thus keep up a demand for arms based on the so-called latest technology, thus leading to further impoverishment of the poor countries. Sir, it is only the Socialist countries that can help countries like ours, because they do not depend on our cheap labour nor on our raw materials. Therefore, a look at the co-operation so far provided by the CMEA countries shows a clear contrast in that it has strengthened our progressive and industrial economies for the betterment of nations, rather than strengthening the individual. Those who decry the continuous and growing friendship of the Soviet Union with India should objectively examine the industrial and economic base on which this has developed from the very start There are no strings, but there is a constant development of mutual trust. Some of our bigger factories when they had fallen short of demand from the' Indian market have had the slack taken up by the USSR in the shape of manufactured goods in the long and short term, so as to keep Indian chimneys smoking.

India's . non-alignment has never been a question of equating the '-aggressor' and the "aggressed". We fought successfully all forms of imperialism and still show the way to those who were or are under the imperial heel. Nothing can be a finer demonstration of this than our solid support to these people, particularly the Arabs. As soon as our party came back to power, our Prime Minister invited the courageous Yasser Arafat and our country has irrevocably linked its entire support to the just cause for which this great Arab leader and the PLO struggle on. Today again according to the statement of our honourable Foreign Minister, we have raised our voice against Israel's decision to annex Golan Heights.

Just as charity begins at home, so will it always be our fervent wish to be on the friendliest terms with our neighbours.

The recent visit of our President to Indonesia and Nepal and the tremendous welcome which he received in both places again shows the people's goodwill throughout these countries.

During our recent visit to China our delegation was completely overwhelmed with the display of warmth, friendship and hope by all sections of the society with whom we came in contact. Therefore, it is a matter of great satisfaction that a dialogue has started with China and is going to continue.

With the countries of the Far-East our relations have always been good. Our support for the people of Kampuchea against Pol Pot's clique has further enhanced our prestige in the eyes of the masses of East Asia.

India has always played a leading role in what is now known as third world countries. Our Prime Minister's consistent and courageous policies and her lucid exposure of those who follow unfriendly or deceitful policies, has brought India great prestige in the eyes of the world which culminated in her triumphal meeting with the President of France, Monsieur Mitterand. I know India will play a greater and more admirable role so that the people of India and the people all over the world can live in peace.

I shall end with an Urdu couplet:

"प्यार का एक नया कानून बनाया जाय,
दुश्मनों को भी कलेज से लगाया जाय ।

इस तरह दुनिया से नफरत को
मिटाया जाय ।

हरम-ओ-दैर का यों झगड़ा मिटाया
जाय ।"

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): Now Mr. Yogendra Sharma. Mr. Sharma, your party's time is only five minutes. I do not know _____

SHRI YOGENDRA SHARMA (Bihar): We are discussing such an important question as world peace; the future of the entire humanity is at Stake and when we are discussing such a question you remind me of three minutes and four minutes....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI); That is true. But our time is also limited.

SHRI YOGENDRA SHARMA: I shall cooperate with you....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): We shall have to listen to the Foreign Minister also. Therefore, please bear with us

श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा : मान्यवर, हम अपनी सरकार की विदेश नीति को एक यथार्थवादी नीति समझते हैं । आज की दुनिया की जो परिस्थिति है, उसमें हमारे देश की जो स्थिति है उसमें हमारी सरकार की विदेश नीति एक बहुत ही यथार्थवादी नीति है । हमें इस बात की खुशी है कि हमारे देश की प्रधान मंत्री ने पिछले दिनों इस दुनिया के तमाम महाद्वीपों में अलख जगाई है । किस बात के लिए अलख जगाई है? शांति के लिए । किस बात के लिए अलख जगाई है? निशस्त्रीकरण के लिए । किस बात के लिये अलख जगाई है? सारी दुनिया को आणविक युद्ध के सत्यानाशी प्रलय से बचाने के लिये । किस बात के लिए अलख जगाई है? इस देश में जो आर्थिक विषमता है उसको खत्म करने के लिए । किस बात के लिए अलख जगाई है? हथियारों का रास्ता छोड़कर बातचीत का रास्ता अपनाओ और दुनिया की समस्याओं को हल करो । हमारी विदेश नीति बहुत यथार्थवादी नीति है । यह केवल हमारे देश के ही हित में नहीं है, बल्कि सारी दुनिया के हित में है । आज यह कहने की आवश्यकता नहीं है कि सारी दुनिया का भाग्य-भविष्य, पूरी मानव सभ्यता का भाग्य - भविष्य इस बात पर निर्भर करता है कि आणविक युद्ध रोका जाएगा या नहीं? हम समझते हैं कि इस सम्बन्ध में सभी एक राय हैं । लेकिन जब हम इस समस्या पर विचार करने लगते हैं तो बहुत से लोग कहते हैं कि दुनिया में दो सुपर पावर्स हैं । दो सुपर पावर्स हमारे वश में नहीं हैं तो हम क्या करें, हम समझते हैं कि यह बहुत ही अयार्थवादी रवैया है । क्या दुनिया में आणविक युद्ध का खतरा हो गया है दो सुपर पावर की वजह से, क्या इससे दुनिया में तीसरे महायुद्ध का खतरा हो गया है । किसने कहा कि

[श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा]

'लिमिटेड अटामिक वार' किया जा सकता है। क्या इस बात को अमेरिका के रीगन प्रशासन ने नहीं कहा ? क्या सोवियत संघ के राष्ट्रपति ब्रेजनेव ने इस बात को कहा ? ब्रेजनेव ने ठीक इसके विपरीत बात कही। उसने कहा कि 'लिमिटेड अटामिक वार' फिर नहीं हो सकता है। उसने कहा है कि तमाम देशों को ऐलान कर देना चाहिये और उसने संयुक्त राज्य अमेरिका के रीगन प्रशासन को चुनौती दी कि यदि तुम सही मायनों में मानव सभ्यता को बचाना चाहते हो तो हम और तुम ऐलान करें कि कोई भी देश आणविक हथियारों का उपयोग नहीं करेगा, फर्स्ट स्ट्राइक नहीं होगा, सेकिंड नहीं होगा, थर्ड नहीं होगा और दोनों को एक ही दर्जा देकर भाग जाते हो। और इसीलिये हम कहते हैं कि आप का अयथार्थवादी दृष्टिकोण है। इस सम्बन्ध में हमको यथार्थवादी दृष्टिकोण रखना चाहिए और हमें खुले आम और साफ साफ शब्दों में इस नीति की आलोचना करनी चाहिए, इस नीति की निन्दा करनी चाहिए और इसके विरोध में जनमत तैयार करना चाहिये कि लिमिटेड एटामिक वार फेयर नहीं है। जो लिमिटेड एटामिक वार फेयर की बात करते हैं वे दुनिया को वार फेयर की आग में झुलसा कर खाक में मिलाना चाहते हैं। इस सिलसिले में सोवियत संघ के राष्ट्रपति ब्रेजनेव का प्रस्ताव ऐसा प्रस्ताव है जिसको ठुकरा देने की हिम्मत पश्चिमी जर्मनी के राष्ट्रपति भी न कर सके। इस बारे में आपका क्या दृष्टिकोण है ? हम जानते हैं कि आप दुनिया में शांति कायम करने की नीति पर चल रहे हैं, हम जानते हैं कि हमारी प्रधान मंत्री शांति का अलख जगा रही हैं। लेकिन शांति का एक जो ठोस प्रस्ताव है उसके बारे में आप क्यों नहीं बोलते? आपको बोलना चाहिये। शायद आपको डर लगता है श्री जसवन्त सिंह जी से। वे भागकर चले गये। वे यह कहते हैं कि शुरू से ही हमारी वैदेशिक नीति गलत रही है।

श्री पी० वी० नरसिंह राव : वे समझते हैं कि आप से डर लगता है, हमें किसी से डर नहीं लगता।

श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा : आप निर्भीकता के साथ बोलिये, शांति की आवाज, शांति की जो बात करते हैं आप उनके साथ अपनी आवाज मिलाइये और जो शांति के खिलाफ बात करता है उनकी आवाज को आपको कमजोर करने की कोशिश करनी चाहिये, हमारी तो यही दरख्वास्त है।

मैं यह कह रहा था कि हमारे माननीय भाई चले गये। उन्होंने कहा, साहब, भारत की वैदेशिक नीति का इतिहास असफलताओं का इतिहास है। उन्होंने अंग्रेजी में कहा। बड़ी अच्छी अंग्रेजी थी। पता नहीं कौन सी इंगलिश थी, ऑक्सफोर्ड की थी या कैंटब की थी, हमारे उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, बड़े मोहित हो रहे थे उनकी इंगलिश पर। मगर जहां तक हमने समझा उन्होंने कहा कि भारतीय विदेश नीति का इतिहास असफलताओं का इतिहास है। क्या मतलब ? उन्होंने नैतिकता की बात भी कही और जब उनकी बात हम सुन रहे थे तो हमको लगता था कि कोई अमेरिकी प्रशासन का आदमी यहां बात कर रहा है; क्योंकि उन्हीं लोगों ने कहा था कि भारत की गुटनिरपेक्षता की नीति जो है वह अनैतिक है और आज नैतिकता की बात उठाई जा रही है। महोदय, हमारे देश में बदकिस्मती से कुछ ऐसे लोग हैं जो कि तब तक भारत की नीति की आलोचना करते रहेंगे, विदेश नीति की आलोचना करते रहेंगे, जब तक भारत अपनी विदेश नीति के क्षेत्र में अमेरिका का पिछलग्गू नहीं हो जाता है। नहीं तो पूरा इतिहास

असफलताओं का इतिहास बनाने का और क्या मतलब है ? मान्यवर, यह सुपर पावर राइवैलरी है, यह युद्ध और शांति राइवैलरी है और आज दुनिया के रंगमंच पर युद्ध और शांति का जो संघर्ष हो रहा है, और इस संघर्ष में हमारा, आपका और तमाम देशों का भाग्य दांव पर चढ़ा हुआ है। इसको आप सुपर पावर्ज की राइवैलरी कहकर छोड़ देंगे ? यह सुपर पावर्ज की राइवैलरी नहीं है । दूसरे महायुद्ध के बाद से जो नयी दुनिया जन्मी, उस नयी दुनिया में साम्राज्यवादी शक्तियों का एक मजबूत कैम्प यदि नहीं होता और भारत जैसे आजाद देशों का उदय नहीं होता, तो शायद दुनिया में तीसरा महायुद्ध हो गया होता । बीसवीं सदी का दुनिया का इतिहास क्या बतलाता है ? साम्राज्यवादी सारी दुनिया को लूटने के लिये लूट का बंटवारा करने के लिये महायुद्ध करते हैं । पहले महायुद्ध के 24-25 साल के बाद ही उन्होंने दूसरे महायुद्ध की आग में सारी दुनिया को झोंक दिया और आज सोवियत यूनियन नहीं होता, समाजवादी कैम्प नहीं होता, भारत नहीं होता, गुट-निरपेक्ष शक्तियां नहीं होतीं तो आज भी दुनिया में बहुत पहले तीसरा महायुद्ध हो चुका होता । मगर 37 साल हो गये, यह खुशी की बात है कि दूसरे महायुद्ध के बाद और साम्राज्यवादियों की लाख कोशिशों के बावजूद दुनिया को तीसरे महायुद्ध की आग में जलने से बचाया, किसने बचाया ? यह जो नया शक्ति संतुलन दुनिया में पैदा हुआ दूसरे महायुद्ध के बाद । दुनिया में दूसरे महायुद्ध के बाद जो नयी शक्ति संतुलन पैदा हुआ जिसमें साम्राज्यवादियों की कमजोरी और उसके मुकाबले में इस दुनिया के पच्चासों देश जो गुलाम थे, वे आजाद हो गये, जिनका हित इसमें है कि दुनिया में शांति रहे ताकि उनका पिछड़ापन दूर हो और वे आगे बढ़ें और यह समाजवादी कैम्प जिसका हित है कि दुनिया में शांति हो तो साम्यवाद की मंजिल में हों, तो इस प्रकार से यह जो शक्ति संतुलन है, इस शक्ति संतुलन ने दुनिया को बचाया है, । अफसोस की बात है, कुछ इसको टू सुपर पावर राइवैलरीज़ कह कर सारी चीजों को फेंक देना चाहते हैं । दुनिया के शक्ति संतुलन की ओर से आंखें मूंद लेना चाहते हैं । मान्यवर, हम अपने देश की सुरक्षा के जो सवाल हैं, उन पर कुछ कहना चाहते हैं । बहुत बातें हो चुकी हैं । जहां तक पाकिस्तान को हथियार देने का सवाल है और उससे जो हमारे देश की सुरक्षा को खतरा पैदा है, बहुत से माननीय सदस्य बोल चुके हैं । हम इसको दोहराना नहीं चाहते, लेकिन हम एक चीज़ पूछना चाहते हैं । आज कौन-सी ताकत है, जो हमारी सुरक्षा को खतरा पहुंचा रही है ? कौन सी ताकत है ? वही ताकत जो सारी दुनिया को आणविक युद्ध की आग में झोंक कर के खाक कर देना चाहती है । वही ताकत हमारे देश की सुरक्षा को भी खतरा पहुंचा रही है। कौन पाकिस्तान को एफ-16 वायुयान दे रहा है। वही अमरीकी प्रशासन की सरकार सारी दुनिया को कह रही है कि हां लिमिटेड एटोमिक वारफेयर हो सकता है । जो न्यूट्रान बम तैयार कर रहा है वही हमारे देश की सुरक्षा के लिए इतना बड़ा खतरा पैदा कर रहा है । क्यों दे रहा है ? इसमें बहुतसी बातें कुछ लोगों ने कहीं । अफगानिस्तान में जो सोवियत संघ की फौज पहुंच गई है इसकी वजह से अगर्चे यह बात स्पष्ट हो गई है, कुछ पाकिस्तान के सर्वोच्च अधिकारियों ने कहा कि यह सोवियत संघ के खिलाफ नहीं है । तो फिर किसके खिलाफ है ? यहां पर हम 1965 के पहले की जो

