

ling these 25 tube-wells there, these were installed at other places where the crisis of water was not so grave. There is very severe crisis of water in Afzalgarh. Therefore, I want that water should be provided there immediately.

Relief operations should be started immediately in Bijnor. The food for work programme should be implemented there. Immediate arrangements should be made for health care and for the supply of fodder for the cattle.

In the end, I express thanks to all of you. Mr. Chairman, I am also thankful to you for allowing me to speak for a little more time than what was allotted.

16.00 hrs.

[English]

SHRI V.S. KRISHNA IYER (Bangalore South): Madam, Chairman, every year and in almost every session, we discuss about the drought situation. It is merely being touched over. But this year, this cannot be allowed to be merely touched over. The Government must come out with a plan of action.

We are really sorry that the hon. Minister, who is a very experienced person, is not giving a true picture of the seriousness of the drought situation in the country. This drought has been unprecedented. Millions of people have been affected by this drought. Out of 25 States, nearly 13 States and 2 Union territories are affected by this drought. I am very sorry to say that the Government of India—ever since I have become a Member I have been observing—is not kind and does not realise the seriousness of the situation of the drought-affected States. You see the way in which they give the financial assistance. Do you know that the assistance given by the Central Government to the States has been only token? I will give two or three instances. For example, Andhra Pradesh had sought an assistance of Rs. 953 crores in 1985-86 and the actual assistance given

was only Rs. 63.09 crores. Karnataka had asked for an assistance of Rs. 587.93 crores and the actual assistance given was Rs. 62.46 crores only. Maharashtra sought an assistance of Rs. 664.37 crores and the actual assistance given was Rs. 65.66 crores.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You please continue next time.

16.02 hrs.

DISCUSSION ON PRIME MINISTER'S
STATEMENT ON 30.7.1987 *RE. INDO-SRI
LANKA AGREEMENT TO ESTABLISH
PEACE AND NORMALCY IN SRI
LANKA*

[English]

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRISHNAN (Badagarc.): For the last few days the Government controlled media, the Doordarshan and the All India Radio, has been trying to whip up a climate of euphoria over the recently concluded Indo-Sri Lanka Agreement or Rajiv-Jayawardene Agreement as it is called.

16.03 hrs

[SHRI VAKKOM PURUSHOTHAMAN *in
the Chair*]

The Prime Minister himself has not been found wanting. He has himself been leading the cheer—boys brigade—a refreshing change for a statesman or an astounding performance by a Prime Minister giving the impression or rather his own verdict, which ought to have come much later from our experience or from historians, that it is an agreement of the century, a great landmark, a great triumph of his conduct of our foreign policy and in defence of our national interests! I deeply regret that I cannot agree with him in his verdict on himself or his historic achievement. He was angry with the opposition that we did not join the chorus of approval when he entered the House the other day soon after the assault on him—unfortunate as it was—

[Shri K.P. Unnikrishnan]

and made the statement in this House, if I remember correctly, on 31st of July. He even refused to meet the opposition leaders who wanted to congratulate him on his miraculous escape—an assault which we considered as a slap on the face of India. But I regret to say that he could not appreciate our gesture or possibly it even offended him, so I find from his letter to me today. Since it has offended him I would on my own—I do not know whether others would share it with me—withdraw this gesture with retrospective effect. He wants us to join the cheerboys over this agreement. Doesn't he? That is what it means. May I tell him that it is just not possible.

Indo-Sri Lanka Agreement or Rajiv Jayawardene Agreement cannot be approached either in a casual or a cavalier manner in which he has approached this question for the past several months or the way he approaches other problems as well. It is as though he has produced a treaty out of a conjurer's bag. Yet another accord from this Messiah of Accords. For a change, this one is international in context. For weeks and months we had called Jayewardene, may I remind my friends....

(Interruptions)

PROF. P.J. KURIEN (Idukki): Are you opposing the Accord?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: He has the right to say. You must not join the orchestra every time.

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRIISHNAN: My dear Prof. Kurien, you have some patience.

PROF. P.J. KURIEN: Sir, he is doing it all alone. It is not orchestra.

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRIISHNAN: I don't yield. For weeks, or even months, we had called Jayewardene—I do not want to name any of these; they are all on the

record—**on the Tamil ethnic minority of Sri Lanka, our own blood brethren just across. We reacted sharply to the situation naturally, not because it was a new problem which had suddenly dawned on us, but the struggle of Tamils which struck a chord deep within our hearts—it entered a decisive and crucial phase and the crisis in Sri Lanka itself is almost a point of catharsis, as in a Greek tragedy. Therefore, I thought that was the basis of mission of mercy, as we called it—didn't we?—which undoubtedly violated certain well-laid acknowledged norms of international law. But in spite of it, we supported it because of the compelling logic of events—Sri Lanka, where an ethnic minority were being fleeced and bled white, almost out of extinction. Who perpetrated this crime? Jayewardene, of course. Here was a leader of Sinhala chauvinism, proponent of a military solution—I can quote any number of statements and I quote even a statement of 6th August, after the Accord; in a minute or two—which in effect meant genocide of this Tamil ethnic minority in Sri Lanka, and continuing assault on human rights, one who violated U.N. Convention on Human Rights, of which India is a signatory, so is Sri Lanka. This was the picture of Jayewardene that we had. I **

Now this ** has overnight been converted into a prophet of brotherhood, a great statesman, or at least a vegetarian tiger. That is what our Prime Minister would like us to believe. What has happened to effect this metamorphosis? A change of heart? Not a trace of it. On sixth August, while broadcasting from Sri Lanka, he made two or three important points—in Sinhala broadcast for which English translations are available I presume; it must be with the Ministry of External Affairs—when he called it a 'temporary arrangement'. He said, "If Indian army comes and helps us, why are you bothered?" This is what he says in his broadcast on sixth. He says, "And as for referendum in the Eastern Provinces, we will win it. I will convass fo it." That is the

** Expunged as ordered by the Chair

worth of that treaty, not even worth the paper on which it was signed on 31st. Was it signed on good faith by the Prime Minister of India? I presume it was signed on good faith. Was that the intention of the Prime Minister of India, one of the signatories, that another signatory says, 'Don't worry about these provisions. They are only on paper. I am not referring to how Northern provinces and Eastern provinces would be linked in the Constitutional package. When referendum comes, we shall win it, we shall fake it. After all, Government of India had also agreed in their great wisdom to include not only Batticoloa but also Amparai deliberately to fake the referendum.

Even on December 19 package.

SHRI P. KOLANDAIVELU (Gobichettipalayam): Referendum can be postponed.

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRIISHNAN: Yes. I will come to that. Where was Amparai? There was no Amparai on December 19th. Who brought Amparai? Sinhale majority who live in Batticoloa and Trincomale—it is configuration of eastern province. Who brought it? Didn't you know?

Therefore, Shri Jayewardene is full of faith. He says why are you bothered of Indian presence or presence of Indian Army. He says soon after the job is done i.e. after ease and put out of pale of trouble they will be sent back and we should not get divided. Sinhale people should not get divided. What is significant is that he continues to speak in the same language a week after the Accord has been signed. Now we should have presumed because we have taken certain positions, I shall come to that later.

For the last forty years position was taken by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, Smt. Indira Gandhi, Shri Morarji Desai. Government of India had taken certain positions. It is my charge to-day that the Prime Minister under his regime, those position have been violated, promises have been violated. That is my

charge to-day and not merely that—we have accepted for ourselves certain precedents like referendum which we have rejected outright as a means for self determination in Jammu and Kashmir. We said—Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part of this country and you do not use referendum as a device, the device to seek even a political solution. That has been our case in the United Nations and throughout the world—no question of referendum. We refused to accept referendum in a sovereign State within a nation. There is no question of accepting the principle or making it applicable elsewhere. What is this conduct of foreign policy? I am amazed. There is no precedent for such conduct anywhere. In a way, may be the Prime Minister was right that there is no parallel to this treaty or accord or agreement, whatever you call it. Not even .

