

और लोगों को वहां पर बुकिंग की ओर पार्सल की सुविधा हिमाचल प्रदेश की सीमा के भीतर मिल सके। मुझे आशा ही नहीं बल्कि पूर्ण विश्वास है कि मंत्री जी अवश्य ही इस उचित मांग की ओर ध्यान देंगे। आपने मुझे बोलने का अवसर दिया इसके लिए मैं आपके प्रति आधार व्यक्त करते हुए अपना स्थान ग्रहण करता हूँ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM): We will now take up discussion on the working of the Ministry of External Affairs. Shri Nilotpal Basu to raise the discussion.

DISCUSSION ON THE WORKING OF THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, we were acutally expecting that the Prime Minister, who is also the External Affairs Minister, will be present in the House. That would have given a chance to him to really find out what Parliament feels about the functioning of the External Affairs Ministry.

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICES (SHRI RAMAKANT D. KAHLAP): Sir, I can assure the hon. Member that I will convey, verbatim, whatever is discussed in the House to the Prime Minister so that he can react.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Sir, this is all the more important because, during the last 10-11 months we have seen that the Prime Minister, who has been the External Affairs Minister all this while, has initiated a very healthy process of involving Parliament to play its role in evolving a consensus in determining the foreign policy decisions and approaches of the country as a whole and not merely those of the Government. In fact, it is in the area of External Affairs that the Government, the present one as well as the immediately previous one, have redeemed the commitments that were made to the people in terms of the

Common Minimum Programme. In fact, a very creative insight into the commitments made by the United Front in its Common Minimum Programme was elaborated in terms of spelling out, developing, translating and realising some of the concepts which were contained in that document.

But, Sir, the achievement of the Government in this regard is not just redeeming the commitments made to the people of this country in terms of the Common Minimum Programme. It goes much beyond that, in the sense that not only has it deepened and further enriched the usual consensus that is there across the political spectrum in this country over foreign policy issues, but it has also added a new meaning and, in that, Parliament has played no mean part. Particularly in this House, time and again we have discussed and debated different statements which the External Affairs Minister had brought up. Now we feel that this aspect of consensus-building has a particularly important meaning at this juncture, because the kind of consensus that we need today has to be on a qualitatively higher level since, as we know, in the post-cold war situation the kind of complexities that the External Affairs Ministry of the Government of India is faced with is many fold more, in the sense that on the one hand, while in the cold war situation we had the advantage of having the counter-vailing presence of the socialist camp which extended support and leant a hand to the efforts of the developing countries in the entire process of decolonisation after the second World War, on the other this new situation has unfolded where there is the challenge of the world driven towards the syndrome of unipolarity. At the same time, we have also seen that with the tensions that were associated with the cold war, era, a tendency of multilateralism has also emerged as a major feature of the post-cold war situation. So, in this situation, India faces the entire global community with a new

sense of reassurance, with a new sense of dignity and with the new sense of pride. At the same time, there are pressures in terms of this drive towards unipolarity. India can overcome pressures. India can play a role in the new multilateral arrangements that are coming up in the world. This is a very complex and a very challenging task.

We want to make it very clear that today we view the world and we read the situation definitely in the changed context. For example, take the question of the Non-aligned Movement. Take the question of South-South constructive partnership. That has assumed a new meaning. The entire approach of these movements and these initiatives has to be redefined. But we totally disagree with those who undermine the importance of these political initiatives, that of the Non-aligned Movement or that of the South-South co-operation in the new context. There are some tendencies within the political spectrum of this country to undermine the challenges posed by the drive towards unipolarism.

We see in the activities of the United States not only a continuation of its policy but also going beyond the Monroe doctrine which dominated the United States foreign policy thinking over a considerable period of time. Time and again we have seen this in the emergence of new issues of trade relations, the GATT, the formation of the WTO etc. Successive American Administrations insist on certain archaic, outdated policies which, we think, are totally unsuited to the contemporary times. There are questions about the continuance of provisions like Super 301 or Special 301 in the US Trade Act or the role they are trying to play in trying to limit the process of democratisation that is being felt, in terms of the structures of the United Nations, in trying to undermine the role of fora like the UNCTAD or the UNIDO or in scrapping of the United Nations Conference on Transnational Corporations or in trying to starve the

United Nations of funds, thereby trying to tailor the United Nations to American national interests. We have seen that. They are quite blatant about this. Warren Christopher made it very clear in the Special Session of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the United Nations that the US wanted to reform the UN, not for the sake of the UN, but for the sake of preservation and advancement of the US interests.

So, Sir, with the new changes and the scientific and technological revolutions that have taken place in recent times, the industrialised societies are moving towards knowledge-intensive societies. We are seeing that the surviving super power is trying to sort of throttle and obstruct the process of democratic accrual of benefits to all nations alike. On the one hand, there is an intensive and extensive unleashing of the possibilities of human race, and, on the other hand, there are efforts on the part of some super powers to take away the benefits accruing to the poorer nations of the world. Here we see that as a result of the scientific and technological revolution, while the question of technology and technology transfer is assuming importance, it is being sought to be blocked by security-related treaties like the N.P.T., C.T.B.T., Missile Technology Control Regime and so on. On the excuse of limiting the dual use of technologies, they are trying to infringe upon the rights of independent countries to shape their own destiny.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM): Mr. Basu, your party has been allotted fifteen minutes and you have a second speaker also.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Sir, this is a very important debate. Therefore, you kindly bear with me a little bit and do not go strictly by the time allotted to the party.

Sir, it is against this background that we have seen the emergence of

multilateralism and new economic realities. While this tendency of rise of unipolarity is there, there are also strong tendencies of multilateralism, different trade blocs emerging as strong players in the international political arena. Against this background, the concept of regionalism has also got evolved. We have seen the coming about the new regional formations—economic as well as political. In spite of the super-power status that the United States is having, a sort of expansionist role that it wants to play through the expansion of the N.A.T.O., in trying to subvert democracies, in trying to subvert the options and the freedom available to nations, we have seen strong regional blocs emerging. Here we would like to compliment the Government of India that after the initial disarray, which came about with the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the collapse of many East European countries, the foreign policy apparatus, this country has responded to re-define its role in this new situation and this is commendable. It has tried to evolve a new strategic partnership with countries like Russia, Iran and China. We have seen how new tendencies are developing and how the barriers are falling down.

The Chinese and the Russians have come together in a historic partnership treaty, whereby they can get their scarce resources released from being spent on defence. They are now building a new partnership. We have seen the new changes where the initial role that the oil producing countries used to play is being replaced by new realities, whereby natural gas is becoming more and more a major fuel. The initiative that India has taken with Iran for the gateway towards the Central Asian Republics is a positive development. The role that India has played in bringing about a full partnership with the ASEAN countries in spite of opposition from the United States, the attempts of the Indian Government to have association with the O.P.E.C. and the formation of

the Indian Ocean Rim regional body are very important and positive developments. In fact, by bringing about the improved relationship with our neighbours, we have secured the biggest amount of success. This new approach of non-reciprocity in our relations with neighbours like Bangladesh and Pakistan should command the widest possible support of all the political parties in the House and in the country as a whole. We have set a new meaning to the role that India has to play by redefining and restoring the relevance of the NAM. I think this has been done in a creative manner. The South-South concept has to be developed in a new way where India can act with reassurance. We have seen both the tendencies in the NAM. On the one hand, they say that the U.N. should be democratised to create a place for the developing countries in the Security Council and, on the other, they oppose the proposal of India for a non-permanent membership in the Security Council. Formally they are supporting our initiative. But the interests that have come as evidence; some time back are slowly receding in to the background. So, there is nothing to be euphoric about the new development, but surely there is a glimmer of hope, a process is on where in we are seeing a process of unification of the NAM. It is fact that the NAM has lost its feet with the momentous changes that have taken place. It is slightly relegating itself to the background. Now, Sir, it is against this background that the question of relationship with Bangladesh has developed. We have seen a new approach by the Government in democratising the process of development on the basis of good neighbourly relations with Bangladesh. I think that there are very few instances in the past where even State Government's goodwill with neighbouring countries has been used by the Ministry of External Affairs and the Government of India in the manner that it did. Definitely this is a new and very significant development because in today's world the SAARC should emerge as a major force

of economic partnership. Here also there is a cause for concern. While we were discussing at the SAARC forum about converting SAPTA into SAFTA, from preferential trade agreement to free trade agreement, we could see the growth of trade among neighbouring countries, among the SAARC countries is 3.5 per cent. So, that kind of insight should be there to elaborate and evolve a concrete programme.

Now, we are told that there is a surplus power in Pakistan. But here in North India we face power shortage. There are very big deposits of natural gas on the borders of Tripura and Bangladesh. If programmes of joint exploration of natural gas reserves take place, it will transform the entire quality of the economy in that particular area. Apart from the initiatives taken by the Government, the initiatives taken by the then External Affairs Minister in terms of inspiring people to people contact should be stressed. These agreements can provide for frameworks and within these frameworks different sections of society who live in this country have to act. In the development of our relationships with our neighbours, we have recognised that we share a common history, we share a common culture, we share certain problems in the environmental degradation, more importantly the question of poverty which plays a role. I think some political parties and sometimes we also, talk about infiltration. Now nobody says that infiltration is not there. But it is a secular phenomenon. It is not restricted to our neighbourhood. In Europe, we see the population from poorer parts of Europe travelling towards the more affluent parts. We should share a common struggle against poverty, strivings, endeavours, against poverty for the alleviation of poverty, for the eradication of poverty. But that is not there. As the Finance Minister was also speaking the other day, it is true that today, external affairs, diplomatic relations, have a very important economic and commercial content. There is no doubt about that. But

there is a much wider dimension, a social dimension, and unless the SAARC, in its arrangement, can reflect that dimension of our need for a common struggle against poverty, I think the kind of acceptability, the kind of legitimacy, that is necessary to make the SAARC a really creative and vibrant force will not be there. So, I think it is very important to have this kind of initiatives, in this particular process, with Bangladesh and with Pakistan. It is a welcome development. We do not think that right now we may become euphoric about all these. But, at the same time, there is a very, very slim glimmer of hope. The decision of the Prime Ministers of the two countries to meet without pre-conditions and a different initiative that we are taking—the secretary level talks—are very positive developments because India, as a poor country, cannot afford to continue with the kind of relationship that we were having with the members.

Now, sometimes, we find that in the House also, whichever subject we are dealing with, we are only talking about the resource crunch. But see the kind of resources that are locked up in terms of our defence-preparedness. I am not saying that defence-preparedness should be lowered down. On the contrary, you have to see the attempts and what India has achieved in terms of developing our own, independent, missile programme. As I was saying, the contemporary world is replete with problems. On the one hand, there is the tendency of a unipolar challenge; on the other, there is the strong emergence of regional movements. We listen to very disturbing news. A couple of days back, there was a report in the press that the U.S. Ambassador had come and advised the Information and Broadcasting Minister about the concrete amendments that were to be incorporated in the new Broadcasting Bill. This is not to be done. However strong a country may be, they should understand that India is a country of 900 million proud people. At the same time, the world over,

the tendency is towards cooperation, international cooperation and regional cooperation. The tendency is towards the realisation of the full potential of the human kind involved in the emergence of the scientific and technological revolution, with the information revolution, with sharing of information. The tendency is part of the democratisation of the society. The kind of monopolist mind-set that is associated with the activities of certain super-powers can never be accepted. But, at the same time, there should be honest efforts to develop good relations with the neighbours so that we can release the scarce resources from the field of defence-preparedness and they can be concentrated for the well-being of the people. That is also very important. It is in this background that I think this Government has made very significant achievements.

Sir, I would like to point out that there are certain major weaknesses in our foreign policy decision making.

...that is, in terms of institution building. Now, the Prime Minister enjoys so much of respect in the House and because of his role that he had played when we were sitting on the other side of the floor, one of the issues on which he spearheaded our entire strategic thinking was the security-related issue and the paramount need for the formation of the National Security Council. Sir, it is a shame on us that India being the third biggest producer of scientific and technological manpower in this country, does not recognise, to the extent it is needed, the input of research in Foreign Policy formulation. I was just going through the old records. I believe in 1965, a Committee was formed by the Government of India. That Committee was called the Pillai Committee. It was to go into the functioning of the MEA and they severely reprimanded the general neglect of the Government of India to integrate research on policy, on policy-making in the formulation of our approach towards the whole question of external affairs, and it was in 1966 that

the process had started whereby the policy planning research division PPRD—group was formed and a Review Committee was also formed. But later on, it had gone into oblivion. There was a tendency on the part of the Ministry of External Affairs to recruit research officers alongwith career diplomats to support the permanent Indian representative in the UNO. What have we seen during the process of GATT? The Americans, merely for the agreement on agriculture and trade-related issues, had formulated 2,000 research papers, apart from several thousand papers which were evolved by individuals, sectors and lobbies. Now, in today's information-based society, unless we are attaching the kind of importance that should be attached to the research input to foreign policy-making, that will be very, very unfortunate. The Common Minimum Programme says and the annual report also says that today the foreign policy question has strong trade, commerce and economic content. But when India is reacting, when our Ministers abroad are reacting, there is no proper coordination and there is no institutionalised mechanism between the Ministry of External Affairs and the Ministry of Commerce. What is the institutionalised mechanism? The Prime Minister would do well to elaborate the new initiative that has to be taken up in this vital area.

Finally, the whole question of the National Security Council is a holistic concept. It is not merely trade and economic relations. I was shocked to know that while we have to draw lessons from the experience of the so-called Asian Tigers, the Ministers of this Government are deriding Cuba, the nation which stands on a shining beacon, and when they are conducting in the most difficult days the question of economic reconstruction in the post-cold war era, they are bringing with all their might many of the questions relating to their development which are equally relevant for us, the deriding of Cuba...

Sir, I would just quote a sentence from

the speech that was delivered by the President Fidel Castro in the Special U.N. Assembly to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of the United Nations. He says—I quote:

“We lay claim to a world without hegemonism, without nuclear weapons, without interventionism, without racism, without ruthless blockades, that cause the death of men, women and children, youth and elders, like noiseless atom bombs. We lay claim to a world of peace, justice and dignity where everyone, without exception, has the right to well-being and life.”

Sir, it embodies the spirit, the concerns, the feelings the agonies, the ecstasies, that we also share. That goes into our foreign policy making. Sir, where will all these issues be cleared? This Government is not just Gujral's, but it is the whole Government and our Foreign Policy is not just the Foreign Policy of the United Front. Behind the Foreign Policy, it is the support of the Congress Party which has continued the very important process and the leaders of the Congress Party have been followers of a very important policy of non-alignment, despite rumblings of certain hawkish tendencies. When Atalji was the Foreign Minister, they had played a very important role. So, at this point of time, I think, Sir, that clarity on Foreign Policy formulations with modern instruments that are available with us, with proper research inputs, has to be there. The formation of a National Security Council is absolute, imperative in the present day. Therefore, Sir, in the end, finally, before concluding, I again compliment the Government and also the Prime Minister who has been our major inspiration behind the initiatives, whatever they are, that the Government has taken in the recent years in terms of making India proud of our foreign policy, bringing back non-alignment, bringing back South-South Cooperation and a place of pride in the international affairs of the country,

and it is not because of capitulation; it is because both the aspects had been combined well, it is because of the firm position that India has taken on the question of CTBT, standing alone, but with dignity and pride, but, at the same time,—using creative methods of regionalism, of good neighbourly relations with our neighbours across the border. With that, Sir, I thank you for giving me more time than what was allotted to our party, and I hope, Sir, that you will also allow our second speaker to speak.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M.D. SALIM): Shri Triloki Nath Chaturvedi.

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI (UTTAR PRADESH): Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman. It is ... (interruptions)...

श्री नरेश यादव (बिहार): आधा हिन्दी में बोल दीजिए।

श्री त्रिलोकी नाथ चतुर्वेदी: सुबह-सुबह हिन्दी में ही बोला था। इससे कोई फर्क नहीं पड़ता है। ... (व्यवधान) ... आपकी आज्ञा होगी तो हिन्दी में ही बोलूंगा। ... (व्यवधान) ... यह तो बात कहने का माध्यम है। वैसे हिन्दी का तो मैं भी उतना ही भक्त हूँ।

Mr. Vice-Chairperson, it is after a long time that there is a discussion on the Ministry of External Affairs in this House. Fortunately, the Prime Minister, Shri Gujral, is a Member of this House, and whether he was in the Opposition or whether he was the Foreign Minister of the earlier version of his own Government headed by somebody else, we have had the fortune, good fortune, of learning his views and his viewpoints, but I think, today, it is all the more necessary that on a number of matters he clarifies as to what the thinking is and how the emerging trends will take this country ahead.

I am saying this all the more because we are talking of a particular year, i.e. 1997, when we complete our 50 years of independence. There was another event fifty years back, or a little bit earlier, the Asian Relations Conference. The Prime

Minister himself made a reference to it earlier, of course, in a cursory manner. But it is unfortunate that nothing was done to celebrate the Asian Relations Conference in a purposeful manner. The little that was done was done by this institute about which I need not say anything more except that once upon a time there was an effort by the Government to take it over for setting its affairs in order. But somehow or the other some difficulty arose. We have to remind ourselves of the role that Gandhiji and Nehru and many others played in that particular Conference.