[श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा]

हालत थी, हम वहां पर जाना चाहेंगे । उस वक्त जब अमेरिका पाकिस्तान को हथियार दे रहा था तो कहा कि हम चीन के खिलाफ लड़ने के लिए दे रहे हैं और आज कहते हैं कुछ लोग सोवियत संघ के खिलाफ लड़ने के लिए दे रहे हैं। हम जानते हैं कि उन हथियारों को किस के खिलाफ इस्तेमाल किया गया और हम यह भी जानते हैं कि जो आज दे रहे हैं वे हमारे खिलाफ इस्तेमाल होंगे । अफगानिस्तान की बात हो रही है, अफगानिस्तान में कारमल सरकार ने जो अफगान समस्या का हल करने के लिये यथार्थवादी प्रस्ताव दिये हैं उनको स्वीकार करने के लिये क्यों नहीं आप पाकिस्तान को मदद कीजिये, सहायता आप कर सकते हैं । हम जानते हैं कि आप नहीं कर सकते, मगर कम से कम उस प्रस्ताव के बारे में बोलिये तो । कारमल सरकार कहती है कि आओ हम बैठकर अफगान समस्या का हल निकालें और वे कहते हैं कि हम कारमल से बात नहीं करेंगे,। यह दुनिया की राजनीति में, दुनिया की डिप्लोमेटिक हिस्ट्री में बहुत-सी घटनायें हो रही हैं कि किसी एक देश ने दूसरे देश की सरकार को स्वीकार नहीं किया, फिर भी बातें हुईं । मगर वे इस दुराग्रह पर डटे हुए हैं कि जब तक कारमल सरकार है, हम बात नहीं करेंगे । कारमल सरकार से बात नहीं करोगे तो किससे करोगे ? तो फिर अफगानिस्तान की समस्या का हल कसे होगा ? अफगानिस्तान की समस्या को हल करोगे तुम अपनी सीमा पर ऐसे हथियारबन्द गुरिल्लों के जत्थों को तैयार करके । अफगानिस्तान की समस्या हल नहीं होगी तो सोवियत फोर्स भी बनी रहेगी । सोवियत फोर्स वहां एक दिन भी नहीं टिकेगी, जिस दिन तमाम घुसपैठियों को, हथियारबन्द घुसपैठियों को जिनको अमेरिका मदद दे रहा है, चीन मदद कर रहा है, पाकिस्तान उसको हथियार दिये हुये है, यह मामला खत्म हो जायेगा । सोवियत रूस अफगानिस्तान से उसी दिन वापिस हो जायेगा । यह हकीकत है कि नहीं । सबसे बड़ी बात यह है कि कारमल सरकार ने जो प्रस्ताव रखा है, उस प्रस्ताव को क्यों नहीं स्वीकार किया जाता है। वे तो शांतिपूर्ण ढंग से अफगानिस्तान की समस्या को हल करना चाहते हैं और उनको सोवियत यूनियन ने कहा है कि हम इस प्रस्ताव के आधार पर अपनी फौज वापस बुला लेंगे । मगर फिर भी हर जगह सोवियत फौज, सोवियत फौज चल रहा है, यह तकिया कलाम हो गया है ।

इसी तरह से मान्यवर, हमारे देश के दक्षिण में भी हमारी सुरक्षा का प्रश्न उठ खड़ा हुआ है । हिन्द महासागर का प्रश्न है । हिन्द महासागर के लिये संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ ने आज से 10 साल पहले यह प्रस्ताव पेश किया था कि हिन्द महासागर को शान्ति क्षेत्र घोषित किया जाय । पिछले दिनों में इसको अमली रूप देने के लिये श्रीलंका में एक सम्मेलन भी होने वाला था । वहां क्यों नहीं हुआ? किसने इस सम्मेलन को नहीं होने दिया । क्या यह सही नहीं है कि अमेरिकी प्रशासन ने इस सम्मेलन को नहीं होने दिया; क्योंकि अमेरिकी प्रशासन हमारे देश की सुरक्षा को खतरे में डालना चाहता है । पाकिस्तान की सरहद, पर हिंद महासागर की सरहद पर, सारी दुनिया में युद्ध का खतरा है और हमारे देश की सुरक्षा के लिये भी खतरा है, मगर आप बोलते हैं कि यह सुपर पावर्स की राइवैलरी है । वाह रे सुपर पावर राइवैलरी । यह सुपर पावर राइवैलरी है कि हमारी जान मांग रहा है और तुम कहते हो नहीं दुनिया में शांति होनी चाहिये ।

वह कहता है कि अगर कोई तुम्हारी जान लेगा तो हम तुम्हारी मदद करेंगे और आप कहते है सुपर पावर राइवैलरी है ? और सुपर पावर राइवैलरी कह कर आप समस्याओं को दरी के नीचे डाल देते हैं। हमारे एक मित्र ने कहा कि अफगानिस्तान को अमेरिका हथियार दे रहा है और आप सोवियत संघ से हथियार ले रहे हैं । लेकिन अमेरिका और सोवियत संघ की स्थिति एक तरह की नहीं है। अमेरिका की स्थिति देशों पर आधिपत्य कायम करने की है और सोवियत संघ की स्थिति देशों को मजबूत करने के लिये है। भारत और सोवियत संघ का पिछले वर्षों का संबंध इसका सबूत है। हम जरा इतिहास में जाना चाहते हैं। उस वक्त हमारे श्री कृष्ण मेनन साहब रक्षा मंत्री थे। दिनेश सिंह जी आप तो उस वक्त सरकार में थे, आपको तो ज्यादा मालूम होना चाहिये, आपको बतलाना चाहिये था उन्होंने पाकिस्तान की तरह या दूसरे देशों की तरह किसी देश से हथियार ले करके काम चलाने की नीति पर चलने की बजाय प्रतिरक्षा के भी मामले में आत्मनिर्भरता की नीति को अपनाया और हम इस बात का फर्क है कि हमारे देश में डिफेंस इंडस्ट्री बहुत हद तक आगे बढ़ चुकी है और जिसके बल पर हम इस देश की प्रतिरक्षा कर सकते हैं। हमारी डिफेंस इंडस्ट्री को बनाने में सोवियत संघ ने हमारी सहायता की है।सोवियत संघ इस बारे में नहीं दिलचस्पी रखता है कि वह अपने हथियार आपको बेचे । वह इस बारे में दिलचस्पी रखता है कि दुनियां के जो आजाद देश हैं, जो अपनी आजादी की रक्षा करना चाहते हैं, वे सही मायने में अपनी आजादी की रक्षा करें और स्वावलम्बी बनें और स्वावलम्बी बनाने के लिये वह हमको मदद कर रहा है। मगर हमारे बहुत से लोग हैं जो एक ही लाठी से दोनों को हांकते हैं । तो हम समझते हैं कि यह जो नीति है, यह नीति समस्याओं को सही रूप से, यथार्थवादी ढंग से पकड़ने की नीति नहीं है, बल्कि उससे भागने की नीति है। श्री जसवंत सिंह जी ने कहा कि अमेरिका से संबंध सुधार लिये जायें । कैसे सुधारना चाहिये ? अमरीका से संबंध सुधारने के लिये मान्यवर, जब हमारे दिवंगत प्रधान मंत्री, प० नेहरू वाशिंगटन गये, वाशिंगटन का दरवाजा खटखटाया, नहीं खुला ।

अभी हमारी प्रधान मंत्री कानकून से होकर आई हैं । वहां पर रीगन ने उनको क्या उपदेश दिया, वह भी हमको मालूम है। क्या कहने । हमारे किसी मान्यवर महोदय ने बतलाया नहीं कि उनसे दोस्ती करने का क्या . . . (**व्यवधान**) पाकिस्तान की जनता हमारी दोस्त है, चीन की जनता हमारी दोस्त है, अमरीका की जनता भी हमारी दोस्त है, हम उनसे संबंध सुधारना चाहते हैं । पर यदि कोई शासनकर्ता युद्ध के रास्ते पर निकल पड़े, तो फिर हमें अपनी आजादी के लिये उसके खिलाफ तैयार होना ही पड़ेगा ? (**समय की घंटी**)

मान्यवर, हम आपका ज्यादा वक्त नहीं लेना चाहते हैं । एक चीज और, हमारे कुछ साथियों, मित्रों ने कहा कि हिन्दुस्तान अकेला पड़ गया है। हमको याद है कि 1970 में भी यही लोग थे जो कहते थे कि हिन्दुस्तान अकेला पड़ गया है। मगर जब 1971 की कसौटी आई, तब सारी दुनिया ने देख लिया कि हिन्दुस्तान अकेला नहीं है, और वह अपनी हिफाजत कर सकता है। मैं उस वक्त के हिन्दुस्तान के नेताओं को धन्यवाद देता हूं ।

अब पाल पोट के सवाल पर कि हिन्दुस्तान अकेला है---पाल पोट कौन है ? वह दुनिया का सब से बड़ा हत्यारा है जिसने कम्पुचिया की जनता का एक बहुत बड़ा हिस्सा खत्म कर डाला ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री दिनेश गोस्वामी) : अब आप समाप्त कीजिये . . .