(Interruptions)

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRIISHNAN: I do not yield. Better listen.

MR CHAIRMAN: Prof. Kurien, he is not yielding.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order. You address the Chair.

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRIISHNAN: I should have thought that we would have consulted the principal party to this Agreement, the leaders of the Tamil ethnic minority and particularly Shri Prabhakaran who was confined to a hotel suite in Ashoka Hotel. People were denied entry to meet him. He was kept as a prisoner. That is my charge. I am speaking from personal experience. I wanted to see him. I telephoned. The security did not allow anyone to see him. Here is what he says—not very edifying—the *Hindu* I presume, you can accept its bonafides. That is from the speech made in Jaffna by Shri Prabhakaran whom you accept as undisputed leader of the Eelam movement. I quote

[Shri K.P. Unnikrishnan]

from his speech made on 8th August in Jaffna.

"You are aware that this agreement concluded suddenly and with great haste and speed between India and Sri Lanka without consulting our people and without consulting us and our peoples representatives, is being implemented with expedition and urgency. Until I went to Delhi, I did not know anything about this Agreement. Saying that the Prime Minister decided to see me, they invited me and took me to Delhi. The Agreement was shown after I went there.

"There were several complications and several question marks in it and I pointed it out. Accordingly, it was made emphatically clear to the Indian Government that we were unable to accept this agreement."

This agreement is, he says, primarily concerned with the India-Sri Lanka relations and again I am not quoting the whole thing. He says:

"it is an attempt to bring Sri Lanka into Indian sphere of influence and nothing more."

I shall come to the other part later. Thus it is an agreement which was imposed, an imposed agreement between the vital parties and an agreement which gives a decisive advantage and leverage to Sinhala chauvinists or at least to the group led by President Jayawardene. Now, what was the dispute, Sir? How did we view it for the last 40 years? It is worthwhile having a look at it briefly. Indian independence gave impetus to the entire region towards freedom and nationhood. We knew and we were aware of complexity of our nationhood as well as that of our neighbourhood. The ethnic diversities had threatened to divide the new born nation in a general sense, the whole of South Asia, but it was more acute in Sri Lanka in a sense because it was a smaller country. But we wished

them well because apart from being our neighbour, we had a share of common heritage with the Tamils of Sri Lanka. They were our brethren with a shared heritage, values, of culture, of food, or at least of the people of Tamil Nadu. In effect, they were our blood brothers. The Sinhala people were also the torch bearers of the Buddhist stream of Indian thought which has brought them close to us. But here was a new nation, a new political nation and our small Island neighbour. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru understood the problem, its sensitive parameters, also possibly its explosive possibilities. The Indian Ocean at that time was yet to emerge as a zone of contention or a possible theatre of war. So, patiently we built up our link with Sri Lanka. We told them about this problem of Tamils—and mind you there are two problems, parallel problems, one of those of Sri Lanka Tamils who they claim Sri Lanka belongs to or those who have been the original inhabitants of Sri Lanka—the Tamil speaking Sri Lankan citizens, and the others are those who had migrated from India during the last 150 years or so when the tea plantations were opened up in Sri Lanka—Tamils of Indian regions. There was another dimension to the problem. I shall come to that. And that is why we said that this is essentially your problem as far as we are concerned, we are aware and we have our ties with the Tamils; we shall lend our good offices and we shall not allow them to be ill-treated. It has wider problem of security which concerns. But, nothing more and nothing less. That did not mean at any point of time I would contend today that till two weeks ago we would enter their sphere ourselves and enter into this kind of wonderful Accord for which a lot is being claimed today, not excluding the Nobel prize sought by obliging US Congressmen! This is exactly the problem. Therefore, we said, we said even when the ethnic violence escalated a few years ago, more precisely in 1981 and 1983 and earlier at the time of Sirimao Shastri Pact, later right through we said that we should not interfere.

We wanted political solution. It is not

that we are running away. We were interested—not merely interested but actively interested—in a political solution and in promoting it. We could also be actively involved in the process of healing, if healing was possible, in the process of getting them together. But nothing more and nothing less. Therefore, the context of the sensitive problem which confronted us has to be understood.

In the Srimavo Agreement, about which there were great misgivings—as Mr. Kolandaivelu would bear me out today—in 1964, we promised to take about 5,75,000 Stateless Tamils as our citizens. And we did our best. We took them. But Sri Lanka did not keep up their promise of granted citizenship to Tamils of Indian origin as agreed to in the past and their percentage and proportion. I do not remember, perhaps it was 1981 when Mr. MGR led a delegation an all-Party delegation from Tamil Nadu when this question came up again. Soon after that, I had the privilege of discussing this with Shrimati Indira Gandhi and she said, “There is no question of taking one more”. I remember her words, “Not are more”. Now, I am told, you have agreed to take 200 thousand people Do you know what is the language used in this Treaty? It is wonderful. It is 200 thousands of Indian citizens. I quote Clause 2.16 (d) of the Agreement.

“The Government of India will expedite repatriation from Sri Lanka of Indian citizens to India who are resident there...”

Who are these Indian citizens? Answering question in this very House last year, they said, there were no Indian citizens in Sri Lanka of this magnitude. From where did Mr. Rajiv Gandhi and Mr. Jayawardene—out of a hat—produce 200 thousand Indian citizens in Sri Lanka? Who were these Indian citizens? Clause 2.16 (d) is wonderful.

“The Government of India will expedite repatriation from Sri Lanka of Indian citizens to India who are

resident there, concurrently with the repatriation of Sri Lankan refugees from Tamil Nadu.”

They are put on a par. People who have been driven out, the citizens of Sri Lanka who have been driven out in an attempted genocide and who have been forced to migrate to Tamil Nadu, India, have been put on a par with people who have been there for 150 years, their families and successors. In the Assam Accord you say all those who cross beyond the date—in 1971—must be given citizenship. They should be treated as Indian citizens. But these are people who have been there for 150 years or so and we have signed this international treaty. Sri Lanka was duty-bound to give citizenship to these people, that is, as far as the Stateless people are concerned, which is the most crucial of these problems. That is how the Treaty approaches.

And the general statement is in Clause 2.14:

“The Government of India will under-write and guarantee the resolutions, and cooperate in the implementation of these proposals.

“2.15 These proposals are conditional to an acceptance of proposals negotiated from 4.5.1986 to 19.12.1986.”

The onus is put on the Government of India, not on the Government of Sri Lanka. Clause 2.15 further says:

“These proposals are also conditional to the Government of India cooperating directly with the Government of Sri Lanka in their implementation.”

Again in Clause 2.16 it is said:

“These proposals are also conditional to the Government of India taking the following actions...:

[Shri K.P. Unnikrishnan]

(a) India will take all necessary steps to ensure that Indian territory is not used for activities prejudicial...."

That is, the militants, those who have taken refuge and sanctuary and those who share the common perspective, common background and common culture would be driven out. In response to what? How much is made out of the security parameters of this treaty and the great achievements. Achievement is nowhere in this accord, it is in the letter exchanged. Accord, it is in the letters exchanged. Trincomalee's port facilities. The agreement as in the Bofors continues with Americans; a valid agreement between Sri Lankan Government and American companies continue to operate and Mr. Jayawardene has been clever, his Government has been clever, it is put nowhere in this treaty. That is in a letter of President Jayawardene to the Prime Minister of India.

I do not want to take much of your time. But I want to say something on the constitutional package which is the most important thing. As I referred to earlier about the Eastern province, where are the guarantees built in this agreement? I do not know. Now you have compelled the Tamil Eelam militant movement to lay down arms and as Mr. Prabhakaran has said, I do not want to quote again. To repeat this is what he said: "we accept your word. You are responsible now. It is not our responsibility. It is your responsibility at least for the time being. We shall lay down arms." But what do you get in return. Can anybody tell me that there has been a political solution to this problem, in this agreement? First referendum to which Jayawardene referred, which I quoted a little while ago, that is the main thing, the referendum.