But that also makes it necessary for us to have an assessment of the goals, the objectives that we have in the foreign policy and how far those strategies that we have adopted succeeded in order to achieve those goals. For every situation, we have to adopt a particular tactics within a particular framework—may be according to a strategy in the overall policy. It becomes very important so that we know about the historical evolution and the domestic-international factors that shape our foreign policy. This was a continuation. The Prime Minister himself has reminded us of the continuation of some of the ingredients of our freedom struggle in many ways, into which I need not go. As I said, it needs reassessment because this is the year when we are celebrating our 50 years of independence. Not only that. The more important thing is, we are talking more and more of the globalised world, international world and so on. We are also talking of going to the next century. What baggage of the current century we are taking with us to the next century is another factor about which the Prime Minister has very often spoken as a Foreign Minister. This year, in the month of March I saw an article written by him in *World Affairs*. It is with me. There he also says that this global world is no longer bipolar, it is multi-polar. This kind of scenario i.e. international economic competitiveness and international political rootlessness

hints at a unipolar world, instead of a bipolar world. Is it really a multi-polar world? What kind of strategies are we adopting? I think it becomes very important. Shri Nilotpal basu has eloquently talked about NAM. I don't say that NAM has lost its relevance. But its contents, its meaning and significance in the changing scenario must carry conviction and credibility. It is not enough to talk big when NAM meets. The next day we bleat like a sheep and change our stand. We make very bold statements when we are collectively there, and when it is a question of taking a decision, then somehow or the other, we shirk our responsibility as a part of the collective entity called the NAM. That is why it is necessary that we know a little more about what the Prime Minister thinks, about what shape the NAM will take and what role it is going to play so that it acquires and ever increasing relevance and freshness in the present times.

3.00 PM

A mention has already been made of institution building and institutional mechanism. The institution primarily concerned with this is Parliament. I am afraid to go into details. A number of studies have been made and they point to the fact that the interest which Parliament took in the initial years—the first 25 years—in foreign affairs has declined and Parliament is not that relevant any longer. That is the reason why Mr. Baby moved a resolution that all agreements that the Government proposed to enter into should be first brought before this House for sanction before they are actually entered into by the Government. The then Foreign Minister, who is now the Prime Minister had to reply. But that was not then possible. The question of institutional mechanism remains. The question of accountability to Parliament and the Cabinet remains. The Government's declining interest in foreign policy and understanding of issues on foreign policy matters by the cabinet has varied from time to time and I need not go into it.

Fortunately, today we have a Prime Minister who was the Foreign Affairs Minister earlier. Till yesterday he was the Foreign Affairs Minister before he got elevated to the Prime Minister's post. He represents the Cabinet and he is the Foreign Affairs Minister earlier. Then we have the bureaucratic setup. When Shri Dinesh Singh was the Foreign Affairs Minister, there was too much interference from the PMO. He talked about the identity, the worthwhileness and the significance attached to the Foreign Affairs office. I had lent him support in that particular Consultative Committee meeting. But I will not go into further details about what happened at that stage. That is why, I hope the Prime Minister remembers this. He should try to ensure that the identity of that particular office is maintained. There are a number of other connected issues and I will briefly refer to them. Lastly, I would like to come to the intellectual-the academic opinion. It is important to make use of them in a combined and a comprehensive manner. It is no use having 2000 research papers or research institutions. We should make optimum use of whatever we have. The main responsibility of the Prime Minister is not only to talk about it but to also implement it. I would also like to mention that the role of the Foreign Affairs office should not be diluted in any manner. I would like to mention the Pillai Committee report which was brought out 38 years ago when I was a young officer. Thereafter, there were other reports like the PAC report, the Estimates Committee report, apart from the reports of the Standing Committees. I hope, at least, this Prime Minister will pay proper attention to these report. He had been the Chairman of one of the Standing Committees and had brought out an outstanding report. He also knows how that report was completely ignored by the Government of which in any case now he is a part. There is a mutuality between the two, Rao and present Govt. which I fail to understand. I am talking

about the WTO and the GATT and it is for the Prime Minister to explain. I withdraw the word 'explain' because I know his difficulties. I know the domestic circumstances in which he is working. The strength of a Prime Minister also depends upon domestic circumstances which support him.

That is also very important and I am happy to say that he has always talked of consensus. Earlier he talked of consensus, he again talked of consensus but I think instead of lip homage which is rather ritualistic there should be much more coherence and substance given to what he means and what he says. I am talking of the role of the foreign office because this is an institutional mechanism. Whether it is a question of appointment of ambassadors or whether it is a question of monitoring of what is happening all over the world, it is only through the foreign office. But there are a few things which have to be taken into account. The first is the cohesiveness and mutual interaction. A reference was made need for coordination "Within the various wings etc. etc." and then also across the Government; as well as intra-Ministry and this I think is very important. Secondly, I would have liked to quote from and make some comments on the Annual Reports of this year and last year but lack of time prevents me from doing so. We have a foreign service training institute. But I think much more has to be done. But that is not enough to teach only the foreigners about the foreign service. Pillai Committee's Report had particularly concentrated itself on training, recruitment and certain other allied problems. I think this is an aspect which is very important. The third thing is about foreign office and I think it was referred to by Mr. Nilotpal Basu also. But it is not correct to say that the policy planning division and the research—there might have been permutations and combinations—has gone into limbo. It does exist but it has been relegated to the

background. About the long-term perspective thinking, the anticipatory action, the monitoring and all that, with the kind of modern equipment that is available to us now and which was referred to by Shri Nilotpal Basu, I think it is possible to keep this Parliament and this Government much better informed and more adequately informed so that proper decisions at the proper time are taken. I will also like to mention, and you will pardon me for saying so, that the foreign office is also supposed to be very insular, sometimes even much more insular than the Ministry of Defence. Now it is said that it is a question of economic diplomacy, external affairs, home affairs and everything. Not only that, Mr. Prime Minister, I just saw very casually your statement that you referred in the meeting at Male to a particular social issue about women, children etc. But some papers commented that there was no response from anybody else. But at least you were sagacious enough to make a reference to a problem which is becoming more and more serious. So, the Ministry also has to interact may be even with the Social Welfare Ministry, With the HRD Ministry, of course it is doing but this coordination, this interaction does not mean that there should be some kind of superior authority to be imposed, only because we deal with foreign affairs. I think with the input that this country has from every branch of Government and the functions that they perform, they have to help you in performing your functions and you have to help them in ensuring that they are able to discharge their duties in an adequate manner so that the country does not suffer. At this stage, I would like to mention a number of references which the Standing committee has made and so many other Committees like the Estimates Committee, the PAC, and in the House itself regarding the kind of insular approach about the citizens, the Indian citizens abroad, the kind of treatment that they get. Yes, there is an

improvement but not enough and the two groups that we have today the Indian citizens and the citizens of Indian origin who may be domiciled abroad permanently are our best goodwill ambassadors. How do we cultivate them? It is not a question of selectivity or choice.

I think this is what we will have to keep in our view. I am saying this, Mr. Prime Minister, from another angle because after all the strength of foreign policy depends upon the domestic affairs, defence affairs. It is these things which will ensure economic viability. These three things combined together will make your foreign policy something worthwhile. You can call it holistic; you can call it comprehensive; you can call it interactive. But this is very necessary.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, I would also like to mention about the objectives of our foreign policy. As I see them, they are four-fold. The first one—and it is primary—is the search for security in this international world. The international world is always politically ruthless despite the concept ‘Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam’—our approach is the pursuit of synthesis and not ignore real politique. The two had to be combined in this. The search for security includes a search for arms, defence, friends, threat perceptions and so on. We want the Prime Minister to do all this. We are on the threshold of the next century and we are also celebrating the 50th anniversary of our independence. We should know where the things stand in this regard.

The second objective is our diplomacy for development. I think it is becoming more and more difficult. In the first 48–49 years, we had to live in a particular way because it was a bipolar world. We received aid flows, grants, assistance from other countries. This was there. But it has not taken a different turn. The arms-twisting is still there, but in a different way, through international

organisations. Earlier we had a sheltered economy, protected market and planning.

All that we did, did not sustain the development process. It did not resultfully, this diplomacy did not result in any useful dividends. Sir, I am not looking at the problems in black and white. I think this is another aspect on which we have to throw some light.

The third aspect is regarding India and its neighbours. It assumes significance particularly because we are talking today of the Gujral doctrine in relation to our neighbours. I will come to the Gujral doctrine in a few minutes. I however congratulate the hon. Prime Minister for the efforts he has been making in this regard. Then the question of national interest emerges and I am sure he will take care of it.

The fourth aspect relates to our search for an international role. It is important because even during Mr. Nehru's time, we had opposed apartheid and we did it on a number of occasions. All these things were part of our search for an international role. It was not just rhetoric. This is international goodwill. We did play that particular role. Then, what is next, in the next century? Now, everybody says—you yourself have said on several occasions—that India has lost its leadership in the world affairs. I don't want that the world should feel that India is imposing its leadership. Leadership of a country emerges in the world, just as the present Prime Minister emerged as the leader of this country. He has certain qualities and that is why he emerged as the leader of the nation. Likewise, countries also emerge as leaders in particular circumstances. They can emerge even without economic strength. Nehru strode like a giant on the international arena at least up to 1962. So, I would like to know from the hon. Prime Minister what kind of role that he is envisaging for the country. So far as

the international threats are concerned, it is not time for me to go into those details. But they are certainly there. Therefore, I am particularly reminding you of them because you seem to have already ruled them out.

For example, there was this Peace-Keeping Force which didn't play its role effectively in Sri Lanka and you said that India will never do this kind of a thing. I am also not for that kind of approach. But the threats are direct and there are indirect threats. There are forces which are always trying to destabilise indirectly. That is why, Mr. Prime Minister, I would like to know about the role of the National Security Council. You have always advocated very strongly about it. Mr. Nilotpal Basu also mentioned about it. I think it is high time the National Security Council provided some kind of convergence, some kind of a meeting point in Govt. I hear sometimes that this Council is being opposed by the Foreign Office. I don't believe in that because the two have distinctive roles and those roles have to be kept in view and those roles have to be appreciated. They are supplementary and complementary. I also expect, since you have the combined role of a Foreign Minister and the Prime Minister, that you do not change your stand now. You should constitute the National Security Council in such a way that it doesn't become an amorphous body. A purposive body is absolutely important.

The imperatives of aid are still relevant. But how far to is added the question of what new strategies should be there? Are there strategies for GATT and WTO? Mr. Nilotpal Basu did not today underscore much about the economic sovereignty aspect, because I know from where he was now speaking. The question of economic sovereignty, the self-reliance aspect of it, the dignity of the country that flows from economic self-reliance, is always important. What kind of strategies in economic diplomacy do you want so that an optimal economic

advantage can be derived? Then there is this report, but I don't have the time to talk about it. But there are many other countries where it is the other way round. The flow of credit was from us to them in different ways. How are you going to optimise it? Or, are these things only formal and just to be embodied in the report of the Ministry, something being done in a routine and ritualistic manner? And this is another aspect of economic diplomacy.

Then you have the African countries. The African continent is a neglected continent. It was called by some as the dark continent. It suddenly came into great prominence and Mr. Nehru also paid so much of attention to Africa. Now, what should be our role there? So many things are happening there, in different parts of that continent. You open the newspapers and the television and you have many distressing photographs and pictures. So, what kind of role should we play? Of course, that again is for the Foreign Office to decide. I know that you have emphasised economic diplomacy and economic issues as they are becoming more important. But you should have interaction not only with business bodies but also with trade unions and other opinion-makers.

The other point that I want to mention is about regional cooperation. I wish I had read out from the Prime Minister's article itself where he talks about our geographical area, the size of our population, etc. etc. and that that is an advantage. Then, he goes on to world economic affairs. Now, it is important because when you go somewhere—and I am today attending the Indo-Bangladesh Friendship meeting which you are going to inaugurate today—some think that India is a compound—State and that it can be fragmented into some small States or units like Thailand and they think that then only the fear of the giant will disappear from their minds. India has always believed that it may be a giant in size but it has the wisdom not to use that

strength because that is not in consonance with its heritage.

Sir, I think that is a very important matter. I just referred to the personality factor. This personality factor is going to count today as you are the Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of this country. These things need your attention.

I would like to say that in the international affairs, we had some kind of a mediatory role. We also had some good-offices role. Now, we also have some kind of a rhetorical role about anti-racialism, anti-imperialism and so on. But, what kind of an exact role now do you envisage, in this regard? I think that should be articulated in the framework of the Non-Aligned Policy. Here, I would like to remind you about one Prime Minister who went into this question of African problems and that found a mention in the African frontline states and in the Constitution of the Africa Fund and then in the independence of Namibia. What role do you envisage for our country for in future international affairs, Mr. Prime Minister?

I would also like to mention that there are a large number of problems on our borders. On the top of it, there is the Chinese problem—I will not go into the details of the visit of the Chinese President to our country. At the same time, there was no mention of Arunachal Pradesh. The other day, the Chief Minister of Arunachal Pradesh was refused a visa. It had happened earlier also. What kind of confidence building measures are you going to take? You may talk of building the confidence of the military area or border. But, if it does not really happen, where will it take us?

The Afghanistan civil war is an unfortunate kind of a situation. We know that some countries are helping them indirectly and some countries are helping them directly, but what are we doing to contain it? What kind of a leadership role do we have in this regard?

We have become a full-dialogue partner in the ASEAN, but what is coming out of it and what do you envisage about the ASEAN?

I hope that you are going to make a statement about the SAARC Conference which was attended by you. We have come to know that by the year 2001, SAFTA will come into force and all trade barriers will be removed. But, what actually is there achieved so far? When we go through the papers circulated by your Ministry, we come to know that it has not been possible to have an extradition treaty between Bangladesh and India. You are aware of a number of issues. These issues have been listed from time to time in the Consultative Committee and in the Standing Committee. The real assessment about your policies will not be made by the statement which has been issued at Malle but by ultimately what we find in the field.

You gave a statement about the Pacific Rim Association just now. What do you expect from this Association in future? At this juncture, I would like to draw your attention to the Kashmir issue. The other day when I spoke about local elections there, you told me about organiser of people-to-people contact here in Calcutta also. You have always been an advocate of the second-track diplomacy. I understand its utility. But, we also have to think that the people of Kashmir are also the people of India. They are not three units, as such.

Then the Kargil offensive was there when the peace talks were on. What signal does it send? The shadow Foreign Minister is now the Foreign Minister in U.K. Of course, you mentioned something about the Labour Policy Resolution, that some people still think that they are ruling India. Now you have to face a particular situation. Even the European Union goes to Pakistan and says that a reference may be made to the international tribunal. You know that there is a super

power. I will not hesitate in naming it. Only because Ms. Raphael has gone and somebody else has come on the scene, it does not change the situation. Here I would like to have a clarification from you because in your speech, while seeking the Vote of Confidence you had mentioned that you had cancelled your visit to the United States of America. With due humility, there is some information which has not been contradicted by the Government that the visit had already been unilaterally cancelled or postponed by the United States of America. I would like to know whether it is a fact or not.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI I.K. GUJRAL): I am sorry, it is not a fact. ...*(Interruptions)*... No visit was cancelled. ...*(Interruptions)*... Let me clarify. I normally would not have got up, but, since my worthy friend for whom I have great respect has mentioned about my visit to America ...*(Interruptions)*... It was on. I would have gone. But, the situation changed here. Therefore, let there be no misunderstanding on this account. ...*(Interruptions)*... Our relations with America are very good and I hope we will build on that more.

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI: That is what we all want. ...*(Interruptions)*... It was stated in an article in *The Telegraph*. It was brought to my notice. It was never contradicted. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL: I am thankful to you for bringing this to my notice. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI: It was recently brought to my notice by somebody. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL: I am not doubting your reasons for doing so. I am grateful to you that you have brought it to my notice. You have given me the opportunity to put it in the correct perspective.

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI: That was my intention to remove the misunderstanding in the country or at least in the minds of those who read that news item. With regard to normalisation of relations with the U.S.A. I would like to say that the United States of America thinks that this depends or hinges upon the J&K solution. I do not want to go into the details of this aspect. I think that impression must be removed. But when this kind of penumbra of doubts and misgivings is built—around as has happened when the American Ambassador with a big entourage met a lot of people, people at different levels, I think it does create a fair amount of misunderstanding. We are a free country. We want transparency. We want movement of everybody. But, at the same time, we have also to keep our interests also in view. Mr. Prime Minister, I need not remind you regarding border disputes with different neighbouring countries. There are a number of items on which I have got the information. I think something serious should be done in this regard.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM) Mr. Chaturvedi, I want to remind you that your party has been given 45 minutes. There is one more speaker from your party who has to speak.(Interruptions)...