(**व्यवधान**)

श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा : . . . और उसको संयुक्त राष्ट्र ने कंधों पर चढ़ाये हुए—और वहां पर लाओस, कम्पुचिया और वियतनाम इन तीनों ने मिल कर जो प्रस्ताव किया है, उसकी समस्या को हल करने के लिये, वह पाल पोट को लेकर खिलौना बना रहे हैं। वह पाल पोट जिसको वहां की जनता समर्थन नहीं करती है, जिसने वहां की जनता की इतने बड़े पैमाने पर हत्या की है। वह इतिहास में हिटलर का मुकाबला कर सकता है। उसको एक बहुत बड़ा जनतांत्रिक कह करके संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में बिठाये हुए हैं। पर एक दिन वह आयेगा, जैसा कि हमारे किसी माननीय सदस्य ने कहा था कि दुनिया हिन्दुस्तान के पक्ष का समर्थन करेगी; क्योंकि हिन्दुस्तान का जो रुख है वह सिद्धांत के, उसूल के आधार पर है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): I would like to be guided by the House. I have before me a list of 4 more speakers including some whose contribution will undoubtedly be quite appreciable for the foreign affairs debate. We have got the names of Mr. Gopalsamy, Prof-Rasheeduddin Khan, Mr. Khushwant Singh and Mrs. Najma Heptulla. I would like to know when the Foreign Affairs Minister should be called upon to reply.

DR. LOKESH CHANDRA (Nominated): Ladies should be allowed first. Let her speak first.

THE ' VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI); Ladies have already spoken. I would like to know the feeling of the House as to when the Foreign Affairs Minister should be called upon to speak.

SHRI NARASINGHA PRASAD NANDA: Sir, I have given you a solution by retiring from participation. I will suggest that ***tow*** others also.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): It will be difficult to postpone the. reply, till Monday because I have seen that our schedule is very busy for the next four days. We can sit a bit late. May I take it that the Foreign Minister will be called by 6.30 or 6.40?, I have got four speakers. Mr. Khushwant Singh has some difficulty. So, he. can speak first.

SHRI KHUSHWANT SINGH (Nominated): I thank you, Sir. I will be brief. The Government Motion was to consider the international situation but the Foreign Minister, in his wisdom, only dealt with 3 topics, i.e. Poland, China and Israel. I have no brief for Israel. But I think it is only fair, as an independent and non-aligned Member, that I should put the record straight. You referred to expansion by force without referring to the fact that Israel, on its own, under the Camp David Agreement, has in fact yielded territory to Egypt, and is meant to do more when it hands over in April Sinai. However, that is not what I am really concerned with. All I would like to mention is that while we are considering the international situation, we have to bear three broad facts in mind. The first is that ever-since the Reagan administration took over in the United States, the cold war has hotted up. It will continue as long as Reagan continues to be the President. There is ho doubt that arms will continue to flow to countries which they regard friendly towards them and inimical towards the Soviet Union. We belong to those countries which are not likely to get any, arms or assistance from the United States. Secondly, the international organisations like the United Nations have lost all rotency and have been reduced barely to debating societies. And, thirdly;. the Non-alignment movement is also in a shambles. I agree with some of the Members that we have made a 'very negative contribution' in keeping the Non-aligned movement going on and as a result there has been considerable erosion in our own image as t Non-aligned nation. Under the circumstances, what exactly are we

to do? I will restrict my comments to only the most direct and immediate problems that have an impact on our own country, that is China and Pakistan.

I welcome the steps you have taken in breaking the ice in' our relationship with China and I hope that the process will continue further. I am afraid, I do not agree in our dealings with Pakistan. I think, you have allowed the initiative to be wrested from our hands and go into the hands of Pakistan. I still think that it is possible for us to wrest that initiative and as it were ran down this no-war pact that they are offering; us down their throats. I do not see why, while we are talking of a no-war pact—bet' it be a political matter for them, a ploy or a trick—what is wrong in our entering into a dialogue with Pakistan and say, "we are ready to discuss with you the comparative strength of our Forces," Our needs are much bigger than theirs. I think, they will realise those needs. We can put it to them that Quantitatively and qualitatively we should have at least three times, four times, five times **as much** strength as they have. But it is a *matter* which we can discuss with Pakistan. I would appeal to you to at least consider that part. What is wrong in our discussing now that our Forces face each other eye-ball to eye-ball, across the borders;, and border . incidents are reported to be taking place? What is wrong in our telling them, 'you withdraw your Forge's 50 or 100 miles from the border, we will do the same?' Is there anything sinister about these movements? No. What is wrong in our opening more avenues of trade with them? Mr. Foreign Minister, you are a man of learning. In two years you have been the Foreign Minister, we still cannot get books from Pakistan and they cannot get books from this country. What kind of improvement of relationship is this? Particularly, you know perfectly well that anyone going to Pakistan and any Pakistani coming to this country has to go and report to a police station as he arrives, like a criminal. He has to report to a police station when he leaves the country. Why can't you or your office say that any Pakistani coming here will not have to report to a police station and I have no doubt that your gesture will be reciprocated from the other side.

Mr. Foreign Minister, the aim of our policy towards Pakistan should have been to see a stable, a reliant and a friendly Pakistan, reliant on us. In the years that you dealt with them, we made a Pakistan unstable, not reliant on us but oh other countries, and strong. I think, if you want to change the state of affairs, we have to face a few facts very squarely. One, there is no possibility in the foreseeable future of there being any elections in Pakistan and a return of democracy. We have no choice but to deal with President Zia-ul-Haq. You have met him, I have met him and many other people met him. He is a military dictator but you will agree he met a military tyrant. There" have been military dictators in Pakistan in the past. They have also not been tyrants. There is a different kind of dictatorship. There is no alternative. There is no strong enough feeling in Pakistan against General Zia-ul-Haq that will give you any idea that we should deal with somebody else.

SHRI KALPNATH RAI (Uttar Pradesh): Like Mr. Bhutto.

-

SHRI KHUSHWANT SINGH: No, not like Mr. Bhutto. What I am trying to say is that you have met him and I say we have no option except to deal with him. General Zia-ul-Haq, he is, as you know perfectly Well as you have met him, a God fearing man ' and a good man, who means well towards India. I think the most important thing is that he is firm in the saddle of Pakistan and if we mean to improve our relations, we have no choice but to deal with him and I think the initiative should be taken by you. I think the situation, as Mr. Pant pointed out, has come from

[Shri Khushwant Singh] the dangerous past. It is like a chamber full of gas. If you strike a little light, it will explode. And, I suggest, it is time if you want to wrest the initiative in this matter from him, of making peace with Pakistan, it is time that you suggested a top summit meeting between our Prime Minister and General Zia-ul-Haq. I think not only will the initiative pass to us but you will have earned the gratitude of the people of this country and Pakistan by defusing a tension. You will assure peace in our life-time and get the gratitude of generations of both countries on either side. Thank you.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am so grateful to you for calling me. Sir, the world has entered into an era where no country can live in complete isolation from the outside world. Days Were there when countries were living in peace and tranquility, while some other countries were facing battles and bloodshed. Only those lands through which Alexander took his army were bathed in blood and only those lands through which the Roman legions trampled upon, witnessed bloodshed and battle and only those lands witnessed the heaps of human skulls built up by Timur and Chengiez Khan and only certain parts of Europe, mostly in Europe, witnessed the onslaught of Napolean. But when Kaiser Wiliam trumpetted the -war band from Berlin, that according to many parts of the world, for the first time the history of the world war, was coined. When Hitler came, he gave the war cry. He wanted to furl the Swastika throughout the world. Then that echo reverberate throughout the world. After that, Sir, new dimensions of alarming proportions have set in the world. Now, whatever happens in any part of the world, that reflects in other parts. Nobody can shut eyes. We canot shut our eyes to the realities of the situation and to the compulsions of the time. Then we would be behaving like an ostrich burying our head under sands. That is why great Jawaharlal Nehru gave the clarion call for total disarmament and nonalign-ment. Sir, I may be called a pessimist but I would like to say that death and destruction stands at the doorsteps of humanity, of mankind. Deadly weapons are stockpiled and people sitting in high places advocate a policy of producing neutron bombs. The situation is dark and bleak. But total disarmament is the only silverlining on an otherwise dark horizon. Sir, on the historic day when India's independence was proclaimed, Pandit Nehru, the architect of the foreign policy of our country, declared India looks on the world with clear and friendly eyes and would co-operate with all nations and peoples of the world in furthering peace, freedom and democracy. In the same spirit he gave the call for peaceful co-existence. I recall the Bandung Conference in which Pandit Nehru ad-vocated the policy of peaceful c6-existence.

Sir, hon. Member, Mr. Jaswant Singh while referring to the Chinese aggression of 1962, said that it was the failure of our diplomacy. Sir, I would like to say that with open heart, Pandit Nehru wanted to befriend with China, not only China but with all other countries. Sir, I recall his letters, Glimpses of World History that he wrote from his prison cell in which he has paid much tribute to the glorious civilisation of China. But nobody can deny the fact that aggression by Red China is the biggest betrayal of this century, and millions of people wept when they heard Nehru, when his speech was broadcast over the radio; millions of people wept and cried and from that day, Jawaharlal Nehru became the saddest man on earth. That heavily told upon his health. He was for peace was for friendship, was for better rela-tions with our neighbouring countries, but we were betrayed. Of course, we rose to the occasion. Today our Foreign Minister has stated that our doors are open; we want to befriend with China. But, Sir, we cannot forget that more than 10,000 sq. miles of territory has been encroached upon by Red China. No force on earth can bully India and at any cost, we would not compro-

mise. We would not compromise the interests of the country. This policy of the Government of India has to be applauded by all section's.

As far as Pakistan is concerned, I was listening with rapt attention to Mr. Khushwant Singh. Of course, from Mr. Zia there is an offer of no-war pact. The same offer was initiated by Pandit Nehru and all the then Prime Ministers. What was the response from Pakistan? Also I am very correct if I say that Hitler also made an offer of no-war pact with socialist countries. He also made an offer of no-war pact with Soviet Russia. Soviet Russia did not want to enter the world war; they wanted to build their nation and they did not want to enter into the conflict which was going on with imperialist powers, colonial powers; but they were betrayed. German tanks marched upon and the Soviet Union were subjected to indescribable horrors. But the German tanks were not able to break their will. Of course, they won after much bloodshed.

Some of the Members expressed that the history shows cordial relations with Pakistan people; history shows mutual love and affection between the people of Pakistan and the people of India. But they have failed to state that the same history shows the battles and conflicts which arose. So, when deadly weapons are piled up there, for what necessity have they got to purchase F-16s? Nobody can justify that. For what purpose, are they stockpiling them when they failed to deliver the goods to the people, when they failed to fulfil the aspirations of the people? A dictator may resort to war.

For this reason, we say keep up the Simla spirit, the spirit of the Simla Accord. Sir, in this connection, It would be very proper if I say a word about Bangladesh. Something has been said about Bangladesh, whether our policy was right or not. This question had been raised here. Even in Bangladesh, sometime back, anti-Indian feelings, pro-Islamic feelings had been whipped up by vested interests. What happened? There was a hue and cry about the New Moore Islands. Credit goes to the Government; the problem of New Moore Islands was settled in a remarkable manner. In the dead of night, when President Zia-ur-Rahman was pierced with bullets, a tense situation arose. But this Government took a very wise decision, acknowledging and recognising the newly formed Government. I still remember it; every sixth hour Bangladesh Radio broadcast that the Government of India had recognised the newly formed Government. In a way, we have helped to defuse the situation, defuse the tension and bring stability and peace in that country.

Many hon. Members have stressed the need to develop better relations with our neighbours. Our relationship with Bhutan is good. Our relationship with Nepal is growing, in a proper manner, as Mr. Bipinpal Das has said. The other neighbour is Sri Lanka. The Indian Ocean also has become a very strategic region. In Sri Lanka, there are about fifteen lakh Stateless people. They are suffering. The apartheid policy of South Africa is practised there also, in Sri Lanka. We have expressed our concern wherever human rights were denied. This Government also has expressed its concern. In this connection, I would like to request our hon. Minister, at any cost, there should not be any pact, detrimental to the interests of the Tamils, detrimental to the interest of the Stateless of people in Sri Lanka. Since the Chairman has assured us that there will be debate on Sri Lanka separately, I do not want to go into this subject in detail now.

