

**Demands for Grants for 1987-88 in respect of Ministry of Information and Broadcasting  
voted by Lok Sabha**

No. of Demand	Name of Demand	Amount of Demand for Grant on account voted by the House on 13th March, 1987		Amount of Demand for Grant voted by the House	
		Revenue Rs.	Capital Rs.	Revenue Rs.	Capital Rs.
1	2	3	4	5	6
<b>Ministry of Information and Broadcasting</b>					
52.	Ministry of Information and Broadcasting	9,59,00,000	48,00,000	47,92,00,000	2,43,00,000
53.	Broadcasting Services	62,17,00,000	55,66,00,000	3,10,85,00,000	2,78,29,00,000

**DEMANDS FOR GRANTS, 1987-88—**

*Contd.*

**Ministry of External Affairs**

[English]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : The House will now take up discussion and voting on Demand No. 21 relating to the Ministry of External Affairs for which six hours have been allotted.

Motion moved :

“That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts on Revenue Account and Capital Account shown in the fourth column of the Order Paper be granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1988, in respect of the heads of demands entered in the second column thereof against Demand No. 21 relating to the Ministry of External Affairs.”

**Demand for Grant for 1987-88 in respect of Ministry of External Affairs submitted to the vote of Lok Sabha**

No. of Demand	Name of Demand	Amount of Demand for Grant on account voted by the House on 13th March, 1987		Amount of Demand for Grant submitted to the vote of the House	
		Revenue Rs.	Capital Rs.	Revenue Rs.	Capital Rs.
1	2	3	4	5	6
21.	Ministry of External Affairs	56,69,00,000	33,34,00,000	2,68,67,00,000	41,71,00,000

**SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY (Kurnool) :** Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the Hon'ble Minister for External Affairs appears to have come from Harare only today. Yesterday, in the Doordarshan I saw the Minister of State for Foreign Affairs meeting the Defence Secretary, Mr. Wienberger, in Washington.

**THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI) :** I had been to Harare. I returned four days back.

**SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY :** We did not see you yesterday and day before yesterday. At any rate, we saw our State Minister in Doordarshan yesterday meeting the Defence Secretary in USA. There is a rumour, Sir—I don't know whether it is true or not—that our Defence Minister has been to China. The Annual Report given by the External Affairs Ministry does not contain upto-date information or the latest information. We naturally expected some additional information or some statements on the latest position especially with regard to what happened at the meeting of the Group of 77.

The Annual Report is a ritual, but I have to make some suggestions with regard to the information that has to be furnished to the Members of the House. Important information is not given, but a mere catalogue of visits of foreign dignitaries is mentioned. There are agreements and declarations made when important dignitaries come; there are consultations and all that. It would be better if the gist of the agreements and declarations are also given to us so that we can assess how far these agreements are beneficial to our national interest, whether it is a one-sided affair or it is mutually beneficial. It would be better if gist of these declarations and agreements are given to us.

We are dealing with the globe. Giving us information with regard to South-East Asia, American countries, Europe and all other places, it would be better if you give the geographical maps also, because we are not expected to be that experts in geography. It would help us to understand these things. However, well-versed a person may be, sometimes we will be making mistakes. Especially, the names of some nations are

so similar that we will be mistaking one for the other, and we may be committing Faun Paus in our debate. While giving us Annual Reports, you may please give us geographical pictures also, when you deal with America, Latin America, South-East Asia and other countries.

With regard to the information which you are giving to us on the various other aspects, I would request you to see Chapter XIII relating to Indian overseas. The information given is not at all precious. It is an information which even a sixth class student knows. It is not an information which is worth of being given to Members of Parliament. We are very much interested in the Indian overseas. How many of them are in which countries? Where is the concentration of the Indian overseas? In which part of the country are they living and how many of them are engineers, technicians, scientists and all that? But the information given to us is only an information which only sixth class students would be able to appreciate.

With these preliminary suggestions, I would go on to the subject.

14.14 hrs.

[SHRI ZAINUL BASHER *in the Chair*]

From a practical point of view, the success or failure of our foreign policy has to be assessed on two important criteria. The first criteria is how far our foreign policy has improved the security environment of the nation, how far it has lessened the burden of defence expenditure and budget by resolving border disputes and tension and improved the nation's sense of well being. The second important criterion is to what extent we have increased our international trade and commerce having direct impact on our economic development.

It is true that we are committed to the ideals of international peace, total disarmament, and elimination of terror of nuclear war. It is true that we are committed to the freedom of man throughout the globe from exploitation for the redemption of the oppressed from colonialism, neo-colonialism and underdevelopment. It is also true that we are committed to non-alignment and for

ending economic exploitation of the under-developed and developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. It is also true that we are staunchly committed to end racial superiority and upholding of human rights, equality, liberty and democracy. This is what we have inherited from our freedom struggle. We do cherish these ideals; we stand by them. But, Sir, without in any way deviating from our commitment, we have to exhibit resilience, flexibility and manoeuvrability to secure to the nation the first two objectives which I have stated.

On the first criterion of national security environment according to the Annual Report given on Defence, admittedly there has been significant deterioration in the national security environment. The burden of defence budget has become heavier this year.

The new dimension which is of a very grave nature is the Chinese invasion, intrusion or invasion, we do not know what it is called, and occupation of about 120 square Kms in the Sumdorong Chu Valley of Arunachal Pradesh. It is described as an intrusion, but for all practical purposes it is an occupation and expropriation of Indian territory.

On August 5, 1986, Shri K.R. Narayanan, Minister for State, informed the Rajya Sabha that the Chinese troops have built up a helipad in the Sumdorong Chu Valley. Subsequently it was also known that the Chinese troops were also building huts for encamping in the area. On 18.9.1986, the External Affairs Minister, Shri Shiv Shankar had the discussion with the Chinese Foreign Affairs Minister in New York in respect of this intrusion. On a question that the Chinese had started collecting taxes in the Sumdorong Chu Valley, Shri Shiv Shankar informed the Consultative Committee on 4.10.1986 that the people of the area had refused to pay the taxes demanded by the Chinese. This answer has great implication and significance. That means that Chinese have got that area and are trying to assert their sovereignty. They have already started tax collection. What the Minister has denied is that the people are refusing to pay taxes. He has not denied that the Chinese are asserting their sovereignty and are collecting revenues.

On the 8th or 9th December, 1986; Parliament passed a Bill conferring Statehood on Arunachal Pradesh. This Act of Parliament provoked China to make a Statement. They reacted very ferociously, if I may say so, to the Act of Parliament. Sir, the statement was issued on 12th December, 1986 and I quote a few sentences from that. "The above mentioned Bill approved by the Indian Parliament is absolutely illegal and that Chinese will never recognise this so-called Arunachal Pradesh established in the most disputed sector of China-India boundary. The Mc Mahon line of 1915 is illegal and that has never been recognised by the Chinese Government. The so-called Arunachal Pradesh is basically an Indian occupied area of the Chinese territory lying between the traditional customary lines and the illegal Mc Mahon line. It is entirely futile for the Indian authorities to try to legalise its occupation of Chinese territory through domestic legislation and the consequences arising there from will be very serious. I repeat. It is said that the consequences arising therefrom will be serious. The language of the statement runs counter to the spirit in which several rounds of talks and negotiations that have been going on. Yesterday also, I saw on the television that Shri Nambodripad was discussing with this dignitary from China—I do not know whether he is the Premier or Vice-Premier of China and neither do I know the name of the dignitary—and he was saying that the boundary dispute could be settled by negotiations! Anyway, I will come to this aspect later on.

In the Annual Report all that is stated is that India has conveyed its deep concern over the Chinese intrusion to the acting Chinese Premier and Foreign Minister during the Seventh round of talks. The seventh round of official level talks were held from 21st to 23rd July 1986. Thereafter nothing tangible appears to have happened though Mr. Jiang Guang Hua, the Deputy Head of the I.L.D. of the Chinese Party led a five-member delegation to visit India from 9th to 31st December 1986 at the invitation of the C.P.I. (M). We have not been informed so far as to what has happened to the so called intrusion. This House must be informed very clearly whether the Sumdorong Chu Valley in Arunachal Pradesh is or

[Shri E. Ayyapu Reddy]

is not under the Chinese occupation. Even now, if you tell us the position, we will be happy. Unfortunately, this issue has been glossed over in the Annual Report. The very fact that the Chinese built a helipad where helicopters have landed and where structures have also come, makes their intention very clear. Added to this, recently there was a news item in which it is stated even more clearly that the Sumdurong Valley has always been a part and parcel of China. Therefore, it may not be incorrect to say that during this year India has lost Sumdurong Chu Valley in Arunachal Pradesh from out of its control and possession to China.

Sir, I need not repeat the past history here. I hope the House remembers very well as to what happened during the period 1959 to 1962. While the slogans 'Hindi-Chini Bhai Bhai' were being raised all over the country, the Chinese had come and occupied the Aksai Chin Plateau in Ladakh region. Now also, the *modus operandi* appears to be the same. While negotiations have been going on one side, the occupation of the valley by Chinese took place, on the other.

Subsequently, on the 16th of this month, the *Times of India* published a news item on its front page under the heading 'Chinese build-up on border'. We did not attempt to draw the attention of the Speaker to this and we pleaded that this must be discussed because it is a very important matter. I do not want to read the entire news item, but permit me to quote the concluding portion of this item, which is of a recent occurrence. I quote :

"Reports from a variety of sources, Tibetan diplomatic and Indian and Western Intelligence, indicate China will attack in summer. This will not be a repeat of 1962, which was a multi-corps offensive all along the front. Rather, the Chinese are expected to administer a series of pinpricks and perhaps to advance for some distance down three or four valleys into India."

Added to this, we have got another dimension, this time more sinister than what happened in 1962, i.e. the concerted collu-

sion between Pakistan and China. Now what is important is—it is admitted even in the Defence Report—that Pakistan and China have upgraded their co-operation in the production of military hardware and Chinese military aircrafts are to be fitted with U.S. engines and Avionic and supplied to Pakistan. The U.S. supplied Helicopters are already making sorties to the Sumdurong Chu Valley by China for the transport of men and supply.

Pakistan's defence experts and columnists are predicting Indo-Pakistan War and that this time China will be starting its own front against India simultaneously. In the words of Air Chief Marshall, Jamal, Chief of Pakistan Air Force, "A unique history binds our two countries Pakistan and China in a comradeship of arms." It must be remembered that Pakistan seceded a portion of our territory even without permission to China and paved way for the construction of highway from Karakoram to occupied Kashmir. All this has been taking place, but we have been exhibiting, as somebody stated "masterly inaction". The message is absolutely clear that an anti-Indian Sino-Pakistan alliance sponsored and sustained and manipulated by the U.S.A. remains very much the most important concern for India's defence and foreign policy. In short, China is poised to tighten screws on India to see, to toe the Chinese lines in respect of its own boundaries. I do not want to go into the question as to how Chinese, in spite of its opposition to so-called capitalism or all those things, developed very close ties with U.S.A. I was one of those people—as a student—who had fully supported the red star over China. We expected the Chinese revolution to revolutionise the entire world. Marx said, Russia, China and India combined together would bring Heaven on Earth. We really expect China to play a positive role, but we are really surprised that China has attacked Vietnam, waged war against us, China has been colluding with Pakistan; China again picked up troubles with Russia in 1969 and had a terrific war in that year. We do not know what role it is playing with regard to opposing apartheid or with regard to supporting the cause of the oppressed and against the colonial regimes. We do not know. But we cannot make any comment upon that.

So far as Pakistan is concerned, we have already known that it is getting sophisticated weaponry including AWACS. It is becoming nuclear. The nuclear scientist in-charge of the nuclear programme has clearly mentioned the motives which propelled him making Pakistan nuclear. Of course, they do not seem to have forgotten the slogan of "Thousand Years War" raised by Bhutto in the U.N. Of course, even today, fortunately or unfortunately for us, for the first time the foreign policy of Pakistan appears to have been discussed in their Assembly—or Parliament, and characterized by a Pakistan Member as a militarized foreign policy, which is formulated by the Military. Therefore, we are happy that such a criticism has come from the Pakistanis themselves; and it is also stated that as far as their policy towards India is concerned, Gen. Zia has been exhibiting *ad horism*. Therefore, what type of stand our good neighbour, member of NAM and of SAARC, *viz.* Pakistan is going to take, is very difficult for us to say. On this point of Chinese invasion of our northern borders, it is necessary to refer to the visit in November 1986 by General Secretary Gorbachev came here. We congratulate Mr. Gorbachev, we heartily congratulate him for the new diplomatic initiative and offensive he has launched, for ushering in peace on this globe, and for banishing nuclear weapons. He has taken several initiatives all round—towards Japans, towards China, towards Pakistan and in respect of Afghanistan, USA and Europe. He has taken them by surprise. We hope his efforts will bear fruit, and that USA will react favourably—though they failed to react favourably at the Iceland Summit.

But inspite of all these, unfortunately for us in India, his peace efforts are twisted by our neighbours, for the purpose of committing aggression against us. In November 1986, when this Delhi Declaration was drafted, at the joint Press conference, Mr. Gorbachev was particularly asked: 'If China attacks India, what will be the stand of Russia?' I will quote his statement. This is what he has stated:

"I think that if we have an improvement in the overall relationships in the Asian region, particularly amongst great Powers and great nations—and I mean China, India and Soviet Union—

that will create a very different situation, and I am also sure your forecast will not come true. No one will have to take sides."

This is what he stated. That means he expressed a fond hope that the relationship between China, India and Russia will improve, and that will have a great effect. This was in November, and the provocative statement of the Chinese was made in December. They must have understood that the Russian stand will indicate that they will never interfere. They are on a peace mission, on a Gandhian mission. Therefore, they may have thought it appropriate to go back and recover all the regions or areas which were once in the Ming dynasty.

This is the position in the west, and in the north. On the east also, the position is not very encouraging. There has been an invasion, a different type of invasion—about 50,000 Chakma tribals have come from the Chittagong hills to the Tripura area. They have to be sent back. We are bearing the brunt of it; and the outstanding issues are under discussion with Bangladesh *viz.* on boundary demarcation and water dispute. All these have not yet been sorted out.

So far as South is concerned, Sri Lankan issue has gone from bad to worse. It has exposed that India's mediatory efforts are not appreciated either by Sri Lanka or by any country. But what is more than that that there has been a diabolic attempt to expose that India counts nothing, so far as Asia is concerned. Sri Lankan issue has been bungled right from the very beginning. We were taken for a ride. We thought that Sri Lanka in right earnest would try to settle the ethnic problem. We did not take any condition precedent for mediation in that matter. We ought to have made a condition precedent for our mediation that either side should not make use of the violence or resort to violence. But without taking any such precaution, we have burnt our fingers and today what is the position? So, the security environment with all our neighbours is not comforting; it is not consoling; certainly it is bewildering. This is the position so far as the first criterion is concerned. I can say that we have not exhibited enough resilience and manoeuvrability and cleverness. We are hugging to our own illusion,

[Sbri E. Ayyapu Reddy]

We have placed all our cards on the table so that our neighbours are able to see our cards and are able to manoeuvre and adjust themselves, because they have got their options open; we have foreclosed our option. We are boys on the burning deck, wedded to our principle and we have been out manoeuvred by our two immediate neighbours : one from the north and another from the west.

On the second criterion of improving international trade and all that, there has been some improvement but not much of improvement. Our efforts to strengthen the NAM have not resulted in tangible results. As far as SARC is concerned, of course, it is good; we all welcome it, but it must yield tangible results; unless it yields tangible results, it will not be of any use or any consolation to the people of India. If NAM has to be successful and effective, members of the NAM must evolve a machinery whereby their bilateral issues are settled, adjudicated or adjusted or arbitrated. So long as members of the NAM are not able to settle their bilateral issues, NAM will be not an effective instrument for keeping the world peace.

The South-South dialogues and the cooperation of the southern nations in order to prevent the exploitation of the developing countries by the developed countries must be pursued more vigorously. We all know that agricultural products and mineral wealth of the under-developing countries is going to the highly developed countries and then it is coming back in the shape of finished product. The growth of Japan as an industrial giant and the recent trade war between Japan and America shows that America will meet its Waterloo at the hands of Japan which is bound to change its attitude towards India and the other Asian countries as it is facing keenest competition from Japan. Now this factor has to be taken in consideration in our foreign policy formulations in future. Thank you.

SHRI BIPIN PAL DAS (Tezpur) : Mr. Chairman, while supporting the Demands for Grants of this Ministry, I would like to make a few observations. The world today is passing through very difficult times. There are four factors which are threatening world peace today and every moment.

One is the mad rush for arms, armaments and the trend towards nuclear proliferation both horizontal and vertical.

The cancer of apartheid is still there, racial discrimination is still there. In spite of tremendous public opinion created in the world this cancer continues. Namibia is yet to be liberated and South Africa merrily carries on its policy of apartheid and racial discrimination.

Thirdly, no solution is yet in sight to narrow the gap of disparity between the developed one-third and the developing two-thirds of the world.

And fourthly, de-stabilising forces throughout the world not only in our environment, in our area, throughout the world are posing a threat to world peace.

Until there is a complete disarmament both nuclear and conventional, human race cannot feel secure.

I welcome the initiatives taken by Mr. Gorbachov with the object of arriving at some agreement or settlement with the U.S.A. for disarmament. His proposals are very positive, in my opinion, and I only hope and wish that there will be some positive response from the U.S.A. to such proposals. At least there should be a meaningful beginning to start the process of disarmament.

Apartheid and racial discrimination must be stamped out from the face of the globe. Although the situation does not hold any promise immediately, I have complete faith in the ultimate triumph of the struggle of the people for complete freedom and for elimination of apartheid. The crusade for economic sanctions against South Africa must continue with greater vigour. I welcome the institution of a Fund called the Africa Fund which will go a long way to help the Frontline States in Africa. I particularly take this opportunity to congratulate the Prime Minister for his success in the Commonwealth Conference in carrying with him countries like Australia and Canada to vote for sanctions and thereby isolating U.K. completely. It is a great achievement.

The struggle for a new economic world order is bound to be a long drawn process. In my opinion, the only practical way to make progress in this direction is to take energetic steps for South-South cooperation with faith and confidence. I said this in the other House seven years ago. I repeat this. When there is too much talk about North-South dialogue which does not make a move forward, I think the only way out is South-South dialogue, South-South co-operation which alone will compell the North to come to the negotiating table with the South. There is no other way. We shall continue, the North-South dialogue if possible at all, if feasible at all, if fruitful at all, but then we should emphasise upon, and India particularly is in a very convenient position internationally speaking to start and initiate and give a push and drive, in this matter of South-South dialogue. We welcome—I welcome—the formation of an Economic Commission under the Chairmanship of Mr. Julius Nyerere which also, I hope, would contribute, towards South-South cooperation.