Nobody knows what provincial councils will be, their size or ambit their powers and so on and Mr. Jayawardene now talks in an interview to some foreign news papers "they have Union Territories in India." Don't

they? Not States. They have Union Territories. He has found out an analogy with the provisions of Indian Constitution. He says "By Province what do I mean? Province means a territory demarcated. Nothing else."

These are the ominous references which have come across. Where is the talk of autonomy? Leave alone autonomy, what are the constituent powers? Out of the proposed constitutional arrangements, where is it in this agreement? What is its value then?

Therefore, I would say that I do not know what kind of security it is what are the guarantees on constitutional set up and whether it will be honoured and who will honour it, in the Indian counter or in the Sri Lanka counter and the most mischievous part of it is, as I have pointed out, while bringing Amparai into the situation it is nowhere there in December 19 proposals, by bringing in Sinhala majority into the Eastern province for the purposed of a fake referendum which is already accepted. It is also a question of who would vote in this referendum after accepting the composition of the province after the Sinhala colonisation. There has been the demand of the Tamil Movement that these should not be regarded as residents of this province allowed, those who have colonised subsequently should not be and they do not belong to that place. There should be a residential qualification. Now not only they would vote, Amparai would also vote, to keep Batticaloa and Trincomalee also off the Tamil territory. This is the achievement of this Accord.

Therefore, this constitutional package envisaged in this treaty is not merely weak but it is non-existent. There is hardly anything of gain that the Tamil Movement, the Eelam movement which has been struggling for the last so many years, paying with their blood sweat and tears paying with their life and facing the genocide bravely, to get. They have today been let down by India. That is my deep regret and

shame. Therefore, Sir, I am sorry, I cannot join, as I said earlier, in the accolades and in the great cheer that accompanies this 'great accord', 'accord of the century' if you like and all that I would like to say is to warn you of its implications—its implications on our security, its implications for conduct of our foreign policy and acceptance of certain basic norms as enshrined in this treaty which would be dangerous for our national interest not only in relation to Sri Lanka, but, as I said, in relation to Pakistan and in relation to our vital national interests.

SHRI DINESH SINGH (Pratapgarh): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have great regard for my friend Mr. Unnikrishnan...*(Interruptions)* But I do not know in what spirit he was speaking this afternoon and what really possessed him...

(Interruptions)

AN HON. MEMBER: He is under obsession.

SHRI DINESH SINGH: He did accuse the Prime Minister of wanting to be a cheer Leader...*(Interruptions)* He can be a good cheer Leader. But, that was not our intention. He even made light of the attack on the Prime Minister in which we could have had very serious consequences. It was providence that saved him and we are glad that he is unharmed and he is with us. If he (Mr. Unnikrishnan) thinks that it was some kind of an acting....

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRIISHNAN: No, I have never said that. On the contrary, I said "we rushed" He did not want to see us Here is the reply For your benefit, I can read it

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. Not now, please. You could have done it earlier.

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRIISHNAN: I did not want to...It is worthwhile, I will have it published.

(Interruptions)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: There is nothing defamatory.

(Interruptions)

AN HON. MEMBER: Don't publish anything else.

(Interruptions)

SHRI DINESH SINGH: I think it is your neighbourhood that probably changed your attitude this afternoon.

Sir, let us look at the objective of this Agreement. Mr. Unnikrishnan spoke in a manner in which we were some kind of an occupying power which had to decide the fate of the people in Sri Lanka and there it was incumbent on us to create certain conditions, force certain conditions on the Government of Sri Lanka to conform to certain ways of thinking that we may have thought to be the best. We, in this region, in South Asia, are all beset with problems of minorities, of linguistic, ethnic groups and we have to find our own solutions. We cannot impose solutions. These are not transferable. What we can do in India, we cannot do in Sri Lanka. What they can do in Sri Lanka perhaps we cannot do it in some other country. That is their domestic affair. They have to decide. Our objective in this Agreement was to help preserve the unity and integrity of Sri Lanka. We did not wish to see a kind of civil war building up in Sri Lanka which might destroy its unity and integrity. It was our objective to see that the violence and the ensuing genocide came to an end. We wanted peace to be restored in which the different parties in Sri Lanka could decide their future by themselves, not by Indian dominance. It was our objective to enable the Tamil ethnic minority in Sri Lanka to live in peace, preserving their cultural and linguistic identity. What we have to see is whether these have been fulfilled, and I make bold to say that these have been fulfilled, that peace has been restored, that the rights of the ethnic minority, the Tamils in Sri Lanka, have been guaranteed in the Agreement, that the unity and the integrity of Sri Lanka has

[Shri Dinesh Singh]

been preserved. In addition, South Asia has been recognised as a region in which the regional affairs will be decided by the countries of this region and not by outside powers.

Look at the course of events in Sri Lanka. I would not wish to go in any detail and take up the time of the House because it is well known to the House. There was a move in Sri Lanka to find a solution between the majority Sinhalese community and the minority Tamil community. This could not be settled peacefully and violence was resorted to. Sri Lanka saw four years of bitter violence and then Sri Lanka asked India to assist in finding a solution. It is not a small matter that a country seeks the cooperation of another country to solve a domestic affair. It can be done only when there is confidence in the impartiality and the judgment of that country that one approaches. If you wish some dispute to be settled, if you wish to find a mediator or even if you wish to find somebody to lend his good offices, then you must have confidence in him. Both sides must have confidence. I think, it is a matter of great honour to India, to Prime Minister Shri Rajiv Gandhi, that the Government of Sri Lanka and President Jayewardene reposed faith in him just as much as the Tamil leaders who were under attack.

In these four years, the Government of Sri Lanka tried every possible way to find a solution, a military solution. They sought assistance from outside, they brought in people to train their commandos, they brought in military equipment, they brought in intelligence groups and they got military trainers from one of the countries of this region. And yet, it was not possible to find the military solution. They had to come to India, and President Jayewardene has made it quite clear that he not only sought the assistance of these people but also of the major powers in Europe and in North America and then he was told that he had to go to India. It was India that could find a solution. It is not a small mat-

ter. I think, it is a matter to be proud of. That is why we call it, 'the Agreement of the Century'. (*Interruptions*) I ask my friend, Mr. Unnikrishnan, to give me an example of another Agreement brought by a country in which a peaceful solution has emerged in this manner. Mr. Unnikrishnan, as others in the media, has tried to find loopholes in the Agreement. And I could add many more loopholes to their list of loopholes. It reminds me of a story, Mr. Chairman. In the 1957 election, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru used to tell a story. He said, "you take a glass. Half fill it with water and show it to your friend, ask him how much water there is". Those that would say it is half full, they take a positive line. Those that will say half empty is what we have from Unnikrishnan.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: But the fact is both are right.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY (Mahabubnagar): There are two sides of every coin.

SHRI DINESH SINGH: We have never claimed that this Agreement like any other agreement is perfect. This is more difficult because it is an Agreement between two sovereign nations dealing with the internal affairs of one of them. Therefore, lot of caution had to be exercised so that people in Sri Lanka did not feel that a solution had been imposed on them. It had to be an Agreement in which the people of Sri Lanka would have felt that they would have arrived at an agreement by themselves if it had been possible. And it was India that made this possible.

Mr. Unnikrishnan referred to certain harsh words said about President Jayewardene in the media and elsewhere in this country. In the heat of the moment, Sir, when one feels that certain violence is taking place, large numbers of refugees are coming away from there, then certain harsh words are at times used. But they are not for permanent application. We have record of countries in Europe having war for many years and then they sat down together and found peace. There,

fore, I do not see any contradiction in it. When an action is wrong, we say it is wrong, when it is right we say it is right. If a person has taken one wrong action should we for ever say that he takes wrong action and should we for ever condemn him? I don't think that. That is not part of human nature.