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI: I will take five minutes more.(Interruptions)... Sometimes it becomes difficult. Thank you for reminding me about the time.(Interruptions)...

With regard to Gujral Doctrine, I would like to mention that I am very happy. I do not consider reciprocity as bloody mindedness, or revenge or avenging and so on and so forth. But, at the same time, we should not give any impression of surrendering of our interests only because we can win applause, from the United Kingdom or the United States of America. Mr. Gujral initiated his doctrine in Dhaka. Subsequently he has written about it. I heard his speech also at

the IIC. I have also got the text of his inaugural speech at Foreign Affairs Association. They are all agreed that neighbours should respect each others sovereignty and integrity.... solve disputes peacefully refrain from interference in the internal affairs, use of our land, etc., are well but, I think, the line which was exciting referred to in dealings with neighbours which are much smaller than India. India should not insist on reciprocity in every respect. I can understand it.

But then, I think, international relations are not just one-way traffic. Yesterday we were discussing the North-East insurgency, transit rights, reciprocity and earlier also it has come up in the Shimla Agreement. It is not a question of reciprocity that you give me with that hand and I give you back with this hand at once.

That is not the point. The point is, overall national interest and the interest of the future generation. That is why while discussing with Pakistan, since discussions are going on, we want your Ministry to formulate what are the fall-back positions, whether it is Siachen or whether it is a something else. Let the country know what your fall-back positions, what your ultimate decisions, are, what the promises are, where the Gujral doctrine ends and where the self-interest of this country and the self-interest of the people begins. I have no doubt, Mr. Prime Minister, you will always keep that in view. That is the reason why I am making this appeal to you that this particular aspect also needs our attention. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I want my other colleague to have his time but before I sit down I would like to submit that I have known Mr. Gujral for the last 30 years. I know something about him and therefore, if there is anything which you have considered pejorative, that should not be considered as my personal

view about you as a person, as a Foreign Minister and as Prime Minister you are aware, I am quoting from Shahnaz Anklesaria Aiyar's article in *India Today* of 31st, March, 1991. Shri Shahnaz Anklesaria Aiyar, goofing around, "The Gulf War has shown,"—This was after the Gulf War, it is further said,—"...that India's foreign policy is in a shambles. Starting with the then Foreign Minister I.K. Gujral's fatal embrace of Saddam Hussain in Baghdad after the takeover of Kuwait,"—as I said, I disassociate myself with the feeling but the fact which is there or the view-point of a particular kind must be seen and it goes to say,—"...the crisis was transparently hostage to the parallel political drama on the domestic front." And here the term 'domestic front' has been going on and the term has not ended. The article continues, "India emerged from the Gulf War in a somewhat ludicrous light—a botched NAM initiative was rudely snubbed by Saddam Hussain." Here also, all said and done, there is recently your assurance about President Arafat. He has not gone public on that but fortunately you did give a public assurance that there is no change in his stand as regards Jammu and Kashmir. The article further says, "...and an equally meaningless peace mission by Rajiv Gandhi, as Prime Minister-in-waiting, went totally unnoticed by the rest of the world." I am saying this because not only I agree with this assessment but the image of the country is involved. That is why, I think, this is the warning, this is the caution which we have to keep in view, and I know you have the vision, you have the strength and you can certainly take care of these things much more adequately, much more effectively and not just hanker for a cheap and popular applause. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM): Shri Bhuvnesh Chaturvedi...

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA (Karnataka): One Chaturvedi followed by another Chaturvedi.

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI: He is a Congress Chaturvedi.

SHRI BHUVNESH CHATURVEDI (Rajasthan): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the subject is very vast. It is a very broad canvas. Therefore, instead of touching upon each and every aspect of foreign policy, I would confine myself to only our-five points which should be the guiding factors, or, which should be taken note of by our foreign policy makers.

Sir, there is nothing foreign in a foreign policy. The foreign policy of a country is based on the history or the geography of that country. It is based on its culture. It is based on its thinking. It is based on the struggle of the people of that country.

Therefore, the foreign policy of ours was not created by the five-year term of a Government, or, by the one-year term of a Foreign Minister, or by the forty-year rule of a particular party. It took birth in our freedom struggle. What we thought at that time and the issues during the freedom movement, ultimately, went into the shaping of our foreign policy. The Congress party then—a revolutionary party—was the forum for all political thinkers, freedom fighters and other people. It was a platform, it was a national platform. The whole nation contributed to the making of our foreign policy.

I remember, Sir, around 1930, or, even before that, in the Congress Sessions, year after year, Resolutions were passed on foreign policy. It was the decision of the Congress Party which resulted in the sending of Dr. Kotnis to China. It was our support to democracy in Nepal against the Ranas. It was our support to the then hero of Iran, Mr. Mossadig, who took courage to nationalise the oil sector. This is the basis of our foreign policy. It was the fight of Gandhiji against apartheid. This was our foreign policy.

Therefore, my submission is that there is nothing foreign in a foreign policy. It is

the home policy projected into the international field. That is the foreign policy. We should be very clear about it.

Many people have said as to what should be the guiding factors of our foreign policy. The learned people, those who have formulated our foreign policy, used to tell us that there were no permanent friends and no permanent enemies, but only permanent interests. That should be the guiding factor of our foreign policy. That is why I say that nobody, no party, no individual, or, set of individuals, can take the credit for our foreign policy. That is how a consensus has developed in regard to our foreign policy because those who fought for the freedom of the country and, fortunately, those who are alive today, are continuously contributing to the shaping of our foreign policy.

Sir, all of us were very sad when there was a tussle or conflict between India and China. All thinking people of the country were very unhappy about our tussle with China. There was a national urge to resolve that tussle. My feeling is that the tussle was more due to some misunderstanding, based more on disinformation and more because of some vested interests which did not like Indo-China friendship.

Just before the dawn of freedom, it was at the initiative of Panditji that the First Asian Relations Conference was held at the Old Fort; it was not at the Red fort, but at the Old Fort which was in a very bad shape. At that time, 30-31 countries participated in that conference and they asserted the Asian identity. That is the basis of our foreign policy. We do not want to be subservient to any particular continent. We have our own identity. Asian identity is the need of the hour. In that context, I am sad that neither the previous Government, nor this Government, has given a serious thought to this question of asserting our identity, the Asian identity. We even fail to remind ourselves of what had hap-

pened in 1946 at the first Asian Relations Conference. I would still ask the Prime Minister that he should take some initiative to establish an Asian identity. That identity is not different from Indian identity; that Asian identity is part of us. We are part of an Asian identity and I would, therefore, urge that some sort of very, very positive, very, very concrete and very, very objective steps should be taken to establish an Asian identity. We crave for it.

[The Vice-Chairman (Shri Triloki Nath Chaturvedi) in the Chair]

Sir, long back, around 1950, Jayaprakash Babu organised an Asian Socialist Conference in Burma. What was that? That was also an assertion of Asian identity. What was our relationship with Burma? The father of the first War of Independence, Bahadur Shah Zafar was buried in Burma. We failed to take any steps to recognise the fact that there lies one of our greatest freedom fighter in Rangoon. We never cared for it. I urge the Prime Minister to take cognisance of it and to see that some sort of effort is made to regain that identity and to recognise that the first Indian is resting in Rangoon.

There is one more instance that I would like to remind you about, very briefly. During the freedom movement, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru had written a letter to President Roosevelt, assuring India's support—that was before Independence—to the World War and also seeking the cooperation of Roosevelt for India's freedom by convincing or persuading Churchill for India's independence. What then happened was, Mahatma Gandhi took notice of it and he sent Mrs. Vijayalakshmi Pandit to America on a thanksgiving mission. That was the foreign policy being formulated soon after Independence, when all the Prime Ministers of India, after taking over office, visited the USA. That was our

concern for friendship with a democratic country. Though we were very close to the Soviet Union, because our revolution was also inspired by the revolution in the Soviet Union, that did not come in the way of the first Prime Minister of this country, Jawaharlal Nehru, and later, others, visiting the USA. But, unfortunately, the USA did not respond.

I also remember, Sir, one instance when Pandit Nehru, as Congress President, asked Mr. Shriman Narayan, General Secretary of the Congress Party—this was around 1955 or 1956—to organise a demonstration before the US embassy despite all the background of friendship. Why? Because they supplied arms to Pakistan. We can understand a General Secretary of that party leading a demonstration. But what we should understand is the importance given by Panditji to that issue in that he decided that Mr. Shriman Narayan would lead a demonstration before the US embassy. But that did not discourage us in our friendship with the USA.

Though I have not seen the letter that Panditji had written to President Roosevelt. I came to know of its contents.

And I remember that though Roosevelt did genuinely try for it, he did not, in his reply to Panditji, respond about appreciating India's freedom movement or India's urge for freedom. That is the point—the reservation—to which I would like, to invite your attention. But despite all this, now we have common democracies, vast democracies and even there is a book written, "Estranged Democracies." We have learnt that it is not enough, it is not sufficient to have a common point of democracy. It is not enough to know how it works in your country, but it is necessary to know how your democracy reflects in international affairs. There is a totally different phenomenon of the American policy. They practise in international affairs differently from what they practise in their own country. So, my submission is that

our assessment, our conception of the cold war should be totally changed.

There is no bipolar world, Gujralji said in one of his speeches which I heard about ten or twelve years back, "There is no unipolar world. It is a multipolar world." I agree with it, and I support this idea. We should not only support this idea, but we should also say that it is not a unipolar world. We should try to assert that it is a multipolar world because if we say that it is a unipolar world, some head will become mad, and we should not allow this to happen. It is a multipolar world, and we have our own identity in that.

I was referring to China. I want to mention one or two historical facts which we somehow ignore at our own peril. Chou Enlai had come to our country before the conflict had started. Unfortunately, we did not behave with him properly. Two Cabinet Ministers of Panditji's Cabinet insisted that Chou Enlai should call on them. That was against the protocol. Panditji's friendship with Chou Enlai persuaded him to call on the two Ministers. It was the greatness of Chou Enlai that he did so. But, unfortunately, that gesture was also misunderstood. None of the two Ministers, to my knowledge, called on Chou Enlai. That was the minimum courtesy required. The fault lies with us also somewhere. That is why I said that this was the root-cause of our troubles.

When we say that we should have good relations with all the neighbouring countries, that includes China also. Despite the fact that a resolution was passed in Parliament, subject to that limitation, we should try our best to develop friendship with China. That is in our interest. That is in their interest, and that is in the interest of world peace. That will keep in balance those people who are almost mad with their power. That will establish our Asian identity also.

I remember one person who had attended the First Asian Conference held at the Old Fort. When he came here to attend the 40th Asian Relations Conference, he visited my flat in North Avenue. He was narrating very enthusiastically his experience of the First Asian Relations Conference. He even said that Mahatma Gandhi had addressed that Conference of 24 or 25 countries in Hindi. He told me that Gandhiji said, "I know none of you understand Hindi, but I will insist on speaking in Hindi because my country is becoming free. Therefore, I should assert this right of communicating in my language."

श्री अनन्तराय देवशंकर दवे (गुजरात): फिर आप हिंदी में बोलिए न?

उपसभाध्यक्ष (त्रिलोकी नाथ चतुर्वेदी): दवे जी, उन्हें बोलने दीजिए।

श्री भुवनेश चतुर्वेदी: आप बाद में बोल लीजिए।
... (व्यवधान) ... नहीं, आप मेरी बात तो सुनिए।

I am deliberately saying so.

My submission is that there should be a resurgence of the Asian identity. I have mentioned this for your consideration.

Sir, I do not want to talk about the recent SAARC Conference because we are told that the Prime Minister will speak on the SAARC or that he will make a statement on this Conference. But, there are two things. I think, during the Question Hour in the Lok Sabha or somewhere, it has been reported in the newspapers today, it was said that Maldives and Sri Lanka did not like India's insistence on a sub-regional grouping. I am not talking about Pakistan's view, but since we are trying to cater to their friendship also, we should somehow try to understand that. There is nothing wrong in the sub-regional cooperation. The S.A.A.R.C. Chapter permits that. The soul of the S.A.A.R.C. is unanimity; the soul of the S.A.A.R.C. is a combined and joint decision. Even if we think that we are allowed to have a sub-regional

grouping, tomorrow what would happen, if Nepal insists that in India and Bangladesh relationship on Farakka, Nepal would also like to be a party? Then we will unnecessarily put ourselves into trouble. Suppose Pakistan tries to make friendship with one or two countries and then we will say that sub-regional groupings or associations are allowed in the S.A.A.R.C.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI I.K. GUJRAL): Sir, I would like to react on this, since this issue has been raised here. I have also taken note of the fact that some newspapers have written about it. It is very unfortunate. This is untrue. No Government, no State has objected to any sub-regional cooperation.

As a matter of fact, the idea of sub-regional cooperation was initially born by a note sent to me by the Foreign Minister of Nepal. Then we proceeded on that. In the South also, the gentlemen, the leader, who is coordinating the whole thing, is the Foreign Minister of Sri Lanka. Therefore, there is no difficulty at all. I do not know how media got the impression that these countries are objecting to it. I will make a comprehensive statement on it tomorrow also. Because my friend has mentioned it and since the media writes about it, lest this impression should perpetuate, I make it clear that this is not correct. Sub-regional cooperation is an essential part of our cooperation. It is not aimed against anybody. It is not intended to isolate Pakistan. It is intended to further the process of cooperation. I have told my counterpart in Pakistan, it is not intended to isolate anybody. We want more and more cooperation in this region. That is what I want to say on this. Thank you for pointing it out.

SHRI BHUVNESH CHATURVEDI:
Thank you, Mr. Prime Minister. We are very happy and greatly relieved also, because it is only in today's papers we have read that. Names of countries were

also mentioned. We expect an exhaustive statement from you tomorrow or the day after, at whichever time that is convenient to you, but that was my concern. That is why I mentioned this. At the same time I will suggest that this economic cooperation between the S.A.A.R.C. countries is a wonderful thing. Though in the initial, six, seven or eight years it was only a talking shop, it is now getting into shape. We are very happy about it. It is rather our primary duty also, not as a big country, but as a vast country, to help our neighbours. We hope that the Prime Minister will take a serious note of it.

At the same time, I would like to remind the Prime Minister, who is a learned man, that though S.A.A.R.C. is there, there is also a *Chanakya* doctrine regarding this. We should take note of it — the policy about the neighbours. *Chanakya* propounded it years back. My view is that we should take note of this while developing our theory on neighbourly relations.

I will now touch upon only one or two points. We are not only happy, but *proud* also that we are celebrating the 50th year of our independence. I suggested once to our Prime Minister, when he was not the Prime Minister. India, Pakistan and Bangladesh were once one country.

We fought for India's independence together and we also got freedom together, one day this way or one day that way. So in this 50th year of our Independence, somehow we should associate them, the parliamentarians of Bangladesh, the parliamentarians of Pakistan. If there is a hitch in some circle to invite Government-to-Government delegations, then, I submit that there are many scholars, many good-intentioned people in Pakistan and Bangladesh whom we can invite. They will very gladly come to the joint session of Parliament which we have decided to have. Let them witness the session or let them, one by one address

this joint session. We are inviting many foreigners, Russians and Americans to address the joint session. Let us create a good precedent by inviting one speaker from Bangladesh Parliament and one speaker from Pakistan Parliament to address the joint session of our Parliament in connection with the celebration of the 50th year of our Independence. I submit this for your consideration. It is for you to think how far it is practical. But this is my thinking and you should be able to do that.

