

18.11 hrs.

BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

[English]

Sixteenth Report

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD) : I beg to present the Sixteenth Report of the Business Advisory Committee.

— — —

18.12 hrs.

MOTION *Re* PRESENT INTERNATIONAL SITUATION AND POLICY OF GOVERNMENT OF INDIA IN RELATION THERETO—*Contd.*

[English]

SHRI M. S. GILL (Ludhiana) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I heard some voices from the Treasury Benches making over and over again the statements that they are proud of this country. I must say at the very outset that we are all proud of this country, not only the persons sitting on the Treasury Benches. So far as the participation of our leaders in the international arena is concerned, we have to support and we have to watch if they do not commit any mistake here and there. Therefore, we have to be very critical and analytical of all the things that are happening before us these days.

I have heard the Hon. Minister for External Affairs making three salient points while he was making the statement on the floor of the House : (1) that SAARC is a historic event, (2) that this international meet at Geneva has ushered in a new era, and (3) that the participation of our country through our worthy Prime Minister has gone a long way to establish peace in this world.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I am unable to convince myself to agree with all these three points of the Statement. About the first point, the fifth clause of the first SAARC

has been blasted today in this very House by my colleague, Prof. Ranga. While he was making the speech, he openly stated, we just cannot believe Pakistan and it is due to this reason that we are not prepared to enter into no-war pact. The relevant clause of the SAARC says that all disputes shall be settled by the parties peacefully. Now, the signatures have been appended on the document by both the leaders, our worthy Prime Minister and the President, Zia, believing that they will settle all these disputes peacefully. Therefore, when Prof. Ranga said, "We are not going to enter into no-war pact", the first clause, the first leg, I should say, of this declaration is broken. It is mutilated and on the very first day we have seen that this Organisation or Association is limping. The other day, I have heard a statement from our worthy Hon. External Affairs Minister that we are aware that Pakistan is training certain terrorists and actually that act of Pakistan is an interference with our internal affairs. Now, there is a clause in this very document that no country will interfere in the internal affairs of the other country. These are the contradictions which, at the very outset, make us believe that the very foundation of the SAARC is not a steady one. I have heard the other day, the President of Sri Lanka making a statement that Tamils are being supported by you. The next day, he is signing the same document that there will be no interference in the internal affairs of other countries, their sovereignty and independence. Under these circumstances, these five clauses are only diplomatic gymnasium. In the future, we will be saddened because we have been hearing these declarations and these charters for the last 20 years. Every day, a new declaration comes for peace, for integrity, and for some of the things and then we see, arms race is going on slowly and steadily. On and off, there is piling up of nuclear weapons, 10 times more than what was there when the declaration started. As far as the other weapons are concerned, they are 30 times more than what were there when the declaration started. Under these circumstances, I am sorry to say that the External Affairs Minister has said that a new era has been ushered in by the meeting of the two superpower leaders. He was supported in this statement by Prof. Ranga, the grand-old-man of this House saying that, at least we have been able to make them meet in Geneva. Our worthy Prime Minister has been able

[Shri S. M. Gill]

to make them meet in Geneva and do you think it is a small achievement, he said. It is wonderful. This meeting was actually fixed by the two super-powers long ago and what our worthy Prime Minister had done, I do not know, actually. That is behind the scene. He might have made certain efforts to improve the relations of the two, or to make certain points settled down between the two super-power nations. But what is the result? The result is no achievement, no success, no declaration for decrease in the arms race, no declaration for destruction of arms and no declaration for removing those medium and long range missiles. There is nothing of the sort. The only agreement is that they will be meeting again. And this very declaration is being honoured as a ushering in a new era in this world. I am sorry, things are not very hopeful as they are being painted. We are still in these dark days and we have to be very careful while making an assessment.

Mr. Deputy Speaker Sir, not long ago, the Scientists, Geologists and more especially Astronomers knew the existence of one solar system in this universe. It was in the years by gone that a new solar system was discovered by the scientists. Another solar system, exactly like this, was a solar system in existence which was known as the Imperialist Solar System before World War I and after World War I, a new system has come into existence which you are seeing with your own eyes these days. Although the previous solar system was situated in England and now shifted to Washington; the new solar system is situated in Moscow and this world merely knows that there are satellites; there are planets. These new solar systems are very strong enough.

The countries which are still in the imaginative stage, I should say, think that they are great people and they are a great country. This way of thinking is not proper. We have to sit silently and quietly and think as to how the economic forces, how the gravitational pull of these two solar systems is affecting the economy of other nations. The economy of our nation is dependent upon other nations and so on. It will ultimately depend upon one solar system, as I have already stated.

Although the Hon. Minister has said that this is an historic event, I fail to understand whether this historic event is in the global forum or simply in the regional forum. If my friends on the other benches opposite want to express that it is an event in the global forum, I am sorry, it is not at all. It is a very small event. We should not be pushed into complacency by these declarations.

Pakistan is there as Pakistan. It is being supported by certain powers and every third day Pakistan gets new armaments. For whom does Pakistan get these armaments? Is it for any other country than India? These declarations are there. Do they want to tell the nation, "Sit quietly, now everything is O.K.?" I don't think this is the proper approach and that this SAARC should not be appreciated in that spirit. It would render us complacent. So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I oppose this motion.

We have to rethink and reassess everything and be on our guard. So far as Nuclear Proliferation Treaty is concerned, our stand is that we are not going to sign it. Well, this is well enough. We should be brave enough to say that we are not going to sign it because we are prepared to make one. If the other country is making one, we have got the option to make it. When we make this positive statement, then all the nations will know that they have the determination and they will do it. But merely saying that because there is no equality in this is no good reason.

Let Pakistan know that if he comes forward one step, we will go forward two steps. If we make this fact clear to our neighbour, it is then and only then that he can desist from moving in that direction, not otherwise.

Therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker Sir, I would submit that under these circumstances my friends have appreciated our foreign policy. Undoubtedly our foreign policy in certain points is very good. But so far as non-alignment is concerned, it is a good idea, it has to be appreciated but we have failed on certain fronts.

For example there are Middle East countries which are non-aligned. Their petro

dollars go to the American Bank, they go to Canada, they go to England and even to France. For us what is left by these non-aligned nations? Certain words of friendship and brotherhood? If non-alignment movement is a reality, it has to be a factor, the petro dollar has to come to the non-aligned countries and there should be a bank of the non-aligned countries and it is only through this way that we can be effective and properly move ahead, not otherwise. Therefore, these are certain draw-backs here and there we have to be careful.

With these words, I am very much thankful to you for giving me an opportunity.

[*Translation*]

SHRI SHANTI DHARIWAL (Kota) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I support the foreign policy in view of the prevailing international situation, particularly in view of the setting up of SAARC about 2 or 3 days back. The setting up of SAARC is an important step, which is intended to foster peace and help the developing countries and the countries which are struggling for their independence. The entire world welcome it. The SAARC secretariat will help in resolving the misunderstandings with the neighbouring countries whether it is with Sri Lanka or Pakistan or with any other country. Its importance has increased in this perspective. There was need for such a forum where all the neighbouring countries could thrash out their problems.

We have tried our best to help Nepal, Bhutan and Bangladesh by providing them with necessary technical aid and economic assistance. It is often observed that most of the countries in the world have misunderstandings with their neighbours. SAARC has helped in resolving these conflicts. It is major step in our foreign policy.

Many Hon. Members spoke about the problem of Tamils in Sri Lanka. It is true that the way that Government is treating them is not proper. We should initiate steps which may resolve the problem and remove misunderstandings. There is need to bring round the Tamils to this view. The foreign policy will have to be formulated accordingly.

We are regarded as the leader of the non-aligned movement. It is, therefore, our responsibility to make more efforts for the poor and oppressed people of South Africa who are living as slaves because in the recent CHOGM conference Mrs. Thatcher's attitude was not satisfactory. We should sever our economic ties with South Africa and persuade other countries also to act likewise. Efforts should be made to fight the enemies of humanity.