I congratulate the Government and particularly the Prime Minister for taking several initiatives in several directions in the world of today. On the issue of disarmament the Prime Minister has taken bold and persuasive steps. On apartheid India's stand is well known and emphatic ever since Mahatma Gandhi's days. It was Mahatma Gandhi who was the first man in the world to raise the banner of revolt against racial discrimination on the soil of South Africa. We should be proud of that and we should be proud that his policy is being pursued even today vigorously.

India is, as I said, in a very advantageous position—I want the Foreign Minister to take note of it—to take the lead and give a further push and drive in the matter of South-South Cooperation. In this field I notice that the Prime Minister is trying to give it a further push and momentum also. So on the issue of disarmament, apartheid, new economic order, the non-aligned movement, the Prime Minister and his Government's initiative deserve full support and applause of the entire nation. It is really remarkable that Shri Rajiv Gandhi within a short period of

2 years has come to be reckoned and acknowledged as one of the world leaders today. It is remarkable. Never it has happened in any country before, not even in our country. Within a span of two years he rose to that height. And by doing that the Prime Minister is raising the stature of the country as a whole.

In foreign policy our first priority is our region—South Asia region. Seven countries are there. Formerly Afghanistan used to be included. Now it is not. And this must be our first priority. In this region we have no problem with Bhutan and Maldives. Our relations with Bangladesh and Nepal are improving, in spite of what my friend has said just a few minutes ago. We have not allowed our relations with Sri Lanka to be strained in spite of the Tamil problem in that country. We do not want our relations to be strained because of this problem. We are extending our helping hand to Sri Lanka to solve this problem. Our effort is to bring the two sides to the negotiating table to find a political settlement of the Tamil problem. I am definitely of the opinion that there is no military solution to the Tamil problem in Sri Lanka. The solution must be political. Both sides must come together and the basis is December 19 proposals. And that, I think, is the direction in which our Government is moving to bring both sides together on the negotiating table on the basis of the December 19 proposals. I am sure, once the Government succeeds in doing that, the solution will be found.

The formation of SAARC is a move in the right direction—I should say a major move in the right direction. About 10 years ago I said: "If they can form an European Economic Community there, why not we think in terms of South Asian Economic Community here?" But SAARC is a beginning in the right direction. Our Prime Minister has played a very key role in bringing this about. With the coming into existence of this organisation with Secretariat stationed at Kathmandu I hope that the SAARC will be able to sort out all our mutual problems and take this region forward on the path of peace and development through mutual cooperation and friendship.

[Shri Bipin Pal Das]

Our only problem in this region is with Pakistan. In spite of our serious and sincere efforts to bridge friendship with Pakistan we cannot say that substantial progress has been made. The main reason is mounting build up of armaments by Pakistan and continued American assistance to them in this regard. We may have made some progress in some other fields like trade and so on but if Pakistan goes on building up its armaments and arsenals with massive American assistance, the real friendship with Pakistan will be difficult to achieve. USA first argued that they were arming Pakistan against the possibility of some trouble being created by Afghanistan and now the Government of USA says that even if the Soviet troops are withdrawn from Afghanistan, they will continue to arm Pakistan against Soviet Union. May I ask this question to the leaders of Pakistan, what is the proof that Soviet Union has become a threat to Pakistan and at what points of time did Soviet Union create difficulty for Pakistan? On the contrary, we have historical evidence that whenever America supplied arms to Pakistan, they did not do anything to anybody else but to attack India. This is what they did. In last November I was in Washington. I met Mr. Robert Pack, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State of the U.S. Government and I pleaded with him for one hour that for God's sake don't do it, restrain them, otherwise they are creating problems for us. Not only they are posing threats of aggression but are also training our terrorists across border. Well, he said so many things, goody-goody, meaningless things. I shall not go into that. So, this USA argument does not hold any water that they are arming Pakistan against Soviet Union, whereas if Soviet Union wants, Pakistan can be blown off in one day. I know Soviet Union will not do that. Is Pakistan a real barrier, a real strong military post against Soviet Union? Whom is the USA going to befool? We cannot be befooled. The past stories tell us that Pakistan's aim and objective is to destabilise India by hook or by crook, either by direct aggression or by training the terrorists or by creating communal riots or by some other means. So, that is the truth. I am sorry to say this.

Pakistan has been armed to the teeth against the interests of India and nobody else. Every time USA supplies sophisticated arms to Pakistan, what did Pakistan do, I have already said. They are now on the verge of producing the atom bomb. I do not know how far they have made progress. I base my argument on the basis of what that scientist has said and what others have said. In spite of USA's declared policy against proliferation, now they are talking of waiving even the Symington Amendment in order to continue arms supply to Pakistan. That means even if Pakistan goes nuclear, that does not matter. They are saying throw the Symington Amendment to the winds and continue supply of arms. This is what they are talking, they are discussing. They have exposed themselves completely. This is a clear attempt at destabilisation in our region and particularly against India.

In the face of all this, I will add something about China. I did not want to mention about China but he has mentioned it. I know what happened in 1962. I was a direct eye-witness of the whole development till the mid-night of 20th of November 1962 when Chinese declared ceasefire ultimately. I know that. I know about China. I had also said earlier that taking the overall picture, our environment, in the ultimate analysis, our main rival is China. Please take note of this. In the ultimate analysis they are our main rivals. How they will operate that rivalry is a different matter.

AN HON. MEMBER : Rivalry regarding what ?

SHRI BIPIN PAL DAS : If you give time, I will explain that. Now, Sir, we have also not forgotten that a nexus was built up between Washington, Islamabad and Peking and it still continues and it will continue. They may be becoming dormant today. But they may become active tomorrow. So, the Government and the Foreign Minister have to take note of these two facts. They are trying to create problems in our border. I hope our Government will be able to sort it out through diplomatic channels. But I strongly condemn the Chinese Statement questioning the right of the Parliament to grant statehood to Arunachal Pradesh. I strongly condemn. They have no right to



question us. Arunachal Pradesh is part and parcel of India and it will remain so. Sir, in the face of all this, we cannot relent and relax and we must keep the country and our armed forces in full preparedness. I also feel that it is perhaps time, Mr. Tiwari will please take a note of this. I also feel that I have never said this before. Today I am saying that it is perhaps time to review our nuclear policy and Government should have a second look at our nuclear policy. It is for us to think over it. The circumstances compel me to think on that line. We cannot afford to be caught napping. We must be prepared to meet any challenge from any quarter and in any eventuality. Pakistan must be told in firm and clear language that we have the capability to meet their nefarious designs. We have the capability and they must be told that if they want to play the game outside the rules; we also know how to play the game. Sir, the situation in Indian Ocean is also very disturbing. Even declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace has not materialised in practice though it was passed in 1971, because of the non-cooperation of the Western powers. While we should continue to make efforts to see that the United Nations declaration is realised in practice, we must strengthen our Navy to meet any challenge. I may say that of all the 3 forces, our Navy is the weakest. We cannot overlook what is happening in our zone. Therefore, our Navy must be further strengthened to meet any situation. I would also suggest that the SAARC concept may perhaps be extended to cover all littoral countries of the Indian Ocean. We should in particular develop much closer relationship with ASEAN countries along with Australia and New Zealand.

Now, I come to a very basic question. Some people feel that we are not treating the two super-powers on equal footing that our policy is tilted in favour of Soviet Union. The advocates of genuine non-alignment want us to be equidistant between the two super powers. Our policy is one of friendship with everybody, every country and we are making efforts to that end. But, Sir, please note that friendship is a two-way traffic. It cannot flow only in one direction. That is the key point to be noted when we talk of our relations with USSR or USA—friendship is a two-way traffic, it cannot flow in one direction,

15.00 hrs.

Sir, what are the facts? Let us see where these super powers stand on some vital issues with which we are deeply concerned. On Kashmir issue the Soviet Union was on our side, America was against us. On the issue of Goa the same thing happened. At the time of Bangladesh crisis, during the crisis we signed a friendship Treaty with the Soviet Union. And what America did? They sent the Seventh Fleet towards this country to threaten us into submission. I am speaking very briefly, Madam, that on these three vital issues in the last forty years, on Kashmir, on Goa and Bangladesh we found the Soviet Union to be on our side and we found America on the other side, against us—not only on the other side, but against us. How can we put them on the same footing? Take the case of economic development. Yes, we have trade relations, economic relations with USA. Good. But in the matter of laying down a strong foundation for India's industrialisation in this country, the Americans have done nothing for us whereas the Soviet Union has come forward to help us in all respects in laying down, I repeat, in laying down a strong foundation for industrialisation in the interest of self-reliance. I give only one example if there is any doubt anywhere. Take the case of Bokaro Plant. This story is important. When the Bokaro Plant was proposed by the Government, we first approached the Americans for help—technical help, financial help—and they immediately put down the condition that it must be in the private sector. Who are they to tell us whether we want to have it in the private sector or public sector? It is our sovereign responsibility and sovereign policy. We will decide where we will go, by the public sector or joint sector or whatever it is. Who are they to lay down the condition? We refused help. Only then we went to the Soviet Union and they came forward, and the Bokaro Plant is there. So, they are varieties of treating the Soviet Union and the United States of America on an equal footing should take note of all these facts. It is in our national interest that we maintain our close friendship with the Soviet Union, and I will go one step forward and say that Indo-Soviet friendship is one of the firm pillars of our foreign policy till now, and this must continue. That does not mean

[Shri Bipin Pal Das]

that we should not have friendship with the USA. We will certainly try our best, but we have seen what they are doing.

Now, apart from all this, Kashmir, Goa and Bangladesh, and economic development and so on, today just at this moment the U.S.A. is arming Pakistan to the teeth knowing full well from the past history that Pakistan is going to use those arms against India. They are arming Pakistan to the teeth. The Soviet Union is not doing that. To my knowledge and belief the Soviet Union has not done anything so far to harm our national interests. I would also say that the Soviet Union may be a super power, but they have never tried to interfere with our internal affairs—never, not once. Let anybody come forward and give the evidence that the Soviet Union is trying to influence the Government of India in this direction or that direction; nothing, they do not do that. They just lend their cooperation and they go ahead.

Sir, I want to relate to the House one important fact, a significant fact. In October 1971 Mrs. Indira Gandhi visited U.S.A. in order to request President Nixon to advise Pakistan to stop the atrocities in the then East Pakistan. What was our problem? Our problem was refugees, 10 million refugees. So, Indiraji told him, advise them to stop atrocities so that we can send back the refugees and relieve ourselves of the burden." The response was negative. He did not say anything and was unhelpful. Finally, Indiraji asked a pointed question to him, which is very revealing. She asked him, "Why are you always supporting Pakistan as against us?" This is what Indiraji asked Mr. Nixon. Do you know what Nixon said? "Because they listen to us and you do not." This I have learned from Indiraji herself. I am not saying from hearsay report. Therefore, Nixon was helping Pakistan because they listened to him and we did not. Mr. Nixon did not know of what stuff Indira Gandhi was made of. She taught a bitter lesson only two months later at Dhaka. That was the talk on which Indiraji was provoked, the tigress was provoked, the lioness was provoked. Nixon's remark was very insulting and humiliating. What he meant was, you listen to us, we will help you. That was the meaning of

Mr. Nixon's statement. What does Mr. Nixon or anybody like him think about us? Are we beggars? Do we bow down? They thought so. But India will never bend its head before anybody for any favour. Whatever we ask for, we ask in terms of equality, on the basis of our rights, not favour, not a grace from anybody. This, the Americans should try to understand and if they are able to understand, they will be able to review their own policy.

We are deeply committed to the policy of Non-alignment. We continue to judge every issue on merit and take our decisions independently. That is the essence of our policy. The security environment, as he said, around us is under clouds. I agree with him. The forces of destabilisation have become very very active of late, not only inside the country but also outside country against India. So, the need of the hour is to remain united and meet the challenges. Whatever may be our internal political differences inside the country, we must not do anything to weaken our unity and integrity, our democratic system, our independence and sovereignty and territorial integrity. Our Armed Forces are one of the best in the world. Let us not do anything to weaken their morale. Rather we must do everything possible to further strengthen them to defend our country's independence and sovereignty.

I will conclude by saying this. The success of a foreign policy ultimately depends upon two factors. Firstly, the country must be internally strong and united. That is the first pre-condition. Unless the country is united politically, economically strong, our foreign policy cannot be expected to achieve much success. Fortunately we have done much in the economic field. Fortunately, in spite of so many *hullah gullahs*, the people of India are standing solidly united. In spite of communalism and attacks on secularism, the people of India remain unfettered and unshaken. Something may happen in one corner of the country but that one corner of the country is not the whole country, the country as a whole. I do not want to go back into past history. Some of my friends on the other side may not like it. Of course, it is nothing against CPM friends. Those have left. The people of India made a mistake in 1977 elections

misguided by the mischievous propaganda by some people, by some forces.

**SHRI PIYUS TIRAKY :** You are speaking on foreign policy.

**SHRI BIPIN PAL DAS :** You did not do it. But the people also realised the mistake and corrected it in three years' time.

**SHRI PIYUS TIRAKY :** They made mistake and realised.

**SHRI BIPIN PAL DAS :** Firstly, the country must be strong and united. Secondly, through you Sir, I address Mr. Tewary, that we should be as much self-reliant as possible in the matter of defence equipment.

I hope the hon. Minister will give out the figures, up to what percentage we are self-reliant by now but we should be as much self-reliant as possible in the matter of defence equipment so that we can hold our head high and can pursue our policy regardless of what others might or might not do.

Thank you very much.

15.12 hrs

[SHRIMATI BASAVARAJESWARI  
in the Chair]

[Translation]

**SHRI ZAINUL BASHER (Ghaziपुर) :** Madam Chairman, I raise to support the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of External Affairs. It gives me much pleasure to say that the work of this Department has been entrusted to Shri Narain Dutt Tewari. In whichever department Shri Tewari has been sent, he has left impression of his unique talent and efficiency. I am fully hopeful that under his efficient management, this Department will achieve unprecedented success in meeting the forthcoming challenges.

Madam Chairman, we establish our relations with the entire world through the Ministry of External Affairs. It will be difficult for me to express my views on all aspects and all areas of this Department within this short time. Therefore, I shall

try to confine myself to relations with the neighbouring countries of India. We have a special type of relation with all of them. Excepting China, all other neighbouring countries were at some point of time or the other, a part of India, though they have now been separated from us for political or historical reasons. Before establishing relations with them, we have find out what is happening in those countries, what situation is prevailing in them and what are their political activities because these influence us? For example, when the Tamils were tortured in Srilanka, about one and half lakh Tamils took refuge in India. Similarly, lakhs of refugees came to our country from Bangladesh and large number of refugees had also come to this country from erst-while East Pakistan. Keeping in view the situation prevailing in Pakistan and riots taking place in Karachi and the way the refugees are being oppressed and the way people there are killing those who migrated from India, I fear that in the near future there will also be a flow of refugees from Pakistan to our country.

Such a peculiar situation is prevailing in our neighbourings. countries. India is a democratic country. India is a country where people of all castes, creeds and religions live together and we try to administer this country in a democratic way. There is no democracy in our neighbouring countries. Some neighbouring countries pose that theirs is a democratic system, but in real sense, there is no democracy, because there are no democratic values there. Whether it is Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, Nepal or China, everywhere this situation prevails. Our colleagues may start questioning me on this point but according to the norms of democracy we know, even China cannot be called a democratic country. Therefore, in such a situation we are up against even more difficulties.

First of all I take up the case of Pakistan. Our relations with Pakistan are very peculiar. Since India and Pakistan were separated in 1947, our relations with that country have been vacillating between love and hatred. India and Pakistan fight with each other on political level, but on non-political level, the people of India and Pakistan love each other. The people

[Shri Zainul Basher]

of India love the people of Pakistan and the people of Pakistan love the people of India. When the people of India and Pakistan meet each other, they do not find themselves as if they are at loggerheads with each other. But due to political reasons, our relations with Pakistan have not been good. What is the reason for this? We have to find out the reasons behind it. One of them is that Pakistan is acquiring deadly weapons from U.S.A. Pakistan is talking of manufacturing nuclear bomb. Despite the Simla Agreement, it is pressing claim on Kashmir. Pakistan is imparting training to the terrorists and sending them to India. Sometimes it concentrates its army along our borders. This creates tension between the two countries. What are the reasons for this? Have not the Indians accepted the existence of Pakistan and is there any threat to Pakistan from India? Is it true? I am of the view that it is not true. The fact remains that there is military Government in Pakistan and democracy has existed there for a very short duration. Our experiences shows that whenever demand for democratic system pickes up there, whenever such an atmosphere is created there, the military administrators of Pakistan, in order to divert the attention of its people, start gathering army on Indian border. In this way tension is created on Indo-Pak border and such an atmosphere is created that the demand of the people for democratic set up may be forgotten and an atmosphere of tension may prevail. Whenever there has been a war between India and Pakistan, it has been during military regime in Pakistan. I would like to give an example. When Shri Zulfikar Ali Bhutto was the foreign minister of Pakistan during the military regime, he used to talk of waging a war with India for one thousand years but when the same Zulfikar Ali Bhutto wes elected the Prime Minister of Pakistan in a democratic way, the relations between India and Pakistan remained cordial to the maximum in the history of the relations between the two countries. But when Shri Bhutto was removed from the politics of Pakistan, and the military rulers again took control of the Government in Pakistan, our relations again deteriorated,

When the pressure of Benazir Bhutto of the Pakistan People's Party increased on the rulers of Pakistan, a bogey of danger raised against India and a scientist Shri Abdul Kadir Khan even went to the extent of saying that Pakistan possessed atom bomb and in case India attacked Pakistan, they would use atom bomb against this country. Pakistan has concentrated its troops on the border with India and has created an atmosphere of tension between the two countries. This has been done deliberately just to divert the attention of the people. Without further dealing on this subject, I would like to say that we have relations with Pakistan not only on Government basis but there is a close relationship between the people of India and Pakistan as well. Therefore, we cannot close our eyes to the movement going on in Pakistan for the restoration of democracy. We will have to support their movement and maintain cordial relations with the people of Pakistan because democracy is not only in the interest of Pakistan but it is essential for good relation between India and Pakistan. We will have to make full efforts in this direction and should help the democratic movement which is going on in Pakistan under the leadership of Benazir Bhutto. Only then the relations between India and Pakistan can become ideal one.