One more point has been made that there are no fresh inputs in our foreign policy. It needs assertion. I am not saying you should repeat the previous exercise of forming a Policy Planning Group. I am not saying that. I am not insisting on that. But I remember Panditji referring the issues of foreign policy to the Indian Council of World Affairs. Mr. Poplair and Mr. Upadraya were the General Secretaries of the Indian Council of World Affairs. The Indian Council of World Affairs was the host of the first Asian Relations Conference. It was not the Congress party which hosted that conference. Sometimes people forget about it. It was the Indian Council of World Affairs who hosted the first Asian Relations Conference. So some such non-governmental organisation should get recognition. I am not saying about the Indian Council of World Affairs. I am not saying about the India International Centre. I am not saying about the Policy Planning Group. But I very earnestly urge the Prime Minister to give a thought to it, how to add fresh thinking to our foreign policy because what were issues then are no more issues today, what were complications then are no more complications today. Therefore, I urge the Prime Minister to take note of this and something should be done on this issue. I would not like to take much time of the House. This is all I wanted to say. I hope that the Prime Minister will not only

provide Governmental and political leadership to our foreign policy but a very objective policy, the policy of a visionary. Once a leader said during the freedom movement:

"जिस नेता को सपना देखना नहीं आता, वह देश नहीं बना सकता, सपना देखना आना चाहिए उस सपने को साकार करने के लिए देश बनता है।"

मैं जानता हूँ कि आप प्रेक्टिकल भी हैं और आपको सपना देखना भी आता है। मैं उम्मीद करता हूँ कि आपके सपने साकार होंगे और जो कुछ हम लोगों की सामर्थ्य है, उसके अनुसार हम आपको पूरा-पूरा समर्थन देंगे।

यही कहकर मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ। धन्यवाद।

श्रीमती कमला सिन्हा (बिहार): उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, माननीय सदस्य श्री नीलोत्पल बसु से आज विदेश मंत्रालय के कार्यक्रम पर बहस की शुरूआत की। यह विदेश मंत्रालय या विदेश नीति कोई आज की बात नहीं है। हम सब लोग जानते हैं, पुरानी बातें अगर कहें तो इतिहास के शुरू से ही कुछ न कुछ विदेश नीति रही है— एक दूसरे कस्बे के साथ रिश्ते कैसे हों, कैसे एक साथ रहें, लड़ाई करनी हो तो कैसे करें, यह सब विदेश नीति ही कहा जाएगा। व्यापारिक नीति भी हमारी रही हिन्दुस्तान की। सिल्क रूट था, विदेशों में हम सामान भेजते थे। तिब्बत की तरफ से भी जाते थे। हमारे हिमालय का वह दर्रा खाइवार पार, नाथुला पास आज भी उसका प्रमाण है। महोदय, हिन्दुस्तान को आजाद हुए 50 साल हो गए हैं। आजादी की शुरूआत में दुनिया की जो स्थिति थी, आज वह स्थिति बिल्कुल बदल गई है। उस समय दुनिया दो खेम्बों में बंटी हुई थी। एक तरफ एक महाशक्ति थी और दूसरी तरफ दूसरी महाशक्ति थी और हिन्दुस्तान एक नया आजाद देश था। लोग कहते थे कि सबसे बड़ी डेमोक्रेसी है हिन्दुस्तान आबादी के लिहाज़ से। यह बात आज भी सही है और यह भी कहा जाता है कि—

"India is a sleeping giant."

इसी तरह एक दूसरे देश अफ्रीका के बारे में यह

कहा जाता था कि — "Black Continent, the sleeping giant." दुनिया को यह डर था कि जिस दिन ये 2 देश जाग जाएंगे, उस दिन दुनिया की महाशक्तियों का पता नहीं क्या होगा।

महोदय, 50 सालों में हमने बहुत उथल-पुथल देखी, दुनिया के नक्शे बदल गए, ज्योग्राफिकल मैप में बहुत अंतर आ गया। अब महाशक्ति तो शायद एक ही है लेकिन सब पूछिए तो इतनी बड़ी महाशक्ति कोई नहीं है। महाशक्ति तो है दुनिया के लगभग 100 कारपोरेट कम्पनीज जो दुनिया के धन को कंट्रोल करते हैं। जिसमें अमरीका के 50 और बाकी दुनिया के 50 देश शामिल हैं। भौगोलिक सीमा रेखा को पार करके ये महाशक्तियाँ हरेक देश की आर्थिक पूंजी को कंट्रोल करती हैं। आज की दुनिया में मुझे नहीं लगता कि कोई देश बम और हथियारों के द्वारा किसी दूसरे देश पर हमला करेगा क्योंकि हमने देखा है कि एटॉमिक पावर का क्या हथ्र होता है, हिरोशिमा और नागासाकी उसके उदाहरण हैं। आने वाले दिनों में अगर कोई न्यूक्लियर वॉर हुआ तो संभव है कि दुनिया ही मिट जाए। इसलिए आजकल दुनिया को कंट्रोल करने के लिए इकॉनॉमिक पावर्स का सहाय लिया जा रहा है और इकॉनॉमिक पावर विदेश नीति का एक बहुत बड़ा हिस्सा बन गई है।

महोदय, शुरू के दिनों में हमने देखा कि पंचशील की नीति हमारी रही। "हिंदी चीनी भाई-भाई" का नाग रहा और इसके बाद हमने चीन का हिन्दुस्तान पर हमला भी देखा, पाकिस्तान का हिन्दुस्तान पर हमला भी देखा और आज हम हिन्दुस्तान, पाकिस्तान और चीन के बीच मैत्री संबंधों के प्रयास भी देख रहे हैं। यह सही है कि दुनिया में न कोई हमेशा के लिए मित्र है और न कोई हमेशा के लिए शत्रु है। आज जो शत्रु है, वह कल मित्र हो सकता है और आज जो मित्र है, वह कल शत्रु हो सकता है। यही बात घरों में भी है, समाज में भी है और विदेश नीति में भी है। महोदय ... (व्यवधान) ... माफ कीजिए, महोदय ... (व्यवधान) ...

I am used to addressing the Deputy Chairman as 'Mahodaya'.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): You will also be here after some time.

SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA: I am sorry I addressed you as 'Mahodaya'.

महोदय, इस देश की विदेश नीति की शुरूआत लाज़िमी तौर पर जो सरकार उस समय थी, उसे ही करनी थी। जब हिंदुस्तान आजाद हुआ था तो उस समय इस देश में बड़े-बड़े नेता थे जिन्होंने हिंदुस्तान की आजादी की लड़ाई लड़ी थी और इस देश को आजाद करवाया था। उस समय पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू प्रधानमंत्री बने। वे इस देश के प्रथम प्रधानमंत्री थे और इस देश की विदेश नीति का प्रतिपादन उनको ही करना था। उन्होंने विदेश नीति का प्रतिपादन किया और कई सिद्धांत जिनकी उन्होंने नींव डाली थी, लोग आज भी उनको मानते हैं — जैसे नॉन ऐलाइनमेंट का सिद्धांत। उन्होंने कहा था कि 2 बड़ी महाशक्तियां दोनों तरफ हैं, बाकी जो शक्तियां हैं हम एक साथ होकर गुटनिरपेक्षता का सिद्धांत अपनाएं ताकि हम दोनों पावर्स को बेलेंस कर सकें। तो पुराने दिनों की बात अगर हम न भी दोहराएं, हमारी सरकार युनाइटेड फ्रंट की सरकार जब बनी थी उसने आते ही एक कॉमन मिनिमम प्रोग्राम बनाया और उस प्रोग्राम में भी यह कहा गया कि हम हर किसी के साथ मैत्री, दोस्ती का रिश्ता रखेंगे, अपने पड़ोसियों के साथ दोस्ती का संबंध हम बढ़ाएंगे और हमें खुशी है कि उस समय देवेगौड़ा जी के प्रधान मंत्रित्वकाल में आज के प्रधान मंत्री श्री गुजराल विदेश मंत्री थे और वह एक सफल विदेश मंत्री रहे। उन्होंने अपने पड़ोसी देशों के साथ जो थोड़ा कटु रिश्ता भी था, उसे सही किया। मुझे याद है कि पिछले दिनों, 1995 में यहां दिल्ली में सार्क कंट्रीज का स्पीकर्स एंड पार्लियामेंटेरियंस की कॉफ्रेंस हुई थी। उसमें बंगलादेश के जो डेलीगेट आए वह बड़े नाराज थे। उनकी दावत इरिगेशन मिनिस्टर श्री विद्या चरण शुक्ल जी के घर पर थी और ऐसे ही हम गप कर रहे थे, मैं भी उसमें डेलीगेट थी। उन्होंने कहा कि हम खाना तो खाने जाएंगे लेकिन हम पानी नहीं पिएंगे क्योंकि उन्होंने हमें पानी नहीं दिया है। ठीक है, बात हल्के ही कही लेकिन उनके भीतर जो दर्द था, वह तो झलकता था। बंगला देश और भारत के साथ जो पानी को लेकर — फरक्का वाटर की जो समस्या थी, वाटर ट्रीटी उसको लेकर जो विवाद मनमुटाव चल रहा था 25 साल से, हमारी सरकार ने उसको सुलझाया। मैं तो दाद देती हूं गुजराल साहब को कि बड़े अच्छे तरीके से उन्होंने इसको सुलझाया। दुनियां के किसी भी देश में आप जाइए, भाषा सबको एक दूसरे के निकट लाती है। एक भाषा बोलने वाले लोग, अगर किसी की देश में आप चले जाएं तो लगता है कि जैसे अपना कोई मिल गया। तो सबसे पहले उन्होंने पश्चिम बंगाल के लोग जिनको

पेरशानी होना था, तो पश्चिम बंगाल के मुख्य मंत्री और पश्चिम बंगाल के सांसदों ने उनके साथ मिलकर वार्ता की और फिर म्यूचल डेलीवेशन करके वह ट्रीटी साईन हो गयी। हमारे दूसरे पड़ोसियों के साथ भी जो मैत्री संबंध हुए — नेपाल के साथ हुए, नेपाल एक लोकतांत्रिक देश है। पूर्व वक्ता ने कहा कि नेपाल की आजादी के संघर्ष में भारत का सहयोग और नेपाल की लोकतंत्र स्थापना में भारत का मैत्री संबंध कितना अच्छा रहा है। नेपाल के साथ हमारा एक मैत्रीपूर्ण समझौता हुआ — महाकाली ट्रीटी, शारदा बैरजेज, टनकपुर बैराज, मंकेश्वर प्रोजेक्ट है। तो इससे दोनों देशों को फायदा होगा। भारत को भी, उत्तर प्रदेश के इलाके हैं और नेपाल को भी फायदा होगा। महोदय, श्रीलंका के साथ हमारे संबंध बराबर अच्छे रहे हैं। सम्राट अशोक के समय से अच्छे रहे हैं मेरा शहर पटना, पटना में गंगा किनारे का एक घाट है— महेन्द्रो घाट, उस महेन्द्रो घाट से सम्राट अशोक के पुत्र महेन्द्र और उनकी पुत्री संघमित्रा — बोधि वृक्ष का एक पौधा लेकर गए थे श्रीलंका और वह वृक्ष आज भी कैडी में है और दूसरे कई शहरों में लगाया गया। वह अनुराधा पुर में भी है। ठीक है हमारे देश में बौद्ध धर्म मानने वाले बहुत कम रह गए हैं। लेकिन बौद्ध धर्म बिहार के बोध गया से भगवान बुद्ध ने ज्ञान प्राप्त किया और दुनियां के दूसरे हिस्से ने उसको अपनाया। सम्राट अशोक ने उसको फैलाया और आज भी बौद्ध धर्म का जो लगाव है भारत के साथ वह हमारी विदेश नीति का एक बड़ा अंग है। बुद्धि कंट्रीज के साथ मैत्रीपूर्ण व्यवहार हमारी विदेश नीति का एक बहुत बड़ा अंग भी है। जैसे जापान है, जैसे थाईलैंड है, जैसे दूसरे और देश हैं, बर्मा हमारे पड़ोस में है। लोग आते हैं, बोध गया में जाते हैं लोग। और वहां भगवान बुद्ध के दर्शन करते हैं, नमन करते हैं, फिर वापिस चले जाते हैं। भगवान बुद्ध ने जहां देह त्यागी थी, कुशीनगर, कुशानगर, वहां भी जाते हैं। तो धर्म भी एक बहुत बड़ा बाइंडिंग फोर्स है और यह भी हमारी विदेश नीति में सहायक सिद्ध हुआ है। भारत से बहुत से लोग ऐनडेंजर्ड टोबेगो बनाकर विदेश ले जाए गये थे मारिशस त्रिनिदाद टोबेगो आदि—पिछले दिनों त्रिनिदाद टोबेगो के राष्ट्रपति आए थे और उन्होंने जाकर अपने गांव को देखा जहां उनके पुराने पूर्वज रहा करते थे। मॉरीशस में तो हमारे हिन्दुस्तान के सारे त्यौहार मनाते हैं। तो जो नजदीकी रिश्ता है, वह विदेश नीति को फैलाने में मदद करता है। वह समझते हैं कि हमारा एक लगाव है। एक यह भी है। दुनिया के दूसरे देशों को अगर देखें—बर्मा तो

हमारा पड़ोसी है, ठीक है, बर्मा में इस वक्त जो शासन पद्धति है, वह उनका अपना भामला है, हमें उसमें कुछ नहीं कहना है लेकिन लोकतंत्र स्थापित हो जाए तो उसमें हमें खुशी होगी। यह भी सही बात है। बर्मा के साथ ट्रेड रिलेशन के लिए हमने, मणिपुर से जो सड़क मार्ग था, उसको खोल दिया और बर्मा के साथ हमारा ट्रेड रूट शुरू हो गया है। चाइना के साथ हमारा ट्रेड रूट है। आकाश मार्ग से जो आता है, वह आता है और सड़क मार्ग से भी नाथुलापास होकर आता है। दूसरी और भी सड़कें हैं। पाकिस्तान के साथ हमारे संबंध सुधरे हैं। प्रधानमंत्री इसके ऊपर प्रकाश डालेंगे। अभी-अभी सार्क की मीटिंग हुई थी, उसके बारे में वह विस्तार से बताएंगे लेकिन हम जानते हैं कि जो पाकिस्तान की वर्तमान सरकार आयी है, यह सरकार जब चुनाव लड़ रही थी तो उस समय हिन्दुस्तान चुनाव का मुद्दा नहीं था। पाकिस्तान के चुनाव में हमेशा India used to be an issue. Sir, this is the first time that, in the history of Pakistan-elections, India was not an issue. They fought the elections on economic issues.

तो यह एक बहुत बड़ा शिफ्ट उनकी पॉलिसी में हुआ है और वह भी समझते हैं कि दोस्ती का हाथ बढ़ाना आवश्यक है। हमारी जो बात है वह तय है। शिमला समझौता—उसके तहत भारत उनके साथ रिश्ता तय करेगा और यह भी तय है कि कश्मीर इस देश का अभिन्न अंग है और कश्मीर का किसी भी शर्त पर हम सौदा नहीं कर सकते हैं, चाहे कुछ भी हो। प्रधानमंत्री ने इस बात को सफाई से कहा है। महोदय, दुनिया के दूसरे हिस्सों में आप अगर देखें तो पाएंगे कि एशिया पैसिफिक रिजन के लोग अपना-अपना आर्थिक संगठन "ओपेक" और अन्य संगठन बनाने लगे हैं। तो यह आवश्यक हो गया है कि एशिया पैसिफिक रिजन में हमारा भी रिजनल आरगनाइजेशन हो। उसमें हम शरीक हों और हमारा प्रैजेंस उसमें हो। लोगों को लगे कि India is also becoming an economic power, and, as a sovereign, independent nation, in her own right, she has her own foreign policy. तो उस नाते भारत वर्ष ने भी एसियान कंट्रीज में अपना रोल प्ले करना शुरू किया और एसियान एरिया में भी, इंडियन ओशनियन रीम के जो देश हैं, उसमें भी भारत ने रिजनल कोऑपरेशन के जरिए काम करना शुरू किया है। हमें खुशी है कि गुजराल जी के नेतृत्व में हमारी सरकार ने उसको आगे बढ़ाया है। महोदय, मैंने शुरू में ही कहा है कि दुनिया का नक्सा बदल गया है।

यूएस०एस०आर० के अलग-अलग हो जाने के बाद जो ईस्ट सैट्रल एरिया के अलग-अलग देश बने हैं, उजबेकिस्तान, किरगीजस्तान, तजाकिस्तान आदि, उनके साथ भी अलग-अलग देशों के साथ हमारी वैदेशिक नीति और मैत्री संबंध बढ़ा है। उनके राष्ट्रपति, प्रधान मंत्री आदि लोग इस देश में आये हैं। हमारे उनके साथ मैत्री को बढ़ाने के लिए व्यापारिक समझौते पर हस्ताक्षर हुए हैं। इन देशों की तरफ दुनिया का हर देश का नेता दोस्ती का हाथ बढ़ाना चाहता है, क्योंकि उनके पास अथाह प्राकृतिक सम्पदा है। There is a huge amount of oil, natural gas and natural resources. उसके एक्सप्लोरेशन में, उसके भागीदारी में, हिस्सेदारी में हर कोई दोस्ती करना चाहता है। लेकिन हमारी सरकार ने पड़ोसी देश होने के नाते उनकी तरफ दोस्ती का हाथ बढ़ाया है। सेंट्रल एशियन रिपब्लिक के साथ हमारे मैत्रीपूर्ण संबंध हैं। साउथ अफ्रीका के बारे में मैंने जिक्र किया था और साउथ अफ्रीका के बारे में मेरे से पूर्व वक्ता ने कहा, अपारथीड मूवमेंट के बारे में उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय आपने भी कहा था, उस मामले में हिन्दुस्तान का दृष्टिकोण बिल्कुल साफ है और हमने कहा कि हम अपारथीड को नहीं मानते हैं। हमें इस बात की खुशी है कि गांधी जी के बाद राष्ट्रपति नेल्सन मंडेला ने साउथ अफ्रीका को असहयोग आन्दोलन और सत्याग्रह के जरिए आजाद कराया। उन्होंने शांति, सहयोग और दूसरे देशों के साथ मिल-जुलकर काम करने का जो तरीका अपनाया वह भी अनुकरणीय है। हमें अलग-अलग इंटर्नेशनल फोरम में काम करने के कारण उनके साथ बातचीत करने का मौका मिलता है, डिफरेंट एशियन कंट्रीज के नेताओं के साथ बातचीत करने का मौका मिलता है। ... (समय की घंटी) ... महोदय, मेरे पास बहुत समय है फिर भी आपने घंटी बजा दी।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री त्रिलोकी नाथ चतुर्वेदी): मैं घड़ी देख रहा हूँ और मैंने आपको पहले ही सावधान कर दिया है।