Mr. Unnikrishnan has expressed great doubts about ascertaining of the wishes of the people in the Eastern provinces. As he would see from the Agreement, we have tried to ensure that the referendum will be fair and impartial. That the Indian Election Commission would be associated with theirs.

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRISHNAN: As observers.

SHRI DINESH SINGH: But Mr. Unnikrishnan will appreciate that we cannot conduct the elections there.

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRISHNAN: You can do everything.

SHRI DINESH SINGH: It is a sovereign country, we can only observe.

(Interruptions)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Let us conduct our own elections

SHRI DINESH SINGH: I do not think Mr Madhu Dandavate could have any objection to our election system. Otherwise he would not have been here. Sir

(Interruptions)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Thank you for small mercies

SHRI DINESH SINGH: You are welcome.

Mr. Unnikrishnan also took some objection to why certain things were mentioned in the exchange of letters. As I said earlier, he might have been influenced by his

neighbour; but otherwise he would have realised that it is quite customary in international agreements to have some portions as part of the agreement and some portions in exchange of letters which is an essential part of the agreement because it says that 'I agree to this'. This is what an agreement means.

Beyond this I would like the House to bear in mind that this is the first time when there has been a universal recognition of India's pre-eminent situation on the sub-continent and a recognition that India would discharge its obligations honestly and in cooperation with others.

(Interruptions)

[*Translation*]

(Interruptions)

Choubeyji has some worry about this agreement. Now he is in a fix as to which side he should extend his support. First, he visited Sri Lanka and thereafter Tamil Nadu. Now, he is in a fix as to whom he should give his support.

SHRI RANA VIR SINGH (Kaisarganj): This is the main reason behind Choubeyji's worry.

(Interruptions)

SHRI DINESH SINGH: He is in an embarrassing position. Whether he should support the people of Bengal or should support Tamilians.

[*English*]

Anyhow Sir, Mr. Unnikrishnan took objection to certain references made by the parliamentarians in the United States and the United Kingdom in which they had recommended the names of Shri Rajiv Gandhi and Shri Jayawardene for the Nobel peace prize. I should have thought that as an Indian he would have been proud that people in other countries had thought it right that this was an occasion when a peace prize should be given to

[Shri Dinesh Singh]

these leaders...*(Interruptions)*...It is my hope that Mr. Unnikrishnan and friends sitting next to him would lend their voice to the same suggestion which has been made in other countries. Thank you.

SHRI G.G. SWELL (Shillong): Mr. Chairman.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: All the big guns are fielded Siri Bofors guns are being fielded!

SHRI G.G. SWELL: I am not a Bofors gun.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: He is not a Bofors gun; so he does not know the secret!

SHRI G.G. SWELL. Mr. Unnikrishnan knows, the leaders of the opposition know very well that I maintain a good line of communication with them and that I hold them in very great respect for the hard work, for the knowledge. I don't doubt their patriotism and to a certain extent for their articulation. I have only felt that a good opposition, good leaders in the opposition are a spice for the deliberations in this House.

But today I must say that Mr. Unnikrishnan's anger, prejudice or frustration, whatever it be, has run away with him. I tried my level best to detect anything positive in what he was trying to say I must say that I have not been able to discover anything positive. I am also at a loss to understand whether he was in favour of the bloodshed, civil war and the killings that had been going on in Sri Lanka to go on for ever!

I think, Sir, that ever since the days when Jawahar Lal Nehru adumbrated the concept of Panchsheel to the world, which has stood its ground till today, and ever since the hey days when the diplomacy of this nation, the sincerity, the wisdom of this nation and to some extent the armed for-

ces of this nation had mid-wifed the oppressed people of Bangladesh into freedom and sovereignty in the world this is one of the greatest foreign policy achievements that this country has ever made.

Now we have to look at the facts. What has happened? Sri Lanka has been bathing in blood. Innocent people were being massacred. Some kind of a genocide was taking place there. Destruction was taking place there. All that has come to an end. All that has stopped until today as a result of this Accord

I will agree with what Mr. Dinesh Singh said, the way of looking at things. If your way of looking at things is that the glass is always half empty that is different. Nothing in this world is perfect. But until today the fighting, the blood-shed, the killings of innocent people in Sri Lanka has stopped. There is peace in Sri Lanka as a result of this Accord

We have to say with all sincerity whether this has been a good thing or a bad thing I cannot quite understand what Mr. Unnikrishnan was trying to say—whether the stopping of the killings and bloodshed in Sri Lanka has been a good thing or a bad thing.

SOME HON MEMBERS: He was confused.

SHRI G.G. SWELL: I wish and I know that he has had a little look at the world press. Almost the press of every country in the world, cutting across ideological lines—whether East or West—have welcomed this agreement as a positive achievement. It is a sad thing that whatever critical thing, whatever pessimistic forecast has been made about this agreement has been sounded here inside this country than outside. We have to take note of these things

Sr, I think it has been in keeping with the great tradition, in keeping with Panchsheel and in keeping with the foreign policy deci-

sions of this country that we want our neighbours to live in peace and freedom

We want them to enjoy their sovereignty and territorial integrity. Wherever we can help to do that we shall do that.

Sir, any person will admit it that Sri Lanka was on the verge of a split, that the Sri Lankan Army was not able to control the situation that a military solution of the problem of the Tamils in northern Sri Lanka and eastern Sri Lanka was not possible. There could be only one solution and that would have been the division of Sri Lanka. It is the intervention of the Prime Minister of the Government of India that has stopped that. Therefore we can claim this credit that India has secured the sovereignty and the territorial integrity of Sri Lanka. This is the message which has to be conveyed and which has to be understood and which has to be received.

Sir, the fact is that we live in this regional part of the world and our neighbours should feel safe and assured that India is a great nation that they have nothing to fear from India that they can receive the utmost of goodwill, the utmost of cooperation from India to safeguard their sovereignty, their territorial integrity and their freedom.

What has happened in Sri Lanka today is a message to the rest of the nations around us. I hope the message has reached Bhutan. The Bhutan press has been very positive. The message has reached Bangladesh. The Bangladesh press has been very positive and very receptive. The message has reached other countries in the neighbourhood. I wish that the message also to some extent has reached Pakistan. Of course Pakistan has its own pre-occupations at the moment. But I hope that some day Pakistan also will understand that the best bet for them is to trust India and to cooperate with India. We do hope that the accord will stick.

Arms are being surrendered. We expect that in a few days all the arms with the

militants would have been surrendered. The Sri Lankan army has been sent back to the barracks or they have been sent to the other parts of Sri Lanka. There is no more confrontation. Things are moving in a positive direction.

We would like from this House to congratulate President Jayewardene for his courage for his wisdom and far-sightedness. We know the personal risk that he has taken. We know the opposition he is facing within his country and I do not think it right to make much of what he might have said on the spur of the moment. We all say many things on the spur of the moment. This is not a part of conscious action. We have to judge the person by what he has done at a crucial time. I would like if it were possible that we send a unanimous congratulation and goodwill to President Jayewardene that he would succeed in what he is trying to do.

17.00 hrs.

Sir, I know my time is limited but I would like also Mr. Umnikrishnan and my friends in the Opposition to consider the national interest of India. If my neighbour's house is on fire it is a danger to my own house. I cannot afford to have my neighbour's house on fire and therefore to ensure my own safety it is my duty to go and to help in all possible ways I can to put out the fire in my neighbour's house.

Things happening in Sri Lanka in the last 3, 4 or 5 years have definitely posed a danger to India. Foreign forces we know very well that in their desperation the Government of Sri Lanka had have to call on the assistance of foreign organisations of certain elements of the special air services of Great Britain and the services of intelligence organisations like MOSSAD and Shinbet which by no stretch of imagination are friendly towards India. We know the struggle, the great power struggle for strategic advantage in this part of the world. We know the existence of the central command. We know the meaning of Diego Garcia and everything else.