Sir, some hon. Members from this side have said, it is hightime we develop our relationship with the U.S.A. because, the relationship is deteriorating. For what reason? We are not opposed to the people of the U.S.A. But can we agree to the policy of Ronald Reagan, who advocates Neutron bomb? Sir, there should not be another Hiroshima. The horrors of

[Shri V. Gopalsamy]

Nagasaki should not be repeated in any part of the globe. Mr. Reagan says, there can be a limited nuclear war in Europe. Is it possible? Can there be a limited nuclear war? Not at all possible. Any war, nuclear war, would automatically escalate into a world war, would rapidly escalate into a world war. This is the reality. In this connection, I would like to say, to what extent, the nuclear weapons are stockpiled. I quote—this is the view of experts.

> "The existing nuclear stockpile is so huge that there is an equivalent of over 8 tonnes of TNT for every human being on this planet.

, Sir, this world has entered into an era of MAD. I say 'MAD', The Super Powers can destroy each other ten times. That is why the experts call it 'MUTUALLY ASSURED DESTRUCTION". This is called 'MAD'. The world has entered into that era. What is the response of India? Sir, throughout the world, crores of people are very much scared about this nuclear war. So far, we have stood by the liberation movements in all these African countries. We have stood by those people who have fought against racism. We have stood by their voice, to demonstrate against colonialism. Now also it is high time that this Government called upon the citizens of every country to raise their voice, to demonstrate against the advocacy of neutron bomb. This is my submission that India gives a clarion call,, that India takes the torch to lead the peace-loving people in the proper direction to achieve peace and tranquility.

With these words, Sir I conclude my speech.

PROF. RASHEEDUDDIN KHAN: (Nominated): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I would not like to spend any more time in registering my protest as to why the nominated Members should always be asked to speak at the end even when an independent Member is in the Chair. I do not know. ..

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): Mr. Khan, the only point is that an. independent Member is not independent in the Chair.

PROF. RASHEEDUDDIN KHAN: Unfortunately, I have not been per--suaded to join any party and, there fore I must suffer my fate. *(Interrup tions)* .

Sir, at the end of this very interesting debate in the House, I can only attempt to formulate certain general propositions for the consideration of the House and the Ministry of External Affairs and make certain brief comments on areas of vital interest to India's own development and peaceful policy. It might appear extreme, if I am to say and I was wondering whether I should say it, but I am almost persuaded to share it as a tentative but very convincing conclusion that never has the world reached a most perillous point where confrontation is a possibility of mispercep-tion of those powers.

It is a most depressing conclusion to which one can come but I admit, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that in the last 11 years of my association in this House, I have never moved to despondency, if one is realistic in terms of the positions of power and available options to different countries to overcome these difficulties. I am not here to apportion blame. After all you have been the students of international affairs, you know it very well, but I can only say that I am somewhat surprised how the U.S. perception of the globe is almost out of tune with realities of the circumstances, and the benefit of doubt which the US Administration is giving is not in favour of overtures to peace, but in favour of concentration of postures of confrontation. It is alarming. You may ask, but how about the

other super power? I am afraid, honestly and truly I do not find a rhetoric idiom in the statement of other super-power which has other weaknesses and miscalculations, that they speak an equal idiom of belligerency. You just have *to* read the statement of the 26th Congress of CPSU. There are series of statements issued by Brezhnev, even when his personal health is failing, you do not find that confrontation and overtures are being countered by confrontationist postures

As a matter of fact, every time some attempt is made to say. "Why don't we sit and negotiate at all levels?" It is very important for us to remember that to have one super power is bad, but it is not bad to have two super powers. Atleast you have one super power which restrains itself and is still able to understand some of the impulses, if not all the impulses, of the struggling people in different parts of the world.

Sir, two propositions I will advance here for the consideration of the hon. Minister and my friends hers. Firstly I will say that three indicators of dege neration in the international situation are as follows. There has been a steady reversal in the process of de tente, reversal of the Helsinki accord, which has also been marked by ac centuation of statements of confron tation. Secondly, a factor which im-pinges on us, is the high increase in global inflation also reflected as stag flation of advanced industrial socie ties, marked by unemployment, group violence, and general restlessness. Thirdly, I am very unhappy to say but let me add, manifest diminution in manoeuvrability of the non-aligned almost to a point where the leverage available to the non-aligned is almost conspicuous by its absence. These three indicators constitute the first proposition indicating the most nega tive trends in the contemporary situa tion.

We also find four processes which are counteracting each other. You have on the one side development of national identities and attempts at stability marked by sophisticated method of destabilisation used by big powers. You also have a process of expanding assertion for peace not only by those who have been in the game for years now, but other countries in Europe, in Americas, in Africa, in Asia who are asking for peace because they are now convinced that unless there is peace, development is not possible. This is also countered in-creasing tendencies—overt and covert — of global conflagration. Thirdly effort by the U.N. for a new international economic order is misused by tremendous expansion in the role and power of multi-national corporations and in the role of trilateral commissions.

These aspects make me conclude that unless initiative is taken by major world powers like India—and 1 am using the word advisedly, major not in terms of industrial potential, major not in terms of its effectiveness not as a major economic power, but major because the voice of India is still, I imagine, heard with respect in the councils of the world, is heard with respect by the Soviet Union, is heard with respect by the Socialist comity of nations and I have got a nagging suspicion that it is also not overlooked by the United States of America and the Western chanceries, because the European chanceries have been somewhat open to this type' of persuasion by India on several issues — whether it be France, whether it be FGR, whether it be Italy or whether it be Belgium—and an attempt is made to understand that if India is taking a position, it should be heard because India has no axe to grind in the global confrontation. This leverage which India still enjoy has to be used for building a strategy of offensive peace and development. My impression is—and the Foreign Minister is an old friend of mine—that we have to work out a strategy of India's foreign policy in terms of what is the overall national interest which we have to defend, in terms of what

[Prof. Resheeduddin Khan] is the regional interest that we have to pursue. I implore him strongly that this exercise has to be gone into.

I will say that when I was speaking about the pessimistive situation, five explosion points are there in the world two of which affect us directly. One is the S. West Asian complex with two points of explosions the Red Sea and the Mediterranean belt from Libya, Egypt, Israel, Lebanon, Syria—the arc of crisis that Mr. Brzesinsky mentioned about.

The other is the Gulf region where the Rapid Deployment Force is working very well. I would strongly say that for purposes of our consideration, all areas from the Gulf eastwards should be considered as directly impinging upon our own sovereignty and integrity. This is linked up with the increasing nuclearisation of the Indian Ocean. Hence an attempt should be made to open negotiations for making the Indian Ocean a zone of peace as agreed upon in the U.N. in 1971 and as opposed unashamedly by the United States of America. Again when people talk of equidistance, they say, "Why are you condemning only one super power and not condemning the other?" We are not interested in condemning any super power. But what can you do if the policy postures of one come within the range of reasonable attack? Our logical impulse will have to be frustrated if we are to take a more unrealisitc view.

Now, Europe is in bad shape. The NATO powers, while their outlay has been increased by 15 per cent, are not very happy With the deployment of Pershing II and Cruise missiles and the decision of the Region Administration to have nuclear warheads planted on Europe. Of course, this whole talk of SS-20, SS-5 and SS-4 of the Soviet Union is there. But the fact remains that the Soviet Union has said that it is prepared to sit down and re-negotiate SALT II. They have said that they are prepared even not to be the first power to strike. Let us be very clear: the third world war will be the last war. Let us have no illusions about this. There will not be a fourth or fifth world war after the third world war, if the point is reached where there is nuclear attack. And we should not make any distinction between a demonstrable nuclear attack and an effective nuclear attack. Therefore, all efforts should be made by our side to build cohesive public opinion among the non-aligned, on the one side. and the members of the United Nations, on the other, to make it clear to the Reagon Administration and to the Soviet Union that we are for their sitting down here and now for comprehensive negotiations to work out a pattern of disarmament which will release the much-needed scarce resources for the development of the Third World.

The Caribbean is another point of explosion where an apparent attempt is being made by the United States not only to hold threats Cuba but also on Nicaragua and EI Salvador. No such attempt has been made by the Soviet Union. Of course, you have Afghanistan. Of course, you have got Poland. Afghanistan complexities are well known to us. I am happy that our position has been very clear that we are against both intervention and interference. The formula of being against intervention and interference should be worked out. And my own impression is that probably Babrak Karmal's proposal for negotiation ought to have been heeded by Pakistan, on the one side, and by the United States, on the other.

[The Vice-Chairman, Shri Bisham-bhar Nath Pande, in the Chair]

Efforts should still be made. I would say that it is in our own national interest and it is in the interest of the Soviet Union that some formula should be worked out because Afghanistan has become a stick by which the Soviet Union is beaten even by those elements who would otherwise not be against the Soviet Union. Some formula should be evolved and you cannot eave it entirely to the Soviet Union.

On Poland the statement of the Foreign Minister is good as far as it goes. This is again a complex situation. But let me add that a certain balance of power has got built after the Second World War in which you have the COMCON countries, the socialist policy, and you have the Western Europe, the NATO alliance system. If an attempt is made to abridge this balance of power, it may upset the whole applecart. Poland *is* a problem of bad management of the internal *economy.* But any attempt to take advantage of what is happening in Poland in order to extend the frontiers of Western influence will be counter-productive.

You just cannot ask for assistance from one super power when another super power is well known to say that no attempt should be made to make encroachment on the sovereignty of the socialist power. India's role I am afraid, is becoming more and more apparent. I am certain that we have to work out a strategy for peace, a global strategy for peace, as a moderator, as a negotiator, as an initiator. I still remember in 1973 when Brezhnev had come to India, in his speech in Parliament he said that India had played the role of an innovator in international bodies. The term'-innovator' is not, in the lexicon of the Marxist-Leninists, in a very simple way. If they use the word 'innovator' it means even if you are not a socialist polity, you have played an anti-imperialist, antiracist, role, as a country with a new ethos of peace, a role which is admirable. Let us again play the role of innovator for peace and development, take the challenge and address a whole scheme for stabilisation of world peace, the real peace between our neighbours. And that cannot be done by reactive response on an ad hoc basis or a sectoral basis. It should be a whole, total, strategy of foreign policy of India. Thank you.