श्रीमती कमला सिन्हा: ठीक है। मैं ज्यादा समय नहीं लूंगी और समय से अपनी बात समाप्त कर दूंगी।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री त्रिलोकी नाथ चतुर्वेदी): यह घंटी इसलिए थी जिससे कि आप पूरी बात कह दें।

श्रीमती कमला सिन्हा: अब यह बात चली थी कि साउथ-साउथ कोऑपरेशन हो, रिच और पूअर कंट्रीज का आपस में रिश्ता क्या हो और हम किस तरह से एक

दूसरे के साथ कोआपरेशन के साथ काम करें। साउथ-साउथ कोआपरेशन में भी हमारी सरकार ने काफी पॉजिटिव दिशा में काम किया है। अफ्रीका के जो देश पहले आजाद हुए थे और जो नये आजाद हुए हैं उनके साथ हमारे रिस्ते बहुत ही अच्छे हैं, उनके साथ कोआपरेशन के रिस्ते हैं। उनको हमसे टेक्नालोजी चाहिए, उनको हमारी डेवलप साइन्स चाहिए और अलग-अलग सैक्टरों में जो खोज हुई है वह उनको चाहिए। हमारी सरकार ने उनके साथ मित्रता को और व्यापारिक संबंधों को बढ़ाया है। यह एक बहुत ही पॉजिटिव डाइरेक्शन है।

महोदय, अगर हम यूरोप की बात करें तो यूरोप कण्ट्रीज में एक देश है जिसके हम गुलाम थे। We had been under this colonial power

अभी दो-तीन दिन पहले अखबारों में आया था कि इंग्लैंड की सरकार बदल गई है, अब वहां पर लेबर पार्टी की हुकूमत बनी है। मैं उनके कम्पलसन को समझ सकती हूँ क्योंकि मैं यह मानती हूँ कि अगले 20-25 वर्षों में शायद इंग्लैंड और अमेरिका ये जो दो देश हैं। They will not be white countries any more. उनके यहां जो बाहरी लोग आकर के बसे हैं या जो दूसरी कलर्ड पापुलेशन है, उनकी संख्या अधिक हो जायेगी। यह चाहे वोटर्स के कारण हो या चाहे जो भी कम्पलसन हो। लेबर पार्टी ने अपना एक रेज्यूलेशन पारित किया है जिसमें उन्होंने कहा है कि काश्मीर के बारे में बिना सोचे, बिना फैसला किये वह रह नहीं सकते हैं। Because they have been the former colonial powers of India. They should forget it. गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया को इसके बारे में जरूर साफ-साफ उनको बता देना चाहिए। That gone are the days of colonial power. India is now a free, sovereign and democratic nation. We do not owe our allegiance to anybody. We owe our allegiance to the Constitution of India and we work for our people and not for anybody else. यह सफाई से कह देना चाहिये और भ्रम में उनको भी नहीं रहना चाहिये। हम भी उनको भ्रम में नहीं रहना चाहते। अमेरिका ने तो सोचा कि दुनिया के पोलिसिंग की जिम्मेदारी उन्हीं की है चूंकि यूनिप्लर वर्ल्ड में The United States of America being the richest country, thinks that it has right to police the whole world. They should also

be told very frankly that we can police ourselves. We will appreciate their friendship. We will appreciate their cooperation. We will appreciate economic relations. But policing is not needed, तो ये बातें कहनी चाहिये और आर्थिक दृष्टि से हम विदेशों से कर्जा ले रहे हैं। हमने दुनिया के सामने अपने घर का दरवाजा खोल दिया, उदारीकरण की नीति हमने अपनाई। उदारीकरण की नीति में भी वैदेशिक नीति का बड़ा भारी हाथ है इसमें कोई दो राय नहीं है। उदारीकरण की नीति के कारण जो परिवर्तन आज हमारे देश में आ रहा है उसके बारे में मैं तो यह कहना चाहूंगी कि यह गांधी का देश रहा है। अपने ग्राम स्वराज्य, अपनी चीजें, उनको हम तिलांजलि न दें। दुनिया के बाजार में अगर हम अपने यहां की बनी हुई चीजें भेज सकते हैं तो भेजें लेकिन दुनिया की चीजें यहां मंगवाकर उनका बाजार हम न बन जायें। आज यूरोप और नार्थ अमरीका इन दोनों देशों में गलत है। They are in a great economic depression. उनको मार्किट चाहिये और यह मार्किट कौन प्रोवाइड कर सकता है, यह मार्किट प्रोवाइड कर सकता है अफ्रीका और इंडिया। इंडिया में 20 करोड़ मिडिल क्लास हैं जिनके पास क्रयशक्ति है। हमें उनका बाजार बनकर नहीं रहना है। यह आर्थिक नीति के साथ वैदेशिक नीति का आज इतना सघन सम्पर्क हो गया है कि इसके बारे में भी प्रधान मंत्री जी और भारत सरकार को ध्यान देना होगा क्योंकि प्रधान मंत्री जी हमारे विदेश मंत्री भी हैं। अगर हम ऐसा नहीं करेंगे...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री बिलोकी नाथ चतुर्वेदी): अब आपको समाप्त करना होगा।

श्रीमती कमला सिन्हा: जी हां, मैं समाप्त ही कर रही हूँ। अगर हम ऐसा नहीं करेंगे तो हमारे लिए मुसीबत खड़ी हो जायेगी। अलग-अलग फोरम में हिन्दुस्तान की बड़ी तारीफ हो रही है। कई जगह जो मृतप्रायः संस्थाएं हैं उनको प्रधान मंत्री जी ने पुनर्जीवित किया। जैसे उन्होंने नॉन एलाटमेंट को भी किया, उसको मीनिंगफुल बनाने की आवश्यकता है। अपने आस-पड़ोस के साथ जो रिस्ते की बातें उन्होंने कही हैं, उन बातों को और सुदृढ़ बनाना है, आगे बढ़ाना है और इंडियन ओसियन रिम कन्ट्रीज के साथ एशिया पैसिफिक ओशन एरिया में, ओशियन एरिया में हमारा अस्तित्व बना रहे, हमारी साख बढ़े, इसके लिए हमें काम करना होगा।

मैं समझती हूँ हमारे प्रधान मंत्री और विदेश मंत्री इसके लिए सक्षम हैं लेकिन मैं भुवनेश चतुर्वेदी जी से एक बात कहूँगी कि प्रणब मुखर्जी जी को कहिये कि भाषण जरा कम किया करें। कलकत्ता से उन्होंने एक बयान दिया कि वे सरकार को गिरा देंगे।

SHRI BHUVNESH CHATURVEDI:
I do not hold any brief on behalf of Shri Pranab Mukherjee.

श्रीमती कमला सिन्हा: ठीक है, मैं आपसे दरखास्त की है, आप उनको बता देना।

श्री भुवनेश चतुर्वेदी: नहीं-नहीं मैं उनको नहीं बताऊँगा।

श्रीमती कमला सिन्हा: तो वे इस तरह की बयानबाजी बन्द करें। इससे देश का भला नहीं होगा, बुरा ही होगा। महोदय, इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करती हूँ।

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, to you, and through you, I want to submit to the House that there is a meeting fixed of Indo-Bangladesh Friendship Association. If the House permits, I will take leave for about half an hour, go there and come back and then I will speak.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): I think that is all right.

SHRI N. THALAVAI SUNDARAM (Tamil Nadu): Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman for giving me this opportunity for discussing the working of the Ministry of External Affairs. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, we have a problem of Indo-Sri Lankan relationship. We are from Tamil Nadu. As far as our State is concerned everyday we have a problem. Fishermen are killed in our State by the Sri Lankan Navy people. Last week there was an incident. Three fishermen were killed by the Sri Lankan Navy. These fishermen are very poor people. Everyday their livelihood is earned by catching fish from the Indian sea and not from the Sri Lankan sea. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, Tamil Nadu has a problem where fishermen are killed by the Sri Lankan Navy.

Last week, there was one incident. Three fishermen from our State particularly from Pudukottai district went for fishing. Their nature of living is only by catching fish from the sea. The hon. Prime Minister must take immediate steps to see that these fishermen are not killed by the Sri Lankan Navy. How are you going to solve this problem? This is not only a problem of Tamil Nadu but it is a national problem. Another incident happened yesterday. Our State Police went and took three men from the Sri Lankan people. They are having weapons in the Indian sea area. I would like to know whether there is any proposal for demarcating that this is the area for India and this is the area for Sri Lanka. If it is not done in time then it will be a great problem for the Tamil people. They are poor people. Everyday they are living only by catching fish. The hon. Minister must take immediate steps to prevent killing of fishermen in Tamil Nadu.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री त्रिलोकी नाथ चतुर्वेदी): मैं सदन की अनुमति चाहता हूँ कि श्री नरेश यादव जी थोड़े समय के लिए पीठासीन हो जाएँ।

श्री ईश दत्त यादव (उत्तर प्रदेश): हमारा इनके लिए पूरा समर्थन है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री त्रिलोकी नाथ चतुर्वेदी): मैं आधे घंटे में आपके समक्ष उपस्थित हो जाऊँगा।

(श्री नरेश यादव पीठासीन हुए)

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL (Rajasthan): Welcome.

SHRI N. THALAVAI SUNDARAM: Sir, as far as this problem is concerned, this is a day-to-day problem of the poor people of Tamil Nadu particularly in the South district of Thanjavur, Nagapattinam and Kanyakumari. These are the areas which are very close to Sri Lanka. I would like to know whether the Government of India will take immediate steps to prevent killing of the Tamil Nadu fishermen. Our hon. Prime Minister, who was the External Affairs Minister earlier, went to Sri Lanka and had meetings with the Defence Minister and the External

Affairs Minister of Sri Lanka. I want to know whether there is any progress after these meetings on the question of killing of the fishermen of Tamil Nadu. It is a day-to-day problem. This problem is being faced by us almost every day. It is not a problem of our own State. It is a national problem. After all, these poor people live on fishing. How are we going to protect them? How are we going to solve this problem? This is an international problem. I request the hon. Prime Minister to take immediate steps to put an end to the killing of these fishermen by the Sri Lankan Navy. The hon. Prime Minister knows the Sri Lankan President very well. He went to Sri Lanka and spoke to the Sri Lankan Defence Minister and appraised him of this problem. He told him that this was one of the major problems being faced by our people. Thanjavur, Nagapattinam and Kanyakumari are the main districts. These people are mainly concentrated in these three districts. They enter the sea for fishing. These killings did not take place for the first time. This is going on almost every day. It is a day-to-day problem. Yesterday these fishermen went on strike. They refused to take their boats into the sea. But this is the only job that they do. How can this country protect their lives and solve this problem? This is a very sensitive problem and I request the hon. Prime Minister to take immediate steps because the State Government is not going to solve this problem. They post some police officials here and there. But as far as our State Government is concerned, they are not taking any steps to prevent these killings. They simply meet the Press. Our Defence Secretary came to Tamil Nadu and he met our Chief Minister. But nothing was done. Our Chief Minister did not take the opportunity to appraise the Defence Secretary of our problem. I also do not know whether the Tamil Nadu Chief Minister has given any memorandum to the Defence Secretary when he met him. Then, how do we solve this problem? After all, the State Government must

take care of this problem. Moreover, it is a partner of the United Front. The Chief Minister met the Prime Minister twice. Has he requested the Prime Minister to solve this problem? These poor fishermen are being killed by the Sri Lankan Navy.

I have a point to make on the issue of passports. As far as our State is concerned, we have two passport centres—one at Chennai and the other at Trichy. In the passport application, there is one particular column regarding 'authorised officers'. The authorised officers are Superintendents of Police, Magistrates, Chief Judicial Officers, etc. We live in villages. Then, can any villager have easy approach to a Superintendent of Police? I put a specific question before this House. I think there is a need to extend the list of authorised officers to sign the verification certificate. I think earlier Members of Parliament were authorised to give the required verification certificate. Can a layman get the signature of the Superintendent of Police? How is it possible? It becomes very difficult for a layman when his son has to go abroad. I request the hon. Prime Minister to take care of this. Whenever these poor people approach the bureaucrats for signatures on their passport applications, they don't sign. They are poor people from the villages. For example, recently a student from my area went to the passport office. He was not given the application form. And when the application is given you have to go to the Superintendent of Police. Sir, do you think the Superintendent of Police will just sign the application? In my District, the Superintendent is from some other State. How can he recognise a local person? So, these are the problems. I would request the hon. Prime Minister that the Member of Parliament should be authorised to sign the passport applications. Originally this provision was there that an MLA and an MP could sign the applications.

The Standing Committee on External Affairs had said that there must be at

least 50,000 applications per annum in a particular area for opening a Passport Office. As far as Tamil Nadu is concerned, there are only two Passport Offices. From Kanyakumari to Tiruchi there is no Passport Office from where one can get a passport application. I request the hon. Prime Minister to open a Passport Office either at Madurai or Thirunelveli.

Another requirement is about Police verification of those people who have applied for passports. We have no objection against verification. But it should be done in a proper manner. As far as our State is concerned, these Police officials never visit the residences of those people who have applied for Passports; they just enquire from this fellow and that fellow and complete the verification. When one approaches the Police officials, they demand money. I am very sorry to say this in this House. If poor people want passports, this is what they have to go through. This is how they have to get the verification done by the Police, this is how they have to get the signatures from the Superintendent of Police or the magistrate. How can it be possible for poor people? There are tribal areas, the most backward areas. How do you expect the Superintendent of Police to sign the application forms of people coming from those areas? So, I request the hon. Prime Minister to kindly take necessary steps in this regard.

My third point is about a project for setting up two nuclear reactors in our State. The former Prime Minister, Shri Deve Gowda, went to Russia. (Time Bell) I will take only one minute, Sir. This is about my State. In reply to an Unstarred Question, the Government said,

“(a) A proposal to commission a Detailed Project Report for 2x1000 MWe VVER type Light Water Reactor Station to be located at Koodankulam in Tamil Nadu with technical

cooperation and financial assistance of the Russian Federation is presently under negotiation. Supply of these reactors will be in conformity with the guidelines of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

(b) Details of the cost of the Project will be known after the Detailed Project Report is prepared in about two and half years.”

How far will this project help our State? When this project comes up, it must recruit the local people. Normally, when a project comes up in any area, they recruit people from other areas and other States. We have many problems. These projects acquire our land.

They acquire land of poor people but don't give employment to local people. I want to know from the hon. Prime Minister as to how far this project is helpful for local people and whether it is dangerous for those villages or not. I request the hon. Prime Minister to take suitable steps as far as this project is concerned. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES (Goa): Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir. In the last 50 years of our independence, if there is consistency in anything, it is in the foreign policy of our country because we have seen that Governments come and go, but the foreign policy of our country stood the test of time. If anything positive has happened to the United Front Government—I had said it earlier also when Shri Gujralji was the External Affairs Minister—it is that they have a good Foreign Minister, now the Prime Minister. That is the plus point in the United Front Government.

Sir, we have seen that even our Planning Commission has given us nine Five Year Plans and there is no consistency in our planning process. The Planning Commission did mention before a Parliamentary Committee that their policy changes with the change of

Government at the Centre because they say that they have to go by the directives of the master of the day. Recently, what has happened with the United Front Government is that they have gone in for co-operative federalism and the planning process has also gone in for co-operative federalism. What I am trying to point out here is that there is no change in the foreign policy of our country. That is the policy we have inherited from Pt. Nehru and other stalwarts who gave freedom to our country.

Sir, last time when we were discussing about CTBT, Shri H.D. Deve Gowda was our Prime Minister and when CTBT was being debated in Geneva, we had seen that Governments were falling like a pack of cards in this country. Governments came and Governments went—for 13 days, the BJP was in power—but the international diplomacy, as far as India was concerned, did not suffer. We had seen how our representatives in Geneva had boldly conveyed the point on nuclear disarmament. When CTBT went to the United Nations for voting—though we knew that we would be isolated—we made a point—though the permanent seat of the Security Council was at stake—we stood by it. Though many countries did not vote with us, almost 150 countries abstained. There goes a signal that there are people, that there are silent supporters of our policy and our stand.

Sir, many hon. Members did mention that the foreign policy of many countries with the fall of the Iron Curtain in the Communist countries, especially in the East European countries, and their diplomacy has shifted towards economic factors. My colleague did mention about silk route. If you see the European Union, you will find that they also have ganged up economically and they have the EEC. In South East Asia, we have also seen that there is ASEAN and all the countries have come together and they work on one platform economically

so that they can derive benefits and fruits of the economy for the welfare of those countries. This also helps them in bonding their relations, as far as the foreign policy is concerned.