[English]

SHRI BRAJAMOHAN MOHANTY (Puri): The U.S. Embassy has already managed Miss Bhutto.

SHRI ZAINUL BASHER: I do not know. He must be having some information.

[Translation]

Madam Chairman, Sir, I would now like to deal with China. Our relations with China have never been cordial and for the past sometime these have been deteriorating. The people of India have not forgotten and nor can they forget the way China attacked India and stabbed in our back. We used to raise slogan of 'Hindi-Chini bhai-bhai' and we had great expectation from China. While speaking on foreign policy, one invariably used the Word Panchsheel. At that time Nehruji was the Prime Minister. He had great faith in China but China attacked on us in 1962

for which we were not prepared and we had never thought even in dream that China would attack on India but after this attack Ching showed its true colour.

We are again holding discussions for normalisation of relations between China and India. On the one hand, talks between India and China are going on for settlement of the borders dispute and on the other, the Chinese forces have been intruding into Arunachal Pradesh. We are talking of peace and settlement of border dispute but at the same time Chinese forces have been intruding into our border.

We have not forgotten that day when during Janata Party regime the foreign minister Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee was in China and the Chinese forces were attacking Vietnam. We have not forgotten that day when China launched an attack on Arunachal Pradesh and occupied some territory there. It is unfortunate that the Government did not inform about it for many days. I hope the Foreign Minister will throw light on it when he replies to the debate. When Chinese troops intruded into that territory, why did India not take action to repulse them? The Chinese troops have been occupying part of Arunachal Pradesh since they intruded into that territory. Under this situation why military action was not taken to drive them away? Does it not mean that we are yielding to China? Had Pakistan done similar thing in any part of Kashmir, would the Government have not taken military action there? Therefore, I would particularly like to know from the Foreign Minister that when such thing happened in Arunachal Pradesh why military action was not taken there? There are reports in the world press that China has plans to launch an attack on India in a big way in the months of May, June, July and August. I do not know the reaction of the Government towards it. But I am confident that our forces are capable of facing the possible attack from China. Had our forces been ordered to drive away the Chinese troops which had occupied part of Arunachal Pradesh, they would have repulsed them. But such decision is taken politically and it should be taken politically. This is a very serious matter. This is agitating our minds and the minds of the Indian people. We are

apprehensive as to what will happen in future and whether China is preparing to launch an attack on us? May I know whether it is a fact that due to this reason the relations between India and China have deteriorated which can result in war with it? In these circumstances we will have to see as to how the relations between China and Pakistan and America and China are going on? We will have to think over all these aspects. I would not like speak on this matter further. I would only request the hon. Foreign Minister to throw light on this matter.

Thirdly, I would like to deal with Bangladesh. Every one knows about the role played by India in creating Bangladesh as a nation. The people of Bangladesh know this fact. Chakma refugees are entering into Indian borders from Bangladesh. This is creating tension in Assam and Bengal. It is also affecting their economy. Similarly this is leading to tension in Bihar also. After all why the people of Bangladesh want to come to India? We all know that the economy of Bangladesh is in bad shape and a number of people from that country try to come to India in search of livelihood. As many as 30 thousand Chakmas have settled in Tripura. We are having talks with them in this connection. So far as I think the controversy between India and Bangladesh is in regard to installing of fence and barbed wires on the border. Whenever we raise the matter of installing fence and barbed wire on the border, Bangladesh objects to it. It does not want that barbed wire should be erected on the border. It means that the people of Bangladesh and the Government of that country do not want to take action to check the migration from that country into India. Not only this it rather instigates them to leave Bangladesh. I hope that the hon. Foreign Minister will deal with it while replying to the debate.

In the end, I will conclude after dealing with Sri Lanka. The present condition of Sri Lanka is very unfortunate. Howsoever it may be condemned, that will be less. India used its good offices to bring about some understanding between Tamilians and the Sri Lankan Government. Meanwhile a cabinet level delegating

[Shri Zainul Basher]

visited Sri Lanka and had talks with the president Jayewardene. In the meeting with him, some proposals were sorted out so that they may provide a base for negotiations with the Tamil extremists. But later on the Sri Lankan Government changed its stand and after giving its consent it withdraw those proposals. At present there seems to be no chance that an agreement may emerge from the talks between the Sri Lankan Government and the representatives of the Tamilians. There is a news that 150 persons have been killed in Colombo and they are being subjected to atrocities. Blockade has been resorted to and ban has been imposed on supply of all the foodstuff and other essential items. The refugees are pouring in here. The extremist elements are also infiltrating into India. This has created a peculiar situation in Southern States, particularly in Tamilnadu. What step should be taken in this respect? I am against military action, I would like that the Government should make maximum efforts to solve the Sri Lankan problem effectively. I hope we will be able to achieve some concrete result in this matter under the able leadership of Tiwariji because if we fail to achieve any success in the matter of Sri Lankan issue the situation in India, particularly in Tamilnadu, will worsen.

With these words, I conclude and express my satisfaction that the Government's intention in improving relations with its neighbouring countries is quite good. The Government, particularly our Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister have enhanced the prestige of the country by following the foreign policy effectively at every forum—be it non-aligned movement, SAARC or the South-South dialogue. The prestige of our country has enhanced considerably in other countries. I hope that we will be capable of upholding that prestige and the disputes with our neighbours will be solved amicably.

[English]

**SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY** (Katwa) : Madam Chairman, Notwithstanding the fact that the Central Government is a very bad Government, its policies inter-

nally are anti-people but we support some of the external policies, such as non-alignment for peace, for disarmament, for anti-apartheid and so on.

**SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE** (Bolpur) : And the nice Foreign Minister !

**SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY** : We firmly say that these policies are not only the policies of the Government but also the policies of the country and its people. Any attempt to de-stabilise these policies will be resisted by each and every member of our country. In this context we have already given our support to some highlights in the peace initiative, namely, the Six Nations declaration; the Delhi declaration, we welcomed your support to the concrete peace proposals made by Mr. Gorbachov and the whole country has whole-heartedly welcomed it. All these are very positive developments and constitute contribution of our country to the peace process that is going on throughout the world.

In this context we view very seriously the attempts of certain Western powers, the Imperialist forces, led by U.S. Imperialism to de-stabilise our country, to dis-member our country and we do not consider that this is a figment of anybody's imagination. This is a real threat. We have been saying this over the years. But I regret to say that the Central Government while stressing that there is a threat to our integrity and unity has so far not identified their names concretely and not tried to make aware our people about them so that we are united in fighting them back. This is a great lapse in our policy perception.

Sir, I have gone through the Report of the Ministry of External Affairs and there I find that only a general view has been expressed that with all the countries we are having good relations or are improving or in the near future it will improve. I have no objection to have this desire that we should have good relations with the governments of all the countries. It is most welcome but the reality is that there are certain governments in certain countries which are hostile to our country and their hostility is not on account of any particular regional grouse but they are hostile to India due to their attachment with the

global conspiracy led by Imperialists. We just cannot do soft-paddling on this. When we talk of USA it is not that we just say that we are trying to improve our relations and we are having our trade developments and all that. We have to tell our people how they are trying to encircle our country. Now, I have read the CWC resolution. Of course, it seems to be good resolution. It also seems that for the last six weeks the process of de-stabilisation has been seen. (Interruptions)

**SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN** (Kishanganj) : Did you have a hand in writing it ? (Interruptions)

**SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY** : But why only for six weeks and this is how a good resolutions has lost credibility. If you try to use question of unity of the country to subdue the fight against scandals and corruption and for your political benefit, then the people of this country would seriously doubt your intentions. (Interruptions)

Now, Sir, in our neighbourhood despite our attempt to have good relations with all the countries; despite the formation of SAARC the reality is that they on their own independently cannot take any political decision to have friendly relations with our country. They are globally linked with Imperialist conspiracy. As regards Pakistan. Mr. Zainul Basher has said how our good relations are linked with the establishment of democracy in Pakistan. Now, for the time being, when democracy was restored in Pakistan, we had good relations. It is right. I quote from a document when the US Defence Department in private briefing to the House of Foreign Affairs Committee said on March 9, 1983 :

“South and South-East Asia is a region of critical strategic importance to the US. It was our interest to control that territory... We could not buy a nation of 100 million people. But we could buy the army, the navy and air force of Pakistan. And we did that.”

So, the military dictatorship in Pakistan is being aided and abetted by US imperialism because it is for their convenience to have military dictatorship there. With the restoration of democracy in Pakistan, their

conspiracies will be foiled and rebuffed by the people and relations between these countries in our neighbourhood will be established. Now the US imperialism is inclined to encourage military dictatorship to help them to be there so that they can continue in their total process of destabilisation.

Now, in this context, if we are serious to understand that—we have a serious threat to our unity and integrity—then we have to clearly identify and pinpoint the enemy. In that, I must say that our foreign affairs policy is very much interconnected with the other policies that we pursue. How is that ? When we understand that we are being threatened, then we cannot be naive to realise that USA will sincerely help us in developing our economy, will give us super computer, technology, all that knowledge and knowhow. How can it be ? What they are saying in this respect ? Outlining the policy goals of Reagan administration, the National Security Council has published a report presented by Mr. Frank Karlracci who came after Mr. Poindexter's exit due to Irangate scandal and it says :

“Science and technology are seen as an instrument of foreign policy;

US world leadership and vast resources in science and technology constitute important strategic assets to strengthen existing ties.”

Now they use them as an instrument to influence the conditions in other countries. As Mr. Bipin Pal Das has said very well that when we had to set up Bokaro, we never first looked to Soviet Union, we want go to USA and what was their reply to us ? They wanted to dictate their terms. I am not an advocate of Soviet Union here. We don't unnecessarily do that. But you learned by your experience with the USA that not they but USSR is true friend of India. But I don't think we have fully learnt it. Still there is some illusion and that is creating trouble in the mobilisation of our people.

Just now we have read in the newspapers that Mr. Natwar Singh is there in USA. What talks he had with Mr. Bush ? What for he has gone there ? All this is very important for us to know.

**SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE** ;  
Fairfax.

**SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY :**  
I don't know for what.

**AN HON. MEMBER :** Some other deal.

**SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY :**  
In the report, it has been said that we are trying to have friendship with all the countries. But then how some other countries are viewing this question of friendship with our country? What you have said about Western Europe, I read :

"These countries in their search for new markets to support their highly export dependent economies have thus rated India on their list."

Right, that is their intention. You should never forget this. They are coming here. They will lend their hand of friendship not on any genuine reason. But they are coming to take advantage of particular situation that you are now providing in our country. How US is interested? For a genuine friendship, narrow interests do not come in aforesaid way.

Now we are trying to establish friendship with all the countries in our neighbourhood. And the question of declaring the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace has acquired great importance in the context of what is happening all over the world. As per the 1971 UN Resolution, it was decided that an international conference should be held to find a solution to this problem. What happened to that? Now, Sri Lanka is backing out. The perceptions of Sri Lanka are different now. Now they are not against the presence of the United States in the Indian Ocean Zone. They clearly say that there may be some change in the situation in India and there may be a threat to their sovereignty and hence they may require the help and presence of US. They are inviting them to their country. They are bringing the Mosad which is a very great destabilising force. Now, what are we going to do about this? Are you going to say that since this conference was to be held in Sri Lanka and they had now backed out you were unable to do anything? Find another venue, try to hold this conference and take a lead to find a solution. As I understand the issue, this is very important.

Now I will take up another very important question. This is with regard to our relations with China. It is really painful to see that while we are hoping for improvement in our relations, there are reports and news that things are getting disturbed and deteriorated. I want a categorical statement from the Minister about the situation in this front. What are the hitches in the way of a settlement? What do they want us to do? What do we want them to do? We do not want a military solution to this problem. That is wasteful. It is impossible. Long ago, we said there should be negotiations. We still insist on that. I also know that we are trying to have a negotiated settlement. Certain rounds of talks have been held. But I want that the Central Government should come out with a concrete picture about the obstacles in our way. They have to tell us. We hear about 'sector-by-sector' deal; then we hear about package deal and so on. But we really do not know as to what is what. Nobody tells us. We do not even know whether we should make some comments or not. A very important step that we have to take in this hostile environment is to mend our fence with China. We should become friends. That will immensely contribute to establish peace not only in this region but also world peace. On the other hand, it will strengthen our economic efforts also because it will give us room to invest more for our economic development. I am not one of those chauvinistic persons to say that we would fight a thousand year war with China. I do not believe in such things. One may say that US is helping China and China is helping Pakistan. Yes, China is helping Pakistan. And we have every right to criticise certain things which we do not like and which are not in our interest. We can do it openly. It is that simple. But, China and India have to be friends. This is a historical necessity. We have to be friends. What is the hitch? You please tell us. What are the obstacles.

**SHRI ZIANUL BASHER (Ghazipur) :**  
We also want to be friends with China. How do we go about it?

**SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY :**  
How can I say? I do not negotiate with China. If the hon. Foreign Minister gives me power, I may try.



Sir, the point I want to make is that we should know what the hitch is. If we can say something, we will say. If you say we have to make war with them, then go to war. In this background when we talk of really improving the relations and other things...

*(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Chowdhary, you conclude.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Why don't you tell them not to interrupt when he is speaking ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : Somnathji, you are interfering. Please don't interfere.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CAOWDHARY : Anyway, Madam, what is required is, first let us clearly set our priorities. By generally going everywhere and talking of friendship nothing will come out of it. We have to understand that some Governments are bad and some are good. The Governments which are good, with them we should try to make friendship. This we should understand first. That is all. Now, when we claim that, with certain countries, we are having good relations, like Switzerland, who are our good friends, I believe, why can't you tell them that you have a Swiss Bank which is creating so much trouble and you disclose certain things ?

I believe, during the debate, we raised this question and like the Swiss Minister, our Minister replied, "Oh no, they do not have the law," who are you to bother about their law ? You tell them, "you disclose and if you don't disclose, we will take action. We will take it to the international fora and we will see it. Some may be said about Sweden. So many things are coming to the fora about defence deal.

Now you tell us, what is our foreign intelligence who are there, doing, whether they are active or not ? We do not know whether they are active or not. But a very active information came from the German Embassy, I believe, about the FAIRFAX affair.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Now you have to conclude. You are just dragging.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : Who gave this information ? What was the information ? So, all these things are very important.

Regarding Swedish Government, we have read in the papers that they are going to do some kind of an inquiry, but in this House we didn't hear anything. Then, you have tell us concretely whether have you taken up this matter with the Swedish Government regarding Bofors or not ? But certain things are revealed now and these are very alarming. Things like, the Chief Arms Material Inspectorate in Sweden was miraculously killed underground in a train accident. It was after the supply of arms by Bofors.

Before that, when the deal was being struck, his predecessor fell ill and died and people now suspect that Bofors has a hand in the killing of Olof Palme also. Now the point is that today something has come in the newspapers that in Bombay a Naval Commander committed suicide.

*(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN : You have taken 25 minutes. The time allotted for your party was 30 minutes.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : Out of 30 minutes, I have taken only 25 minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Now you have to conclude.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : Why ? No. Our party has no other speaker left now.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Don't say no. You have to conclude now. You must be as brief as possible. You cannot say no.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : What I must say about our foreign policy is this. What should be our perspective and priority ? We have to pursue all these things which will really benefit the interests of our country. That is very important. It will give security to our country. In that, you have to tell in clear terms, as to who are the enemies who are trying to

[Shri Saifuddin Chowdhary]

sabotage our country and who are trying to destabilise our country. Not that by suppressing certain things we can have a hope that things will go on improving in the near future. That won't if we understand certain things, we have to tell them clearly. I believe that there may be many attempts outside, may be imperialist powers trying to destabilise our country. But if we are a good Government, if we are a sharp Government and if we take the country into confidence, if we make them aware and make them conscious, if we unite them, then no power will be able to destabilise our country in any time in future.

PROF. N. G. RANGA (Guntur): Madam Chairman, I was just wondering while our delightful friend Shri Saifuddin Chowdhary was holding forth. What is it that stands between them and us so far as foreign affairs are concerned? He says he has no quarrel with Soviet Russia. (*Interruptions*) He does not say so, but China is their friend. (*Interruptions*) Who is our enemy? He wants us to declare who is not our friend, and is it possible for us to say, so, so and so is our enemy. What is that he wants. Is that the way foreign affairs are conducted? Even Soviet Russia and China, Soviet Union and America are not seeing eye-to-eye with each other. They find it difficult also to come to the same table from time to time; and at the same time, they hail an opportunity of coming together sometimes, sometimes in the centre of Europe, sometimes some where there in Finland and so on; and all the time in Geneva and not yet coming to any conclusion. Therefore, I don't think he is on the right lines when he accused our government for its failure to say so and so is our enemy, so and so is our global opponent; that is not the way that he would like to run the government, if he were in charge of foreign affairs. Secondly, what is it that stands in the way of India coming to some kind of a reasonable settlement with China? What is it that stands now today between China and Russia? Are they all on fours? They are not. Why? What is it that differentiates China from Vietnam? They were friends at one time, bosom friends against western imperialism and so on. The same force which is now working for

Star Wars; which is working there in Pakistan, in Ceylon, in Sri Lanka. Somebody was saying that Sri Lanka was so small; we need not have quarrel with them and yet it looks as if from time to time we were coming together. On 19th of August; an offer was being quoted by our friend, Bipin Chander Paul in his excellent speech, but, yet, why is it that it has not fructified? The same force again is there against it. But that does not mean that we should tell them so and so is the enemy of the world as a whole. We cannot do that. Until there is a war, there is no such thing as an enemy on the other side. Taking that for granted, here is Pakistan. What is that stands between them and us? Our friend, Mr. Basher, in his very frank and honest speech, said, people in Pakistan are very friendly with us: we certainly know about it; we are having friendly feelings towards them, but we do not know what feelings they have today about us, because it is all dictatorship. While USA is having her own democracy and hugging it, it does not mind if there is only dictatorship in Pakistan, or in any of the other countries which is very close to her, because she wants a convenient friend. A domestic friend is not so very convenient, because there will be a tussle as we have been having in our democracy. Yes and no, yes or no, reason and unreason; and they do not want that kind of a thing. They find it convenient to deal with a dictator. When is it and for how long Pakistan has had a democratic regime there after the assassination of Liaquat Ali Khan? For all these times, it has been a dictatorship, military dictatorship? Why so? Why is it that the people have not been able to assert themselves? They were kept down by the military. Once they were brought down to that level, it has not been possible for their people to emerge out of that terrible trouble. This is going on. Everybody knows. Then what is it the Government of India has to do? So far

16.00 hrs.

as China is concerned, we want to be friends with her. Indiraji had the courage to go against—till then what happened to be—the general trend in our country of disbelief in China because of 1962 betrayal. She had the courage to say to the nation,

that the time had come that we should make friends with China. There were lot of people who resented; but some of us who were not yet four square with the Congress, had also displayed courage to support her. We appreciated her gesture. But what is it that has stood between China and ourselves coming together during all these—how many years?...more than 12 years? Because of the same force. What is the use of blinding ourselves by simply saying that, China is very independent, completely independent? Independent China is just as independent as any other country but I say, independent China has to heed advice of some friend of hers and that friend, everyone knows is one of the greatest and most powerful powers in the world today.