[Shri G.G. Swell]

We know that the United States in America had acquired 1600 acres of land for the broadcast service for the Voice of America. For a broadcasting station you do not require more than 2,3 or 10 acres of land. Why do you need 1600 acres of land. And all the intelligence indicate that these are not just broadcasting services, they are there to set up other stations, listening posts, monitoring posts. to guide the movement of the submarine in the Indian ocean and this part of the world. That is why they need so much of space

Mr. Unnikrishnan has been talking about some kind of an agreement between the Governments of Sri Lanka and United States of America over the Bay or Trincomalee. So, we have to understand what this Trincomalee base is. I think this is one of the best natural harbours in the whole world. It is naturally protected harbour. Even today it can receive ships of about 30,000 tonnes. With the little deepening, it can receive ships of double size. In addition to all that there is a legacy which the British Government has left in the form of 99 fuel storage tanks with a capacity of 12,000 tonnes per tank. It means even today easily 120,000 tonnes of fuel can be stored in Trincomalee at any given time.

Now, Sir, what is this agreement? Mr. Unnikrishnan made a point of the fact that these things have not been mentioned in the agreement itself. Well, as my friend Mr Dinesh Singh has said, it is part of the exchange of letters between our Prime Minister and President Jayawardene. And if you look at the dates of the letter, the date of the letter of our Prime Minister seeking clarifications and confirmation from President Jayewardene it was July 29. The reply from President Jayawardene was also on the same date

It was only after the clarification of these things that the agreement was signed on that particular day. It is not an after-thought. It is not an addition. It is very

much a part of the agreement. And what does it say? It says:

"Trincomalee or any other ports in Sri Lanka will not be made available for military use by any country in a manner prejudicial to India's interest."

So, it is done by one stroke of the pen.

It would be a very great prize for the United States of America or for any other superpower to have a base in Trincomalee. We know what the Subic Bay Base in the Philippines means to the United States of America. We know what the Clark Air Base in Phillipines means to America. We can very well imagine that Trincomalee Bay has greater value as a base for America, in this part of the world, at this time, when the gravity of the world situation is shifting more to the East and the Far East. So, the importance of Trincomalee Bay could easily be understood. And Trincomalee in the hands of the United States of America will be a dagger right into the heart of India. Well, by this agreement now, nothing can be done in Trincomalee without the knowledge of India.

More than that, the work of restoring and operating the Trincomalee Oil Tank Firm—of those 99 tanks...

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRIISHNAN: 100 tanks.

SHRI G.G. SWELL: Thank you very much. If you add one more, you reinforce by argument all the more.

The work of restoring and operating the Trincomalee Oil Tank Firm will be undertaken by a joint venture between India and Sri Lanka. Sri Lanka cannot do it alone.

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRIISHNAN: Prof. Swell, would you yield for a minute? Now, there is an agreement between Sri Lanka and a Coastal Corporation called the Ore-licium, which is still valid. It has not been cancelled and they have no intention of cancelling it. You please get from the

External Affairs Minister, the post-treaty broadcast and various interviews he has given to the European newspapers.

SHRI G.G. SWELL: I suppose this agreement between sovereign Sri Lanka and sovereign India will have an effect, if not an overruling effect, on it.

PROF. N.G. RANGA (Guntur): It should have. If it does not, we should strive for it. We should not jibe at the agreement.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Shri Tiwari has assured that it would be superceded.

SHRI G.G. SWELL: It will be. In any case, America cannot do a thing in Trincomalee without the knowledge or consent of India and Sri Lanka. Is this not safeguarding the national interest? Do we have a point of quarrel over this? I am really pained. I do not understand this because I respect Shri Unnikrishnan for his intelligence and knowledge. One day I happened to go to his house and I did not know whether it was a book shop or his house, because his house was littered with books.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: That is because he is not properly organised at home.

SHRI G.G. SWELL: I thought, if the man could read all those books, he is not a man, he is a superman.

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRISHNAN: Thank you.

SHRI G.G. SWELL: Therefore, I do not understand his saying all these things. The same thing is about the broadcasting stations. The agreements with Sri Lanka will see to it that all foreign agencies in Sri Lanka will be withdrawn. I say it is a great thing. Yes, of course, it is an unusual agreement in a way because the quarrel was between the two factions in Sri Lanka. But it is also a fact that the people in Sri Lanka were not able to decide things for them-

selves. They were going down hill. Therefore it is to the everlasting credit of India that it has helped to save Sri Lanka and to bring about understanding and to set the process for healing. Let us look into the future. We have to look into the future with optimism. If I decide that I am defeated—I may be defeated from the beginning—I will be doing no good. I will never be able to any good. Why should we run down everything? We may have differences internally. It is only natural. But, I think the nation requires that we must rise above our party differences or our personal differences and acclaim something that is good.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY (Mahbubnagar): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, today, apart from my senior colleague Mr. Unnikrishnan, I had the opportunity of listening to two of the most articulate spokesmen of the ruling party. They sounded like ardent advocate of the Accord. But I must say in fairness to them that even they felt that glass of Accord is only half full. If that is so, they will not be able to reconcile this proposition of half glass with the praise they heaped on the Accord.

As we all know, this tiny and beautiful island of Ceylon-Sri Lanka has been bleeding for the last thirtyone years, resulting in the death of about 16,000 people. Since 1983, this civil strife has been on the increase resulting in the death of more than 6,000 people. Any effort made to bring such hostilities to a halt is always welcome. One is not deploring the effort that has been made. One is only trying to analyse the results of the efforts. My friend Mr. Unnikrishnan drew the attention of the House to the various loopholes in the Accord from the viewpoint of Tamil brethren who fought for three decades and from the viewpoint of our nation as a whole.

It is also significant to note that this Accord has met with enormous and violent resistance from the Sinhalese themselves.

I do not know how can one wish away or conjure away the violent opposition of an extremist organization known as JVP, and

[Shri S. Jaipal Reddy]

the Sri Lanka Freedom Party led by Shri-mati Bandaranaike herself I do not know how we can ignore or disregard the open dissent by none other than the Prime Minister of Sri Lanka.

SHRI ABDUL GHAFOOR (Siwan): He has changed his attitude; he has fallen in line.

SHRI S JAIPAL REDDY: But he boycotted the visit of our Prime Minister (*Interruptions*) In fact, I am in line. I am only giving expression to my misgivings.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE Their boycott is different from our boycott

SHRI S JAIPAL REDDY: We cannot also turn a blind eye to the vehement opposition of the Buddhist monks who are just now on the warpath.

The whole nation condemned the dastardly attack on our Prime Minister. Condemnable as it was, it has its own message I want Parliament and our friends in the ruling party to note this. We have been, of course in the last two years, very good at concluding Accords. We have set up a new record of Accords.

AN. HON. MEMBER. This is an agreement.

SHRI S JAIPAL REDDY. But we also know how each Accord has turned out to be an apple of discord. (*Interruptions*)

They were referring to the praise heaped on our Prime Minister and President Jayewardene from such unlikely quarters as the U.S. Congress. Just now, if I heard him aright, Prof. Swell was waxing eloquent about the terrible losses inflicted on the strategic interests of the United States by this Accord. If that were so, why did the U.S. Congress run into such raptures, as to recommend the Nobel Prize for Peace to our Prime Minister? How is it?

(*Interruptions*)

I would like someone to throw light. I am relatively a new Member. (*Interruptions*) I would certainly welcome somebody's effort to illumine the dark patches in my mind. (*Interruptions*) When these people talk of Nobel Peace Prize...(*Interruptions*)

PROF. K.K. TEWARY (Buxar): It is an impenetrable darkness.

SHRI S JAIPAL REDDY. I know that the mind of Mr Tewary is opaque I cannot penetrate it.