I think we have to shift our foreign policy towards the international economic policy. It would not be the duty of the Commerce Ministry. Here the Ministry of External Affairs, the Prime Minister has to be a good salesman and bring in the fruit of our economy to this country. Sir, we have seen that we have initiated the SAARC movement. It has seven members. Yesterday only the hon. Prime Minister returned from Male. Through SAARC also we can solve many economic problems if not political. At the moment, we are doing a lot of illegal trade with our neighbouring countries on the western front because they are shy to have direct trade with us. They prefer either to smuggle across or prefer to import from countries like Singapore the Indian goods. I feel it will be appropriate for our Government that at least we establish trade links with these countries. We have seen the political irritants that we have with China. The immitant of border dispute has not come in the way of the relations between the two countries. I do not blame our neighbours on the western front because they have their own internal problems. It has been said that when Washington has cold, Islamabad sneezes. That is their foreign policy. They have isolated themselves by adopting this policy. It is high time that they woke up from their slumber and did not get themselves isolated by following a foreign policy through proxy. I do not think that it will help the region as a whole. Sir, the hon. Home Minister replying to the debate yesterday on insurgency in the North-East said that many young boys were arrested while crossing our borders. They came from the Middle-East. They were being mobilised by Pakistan saying that there was a religious war, *Jihad*, going on in J&K. I

think in this regard the Ministry of External Affairs can play an important role by briefing these countries in the Middle-East. I do not know what the thinking of the Government is in this regard. Unless we have a pre-emptive diplomacy, the problem of insurgency, disturbances on our borders either by terrorist activities or insurgent activities, cannot be solved. Therefore, it should be the duty of the Ministry of External Affairs to see to it that we adopt a proper policy whereby the irritants are neutralised across the border, so that the problem which is created is not imported back into our country. I do not know whether the Government has framed any policy for the Middle-East *vis-a-vis* the Islamic card which is being played by Pakistan against us. I do not think that is the problem with them because basically the problem with this Islamic war, *Jihad*, is that you need money. When a country is poor, you need money. As you know, there are so many petro-dollars on the other side. Naturally, you have to fight this war. Yesterday I mentioned as to why people join these insurgent groups. People join these groups because they need money. They get this money from across the border. They start factories to give employment to the insurgent elements. It is my humble request to the Government that we do something in regard to the pre-emptive diplomacy and ensure that terrorism and insurgency are not imported back into this country. I think we will be spending less money on this than we are spending on our security forces to fight for peace with the barrel of the gun. Sir, the Prime Minister when he was Foreign Minister mentioned that for the first time he started discussions with the diplomats region-wise. Take, for example, South-east Asia, the Gulf region, European region, African region, etc. We have to frame our policy region-wise. The Prime Minister mentioned that process had started. But, I do not know what happened to it.

Have we framed this policy, have we

disseminated this policy to those countries because most of these countries are developing countries? When they are developing countries, they look forward to India as a leader. To give an example, I happened to be a member of the U.N. delegation for the 50th year of the U.N. celebrations. Being a delegate, I was sitting on a seat allotted to India. When I was told to press a button for voting, I had to do it immediately because other countries look at us as to how we vote, either we vote 'Yes' or 'No'—red or green and on that the other countries decide which side to vote. What I am trying to imply here is, the developing countries still look to India as a leader because we have to provide them with some policy framework within which they can function internationally. In that regard also I had mentioned last year that most of our diplomats are trained abroad and they have a western approach. Even now, the IAS officers still are being sent to England for training under the Colombo Plan. We should have our own school of thought. I had mentioned the other day, when we were discussing about the celebrations of Krishna Menon's birthday, that it is high-time that this country start a school or an institute of diplomacy so that we could disseminate the information we collect, the information we have in our think-tank and give it to the smallest countries around us. I do not know what the response of the Government was because the Government was silent on that matter. One of our colleagues did mention that there should be people-to-people contact. I think, Shri Chaturvedi did mention that we have to have people-to-people exchanges specially, between Members of Parliament. He has also suggested that we invite some Members of Parliament from Bangladesh and Pakistan. Sir, again I am reminding you when I went to a conference of the Preparatory Committee for Social Development in Malaysia and the hon. Deputy Chairman, Dr. Najma Heptulla was leading the delegation to Malaysia at Kuala Lumpur, I happened

to deliberate there. There were delegates from Pakistan and Bangladesh. When I made a point, two Members of Parliament—one from Bangladesh and one from Pakistan—came to the mike and supported the stand taken by us. So, I do not know why we should be shy? Why should we feel shy to have an interaction at international level? We can have an exchange of Parliamentary delegation so that irritants, if at all there are any, between the Governments could be settled through people-to-people and through parliamentarians-to-parliamentarians exchanges. I think that is a good suggestion.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, we have seen how the stick of human rights is used against the developing countries. Wherever we say anything or oppose anything; we oppose a diktat when they say anything. And, when they say anything and if we say something or if we do not say, then they use a stick as the weapon of the so-called human rights; they will point a finger at Punjab or Jammu and Kashmir. That has been the tendency of the so-called super-power to browbeat smaller nations. I do not know whether we have prepared any paper. I think in this year of 1997 in my State—I come from Goa—we are celebrating the arrival of Vasco-da-Gama, a navigator. When the Portuguese descended in that part of the land of our country, thousands and thousands were slaughtered. When the Portuguese came and invaded that part of the country, I do not know, where were the human rights? Now, they are teaching us human rights. What have they done in the other parts of the world? How have we fought the British? If one watched the movie 'Gandhi' one would know, and the movie was being seen by the Western countries. Now, where were the human rights? The very same powers are teaching us what human rights are. I do not know whether

we have any concept in the Foreign Ministry. I do not know whether they have prepared any paper because when I went to the U.N., you know, there was hardly any material. I do not think that we trained our diplomatic corps properly. I should not be misunderstood that I am casting aspersions. Their only interest should not be to go to America to put their sons and daughters in schools and colleges and get a Green Card. That should not be the only ambition of our Foreign Service.

They should be committed. The foreign service people who are devoted to the cause must prepare a paper listing the instances where the West has used the stick of human rights against us. It is high time we expose them and tell them: 'This is what you did in our country and this is what you are doing in your own country'.

What is happening in Bosnia, Sir? Why is the conflict in Bosnia? When thousands of people were being killed in Bosnia, the President of America was more concerned about one of his countrymen being caned in a Singapore prison. If that is not human rights, what is human rights?

Take the question of land-mines. The so-called Western powers, the developed countries, sold millions of land-mines. As a result, lakhs of people were disabled. Why don't they speak of this violation of human rights? They themselves had developed these inhuman weapons and dumped them on the Third World countries. Now, just to take out these mines, to remove these land-mines, they want money from the United Nations. Who is to fund them? It is the poor countries like India because America never pays its dues to the United Nations. It is the poor countries like India. We have to fund them in order to remove these land-mines which they themselves had set! The cost of removal of each land-mine, I am told, would be about a thousand dollars.

Sir, as I said, we must prepare a report. We must come forward with facts.

The Ministry of External Affairs should come out with a comprehensive paper. This would be useful not only for our diplomats, but it would be useful to us, Parliamentarians, also, because we also go abroad off and on to address some international conferences and seminars. Therefore, it is not enough that we frame our policy and keep it in the vaults of the South Block. I would request the hon. Prime Minister because he is the right person to frame a good policy for the country, keeping in view the changing times.

With these few submissions, I hope my suggestions would be considered seriously and Government would respond positively.

Thank you, Sir.

श्री ईश दत्त यादव (उत्तर प्रदेश): उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस आसन पर विद्यमान होने के लिए मैं आपको हार्दिक बधाई देता हूँ। मान्यवर, विदेश नीति और विदेश विभाग, इनका क्षेत्र बहुत व्यापक है लेकिन चूंकि मेरे बोलने का समय केवल 7 मिनट है, इसलिए इसी सीमा के भीतर मैं अपने और अपने दल के विचार सदन के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ।

महोदय, विदेश नीति को मैं गूढ़ नीति मानता हूँ क्योंकि इसको बनाने और इसको कार्यान्वित करने में कठिनाई होती है। हमारे जो शासक हैं, जो सरकार में बैठे हुए लोग हैं, वे मन से चाहते हैं कि हमारी यह नीति लागू हो जाए लेकिन अनेक कठिनाईयाँ इनके सामने आती रहती हैं। महोदय, विदेश नीति नाजुक भी होती है क्योंकि कहीं कोई ऐसी बात न कह दी जाए जो हमारी विदेश नीति के खिलाफ हो और उसका हमारे किसी मित्र देश के ऊपर कोई अवांछित प्रभाव पड़े। महोदय, हमारी जो विदेश नीति है, मैं मानता हूँ कि इस पर इन आजादी के बाद के 50 वर्षों में वाक्य और शब्द के अलावा किसी दल का कोई मतभेद नहीं रहा है। इस तरह से हमारी विदेश नीति प्रशंसनीय है। इन 50 वर्षों में जो सरकारें आईं, सभी ने प्रयास किया कि हमारे संबंध अपने पड़ोसी देशों से अच्छे रहें, हमारे संबंध सुधरे, हमारे व्यापारिक और सांस्कृतिक संबंध अच्छे हों।

5.00 P.M

अच्छे हुए भी हमें सफलता भी मिली लेकिन बहुत हद

तक अभी सफलता नहीं मिल पाई है। मान्यवर, आज मैं सहारा अखबार पढ़ रहा था। उसमें पहले पृष्ठ पर है कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी जब कल माले से स्वदेश वापिस हो रहे थे तो विमान में उन्होंने पत्रकारों से कहा कि पाकिस्तान से हमारे संबंध सुधरने की यह शुरुआत है लेकिन मुझे कोई उम्मीद नहीं है। जो समाचार पत्र में था उसमें यह था कि हमारे और नवाज शरीफ की वार्ता का कोई चमत्कारी परिणाम निकलने वाला नहीं है। यह समाचार पत्र की न्यूज है। मैं नहीं जानता कि प्रधान मंत्री जी का इस तरह का बयान है या इस तरह का बयान नहीं है। क्योंकि एक दिन पहले ही यह निकला था, जिस दिन प्रधान मंत्री जी माले पहुंचे थे और उनकी नवाज शरीफ से मुलाकात हुई थी, तो समाचार यह था कि दोनों देशों के संबंध अब बहुत अच्छे होंगे, दोनों देशों की समितियाँ बनेगी ताकि कम्युनिकेशन गैप न रहे और वे आपसी संबंधों की बात करेंगे। हमारे विदेश सचिव पाकिस्तान जाने वाले हैं। एक चक्र की वार्ता अपने देश में हो गई है और दूसरे चक्र की वार्ता वहां होगी। अब दोनों देशों के प्रधान मंत्रियों के बीच में हॉट लाईन रहेगी। यह भी पेपर न्यूज है। मुझे बड़ी उम्मीद थी लेकिन आज जो पढ़ा अगर यह वास्तविकता है तो हम समझते हैं कि इस तरफ बहुत प्रयास करने की जरूरत है, हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी को जो विदेश मंत्री भी है, हमारे देश की सरकार को भी और हमारे देश के हर व्यक्ति को इस तरफ गंभीरता से सोचना पड़ेगा कि हमारे आपसी संबंध सुधरे देश के प्रथम प्रधान मंत्री पं० जवाहर लाल नेहरू जी ने जो विदेश नीति बनाई, जो उनका मिशन था, जो उनका उद्देश्य था शांति और नॉन एलाइड मूवमेंट का उसको दृढ़ता से और स्ट्रॉंग विल पावर से सरकार को चाहिए कि उसको पूरा किया जाए। हमारे संबंध सुधरे, पाकिस्तान से सुधरे, बंगला देश से सुधरे, श्रीलंका से, भूटान से, बर्मा से जब तक हमारे संबंध अच्छे नहीं होंगे और दुनिया के हर देश से जब तक हमारे संबंध अच्छे नहीं होंगे तब तक हमारी विदेश नीति बहुत सफल नहीं मानी जाएगी।

श्रीमान् आज दुनियां छोटी हो गई है, पहले बहुत बड़ी दुनियां थी। अब वायुयान हो गया। 6 घंटे में मास्को पहुंच जाइए 8 घंटे में इंग्लैंड पहुंच जाइए। टेलीफोन हो गया, विदिन नो मिनिट आप अमेरिका से बात कर लीजिए। फैक्स हो गया और दो मिनट में आपका समाचार पहुंच गया। इसलिए मैं कह रहा था कि आज दुनियां छोटी हो गई है, एक जगह हो गई है। जब दुनियां एक जगह हो गई तो संबंध सुधारने की जरूरत

है। विदेश नीति पर मैं कोई संशोधन नहीं चाहता। लेकिन हमारी जो विदेश नीति है वह प्रशंसनीय है, इस विदेश नीति को दृढ़ इच्छा शक्ति से लागू करने की जरूरत है और कम से कम दो देशों का संबंध तो हमें बहुत अच्छे बनाने की जरूरत है। श्री भुवनेश चतुर्वेदी जी चले गए, श्री जान एफ० फनाडिस कह रहे थे कि मैं इन लोगों से भी थोड़ा आगे बढ़कर बात करना चाहता हूँ। इन्होंने तो कहा कि जो हमारी आजादी की 50 वीं स्वर्ण जयंती मनाई जा रही है उसमें पाकिस्तान और बंगला देश से प्रतिनिधि बुलाए जाएं। हमारी पार्टी समाजवादी पार्टी की स्पष्ट नीति है कि भारत, पाकिस्तान और बंगला देश का एक महासंघ बनाया जाना चाहिए। हम भाई-भाई थे, 50 साल पहले अलग हो गए। लेकिन यह नहीं कि जो हमारे भाई अलग हो गए और सब के मन में एक दूसरे के प्रति नफरत है। कल मान्यवर, मैं टेलीविजन देख रहा था। उसमें पाकिस्तानी खिलाड़ियों का रिएक्शन आ रहा था।

मान्यवर, कल मैं टेलीविजन देख रहा था। उस पर पाकिस्तानी खिलाड़ियों का भी रिएक्शन आ रहा था। आपने भी बहुत से लोगों ने देखा होगा। वह इस देश के प्रति अपना प्रेम प्रकट कर रहे थे, उन खिलाड़ियों का नाम तो मुझे याद नहीं है लेकिन उनमें से एक ने कहा कि राजस्थान हमारी मातृभूमि है। दूसरे ने कहा कि हरियाणा में हमारे रिश्तेदार हैं और तीसरे ने कहा कि दिल्ली से हमारा पुराना संबंध है जब देश का मानचित्र एक था, नक्शा एक था पूरे भारत का, अखंड भारत का तो हम सब एक थे, भाई-भाई थे, वह अलग हो गए। अलग होने के बाद संबंध खराब होते हैं पर इन संबंधों को सुधारने की जरूरत है और इसीलिए हमारी समाजवादी पार्टी ने कहा कि भारत बंगलादेश और पाकिस्तान का एक महासंघ बनाना चाहिए। मैं देश के प्रधान मंत्री जी से चाहूंगा, वह अनुभवी विदेश मंत्री भी है, राजनयिक भी आ रहे हैं, उनका लाम्बा अनुभव है, राजनैतिक अनुभव है। मैं चाहूंगा कि इस दिशा में वह और भारत सरकार प्रयास करें। आपस में बैठकर तीनों देशों के राजनयिक लोग बात करें, तीनों देशों के नेता लोग, शासक लोग बैठकर बात करें कि क्या इस तरह से हमारा एक महासंघ नहीं बन सकता है? हमारा एक संगठन नहीं बन सकता है ताकि हमारे आपसी संबंध सुधरें, हम मिल-जुलकर एक दूसरे की मदद करें और एक दूसरे के विकास में सहायक हों। हमारे सांस्कृतिक, राजनैतिक, शैक्षिक और व्यापारिक संबंध सुदृढ़ हो और