I was disappointed to hear the speeches of the Opposition Members. The foreign policy of the country is so sound and dynamic that the Opposition could find no loopholes to criticise it. An Hon. Member said that he was able to see Shri Rajiv Gandhi only on the television as the Prime Minister rarely attended the House. Shri Venkata Ratnam pointed out in ignorance that India should solve the problem of Afghanistan. If India could solve the Afghanistan problem, then the USA would stop helping Pakistan. He should know that USA has been giving arms and other assistance to Pakistan since its inception. The problem of Afghanistan arose only 5 to 6 years back. An Hon. Member questioned Shri Rajiv Gandhi's visit to Japan and wanted to know what did we achieve thereby. I would like to inform him that we have received assistance to the tune of \$ 140 million. We should welcome it not for the amount but otherwise as well. An Hon. Member said that whenever the Hon. Prime Minister arrived in the House, he was welcomed by clapping and whenever he rose to speak he was cheered. I would like to remind them that the image of the leader of the country should be built in a manner that he gains international recognition. It is through the status and standing of the Prime Minister and his achievements and foreign policy that the country will have the place of pride among the comity of nations. Therefore, such negative comments should not be made here. You may say anything you like in public but they should not be ventilated in the House where we discuss the basic facts.

I would like to make a submission to the Hon. Minister of External Affairs with regard to nuclear arms. It is time now when we should take a final decision whether we

[Shri Shanti Dhariwal]

should go in for nuclear arms or not. We must fix a time limit, and if within this period disarmament comes about and all the bombs are destroyed, there is no need to go in for nuclear weapons but if disarmament does not come about, we must go in for nuclear weapons or hydrogen bomb for the defence of the country, whatever be the cost.

With these words, I congratulate the Hon. Prime Minister and Hon. External Affairs Minister for bringing about improvement in the international situation.

[English]

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Basirhat) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, before you ring your bell I have to make one or two points though I am speaking at the fag end of the discussion. First of all I would like to say that we have on this foreign policy question two motions before us. One is the motion moved by the Foreign Minister and the other is the substitute motion moved by my friend, Shri Dinesh Singh. I would just suggest that it is better for the House to confine itself to the motion moved by the Foreign Minister, the reason being there is, by and large, and always has been a general approval in this country of the broad canvas of foreign policy which has been pursued over the years. But I am afraid if Shri Dinesh Singh's substitute motion is sought to be adopted here it may not be adopted unanimously and that will not create a good impression abroad and outside this House.

Sir, you may ask what is our objection to this? Our objection is that while we have a general support for the foreign policy, it does not mean we do not consider it to have many flaws, many defects and shortcomings also in the implementation of that policy and, therefore, Shri Dinesh Singh's motion which speaks of full support is something which is unnecessarily in my opinion seeking to rub into it. We would not like the canotation of that to be forced on us. If that motion is sought to be passed, you can pass because you have majority, but we will be forced to oppose it. I do not think on this issue at this juncture in world affairs we

should go in for division on this question. It is better we stick to the official motion which has been moved here by the Foreign Minister. Though, I find, it only asks for consideration yet that is a Parliamentary term we use and everybody knows that we are generally in support of this policy.

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY : Sir, we also agree on the stand taken by Shri Indrajit Gupta on this matter.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Sir, before I say one or two words about SAARC, I should just like to make one or two suggestions about one or two developments which have taken place in recent days. One is the fact that in the last few days the Government of U.K. has taken two-three decisions which are, for us at least as a member of the commonwealth, very disturbing and which run counter to the whole spirit of the efforts that we are making and other countries are making in the direction of peace. First of all, everyone knows the attitude which was taken by the British Prime Minister at the Commonwealth Conference on the question of sanction against South Africa. After that has come the decision, recently announced that the United Kingdom Government is officially going to participate in the Star War programme of the United States of America and has officially become a partner of the Star War programmes. As far as I know our Government has opposed it, the Prime Minister has spoken about it more than once. The United Kingdom Government has announced its decision to pull out of UNESCO. The United States has done it much earlier thereby depriving the UNESCO, I don't know, some 25 to 30 per cent of its budget and the UNESCO is faced with the prospect of collapse. Now, the UK Government whose contribution. I think, rose to 15 to 16 million dollars a year has also announced that it will pull out. There is a conspiracy to wreck the UNESCO which, for us and for other countries, particularly in the developing world, is a very very important institution of the United Nations which performs a very useful function and for their own political reasons, these two countries, these two Governments seem to be determined to wreck this whole UNESCO institution. I do not know what is going to be the reaction of our Government. But this is the way the British

Government behaves on one issue after another. Then, I think India which is after all the biggest country in the Commonwealth, should think seriously of doing something about mobilising some other Commonwealth countries for a more effective protest, putting some pressure on the British Government and if India pulls out of the Commonwealth, what will be left out of the Commonwealth? So, I am not inviting you to pull out of Commonwealth because you know the views on that question, but at least, as a gesture of protest of what they are doing, I would suggest humbly that we should pull out from the Secretariat of the Commonwealth withdraw your membership from the Secretariat of the Commonwealth as a mark of protest against what is going on one after the other. Is it what we are in the Commonwealth for? So, please consider this.

Another situation has arisen. Now, we read in the newspapers about the United Nations, it has been practically accepted because we have no other go, that the proposed Conference to have been held in Colombo on the question of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace, has been consistently constructed and opposed from the beginning by the United States of America. Now, in the United Nations Security Council, a few days ago, a proposal was again raised, advocated very strongly by India and other countries and it has been opposed and now some sort of conclusion has reached that it cannot be held earliest before 1988 and we have been reconciled to that position because the United States say that the time is not ripe for them and, therefore, no conference can be held now. What are we going to do now? Obviously we cannot go ahead unless the United Nations accord approval on the action we take. I would suggest to the Government of India to consider it seriously with the littoral States of the Indian Ocean, that is, the countries whose shores are washed by the water of the Indian Ocean and they are almost all, I think, the States of Asia and Africa who are very much interested that this Indian Ocean should be demilitarised, that steps should be taken really to make it a zone of peace. Why can't. Our Government, as the largest country, as the leader of the non-aligned world, take the initiative to bring about a kind of informal, unofficial or non-official conference of these

littoral States. You may say 'I know this question'. When it was raised earlier in the Parliament, the reply given was that such a meeting would not be useful or effective unless the participation of the United States of America and the USSR are guaranteed, because what is the use of the meeting? But then I would say that any question of nuclear disarmament in the world today cannot be effective without the USA and the USSR. In spite of that being a fact, our Government took the initiative to bring about the Six Nation summit meet which made a proposal to both the USA and the USSR about nuclear disarmament, about nuclear freeze, about monitoring of that nuclear freeze. Why did you do it when the others were not participating? We did it because that is the correct form of initiative to do on such issues. You may not immediately produce a result. And we found that it paid off in the sense that at least the Government of the USSR responded positively and favourably to the proposal. Why not in the case of Indian Ocean question which is being dragged on from year to year? We take the initiative along with other friends to organise a conference of the littoral States of the Indian Ocean, where at least some concrete measures can be suggested as to what are the positive steps to be taken to bring about a situation which can be described as a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean. And then, that would create a tremendous influence on world opinion and would affect the USA and the USSR also, otherwise you will go on like this. In 1988 also we will be told that the whole thing has been blocked by the USA, so there can be no advance.

Even the Six-Nations had done a very good job, but after the Geneva Summit and after the SAARC summit, I think the initiative of the Six-Nations should be carried forward further. It is not something which is over now. Let the Government consider these matters.

I do not agree with those friends here, who have said that our Prime Minister on his so many visits abroad has not brought back anything for the country. In fact, I have got some misgivings. Certainly his visits to USA, France and UK, and now to Japan, are perhaps paving the way on a very large scale for entry of multi-national firms into our

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

country in the name of collaboration for higher technology. That he is achieving. I should say that the foreign policy of ours, of peace and non-alignment, as it has been fashioned and pursued since the days of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, has its strong foundations in a policy of self-reliance. Every Congress man knows it that without a policy of self-reliance and standing firmly on our own feet and building our own economic independence, the foreign policy could not have been elaborated and carried forward. I would just like to warn the Government. I know that we are much stronger than many other countries and so on and so forth, but if this process is carried too far in the name of modernising the country and even open-door policy is followed, which allows the trans-national companies to come in here on a big scale, it may begin to vitiate and undermine the basis of our foreign policy. Please do not pursue it to that point. This is not an imaginative thing. Such things do happen.