What is it that China demands now from India? A little there, a little here. Do we claim even an inch of Chinese territory? No. But she claims some. Even in regard to that also she was prepared to come to negotiations but the moment she is willing to come anywhere near reasonable limits some friend or other twists the tail. And the Chinese know it.

The other day one of our respected patriot of our country, Mr. Shankaran Namboodiri had gone there—he was my jail-mate—and visited their country, and gave a Press statement giving an impression that the Chinese Government and the Chinese leaders are likely to be reasonable in setting this border trouble. I would like him to succeed, our friend Shri Shankaran Namboodriped. But then would he succeed? We do not know. Our friends are their friends. Are they not? They are. No harm. We would like such friends as these very important people here in this House and also some in the States want to be friends with China so that we would have some settlement. We do not want to stand in the way. Government of India has not stood in the way. Indeed, Government of India's diplomats have been going there periodically. But some how something is happening and for nothing at all, we seem to be quarrelling. This is what is happening!

But what is the real trouble over the

Indian Ocean? Sri Lanka, as I said is not a free power. We should have had a conference there in Sri Lanka. Some three or four years ago, your predecessor, Mr. Minister, wastelling us that the United Nations had passed a resolution and they all agreed to meet there but again repeatedly requests were being made to the leaders of Sri Lanka for having a conference. Somebody stands behind them. And the invitation is not being sent out. And in those days Mr. Dinesh Singh was the Foreign Minister when that resolution the first resolution, was being passed. Then somebody said, "Oh, Indian Ocean should be guarded from this menace of super power rivalry." Indeed both sides were guarding the sea. It is not only the Diego Garcia area. Both their Navies are there. They cannot be separated because they have got to watch each other. We will have to watch them and this is where I agree with my hon. friend Mr. Bipin Pal Das in his plea that we should strengthen our Navy and develop it further. But some of these friends have been doing things which are not very helpful towards that. Because it is easy to say that we should be self-reliant with regard to defence equipment, defence forces defence training and efficiency and all the rest of it. But we cannot be so independent. We have got to get so many of these things from other countries. And most of these countries are under the control of the United States of America. Sweden is a little farther away; little less farther away is Germany and so is France. But England is not at all far away from the United States of America. Therefore, we are not going to England. But to all these other countries we go. As we go to these countries they have their own conditions to prescribe. We have got to be very careful. We have got to be honest in our intentions. There I agree, with our friends in the opposition have been asking the country to be careful in regard to the deals that we are having with these countries. Certainly we should be very careful about it. We should avoid any kind of suspicion, even genuine suspicion of corruption. But nevertheless we have got to deal with them in a very quiet way, diplomatic manner. Otherwise, we cannot get all this equipment. Suppose, we get this equipment, have we got enough?

[Prof. N.G. Ranga]

Our friend, Mr. Reddi, was drawing the attention of the House and through the House to the people that we are obliged to spend so much on our security and the defence forces and, therefore, it may be a sign of the failure of our foreign relations or foreign affairs. It is not so. As long as Pakistan is being armed in the unscrupulous manner, dishonest manner according to me, and from the world point of view in an inhuman manner by the United States of America we have got to strengthen our own defence forces also and therefore, spend more and more. We have no escape. When we spend more and more and we buy more and more. We have got to depend upon many of these people who are not entirely free from the control of the United States of America. Let us keep that in mind. We are not entirely free from those indirect controls because those countries are not entirely free from the ultimate hold which the United States of America is able to have, is trying to have is maintaining and is trying to increase over all these countries all over the world.

Then how can we safeguard ourselves against this menace? The main menace is this. The United States of America fears of Soviet Russia. It is a kind of paranoid fear. They are too rich, too luxurious, luxurious loving and soft going. Therefore, they have got to save themselves. So they become inhuman. They do not mind what happens to the rest of the world. Democracy or no democracy but they must be safe. In order to become safe they have got to go to war. But they dare not go to war in the Gorkha manner sacrificing themselves in a courageous manner. They want to do it in the latest manner and that is by simply throwing nuclear bombs on other people with the help of these missiles and the rest of them—small, medium and all sorts of things. But these are also not enough. Therefore, they have thought of the sky. From the skies they want to throw. And if they could do it, they want to throw one, two, ten bombs. They would like to destroy the Soviet Russia so that they could be safe. This is a kind of madness they are suffering from. We have got to ensure ourselves against all that. In order to be able to do it we have no other go but to make friends with China on one

side and Russia on the other. There is no other go. But China is their friend now. Now my hon. friends can whisper in their ears to the extent they possibly can. Let them advise them.

**SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY :**  
How can we do that ?

**PROF. N.G. RANGA :** So far as Soviet Russia is concerned it has come into the open. It has opposed the star war. It has taken a lead also. I congratulated them the other day when their Radio people came to me. I have been opposed to the communist ideology, their faith in dictatorship, proletarian and the rest of it for the last 50 years. But nevertheless I congratulated Gorbachev because he had the courage to come forward and say, come what may, they are in favour of moratorium. First for three months, then for six months and then for another three months. Then afterwards he said, "Very well, if you are going to make your tests again and again without any sense of shame, without any sense of responsibility to humanity all over the world, then we are putting an end to the moratorium. Now Americans are becoming a little more reasonable. They sent their Shultz the other day. Previously they said no agreement, but now there is going to be some agreement. Before that agreement, they are going to sit across the table. These are all happening. In this perspective. What is the role that India and India's leaders have been playing? My hon. friend Mr. Bipin Pal Das paid a very high compliment to our Prime Minister. I agree with him. Our Prime Minister is not all alone. Our Prime Minister is at the head of our Government, at the head of our Parliament, of our nation. This nation has been pursuing this policy consistently for the past 20 years and more even from the days of Jawaharlal Nehru. Before Jawaharlal Nehru was prepared to commit himself to the non-alignment, quite a number of us—Jayprakash is not here with us, Lohia is not with us today, but we were all together—began to plead for a third front, began to plead for a peace front. And when Jawaharlal Nehru found that the time was ripe, he went to Bandung and thereafter to Belgrade Yugoslavia and gave shape to this Non-Alignment Movement. This Non-Alignment Movement is the biggest guarantee

against the Third World War—if there could be any guarantee at all in this mad world. At one time, America, did ridicule it. Soviet Russia also was very indifferent to it. Now Soviet Russia is a great champion for it. America is prepared to say, yes it is good, it is useful. Why is it good? It is good to keep them apart, to prevent them from rushing against each other and destroying the whole of the world. And yet America has not got sufficient faith in this NAM as an effective buffer. That is why she continues to create these troubles for us. India does not want to be a great power. Some people, some section of their Press says, "Oh, India is going to be a great power". We do not want to be a great power. We want to be left alone so that we are able to develop our own industrial, agricultural and social economy in our country, so that our poor people can get rid of their poverty, so that our masses can be helped to become fairly educated people, well-fed people, people who can call themselves as human beings. We want just this little mercy, and this is the appeal I made to some Members of the Senate as well as to the House of Representatives of America. But I do not think in America today the majority of the people are sane-minded. I cannot say they are made because they are highly educated people, prosperous people, going about the whole of the world, gadding about as tourists and then helping us all with all their attractions, with all their temptations. But they are not sane-minded towards us, they are not sane-minded towards the rest of the world and that is why I welcome the foreign policy of the Government of India which is tending towards keeping these two great powers far away, farther away from the was mindedness and that is why I continue to congratulate Soviet Russia's leadership for the moral courage that they have been displaying for the last one year in spite of many a provocations that America has been creating directly, openly and secretly. I congratulate the Government of India and our Prime Minister and our Foreign Minister also for the manner in which they have been helping our country towards peace, as much of peace as we possibly can hope for in this very troubled world. Thank you.

16.15 hrs.

[SHRI VAKKOM PURUSHOTHAMAN  
in the Chair]

SHRI BRAJAMOHAN MOHANTY (Puri) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, with all my attention I was listening to Mr. Chowdhary because he belongs to a party which has the international background. Their analysis and policies are always based on international understanding. Sir, I was listening to Shri Chaudhury. I was surprised to listen to him that it was as if Indo-Chinese friendship was not possible on account of India. I would like to categorically answer this point. What was the origin? Is it not the origin that the Chinese developed the combination of forces and joined with the United States of America to fight against the Soviet hegemony? Is it not the origin? Is it not the thesis that one divided by two is half, but half plus half is not one? Is it that when the Chinese and the US friendship started, the original purpose was to fight against the Soviet hegemony? That is the charge against India? The Chinese are charging that the Soviet Union is organising an encirclement around China by Vietnam, India, Afghanistan, Mongolia, etc. So, that is the fault of India. I shall be happy if Shri Nambudiripad who has the highest credibility in China, who was behind the split of the Communist movement during 1964 in India and now when he has gone to meet the Chinese leader, I hope he will bring some positive messages. We shall be happy to have friendship with China. But it is a known fact. (*Interruptions*) Please listen to me. So far as Chinese are concerned, all the nuclear weaponry that has passed from the United States of America to China is now being passed on to Pakistan. This is my assessment. You should know one thing that so far as the designing information of the nuclear weaponry is concerned, I would say that that is passed on from China to Pakistan. So, this is the position. I fully agree that if one can be divided into two forces, one is the colonial imperialists and the other is the Socialists, those who stand for genuine peace, those who stand for economic freedom, those who stand for the struggle

[Shri Brajamohan Mohanty]

against imperialism and colonialism. If the world could be divided, it would be the happiest moment in the history of the world. But it is not possible today. You know that when a snake has been embraced by a baby, neither we can kill the snake nor will we be able to kill the baby. We are incapable of killing the snake. This is the position here and we should not encourage that.

Sir, I would like to know one thing. Let us positively think about it. We should not forget the reality of the situation. I know that the Indian image in the international field is the highest because of our principled foreign policy because of our commitment to peace, because of our commitment to anti-colonialism, because of our commitment for national liberation. Our image is very high in the international field. Our leaders starting from Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru to Shri Rajiv Gandhi have played a very significant role to remove tensions in the world.

So far as South Africa is concerned, the role of India to isolate South Africa is well-known to the world. All are aware how it has enhanced the image of India and the image of the Prime Minister and you know how it has been counter-acted by the President of the United States of America. There was a report that the President of the United States of America was threatening the women of that country that if they boycott South Africa, they will have to bury all the jewellery and this was retorted by the Women's Organisation. This is the situation. You know, there are forces, unfortunately certain socialist countries are associated with them. There are forces who are against India. Why they are against India? What is the reason? The United States of America is also a democracy and ours is also a democracy. You know, during the Indo-Chinese conflict—I do not say you are together because it may annoy you, so I say it is during the Indo-Chinese conflict the United States of America also helped us. So, certain new changes seem to be emerging. The Soviet Union also kept neutral. The entire international world is against China. You know, the Prime Minister is interested for an honourable settlement with China and

had taken us into confidence about it, you were there and I was there. But the problem is, you know, what is the package deal? Could you define it? I checked up. The package deal is as nebulous as...

(Interruptions)

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY :  
We do not know.

SHRI BRAJAMOHAN MOHANTY :  
You do not know because if you try, you will find that it is more nebulous. (Interruptions) I know that, I have checked it up. You must also check it up. Did China define this package deal? Did they define it during all these negotiations? No. Now, they are not for package deal. They are after the drop of blood, not for package deal. This is the position, and we are for friendship with China. Even the Prime Minister is thinking to go back to the Fifties for the relations of 'Hindi-Chini bhai bhai'. But the fact remains that. China must be very reasonable. But China was soon to play the imperialist role and China was soon to play the game of imperialism, the game of the USA in this region. But before us what is the problem? Two or three days before we saw mobilisation of forces in between China and India in the Arunachal sector. And, you know, it is not that Pakistan that is going nuclear, it is the entire region that is going nuclear. You know, Israel is equipped with the nuclear weaponry. Pakistan can produce one nuclear warhead annually. They have accepted their capability, and so far as China is concerned they have 300, so far as France is concerned, they have 500, so far as super powers are concerned, they have 2700 each of the nuclear warheads. This is the position. What is the alternative for us? Tell us. It is not that Government alone has to decide. It is the nation that has to decide. What alternative we have to accept? If this region is nuclear, what will be our position? All this is because those who have spoken before me are very much concerned about it. This is the position that we have to see and give an answer to it. No doubt, the Government of India has declared that we have to react if Pakistan goes nuclear. No doubt Pakistan has gone nuclear, but it is also painful to

review our own option. That must be taken into consideration.

Another aspect is that so far as Pakistan is concerned, about its behaviour in the Non-Aligned Movement, once Mr. Natwar Singh said here that it is very difficult, all the same, that a single country is to be eliminated from the Non-Aligned Movement. You know, now they are canvassing to be there in the Commonwealth. So far as Pakistan is concerned, as a matter of fact, in no area they have accepted their own commitments. This is the position. Another aspect is that so far as Pakistan is concerned, it is not only receiving the support from the United States of America, it has nuclearised itself, but the most significant aspect of the problem is that Pakistan is being treated as a front-line State in this region to play the game of international diplomacy or USA diplomacy. That is the danger you should know. So far as China is concerned, on minimum things, negotiation has been started and no doubt, anti-Indian propaganda has been stopped. But in this region, their policies are so directed that go against India. This is the position. We are struggling against these things. In the movement of world peace, in the struggle for establishing new economic order, we find that China and Europe are standing in the way. These are thy aspects, I would request the hon. Members to consider very seriously.

So far as external affairs are concerned, they can be diversified from our security problem; they can be diversified from our economic problem. Therefore, our external policies should take into consideration, the security aspect, the economic aspect and all these matters.

I would like to know from the hon. Minister one thing. So far as Harare NAM meeting is concerned, how is it that a representative of the Occupied Kasbmir attended it? That is why, I say, you see how things are manipulated by Pakistan and imperialist forces. I would appeal to the Government, to all the Members of this House and the nation as a whole that we must stand unitedly to the commitment of peace and our struggle against colonialism, imperialism and against economic injustice.

SHRI D.P. JADEJA (Jamnagar) : Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Demands for Grants for the Ministry of External Affairs. For the past two hours, I have been listening to the debate concerning the relationship of India with its neighbour. I will try to draw the attention of the Members to the other area because I am going to concentrate mainly on our relations with distant Latin America. Sir, it is this region where India has to concentrate much more than what it is doing. No doubt, India's relations with countries of Latin America and the Caribbean, as the Annual Report for the Ministry says, "continued to grow" and "laid the basis for further development of ties". This is satisfactory to an extent. The State visits of the President of Nicaragua, Daniel Ortega and the President of Peru, Alan Garcia—the two young leaders from Latin America—during the past year has contributed a great deal to bilateral relations between India and these two countries. Our Prime Minister's visit to Mexico in connection with the Six-Nation Summit on Disarmament occasioned a meeting with Mexico's President Miguel dela Madrid to discuss and give content to bilateral economic cooperation between India and Mexico. All these are positive evidences over our growing relations with Latin America.

Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding these encouraging trends, it is my considered feeling that our ministry has to invest more of its energy in forging close relations with the countries of Latin America. As we all are aware, the decade of 1980 heralded a turning point in the Latin American developments. Politically it has meant return of democracy to most of the region. It is an expression of the faith and commitment of the people of Latin America to democratic values, norms and practices. Consequently, almost ninety per cent of the people of Latin America are enjoying a government of their choice. While it is a heartening trend currently witnessed in the region, it is also an opportunity for India which firmly believes in strengthening democratic institutions and values. It is for these reasons more and more of Latin American countries are keenly interested in forging relations with India and learn by our experience. Wherever we go in Latin

[Shri D.P. Jadeja]

America, the people and leaders of the region show an insatiable appetite for knowing more about our country—our economy, our achievements, our parliamentary practices, our views on global affairs and so on.

May I know from the hon. Minister as to what are we doing to meet this increasing demand and whether we can afford to ignore them.

The existing channels of diplomatic communications and the already established mechanisms of specific treaties and agreements are hardly adequate. I say hardly adequate because in most instances such agreements are not at all operative. While every effort must be made to activate these agreements—especially the cultural and educational exchanges as well as the scientific and technological protocols that we have signed with some of the countries of Latin America, now we will have to initiate or promote new protocols and agreements with the other Latin American countries. I can say this with confidence, for I am saying this on the basis of my inter-action with the leaders and parliamentarians of at least a few countries of Latin America that they desire setting up a mechanism for informal bilateral political consultation such as the ones that they have with a host of other countries. A continental-sized country like Brazil, for instance, is keenly interested in setting up an arrangement such as this. After all, there are a number of parallels between India and Brazil into which I do not like to go at this juncture.

There is no gainsaying that the fledgling democratic regimes and their leaders, unlike their predecessor regimes, are genuinely committed to reordering their global, regional and domestic priorities. Confronted as they are with a variety of problems both economic and political, these problems have been sharply and acutely relieved in two major fronts—one, the external debt and the other, the soaring domestic inflation. The political future and processes in these countries largely depend on how these critical issues are going to be tackled in the coming years. The concern and energies of these regimes are increasingly

seen and spent in forging a new economic order both within their countries and internationally that will pave the way for more meaningful South-South Cooperation.

In this time of crisis, it is necessary and imperative that we reciprocated and offer our support and assistance to these countries. In their effort to meet the debt crisis these countries are seeking increasing economic cooperation mainly with developing countries, including importantly India. Economic cooperation is not simply trade exchanges. It includes significantly in the present day, technology transfer and exchange, and dissemination of technical know-how. The Ministry operates what is known as Indian Technical and Economic Cooperation Programme providing bilateral assistance to developing countries. Let us consider extending technical assistance under the INTEC programme to deserving small medium-sized countries of the Latin American and the Caribbean regions. This is not the occasion where I should elaborate this any further. I have already handed to our Honourable Minister of Commerce a report containing specific projects and programmes which deserve some attention. However, the Ministry of External Affairs should seriously consider ways and means to assess the scientific and technological need of these countries and on a continuous basis monitor them to appropriate Indian agencies so that follow-up action can be conceived and implemented.