When our friends have so ecstatically referred to the suggestion of Nobel Peace Prize, I have been reminded of a very unpleasant award of Nobel Peace Prize In the Middle East, Henry Kissinger arranged for a similar peace prize for the President of Egypt, the late lamented Mr Sadat and the former Prime Minister of Israel, Mr Begin—I do not know who. Therefore, I might tell them, in the words of Shakespeare "Comparisons are odious."

SHRI ABDUL GHAFOOR Have you asked Tewary Ji?

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE They will ask Who was Shakespeare?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE Even Shakespeare had consulted him

SHRI S JAIPAL REDDY I consulted Bradley who is more referred to than Shakespeare.

Let me come to the agreement

Mr Unnikrishnan made the Point that the Amperai District was not included under December 19 proposal I would like the government to enlighten us as to how the inclusion of this District, which is dominated by Sinhalese majority would help our Tamil friends? Our Prime Minister has a lot of fascination for time-bound targets. Similar targets were fixed in connection with Punjab problem. Now time fixed for

referendum in Sri Lanka is 31st December, 1988, but the President Jayawardene can Postpone it unilaterally on his own discretion; this date of referendum is almost indefinite. At the moment this Accord has certainly brought peace to the island; to that extent, I welcome the Accord. But that should not blind us to the many unpredictable difficulties the Accord bristles with.

Our Indian forces are there now in Sri Lanka. They have conducted themselves with great restraint, effectiveness and distinction. But then we must see how they are perceived and how their role is perceived by the Sinhalese. It is a very important aspect. Shrimati Bandarenaikē, who has been a great friend of our country, referred to Indian army as an occupation army. I do not know whether our friends saw the news item in the teiegraph. (*Interruptions*) Ali of us cannot manage to be in the ruling party all the time

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE How can both sides be in the ruling party? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI S JAIPAL REDDY I am referring to the perception of the People belonging to a particular section in Sri Lanka (*Interruptions*) I am told that on the 7th of August our army was stoned in Trincomalee. May I know from the Ministr of External Affairs whether it is a fact that our Indian peace keeping force was stoned by Sinhalese mob on 7th August? If it is true, it is true, it is a very disturbing indication

I heard Shri Dinesh Singhji and Prof Swell dwell at length on the implicit achievements of this Accord in the area of foreign policy. Well, they have no doubt referred to certain understanding We reached with President Jayawardene in regard to strategic Sri Lanka Port of Trincomalee, in regard to use or non-use of foreign military personnel in Sri Lanka and in regard to non-use of Sri Lanka broadcasting services by outside powers for military purposes. But as has been pointed out, this understanding was reached more in the

form of a letter, nay only in the form of letters.

A question was put both to our Prime Minister Shri Rajiv Gandhi and President Jayawardene at Colombo as to whether these letters had the same status as the Accord itself. Both of them maintained studied but significant silence. So, I would like the External Affairs Minister to enlighten us as to the status and the effectiveness of these letters.

Mr. K.K. Tewary has just now propounded a new doctrine.

PROF. K. K. TEWARY: I have not spoken at all

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Mr Tewary has blair for novelty.

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER Do not bring his name. Then afterwards you will have to reply and a controversy may be there. Do not unnecessarily do so.

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRISHNAN. He is appreciating today.

SHRI S JAIPAL REDDY: I am not naming him (*Interruptions*) He said that these letters exchanged between President Jayawardene and our Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi automatically supersede all other accords concluded between the Government of Sri Lanka and other Governments in the world!

AN HON MEMBER How?

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY. Well, I am not among those who under-estimate the expertise or the super-specialisation achieved by Shri K K Tewary in the area of foreign policy.

AN HON MEMBER He is an international lawyer

SHRI S JAIPAL REDDY I have not been able to understand this point at all

[Shri S. Jaipal Reddy]

As for our Tamil friends, I am really thankful to them because of the magnificent manner in which they responded to the Accord in spite of deep reservations.

Mr. Prabhakaran, who helped us a great deal in the last two weeks had this to say at a public meeting at Jaffna:

" We have no way other than cooperation with this Indian endeavour. Let us offer them this opportunity. However, I do not think that as a result of this Agreement there will be a permanent solution to the problem of the Tamils. Time is not very far off when the monstrous Sinhalese racism will devour this agreement. I have unrelenting faith in the proposition that only a separate State of Tamil Eelam can offer a permanent solution of the problem of Tamil Eelam. Let me make it clear to you here beyond the shadow of a doubt, that I will continue to fight for the objective of attaining Tamil Eelam; the form of struggle may change, but the objective or the goal of our struggle is not going to change. If our cause is to triumph it is vitally necessary that the whole-hearted totally unified support of you, our people, should always be with us.

Circumstances may arise for the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam to take part in the interim administration or to contest elections, keeping in view the interests of the people of Tamil Eelam. But I shall firmly declare here that under no circumstances" please note here-

"at no point of time will I contest elections or accept the office of Chief Minister."

This shows with what serious reservations our Tamil friends have accepted this Accord. I am sure that we will face prob-

lems in course of time. Now our Indian forces are there. I do not know how long they will have to be there. I do not see how our Indian Peace keeping force can quit Sri Lanka atleast before eighteen months if the referendum is held on time. If the referendum is not held, our forces will never be able to quit the place. So, it is not as though we are proposed to the Accord. But some of the misgivings that have been provoked by the accord need to be allayed and I therefore look forward to the reply of the Minister.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT (Arrah): Mr. Deputy Speaker Sir, I think the House will agree atleast on this day that this India Sri Lanka accord brings to an end a tragic chapter in Sri Lanka's recent history and marks the beginning of a new chapter in India Sri Lanka relations. The House has been seized of this matter since July '83 and I remember on all occasions, the House has displayed a unique sense of urgency, solidarity, and unanimity on this question.

The Government right from the beginning emphasised two or three basic principles in this question that this is a political problem and has to be solved politically. Whenever the Sri Lanka Government took recourse to the military solution, resulting in violence, conflict and loss of life, the House expressed great concern and anger every time and chided the Government for not being effective in dealing with the situation. Many Members on the other side and on this side also were unanimous on this aspect that the situation as it is unfolding in Sri Lanka is becoming a security problem to India. In the north, in the west and others. we are faced with deteriorating security environment. A Member said that even from the sea in the south, the security environment is deteriorating because we have all kinds of people coming over. We have the Mossad, we have SAS, we have Pakistanis, we have all kinds of intelligence people, military people and all these were trying to meddle into Sri Lanka's internal affairs taking advantage of a very difficult internal conflict which is taking place. The

House expressed a desire that we must secure our security. This agreement is one of the boldest agreement and the two leaders—Prime Minister Shri Rajiv Gandhi and President Jayawardene have shown exemplary courage in implementing. Only the other day, the House and the whole country heaved a sigh of relief at the providential escape of the Prime Minister Shri Rajiv Gandhi. We know the fact that how much terrific pressure and danger President Jayawardene is facing after signing this agreement. Does it not show the courage of conviction?

So far as we are concerned, it is an hour of triumph for basic principles. Satyameva Jayathe. President Jayawardene says that this is the triumph of non violence and truth of mahatma Gandhi's teachings. Should we not take it as a guide at this hour when our objective is being realised? Now what has happened is that we wanted the ethnic Tamil problem to be solved; their legitimate aspirations to be realised. Today justice has been done as a result of this agreement to the ethnic Sri Lankan Tamils. There is a proposal for devolution. You know the enormous time that was spent on various proposals and the last one was December 19 proposal which our Minister carried to Sri Lanka. There was the question of linkage. Now the northern province and the eastern province will be one administrative unit. They will have the Chief Minister, the Governor. More than that, Tamil has been recognised as one of the national languages. And all the aspirations which you can catalogue, all the demands of the Tamil have been realised. That has created a major problem for Mr. Jayawardene. There were differences in his own party, in his own Government. The leading opposition party. The Sri Lankan Freedom Party led by Shrimati Bhandaranaike, the JVP and other terrorist groups are up in arms. These difficulties are there before Mr. Jayawardene. I think, the first thing we should do is that this House must express its great support to President Jayawardene in his courageous step in bringing about this accord. We have already given our support to our Prime Minister. The whole

House has given it. The two leaders have achieved a momentous agreement.