डा० (श्रीमती) नाजमा हेपतुल्ला : मान्यवर, सुबह से शाम तक इतना कुछ बोला जा चुका है अगर मुझे बोलने के लिये जब आखिरी वक्त कहा--वह भी पांच मिनट में। तो मैं यही कहूंगी कि अगर कोइ बोलना चाहे अपने मकसद को टेबल के एक्रास रखना चाहे, तो दो मिनट में भी रख सकता है और अगर अपनी बात कहने पर, तो सारा दिन भी बोलता रहे, तो न बोल सकेगा। मुझे मालूम नहीं कि मैं इन पांच मिनटों में वह कुछ कह सकूंगी, जो कुछ मैं यहां रखना चाहती हूं।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री विश्वम्भर नाथ पांडे) नहीं, पांच मिनट आप और ले लीजिए।

डा० (श्रीमती) नाजमा हेपतुल्ला : शुक्रिया मैं अपने एक्सलेंट अफेयर्स मिनस्टर साहब को अगर हमारे देश की प्रधान मंत्री को इस बात के लिए मुबारकबाद देती हूं उन्होंने एक ऐसी पालिसी बनाई जिसमें कम से कम, सिर्फ चंद लोगों को छोड़ करके, जो भी मैंने तकरीरें सुनी है, उससे मुझे खुशी हुई कि बारहवार कुमोबेश उदासनर लोग उसको सपोर्ट करते हैं और उसको सराहते हैं।

इसी से जाहिर होता है कि हमारी फारेन पालिसी जिसकी बुनियाद जवाहर लाल नेहरू ने रखी थी वह सही है और सीधी डाइरेक्शन में जा रही है। इससे बेहतर शायद वक्त कोई दूसरा नहीं होता इस फारेन पालिसी के ऊपर इन्टरनेशनल सिचुएशन के ऊपर बात करने का, क्योंकि आज जब भी आप अखबार उठा करके रोज देखिए, तो जहां हिंदुस्तान में होने वाली खतरनाक खबरें होती हैं, वहां दुनियां के सीन पर भी होने वाली ऐसी खतरनाक खबरें पढ़ने में आती हैं और इंसान यह सोचने पर मजबूर हो जाता है कि यह हमारी दुनियां, हमारी क्रीएशन इंसान की जो रेस है, वह कहां जा रही है? किस रास्ते पर जा रही है? यह तबाही के रास्ते पर जा रही है।

[डा० (श्रीमती) नाजमा हेपतुल्ला]

अब मैं फारेन मिनिस्टर का ध्यान इस तरफ दिलाऊंगी कि यह शुरुआत हुई जब अमरीका ने इजराइल को आर्मामेंट्स दिये । मैं बहुत पुरानी तवारीख में नहीं जा रही हूं । सन् 1948 की तवारीख में नहीं जा रही हूं । सिर्फ दो-तीन साल पहले की बात मैं बता रही हूं । सबसे पहली बार शुरुआत हुई कि जायनिस्ट गवर्नमेंट जो इजराइल में है, उसको पहले आर्म किया गया क्योंकि जो कुछ दौलत थी, वह वैस्ट एशिया के अन्दर ही थी । आज की लड़ाई सिर्फ आक्युपेशन आफ लैंड के उपर नहीं है, बल्कि आज की लड़ाई एकतसादी लड़ाई है। आज की लड़ाई दुनियां के रिसोर्सेज पर कब्जा करने के लिए है और इन्हीं बातों को देखते हुये इजराइल पर, वैस्ट एशिया के अन्दर शुरुआत की गई है।

फिर पिछले साल टर्की के अन्दर एक दूसरा रैवोल्यूशन हुआ जो अमरीकन सपोर्टेड रैवोल्यूशन था । एक फौजी हुकूमत को हटा कर के और ज्यादा अमरीकन सपोर्टेड फौजी हुकूमत लाई गई ।

फिर बड़ी अनफारच्युनेट बात हुई कि हमारे दो नान-इलाइनमेंट के साथी ईरान और ईराक में किसी वजह से लड़ाई छिड़ गयी । हमारी हिन्दुस्तान की प्रधान मंत्री ने और हमारे फारेन मिनिस्टर साहब ने खास तौर पर बहुत कोशिश की और कर रहे हैं कि वह किसी तरह से उनके इस झगड़े को निपटा सकें ।

यों तो हमें मालूम है कि वर्षों से इंडियन ओशन के अन्दर जो दूसरों के जंगी बेड़े, खास तौर पर अमरीका के जंगी बेड़े मौजूद थे उनमें और बढ़ोत्तरी होती जा रही है, लेकिन जैसे-तैसे हमारे देश में तरक्की होती रही, हमारे देश में टैक्नोलोजिकल उन्नति होती रही, जैसे-जैसे हमारे साइंटिस्टों ने, वैज्ञानिकों ने आसमान की बुलन्दियों पर अपने झंडे गाड़े, जैसे-जैसे हमारे साइंटिस्टों ने, ओशनोग्राफर्स ने समुन्दर के अन्दर छिपे हुये खजानों को निकाला, वैसे-वैसे ही इन जंगी बेड़ों में और बढ़ोत्तरी होती गयी इंडियन ओशन के अन्दर और एक भूचाल सा आ गया । यही नहीं, पिछले साल जनवरी की बात है कि अमरीका ने अपना एक स्पाइ सेटेलाइट हमारे सिर पर लटका दिया । आज की लड़ाई रिसीसेज की लड़ाई है ।

मुझ से पहले मेरे फाजिल दोस्त बोल रहे थे । उन्होंने कहा कि लड़ाई का जोन हमारे दरवाजे पर आ गया है। वोलेटिलिक सिचुएशन हो गई है और ऐसा लगता है कि हम एक आतिशफिशां पहाड़ पर बैठे हैं, पता नहीं यह कब फूट जाएगा और इसका लावा हमें कहां ले जाएगा । जब हमारी प्रधान मंत्री हमारे लोगों का और दुनिया के लोगों का ध्यान इस तरफ दिलाती हैं तो यह कहा जाता है कि यह पब्लिक कन्जम्शन के लिए है, हिन्दुस्तान में जो हो रहा है उससे लोगों का ध्यान हटाने के लिए है । मैं याद दिलाना चाहती हूं कि दो वर्ष पहले जब अमरीका ने एफ-15, एफ-16 और एफ-21 सोफिस्टिकेटेड एयरक्राफ्ट इजराइल को दिए थे तब मैंने अखबार में एक लेख लिखा था । अमरीका और इजराइल ने कहा था कि हमने ये डिफेंस के लिए लिए हैं, हालांकि वह आफेंसिव एयरक्राफ्ट थे, जिनके अन्दर तमाम बाम्बिंग रेंक्स मौजूद थे । उन्होंने आश्वासन दिया था कि ये वे अपने बचाव के लिए ले रहे हैं, अपनी हिफाजत के लिए ले रखे हैं । मगर नतीजा क्या निकला ? दो साल पहले दिए और इस साल जून के महीने में साबित हो गया जब ईराक के न्यूक्लियर रिएक्टर पर उन्हीं हवाई जहाजों ने हमला किया । अब पाकिस्तान को हवाई जहाज दे रहे हैं और कह कर दे रहे हैं कि डिफेंस के लिए दे रहे हैं, हमारा इरादा हिन्दुस्तान पर हमला करने का नहीं है । कैसे मान लें कि जो वह कह

रहे हैं वह सच है, जब कि हमारा पुराना आज तक का तजुरबा यह है कि उन्होंने कहा कुछ और किया उसका उल्टा।

मान्यवर, हिन्दुस्तान की तारीख रही है आज से नहीं बल्कि सदियों से कि हिन्दुस्तान ने अपने बार्डर से निकल न किसी पर हमला किया, न किसी की जमीन पर कब्जा किया। सदियों हमारे ऊपर हमले होते रहे, महमूद गजनवी जैसे हमलावर आते रहे और लूट कर चले गये, लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान की तारीख में कभी कोई समय नहीं आया जब हमने किसी देश में जा कर किस की जमीन पर कब्जा किया हो। हमारी यही तारीख रही है कि जहां किसी की मदद कर सकें, पिछड़ेपन से बचा सकें, एक्सप्लाइटेशन से बचा सकें वही करते रहे। बांग्ला देश में ही देख लीजिए। उनका देश आजाद हुआ, हमारी तमाम फौज वापस आ गयी, एक भी इनसान नहीं रहा हमारा वहां, कोई एक्सप्लाइटेशन नहीं किया।

पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरु जैसे हमारे नेता ने नान-एलाइनमेंट का दीप जलाया था। क्यों दीप जलाया। उन्हें मालूम था कि ये तरक्की किये हुए मुल्क से साम्राज्यवादी मुल्क हम जैसे तरक्की करने वाले मुल्कों को, जो सेल्फ रिलायेंस से जीना चाहते हैं, जीने नहीं देंगे, उनकी मदद नहीं करेंगे। इसी लिए उन्होंने इसकी बुनियाद रखी न केवल एक्सटर्नल पोलिसी में, बल्कि इन्टर डवलपमेंट पोलिसी, इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट पोलिसी यही सोच कर बनायी गयी कि हम थर्ड वर्ल्ड कन्ट्रीज एक दूसरे के साथ मिल कर, एक नये इकोनोमिक आर्डर, एक नये पोलिटिकल सेट-अप के साथ आगे बढ़ें ताकि हम किसी के एक्सप्लोइटेशन में न आ सकें। वह दीप जो उन तीन लोगों ने मिल कर जलाया था, जिसकी रोशनी सैकड़ों मुल्कों में पहुंच चुकी है, उसी रोशनी को लेकर हमारी प्रधान मंत्री तीन कांटीनेंट्स के दौरों पर गयीं। चाहे ईस्ट में गयीं, चाहे नार्थ-साउथ डायलोग के लिए कानकुन गयीं। उन्होंने उसी चीज को बढ़ावा दिया, उसी नान-एलाइनमेंट की बात को आगे बढ़ाया। हम किसी दूसरे के ऊपर भरोसा नहीं कर सकते। हम नये इकोनोमिक आर्डर को, टेक्नोलोजी को शेयर न करें, एक दूसरे का साथ न दें तो दूसरे बड़े-बड़े मुल्क हमें जीने नहीं देंगे। और आप देख रहे हैं कि अफ्रीका और लैटिन अमरीका और एशिया के मुल्कों में कितना एक्सप्लायटेशन हो रहा है। दूसरे जो इकोनोमिक वार फेयर की बात मैं कहती हूं—खास कर अमरीका जब यहां के मुल्कों को आर्मामेंट देता है तो उसका मतलब यह होता है कि वह हमारे डवलपमेंट को रोकना चाहता है और अपने यहां की इडस्ट्रीज को और इकोनोमी को मजबूत करना चाहता है। जो हमारा पड़ोसी देश पाकिस्तान है उसको वह इतने आर्म्स किस वजह से दे रहा है अगर इस बात को सोचें तो पता लगेगा कि वह रूस और अफगानिस्तान से घबरा रहा है और उस घबराहट में अपनी पोजीशन को इस एरिया में बनाये रखने के लिए वह पाकिस्तान को आर्म्स दे रहा है। अगर पाकिस्तान को हथियार मिलते हैं तो जब इतने साफिस्टिकेटेड आर्म्स उसको मिलते हैं तो यह नहीं हो सकता कि हम चुपचाप बैठे रहें और हम अपने देश की हिफाजत के लिए कोई कदम न उठायें। हमें भी अपने बार्डर्स की हिफाजत करनी है और इसलिए जब हम इस तरह से इस आर्म्स रेस में आते हैं तो जाहिर है कि जो रुपया हमारी कंट्री के डवलपमेंट पर खर्च होता था, जो हमारे यहां के करोड़ों गरीब लोगों के फायदे के लिए काम आता था वह रुपया आर्म्स पर खर्च होता है। और इसलिए वे दो तरह से व्यवहार करते हैं। एक तो वह अपने यहां आर्मामेंट की फैक्ट्रीज को बढ़ाते हैं और अपनी इकोनामी

[डा० (श्रीमती) नाज़मा हेपतुल्ला]

को मजबूत करते हैं और दूसरी तरफ हमको पिछड़ा हुआ रहने देते हैं । हमारी हालत तो आज एक गिनीपिग से भी बदतर हो गयी है। गिनीपिग तो इंसान की बेहतरी के लिए बलि होता है । ऐसे-ऐसे रिसर्च के लिए उसका इस्तेमाल होता है जिससे कि इंसान की बहबूदी हो, लेकिन हमारे थर्ड वर्ल्ड कंट्रीज के लिए आर्मामेंट का इस्तेमाल किया जाता है, नेपाम बम का इस्तेमाल किया जाता है । आप देखें कि कोरिया में क्या हुआ, लेबनान में क्या हुआ, फिलिस्तीनियों के लिए क्या व्यवहार किया गया । उन पर वह बम फेंके गये । हमारी हालत तो गिनीपिग से भी खराब है । हमारे ऊपर इस तरह के बम इस्तेमाल किये जाते हैं कि जिनसे पूरी इंसानी रेस को ही बर्बाद किया जा सकता है । मैं तो कहूंगी कि हम गिनीपिग से भी बदतर हैं ।