The ITDC as well as the Indian Council of Cultural Relations should in their publicity activities highlight the significant strides that India has achieved in specific modern scientific and technological fields. This, to some extent, will meet the concerns of many Latin American countries. At the same time, educational exchanges, essentially in respect of teachers, specialists and experts in specific fields should be further encouraged. Efforts must be made under the auspices of the ICCR to study and assess academic and research programmes relating to Indian studies in several of the Latin American Universities and research centres. Educational exchanges are very necessary to create a climate favourable to close



cooperation. Equally, our efforts to promote Latin American studies should be enhanced, I would like to be enlightened on what we have done to promote Latin American studies in our Universities and Research Institutions. Almost some 15-16 years ago, the Ministry had announced that they are going to set up a Centre for Latin American studies. Sir, I do not know of any programme of Latin American studies except the modest one established by the Jawaharlal Nehru University. I do not know why we should not provide additional facilities and support to this solitary on-going programme and at the same time encourage more such institutions elsewhere in the country.

Recently, I was in Panama and it was there that I learnt from a few Spanish-speaking people of an excellent magazine called 'La India' being brought out in Spanish by our Embassy in Panama. I take this opportunity to congratulate all those concerned and such all-round informative literature should be more circulated in Latin America.

Sir, in the Annual Report that we have been given, on Policy Planning and Research, there is mention of a modest budget to assist Seminar and Conferences on international affairs. But, unfortunately, there is mention of a single instance of Latin America being considered. I hope this would be taken up more seriously in future to assist such programmes on Latin America.

In the Chapter on Cultural Relations—I refer to page 92—a mention has been made of setting up a centre for Africa South and South-East Asian Cultural studies. May I know: why not Latin America? Why are we trying to give a feeling to that part of the world that Latin-America would follow after the other regions of the world?

An important event that is to take place in that part of the world is the 150th Anniversary of Indians setting foot on Latin American soil which is going to be celebrated next year, in May, in a big way in Guyana, Surinam, Trinidad and other Latin American and Caribbean countries. I do hope that we will assist and encourage them in a big manner.

Sir, another important factor regarding that part of the countries is that the Latin American Parliament where India was an invitee as an observer in the early 70s, seems to have lost touch after that. It was only during 1973 and 74, an observer was sent from here. Now, that the democratic process is in full swing in Latin American countries, we should make all efforts to revive our contacts with the Latin American Parliament.

With this, I would like to, once again, congratulate the Government for setting up a Consultative Committee for Non-Resident Indians. Also, I would like to know as to how the NRIs from Latin American countries are being encouraged and involved in the activities of this council.

While concluding, I would only like to remind the Government that these friendly Latin American countries while extending their hand of friendship, who are giving their support to all our programmes, who are also encouraging us to participate in a lot of programmes there, if we do not take the opportunity now, probably tomorrow, it may be too late.

Thank you.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN (Kishanganj): Mr. Chairman, Sir, as I went through the Annual Report of the Ministry of External Affairs for 1986-87, I had a feeling that our diplomacy during the last year represented a lot of notion but very little movement. I tried to understand the mind behind this diplomacy and I felt that, in the dimension of time, it take a long-term view rather than a short term and immediate view, and in the dimension of space, its eyes seem to be focussed on a distant horizon neglecting our immediate neighbourhood. We have to come down from the sky, and instead of taking a bird's eye-view, I plead, we take a worm's eye-view. Let us understand that diplomacy cannot be measured in terms of the number of countries with which we exchange VIP visits, that diplomacy is not just champagne and roses or receptions and candle-light dinners. It is hard, sustained and intelligent pursuit of national interest. It takes place more often in a smoke-filled room until the wee hours of the morning. That effort

[Shri Syed Shahabuddin]

seems to be lacking. We seem to take a superficial view, and it is time to re-state some of the basic fundamentals.

It does not need to be said that national interests are supreme. But national interests must be defined in a certain scale of priorities. We know that we are not a territorially-hungry power. We are even exceptional in the sense that we have abjured violence in trying to recover what rightfully belongs to us. We do not aspire to conquest or, as Prof. Ranga has said, even to a great power status. We do not believe in aggrandisement or in armtwisting or in influence-peddling, nor do we aspire to the leadership of this bloc or that. But everybody will agree that our independence and sovereignty are supreme and their protection and defence is of paramount importance. Everybody will agree that we must live in peace with our neighbours, and wherever there are conflicts of interest, we should make every possible effort to harmonise, to reconcile our differences and to reduce the area of conflict. Everybody will agree that we must make a sincere effort all the time to resolve outstanding bilateral questions, that we must, looking forward, try to convert this area, South Asia, of which we are a part, into an area of peace, friendship and cooperation. I think we have a legitimate right to say that we want the Indian Ocean to be a Zone of Peace and not of rivalry. Also, since we are also a part of the world, we also wish to make a modest contribution to the evolution of a just international order in its political and economic dimensions. We want a world without war and without want, without dependence and without fear. We are, therefore, for de-colonisation, for peace, for disarmament and development and for human rights. But we also want access to development resources and technology on equal, equitable and reasonable terms in order that we can achieve the final objective of nationhood, a life with dignity for our people, and not only for our people but for the people of the third world as a whole.

But, Sir, when, with this criterion we judge the performance of one year, what exactly have we to offer? If the defence budget can be taken to be a simple index—it is not enough or absolute—the mere rise in the defence budget implies the relative

failure of diplomacy. We know the social cost of defence. And yet, defence and defence preparedness, as I said the other day, is supreme. But when we analyse our trade we find that the terms are negative, they are deteriorating. Our share in world trade is going down. Our Balance of Payment is increasingly adverse. The terms of economic aid that are available to us are getting stiffer. And the terms on which technology is available for our development is also becoming more and more constrained.

In our security environment, we find once again both Pakistan and China looming large on our horizon. We cannot wish them away and yet I feel that we have to take a somewhat detached and emotional approach. Sometimes, I feel that our relations with our immediate neighbours are seen through the haze of history. Sometimes through the emotional view of, shall I call it ethnic memories. If we are to achieve our priorities, then in that case, well while I applaud all that the Government has done on the question of Apartheid it cannot take precedence over a meaningful term to our relation with China or Pakistan. It cannot take precedence over the situation in Sri Lanka. We cannot afford to ignore the occupation of Afghanistan by a foreign power. We cannot possibly line with equanimity with the continuing war in our neighbourhood between Iran and Iraq. Even the ebb and flow of detente cannot take precedence over the ebb and flow of the terms of transfer of technology or of development resources to developing countries. De-escalation of nuclear confrontation on the European soil cannot take precedence over the problem posed to us by the escalation of nuclear rivalry in the Indian Ocean. Border negotiations with a neighbour cannot take precedence over restoring the disturbed border situation in a distant part of the world, however laudable that objective may be.

The funny thing is that we harp on non-alignment as if non-alignment was itself a policy. Non-alignment is really a principle, it is not a policy. I shall not go into its definition whether it is static equi-distance or a dynamic equilibrium between super powers. Supposing super powers came together what shall happen to our non-

alignment. So non-alignment must be defined in terms of independence of judgment, the capacity to be what we are, to do what we feel like what we consider as supreme in national interest. This non-alignment will remain permanent as a matter of principle. The Prime Minister inherited the Crown of the Non-aligned movement. In course of time it has passed on to another nation. But, it seems to me that he liked it and I grant that he should. But, somehow, I feel sometimes in the moments of euphoria he tended to show the infatuation of a green-horn when he discovers his first love. Or perhaps, somebody thinks that he invented Non-alignment. In any case whatever it was Non-alignment, simply harping on it as Mantra is no answer. We have to have a definite policy towards specific problems, towards States which are of significance in our relations, towards regions which are worthy of note, towards specific world problems and towards, if I may say so, our customers and our suppliers. We must have a clear conception about what we wish to do in a specific situation as it confronts us. Sir, when I come to the specific situation in South Asia, I wish to felicitate the Government on the step forward that SAARC has taken, with the second SAARC Summit held in India as well as the establishment of a permanent Secretariat. But, South Asia has to be looked upon in a much larger sense. South Asia is a geographic, a strategic and an economic unity. Our foreign policy must not deviate from that basic perception. We have the capacity as a nation, we are blessed by God that we are at the heart of this region and we have the means in terms of ethnicity, language and religion to build bridges with every single neighbour of ours in this region. How much are we doing to achieve than to build these bridges?

We had a communication gap with Pakistan to which the Hon. Minister of State testified the other day and we almost came to blows a few months ago. We are at the threshold of a nuclear arms race. I wish to plead with you Mr. Chairman, let us stop it with all means at our command. It is *per se* an evil. It is nothing but madness to have an arms race and worse to look for an arms race in nuclear terms in our sub-continent. We must do everything possible in order to stop the ball from being

set rolling which in the form of a Greek tragedy may leads us to a nuclear confrontation on this soil.

What progress have we made on the proposed treaty of friendship and cooperation with Pakistan? Why have we not achieved any meaningful progress on trade? Let that be explained to the nation. We must not allow any inhibition to come in the way of direct negotiations even—I am using a very basic suggestion, once again on the question of joint defence of the sub-continent and cooperation in the field of nuclear energy. Let the guns which are turned against each other be turned outward to the defence of the sub-continent as a whole and not be used for fratricide.

I again wish to congratulate the Hon. Minister for finalising the delimitation of the maritime boundary between India and Burma. That is something which was started, if I may say so humbly, at the time when I was in charge of that area. I am happy that it had come to a fruitful conclusion. And yet the people of Indian origin in Burma go on suffering discrimination.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please conclude.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN : Just two-three minutes Sir.

In Sri Lanka we are facing a terrible situation. It has gone beyond the situation of violation or a persistent violation of human rights, as the phrase goes. It has reached to the dimension of ethnic genocide. It has gone to the situation practically of a civil war. If every street of Colombo becomes a battle ground, where shall we be? With a neighbour completely chaotic and unstable we have get to think in terms of what are we going to do about that.

In Bangladesh, while we had the unresolved question of Ganga water, now we have the 'Chakma problem also. In Nepal, I understand that they have unilaterally cut away the privileges of the Indian nationals there. I would like to know more about it. There are increasing signs of Chinese presence there.

With China, I need not dialte about their intrusion in Arunachal Pradesh

[Shri Syed Shahabuddin]

although I don't want that to become the final stumbling block. I would still believe that every effort must be made to find a settlement and to come to on settlement. Let us have a dialogue and let us at least make them agree that while we have a dialogue, they shall not move forward. They shall maintain the status quo.

In Afghanistan, we still have the problem. Finally, it is a question of priorities.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please conclude.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN : Yes Sir.

In the Middle-east, we have always been harping just as on Indian Ocean, about an international conference. We see it nowhere on the horizon. We have the horrible example of the use of chemical weapons in violation of all international obligations by one nation against another in our neighbourhood and we remain silent about it.

In the economic field, where is the much wanted new international economic order? SDR's have not been replenished. The multi-nationals are coming in with greater impunity. The transfer of technology has become more worrisome.

The south-south cooperation has remained a pious phrase despite all the resolutions of the last non-aligned summit. We have given Rs. 9 crores for 60 countries. I just worked it out. It comes to Rs. 15 lakhs per state. That is the measure of south-south cooperation, as far as we are concerned.

Finally I wish to point out the institutional gap. The foreign office today stands emasculated and demoralised with the public execution of a foreign secretary before the eyes of the television. We have a peculiar situation there. We had four Ministers, five Minister of State and four Foreign Secretaries in the course of a little over two years. How can you run the foreign office in this manner as an institution? Therefore, I would say please restore the continuity of our diplomacy. Please do not meddle with it. Foreign policy does not vary from

Government to Government. It should not vary because it represents permanent interests. Foreign policy must represent a national consensus and for the execution of that policy we have no other instrument except the foreign office. Treat the foreign office with respect. Treat foreign office with a little consideration. Evaluate your priorities. Assess our immediate needs and resources. Apply our limited resources carefully. Identify national interests and pursue the national interests relentlessly without fear or favour whether it hurts the great powers or anybody else.

SHRI T. BASHEER (Chirayinkil) : Sir, I rise to support the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of External Affairs. This gives me an opportunity to express my views on our policy regarding international relations and other concerned matters.

Sir, our foreign policy has stood the test of time. We had been very consistent in our foreign policy. On all the world issues our opinion is very clear and the world community appreciates our stand. Actually the main thrust of India's foreign policy has been always a strong sense of identity with non-aligned movement; stubborn opposition to the nuclear arms race; stubborn opposition to the move to militarise outer space and our solidarity to the people who fight against colonialism, imperialism and racialism.

The wisdom of Panditji is an inspiring source not only for India but also for all countries especially the developing countries and the countries which are fighting for their identity and freedom. It was Panditji who raised his voice against the nuclear armaments more than 20 years ago. He appealed for stopping of nuclear tests pending signing of test ban treaty and now we are living under the serious threat of a nuclear holocaust. I know my time is very limited. So I do not want to go into those details because the general issues and our approach towards those issues has already been stated by my colleagues and particularly by Shri Bipin Pal Das.

17.00 hrs.

Sir, I would like to draw the attention

of the hon'ble Minister to some of the points which I consider important in the given situation. One is, as many friends have said here, about our relations with our neighbouring countries especially with Pakistan and China. Despite all our sincere efforts to normalise our relations with these countries, the situation is going bad. Everybody said so in their speeches while participating in the discussions.

Sir, about our relations with Pakistan, India's initiative to diffuse the tension demonstrated our desire for good relationship with Pakistan. But the reports appearing in the Press and the reports we receive from other sources are causing a great concern to us. There had been meetings of Heads of States of both these countries. There are also expression of views of Secretaries level. But I would like to say the things are going bad.

Sir, in the annual report it is said :

"During January 1987, tension on the India-Pakistan border aggravated on account of Pakistani forces having moved to provocative and threatening positions."

After that also, tensions in Indo-Pak border are reported in the newspapers many a time. So, I would like to know what is the present position? What steps the Government have taken in this regard?

I would like to refer to two or three things in this context which come in the way of normalisation of our relations with Pakistan. One is Pakistan's getting a massive build-up of sophisticated weapons including AWACS. Sir, Pakistan's nuclear programme affects our security environment. In his recent interview with the 'Time' magazine, President Zia-ul-Huq of Pakistan acknowledged that Pakistan has the capability to develop nuclear weapons. Earlier to that, Dr. A.Q. Khan, the leading nuclear scientist of Pakistan, had admitted in an interview reported by 'Observer', London, what CIA has been saying about Pakistan's possessing a bomb is correct. Pakistan's acquisition of nuclear weapons is a development which we cannot afford to ignore. So, I would like to know from the hon'ble Minister what is the reaction of the Govern-

ment. Also, I would like to know whether the Government propose to reconsider our policy regarding the use of nuclear weapons.

Sir, we are also concerned about the role of USA in Pakistan's military build-up. I would like to draw, in this context, the attention of the House to the Pakistan Prime Minister's visit to Washington in July last year and the United States' 4.02 billion dollars package for Pakistan. Incidentally, I remember a statement made by Shri Junejo, the irrelevant statement on India planning to attack Pakistan during Indiraji's time. So, Sir, I would like to know from the Hon. Minister whether the Government have taken these issues with Pakistan, if so with what results?

Next is our relation with China. Our relations with China are also running into difficulties day-by-day, especially in the context of new posture that China has adopted. Now, you know everything and due to lack of time I cannot explain. You also know about China's new tactics. My colleague here said about the nexus between China and Pakistan, Islamabad and Beijing. I also feel that there is a gang-up between China, Pakistan and America.

Sir, the main hurdle between India and China is about this question of Chinese intrusion. Many colleagues have asked about this, I am not going into details now. Then my colleague said about China's objection to the conferment of Statehood to Arunachal Pradesh. Such instances are taking place. We had discussed many times these problems. In the last Session, I remember, the Minister said that and we protested all this. But, despite all protests they go with their plans; that is what is happening, Sir.

Now, Sir, I say, China and Pakistan opened 4620 m high Kunjerab Pass in Pakistan occupied Kashmir to third country nationals. Sir, the pass was earlier opened for those two countries only. Then we protested, but they forgot. Now, they opened this pass for all. That is happening, Sir.

Sir, here is a report. The report says that the survey teams from China and Pakistan are now demarcating the boundaries across the Mc Mohan Line in the

[Shri T. Basbeer]

eastern sector recognising sovereignty over occupied Kashmir in this region. It is reported that they are carrying their surveys, I am not going into the details. Mr. Saifuddin has said about Pakistan and then U.S.A. Mr. Saifuddin must understand there is an addition also to that and that addition is China. There is a U.S.-China-Pak gang-up.

I would like to suggest the Hon. Minister about our policy with neighbours. Sir, considering our past experience the Government should do a detailed review about our neighbourhood diplomacy and should come forward with some new ideas.

Sir, another issue is that of increasing military rivalry in the Indian ocean. Sir, instead of implementing the U.N. Declaration, interested powers have gone ahead in increasing their military presence in the area.

We have been talking about the meeting of the littoral States. I would like to know from the hon. Minister as to what steps are being taken by India in this direction? What new initiative is going to be taken by the hon. Minister in this direction to convene a meeting of the littoral States?

As my hon. friends have stated, terrible genocide is taking place in Sri Lanka. Because of the limited time at my disposal, I cannot elaborate on this. But I really do not know as to what our hon. Minister thinks about this problem. Something must be done now.

17.11 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

[*Translation*]

SHRI NARESH CHANDRA CHATURVEDI (Kanpur) : Mr Deputy Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of External Affairs and convey my congratulations to the hon. Minister, Pandit Narayan Datt Tiwari for following the same policy which was followed by Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru from the very beginning of our

independence and was founded by Mahatma Gandhi even when India had not become independent.

Love, peace, mutual goodwill and amity has been our policy and this farsightedness has been continuing since pre-independence era till date *i.e.* after 40 years of independence. Some colleagues say that there is no stability and farsightedness in the policy of the Government. But I think this is wrong. The policy of the Government has remained unchanged. I would like to say that though some persons have taken undue advantage of the liberal policy of the Government but India has performed its duty correctly and has never shown any laxity. I would also deal this subject in brief.

The name of China has been mentioned. I would not like to repeat the old things. But I would like to draw the attention towards the recent happenings in Arunachal Pradesh. A disquieting situation has arisen in the matter of relation with China. I would request the Government to consider over it seriously and try to solve it.