जब यह महासंघ बन जाएगा तो धीरे-धीरे इसमें पड़ोसी देशों से भी संबंध अच्छे होने लगेंगे। हमारे ए०आई०डी०एम०के० के साथी कह रहे थे, उनकी समस्या और तमिलनाडु की समस्या बिल्कुल सही है। बार-बार इस सदन में यह मामला उठा कि हमारे देश के मछुआरे जो जाते हैं उनको जान से मार डाला जाता है, उनका अपहरण श्रीलंका के द्वारा कर लिया जाता है तो हमारे ए०आई०डी०एम०के० के जो मित्र कह रहे थे उनकी बात सही है। बहुत बार उस सदन में यह प्रश्न उठा कि क्यों नहीं हमारा विदेश विभाग इस पर गंभीरता से विचार करता। मैं चाहूंगा कि प्रधान मंत्री जी इस पर गंभीरता से विचार करें। यह कोई बहुत बड़ी समस्या नहीं है। हमारे अगर उनसे संबंध अच्छे हैं तो और अच्छे करके इसका एक हल निकालना चाहिए। बंगलादेश से हमारा पानी का मामला है। यह कोई जटिल समस्या नहीं है, इसको हल किया जा सकता है और सरकार ने इसको हल करने के लिए प्रयास भी किया है। इसी तरह से मान्यवर, हमारी जो विदेश नीति है, वह प्रशंसनीय है। मैं इसकी तारीफ करता हूँ। हमारे जो प्रधानमंत्री, विदेश मंत्री और सरकारें रही हैं, उन सरकारों की भी मैं प्रशंसा करता हूँ कि सबने इसका प्रयास किया है कि इसमें चरितार्थ किया जाए, लागू किया जाए और दुनिया के तमाम देशों से, विशेषकर जो हमारे पड़ोसी देश हैं, उनसे कैसे हमारे संबंध सुधरें। मैं आपके माध्यम से सरकार से अपील करना चाहूंगा कि इसमें अगर कहीं खामियां हैं, हमारे प्रयास में कहीं कोई कमी है तो इसको पूरा करने के लिए प्रयास किया जाए। मान्यवर, अंतिम बात मैं यह कहना चाहूंगा कि यहां विदेश मंत्रालय के कार्यकरण के विषय में चर्चा हो रही है। The working of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is being discussed here. हमारे साथी ठीक कह रहे थे कि केवल उनके साथ, केवल तमिलनाडु की यह समस्या नहीं है बल्कि हमारे उत्तर प्रदेश की भी और हम समझते हैं कि पूरे देश में यह पासपोर्ट की समस्या है। यहां भारतीय जनता पार्टी के हमारे भाई लोग बैठे हैं, कभी हम लोग एक पार्टी में थे — 1977-78 में हम भाई-भाई थे। आज आपकी नीतियां हमें पसंद नहीं हैं। उनमें विरोध है लेकिन 1977-78 में हम सब लोग जब एक थे तो देश के विदेश मंत्री माननीय अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जी थे। उन्होंने पासपोर्ट के बारे में जो नियम बनाया था, जो कानून बनाया था उसकी सचमुच में आज भी प्रशंसा होती है। आज का पासपोर्ट बनाने का तरीका पता नहीं क्या है। पासपोर्ट बनवाने के लिए लोगों को एक-एक साल तक प्रेशान होना पड़ता है। पासपोर्ट बनवाने में कम से कम छह महीने तो जरूर लग जाते हैं

और जितने महीने पासपोर्ट बनवाने में बीतते हैं उतने ही हजार रुपये उस गरीबी आदमी को खर्च करने पड़ते हैं। पहले पासपोर्ट बनवाने के लिए प्रार्थना पत्र जमा किया जाता है और उसके बाद वह जांच के लिए जिले के कतान, जिले के एस०पी० के पास जाता है। उसके बाद एस०पी० उस पर रिमार्क करता है कि इसपैक्टर उसकी जांच करे। जो इसपैक्टर अलाऊ होता है वह उस हलके के सिपाही को उसे दे देता है और सिपाही उस आदमी का पीछा करता है। वह गरीब आदमी रोजी-रोटी के लिए अपना वतन छोड़कर दूसरे देश में जाना चाहता है और कर्जा लेकर टिकट की व्यवस्था करता है। मान्यवर, हमारे पास एक उदाहरण है कि जो रियेपोर्ट पासपोर्ट कार्यालयों में जांच होने के बाद पहुंच भी जाती है, जो वे सही भी होती हैं उनको भी पासपोर्ट कार्यालय में जाकर लाइन लगानी पड़ती है लेकिन उनको कोई पूछने वाला नहीं है। तो क्यों नहीं भारत सरकार और वर्तमान प्रधानमंत्री जी, जो विदेश मंत्री भी हैं और विदेश मंत्रालय क्यों नहीं इस पर गंभीरता से विचार कर रहा है? मान्यवर, श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जी के समय की बात मुझे स्मरण है। उस समय पासपोर्ट के लिए जो प्रार्थना-पत्र दिया जाता था उसे एमपी या एमएलए सर्टिफाई करते थे कि मैं इन व्यक्ति को जानता हूँ, इसका चरित्र अच्छा है और उसको 30 दिन के अन्दर पासपोर्ट मिल जाता था। क्या एक सिपाही के बराबर की भी हैसियत नहीं है एमपी और एमएलए की, क्यों नहीं पासपोर्ट के लिए वैसी व्यवस्था की जाती है?...

श्री महेश्वर सिंह: (हिमाचल प्रदेश) दुबारा वह समय आयेगा।

श्री ईश दत्त यादव: हां, यदि एमपी, एमएलए गलत लिखें, कोई गलत सर्टिफिकेट दें तो उनके लिए इंडियन पीनल कोड में व्यवस्था है। गिविंग फाल्स सर्टिफिकेट एक जुर्म है, एक अपराध है। इसलिए मैं आपको माध्यम से कहना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार इस पर गंभीरता से विचार करे। जो पासपोर्ट जारी करने का नियम है इसको थोड़ा सरल बनाया जाए। आसान बनाया जाए जिससे कि जरूरतमंद आदमियों को पासपोर्ट आसानी से मिल सके और उसके द्वारा एलाई करने के लक्षण एक महीने के अंदर उसको जरूर मिल जाये।... (समय की घंटी)...

मान्यवर, मैं आपको उस आसन पर बैठने के लिए बधाई दी है। इसलिए मैं आपके आदेश का उत्तर नहीं करूंगा। मैं आपके माध्यम से प्रधान मंत्री जी और सरकार को बधाई देते हुए उनकी प्रशंसा करते हुए कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी अनुभवी विदेश मंत्री रहे हैं और आज भी प्रधान मंत्री होने के साथ-साथ भी हैं। उनको यह विभाग हमेशा अपने पास

ही रखना चाहिए। संविधान और कानून में तो यह कहीं नहीं है कि कौन सा विभाग किसे पास रहेगा। लेकिन अभी एक माननीय सदस्य ने कहा और मुझे भी राजनीति की थोड़ी सी जानकारी है, इतिहास की जानकारी है और हमारे प्रणव मुखर्जी जी बहुत अनुभवी नेता हैं, वे भी जानते हैं कि कभी-कभी प्रधान मंत्री और विदेश मंत्री में मतभेद हो जाते हैं, किन्हीं-किन्हीं बातों पर मतभेद हो जाते हैं। इसलिए यह ठीक है कि गुजराल साहब जो हमारे माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी हैं, वे अपने पास विदेश विभाग भी रखें और यह विभाग इनके पास ही रहना चाहिए, किसी और को इन्हें यह विभाग देने की आवश्यकता नहीं है। मुझे पूरी आशा है कि गुजराल साहब के नेतृत्व में इस देश की जो विदेश नीति है, जो शाश्वत है, जिसमें 50 वर्ष में भी परिवर्तन नहीं हुआ है और जो सभी दलों की एक नीति है, हर दल की अर्थ नीति अलग है, शिक्षा नीति अलग है, व्यापार नीति अलग है, स्वास्थ्य नीति अलग है लेकिन सभी दलों की विदेश नीति एक ही है। इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि पूरे देश की एक ही विदेश नीति है जो कि बहुत ही अच्छी है। इसको मन से और स्टांग विल पावर से सरकार लागू करे। आपने मुझे बोलने के लिए समय दिया इसके लिए आपका बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री नरेश यादव) आपको भी बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद। (डा० गोफालराव विठ्ठलराव पाटिल।

DR. GOPALRAO VITHALRAO PATIL (Maharashtra): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am very happy to note that our External Affairs Minister, Shri Inder Kumar Gujralji is a very wise and experienced diplomat and a politician for whom we can say:

विद्या विनयते शोभते

meaning thereby knowledge and wisdom shine with humility. He is an embodiment of humility and knowledge. Therefore, such an experienced and wise man is elevated to the higher post of Prime Ministership. Therefore, it is my first duty to congratulate him on his elevation as the supreme leader. I feel under his able leadership India's foreign policy will get a new boost and thrust in the right direction and in a proper perspective. By this what I mean to say is that any nation's foreign policy should ensure

three or four things—it should be able to protect the national interest of that country, it should be able to safeguard the borders of the country and it should be able to safeguard and protect the sovereignty of the country and it should be able to protect the cultural ethos and the great heritage in which we have great pride. Therefore, I feel that the new foreign policy approach will ensure all these things. We are living in a world which is changing every moment, day by day, week by week, month by month, year by year. In a few years, there will be a sea-change in this world. The post cold war era has appeared on the international scene wherein very few powers are dominating this world. For example, there are various groupings. There is one group which is known as P-5. Those are the powers who are having nuclear weapons, nuclear powers. They are Russia, America, China, France and Britain. They are known as P-5 Group.

There is another important group of economic powers which is known as G-7. This Group consists of America, the three European countries, Germany France and Britain along with Italy, Canada and Japan. These seven economically strong countries and these militarily powerful countries want to control the whole world, 200 countries in such a way that no other country should be able to do that. There are four or five things with which India is concerned. The first is this that our national interest demands that we should exercise our nuclear option. The second thing is that we should develop missiles. The third thing is that India should get a permanent seat in the Security Council and as a Member should have a greater power whenever there is a restructuring of the United Nations. The fourth thing is our policy on Kashmir. It is one of the main issues. When you consider four or five things as our national interest, what will be the effect of our foreign policy and the reaction of other countries? The groupings of countries which I have

mentioned earlier are propagating that the world should be free of arms. That is the basic tenet of our foreign policy. We are the first and the last to advocate disarmament policy in this world. These people are talking in different terms instead of disarmament. They say that first we should have a non-proliferation treaty. It was discussed in the United Nations and passed there. Then they came with the CTBT, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. And then, now again, there is another discussion going on about one thing and that is the FMCT, the Facile Material Cut-off Treaty. No country should produce the material which is used in the manufacture of bombs. That material is known as the facile material. But this material has got dual use. It is used for the production of bombs. But it is also used for peaceful purposes. It is used for civil purposes also. It is used for the production of electricity; it is used in isotopes which are used in medicines. In the production of electricity, we need raw material in the form of nuclear facile material. This treaty which is being discussed in Geneva at present is known as the Facile Material Cut-off Treaty. And this treaty will also be forced on India in the days to come, in the months to come. Rather, in a month or two, we will have to take a decision whether to sign this treaty or not. These powers, these P-5 and G-7, as I said, are bringing certain other issues also. The other issues are the issues of environment, the issues of human rights and with these things, they want to restructure the whole world which should be in conformity with the view of these five or seven or ten countries—the P-5 or the G-7. They behave as if they are the only countries and the other groups like G-77 do not exist at all.

(THE VICE-CHAIRMAN, SHRI
TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI, IN
THE CHAIR.)

Therefore, what I think is, we have to form our policies as they concern with the approach of these countries. More

and more pressures will be exerted on India to be in conformity with the approach of the new western order. And this order is not at all a fair order; it is not an equitable order. It is rather the propagation of the 'neo-economic materialism' as we call it. They want to propagate this. They want to propagate the oldest thinking that might be right. The law of the jungle will prevail in this world also. The poor have got no right to survive. The small nations will never survive. There is a Sanskrit proverb,

यस्मिन् कुले त्वमुत्पन्नः

गजसैनं न हस्यते।

It means that in the environment in which you are born, you cannot kill an elephant. You are living in a jungle. How can rabbits, cats and deer kill an elephant? To kill an elephant, there should be a lion. And in this way, the world in which we are living is a world which believes in power. And only those who are having this power can survive. Only they can survive. (Time-bell).

Sir, I have to request you to permit me for 5-10 minutes more.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): Yes, please.

DR. GOPALRAO VITHALRAO PATIL: I was talking about four things and in that respect, how pressure will be brought on India. Suppose, tomorrow, we decide that we will make our nuclear weapons and manufacture a bomb. How many countries will support us? In this context, I would say this. We are a member of the NAM. From 25 countries, it has now 113. How many friends were we having there when we were struggling to get their support in the United Nations at the time of the NPT, at Geneva, when we were going to sign the CTBT and when we were fighting in the WTO for our rights which were related to patents and many other multi-fibre agreements?

Therefore, when it is revealed and when we are saying and taking pride in the fact that India is the leader of NAM world, I find that here is a leader without a single follower. Whom are we leading? Who is our friend? Who will come to our rescue when the question of Kashmir will be discussed and when all the countries will be voting against us in the United Nations? This has happened. WTO.

At the nick of time when the things were just coming to decision-taking stage, there were a few countries, rather, there were no countries who were in India's favour and we also buckled at the nick of time, and therefore, when we say that NAM is the need of the hour, in what way, is NAM going to help us in Kashmir? When we say that even the Pak, that is the Pak-occupied-Kashmir, is a part and parcel of India, the solution of the problem lies in the fact that Pakistan should vacate the Pok. Who is going to accept this view? We say so many things about our policy in the Gulf region. Some of those countries are very friendly with us. I don't say that there is no acceptance of our view, there is no understanding amongst the Muslim countries about the Kashmir problem. But recently, there was a meeting of the 34 Muslim countries in which nobody, including Yasser Arafat, objected to the Kashmir Resolution, which was passed in this conference. Everybody endorsed the Pakistani stand and no Muslim country came to our help to make our stand clear in this gathering. Therefore, in the Gulf region, we have to review our foreign policy in the context of Palestine and Israel. We should be more friendly even with Israel. We have to change our approach towards Israel. In a nutshell, this is my idea as far as this region is concerned. In the other two regions, that is, Russia and America, we have to be more cautious. I am very sorry to say that we have lost a very good friend, that is Russia. It has become very weak. It was our real good friend at crucial moments, in the sense that it used to come to our

help in the hour of need. Now it has lost its strength, and therefore, my appeal to the Prime Minister is that he should analyse the things very carefully. When we are walking in a straight line, people feel that we are leaning slightly on the left side and we are more friendly with the Soviet Union because of the very fact that you were an Ambassador there not only in the simple sense but you were the Ambassador of goodwill, and therefore, you had a very good understanding and relations with the Soviet Union. But this should not come in the way of our developing relations with the United States of America. That is my contention. Sir, the United States of America also is a very big country. Now it is a unipolar world. It is dictating its views. That does not mean that we should agree to whatever the United States says. But what is the difference between India and the United States? The United States of America is the most powerful democracy. We are the largest democracy. We also follow the same principles, the principles of liberty, fraternity, open society, open judiciary and human rights which they plead. Such things are common in India and in the United States of America. There are no real problems with the United States of America. So, nothing should come in our way, including our previous bias, in developing our good relations with the United States of America. Therefore, my appeal to the Prime Minister is that we should make special efforts to have good relations with America—economically and militarily. We have not been able to purchase anything.

That might be due to the United State's policy uptill now, but now it can be changed. So, instead of visiting Burkano Fasse, Swaziland and other places, we have to look forward to the South-East Asian Region where there are many big countries. There is an Economic Power, Japan, there. Our relations with it are not that cordial, without any reason or rhyme. So, we must make special efforts to have very good relations with the

United States, with Japan, with Israel, with Russia and even with China and Pakistan which are our neighbours. Here, I think, we can have a policy of *status quo*. That is my personal opinion—and, therefore, if, for 20 years, we don't have wars with these two countries, we can progress economically, we can gain our strength otherwise. As you have rung the bell twice, Sir, I am concluding by saying that we have to be strong, and in this context, I will bring to your notice one or two things. As I said, this is a world which believes in power. Until and unless we have real power, nobody is going to trust us, whether it is Male or Bhutan or Nepal or Bangladesh or Sri Lanka or any other country, including our small neighbours and the people who are beyond our region. Therefore, my contention is that India should exercise this nuclear option, we should produce a nuclear bomb, we should have the delivery system; that is the message. Until and unless we manufacture "Agni", which is a very important missile in the sense that it is an intermediate ballistic missile, having a range of 2500 kms.—by manufacturing that we can have a range from—Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Iran and the middle of China, Malaysia, Indonesia.....(*interruptions*)....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): You need not dilate upon that. You have referred to Agni.

DR. GOPALRAO VITHALRAO PATIL: Sir, Agni missile should have to be developed at any cost. What is happening in our country is,—this is what I feel—what the military people gain, the politicians lose. We made such treaties that we had gained vital areas like Hajipur and others in Kashmir. We have lost them by some other treaty. Take, for example, Israel; they are still maintaining the Golan Heights. We have developed a technology to manufacture nuclear weapons, we have developed a technolo-

gy to manufacture the Agni missile. Agni cannot be manufactured overnight. To develop a long range missile, it takes 10 years. For 20-30 years, we have not been able to develop an LCA; we have not been able to develop an engine of MBT (Main Battle Tank); 1500 horsepower engines we cannot manufacture. When we have not manufactured the engine of this Light Combat Aircraft, how can we develop the most modern technology of manufacturing Agni? It takes ten years. Unless and until you take a decision, it won't be possible. If at all you want to take a decision, you have to take that decision today itself, and that is the urgency of the problem. We have to be really strong; our entry into the United Nations as a permanent member should be through Agni and nuclear weapons, and not by begging votes in the environs of nations. Therefore, my plea is, India should become stronger. Economic strength is there. Nowadays, economically, people are getting together, nations are getting together on various counts. Nowadays, the most important thing is diplomacy and, therefore, I want to give two contentions. First, in our internal affairs we should bring nationalism, and second, in our external affairs we should have bilateralism. We should have friendship with every nation; we should have good relations, and along with this, we should have this rhetoric of NAM, SAARC and ASEAN which are not ready to admit you, saying that we are still not powerful enough to be admitted into ASEAN! And which are the countries of this ASEAN? New Zealand and Australia.