कल के अखबार में जो खबर निकली थी, वैसी ही आज भी खबर निकली है कि गोलन हाइट्स को इजराइल ने एनेक्स कर लिया । हमारे एक्सटर्नल अफेयर्स मिनिस्टर ने हम लोगों को बतलाया कि यूनाइटेड नेशन्स ने इजराइल को इसके लिए सलाह दी है। हम लोगों ने हमेशा से जो भी दबे हुये थे, चाहे वे किसी भी मुल्क के रहने वाले हों, चाहे वे इजराइल के हों या किसी और मुल्क के, उनके लिए आवाज उठाई है और इस तरह के गासिबाना कब्जे के खिलाफ आवाज उठाई है और इसके लिए यूनाइटेड नेशन्स में और दूसरे बाडीज में इसके लिए पहल की है । लेकिन मुझे अफसोस होता है यह देखकर कि आज यूनाइटेड नेशन्स की क्या वेल्यू रह गयी है। उसकी बात को कौन मानता है । आज उसके हजारों रेजोल्यूशन्स ऐसे होते हैं, चाहे वे जनरल असेम्बली के हों या कहीं और किसी दूसरी बाडी के जिनको अमरीका के पिट्ठू अपने जूते की नोक पर मारते हैं । यूनाइटेड नेशन्स की क्या वैल्यू रह गयी है । अगर यूनाइटेड नेशन्स ने अपने किरदार को नहीं समझा तो उसका वही हश्र होगा कि जो लीग आफ नेशन्स का हुआ था। मैं यह पूछना चाहती हूं कि अमरीका की सर जमीन पर बनाये गये इस इरादे में जिसमें वोट आफ वीटो लागू हुआ है, क्या आप उम्मीद करते हैं कि वहां से किसी को कोई इंसाफ मिल पायेगा। मुझे तो एक शेर याद आता है :

"तुम्हीं मुन्सिफ तुम्ही कातिल,
तुम्हीं जल्लाद भी हो,
अकरबा मेरे करें खून,
का दावा किस पर ।"

जहां कोई ऐसी बात आती है अमरीका का वीटो आ जाता है । क्या फायदा है ऐसी कोई बात करने का ? क्या फायदा है लोगों को बेवकूफ बनाने से । आज हम उस मौके पर पहुंच गये हैं कि हमारे नान-एलाइन्ड कंट्रीज और हमारे वर्ल्ड कंट्रीज को मिल कर सोचना चाहिये कि हम क्या कर सकते हैं और किस प्रकार से हम आगे बढ़ कर यूनाइटेड तरीके पर ऐसा मोर्चा बना सकते हैं कि जिसमें हमको इज्जत से जिन्दा रहने का मौका मिले ।

मैं एक शेर के बाद खत्म कर रही हूं :

"उठा वरना हश्र नहीं होगा फिर कभी,
दौड़ो जमाना चाल कयामत की चल गया ।"

हमारे भाई जो सामने बैठे हुये हैं, मैं कहना चाहती हूं कि अब आंखें खोलें। जो नेहरू जी की पालिसीज को क्रिटिसाइज करते थे . . . .

श्री हुकुमदेव नारायण यादव : खोले बैठे हैं ।

डा० (श्रीमती) नाजमा हैपतुल्ला : तो कान भी खोल लीजिए । आपके कान तो यूंही बन्द हैं । तो कहना चाहती हूं कि जो आज तक नेहरू जी की पालिसीज को क्रिटिसाइज करते रहे वे आज कह रहे हैं कि नेहरू जी की पालिसीज क्रिएटिव हैं और वे ही आज उनकी तारीफ कर रहे हैं । आज उन्हीं पालिसीज को लेकर हमारो प्रधान मंत्री और हमारे एक्सटर्नल अफेयर्स मिनिस्टर आगे जा रहे हैं और इस लिये आप घबराइये मत । कभी तो आप गौर से सोचिए कि देश के ऊपर आपको भी कुछ जिम्मेदारी है । खाली दूसरों के ऊपर, किसी दूसरे के बलबूते पर हिम्मत करेंगे तो इससे आपको कोई फायदा नहीं होगा । देश में जब लड़ाई होगी तो ऐसा नहीं होगा कि एक गोली आएगी तो मेरे लग जायेगी और आपके नहीं लगेगी । जब लड़ाई होती है तो सब के ऊपर उसका असर पड़ता है । मैं इन्हीं चंद शब्दों के साथ इसको सपोर्ट करती हूं और यह उम्मीद करती हूं कि यह हमारा हाउस भी इसे पूरे तौर पर सपोर्ट करेगा ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BISHAMBHAR NATH PANDE): The list of speakers having been exhausted— some 22 speakers have participated in the debate....

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO; Only 17, according to my information.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BISHAMBHAR NATH PANDE): I now request the External Affairs Minister to reply to the debate. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, as I said, 17 hon. Members have participated in this debate. I am extremely grateful to them for a plethora of ideas and arguments which they offered during this-debate. Sir the more I listen to the debates in the Houses of Parliament in this country on external affairs, the more I am convinced about the exis tence of a very definite consensus in the country which is reflected by the consensus in Parliament. I have stated time and again that consensus is not unanimity. There is an area where consensus and unanimity differ, and area between" the line where con sensus ends and the like to which unanimity extends. That is the area in which, I have found, most of he Mem bers from the Opposition have to be placed. This is a shifting area it chan ges with the issue. Suddenly Mr. Shahabuddin comes into one area. When it comes to another issue, Mr. Shahabuddin comes into our area, the consensus area, and Mr. Yogendra Sharma comes as the person between the two areas. *(Interruptions)* So the area between the consensus on the one hand and a complete unanimity on the other is a shifting one, which only proves the existence of the consensus. So to say that the consensus is getting attenuated, is, to my mind, incorrect. I have heard the speeches of hon. Members several times during the last two years. It is not getting attenuated. It is being demonstrated repeatedly. I have not seen any new argument coming from any side in regard to any point. That is what makes me a little sad because everywhere in the world things are changing. Only in this Parliament they are not. The views that were expressed on Afghanistan and Kampuchea, say, one and a half years ago, continue to be expressed by Members here, while these views were expressed one and a half years ago by others in other countries where they are no longer harping on the same thing now. They have changed. How they have changed I will come to little later.

Sir, at the outset I would like to dispose of some points raised. I do not call them unimportant. But I do think that they could be disposed of in the beginning so that we should come to the major issues a little later.

[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao] Mrs. Margaret Alva spoke about the report that appeared in the Press two days ago suggesting that India had declined to receive a delegation sent by the Vatican reportedly in an effort to persuade the nuclear powers to end the nuclear arms race. This is what the newspaper reported. Now, this is a peculiar report. I have gone into the facts. I have ascertained the position. The Vatican Mission here has confirmed that as far as India is concerned, in information is not correct. • That means that no one was coming here for the simple reason that India is not nuclear power. They were going to nuclear power countries and if someone asked us whether they could come here and we said in a hypothetical way that they would be coming to the wrong country because we are not a nuclear power what was wrong about it? I think that was quite correct. But the fact remains that that was a hypothetical answer to a hypothetical question based on a non existent situation. This is how it has turned out to be. But since the point has been raised. I have to reply to it because it should not be seen as a kind of lapse on our part or we should not be seen as having done something improper or not having done something which ought to have been done. Only from that point of view, I am setting the record straight.

Sir, another question was raised in regard to regional cooperation in South Asia. I am disposing of these matters because on facts there need not be any difference of opinion and I am volunteering the facts to the House. As the House is aware, last year, for the first time, the question of regional cooperation in its present setting was. raised. After some initial discussion, India agree to the idea. I made a statement in this House and the other House. I only said: let us do our home work first and let us do it properly. Let us not rush into anything with our eyes closed only to find that we cannot agree on anything. That will be counter-pro-ductive. There was a suggestion first that the Heads should meet, that there should be a Summit, that should start with a Summit. We said 'No'. You just cannot start with a Summit. What is it that, at the Summit, our leaders are going to discuss unless we prepare some agenda and we do some homework in regard to the areas of agreement and cooperation which could he worked out in detail? This was accepted and we therefore started at the level of Foreign Secretaries. The first meeting took place in Sri Lanka, in Colombo, and agriculture, rural development, telecommunication, meteorology, and health and population activities were the subjects agreed upon for regional cooperation, and study groups were set up. I have clarified in this House before that when we talk of regional cooperation and subjects for regional cooperation, we have to steer clear of the subjects which are capable of bilateral cooperation. We have to keep out bilateral aspects and we have to take up, at least in the beginning, only those subjects or areas in which cooperation can be meaningful only at the multi-lateral regional level. It is better to make a humble beginning with a few subjects rather than take too many subjects and get confused. So Sir, these were the subjects about which study groups were appointed. Those study groups examined the subjects, came up with certain formulations and there was the second meeting of Foerign Secretaries in Kathmandu recently in which the study groups presented their reports. There was a discussion on the Reports. And what was decided was this: "The recommendations of the Study Groups set up at the Colombo meeting were considered and endorsed. It was agreed that the Study Groups be converted into Working Groups for the purpose of working out the modalities for implementing programmes identified for regional co-operation in their respective fields. The Foreign Secretaries also broadly indicated the components of immediate and long-term aspects of co-operation which would hare to

be kept in view by the Working Groups in drawing up action programmes."

Again, Sir, the Foreign Secretaries identified three more areas for investigation by the Study Groups. These there areas were: postal services, transport, and science and technology. So, after Kathmandu, the Working Groups or the Study Groups, as the case may be, are continuing their work, and it is expected that after one or two more meetings at the Foreign Secretaries' level, the stage will be set for a meting at the Foreign Ministers' level. We are going step by step. We are feeling the ground as we go, and we find that the atmosphere has been good. We are encouraged. And to say that nothing has been done on regional cooperation would be quite wrong because within one year what has been done is quite remarkable by any standards. The Foreign Ministers of ail these countries have expressed their satisfaction at the progress on this matter.

Sir, I now come to another important aspect on which Mr. Yogendra Sharma's eyebrows went up. This is in relation to what he very strongly deprecates, namely the reference to "super power rivalry". Now, I am not quite able to understand whether his objection is to calling it "super power" or to "rivalry", or to both, or to something else. But the point is, as I have explained in . the other House, this phraseology that we have used in relation to the Indian Ocean occurs in the Resolution of the United Nations in regard to the Indian Ocean. It is not our invention. We have not started it. The point is that the Indian Ocean has several presences. Whether it is in the context of rivalry or in any other context—in fact, we are prepared to go a step further and say that while the Resolution of the United Nations is confined to the context of rivalry, we are prepared—the littoral countries. I am sure, would be prepared to say—to go a step further and say that even if the powers want to stay there by mutual consent, we still do not want them. Therefore, there is no question of our equating one with the other. We do not want any presence whatsovere here, as the Prime Minister has said, one presence attracts another, and we are interested in making this a zone of peace and therefore a zone where no presence is there. So, this is the idea. And we have not been using this in any other context. We know what one friend has done, what the other friend has done. We know our relations with the other powers. We have not said that both are equal in all respects. To draw that meaning out of what we have said would not be correct, would not be realistic.

SHRI YOGENDRA SHARMA: We consider you to be very realistic.

SHRI P. v. NARASIMHA RAO: We are realistic. That is why we use the correct word at the correct place.

Sir, about the South-South Dialogue. This again has been stressed by the hon. Members. Since there is again no difference of opinion on this. I would like to place before the House the factual situation. As far as we are concerned, it was basically because of the Indian initiative that at the Sixth Non-aligned Havana Summit, a resolution on policy guide-lines for reinforcing collective self-reliance was adopted. Subsequently, India participated actively in a series of meetings that culminated in the Caracas programme adopted last May. I had the privilege of attending that meeting. There is now a Group of '77 set up for ECDC in New York and India has already pledged U.S $ 60,000 to it. India will also be hosting a meeting of heads of national agencies of science and technology of developing countries in April 1982. In a few months time there will be other important meetings on co-operation in the field of development finance; in Baghdad in February, 1982

[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao] and Kingston, Jamaica, in April, 1982. A meeting of the governmental agencies in charge of import of crude oil for better co-ordination of supply and demand is expected to take place in the middle of next year, *i.e.,* 1982. There will also be a negotiating conference on the global system of trade preferences among developing countries in the first half of 1982. This will show that within the last one year there has actually been a spurt in the activity on the South-South front, and I am sure that this will result in very beneficial programmes being chalked out and areas being identified for specific co-operation.