The very creation of Pakistan has been on the foundation of hatred and ill will. Therefore, we do not expect any good from the machinery which has been ruling that country since its creation. Whenever some trouble takes place there, they try to divert the attention of their people by raising the bogey of India. Therefore, it is unimaginable to expect from them adoption of friendly policy towards India. Yet our Government has been making efforts again and again to solve the border problem with Pakistan amicably. This has not been done only at present but during the time of the late Shrimati Indira Gandhi, late Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri and the late Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru also. We should restore amity between the two countries, but the response from the other side has not been encouraging. I want that Government should made efforts in this direction once again and as has been said by my brother Shahabuddin, what objection the Government of India can have if wise counsel prevails on them? There cannot be a happier thing for India if peace prevails in the world and India and Pakistan jointly strive for it.

Now a submission about South Africa. The issue of South Africa is causing deep concern to us. Even the *Ashram* of Mahatma Gandhi was burnt there. India has always raised its voice against racial discrimination of Blacks the world over. These Super Powers have not said good bye to the politics of injustice and atrocities even today. If there is any democratic country in the world who has continuously stood against it, it is India. And, it is still continuing its crusade. The whole world appreciates India for this stand of ours. This august House as well as all peace loving citizens the world over have always been sending their good wishes to Indian Government and its leadership for it. This work should always be kept up so that the historical role India has played in keeping peace in the world may always be written in golden letters.

There is one more point to which I want to draw Government's attention. The problem of the people of Indian origin living abroad has become very complex. Sri Lanka's example is before us. Our relations with the countries which are now better off, such as Surinam, Mauritius, Fiji and Guyana where people of Indian origin are living and have accepted them as their own countries, are somewhat strange even though these people have helped them in bringing prosperity there. We shall have to bring changes in our approach with regard to our liaison with those countries. In my view, we try to complete the formality of keeping relations with these brothers of Indian origin in the same way as we do in the case of our relations with other countries of Europe. If we continue with this approach, it is not going to strengthen our relations; rather it will adversely affect our established relations. In my view, it cannot be achieved on political front alone. Our art, culture, literature will play a vital role in it. One of our friends has rightly said that at one time, religion too played a role in it. India has never invaded any country. If at all it invaded thousands years ago, it was in the field of religion, art, literature and culture through which it spread its message of peace and love. There was not an iota of injustice or atrocity involved in it. Today our view point remains the same but we have rendered our culture and art

weak. Our approach has also weakened. If we could strengthen that view point, we would be able to strengthen our relations with the countries where people of Indian origin are living because they would be tied with the bonds of brotherhood. Our relations with those countries will be further strengthened if we meet or try to meet them at an informal level.

There is yet another point that I would like to submit and I have a personal experience also in this regard. The Indians who go abroad are not given good treatment by the Indian Embassies. Their attitude is not as cooperative as is in the case of embassies of other countries towards their respective citizens. Government should look into it as to why indifference is shown by them? There is a general complaint of the Indian citizens that an indifferent attitude is shown to them by the Indian embassies, leave aside paying attention to their cultural, linguistic and other problems. I have also heard complaints that the bundles of books sent by the Ministry of External Affairs to the Indian embassies are not even opened. Reading material worth lakhs of rupees remain there untouched for years. Why this indifference? If such kind of indifference continues even under the stewardship of wise and learned Minister like Shri Narayan Datt Tiwari, it would be quite strange.

I have to say one thing more. The Hon. Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi has been trying to solve mutual problems with the neighbouring countries. By now these problems should have been solved but for the obstacles put by some quarters in this regard. So far as the question of creating trouble within the country is concerned, the Hon. Prime Minister himself has resolved the issues involved. Peace has been restored in a number of border States. But caution will have to be taken against the internal disturbances and the activities of the terrorists, who are out to create conditions which may lead to strained relations with outside world.

I would like to make a submission about Sri Lanka too. The Government of Sri Lanka should be asked to stop atrocities against the Tamil and Tamil extremists too should be cautioned

[Shri Naresh Chandra Chaturvedi]

against causing harassment to Sri Lankan Government. I want that Pakistan too should be asked to refrain from unwanted activities. Whatever steps Government wants to take in this connection should be taken firmly.

With these words, I once again thank you and conclude.

\*SHRI P. SELVENDRAN (Periyakulam): Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, on behalf of the All India Anna Dravida Munetra Kazhagam let me express my views on the demands for grants relating to the Ministry of External Affairs.

At a time when the aggressive design of imperialist nations are at its zenith and when external forces are working against the stability, unity and integrity of our country, it is my bounden duty to caution the Government against the challenges, I bring to the attention of this House that it is time we reorient our diplomatic and military strategies.

Foundation of our foreign policy were laid by late Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru. Our foreign policy is aimed at the peaceful co-existence of nations and there cannot be two opinions on this.

India's avowed enemy Pakistan amassed troops on the border and escalated the tension. China went a step further and committed intrusion into Arunachal Pradesh. War clouds were hovering. Everyone expected a war to explode at any time out of this dismal situation. However, the sagacity and statesmanship of our hon. Prime Minister Shri Rajiv Gandhi averted the war.

China has for long accepted, in practice, that Arunachal Pradesh indisputably belongs to India. However, to give formal recognition of India's sovereignty over Arunachal Pradesh, the Chinese have been urging upon India to concede Aksai Chin in Western sector in favour of them. When we granted statehood to Arunachal Pradesh, the Chinese, not only objected to it, they even warned us of serious consequences.

Pakistan is in possession of a nuclear bomb. After concentrating troops on the border and escalating the tension on the border, President Zia Ul Haq of Pakistan visited India to witness a cricket match, perhaps to play his own cricket diplomacy.

At this juncture, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister. When Shri Gorbachav visited our country, he openly advised us to try to mend our differences with Pakistan by peaceful negotiation. During the war of Bangladesh liberation, when U.S. Seventh Fleet moved menacingly towards the war torn waters in support of Pakistan the Soviets roared that they would not wait and watch the fun. The present appeal on Indo-Pak relation also emanate from the same Soviet land. Even a Pakistan daily had reported that the appeal of Shri Gorbachev is in sharp contrast to the stand of another Soviet leader Shri Kurushev when he visited India in 1955. Shri Kurushev declared that the accession of Kashmir to India was a final and once for all a closed affair. We cannot forget how this enraged our Pakistani compatriots. New Delhi must closely monitor the reactions of Pakistan to the statements made by Shri Gorbachev on Afganisthan and Indo-Pak relations.

Strains in the ties of India with Pakistan and China are not new. We are fully aware of the perspectives and dimensions of our relations with these two neighbours.

In the case of Sri Lanka it is a different thing, I draw the attention of this House to the sordid fact that Sri Lanka is no more a friendly country. Sri Lanka is fastly distancing itself from us. We must note it. Sri Lanka fails to understand Indian goodwill and mediatory efforts with a view to settle the ethnic problem. It fails to understand our moves in the right perspective. Instead it emits enmity against us.

Sri Lanka is waging war against its own men. It imposes economic blockage against its own citizens and starves them to death. These gory and genocidal incidents form the blood-stained chapters of the history of that island nation.

\*The speech was originally delivered in Tamil.



When I think of the Sri Lankan imbroglio, I am reminded of the Sri Lanka of the epic age. The Eelam Tamils may be compared to Sita in distress. I am proud to cast our Hon. Prime Minister Shri Rajiv Gandhi in the role of Sri Rama, the Saviour. The Eelam Tamils are in the perpetual hope that a time may sooner come that they need shed tears no more; no more they would suffer. And that India will its protective hands. I am sure that the Indian Government would not betray the confidence of the Tamils. Tamils would not be disappointed on this count. Government must, therefore, take urgent steps in this matter.

As far as Sri Lankan ethnic conflict is concerned, the Indian side laid emphasis on these aspects. Firstly, negotiations must continue on the basis of talks held on Dec. 19. Secondly, the Sri Lankan Government must immediately lift the economic blockade. Lastly, the Sri Lankan Government must stop killing of innocent Tamils. Despite our insistence on the Sri Lankan Government to accept these proposals, have they agreed to these suggestions? Have they lifted the economic blockade? Have they stopped killing innocent Tamils? No. All our appeals have fallen on deaf ears. Shri Jayawardane's statement that he had lifted the economic blockade is untrue; a cosmetic distortion of facts; a farce; a political chicanery.

I would also like to draw the attention of the Minister to an important thing. To hold talks with the Sri Lankan Government you first sent Shri Parthasarathy, then Shri Bandhari and thereafter Shri P. Chidambaram and Shri Natwar Singh. And now you have sent Shri Dinesh Singh. I am happy that you send emissaries to hold talks. But why do you change the emissaries often. Whether it is Shri Parthasarathy or Shri Bandhari or Shri P. Chidambaram or Shri Natwar Singh or Shri Dinesh Singh, they are simply carriers of the Government's message. Why do you change the emissaries? Do we derive any benefit by changing them? Why one has been preferred over the other? I believe the Hon. Minister will explain these questions in his reply.

When a solution is in sight, some unfortunate incidents happen and the parties

tumble into the quagmire again. It is something like when butter is eagerly charned, the milkpot abruptly breaks.

Even in the morning we had learnt from newspapers that nearly 150 persons died and more than 200 injured in a bomb blast in Colombo. We condemn the perpetrators of this crime, whoever, they may be. We always condemn violence and we desire that it should be quelled with all vehemence.

Violence is like a double-edged sword. Those who live by the sword, shall perish by the sword. That is what is happening in Sri Lanka.

The charged remains of both the cigarette and the match stick which lighted it, go to the ash-tray at the end. Likewise, both the perpetrators and the provocateurs of violence go to graveyard ultimately.

We cannot squarely blame the innocent Tamils for what had happened in Colombo yesterday. The Tamils in Sri Lanka are shedding blood everyday. They are undergoing ordeals for the past four years. Their womenfolk are dishonoured. They do not have security to life and property. I strongly feel that this massacre is nothing but a sabotage to divert the growing global sympathy for the Tamils. May be even the handiwork of the political opponenets of Shri Jayawardane.

Recently, some 100 bus passengers were killed in Sri Lanka. Consequent to the killings, the Sri Lankan President announced that he would arm 5000 sinhalese civilians with guns for providing self-defence. Provision of security to life and property is solely the duty of the Government and self-defence of this sort is no answer. This would only worsen the situation. I request the Hon. Minister to impress upon the Sri Lankan Government to desist from any such dangerous move.

We condemn the racist regime in South Africa. When we raise our voice against the racist regime and suggest an economic embargo we spit anger as fury flushes out of Lord Shiva's third eye. We are as stout and firm as a banyan tree in our solidarity against the Pretoria regime. But when it come to settle the ethnic problem in Sri

[Shri P. Selvendran]

Lanka our determination is not even as stout as the wayside creeper. I am sad to note this.

When we voice the demand for an economic embargo against the South African regime, why should not we impose the same on Sri Lanka which has unleashed an economic blockade against our own brethren.

Sri Lanka is a member of the non-aligned community. The movement is a comity of nations which abjures all forms of violence and condemn human rights violations. I request the Government to muster strength among the non-aligned nations to expel Sri Lanka which is abusing its right as a member of the Movement from the Movement itself. It perpetrates genocide against its own population.

South African question is simply a thorn in the flesh of Mother India. But the problem of Tamils in Shri Lanka is a sore in the very eyes of Bharat Matha. There is vast difference between these two problems. There is hundred fold urgency to settle the Tamil question.

Sir, I caution the Government to be beware of Sri Lanka in the guise of a friendly nation. By shaking hands with us in a friendly manner, it may even steal our very fingers and if chance comes, it may even wipe the life lines of our palms.

At this juncture, I caution the Government that Shri Lanka is becoming a base for imperialist powers. If at all a threat comes from Indian Ocean, it will come from Sri Lanka.

I am now reminded of the lines of our Kingpoet Kannadasan. He said enemies are like thorns well visible whereas friends are thorns hidden. He therefore prays to god to save him from friends as he can take upon the challenge from his enemies. These meaningful words are true in the case of our relations with Sri Lanka.

Please do not hope that Shri Jayawardane will show compassion on our brethren Tamils. Do not hope he will sympathise

with Tamils. Do not hope he will solve their problem. I am convinced he will not do it. A tigress never suckles a fawn. We, must, therefore, change our approach and policy towards this island nation. Lastly, let me quote a famous Tamil Poet Shri Vairamuthu :

“O, Cartographer, You are a prophet, for on the map of India, you had shown Sri Lanka too.”

I do not think that the poet insinuates that Sri Lanka forms part of our territory. But, I hope that Sri Lankans may not drag us to the point that we act in a manner that these light, innocuous and prophetic words of the poet come true.

[English]

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Basirhat) :  
Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, one would like to speak about a very large number of subjects falling within the scope of this Ministry, but unfortunately or fortunately—I do not know which—the constraints of time compel me to limit my remarks to just a few topics.

I may say, at the outset, that within the broad framework of the country's foreign policy, which is not the foreign policy of any particular Government or particular Prime Minister, I should say it is a traditional policy of this country which has been followed for so many years and which we fully support, I restrict myself to pointing out what I consider to be a certain lack of initiative. There is need for making the same policy more dynamic and, therefore, taking certain initiative which, I believe, are very very necessary in the present situation.

First of all, let me just make a brief reference to South Africa to remind the House that this is the 75th anniversary this year of the African National Congress which is being celebrated and observed all over the world. My suggestion is that the best way of honouring the South African people and the African National Congress on the occasion of this 75th Anniversary is, for our Government, to give diplomatic status, diplomatic representation to the African National Congress. I see no reason what-

soever why this should be delayed. We have given recognition to SWAPO of Namibia which was very welcome indeed. We have got very very close relations with the African National Congress. At present, the international public opinion is more against the Pretoria regime than it was ever before. At the same time, the liberation upsurge of the South African people has reached a much higher level than it had ever reached before, and at such a time to give a further boost to the morale of these freedom fighters, to extend our hand more firmly to giants like Nelson Mandela and Walter Sisulu and others who are rotting in the jails of the racist regime. I think our Government should seriously now consider this question of giving diplomatic recognition to the African National Congress. It would be something fitting the long history and tradition which this country has got of standing squarely behind the South African peoples' struggle. This is one suggestion I have to make.

Another one is regarding the Indian Ocean. Over a space of 14 years, from the 16th December 1971 to the 16th of December 1985, the United Nations General Assembly has passed 16 Resolutions in 14 years recommending the convocation of this conference whose venue is also decided upon in Colombo to discuss and decide on this question of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. Now, the latest target date for this Conference, latest, it has been constantly shifted and shifted and postponed, has been fixed as the first half of 1986. Now, we are in the first half of 1987, no conference has taken place. Every time it is being sabotaged and torpedoed by the United States Government, everybody knows it. They flatly refuse to participate in such a conference although it is a decision of the United Nations General Assembly, repeated 16 times in 14 years.

So the point I want to make is : what do we propose to do about it ? Where do we go from here ? We can follow this policy of just waiting and waiting and waiting passively knowing very well in our heart of hearts that this conference will never materialise because of the present policy of the United States. Meanwhile, the situation in the Indian Ocean is becoming more and more dangerous from the

point of view of the security, not only of our country but of this entire region. Sir, on the 13th October last year, speaking at some function in Jakarta in Indonesia, I find that our Prime Minister had called for and I quote :

"Fresh initiatives by the littoral States in order to halt the military build up and the naval rivalry in this region,"

This is what Mr. Rajiv Gandhi said in Jakarta. He emphasised the need for fresh initiatives by the littoral States.

Who is to take this initiative ? All the littoral States can't act together simultaneously, somebody has to take a step forward. And therefore I propose, I have proposed it on earlier occasions too, that the Government of India should find ways and means, take the initiative to bring about a conference. It won't be terms of the United Nations General Assembly's resolution at all. I am fully aware of that. It can't be because that is being frustrated. A conference of all those littoral States, the Governments of those littoral States bordering the Indian Ocean who are willing to come together may be a sort of an informal or unofficial conference to come together in order to spell out what they consider to be the components of this concept of a zone of peace. What exactly should it mean ? What are the measures necessary ? What are the steps to be taken so that this region can be converted from a region of tension and hot-beds of war into a region of peace ? Of course, I know if the United States was boycotting even the officially mooted conference of the United Nations it will certainly not take part in such a conference and in any way it is not one of the littoral States. It is not by any stretch of imagination a littoral State of the Indian Ocean, though the whole of the Ocean is dotted with its bars including Deigo Garcia. But some of the other States may not like the Soviet Union to take part in such a Conference. The Soviet Union, strictly speaking, geographically is not a littoral State either. So, for the time being I would suggest that even if these two powers are not present, let there be a Conference of the Littoral States and let India take the initiative to try to persuade the Governments with whom we have got such

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

good relations and close relations, at least let it be a forum of the littoral States from where they can spell out and speak out and say 'this is what our idea of what a zone of peace is'. Are we going to go on waiting helplessly, year after year, for something which we know will never materialise? I cannot go into further details, but I think this is a matter worthy of serious consideration by the Government.

The third point I would like to say, Sir, is that it is high time that certain naive illusions which seem to haunt our External Affairs Ministry are given up. This also requires some initiative. We seem to have some kind of illusion, continuing illusion, in spite of what even our esteemed old colleague like Prof. Ranga was so categorical and clear about in his mind, but the cobwebs in the mind of the Foreign Ministry require to be cleared up and to be dispelled. There are certain harsh realities on the ground and those realities are the United States' global strategic consensus, of which Pakistan has become an integral part. The fall out from the recent Asian mission of Mr. Casper Weinberger is very plain for all of us to see. I have not understood to this day why our Government went out of its way to invite Mr. Weinberger to come to this country. We have talked so much in the last few days about dangers of destabilization and saying that we, on this side of the House, do not understand it, we are falling into the trap of the destabilizer. The biggest destabilizer of all, notorious for destabilizing operations, the United States Secretary of Defence, Mr. Casper Weinberger, one of the hawks in Washington, was brought here and given a red carpet welcome. For what purpose? What illusions do we have? Do we still think that we can convince the Americans and persuade them to give up their ties with Pakistan? Is it something sentimental? This is not sentimental ties. This is a reality of the Americans having a very very clear-cut strategic consciousness of the whole region, of how they want to behave here, particularly after Iran. Well, what shall I say about Iran? One Iran was that Iran which was there at the time of the Shah. Then there was an Iran for some time after the Shah was overthrown. And now there is another Iran whose future of course I am

not very clear about, but with whom the Americans who talk so much in recent years about international terrorism, global terrorism and how America was going to be in the vanguard of the fight against terrorism for which they went and bombed even Libya when they thought it necessary. This America, as it turned out, was utilising under-cover operations to supply arms to people in Iran who they thought would overthrow the Government there, arming them in order to carry out terrorist activities and then using the money received from the sale of those arms in order to finance these Contras in Nicaragua. Such is the face of this Government of President Reagan and even now apart from the futile attempts we made, I do not know what talks we had with Mr. Weinberger, but he flew away from here, landed in Islamabad (*Interruptions*) He announced there that they were going to give Pakistan AWACS system and so many more sophisticated weapons. Even now I read in the papers today and yesterday, in Washington, Mr. Natwar Singh has again been talking to Weinberger, trying to impress on him that, "It is very much against India's interest, what you are doing and why did you go and supply them all these lethal weapons, sophisticated weapons which are going to be used against us". What is he trying to persuade them about, I do not understand. This is all old calculated policy of the American Administration. And further more, they want to involve us, if possible, in a nuclear areas race with Pakistan also. Nothing will destabilise our country more than that. If we are some how or other stampeded into nuclear arms race with Pakistan, what will happen to Pakistan, well that anybody can imagine. But what will happen to us? So, I think that we are suffering from naive illusions. It is high-time that these things were given up. We should call spade a spade and know how to move.