I feel humiliated as an Indian that the head of a company, Union Carbide, Warren Anderson has the nerve and the impudence to give a statement saying that if the Government of India does not come to a proper settlement with them over the question of compensation for the Bhopal victims, then they may not get any more aid from USA. What does he think of himself? This is the climax. They think that this is the ultimate argument to use against the Indian Government, frighten them with this spectre that the American aid will be cut off; India better listens to everything they say. I know, we are not going to be servile like this in the name of modernization and technology. Please keep a sharp watch on the activities of these trans-nationals, who have wreaked havoc in many countries of the world. We know what they have done in many countries of the world, how they have undermined the national sovereignty and independence. They are the vehicles by which the neo-colonialism has been carried out now-a-days. If you go too far on that road, well, one day we find our foreign policy slowly and slowly being undermined also.

Then Sir, I would just like to say one or two things more. This discussion, I think,

would have been more fruitful if we could have it after two or three days, when the Government have some time to give us a proper perception of what happened at SAARC in Dhaka. Unfortunately, we have not been given any such perception. It only finished last night. You see, we do not have the time to digest properly this morning's newspaper and read between the lines and all that. How do you expect us to contribute on this question? It is very difficult. But I must say that it seems to me that some people there, have been speaking with their tongues in cheek. SAARC Declaration and all that have come out. There is nothing to say about the Declaration except that what is going on is not in conformity with that Declaration at all. In terms of that Declaration, all these member States of SAARC should unhesitatingly renounce any kind of nuclear arming by themselves. Otherwise, the Declaration has no meaning. But Pakistan, I suppose, will go ahead. And I think, we should also start thinking. I am not predicting anything just now. But I hope the Government of India will keep in view this question also that the other SAARC countries, our neighbours are much smaller than India. Do not forget that we are overwhelmingly a bigger country. Suppose, at one stage, Government of India decides that we too must go in for a nuclear bomb, are you sure that Sri Lanka or Bangla Desh will not also start saying, "Now that India has got a bomb and though of course, she is not going to attack us now, we should also have a deterrent. Why should we not have a deterrent against Indian bomb also?" So, those countries who are not yet in a position to have the nuclear capability for making a bomb may think about it. Pakistan is getting the capability with the help of others. But there are other countries which do not have any capability at all. You are talking to them at Dhaka and at so many places. If we develop a bomb at some stage, please tell me, these members of the SAARC who do not always regard us with very much trust and confidence, would any of them start saying that because India has also got a bomb, they should also, for their own security, for the security of Sri Lanka or for the security of Bangla Desh should have a deterrent? Then Sir, if they have no capability of their own, they might start trying to get a deterrent from somebody else, planted in their country. So you see, we should think ten times before we are stampeded

into a nuclear arms race in this region because nothing would suit Mr. Reagan's plans better than that. Already they are trying to provoke the countries of the third world into hostility against each other so that many arms races take place and tens and thousands of rupees and dollars are spent on armaments instead of being spent on alleviating the poverty of the people. If we are now going one step further, if we go into some kind of a mini nuclear arms race in our whole region, whose game will it suit? Who will like this to happen? So, please think over this because I do not know what Pakistan is going to do and I do not know why General Zia is coming here on the 17th, just for one day. It must be some urgent matter, but they are not going to tell us. There must be something very urgent to discuss between the two Governments. Anyhow, discussion is always good. But I never understood this idea of visiting nuclear plants. For a few days now, we are saying that we should go and inspect their nuclear facilities and General Zia should come and inspect our nuclear plant. What is the idea? What are you going to do out of such a thing? I hope the idea is dropped now. I do not understand what we are going to get by Rajiv Gandhi going and visiting Zia's nuclear plant and he coming and seeing our plant. This is all very confused thinking, according to me. What is the aim of it? You please tell us. I do not understand these things.

**SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY :** It has been dropped by Zia.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA :** It is because he has suddenly remembered that 16th December on which he is supposed to come happens to be the date on which the Pakistani troops surrendered in Dhaka to us in 1971. Therefore, the date has been changed from 16th and 17th. If that coincidence had taken place and he had come on the 16th, then are we going to take him to the Trombay or somewhere to see our atomic plants? For what purpose? Anyway, than Mr. Jayewardane has said, of course, that he seems to be still for a military solution of the Tamil problem, he does not see anything else. And there is no ceasefire now. Things are going on. I think, if this is allowed to persist, ultimately, I am more worried because it will further spoil the atmosphere and the relations between Sri Lanka and India. It is in our

interest that we want peace to be restored and a political settlement to be brought about there. I do not know what the TULF has proposed. They have given some papers—submitted some papers containing proposals to our Government also. I do not expect the Minister to divulge it here. But at least, he should tell us whether there is some hope, some positive element; in it—in the TULF document, on the basis of which the Government can work for a paper political solution. Mr. Jayewardane has made a remark, Sir, at Dhaka which is quoted in the press. I do not know if it is correct or not. He said, “Mr. Rajiv Gandhi is our leader, this and that, pilot of the ship and so on.” He should be careful to see that there is no mutiny on the ship—mutiny on board. I do not know. So, it seems that some elements of mutiny are also discernible in this SAARC ship. Which are those I do not know. Perhaps Mr. Bhagat should enlighten us. Anyway, I will only end by saying that you see, people are saying nothing come out of the Geneva Summit and all that. That is true. What did you expect to come out of it? On the eve of the Geneva Summit, some one or two days before it, what was the general mood in the world? What were they expecting was that the whole thing would collapse, and that it would break down, it will be sabotaged. There were attempts made to sabotage it. Still while Mr. Reagan was flying to Geneva, a letter was leaked out from Mr. Weinburgar, his Defence Secretary, A confidential letter from Mr. Weinburgar to President Reagan was very conveniently leaked out in the world press in which Mr. Weinburgar was advising the President, “you are going to Geneva, but don't fall into the trap of the Soviet follows. Don't believe them. Don't trust them. They are deceitful people. They will put pressure on you, but you should resist.” This kind of atmosphere was created. Personally Sir, I also was thinking that nothing will come out of it. And you expected their meeting for two days, they were going to bring about nuclear disarmament. Now what has come out of it is that, we had got a breathing time in order to redouble our efforts. The people of the world have got a breathing time to redouble their efforts and their mobilisation to put pressure to see that the world is halted in its drift to war and the powers are forced to come to the path of disarmament to dialogue and not to conflict. That is all you have got out of it. And I should say that Mr. Gorbachev went home and placed his report

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

before the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, that is the Parliament of the Soviet Union on the Geneva talks, I hope you have read it. It is a very informative document. In this context, I will just quote briefly :

“Interaction with the Non-Aligned Movement including comprehensive cooperation with the Republic of India for the people and Leaders of which we have profound respect has a great role to play in the improvement of international relations.”

Mr. Rajiv Gandhi has already told the country in reply to questions that, he is in constant touch with Mr. Gorbachev. He is not in constant touch with Mr. Reagan, I hope. Mr. Gorbachev goes on to say :

“This Region, Asian and Pacific Region is not a source of tension and an area of armed confrontation. We stand for the broadening of the political dialogue among all States of this region in the interest of peace, good neighbourliness, mutual trust and cooperation.”

If SAARC takes a step forward in this direction, we should all welcome. There are other groupings also in this region we know. But now the idea of Asian Cooperation is no longer confined to words. It is becoming more and more reality because apart from anything else, the people of the world who are the have nots welcome it. They have got to stand together in the struggle for building a new international economic order and all that we are doing about changing the balance of forces in the international economic and financial world.