Finally, Sir, as Mr. Dinesh Singh told the House, there is a proposal to have a Summit, a South-South Summit in Delhi. Certain countries have been sounded. They have agreed. Others are being contacted and details of this will perhaps be discussed, if all of them agree, around 22nd February, 1982 in New Delhi, at the time of conferring the Third World Award by our Prime Minister on President Nyerere of Tanzania. These consultations are expected to concentrate on South-South co-operation. So, even South-South has now on the way to the Summit level. This has not happened before and if within some months, within a period of less than one year, all these things have happened no one can say that the progress has been slow or unsatisfactory. So, I would like to tell the House that we are very much conscious of it. India has been in the vanguard of the South-South movement and we shall continue to do whatever is possible and what we have done is already large enough in quantitative terms. I really cannot tell you the exact number of countries, developing countries, with which India has these relations already, has on-going relations on-going co-operation programmes. However whenever these Heads of Government or Foreign Ministers or other Ministers have come to India they have had meetings with the respective Ministries here identifying programmes, trying to give a fillip to the programmes, trying to pinpoint why certain programmes are not going ahead. In course of time, we would also like to have a monitoring machinery set up in the Ministry of External Affairs or in some other appropriate Ministry, at an apropriate level, because the range of this co-operation is increasing so rapidly that we may have to have a machinery for continuous monitoring and continuous sorting out of difficulties that may be cropping up from time to time.

Sir, I understand that, for the South-South co-operation programmes, again the summit comes last and we will have to go through the other levels also. That is quite in order. That is what I wish to tell the House.

Sir about the Seychelles I did not have an occasion to make any statement in this House or the other House. The statement on the day our plane was hijacked was made by my colleague, the Minister for Civil Aviation. As hon. Members might remember, the first concern of Members of Parliament was in regard to the safe return of the passengers on board the Air India plane, which was hijacked to South Africa. We had several anxious moments that day and finally when the passengers and crew came back safely, the whole nation heaved a sigh of relief.

Then we went into the facts of what happened there. Naturally we could not depend only on the newspaper reports before coming out with an official stand. Now that the facts have come out our representative in the United Nations has already expressed his support and sympathy for the Government of Seychelles and I would like to reiterate the stand of the Government of India that we are totally opposed to this kind of adventurism that was resorted to in Seychelles to bring down a constitutional government, a legitimate government.

We support that Government and we very strongly disapprove of actions like this. This happens to be a mercenary action, action by a kind of consortium because we understand that they are drawn from several countries. So, this action is very much to • be condemned and we express our support to the Government of Seychelles. Our Prime Minister has already written to the President of Seychelles expressing her satisfaction that this coup was foiled in time.

Now, Sir, one small matter, with which I am not fully concerned but which has to be touched upon atleast lightly, is about the IMF loan. The point was raised by certain Members. I don't know how it fits into this debate but anything can be made to fit into anything? That is the fiexibility of our debates. I would say, without repeating the arguments which the Finance Minister has already given in both Houses in regard to the IMF loan, that India has always favoured multilateral international financial institutions. There was a tendency to tell us that there is no need for these institutions; you can go to the open market and whatever loans etc. would bo made available, they would depend on the bilateral relations of the country taking the loan and the country giving the loan. Now this was a very dangerous trend that was developing. We opopsed it in the United Nations; we said that we would like these multinational institutions to be preserved because ultimately it is through these institutions that loans will have to be disbursed and the recipient country will be able to preserve its own independence much better than if it had to go to one country, like to a sahukar, and get loans and become subject to all kinds of strings attached by that country or those handpicked countries. So, this was our stand. We have always supported this system although we have also supported the idea of reforming these institutions'. We are not against these instituions; but we are against the manner in which these in-sttiutions are functioning today. That is apart of the North-South dialogue; that is a part of the new economic order which we all support, and the new economic order involves lot of reforms in the working of these institutions. Sir, I would like to say in principle, we are always for multinational institutions. Conditionality and other things I will not go into because they have already been dealt with by the Finance Minister. This is one aspect of our policy which I wanted to bring before the House. .

Sir, now, I come to the aspects over which the area between consensus and unanimity comes into operation. Taking West Asia first, I am grateful to Mr. Jaswant Singh, for having said some good words per-sonaly about me. Such words are so rare these days that when one hears them, they sound like music. Mutual admiration apart, I would like to ask him, was it fair on his part to say that in our dealings with the Arab world, we went and told them that we are also good Muslims. Is it not hitting below the belt? Is it not factually a very incorrect statement? When did our friendship, India's friendship, with the Arab world begin? Was it after they struck oil? Was it after they became rich? Had we not been their friends throughout?

SHRI KALPNATH RAI: Before Independence.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Before Independence. What does history show? And how are we interpreting this relationship? Coming from an hon. Member of this House, from any Party, I would feel very sad about these comments. Our support to the Arab cause is based on certain principles. These principles are very dear to us. They have been handed down to us by our leaders. Mahatma Gandhi laid stress on these relations and we have always been shaping our policy on the basis of our support, out and out support, to the Arab cause.

[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao] Therefore, I would like to say very respectfully to the hon. Member, that these remarks were not called for.

Sir, he asked me about the evolution of our foreign policy. A very good question. The only thing is that I do not really have the time to go into it. But this is not a new question. The evolution of India's foreign policy is common knowledge. It has not evolved overnight. It has not appeared overnight. It is possible that, on certain matters, certain Members, certain matters, certain citizens of this country, may feel that we are not going fast enough that we are not behaving firmly enough. That is a different question. That is a matter on which there can be differences of opinion. Also, there can be differences in the opinion of those who are in Government and those who are not. For example, a person who is a Member of Parliament and a person who is not a Member of Parliament. Again, there is a gradation. A Member of Parliament may not go to the extent to which an outsider can. A journalist again has certain privileges. The Government has certain limitations, Therefore, all these gradations can be understood. But the evolution of the policy has been very clear. It has not evolved from anything borrowed from outside. It has sprung from the soil. It has come out of our traditions, our own traditions; old traditions, not merely traditions of the 20th Century or the 19th Century; traditions which have been given to us, which have been handed down to us right from the *Upanishadic* days, if you really want to trace the history and the evolution.

7 P. *M.*

As I said, we need not agree on all details. On details we can have different perceptions. That is a different story. But this is something which everyone has understood in this country, which everyone believes in, and we would like to reiterate this.

Then, Sir, coming to Asian identity, you may recall the Panditji was the first to bring the Asian identity into focus in the Asian Relations Conference in 1946, before we became free. So it is not as though Asian identity has been forgotten by us. History alone will say who disrupted this Asian identity, how it came to be disrupted. So • far as I am concerned, so far as I have made a study of the chronology of events, I could say with a good deal of force that we were not responsible for disruption of the Asian identity. Some others were.

But I will not go into that. What I would like to say is that, merely because we do not agree with certain Asian countries on certain issues, Asian identity is not disrupted ipso *facto.* With each of these Asian countries we have very good relations. If there are regional groupings and those regional groupings have their own logic and opinions and stands or any public postures and we do not belong to that region and we cannot look at things on a particular issue in the same way as they look at it, that again is to be understood; that does not, again I say, disrupt the Asian identity. And, therefore, I would like to respectfully submit to the hon. Member that the concept of Asian identity is very much in our minds in this country, and we cannot be charged with having done anything, to bring harm to it.

Sir, disarmament and development have been commented upon. Mr. Shahabuddin, again in his habit of diplomacy, said something about developmental concerns about development needs of this country being eroded by armaments. He said, this has to be addressed to ourselves. I have tried to address it to ourselves, and I find that in 1977 India spent 3.4 per cent of GNP; in 1978, 3.2 per cent; in 1979 3.9 per cent—it is hovering between 3 and 4 per cent—whereas other countries have gone up to 6.3 per cent, 6 per cent and 5.7 per cent, etc., almost 6'() to 70 per cent or 80 per cent above our percentage, And do not forget the

fact that while we are spending our own money, others may not be. I do not think that this question can be legitimately addressed to us and any fault could be found in us. Every country has certain perception;.. It is not necessary that these perceptions can be worked out in a cut and dried manner, whether it is a small country or big country. These perceptions also are a part of the overall thinking. And, in particular, when yon have a country of India's size and dimension's, India's complexities, from all this springs a concept of its defence percption. And by no standards can it be asserted that the perception in which the defence need's of India are being met is anything excessive or is anything disproportionate. I have no doubt that we are well within what the legitimate perception of this country should be. In fact, we are much less for the simple reason that we cannot afford it and we do not want to step it up too much. I would like to tell Mr. Shahabuddin that his comment that we are spending more than we should is not correct, is not borne out by any standards of judgement.

Sir, I now come to a few remarks which were made about the Non-Aligned Movement. The question of success was raised by Mr. Jaswant Singh. I entirely agree that when you formulate a policy, it has to *be.* assessed it has to be evaluated, its success has to be judged. Either you find success or lack of success. This is a continuous process that has to go on.

Sir while talking of India or India's policy, I would not like to arrogate to myself or to this country all the policies or policy aspects of the Non-Aligned Movement. We are one of the founders of the Non-Aligned Movement. No one can say that we are unimportant. We are an important country. There are two aspects. Has India played a role within the Non-Aligned Movement since its inception? Has the Non-Aligned Movement played a role in global matters? These are the two questions. Because I operate through the Non-Aligned Movement, did I or did I not, did this country or did this country not play a role in the Non-Aligned Movement in the shaping of its policy, in finding consensus successfully? Now how do you measure the success of this movement, if more and more countries are joining the movement, is that success or failure? At least, *prima facie,* it cannot be called a failure. A country becomes free today and joins the Non-Aligned Movement tomorrow, what does that mean? Does it mean failure? One may claim or may not claim that it is a success, but is it a failure? On the face of it, it appears to be a success, untill the opposite is proved. Let any one prove that such a large number of countries coming into the Non-Aligned Movement is a failure of the movement and I am prepared to agree, but how is it to be proved I do not know. That is number one.

Number two, is the Non-Aligned Movement is loated? Is it gaining frie nds or foes? That is the measure of the success of the movement. Its size is one; its achievement is another. Non-Aligned Movement has not behaved like a Super Power. It does not have its own arsenal; that is quite clear. Non-Aligned Movement is non-aligned because it does not want any arma ments for keeping peace; it does not believe in deciding question through the sanction of armaments. So by de finition the Non Aligned Movement makes use of methods other than ar maments, other than war, other than aggression, other than conflicts. There fore, has the Non-Aligned Movement gained friends or has it not gained friends over the years? Let us take this very question. of West Asia. Take the position five years ago, or three years ago or two years ago. Compared to that time, do we or do we not And more countries outside the Non-Aligned Movement now agreeing with the Non-Aligned,

stand?

[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao]

They are not non-aligned. They have not joined you. Those who have joined are already there but there are those who are non-aligned. I would prefer to call them non-non-aligned because they are not aligned, all of them, at one place. Therefore, I can't call them aligned. I can call them only by a double negative, non-non-aligned. If we fined that on West Asia, on Namibia, on South Africa and on the North-South questions more and more countries outside the non-aligned movement have come to agree with the formulations of the non-aligned movement is it a success or failure? Let us leave India alone. If it is a success and India has been part of the movement, how can India be said to have failed and how can it be said about India that there is no success at all? Naturally this success will depend on many other factors. You are not going to silence all the Super Powers, all the nuclear weapon States and bring them to your own way of thinking overnight. But it is a fact that in Europe today, for various reasons—it is not only because of the non-aligned mevement; nothing can be attributed to only one cause but there are various causes—the European position is crystallising as different from the non-European position even in the Western camp. Now we need not go too much into details since it is an evolving situation. Today we have to feel satisfied that something is happening on the right lines and no one can deny that this happening. On Namibia, Sir, what a difference there has been in the situation between last year and this year- What a difference there has been in the attitude of the contact group in their activity, in their approach, in their views? Now all this has come about. I still don't 'say that there are no countries outside the non-aligned movement and that they do not have a unity of their own. When it comes to crunch yes. there is unity. But the point is that there are cracks and all this is for the good of humanity, for world peace because, again the movement of non-alignment is not a third bloc. People used to refer to it as a third bloc, but it is not a third bloc. It has its own differences within, but on certain global matters it has a cohesion which it has been able to maintain for the last twenty years. So, this is how India has been playing her role within the movement and making the movement also play a role which is becoming increasingly important with every passing day.