Pakistan has become the regional policemen of the United States to defend their interests in this region. If you understand that, then we will move in a particular way.

So, two or three suggestions, I want to make in this connection. We should pursue a much more vigorous diplomatic

offensive. I do not think we are up to the mark in this. We should go in for suggesting and proposing some confidence building measures. We have to live by the side of Pakistan after all. Both these countries are neighbours and we cannot go away anywhere; nor can they. We have to establish India's credibility. And the fact is that a lot of media, both Indian media—I regret to say—as well as foreign media do show a pro-Pakistani bias, sometimes even boosting the image of Gen. Zia-ul-Haq as being a much more outspoken and consistent fighter for peaceful relations between India and Pakistan than we are. This needs to be exposed. We should not go on swinging from one extreme to the other. One day, we go into ecstasy about how wonderfully our relations are developing with Pakistan. The next day, we are down in the dump, because the situation gets worse. We should have a balanced policy. There is a transparent fraudulence in the Pakistani proposal for so-called peaceful settlement, Treaty of Friendship. That transparent fraudulence should be exposed. We should renew our demand that we are ready for any treaty which provides for not having any foreign bases in either of our two countries. If Pakistan does not like it, let them say so. But we must go on telling the world, this is our stand. We are prepared to sign any treaty of peace and friendship but the pre-condition is, neither in Pakistan nor in India will there be any foreign bases. We must remember that there is a very large and growing public opinion in Pakistan also. Pakistan is not only Zia-ul-Haq. There is a large body of public opinion in Pakistan which is against mortgaging the sovereignty of Pakistan to the United States. If you read the Pakistani Press, you will see that. They are against even Zia-ul-Haq's Afghan policy. More and more people are speaking up in Pakistan. Our strategy should be to strengthen the desire of people in Pakistan for peace and for an independent foreign policy in Pakistan.

Then, Sir, I will also suggest a proposal which we had made in December, 1985. But we appear to have given it up now. We should renew that proposal, that we want to have an agreement or a treaty not to attack each other's nuclear installations. We must go on on this, harping on this.

Every day they are saying that we are going to bomb Kaluta. Let there be an agreement that neither country will attack each other's nuclear installations; neither country will use nuclear capabilities of any kind against each other.

Judging from what happened a few weeks ago on the border, I would say, why do we not propose that in future, military exercises which are carried out by either of the two countries, observers should be allowed to be sent to each other's country? Observers should be present during the military exercises, Pakistani observers here and Indian observers there, when the military exercises are held above a certain level. As you know, there is such an agreement even between the Warsaw Pact and the NATO Pact powers that if they use more than a certain number of troops in these exercises, each side will allow observers of the other side to be present. This is the best way to prevent surprised attacks.

I would suggest that the Government should think about all these things and do something.

The last thing I would like to say is about Pakistan. On course, we do not know how far away Pakistan is from the bomb, one screw driver away or two screw drivers away, I cannot say. But in any case, we should not go on describing it as an Islamic bomb. I do not like that. That is a mistake made. It has aroused some indignation among all the Arab countries who are good friends of ours. In the suggestion that this is an Islamic bomb in the making of which the Arab countries have contributed, I do not think we have any evidence of that kind of thing. Somebody will want a Hindu bomb, somebody will want some other kind of bomb and all these bombs are bad.

I would say finally only one word about Sri Lanka. The annual report of the Ministry at page 6 of the Introduction admits that the situation in Sri Lanka has taken a turn for the worse. These are the words that they have used "turn for the worse." It is a very serious matter. I cannot give any specific suggestion as to what to do but I can see one thing that

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

there is a flurry of emissaries going all the time to Sri Lanka. First it was Mr. G. Parthasarathy, then it was Mr. Romesh Bhandari, then it was Mr. Natwar Singh, then it was Mr. Chidambaram and then it was Mr. Dinesh Singh who suddenly appeared on the scene and there is an illusory impression being given of progress towards solving this vexatious problem. But we should not deceive ourselves. The bitter fruit of deception was seen in the siege of Jaffna and in the blockade of the whole North and of the savage military and air assault which was made on the East and the North. I think that in the absence of any firm Indian policy and line, President Jayewardene will continue to play hot and cold. He will come to negotiations at the table and follow it up by military offensives on the ground. World opinion unfortunately has been confined so far to crocodile tears. We have not been able to rouse public opinion at all in the world. This is another admission of failure of diplomacy, I think.

Of course, the Tamil militants, I feel, should also sometimes be more restrained but then here too the interests of foreign powers are involved, very much so in Sri Lanka. It is not as though it is an independent Government taking its own decisions. There are foreign powers involved who are interested in no peaceful settlement coming about. They are seeking to get bases in Sri Lanka. We should have no illusions about it and, therefore, we should not delude ourselves that simply by sending now somebody and tomorrow somebody else to have some talks there, the matter is going to be solved. I am not advocating the sending of Indian armed force to Sri Lanka. It cannot be done obviously. But we have to take some tougher line and we have to step up our diplomatic offensive and we have to rouse international public opinion against what is happening in Sri Lanka. In this cause, I would plead with the Government to give up the old rut of thinking and to take some more dynamic steps and some initiatives and to make this foreign policy of ours more meaningful and more in the interests of our country in the crises we are facing today.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER :** It is now around 6 O'Clock. Can we extend one more hour ?

**THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI SHEILA DIKSHIT) :** If we could extend by one hour.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER :** We will extend by one hour. Tomorrow the hon. Minister will reply.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS :** No. No.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER :** We want to discuss more Demands under Departments also. If we go on like this, we have to follow the guillotine. That is why, within one hour we can discuss.

**AN HON. MEMBER :** We had no lunch today.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER :** That is why, for example, Mr. Gupta said that he will take 3 minutes. But he has taken 25 minutes. I cannot stop certain things.

**SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI :** You are exercising the guillotine day after tomorrow.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER :** But in order to avoid those things, I want to take some more time.

18.00 hrs.

**SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI :** Is the guillotine applied to tomorrow or not ?

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER :** It is not done tomorrow.

**SHRIMATI SHEILA DIKSHIT :** May be, it is on 28th.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER :** It is only on 28th. If we can spare one hour, we can take up more Departments. Now, Mr. Goswami, you can continue. I think we can extend the time of the House by one hour today.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS :** We can continue the discussion tomorrow. We can forgo lunch tomorrow.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : There are so many other Departments to be discussed. The Minister has to reply and he requires one or two hours.

(Interruptions)

SHRIMATI SHEILA DIKSHIT : We have already forgone lunch.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA (Bankura) : It is better that we continue tomorrow.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Today we will finish the discussion. There are only limited members. Tomorrow the Minister will reply. I think we can extend the time by one Hour.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA : Tomorrow we can forgo lunch...

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Today also, you have forgone lunch.

SOME HON. MEMBERS : We can speak tomorrow...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : We can extend the time by one hour. That is the maximum limit. I think, the hon. Members will accept it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS ; Yes.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Mr. Dinesh Goswami, you can continue.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I want to give some opportunity to other members. Otherwise, I can finish it within half-an-hour. Tomorrow, the Minister can reply.

(Interruptions)

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI (Guwahati) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, one really do not feel like speaking on an important debate like that of External Affairs in the late hour of the day when interests are virtually flagged. But still, as you have called upon me to speak, I will briefly express some of my own view points.

Sir, so far as the theoretical basis of our foreign policy is concerned, there is obviously the broadest consensus. Even though Governments have changed, the policy stood the test of time. It is an heartening matter to know that even when our foreign delegations have gone abroad with all the internal differences, when we have talked in terms of our foreign policy, we have always talked in one voice, that is the voice of the party in power.

Non-alignment, which was at one point of time, described as unethical, those powers are trying to put their own all allies into the Non-aligned Movement... (Interruptions) A number of non-aligned nations have grown. But I believe it is time for us to reflect. Because of the increase in the bulk of the non-aligned nations, the movement has lost some of its incisiveness. There was a time though when we were less in numbers and probably we were less powerful than today in terms of technological development, India's voice and those who were leading the Non-aligned Movement really cut much more ice in the international developments than it is being done today. One of the greatest tragedies that they are facing is that when we are telling others to settle the disputes peacefully, the Non-aligned nations have themselves become victims of the machinations of the imperialist powers. The Iran-Iraq war is going on. Even in the Sub-continent, we are facing new problems. One of the developments, which has been a positive development in this region, has been the establishment of South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation. I had the privilege of initiating that debate when the Minister made the statement in this House and I just pointed out that there are imponderable difficulties in making the SAARC a success. Difficulties on the difference of size of the seven countries, the difference in technological development, the difference in Government, the difference on global perceptions are there but one common factor that is there and that factor is; thousands of years of history and culture and also the bond of friendship arising out of poverty. The Seven SAARC nations contribute to the 20 per cent of the world population in only a three per cent of the land mass. Though we often say that we are very rich yet, figures show that the SAARC countries, including India, have only one per cent of the total natural resources.

[Shri Dinesh Goswami]

ces of the world. Therefore, this underdeveloped situation among the neighbouring nations and a long tradition of culture and history and common bonds of friendship led to the success of the start of the SAARC. But for SAARC to be a success, India and Pakistan must come together. If hostility between India and Pakistan continues, SAARC can never be a success. We can appreciate the need for better India-Pakistan relations in the context of the US role in Pakistan. I am in full agreement with Mr. Indrajit Gupta when he has said that if we jump into the race of nuclear race, we will be contributing to the causes of destabilisation. I am not saying like Morarji Desai that India should never have nuclear weapons. But I have seen also that there has been a demand from many quarters that because Pakistan possess the atom bomb, India should also go nuclear. I would say that we should be very careful in exercising this option. After all, threat to a country comes not only from external sources but also from internal sources, and the greatest threat to a country like India is its underdevelopment. There are millions of unemployed youth in this country who are waiting for opportunities and if we cannot fulfil their aspirations and urges, they will be a greater threat than the threat of atom bomb possessed by Pakistan. We have already committed about Rs. 1200 crores for defence, and I do not know how far that amount will be increased by the end of the year when we will have either the mid-term review or the final budget. But I believe that at this moment we should try to have more people-to-people contact with Pakistan. I have never been to Pakistan; I would like to be in Pakistan. But whatever reports we get from Pakistan we find that the people of Pakistan also suffer from certain apprehensions regarding our own approach to Pakistan. There seems to be a crisis of confidence between Pakistan and India, even at people-to-people level. That crisis of confidence must be removed. India has no intention of any territorial ambition so far as Pakistan is concerned and that is something on which we have not been able to put the diplomatic offensive as effectively as it should be.

We have taken the initiative in South Africa. I am happy about it. There are

often criticisms that a country like India which has so many problems of its own should not take upon itself the problems of South Africa, but I believe that when India launched its struggle for independence, we made it a point that India's struggle for independence is a global struggle against imperialism and oppression, Gandhiji launched his first movement of non-violence in South Africa. I do not consider that our own independence is complete unless the South African people get their inalienable right. What is South Africa's problem? The problem of South Africa is not only a problem of colour between white and black but it is a problem of differentiation in the same colour; in South Africa not only whites and blacks are differentiated but the blacks are also differentiated according to the colour of the skin. I will give one illustration to show the immensity of the problem in South Africa. There was a girl named Shandra Luing in South Africa. She had two white brothers but unfortunately she had a dark skin and crinkled hair. Both of her parents were white. But because the girl had a dark skin and crinkled hair, she was driven out of the school. The parents went to the court, but the court expressed its helplessness. It shows that in South Africa even white children, if they have got black skin, are punished. Ultimately, of course, because of international opinion, the law had to be changed in South Africa that if both the parents are white, the natural born children will automatically be given that classification. I feel that the stand that we took in favour of sanction should be pursued further. But, I am worried about one thing. And that is that the problem of Palestinians, which used to occupy such an important position in our international agenda, has gone to the background. Today, people are not talking in terms of merely generalisation but there are in constant movement by the Palestine people to restore to them their inalienable rights which are not there. I feel to that extent that the people of Arab world also has to be blamed. The differences amongst the Arab nations have played its part. The fact that the oil rich countries of the Arab world pumped their money in the United States when they became affluent also have played its part. But, I believe, India should take the initiative of linking up the question of South Africa with that of the Palestine



and should start the global movement because, if the Palestine problem is not solved, if the South-African problem is not solved, these are the two volcanoes from which ultimately there will be such an eruption which may lead to the total annihilation of the mankind.

Sir, to conclude, we have always talked in terms of disarmament and development. Let us not forget that during the last decade about 114 wars have taken place in the developing world because of the intervention of those powers which used to politically dominate us. Small countries developing countries are spending today even in our neighbourhood, much more per capita than even United States of America. The per capita expenditure of some of our neighbouring countries are more than the per capita expenditure of countries like United States. I think more initiative is necessary on our part to bring these countries together and to have common approach—Unless we can do that. I believe, that the Non-aligned movement may reduce itself to more or less a movement without showing much result or reduce itself to a talking shop. Therefore, I hope that the Government of India will take fresh initiative particularly in the vicinity of the neighbouring countries and will try to make SAARC a real success. Thank you.

SHRI C.P. THAKUR (Patna) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I thank you for giving some time on the Demands of External Affairs. I rise to support the Demand. The basic framework of the foreign policy of our country has been laid by late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru which has been pursued by late Smt. Indira Gandhi and the same policy is being pursued by our present Prime Minister. Everybody has appreciated the the efforts of our Prime Minister to defuse the teasion recently between India and Pakistan. If you now study the foreign policy of any country of the world, there are two aspects of it. Even the super powers, they want to remain super powers not only by increasing their strength but also decreasing and destabilising the strength of the other country. And to this aspect, everybody whether he is a Member of Parliament or public of all the developing countries of the world, whether he belongs to ruling party or whether he belongs to opposition,

they have to know and they have to become careful about it.

Now, the super powers, they buy time and they want to remain super powers. If we study that when America said that they are going for a Star Wars projects, possibly the Russian were not prepared so much and they bought some time and now they are equals. The major powers, they want to become super powers and then what is the alternative for the developing powers like us. I remember the history of England, when the Elizabeth-I was Queen of England, she used to say sometimes to Duke of France and sometimes to the Spain that whe will marry this man or that man. In the meantime, she built here country into a very powerful country. I think the same approach has to be followed by the developing countries. Coming to the question of our relationship with our neighbours, Chanakya said long back that our immediate neighbour will be our enemy and our neighbour's neighbour will be our friend. That does not mean only enemy, there will always be some sort of a fighting between our neighbours. So, we have to be careful.

India is a big country. Most of our neighbours suffer from the big-brother fobia. In Pakistan, it appears that in the recent past or in the recent months, developments have shown that it has actually become a path of the defenc strategy of United States of America. Whatever cry we make that Pakistan should not go nuclear, it should not be held by America or Canada etc., all our cries will go in vain.

We do support the idea that our Prime Minister has that we are against any nuclear race. But again we have to review our strategy. Every country is reviewing its strategy. Take for example the case of Iran. Iran was not involved in the Afghanistan affair. Now they say that when the problem of Afghanistan comes up, they should also be consulted. The same thing applies to India also. Pakistan is in broad framework of American policy.

Another important event has taken place very recently. There was a radio broadcast by Chinese Minister that the relationship between Russia and China is improving. If the relationship between China and Russia

[Dr. C.P. Thakur]

will improve, what will be the automatic framing of the policy of America in the coming ten or twenty years? They plan for twenty years ahead. America will now think—starting from Turkey, a different between two major powers. Saudi Arabia, Pakistan and other countries—whether the country, that super-power leads India or not. They will like India under their thumb so that they can make a defence umbrella starting from Turkey to Calcutta or something like that.

India has to be very careful about the policies and the way the defence strategies of different countries are changing. We always talk about Pakistan having this bomb or that bomb, it has got one nuclear manufacturing unit at Kahuta or somebody else saying that there are two and like that. Now the nuclear is not actually a race. The nuclear race involve many aspects, the industrial aspect, technological aspect and many other aspects. In that way India has to emerge as a power in South-east Asia. If it has to be balanced with the major thrust of countries like China, it has to go nuclear.

As Dinakar said once.

[Translation]

*Khsama Shobhati us bhujang ko  
Jiske paas garal ho'*

[English]

If India keep on saying that we will keep our nuclear option open, I think it might be too late for us.

We are in the age of technological revolution. Every technology becomes obsolete within two or three years. We have also to jump in this race because it is forced upon us. If we review the American strategy, then it is forced upon us.

Even all the missiles of China are directed towards India, there are reports. Then what India will do? India has to defend and for its defence it has to go nuclear.

Regarding China also if you see the things of the Chinese events, it appears that

whatever China does—whether intrusion into the Indian territory, whether objections etc.—everything is well timed and calculated moves. When India was taking up the non-aligned movement and held Foreign Ministers' conference, just after that there was some intrusion. When India took the stand of helping the coloured people, there was the hijacking of a plane in which Indians were there to Pakistan. So, India has to review in this set up.

More work has to be done by our foreign embassies. They have not only to propagate and look after our economic and political interests but they have also to warn against the evil designs of the other countries. If we are not careful at this moment then we are going to land ourselves in trouble. India is passing through a difficult phase of history and it has to be very careful. Though the policy of non-alignment which has been enunciated by Panditji is a sound one yet it needs updating, review and modernisation.