I remember, years ago that in the Central Hall of Parliament the late Mr. Leonard Breznev while addressing the Members of Parliament here had made a reference to the need for an Asian Collective Security. I thought that, that idea at that time was a bit too premature. It was not that he was going to impose it on anybody but he said that they would like the countries of this region to think about an Asian Collec-

tive Security arrangement. But, after all these years, now at least some talks, some ideas are now being taken by different groupings in this region and SAARC is the latest example of it. But, much responsibility devolves on India; there is no doubt about it. It is true that India occupies a special place, a great strength, more prestige and very good relations with different countries and its, peace policy, its non-alignment policy, its anti-imperialist policy its policy of opposition to racism, to nuclear weapons, its policy in favour of disarmament—all this has won some prestige, there is no doubt. And we would like this to be used in a more dynamic manner. More initiatives must be taken on all these issues. We should not sit tight and go along in some routine fashion. We must also safeguard this policy and not allow it to be in any way diluted or undermined by allowing the borders of our country's economy to be open to these forces which are inimical to this foreign policy and which are out to undermine our economic sovereignty.

Thank you.

SHRI SHARAD DIGHE (Bombay North Central): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I rise to support the Motion moved by Hon. Shri Dinesh Singh approving the foreign policy of this Government.

As he has said, this canvas of foreign policy is a very big canvas and to deal with every thing within a short time in the foreign policy would be a difficult job. Therefore, I will only emphasise the achievements of South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation which was launched only the other day. Of course, it is difficult to assess fully the implications of the results of this Conference because it is too early to say so. But I must say that this is a great achievement of the policy of this Government. It was very difficult to bring together these South Asian countries on one platform because of two reasons: One was intra-regional disputes between them, we know that we have serious differences with Pakistan and with respect to its programme for nuclear arms we have got more misgivings and there has been convincing evidence that Pakistan is manufacturing a nuclear bomb. Even the President of U. S. A



had categorically told our Prime Minister that we should—or advised our Prime Minister—that we should talk over about this matter with Pakistan before it reaches a point of no return. From all these things it is practically convincing that Pakistan is manufacturing a nuclear bomb.

Then, we had also complaints about Pakistan training terrorists outside our boundaries. With this background it was difficult to bring together all these countries.

Similarly, in Sri Lanka also we have been suffering due to their violation of ceasefire and butchering of Tamilians everyday. The refugee and human rights problem will force us to look into this matter. Therefore, from this point of view also the difference between Sri Lanka and our country had also been, to some extent, serious. So, with this intra-regional disputes, it was difficult to bring all these countries together.

The second reason was the pre-dominant position of India in this region which kept the small neighbours at bay. Of course, there were several common points among all these countries. These are all low income economy countries as defined by the World Bank in 1983 with GNP per person less than \$ 400. It varies from \$ 130 in Bangladesh to \$ 390 in Pakistan. Similarly, the average growth rate of these countries in the 'seventies was between four per cent and six per cent. All these countries are densely populated. The six countries in the region cover nearly 20 per cent of the world population and their area is about 3.3 per cent of the world's land mass. These are all developing countries and belong to the block of 'havenots'. So, with this common background we have been able to succeed in overcoming the difficulties which were already there and this Association has been formed. Therefore, I should say that it is a great achievement. Not only the Association has been formed but a Charter has also been announced so that there is some common thinking among all these countries. This Charter includes very significantly the re-affirmation of the commitment of the seven nations to the Charter of the United Nations. It also includes the objective to accelerate

economic aid and social development through optimum utilisation of their human and material resources. Unprecedented acceleration of the arms race particularly nuclear arms wars has particularly been opposed by all the nations. So, I must say that it is a great achievement though we have to be cautious in future to build up this Association in a successful manner. The main obstacle is the pre-dominant position of India among these nations. Therefore, there will always be fear in the minds of small nations. This fear will always have to be removed in a very shrewd and diplomatic manner. Therefore, always confidence should be instilled in these countries so that this Association will remain together and be able to help to further peace, prosperity and development throughout the world.

19.00 hrs.

So far as our achievement in disarmament is concerned, it is no use belittling it. True, that the two super-powers were not able to enter into an agreement regarding disarmament. But we should not think that we did not play any part in this matter. As said by earlier speaker, things take place slowly. Some achievement is made in every meeting. Who reference. The two super powers were formerly not prepared to meet and then they met. At least one of them smiled and the other said that nuclear wars would not succeed and in fact, they should not be fought at all. To that extent some progress has been made and for this purpose our country has played a modest role. In NAM we have always been pursuing this matter, in UNO also we have been pursuing this matter and there has been the Delhi Declaration also, With this contribution, we must be proud that as far as disarmament and peace in the world is concerned, we have also been able to make our humble contribution because ultimately disarmament race can be stopped by the pressure of world public opinion, and world public opinion will be built when these Third World countries, especially the countries belonging to the Non-Aligned Movement and the other small countries, will assert that there shall be no starwar and that the nuclear weapons should be stopped. With this pressure only some achievement can be made, and I must submit that in this respect

[Shri Sharad Dighe]

not only the small developing countries but now even the countries in Western Europe also have been bold enough to take a particular stand regarding disarmament. It is very significant that in the star war programme only Great Britain agreed to join, whereas France and other countries refused to join. It is also an achievement that in the Western Europe also there is some wave regarding disarmament, regarding opposition to star war, opposition to nuclear war. So, from this point of view also the international situation has to be gauged. And we must be proud that in order to create this atmosphere, our country has been playing a good role through our Foreign Affairs Ministry.

We also cannot undermine the visits of our Prime Minister to different countries. It is not proper to compare this Prime Minister with some other Prime Minister, but we must admit that with his new dynamism, with his new approach, there has been more and more improvement in the stature of this country throughout the world, and the world is confident that the present Prime Minister of this country who is very young and dynamic and who has got progressive and dynamic ideas, would be able to contribute a lot as far as the peace, development and disarmament in the world is concerned. With these words I support this motion.

[*Translation*]

SHRI ABDUL RASHID KABULI (Srinagar) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I would like to appreciate the Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi who, since he became the Prime Minister of India, has participated vigorously in various international conferences, in SAARC conference of the Asian countries and in the sixth nation summit held in New Delhi. Because of the efforts of the Prime Minister in all these conferences and meetings, India gained recognition and prestige in the international field and we have high hopes of him. I, therefore, think that it becomes necessary that we should appreciate the bold steps taken by the Prime Minister for refurbishing the image of the country in the world. But, I think, the time has not yet come when we could say confidently that India, by her bold steps, has made history

and that the expectations of the nation have been fulfilled. This requires considerable time. So, the Resolution of Shri Dinesh Singh is irrelevant and premature. The Prime Minister has yet to face many trials. India has been consistently supporting those countries where the people have been subjected to atrocities and which are backward. The country has played an important role in the matter of apartheid policy being pursued in Africa. India has been pursuing the same course consistently. The Palestinian problem is a major problem in the world where the people of a particular race have been thrown out of their homeland. As regards the Palestinian problem, first Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru, then Indira Gandhi and now Shri Rajiv Gandhi have been supporting the rightful claimants who have been deprived of their homeland. We are supporting P. L. O. because India herself had been a victim of British imperialism and we had to pay heavy price to attain independence. We can understand the difficulties and the plight of the Palestinians. We must extend them all possible help to regain their homeland.

In this connection, by conferring honour and importance to Yasser Arafat in the country, we have earned respect not only in the other countries of the world but in Arab Countries also. This is the result of the policy which we have been following consistently. Today, the people of Africa are fighting vigorously against the racist regime in South Africa. The minority Government in South Africa have been killing thousands of innocent people. The people of South Africa have been deprived of their land and atrocities are being perpetrated on them continuously. The voice of India is heard in the whole world because it is one of the biggest democratic countries. But I would like to urge that this is not sufficient. I think mere discussions and passing resolutions would not serve the purpose in this world because big powers are actively supporting the tyrants.

The fascist regime of South Africa is not alone. The imperialists are backing them. Today, the people of South Africa are themselves struggling to free their country. It becomes the duty of India to help the freedom fighters of South Africa. India should not fight shy of her duty. When big powers are openly supporting them financially and mili-

tarily to make that regime stronger, India should come forward to support the P. L. O. and wherever racist imperialism exists in Africa, the country should come forward to demolish its citadels. This step is quite necessary.