Its impact is far and wide. I was rather disappointed at the reaction of my very experienced colleague, Shri Unnikrishnan. But for his benefit I would like to say that he may be aware of the reaction in our own press, but I would like to hurriedly go through the reaction in the world press. Except one country in our neighbourhood, the entire world press has praised him, firstly for his bringing peace to Sri Lanka, secondly for the basic principles underlying in it, the principles on non-alignment, the principles of reasonableness in arriving at an agreement. Also some countries' presses have admired the very principled relationship by a big country like India for the restraint it has shown the concern it has shown for the unity of Sri Lanka.

India has been made under the agreement the guarantor for the implementation of the agreement. So we are involved. The Parliament, The Government and the people of this country are involved in guaranteeing the implementation of this agreement.

Coming to the reaction of various presses in the world, the "New Nation" of Bangladesh has termed the agreement as a measure of statesmanship of the two leaders. The "Sangbad" described it as a strong attack against imperialist conspiracy to create instability in the region. "Dainik Desh" says that every right thinking person would welcome the solution of the strife. "Dainik Patrika" says that the agreement had been welcomed worldwide and that it had enhanced the image of both President Jayawardene and Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi.

It is no wonder that the demand has come from the Members of the US Congress and the British Members of Parliament for a joint conferment of the Nobel Peace Prize on both the leaders. Nepal says that the Agreement was designed to end violence and the Nepalese Government sincerely hopes that the objectives of

[Shri B.R. Bhagat]

the Agreement will be achieved. Bhutan says, "The end of four-year ethnic conflict would be success."

Then come to the Arab world. Saudi Arabia has described the Sinhalese outcry against the accord as "illogical", that is, they have criticised the outcry against this in Sri Lanka itself among the Sinhalese section. *The Egyptian Gazette* has said that it will set an example for settling ethnic disputes elsewhere. The Accord will set an example. *Al Ahrām*, the well-known paper says, that the Agreement has taken a practical step towards ending the blood bath in Sri Lanka and establishing peace there. Similarly, in Kuwait, the *Kuwait Times* has said that in human endeavour what should be seen on the positive side is the faith.

Then come to the Western Europe. In U.K., the *Financial Times* has welcomed it. The *Guardian* says, "Those of goodwill everywhere will show and hope that the agreement—between Mr. Gandhi and President Jayawardene—can be made to stick." The *Scotsman* says, "The accord does offer a real chance of peace in Sri Lanka." Similarly, the *Glasgow Herald* says, "The main factor suggesting that the Indian-Sri Lankan Agreement respecting the Tamils is roughly right."

In Soviet Union, the *Pravda* says, "The Agreement will finally bring peace to Sri Lanka and specially to its Tamil populated regions."

In America, as you know, President Reagan has welcomed it. The *Washington Post* in its editorial has said that the Accord will bring Sri Lanka the respite it deserved. Similarly, in Latin America, in Peru, the *La Republica* in its editorial says, "This would be the first time in which a conflict of a religious nature is solved so easily." In Santiago, the paper says that it will bring to an end the violent conflict between Tamils and Sinhalese.

So, Sir, I took the liberty of quoting all

to show to the hon. Members who have expressed their doubts or criticisms about this Agreement, that the whole world has welcomed it. It has been said that it is the triumph of the basic principles of Indian revolution. It is not only that. It is also the Indian civilisation. If you go back, our relations between Sri Lanka and India are not only a relationship between two neighbours - a good neighbourly relation - but it is a relation of heart and mind. After all, the people who are there, some of them had gone some 2,500 years ago, led by king Vijaya from Bihar. Now they are these Sinhalese, the Buddhists, and a few hundred years ago the Tamils went. But they are all stock of the same Indian people....
(Interruptions).

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: Sir, this is the whole trouble of gross misunderstanding of Sri Lankan history. The Tamils are the original inhabitants and the people under king Vijaya came much later, and he is confusing them with the Tamils who went 150 years ago after the plantations were opened up. These are two separate categories of Tamils. That is the crux of the problem.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: He has missed the point I think. What he is saying is correct...
(Interruptions). Will you hear me? The point I am making is that the people of Sri Lanka are the same stock of the people of India. They have different languages. They are multilinguals. They have a different language, different religion, and the Accord registers the triumph of the basic Indian approach. This is a point I am making.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Did you mean to say that the Indians extended their forum to Sri Lanka?

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT: I mean to say what I have said. So, in this agreement we have a structure, a frame work for a durable solution to Sri Lanka's ethnic problem. The agreement meets the basic aspirations which emanated from the Tamil struggle and which reverberated in the various meetings and the debates here in this House namely-

1. the desire to be recognised as a distinct ethnic entity;
2. political autonomy for managing their political future;
3. an appropriate devolution of governmental power to meet this objective, the recognition of the Northern and Eastern Provinces of Sri Lanka as areas of historical habitation of the Tamils.

These two provinces constitute 1/3rd area of Sri Lanka.

4. the acknowledgement and designation of Tamil as an official language of the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka.

These were the demands that were coming up in the House. Now they have been realised, instead of accepting, acclaiming it, welcoming it. Now the doubting Thomases are raising all kinds of doubts whereas the doubts do not exist.

THE MINISTER OF ENERGY (SHRI VASANT SATHE): They are called by different names - S/Shri Jaipal and Unnikrishnan, etc.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: I am sorry to say, he says referendum is not in our interest to take recourse to. I think he is a very keen student of political science. How does he get this idea that referendum is not very desirable? It is a democratic norm.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: Would you accept it as a device for all disputed areas?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: I will not in the case of all disputed areas. That is why I am saying.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: Let us not talk about it loudly.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: Do not mislead the House. I am sorry. Do not try to create a deception. In Kashmir it is not. In Kashmir

you know about the right of self determination—it is an imperialist ploy to use referendum to break away Kashmir from India. Our position is - Kashmir has been an integral part of India. The people of Kashmir have expressed not once but several times their right of self determination through free and fair election. So, that is the question..

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: They are not integral part of Sri Lanka.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: We have taken resort to referendum. What happened in Goa? Now Goa is a State. But earlier when it was decided whether it should be a Union Territory or a part of Maharashtra, how was it decided? It was decided through a referendum.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: That was an opinion poll.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: You call it opinion poll.

Similarly President Jayewardene has said it is not only this, he goes further. He is confident enough to say that even other provinces - the Central Province, the South Province or other provinces, if they want to joint, they can join. If they want to later on separate, they can separate. So, there is nothing basically wrong about it. The question of bringing in reference to Kashmir is very very wrong, I may say so. If you permit me to use this the analogy is wrong and it should not have been brought to this.

Finally, it has been said why the Agreement or the Accord regarding the security aspects has been put through a letter. Shri Unnikrishnan describes it as a private letter. I do not know what a private letter is between the two heads of the Governments. Shri Jaipal Reddy challenges it. I think Minister would answer it properly. But I can say you should not go by letter but by the spirit, substance.

(Interruptions)

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: Do not be in a hurry. What I say about regularly accorded agreements, agreements have been broken. Have they not been broken in the past?

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: There is no difference..... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: If the two leaders, if the two countries, if the two Parliaments, if the two States, if it is an act of faith - whether they can express it through a formal agreement or through an exchange of letters as it has been done - on the question of implementing it, there is no difference. The agreements had been broken in the past and the letters of exchange have been broken in the past, but they have also been implemented and the point is that in this....