Sir, I now come to our neighbours. I have dwelt on this topic in detail in this House and the other House more than once but on this occasion, Sir, since we did not come across any strong criticism I would only refer Nepal's idea of the zone of peace which was raised by Mr. Shahabuddin. Sir. I have been to Nepal only recently. I was there for three or four days. I had detailed talks with the Prime Minister of Nepal who also is in charge of Foreign Affairs, the King of Nepal and also with some officials, and some non-officials as well. Sir, I would not like to anticipate anything at this juncture but I made a very sincere effort to understand the implications of this proposal which has been adumbrated by Nepal. I shall continue to try to understand this. I have not said anything in rejection of the proposal because I just cannot reject anything which I do not understand; nor can 1 accept it. So, so far as this particular proposal is concerned, the position is that we are trying to understand the implications of it. We have not come to a stage when we could make a pub-lie statement one way or the other.

And I said this to the Press in Kath-mandu, while leaving Kathmandu. They understood my position; they understood Inia's position. It is always good to understand things, work out the implications before we rush into something which might turn out to be different from what we thought it was. That is why I would like to say with a full sense of responsibility that what they have proposed we are examining not without reference to them; in consultation with them, we will continue to do so, and at the appropriate time certainly Parliament will know, the country will know, the whole world will know about the decision.

Again, in relation to Nepal—and perhaps in relation to all our neighbours —one salient feature of our policy has been—and rightly so—the concept of mutuality. That is why, while speaking to a prestigious institution in Nepal, their Council for World Affairs. I told them that India and Nepal have had a glorious past characterised by a commonality; while keeping that intact, let us now work consciously towards an equally glorious future characterised by mutuality. Now these two concepts we would like to combine in our relations with our neighbours. With each and every neighbour we have a commonality, whether with Pakistan or Nepal or Bhutan or Bangladesh or with Sri Lanka; that goes without saying. It is there; it is a historical link; nobody can wish it away. But this alone is not enough for friendly relations between sovereign States, between nation States, as we have become. So this relationship has to be fostered not only on the basis of commonality but also on the basis of mutuality. If we do something, both countries should get the (benefit; it cannot be a one-way traffic So that is what I have proposed to one neighbour; I am proposing it to all neighbours; and this is an impeccable position and I am, sure that the response from all our neighbours will be equally good.

Now, Sir, I come to the last question about the Indo-pak relations in general. Much has been said by hon. Members. I do *not* have to go into all those points: in regard to armaments, why they were taken, why they were given, what are the implications to us and to the region. All these questions have been very well gone into and analysed by other Members and I am grateful *to* them that I do not have to repeat all that has been said. I only confine myself to the 'No War Pact' offer. Sir, I have made a statement in this House and in the other House. I find that some hon. Members have criticised me on grounds which are not very complimentary. They seem to say: O.K.; Pakistan has given this offer as a propaganda stunt, as a PR exercise, as a ploy. In this very debate all these words were used in regard to the Pakistan's offer. I am being asked, "Why do you not also do a P. R. exercise? They will cancel each other out, and there the matter will end if at all." . Now, Sir, with very great respect to the hon. Members I would like to say that I am not prepared to take this offer of Pakistan as a P.R. exercise. I am not prepared to take it as a ploy. As a responsible Government, I have to take it as a responsible offer from a responsible Government. That bring the premise, I cannot react in a light hearted manner. I know what advantage Pakistan has over India in regard to propaganda everywhere; I am not unaware of that. But that is no reason why I should emulate this on the basis that this is only a ploy or only a propogan-da. No. I am to take their offer seriously which I have done.

I find some difficulty in regard to this offer, which no hon. Member has tried to remove. I must even complain that this has not been done. I am not sure whether we are talking the same language. This is all I want to know. We made an offer some 30 years ago. It is not childish to ask. We made it seriously 30 years ago. Today they are making an offer. Is it the same? Have the Members satis-

[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao] fled themselves before speaking here that it is the same? I would like to repeat this question to each Member who has expressed an opinion on this.

Sir, while an offer is being made on one side, something is being said on the other which takes away the offer, knocks out the bottom of the offer, the basis of the offer. How then do I know this is the same things? Had I concluded that is the same thing, some Members would have risen here in their seats and said that I have been taken for a ride. While there is a statement contradicting the offer, how can I take it as serious?

Sir, still I have not rejected it. I would like to say this again and again that my response, has not been negative. It is positive on a particular basis. What is that basis? The basis is that today Pakistan has accepted the offer we had made 31 years ago. In This there is an implication in regard to what all has been said during the 31 years from the other side. This is as simple as that. But to say that I have mishandled it or that I have not responded properly Or positively, I would like to submit, is uncharitable and is not borne out by my statement.

Therefore, I am actually in a stage of analysing, trying to understand, whether our offer which was made 31 years ago has been accepted, while making the recent offer. If that is so it does not matter whether it is our offer or their offer. That is why I have taken a cautious stand, a positive stand, on the basis on which such a stand can be taken by India. Now, we would like to know whether the basis on which we have taken this stand is the right basis from their point of view, is the same basis which they have in view. If the answer is yes, our answer is yes, within the bilateral framework of the Simla Agreement. So, Sir, this is the implication of this offer and the statement made by me. I would like hon. Members to appreciate it. I would like them to think about it and tell me how it is the same. Or, if something authoritative comes, something official comes, naturally one step further would be taken. So I would like to disabuse the minds of hon. Members and to submit to them respectfully that my statement and the Government's response can in no way be construed as negative. It is positive on a given basis.

Sir, I think I have come to the end of the points which I had noted down. Many other points have been raised, particularly with regard to Sri Lanka, where a point of foreign affairs became a point of internal affairs. As hon. Members know, the agreement between the two Governments has come to an end last month, but the problem has not fully been settled. We still have a portion of the problem on our hands, but I would like hon. Members to appreciate that perhaps it is a very rare occasion on which two countries have entered into an agreement and within a time stipulated, actually got so many lakhs of people repatriated, rehabilitated and resettled. This is a very positive achievement. We cannot and we should not underestimate the importance of that achievement. That it has been incomplete is for various reasons. We will have to go into those reasons. But the fact remains that we have been able to do this much. I am not aware of any other case in which between two countries an achievement of this kind, of this magnitude has been made. So there is nothing to feel disappointed about. If anything, we have to go ahead with determination. We are sorry for the incidents that took place, but they have nothing to do with this. That is a matter about which we are in touch with the Government of Sri Lanka. I have mads a statement here and in the other House so far as this particular matter is concerned. I think that it is well on the way to a solution. The solution has been partial

so far; the achievement has been partial so far. Within the time stipulated we could not do it. Now we have nothing to base our further action on. Still both the Governments are there; our goodwill is there; the problem is there; our determination to solve the problem is there. So in view of all this, I think that we will succeed. That is all I would like to say.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: With your permission, just one clarification. On the question of Poland, it would reassure all of us immensely if you or your Ministry or the Government were to tell us that you will not let a Czechoslovakia or a Hungary be repeated.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I do not know what kind of postdated cheques you are asking for. This is an evolving situation. Something happened yesterday. I made a statement today. That is all that we can do. In fact, there was some comment that I did not make it soon enough. We don't make statements merely *on* the basis of newspapers reports, I have nothing against newspapers. I have said that several times. I have been a newspaperman myself. But the point is that a Government will not come out with a official statement only based on newspaper reports. The Polish Ambassador came and explained to me the position yesterday. I have made the statement today. Sir, in the end I would like to appeal to the House to accept the amendment moved by Mrs. Najma Heptulla, which is for lending support to the policy.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BISHAMBHAR NATH PANDE): I shall now put the amendment moved by Shri M. Kalyanasundaram to vote.

The question is—

1. "That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be added, namely: —

and having considered the same this House—,

(a) while appreciating that India is keen to normalise relations with the neighbouring countries, deplores the decision or US to supply most uptodate weapons, to Pakistan and China, which are dangerous to the cause of peace in the region;

(b) notes with regret the obstructive attitude pursued by US against holding a conference for declaring Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace in accordance with the resolution of UN General Assembly;

(c) expresses its grave concern over the US Nuclear strategy and arms race, as a source of serious threat to the cause of world peace and peaceful development of developing countries;

(d) welcomes the appeal adopted on 23-6-81 by the Supreme Soviet of the USSR against arms race, for negotiations on disarmament and to avert the risk of nuclear war, which is in conformity with India's approach to the cause of world peace and the policy of peaceful co-existence;

(e) calls upon the Government to pursue more vigorously the time-tested policy of non-alignment and to strengthen India's relations with the forces opposed to imperialism and war;

(f) expresses its concern for the overseas Indians harassed by forces of racism in countries like the U.K.. Sri Lanka etc. and urges upon Government to take necessary steps for the protection of the legitimate rights."

The motion was negatived.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BISHAMBHAR NATH PANDE),: I shall now put the amendment moved by Dr. (Mrs.) Najma Heptulla.

[The Vice-Chairman] The question is—

2. "That at the *end* of the Motion the following be *added,* namely: —

"and having considered the same this House approves of the said policy."

The motion was adopted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BISHAMBHAR NATH PANDE): Now I shall put to vote the Motion moved by the honourable Minister as amended. The question is—

"That the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto be taken into consideration, and having considered the same, this House apporves of the said policy."

The motion was adopted.

ALLOCATION OF TIME FOR DISPOSAL OF GOVERNMENT AND OTHER BUSINESS.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BIHAMBHAR NATH PANDE): I have to inform Members that the Business Advisory Committee at its meeting held today the 17th December, 1981 allotted time for Government Legislative and other Business as follows;

Business	Time allotted
1. Consideration and return of the following Bills as passed by the Lok Sabha:—	
(a) The Appropriation— (Railways) No. 6 Bill, 1981	3 hours
(b). The Appropriation — (Railways) No. 7 Bill, 1981	
(c) The Appropriation — (No. 6) Bill, 1981	4 hours
(d) The Appropriation — (No. 7) Bill, 1981	
(e) The Kerala Appropriation (No. 4) Bill, 1981—	—2 hours
2. Discussion on the Resolution seeking approval for the continuance of the Proclamation issued by the President in relation to the State of Assam and consideration and return of the Assam Appropriation (No. 2) Bill. 10,81, as passed by the Lok Sabha . . .4 hours	
3. Consideration and adoption of the 2nd and 3rd Reports of the Committee on Rules	1 hour

ARREST AND CONVICTION OF SARDAR JAGDEV SINGH TALWANDI MEMBER, RAJYA SABHA

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BISHAMBHAR NATH PANDE): I have to inform Members that the honourable Chairman has received the following communications dated the 17th December, 1981 regarding the arrest and conviction of Sardar Jagdev Singh Talwandi, Member, Rajya Sabha: —

Communication from the Deputy Commissioner of Police, New Delhi District, New Delhi

"I have the honour to infrom you that I have found it my duty in the exercise of my powers that Jathedar Jagdev Singh Talwandi, honourable Member of Rajya Sabha, who along with his 37 other party workers voluntarily violated prohibitory orders promulgated u/s 144 Cr. P. C. on Pandit Pant Marg near Gate of Gurud-