We have always supported U. N. O. We want that this forum should remain in existence. The world is looking to it with great expectations. But in reality the U. N. O. is dominated by big powers and the voice of the countries, which are in majority, is not heard. Although we do criticise U. N. O. for its weaknesses but we do not want that U. N. O. should cease to exist, because in spite of these hurdles, the existence of the U. N. O. is quite necessary. Actually, the non-aligned countries, particularly our country has an important role to play and I think it is not enough to depend on U. N. O. India should come forward to play her part.

It is true that the danger of nuclear war is looming large over the world. The big powers have nuclear weapons in their arsenals. But in spite of this, the world moves on. If nuclear holocaust takes place, the entire world will be annihilated. The scientists are of the view that the stockpile of nuclear weapons is so large that the world can be destroyed ten times over.

We should not give in to nuclear blackmail and should support those countries in the world which are struggling to attain independence. We should not lament over the resolutions of the U. N. O. which are not effective and are not being implemented.

We had great expectations from the commonwealth of which we are the member. You must be aware that in reality the Government of U. K. is supporting the racist Government of South Africa and is not siding with us in any matter. She has dissociated herself from those who are engaged in the struggle for freedom. The commonwealth is a very important forum. It is the hope and aspiration of the other member countries that they should continue in that body and work unitedly to fulfil their objective. But today that objective is not being fulfilled and hurdles are being put in the way. So, I think it is better for us to leave the commonwealth.

The problem of Afghanistan is a ticklish one. Afghanistan was a non-aligned and a sovereign State. But, unfortunately, she has become an international arena of war. India should intervene in it and find some way out of the impasse because the danger of war has come to India's doorstep. We are not taking it seriously. We talk of Kampuchea and attach great importance to wars being fought in other countries of the world but we have closed our eyes to the problem of Afghanistan. Why are we not paying attention to that issue? Why do we not put forth our views clearly on that issue? On the issue of Afghanistan, I would like to say that the forces of USSR are still present there. USA is also siding with Pakistan and this big power rivalry might engulf the entire world. In such a situation, India will suffer the most.

Today, USA is providing military assistance to Pakistan. Pakistan is getting F-16 planes and other big jets and lethal weapons. It is the contention of the US Government that they are helping Pakistan because Pakistan is embroiled on the issue of Afghanistan and about 30 lakh refugees have entered Pakistan. The problem cannot be solved by remaining silent over it. India has very cordial and friendly relations with the USSR Government. I think, in the interest of India, USSR should be motivated to find some practical solution to the problem and the same position should be restored in Afghanistan which it was enjoying as a non-aligned country. We are being criticised severally on this score. Our attitude on the Afghan issue is not proving useful either for USSR or for India or the world peace. It is creating difficulties for USSR also because Afghanistan lies on her border and *mujahideens* (freedom fighters) of Afghanistan are getting help from other world powers who want to humiliate USSR. The borders of USSR are not safe and India also is not safe. For us, our national interests should be uppermost. We should watch our national interests in the first instance. We should not be apprehensive that if we talk of Afghanistan bluntly, the USSR or the USA will be antagonised with us. At present, the situation is deteriorating rapidly. We should find some solution and the Government should take some decision in this matter.

Our Government have extended hand of friendship to Pakistan. I welcome it. It is a

[Shri Abdul Rashid Kabuli]

fact that earlier India and Pakistan constituted one country which was partitioned later on. We should strengthen our bonds with Pakistan whether it is in the form of cultural relations, trade or communications. We should make concrete efforts in this regard.

It appears to me that some secret talks are going on between General Zia and Rajiv Gandhi. Whenever talks are held with Pakistan, they raise the issue of Kashmir. As a responsible representative of the National conference, which is a regional party, I would like to forewarn you that there are Press reports to the effect that it is proposed to make the line of actual control in Jammu and Kashmir, which is not an international border, a permanent one. I do not know how far it is true. But you cannot ignore us in this matter. You cannot take any decision on the matter with General Zia without knowing our views. You may take any decision regarding the line of actual control on the topography, geography of Jammu and Kashmir, but you will have to take the people of Jammu and Kashmir into confidence. I would like to say this thing categorically.

It is a good thing that we are extending the hand of friendship to China. China is a big power and is situated on our borders. We want that friendship with China should flourish. As is well known, we had cultural and trade relations with China for centuries. Just now a veteran M. P. belonging to the Congress Party has said that we should pay attention towards establishing friendship with China. But you should not lose sight of the fact that the area of Aksai-Chin in Jammu and Kashmir is in the occupation of China. What have you to say about it? Why are you silent on it? There are a number of areas of Jammu and Kashmir which are in the occupation of other countries. I would like that our Foreign Minister should take the House into confidence and tell us what is his opinion in this respect.

[English]

SHRI VIJAY N. PATIL (Erandol) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, world history is full of episodes of exploitation of the weak by the

strong, exploitation of the underprivileged by the privileged. In the beginning, the crusaders in the name of spreading the religion exploited the others. Then there came an era of military and colonial exploitation.

Now, we are facing the danger of economic exploitation of the underdeveloped by the developed. Under these circumstances, the formation of SAARC is a welcome step. Further, SAARC has come in the face of deteriorating international situation.

I congratulate the Prime Minister for achieving this. His achievements as N.A.M. leader are important, but starting of SAARC is no less important an achievement.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, we must also thank the Heads of Governments who have readily agreed to join in SAARC.

(interruptions)

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Sir, we are to sit tomorrow. So, why do we sit now?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Let him finish. Don't interfere. When one Member is speaking, don't interrupt.

SHRI VIJAY N. PATIL : Regional economic cooperation is not the monopoly of developed countries alone. Of course, they took the lead some decades ago—the formation of European Economic Community. But at present what do we see there? The one time all mighty U.K. is bowing to the dictates of Big Brother. Sir, it is a pity that U.K. has decided to withdraw from UNESCO. Now, the worst thing is U.K. has joined the Star War Programme of U.S.A.

One big brother is leading the other in developed world towards the path of ultimate disaster. But here, the big brother India is leading other brothers towards the path of economic and social cooperation.

My friends on the opposite side are alleging that we want to eulogize Shri Rajiv Gandhi. What a height of imagination is that? I do sympathise with them that they do not have a leader of Shri Rajiv Gandhi's stature in their parties.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, it is better to have a cooperating neighbour rather than a quarrelling neighbour. What we expect in our foreign policy are peaceful coexistence and cooperation in the economic and social fields. The cooperation is required to be on the ground, over and under the sea, and in the sky. This kind of cooperation with a fellow country is a best foreign policy. It is good that we have accepted to host the next meeting of SAARC in India. Further satisfying thing is that greater participation of women is contemplated.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the countries who have become partners in SAARC have many things in common. Specially India shares the natural resources of Himalayas with Nepal and Bhutan; common sea with Bangladesh, Sri Lanka and Pakistan; common rivers with Pakistan and Bangladesh. The natural wealth of the Himalayas and Indian Ocean can be harnessed with mutual cooperation and common projects. The rivers flowing from Himalayas have got potentials for generating thousands of mega watts of power. Like the European Economic Community, there can be concessions within SAARC countries with regard to custom import and export of items. The Indian Ocean can be commonly used in many fields. Sometime ago there was a talk of putting submarine cable between India and Abu Dabi. They wanted to put it *via* Karachi. For this we were little hesitant. But with the good neighbourly relations with Pakistan, we can overcome such difficulties and a project can be worked out. So also in the field of space, we see that our INSAT-II is covering 1/3rd portion of the globe. Sometime ago there was cyclone in Bangladesh wherein thousands of people died and property was damaged. Remote sensing part of the Satellite can be utilised in the SAARC countries for any advance intimation of such cyclone. So also with the common geography, more or less, we can have common research conducted in the field of solar energy. These are different areas where there can be cooperation, and transfer of information with the SAARC countries in this region is a welcome step.

At the end, I would urge upon the Opposition to join in fully supporting the motion moved by Shri Dinesh Singh also.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Time is up. Can I ask the Hon. Minister to reply ?

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY : We have been waiting to speak. I will not take much time.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : If you finish within 5 minutes, it is all right.

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY : I will confine myself to the points rather than to the elaborated speech.