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Don't weaken the Government of India's position.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: I was saying about one point. I wanted to make the point regarding the security aspect of it. It has been said that this Agreement registers as a triumph on the basic principles of non-alignment. Recently, there was a conflict about which you have expressed concern and because of the conflict, various forces were operating in Sri Lanka and they were trying to weak it away from non-alignment. This Accord registers the triumph of non-alignment and the non-alignment cause has been strengthened and the forces of non-alignment have been very much strengthened as a result of this Accord. It is a vital interest to the country and India's vital security interest has been safeguarded.

Some doubts have been expressed as to what will happen afterwards. There are some agreements you have quoted, some agreements Shri Jaipal Reddy quoted. But I think that if you see the first para of the letter which says.....

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: You can lay it on the Table of the House.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: You have said: what happen to the agreement and the reference to the exchange of letters? I would like to quote here the para -

"Your Excellency and myself will reach an early understanding about the relevance and employment of foreign military and intelligence personnel with a view to ensuring that such presence will not prejudice India-Sri Lanka interests."

So, it has been amply taken care of and India's security is very well taken care of and I think like on all other occasions we must at least express our solidarity towards this Accord. Thank you.

SHRI P. KOLANDAIVELU (Gobichettipalayam): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, as far as this Accord is concerned, we wholeheartedly welcome and appreciate for having resolved the ethnic problem in Sri Lanka which was prevailing for more than 20 years. Sir, by the swift initiative and action taken by our Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi and the hon. Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu, M.G.R., this Accord has been reached. Sir, after the Indo-Soviet Treaty, I find that this accord is the best one of this year and the best of the century and it is an historical Accord. Sir, so many Prime Minister tried to solve the problem, but they failed. But here is the young Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi who won the hearts of the people of Sri Lanka, found a solution and brought a settlement to the ethnic problem.

Sir, first of all, I went to remind the hon. Members in this House about one important point. Why this ethnic problem was prevailing from 1956 onwards in Jaffna Peninsula, in the small island?

Sir, actually after getting independence in Sri Lanka, i.e. in 1948, right in the first year of independence, the then Ceylon Government enacted the Citizenship Act of 1948 which made one million plantation Tamils stateless. No. 2, the next year, in

1949, the Ceylon Parliamentary Election (Amendment) Act made these plantation Tamils voteless as well. No. 3, the Ceylon Parliament enacted the Official Language Act or the Sinhala Act in 1956 making Sinhala the only official language of the island.

The Tamil violence rocked the island not only in 1977 or 1981 but also in 1956, 1958, 1974, 1975, 1976, 1977, 1981, 1983 and up to this date. No. 4, Mrs. Bandaranaike passed this Standardisation Act in 1970, a system of educational reformation or segregation which demanded the Tamil students to score more marks than that of their counterparts for admission into universities and colleges.

The Tamil movement of the 1970s has become a historical product of this unjust measure. And the hero of this movement, of this L.T.T.E. is Mr. Prabhakaran who rose to the status of hero now. Actually, he obliged and obeyed the terms of the agreement and he has laid down the arms. Mr. Unnikrishnan was stating that Mr. Prabhakaran was under pressure and he was treated just like a political prisoner; he was kept in a private room and that is why, he has gone to the extent of laying down arms. Sir, I know, Mr. Prabhakaran personally well. More than Mr. Unnikrishnan, I know him well. I met Mr. Prabhakaran here in Delhi. Mr. Prabhakaran did not make anything of the statement that he was kept as a prisoner in any of the rooms either in Delhi or in Tamil Nadu. When such is the case, how our hon. Member Mr. Unnikrishnan has gone to the extent of saying that he was kept in a private room, he was not given a telephonic connection and he was altogether treated as a prisoner?

Actually, Mr. Unnikrishnan wants to say that this Accord is not an Accord but a "discord". Do you mean to say like this? When you say this, I want to know from Prof. Madhu Dandavate because he was also a Minister here for Railways. When Mr. Morarji Desai was the Prime Minister here, the very same problem was prevailing in Jaffna Peninsula. Did he try to solve the

problem? No. Mr. Morarji Desai did not try to solve the problem because he was not at all interested in solving the problems. Altogether they were saying, at that time, actually it was a Tamils' problem and it was not an Indian problem. They were saying like that. But here is the Prime Minister who came forward for the Tamils in order to solve the problem and brought the Accord. It has to be welcomed by one and all.

Even with regard to the Nobel prize, our hon. friends Mr. Jaipal Reddy and Mr. Unnikrishnan were criticising, why should we give Nobel prize to our Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi and President Jayewardene? Sir, all along we were saying...

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: I want Mr. MGR to be included in the list.

SHRI P. KOLANDAIVELU: Yes, why don't we include Mr. MGR also for the award? (*Interruptions*)

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order please.

SHRI P KOLANDAIVELU: All along in this House, from 1985 upto this stage, for more than 9 times, we had discussion with regard to Sri Lanka problem. We were accusing Jayewardene. Why? When genocide was going on in the small island, when Tamils have been massacred and so many ladies have been raped and killed, we were accusing Jayewardene. But even in the hard-heart of Mr. Jayewardene, a soft corner is there and we have to welcome it and we have to appreciate Mr. Jayewardene for having brought an amicable and historical Accord.

Let me continue tomorrow.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You speak.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: I think he can finish it today

SHRI P. KOLANDAIVELU: Let me continue tomorrow

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Let him finish today

SHRI P. KOLANDAIVELU: No, no. I cannot. I want two or three minutes more.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: He wants to speak in the presence of the Prime Minister!

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Carry on.

SHRI P. KOLANDAIVELU: At considerable personal risk, this Accord has been brought about. Here one cannot forget the attempt made by one sailor when actually the guard of honour was taking place and, at personal risk actually, this Accord has been brought about. Only a young Prime Minister can do it but not the old Prime Minister like Mr. Morarji Desai.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Mr Morarji fell down from that aircraft. Even then he just walked away.

SHRI P. KOLANDAIVELU: I know.

SHRI BIPIN PAL DAS (Tejpur): Mr. Morarji Desai did not fall down. It was the aircraft that crashed.

SHRI P. KOLANDAIVELU: Had the Accord not been signed, the magnitude of the disaster will be still worse and it opened actually a new opportunity for increased self-reliance, cooperation and security in our neighbourhood. This is very important. By this Accord, the Northern and Eastern portions of Sri Lanka where actually the Tamils are living have been merged now. Is it not an important event that has taken place by means of this agreement? It is very important. Even Tamils have been recognised by this agreement itself. So far, even the Ceylon Government have not recognised the Tamils but they have recognised Tamils under this agreement. That has to be appreciated.

SHRI BIPIN PAL DAS: Tamil Language also.

SHRI P. KOLANDAIVELU: I will speak tomorrow.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Finish. We are having 193 also. There are other speakers tomorrow. Let him finish. You take even 15-20 minutes and finish today.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Tomorrow there is an advantage.

SHRI P. KOLANDAIVELU: I will continue tomorrow.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA (Bankura): You continue tomorrow.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: He has a strong desire to continue tomorrow.

SHRI P. KOLANDAIVELU: Yes. I will continue tomorrow.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You continue now.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: There are no important subjects for discussion tomorrow.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please order.

SHRI P. KOLANDAIVELU: Actually the independent and forthright role of India is the only factor which determined in compelling Sri Lanka for a settlement.

PROF. N. G. RANGA: Let us adjourn now. You can adjourn the House.

SHRI P. R. KUMARAMANGALAM (Salem): Now we are tired.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: He strongly desires to continue tomorrow.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There are many other things for discussion tomorrow.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: Adjourn today.

SHRI VASANT SATHI: Kindly adjourn. Adjourn it.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE
MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY
AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI SHEILA DIKSHIT):
Hon. Members prefer to continue tomor-
row. Yes.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The House is
adjourned to reassemble tomorrow at
11.00 AM.

18.03 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till
Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday,
August 12, 1987/Sravana 21, 1909
(Saka).*