[Translation]

SHRIMATI USHA THAKKAR (Kutch): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I express my thanks to you for giving me an opportunity to speak on the Demands for Grants relating to the Ministry of External Affairs.

Barring a period of 2½ years, all our Prime Ministers have been following the foreign policy laid down by our revered leader Nehruji. One of our hon. M.Ps. has said that our Prime Minister emerged on the political scene two years ago. There is a saying in our Gujarat—"Morua inda chitrava na pade"—peacock lays eggs and they do not need to be coloured. The people of India are very wise and they realise how much time they wasted on colouring the eggs. I remember, when U.S.A. despatched its Seventh Fleet to the Indian ocean, the people became apprehensive as to what was going to happen. But our late Prime Minister, respected Shrimati Indira Gandhi, a warrior as she was, plucked up courage and called a public meeting in Delhi. The cooperation extended by the people of India at that time was unprecedented. Five lakh people had gathered in the meeting and they expressed

full confidence in her leadership as a result of which we came out victorious. We are concerned about the atomic weapons and that is why we are telling the Super Powers to use restraint. The Super Powers too know that it is no use piling up nuclear weapons. Pakistan too has joined the race. I think, we are not lagging behind in facing any challenge. We know from the episodes of Ramayana and Mahabharata as to what kind of destruction nuclear weapons can cause. It is because of this that India has played a vital role in establishing peace in the world. One of the hon. Members has rightly said that it concerns the people of India and Pakistan. Governments of both the countries should abandon the idea of making an atom bomb in order to live like good neighbours. Respected Indiraji had endeavoured to extend a hand of friendship to its neighbours inspite of having won the war in 1971. By signing the Simla Accord with Late Shri Bhutto. Indiraji had shown her greatness as she sensed the feelings of the people of the two countries. It is not good to fall in the trap of big powers and to talk of nuclear weapons. Government of India is fully capable to meet any challenge. We know from Puranas what atomic weapons are? We are second to none in any respect. Prithviraj Chauhan had forgiven Mohammad Ghouri seven times, but when it came to Mohammad Ghouri, he blinded his eyes, what to talk of forgiving him. The Governments of neighbouring countries should understand that India is capable in all respects, but we do not want to commit any such mistake which could jeopardise the security of our country.

Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I want to express the voice and the feelings of the people of India and Pakistan. Someone can say as to how can I voice the feelings of the people of Pakistan. My constituency is contiguous to Pakistan. Tuna village is my birth place. Muslims are in majority there. I have been the 'Sarpanch' of this village for the past 25 years. At the time of partition, many people of this village migrated to Pakistan. Although our families got divided, yet they visit the village occasionally and treat me like their sister. There is a saying—"Pablo sago padoi"—the relatives live at a distance, it is the neighbours who come to help first when

needed.. Therefore, it is very necessary to take concrete steps to establish good relations with the neighbouring countries.

My area has one speciality. Many years ago, the river Indus used to flow through Kutch.

I want that the relationship of the two countries should improve and the drinking water problem in Kutch should be solved by getting water of the Indus river. I want to appeal to my countrymen that regardless of their party affiliations they, in this critical hour, should not play the role of the washerman in the epic 'Ramayana' who had blemished Sita without any evidence and had disgraced the system. They should rather unitedly stand by our clean and taintless young Prime Minister.

Kutch is a desert area and wild asses are found there. An international tourist resort should be set up here. Sir, through you, I want to request the hon. Minister that these asses are found only in Kutch region and nowhere else in the world. I also want that Kandla should be made an international airport. This will be very helpful for those people of Gujarat who are living abroad. There is a customs office at Kandla as well. It will also help in the development of the backward areas. The condition of the Free Zone of Kandla is not proper. Orders from abroad are not received in adequate number. After consulting the Commerce Ministry, the units at the Kandla Zone which are not running properly should be streamlined. The report of the Kaul Committee is concerned with this problem. Therefore, I request that the Commerce Ministry and the Ministry of External Affairs should coordinate in making arrangements for ensuring the development of the Kandla Free Zone.

[English]

SHRI PIYUS TIRAKY (Alipurduar) : Sir, I would like to confine myself to our immediate neighbours, what relations we have got with the neighbouring countries. What wrong have we done? Perhaps no immediate neighbour has good relations with us. The Government should think about what relations we have got with our neighbouring countries; Pakistan, Nepal, Bhutan, Sri

[Shri Piyus Tiraky]

Lanka and Bangladesh. Every now and then, people are coming from Bangladesh, including Chakmas, Muslims, Hindus and others also. We have treated some of the refugees as stateless citizens in India. Muslims also come irrespective of religion and something like that. What treatment are we giving here? In the case of Chakmas, the Government is very much serious to send them back even if they don't want to go back. In the news bulletin, the Bangladesh Government are propagating that the Indian Government is keeping them by force. They want to come back but the Government is preventing them from coming. Is such type of news true? If so, what does the Government think about it?

If the Government is so serious about our neighbours' relations with India, then why doesn't the Foreign Minister ask the Members of Parliament to see at this? In this context, what is the thinking of those people who have come to India?

What is happening in Bangladesh? Also from Tibet many people had come. From Nepal, poor people are coming and the relations with that country have got strained because of this movement from there. Nepalese have a distinct nationality. They have relations with Nepal. So, the Indian Government should think that if the people are coming into India, then the Governments of both these countries should sit together and finalise the situation. So, you have to think about all these things. The Foreign Minister is moving all over the world and does not think about the relations with our immediate neighbours which are getting from bad to worse.

Bhutan is nearby but it has given no trouble. You should not go to educate Bhutan. They have got poultry and many other things. They are very much advance in the field of herbal medicine. Why don't you call them and have an effective dialogue by treating them as your equal? Whosoever goes to Bhutan, he goes there like a master. This kind of attitude is antagonizing our neighbours. This sort of treatment must be corrected. We speak of equality; we speak of equal respect to all our neighbours, but in our behaviour we always show that we are superior to them

and they do not know anything at all and they need to be educated in all respects. If this attitude is not corrected, our neighbours will not be friendly with us.

As regards Sri Lanka, there is a lot of problem and many hon. Members have spoken about that. We have some duty towards people of Indian origin in Sri Lanka; not only there, but wherever our Indian people are living all over the world. While the Indians are not loved in other countries, we are making friends all over the world. When we do so, we are living in the fool's paradise. In fact, we have no friends at all; it is only Russia, which is our friend. Russia is a friend indeed. I do not think, we have any friends in the immediate neighbourhood.

We have been having problems in Darjeeling district. None of the neighbouring countries like Bhutan and Nepal and other countries have spoken a single word about that. If these people are our friends, why don't they say that if everybody wants to have their own State in India, where will be India?

As I said, our relations must be on the basis of equality with all our neighbours. If we want to be respected, we should try to give them respect. We should have proper dialogue with the people in the neighbouring countries instead of going to Africa, America or the Latin America. What is needed is that if some of our neighbouring countries like Bhutan or Nepal want help financially, technically or in the field of education, we must help them in whatever way we can. We are getting loans from outside, we should not boast that we are very much powerful. We have so many problems and we must revise our position correctly.

We find that quite a number of foreign nationals are coming to India. In fact, it is open for all. It is like a *dharamshala*. This *dharamshala* should be stopped. If Bangladesh cannot accommodate all their population, why don't you ask them for compensation? If they cannot rehabilitate their people, you must ask them for compensation. People are coming to India in thousands. How can we bear this burden? Whenever any State wants some economic help, you always say that you are

short of funds. West Bengal economy is failing. When these people come, my constituency Aliporeduars has to face the first brunt. This is the situation.

Then, the opposition leaders are never allowed to go anywhere. In my tenure of ten years, I have not been even to Bhutan, what to talk of other parts of the world. But you are going around the world all the time and doing thing.

A number of foreigners are coming to India as tourists. But they must show minimum respect to our culture. What do we see in India? A number of persons, hippies, have been coming from America, Britain, Switzerland and other places. Why don't you tell them that they should not disturb our culture. There should be some minimum regard for our culture. We find that these people move about half naked. How can we accept all these things? What are you going to do in this regard? Can't you at least ask these people to show some respect and regard to our culture? Our culture is being adversely affected because of these people. And the only thing that our Indians know best is to imitate all and sundry. They say simply, "Nakal karo". And this contributes to further degradation of our culture. So please be careful about these things.

Lastly, I would like to say that before becoming great leaders of the world, please try to improve our relations in our immediate neighbourhood, i.e. with the four countries of Bhutan, Nepal, Bangladesh and Pakistan. Sort out all the differences in this region. Then you can think of the Non-aligned Movement and of becoming a big leader of the NAM and so on. Some members think that India is going to be a Third Power. You know very well how much power you have. You have no power. We only have so many problems here. Don't try to be a world leader. Instead try to be humble and concentrate on solving our existing problems.

[Translation]

SHRI RAMSWAROOP RAM (Gaya) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the Demands of the Ministry of External Affairs. Through you, I want to submit certain suggestions to the hon. Minister.

The year 1986 has been a year of achievements for us. The Indian Foreign policy of 'Panchsheel' is based on the principle of 'Live and let live'. Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru had given shape to our foreign policy and today under the leadership of our Hon. Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi our policy is making progress.

The year 1986 has been an eventful year for India. Very significant efforts were made, specially for upholding the rights of the African countries and for encouraging the work done in the field of world peace and disarmament. We want to congratulate the hon. Minister of External Affairs for it but I want also to submit as to where have we slipped that our relations with our neighbours have not been cordial and why have we never pondered over it? Why do their policies differ from ours? We have been carrying on with the Non-Aligned Movement for the last 40 years and we consider ourselves as the leader of the Third World but why our relations with our neighbours like Pakistan, Bangladesh, Nepal, Burma, Bhutan and Sri Lanka remain sweet and sour? We have to think seriously over this matter.

In 1950, India and China entered into an Agreement based on the principle of 'Panchsheel', Slogans of 'Hindi-Chini Bhai Bhai' were raised in China. When Shri Chou-En-Lai visited India, the Indian people welcomed him wholeheartedly. Yet China attacked us in 1962 in violation of the principles of 'Panchsheel'. Our relations with Pakistan have been bitter, though due to the initiatives taken in the year 1986, there have been some improvements in this regard. Our relations with Bangladesh and Nepal have improved considerably. The Hon. President himself visited Nepal. India and Nepal have almost similar cultures and that is why there has been a considerable improvement in our relations. However, on account of Pakistan some deficiencies have crept into our relationship.

India is a developing country and has emerged as a mouthpiece of the poor and the oppressed nations. It has been the conspiracy of the imperialist powers to create disturbed conditions in and around India and to keep us entangled with our neighbours. We are committed to peace. If we

[Shri Ramswaroop Ram]

look into our history since the time of Emperor Ashoka till today we will find that we have never been aggressive to usurp the rights of others. U.S.A. which is an imperialist power and which calls itself a Super Power, wants us to be always engaged in conflicts with Pakistan and Bangladesh and wants to colonise the region. I want to submit through this august House that India is powerful and self-reliant enough to be able to answer the threat posed by these Super-Powers. We will never allow their hegemony to thrive. We see today as to how the racist regime in South Africa is trying to shut the protesting voices of the native people. Mahatma Gandhi had initiated the democratic fight of the South-Africans people. We have helped them further in their struggle. The supporters of China sometimes raise their voice here. India has its own policy and it can thrive only on that. But it is unfortunate that the C.P.I.(M) people emphatically criticise our policies and support Chinese policies and thus try to gain international reputation. I want to ask the hon. Minister of External Affairs as to whether there has been any improvement in our non-aligned policy or have we merely repeated that we will never go in for the atom bomb. It will be dangerous for us. If we are powerful enough, then even the mightiest of the powers will not dare to intimidate us. But the day we become weak, those very powers will pounce upon us. Hence, I want to request to the Government through the august House to remain prepared to develop the atom bomb. Our atom bomb will not be to overpower any country and scuttle its independence, it will not be used against socialist forces and it will not snatch away the economic independence of any country. It will be made with the sole purpose of development. Of course, we shall not use it for destruction but for peace and development. We should not hesitate in this matter but we should go in for the bomb for our own existence. Only then we will be able to maintain our leading position in the third world and we will make progress under the leadership of Hon. Shri Rajiv Gandhi.

[English]

**SHRI AMAR ROYPRADHAN (Cooch**

Behar) : Sir : The world is under the threat of a nuclear war; and the imperialist forces under the leadership of the USA are having their exercises with nuclear weapons not only in Europe, but in Trincomallee of Sri Lanka, as also in Rawalpindi of Pakistan. Against the threat of Star War and nuclear war, we must boldly say that we are for peace, and for world peace. We are committed to a non-aligned policy. We want friendly relations with other countries.

Before I speak about our next-door neighbours, I want to congratulate our Government for recognizing the SWAPO Government, I fully agree with Mr. Indrajit Gupta that we should set up some sort of relationship with, or give recognition to the South African National Congress which is now passing through its 75th anniversary. We would like to develop cordial relations with Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, Nepal, Bhutan and Burma.

I certainly differ from the other Members on the Government side. We would like definitely to develop friendly relations with China who is our neighbour; but it is not for our purposes, but for global development and global peace also. But I think that in the matter of our relations, with our neighbours we have got an appeasement policy.

Let us look at our next-door neighbour, *viz.* Pakistan. Pakistan is getting arms from USA-F. 16 and nuclear weapons also. About the recent visit of Gen. Zia to see the cricket match at Jaipur, I think we should not be very happy. It is merely a game, *i.e.* an LBW tactic of Gen. Zia, as a result of which he came to Jaipur.

Regarding Sri Lanka, Sir, you know better than I. With Sri Lanka we are having one conference after the other, as also negotiations. But what is really happening there today? It is matter of great regret that the Sri Lankan Government has opened a slaughter house where the Tamil militants and the Tamil innocents are being butchered. It is a hard fact.

Regarding Nepal, our relations with it are so-so. They would like to be a party in the Ganga river dispute, along with Bangladesh. It is their attitude.

It is reported in the paper that they are supplying arms for GNLFF movement in Darjeeling District of West Bengal. Is it a sign of good relations with Nepal ?

Bengladesh is at least very near to us from West Bengal. We are making so many negotiations with Bangladesh and holding so many conferences. Another conference will be held on the 7th or 8th of next month. What happens in the conference ? In the conference again some other obstacle comes up and they give some reasons.

Regarding sharing of Ganga water, you know that at least 40,000 cusecs of water is required in the Ganga River from the Farakka barrage just to save Calcutta Port. Calcutta Port is the heart of Calcutta city and Calcutta is the heart of the entire eastern region. But so far in the JRC meeting you have given us only 16,000 cusecs of water in the lean months.

Chakma refugees are coming to India and they are being settled here and there. According to your figure, it is about 56,000. I do not know. You are having negotiations with Bangladesh. They say that they will take them back, but they are not doing so. I don't think it concerns only Tripura but also Assam, Manipur, Mizoram and West Bengal. This is your policy.

Regarding New Moore Island/South Talpatty Islands, the last talk was held in January 1982. After that was there any other talk regarding this New Moore Island. This is an integral part of India. But nothing has been done.

Regarding the land boundary agreement of 1974, according to Indira-Majib Pact, it was mentioned that Tinbigha you like to hand over to Bangladesh. It is an integral Part of India. But according to Indira-Majib Pact, you have given it on a lease of 999 years to Bangladesh; and by this Pact, if you offer this small piece of land to Bangladesh, what will happen ? The major portion of our Indian territory that is one full gram panchayat, an area of about 16 square miles with a population of 35,000 Indian citizens would be the

citizens of Bangladesh virtually. Now this is a problem with Angarpota and Dahagram of Bangladesh enclaves to link with Bangladesh territory. If you offer Tinbigha to Bangladesh, then a similar problem will arise with Kuchlibari Gram Panchayat with a population of 25,000, and this area would be turned into another Indian enclave.

In the Indira-Majib Pact of 1974 it was agreed that the Bangladesh enclave—total 95—an area of 18 square miles with a population of 25,000 will be exchanged with an Indian enclave of total of 135 units and an area of 29 square miles with a population of 1.50 lakh. Do you know who are these people ? They are Indian citizens—1.50 lakh population ? Are they taking part in the voting ? Will their names be included in the electoral rolls ? No, certainly not. You know what is going to be the situation there ? Within the Indian territory, a rule of jungle is prevailing—arson, looting, raping, etc.—in this area of 29 square miles. Have you made any attempt to talk with the Bangladesh people ? You are very much eager to give a pass for Dahagram Enclave via Indian territory. Mr. Ershad, the president of Bangladesh is known to me personally because originally he is from my district Cooch Behar before 15th August, 1947. What is happening today within the Indian Territory ? There is a rumour that a rule of jungle is prevailing in the Indian territory—arson, looting, raping and loss of life of the people. Have you taken up this case with the Bangladesh President ? Have you ever asked him to give you a pass to visit once at least for a day or for an hour to those areas of Indian enclaves ? No, you are not concerned about the Indian citizens numbering about one lakh and fifty thousand, those who are staying in the Indian enclaves. You are only concerned and eager to see that the Bangladesh people may go to their own enclaves. You want to improve your relations with Bangladesh, but it should not be by neglecting the Indians living in those Indian enclaves. This according to me, is a policy of appeasement.

Tinbigha is our land and it is an integral part of India. Just as Kashmir to Kanyakumari and Kutch to Kohima it is all India, and it forms parts of Mother

[Shri Amar Roypradhan]

India, then if a small portion or a little bit, be it Tinbigha or any part is left out, then you will be committing a murder on Mother India. Do you look at it from that point of view? We do not like this. At least, I do not like it. So, let there be a new approach, and let there be some new thinking.

We should, no doubt, do our best to improve our relations with our neighbours like Baogladesh, but not with such a policy of appeasement; our national integrity and sovereignty must be given the first priority.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : The hon. Minister will reply tomorrow.

SHRI SYED MASUDAL HOSSAIN (Murshidabad) : One clarification. Only one sentence.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : When the Minister replies tomorrow you can ask. What is to be clarified now?

SHRI SYED MASUDAL HOSSAIN : The Food Corporation of India has brought out this book, 'FOODCORP' and in this

periodical in this Volume 17, it is given that "Food Corporation of India has started loading 57000 Metric Tonnes of wheat from Kandla Port" and it is "Prime Minister's gift to South Africa". This is the news. I wanted to know whether we are going to change our diplomatic relations with South Africa, or what is it?

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI) : It is 'Southern Africa' but not 'South Africa'. It must be a misprint.

I will have it checked up.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : The hon. Minister will reply tomorrow.

---

18.58 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, April 23, 1987/Vaisakha 3, 1909 (Saka).*

---