Sir, the action of the U.K. Government, who is a permanent member of the Commonwealth in lending support to the Star-wars programme and also withdrawing from the UNESCO has come as a rude shock. This fiercely elegant lady; Mrs. Margaret Thatcher has a hand of steel with a velvet glove. At the recent Commonwealth Conference also, she had her own way. The firm stand taken by Rajiv with regard to Pretoria's regime somehow or other was watered down ultimately when it came to the question of adopting a resolution. She had her all the way and the general impression is that this lady is able to persuade Rajivji to accept her stand.

Well, the earlier stand taken by our Prime Minister attracted the support of the entire African nations. I don't know what is their reaction subsequently when the entire resolution was watered down and her stand was practically accepted.

Sir, even at the time when the Commonwealth Conference was going on, the South African Government had the audacity to hang, to execute, the African leader who fought for the liberation of Africa. That was an utter contempt of the Commonwealth countries. But it is very sorry that we are not able to do anything. Even the entire Commonwealth has not been able to do anything about that. If we take this as a test of our success, as a leading member of the Commonwealth, then we will be able to impartially and objectively assess the success of our foreign policy namely, the recent attitude of the U.K. Government.

Sir, on this occasion I would like to say that in Africa and in other erstwhile colonial nations, there is a subtle attempt to

[Shri E Ayyapu Reddy]

create racial differences among the Asians on the one hand and Negroes and Blacks on the other hand. What happened in South Africa when an attack on the Phoenix Ashram, an attack on the Asians and Indians was made? What happened in UK about the attack on the Indians? All these things must certainly evolve some method by which the differences between the two nations viz., the people of Asiatic region and of the Negroes are solved. There are no differences and no suspicions and that we stand united for the fight against colonialism and neo-colonialism or economic domination. Some steps have to be taken in this regard.

Similarly, our attitude and our relationship towards other countries like Australia, Burma and small but none the less progressive countries in Europe and other places have to be improved. Because our position and stand are bound to improve slowly and steadily and bound to play an important role in the future. The centre of gravity of power is bound to shift and India with its potentialities not only on account of its population, but on account of its rich heritage, culture as well as scientific progress and technological progress is bound, within ten or fifteen years to reach a higher standard and higher place in the international arena. Therefore, it is essential to develop our interests and also our good relationship with other countries such as Australia, Burma and countries which are not actually in the news everyday.

About our relationship with China, a trade delegation has recently gone and it is essential to improve the relationship with China and try to settle the border dispute. Because this border dispute cannot be kept in a cold storage for long. It is essential that this dispute is settled in some amicable manner in which the dignity and respect of India is not compromised.

Our relationship with Japan has improved. But that is not enough because the trade with Japan has to multiply itself and I don't think that it will in any way be compromising or an invitation to multi-nationals if we try to get the technological assistance from Japan.

Sir, with regard to our relationship with our immediate neighbours, the SAARC has been a success. I only hope that the poetic ecstasy which was displayed at Dhaka will not evaporate as mere effervescence, because, for the first time, the South Asian Association has given hope of warding off external influences. SAARC ought to have begun, in my opinion, about 10 years ago. The sentiments which were expressed at Dhaka by all the heads of the seven nations, I hope are not mere artificial expressions but they are actual outpourings of people who were subjected to colonialism and who had emerged and who are trying to find their independence—political, social, cultural and economic and we all know that we can stand together only if we are united. This ought to have begun 10 years ago. But right now it has begun and we welcome this, we have to strengthen it and there is no use trying to belittle it or trying to dewater it by referring to some pin-pricking issues which are bound to arise between neighbours. All those things must be forgotten. The past must be forgotten because it is essential that this is the beginning of a new era of co-operation and a new era for us to assert in the world political atmosphere and also to forge ahead with unity amongst the South Asian countries.

The next point which I would beg to bring to the notice of the Minister for Foreign Affairs is the so-called agreement to disagree at Geneva. It is very well known that both the super powers realise that they cannot fight a nuclear war because a nuclear war can never be won. They also know that after a nuclear holocaust there will be no rich nation or a powerful nation or a developed nation or an under-developed nation. The entire civilisation will be wiped out and therefore they know full-well that they are not going to fight a nuclear war. The so-called doomsday clock ticking towards the midnight will never happen because the super powers fully know that they can never win a nuclear war. But the tension in the world to have a nuclear war will always be built up, for the simple reason that it is a well-known fact that the world is spending 2 million dollars a minute on all the war budgets of the nations put together. This has been admitted. That fear psychosis has to be created to sustain the industries which have been receiving the benefit out of this

spending of 2 million dollars a minute. This fear psychosis has to be sustained for the benefit of the vested interests which are trying to sell arms to under-developed countries and the developing countries. It is precisely to ward off this market for the Asiatic countries that they stand united, that their mutual bickerings have to be solved peacefully, that they should not try to purchase arms from either France or UK or from any of these countries which are overflowing with arms because for them arms-making is an industry. Therefore, it is here that NAM has to play its role and the Non-aligned Movement has to be strengthened so that this so-called war psychosis and fear psychosis is not really taken seriously. Fear has become every-day companion. That is what has been stated and by itself is prompting further investment in weapons which themselves act as a catalyst for fear. Therefore, in order to avoid this fear psychosis our foreign policy has to be so moulded that there is constant exchange of views and the NAM movement is strengthened very much.

In conclusion I just want to say that so far as our foreign policy is concerned, it has its origin actually in our Freedom Struggle, our colonial past and our sufferings during the colonial past and it has drawn its inspiration from the very many 'revolutions and Nehruji claimed himself to be the sun of the revolution. He has set the foreign policy and that foreign policy is taking us in the right direction. That has been an inspiration to our freedom struggle and so far as foreign policy is concerned, there cannot be any differences and so far as the Prime Minister is concerned, he represents the entire nation when he is speaking on the foreign policy and when he is going to other countries, and there is no question of trying to belittle his personality when he is trying to represent India on the foreign forum.

**THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI B. R. BHAGAT) :** Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, for nearly five hours the House has debated the question of international situation and I am happy to say that among the 18 members belonging to both sides of the House who participated, excepting one or two, most of them have lent their powerful support to the foreign policy. Broadly I will categorise the speeches

in three categories. The large majority belonging to Hon. Members on this side and quite a few members on the other side have supported the foreign policy and the various recent developments of the international situation and the initiative taken by the Prime Minister and the Government in order to deal with these developments.

Shri Indrajit Gupta characteristically gave a new concept or a vision to this whole question and I am happy to say that I welcome his basic support to the foreign policy as being implemented today. I also welcome certain suggestions that he has made and the warning that he has given. I can assure him that they are very well taken. There is no disagreement with him so far as the role of imperialism, colonialism in its new form and neo-colonialism and the role of multi-nationals is concerned. We are fully awake and wide awake about it. The policies we have so far followed, the policy of self-reliance is manifested in every aspect in our political initiative, in our international relations, the non-aligned movement, the role in the United Nations, our friends in the Socialist world and on the basic issues of peace and disarmament and also the problems that face the world—the problems of new international economic order. On all these questions our attitude is absolutely clear and as I said earlier I welcome his warning. He has found fault the way we are pursuing the foreign policy of this country. I do not want to repeat but it is worth repeating that our foreign policy has emerged from our national freedom struggle and the Congress is completing its 100 years. It is the biggest anti-imperialist force in history. It cannot compromise on that basic thing where the question of country's national independence...

**SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY :** Which Congress.

**SHRI B. R. BHAGAT :** ...and self-reliance is concerned. I am coming to the Hon. Member. He has the least concern and he is satisfied if he brings forward a negative approach to this issue. I can only say that he is using his good talent in the wrong way. Sir, I would say that my friend Shri Amal Datta and my esteemed friend Shri Jaipal Reddy do not rise to this occasion, the debate on the foreign policy where we always

[Shri B. R. Bhagat]

seek national consensus and the interest is common and in national interest and wherever the implementation is required, well, the debate should be how far the policy pursued is going to strengthen the country's interests or protect the country's interest and protect the basic objectives. It hurts us, it hurts the country when you question the basic objectives of the foreign policy and I am sorry to say that both my esteemed friends, Shri Amal Datta and Shri Jaipal Reddy have questioned the basic approach.

**SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY :** I did not. On the contrary, I said that the foreign policies themselves have to be on national consensus.

**SHRI B. R. BHAGAT :** I have not tried to intervene when you were speaking because I was closely taking down notes. So far as Mr. Amal Datta is concerned and also Mr. Jaipal Reddy is concerned, although they belong to different opposite spectrum of ideology, political ideology, they agree on one point that the Prime Minister's visit to foreign countries has not served any purpose and Mr. Datta questions even this debate. He questions the motive for the debate and he says that it has been arranged so as to project the Prime Minister's visit abroad and to project that he has achieved great things. Everybody knows how the Business Advisory Committee made the programmes and the debates are arranged. They are arranged on the result of the decisions of the BAC and it is not the Government or any individual who arranges the debate on the international situation and now the Hon. Member says that it is to justify his visits to foreign countries. Now, if this is not a negative approach, what else can it be ?

Now, Mr. Jaipal Reddy has said what concrete results have the foreign trips by the Prime Minister achieved ? Then somebody else goes on to say that he has visited certain countries which are not friendly to us or which are not progressive and he has not visited many developing countries I have tried to bring about an analysis of the visit, the bilateral visits of the Prime Minister in May and June. If you see the developing countries of the Third World where bilateral

visits have taken place, they are : Cuba, Vietnam, Oman, Bangladesh, Egypt, and Algeria—six countries. Now, the developed countries which he has visited are : USSR, USA, UK. Holland, Japan and France and the USSR stands apart from all other countries. Then, there are multi-lateral visits. His visit to the Commonwealth—it was absolutely necessary. I do not think that even Mr. Jaipal Reddy will say that it was not essential. Then, his visit to the UN 40th anniversary in which sixty-three Heads of Government and State came. I think that visit was also necessary by any standards.

On the other hands, my Hon. friend Mr. Dinesh Singh said that India should take new initiative. It is a right question. We have taken initiative in the past. He referred to the Six Nations initiative. Mr. Indrajit Gupta has rightly quoted the General Secretary, Gorbachev in which he paid a tribute to the non-aligned movement and the role played by India for bringing about a climate of peace in the world. Although we do not take credit that as a result of our initiative the Geneva talka between the President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev have taken place, but it is a fact that India along with other countries and earlier India and the non-aligned movement were taking initiative on the same very issues on which the Geneva Summit took place. Is it not a fact that in 1983, the Summit declaration pinpointed two major issues ? The first issue was the issue of disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament and the disaster that the world is going to face if there is a nuclear holocaust. The second issue was the question of restructuring the whole world economic order being unjust and unequal; the developing countries, the poorer countries or the countries belonging to the South, as it is called, were finding it difficult to maintain the rate of growth that they were having. Many of them were facing serious economic problems. Similarly, the developed countries, particularly the industrialised countries were facing questions of unemployment, facing questions of unutilised capacities, facing questions of inflation. They were also in difficulty. So, it was the question of interdependent world. question of solving the economic problem, its reform and the call for later on monitoring the financial conferences. These were the issues that came out of the 1983 meet. And then was the



22nd May initiative by our late Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi on calling the two Super Powers to start a dialogue. And then the Six Nation initiative on moratorium and complete ban on testing. Which country and which movement has a consistent record of a policy, a clear direction of peace and changing the world so that there is an equal development for all? Which country and which movement gave to the world a leadership giving a direction of creating a world in which everybody can prosper, fighting imperialism, neo-colonialism in all its operational dimensions, hegemonism, etc. ? Hon. Member, Shri Amal Datta said : "Well, you are a peace movement, and you do not talk to anyone." He is trying to find fault in everything we do. What does he mean? Our Prime Minister, late Shrimati Indira Gandhi, described the NAM rightly as the greatest peace movement in history. Has there been any bigger movement than this? It is now recognised by everybody. Now Shri Amal Datta finds fault that in NAM there is no positive leadership, no positive direction; all this he has been saying. We are in close touch with all the peace movements, in the UNO, the various bodies, the various peace movements, the various governmental organizations. We are in very close touch with all these organizations. And the Hon. Member says that we are not having anything to do with the Peace Movement.

I would say that the Prime Minister's visit was not with a view to projecting himself as a world leader. Although, it is a fact that in one year, he has emerged on the world scene as a dynamic and respectable leader. It is very necessary in the present day world that he has to take the initiative and as the Chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement, it is his duty. He did it as a matter of duty. It is his responsibility to keep in contact with the world leaders so as to know them and to understand the movements and the main currents of the international relations today. There are powerful negative forces working, forces variously described. And you have to know about them. The biggest danger that the world faces today is the danger of nuclear war. You have to keep in touch to know at least about the various forces that are working. Then you also to keep in touch with the positive factors, the positive leadership and the positive forces that are going

to work for peace, forces that are going to solve the world's economic problems. So, it was his duty and he has fulfilled it. It is a fact that his own judgement of men and matters has given him a new insight. He is fulfilling his responsibility as the leader of the Non-aligned Movement and it is necessary for him to keep in contact with the various leaders of the world.

Now Sir, I would like to crave the indulgence of the House to spend a few minutes on the question of South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation. The Declaration is only 24 hours old. It was signed in Dhaka only yesterday between five or six O'clock, and just a little over 24 hours back, SAARC has been born. I am happy to see that the Hon. Members have shown a keen interest in this regard. Our Prime Minister in his valedictory speech yesterday, described it as the 'Birth of a New Dawn' in this region, quoting from the famous poem of Nazrul Islam. He has appealed to all the leaders to work for creating a SAARC Spirit.

In this part of the world—Asia, we are all aware of the fact that Breznev gave a speech in this Central Hall of ours on Collective Security in Asia. And the idea that he has given has to be worked out. We are all aware of the initiatives for creating some sort of an Asian Spirit. We are also aware of the developments in South East Asia, we are aware of the conflicts in Korea, we are aware of the role played by the major powers in Japan and China and then in Vietnam. In this connection, I would like to say something. You have been saying that only we, here, are praising the Prime Minister's visits. When our Prime Minister visited Havana, half a million people lined up on the road from the Airport for 20 kilometres. Similarly, in Vietnam also, the leaders, the people and everybody else have such a deep love and affection for India and the Indian people and the bond that is there is that they know the Indian people have fought for their independence as the Vietnamese people have fought for their independence. The national independence, love of independence and love of freedom are the bond that exists between the Indian People, the Indian leadership and the Vietnamese people. His

[Shri B. R. Bhagat]

visits have strengthened these great bonds—the peoples' bonds. These powerful movements create trust in the internal relations. And Vietnam is the country which is going to play an important role in Asia. Therefore, we have the Asian Regional Conference. We have conflicts going on in that part. But due to wise leadership of Vietnam, a climate for peace and cooperation and discussion and dialogue have started. We hope that this will prevail. The Prime Minister talked with the Japanese Prime Minister on this basic question—on the question of peace and stability in Asia and in the Pacific region. So there are forces on the one hand and outside interference on the other. Imperialist interference from outside is trying to divide the country by setting one against another by exploiting them all. Then we have powerful forces in the country also. Therefore, each country has to be built on the basis of self-reliance and then regionally on the basis of collective reliance. Unless each country's economy and stability is strengthened, you cannot have regional or sub-regional stability. SAARC is developed and promoted into an area of stability and peace as has been mentioned in the declaration. Then Asian countries should cooperate with the individual countries who are strong and also among the major countries on their own understanding. We have a long way to go. But this is the only way in which we can proceed so that this continent can emerge into a continent of peace and stability and Asian spirit emerges out of this. I think Sir, we have to see in this respect and I am happy to say that the various statements have been referred about President Zia's statement that in this area there should not be any nuclear weapons. Our Prime Minister also in his speech has said that any kind of use of force or any nuclear weapon should not be there. It has also been mentioned in the declaration itself. In Article 1 of the Charter it says :

“It emphasises desirous of promoting peace and stability and amity, principles of sovereign equality, territorial integrity, national independence, non-use of force and non-interference in the internal affairs of other States and peaceful settlements of disputes.”

To this itself, several leaders have signed yesterday. So this also gives emphasis on this.

Then the Dhaka declaration. Article 5 of the Dhaka declaration says the same thing. The leaders of several Asian countries reaffirmed their commitment to the U. N. Charter and principles of governing sovereign equality of the States, peaceful settlement of disputes, non-interference in the internal affairs and non-use or threat of use of force against the territorial integrity and political independence of other States. So, there is an abundant caution, because we are aware—some Hon. Members have said so—about, the pitfalls, the bilateral difficulties, the relationships and the history of mistrust and conflicts among the States. So, the Charter provides for it, in this framework of SAARC, the regional framework, but bilateral disputes and contentions political matters will not be taken up.

20.00 hrs.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA :** What about trade ? Is there no mention of trade ?

**SHRI B. R. BHAGAT :** There will be. It says of cooperation, but at the moment economic cooperation is there and there has been in the Declaration a mention about trade.

They have taken up and identified nine areas on which there has been an agreement. The basis of functioning in the SAARC is like this. Firstly, that political matters should not come in; secondly, all matters and subjects will be taken up for studies and taken up for implementation and cooperation will be through unanimity. They have identified nine areas; technical committees are going into it, some have advanced, and others, that is, the council of Ministers—Foreign Ministers—will take a decision. Ultimately the Summit when it meets—now it will meet once in a year—it will take a decision. There they have identified two areas that is terrorism and drug trafficking and drug abuse. There is a suggestion now, many of these leaders have said, that SAARC will achieve its full aims and objects and its potentialities can only be realised if it takes up economic issues, that is, the

issues of trade, industry; environment and various other matters. But for that even the Secretariat is not there now. They have taken a decision to set up a Secretariat and these things are bound to come up when the organisation gets going which it will, in the coming weeks and the coming months.

Now, another subject is there. In this connection, I would like to deal with some of the neighbouring areas, for example, India-Pakistan relations. Some reference was made here, and President Zia's reference to nuclear weapons. Somebody warned that we should not believe them; some other Member, Mr. Gill said, "Let us make a bomb ourselves," and he objected to their Prime Minister Shri Rajiv Gandhi's statement that we are not going to make a bomb and President Zia's visit on the 17th December. So far as the question of nuclear weapons is concerned, we have said that it is not so; but there are reports emanating in various quarters. For example one of the areas is the U. S. Congress. Then the various other elements which say that they are getting them from various countries, and it goes to say that they are going on a nuclear weapons programme.

Secondly, we have stated our position clearly. We are not going to sign the Nuclear Proliferation Treaty but that has nothing to do with our bilateral relations with Pakistan or Pakistan going in for nuclear weapons. The pact, therefore, is going discriminatory; it is discriminatory against the non-weapon States and we do not want to compromise on any of the big programmes that we are having, the nuclear power programme, the development that we have made, the Kalpakkam reactor that is going to be inaugurated on the 16th and it is true that President Zia was invited, because he was coming on the 16th, not for the simple reason—not for inspection—and we have said it very clearly that inspection is not going to solve the question. We have to create confidence building measures among ourselves. For example, our programme is absolutely open. We are not indulging in any clandestine operations. Therefore, we have invited President Zia to visit Kalpakkam. He is coming on 17th. We are going to discuss the economic measures. His Finance Minister, Mr. Mahbubul Haq, came and discussed certain trade and economic

pacts. He is going to discuss it further. I think his visit will be good since we have been discussing some of the new economic and trade and other matters among ourselves between the two countries.

About Sri Lanka, a very impatient speech was made by our young friend, Shri Kumaramangalam, and some other Hon. Members. It is rightly said both by him and by our friend, Mr. Kollandaivelu, that it is not a Tamil issue. Absolutely not. What we have said is that there has been a continuous dialogue at the top level. Even in Dacca Prime Minister, Rajiv Gandhi, and President Jayawardene met. They had earlier met at Nasau and in Oman also. The crux of the matter is that there cannot be a military solution to this problem. If there is a feeling in any quarters, if President Jayawardene has said so, there cannot be. Even if it is feasible as he says, it is not wise. He is not for a military solution; he is for a political solution. But it is also true that everyday there is violation of the ceasefire, that there is allegations and counter-allegations about violations. We have been telling the Sri Lankan authorities that the violations must cease. We set up a monitoring committee which was enlarged so as to include representatives of the Tamil group so that it is monitored properly. But we are concerned at the continuing violence in Sri Lanka and our concern has been forcefully conveyed to the Sri Lankan authorities. We have also stressed upon them the importance of controlling the security forces. Mr. Kumaramangalam has said that we should consider afresh as to what more could be done as this is not working and they are losing their patience. It is not only their concern, but we are equally concerned about this. This issue is of national concern and is not just limited to Tamil Nadu. We have pointed out to the Sri Lankan authorities about the fatality and the enormous cost in terms of human lives and human suffering for any attempt to seek a military solution or of setting a deadline. We continue to work towards a negotiated political settlement. The legitimate grievances of the Tamil people of Sri Lanka are very much in our mind and will have to be addressed clearly by an proposal for a lasting solution. This is the course we have been following in talks at different levels that are going on and we are trying to take this line and direction.

[Shri B.R. Bhagat]

The Hon. Member Shri Kabuli said about Jammu and Kashmir, the line of actual control, and he asked, "Did we discuss it?" We have not discussed it. In all these meetings, Jammu and Kashmir has not so far been discussed; that I can tell the Hon. Member. He knows our position that Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part of India. Although for military purposes the line of actual control is there, but our stand is that Jammu and Kashmir, the whole of it is an integral part of India. But this matter has not been discussed recently with President Zia-ul-Haq.

About South Africa, our position is known on that. We are doing everything possible. Our stand is that all help should be given to them. The struggle there is intensified and I think we can look forward to the dawn of freedom there as a result of that. But still the struggle there will be long and we have been helping them.... (Interruptions).

**SHRI ABDUL RASHID KABULI :** But we must help them militarily.

**SHRI B. R. BHAGAT :** In every forum, the struggle must be helped. The modalities and other things have to be worked out in a different way but as a principle we have taken the stand to help them.

Similarly, about the PLO, the struggle there is intensified. They are getting united despite the fact that the imperialists, the colonialists, the racists and the apartheid, all are trying to divide the people. Earlier they did it between the blacks and the browns. But it has not worked and the struggle goes on. Unfortunately, the same unity is not there. And you know the difficulties—the forces that are operating. Far too bigger outside forces are operating but still we know the direction, we know our vision on this PLO matter also. (Interruption).

**SHRI ABDUL RASHID KABULI :** Regarding Afghanistan also I raised the issue. I would like to know your stand on that issue.

**SHRI B. R. BHAGAT :** We are for the political solution of the issue and it is a fact that there has been some talk about this in Geneva between General Secretary

Gorbachov and President Reagan. We hope that another round of the proximity talks under the representatives of the Secretary General is going to take place in Geneva this month very shortly, and we hope that will produce some result. The only question is the withdrawal of the Soviet troops and the guarantees, so that there is no outside interference—military or other. The modalities have to be worked out but obviously this can only be worked out between the Soviet Union and the United States. But we hope that this problem is solved and the solution lies through dialogue and political settlement. Again, in this matter also, there cannot be a military solution.

I think I have tried to cover most of the points. If anything is left, I can assure the Hon. Members that all the suggestions that they have made will be taken care of. With these words, I am again very grateful to the Hon. Members for the contribution that they have made and for participating in the debate.

**SHRI DINESH SINGH :** Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, it would be cruel on my part at this late stage to impose myself on my friends and colleagues here. My purpose has been served. Shri Indrajit Gupta and all other friends have lent their support to our policy and, therefore, my substitute motion has really become infructuous. Having already spoken against the tyranny of numbers, I can hardly be expected to put it to vote. Thank you very much.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER :** Are you withdrawing your substitute motion ?

**SHRI DINESH SINGH :** Yes, Sir.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER :** Has the Hon. Member leave of the House to withdraw his substitute motion ?

**SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS :** Yes.

*The substitute motion was, by leave, withdrawn*

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER :** The House now stands adjourned to meet again tomorrow at 11 A. M.

20.16 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, December 10, 1985/Agrahayana 19, 1907 (Saka).*