And some other groupings are coming together and saying that India is the largest country in this region and, therefore, it cannot become a member of ASEAN. This is our credibility. Is this the result of our foreign policy? Has not the time come to think over it? If somebody talks from a platform, he will say something. That is quite a different

thing. We have to continue this economic dialogue. We have to develop economic relations, bilateralism in external affairs, nationalism in India. We have to have very good relations on one-to-one basis. As one hon. Member mentioned, there is a sub-regional grouping. What is the sub-regional grouping? Already SAARC is not functioning properly. This concept of subregional grouping was not at all mentioned. As the Prime Minister has said, it was mentioned by the Nepali Prime Minister. It was mentioned by the Sri Lankan Foreign Minister. Now there is an apprehension that India is going to oppose it. In what way is it going to affect our relations with any other country? Our foreign policy must be very good. We are a big country. Sometimes, we should be more liberal. We are not supporting the Ganga water agreement with Bangladesh. But we have to give something to Bangladesh. We know there are certain problems. But there should be some understanding with that country that during a lean season water will not be available. Whatever is available, it should be shared equitably. My contention is that we should become strong. Already it is too late. Once you take a decision, there will be so much criticism and a hundred of countries will come....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI):
Kindly conclude.

DR. GOPALRAO VITHALRAO PATIL: I am concluding. I appeal to the Prime Minister to adopt a new approach. There is a good thing that there is continuity. Continuity is only for peace and love. There should be everything in the world. But who says that there should be war in the world? We have to change our policies in our own interest. That is my appeal. Thank you.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am glad to share my views at the fag end of the debate when the Prime Minister is

also present here. When we decided that the discussion on the Ministry of External Affairs would be taken up in the second part of the budget session, at that point of time, we did not have an idea that the Foreign Minister would become Prime Minister and would retain his portfolio.

We wanted to have a discussion on this subject. I am glad that now we will have the most authoritative response from the Government to various issues raised by my colleagues who have participated in the discussion because he is both the External Affairs Minister and the Prime Minister of the country. As has been mentioned by every Member who participated in the discussion, there is a continuity and there is a broad national consensus on the policies on external relations. Its basic foundation was laid even before independence because some of our national leaders considered that our fight against imperialism and colonialism is not in isolation but it was closely linked with the aspirations of the people to throw away the yoke of colonialism and resist exploitation by the imperial forces. Therefore, it was quite natural that when India obtained independence it persistently continued its contribution to every part of the world where people asserted their right against their colonial masters. At the same time, in this changing world, you cannot live in isolation. We have to adjust our policies with the changing situation, the changing perspective and the changing ground realities. We have to adjust your policies and you have done so. The flexibility which is inherent in the policy has made it very relevant and more appropriate. So far as the year under review is concerned, we are discussing the working of the Ministry of External Affairs for the year 1996-97. There are important land marks like the agreement signed between India and Bangladesh to share the Ganga water. There are different perspectives to it. But at the same time, the hard fact is that we have been able to arrive at a certain arrangement with our neighbour,

particularly, in the 25th year of Bangladesh's existence and the 50th year of our independence. We have also signed the agreement on the Mahakali river basin. Fortunately, this time it has been ratified by the Nepalese Parliament and it has the final seal of approval from their side. There is reduction of forces by both India and China on the border area. This began in 1998 with the signing of the agreement to maintain peace and tranquillity in the border area. The opening up of border trade and the series of confidence building measures which we adopted have no doubt rejuvenated our relationship.

We have very assertively expressed our views on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and though we did not have the support of the majority members of the United Nations, our viewpoint, our stand, was appreciated. These are some of the important achievements. There may have been some lapses here and there. We suffered a setback in our effort to get adequate support for a non permanent seat in the Security Council. But I must say that the policies which we pursued over the years paid good dividends. The Prime Minister is just now coming from Male after attending a SAARC summit. In this context, a couple of new initiatives have to be thought of. While making his observations, the previous speaker referred to ASEAN and how it was relevant to adjust our policies according to changing times. There was a time in the seventies when ASEAN offered its membership to us on a platter. But we did not accept it because at that point of time, in that context, it was considered not necessary in the national interest. But we simply cannot stick to the past, completely ignoring the ground realities. Today our relationship with them, because of full dialogue partnership and also because of our closer interaction, has deepened. Unfortunately, I was not present in the morning when the Prime

Minister clarified the position with regard to the role of the sub-regional groups within the SAARC. We are emphasising on this aspect because there is another model which is operating. Take the case of Thailand and the concept of the Golden Triangle. Thailand and certain other ASEAN and Non-ASEAN countries are expanding that triangular concept to have deeper interaction in the fields of trade, economy and technology and this is paying rich dividends. The changes which have taken place in the last decade are almost monumental. It was said in the history that after the Battle of Waterloo in 1815 it was very difficult to re-draw the map of Europe. I am not going to that parallelism but the changes which have taken place in the international relations in the last decade are almost unparalleled. I am not going into that controversy, whether the world has emerged as a uni-polar world or a multi-polar world. But the fact remains that there have been many areas, many concerns, many initiatives which could not be contemplated even two decades ago. Therefore, these are the ground realities within which we have to work-out our policy. Sir, it was decided last year, when we celebrated the tenth anniversary of SAARC, that we must convert this region into South-Asian Free

Trade Area preferably by 2000; if not, latest by 2005. Now, how to operationalise it is an important subject and in this regard I would like to make certain suggestions which the hon. Prime Minister is already following. He has taken certain initiatives. Sir, if we look at the figures of trade between SAARC countries and India we will get some very interesting studies. SAARC was established in 1985.

The total trade turn-over between India and the six other SAARC countries was Rs. 220.36 crores. India's export to the six SAARC countries were Rs. 128,19,00,000 and India's import from those six countries, viz. Pakistan

Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, Nepal, Bhutan and Maldives, were just Rs. 98.17 crores. The total turnover was Rs. 226.36 crores and in 1995, after just ten years after the total trade turn-over between India and these six countries has increased to Rs. 6562.33 crores, from Rs. 226 crores to Rs. 6562 crores, and export has increased from Rs. 128 crores to Rs. 5708 crores. Therefore, if somebody talks of reciprocity, it does not apply in these areas. Here we have to take the initiatives and provide more opportunities to these countries. Therefore, if we want to give this sub-regional developmental concept a meaningful momentum in our relationship, we must completely forget about the question of reciprocity. Our economy is complementary, our economy is basically complementary to each other. We can export more or less the same goods. Therefore, if we can work fast for conversion of these regions into free trade areas, we will be the beneficiary because it will be a market of 1.2 billion people where the consumption would increase substantially. We have the natural resources and if we utilise those natural resources, harness them for the benefit of the people of this country, we have to take initiatives, and those initiatives are being taken and we should welcome it. But at the same time, as in international diplomacy, there is no room for romanticism. We cannot expect that if we take some initiative today, it will be immediately responded to by tomorrow and things will start improving from the day after tomorrow. It does not happen.

It requires patience. We shall allow some time to pass for the things to be appreciated. Things can properly be appreciated only if we take certain initiatives which are less controversial. It is true that a dialogue between India and Pakistan has begun. But at the same time if we expect that overnight it would be possible for us to sort out all the outstanding issues and if it does not happen if we feel that our efforts have not paid dividends, it is not correct. Just

look at the experiment which we started with China. We had excellent relations. In 1959, that relation was disturbed. In 1962, it was cut off. It took more than two and a half decades to take an initiative even to break the ice. After the visit of the late Prime Minister, Rajiv Gandhi, things actually started improving which came to a definitive conclusion in 1993. Thereafter, it has progressed to a considerable extent. But still the major problem remains unresolved. Similarly, with the opening of a dialogue, between India and Pakistan at whatever level, be it at the level of the Prime Ministers, be it at the level of the Foreign Ministers, be it at the level of the Foreign Secretaries, we cannot expect that the issue which is acting as the bone of contention between these two countries since its inception, since 1947, could be sorted out in one or two meetings or in one or two years. It cannot be done. Therefore, it will take time and we shall have to work hard to achieve that goal which we want to achieve. But here we wish to draw them into the area of economic co-operation, trade and technological co-operation. What happened? I have just now quoted the trade figures. If you go through them you will find that there has been a phenomenal growth in the last 5—7 years in our trade turnover, particularly between India and Bangladesh. How has it happened? The first initiative was taken by the Chambers of Commerce. The first initiative was taken by them. The Prime Minister also associated himself with what is called the second track of diplomacy in ensuring people-to-people contact, through close relationship between various trade and industrial chambers. If we can have that approach towards Pakistan, to my mind the confidence-building measures would receive a real momentum. Therefore, our efforts should be towards that direction.

Somebody has come to a conclusion after the experiences which we had during the lean season on the question to sharing of the Ganga waters. It is true that this year

both the countries have problems. It is mainly because of the fact that the availability of water at the Farakka point was much less than the average which was calculated. In this connection, I would like to suggest one thing to the Prime Minister for his consideration and also for the consideration of Bangladesh. Perhaps arithmetically we are a little wrong when we took the average of 1947 onwards. In the average between 1947 and 1988, in these 41 years, there has been some shortfall because a large number of projects were constructed in the upstream between 1950 and 1988, particularly during the Second and Third Five-Year Plans, in the sixties and seventies. Therefore, we have got some erroneous statistical advantage as the flow in first 15 years, from 1947 to 1962 were rare and this increased the quantum of the average availability of the Ganga water at Farakka Point. Therefore, I would like to suggest that we should have a fresh look on this, of course, in full consultation with Bangladesh. If both sides agree, we can arrive at a realistic figure about the availability of the water at the Farakka point, particularly when the lean season starts as the present calculation of average availability is erroneous.

This year was an extraordinary year because there was shortfall in rains in the upper regions from where this water flows. I am flagging this point at this stage because when the question of review comes this point is taken note of so that we can give a real test to the arrangement that we have made. And why I am talking about these things is that it will help both the countries. Instead of expressing our goodwill and our intention in words, if we take up certain economic activities which affect the lives of people in the countries concerned, then it would help us. Now, we are going to finalise the 9th Plan. The details are to be worked out in the next couple of months. The Prime Minister is also the Chairman of the Planning

Commission. And we know from our experience, as we have been in the Government, that unless there is a directive from the highest authority it wouldn't help in regard to certain projects which are going to help, in improving bilateral relations. For example, the agreement that we have signed with Nepal for harnessing hydel resources and water resources of Nepal, in Kashi Project for augmenting the water-flows into the Farakka point. To augment flow in Farakka point there are proposals for development of Bhutan rivers Maunsa and Serish we can help in joint venture projects to utilise gas and oil resources available in Banglaesh. For that you require adequate resources. From where will these resources come? Yes, the multilateral agencies will provide some assistance but they will go by their own yardsticks. In this connection, my suggestion to the Prime Minister would be whether it would be possible for him to direct the Planning Commission to earmark certain part of the resources for bilateral development projects. Of course, somebody may get up and say that technically it is not national planning but international planning. I do agree. But to that extent the arrangements could be made. Of course, the resources are to be provided to the Ministry of External Affairs. It cannot be done in any other way. But certain amount has to be earmarked. A substantial amount has to be earmarked so that those projects could be funded. For example, we helped and helped substantially in the construction of a large number of projects in Nepal in the last three or four years. Involvement of resources was not very high. But it created a tremendous amount of goodwill which helped us to get the Treaty ratified by the Nepalese Parliament indirectly, of course not directly.

If they feel that India despite its own problems is coming forward to help them—and I am again saying that help not in words, not in good intentions, but

in some substance—then it helps us to have our credibility.

You need not look at the watch, Mr. Vice-Chairman. I will conclude in just five minutes because I know that the Prime Minister will have to reply.

The third ~~point~~ which I would like to flage at this stage is in connection with our vital interest about the permanent seat in the Security Council. As I understand it, it would not be possible for the open-ended working group to come to any conclusions. And there are differences even amongst the Non-aligned countries and it would be difficult for them to take an approach where we can resolve these issues. Perhaps we can have some sort of a consensus in coming to conclusions that there should not be any piece-meal arrangement. By piece-meal arrangement I mean that there is a move and this move is not new, it is going on for quite some time, that all right, the developing countries are not in a position to come to any conclusion as to who will be in the permanent category, therefore let them go on working, debating, discussion amongst themselves and find out a mechanism in the meanwhile to see to it that two rich countries are inducted as permanent members of the Security Council. I think we should try to resist that.

6.00 P.M.

That is our principled stand. But, we shall have to work a little hard for that. There should not be any piecemeal arrangement. There should be one integrated arrangement where the expansion of the Security Council can take care of the ground reality. Again, the question of ground reality is coming. When the United Nations was constituted after the Second World War in 1945, the ~~composition~~ of Security Council was ~~practically the victors'~~ club; all those who won ~~the~~ war they appointed themselves as the Permanent Members of the

Security Council. Perhaps, after 50 years of United Nations existence, they have become a little bit conscious of the fact that in order to convert it from victors' club, let, at least the two vanquished be of Permanent Members of the Security Council, though the third vanquished is not yet considered to be the Permanent Member. But their approach should not be like that. To resist this approach perhaps we can get the support of all the other countries. If we want to resolve the issue right now in our favour — I am afraid that it may not be possible. It is not only the question of representation of India in the permanent category, but also the question of representation of Africa or countries from Latin America.

Therefore, we shall have to buy some more time and we should try to do that. What is needed for this type of a situation is constant lobbying and talking. I am sure that our people will be doing that; they are experts in doing that.

There is ~~no~~ doubt in it. On all these issues, the country has given full support to the initiatives taken by the Government because here not one individual speaks, but 900 million people speak through the voice of the Foreign Minister or the Prime Minister. Therefore, it has its own merit and strength. With these words, I thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, for giving me this opportunity. We are delighted to have a Prime Minister-cum-Foreign Minister after many years. In the fifties and in early sixties, we had it, and now in the nineties, we are having Prime Minister-cum-Foreign Minister and we are eagerly awaiting his response. Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): You are flattering his discretion to reform his Cabinet the way he wants.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Not at all, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): We would like him to continue as Foreign Minister as also Prime Minister because the personality counts. Now, the hon. Prime Minister has to reply. Dr. B.B. Dutta, I am sure you would be able to finish within five-seven minutes.

DR. ALLADI P. RAJKUMAR—Sir, let the Prime Minister reply now. *...(Interruptions)...*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): Dr. Dutta had gone for some important meeting. His party has three-four minutes. I am sure he would be able to finish his speech within that time-frame. Dr. B.B. Dutta.

DR. B.B. DUTTA (Nominated): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, as there is hardly any time left and many of my colleagues have spoken in detail about the foreign policy and the functioning of the Ministry, I would like to confine myself to only three-four points.

Sir, just now, our veteran Member, Shri Pranab Mukherjee, said that we are delighted to have after many-many years a Prime Minister who is holding the External Affairs portfolio. That way, we are reminded of the glorious Nehruvian period because just after Independence, when we started our march towards freedom and prosperity, the External Affairs Ministry was the most important one and it was receiving a lot of attention from all over the world. At that time, we were school children. That is why we remember how we used to read newspapers and get excited over many memorable statements Pt. Nehru used to make whenever there were occasions; historic occasions were, of course, there. In this connection, first of all, I would like to say what the scenario today is in

(THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, *in the Chair*)

Does anybody get inspired by India's Foreign Policy?

I have talked to many people who are young, who are at the college and university level. There is a feeling of despondency about what is happening to this country which was destined to be a great country and play a great role, with such beautiful traditions in our foreign policy what are you doing today? A question is asked: Are we pursuing a free and independent foreign policy? Is our foreign policy today free from pressures, free from interferences from certain quarters? The way we are handling our policy a message goes to the public, 'No, we are under pressure. There are some interferences. That is why on vital matters connected with foreign policy, there are delays, there is procrastination.' There are important programmes both in the Defence Ministry and the External Affairs Ministry. The Ministries of External Affairs and Defence go hand-in-hand. There are inseparable links between the two. You cannot separate them even though they are separate Ministries. We find that there is some delay. There is some bottleneck. There are some pressures. So, we feel like this. My question is: I want our Prime Minister, Who happens to be the External Affairs Minister also, to revive that glorious period of Indian history. Please give a message and talk in that tone and in that language, as Nehru used to speak, so that every Indian would feel that we are not under pressure and we would not like to listen to anybody. The various programmes being pursued by independent India, be they in the Defence Ministry or in the External Affairs Ministry, should go ahead. We are a big country. We are destined to play a great role and contribute to the rest of the world. Well, this message is missing. This is my first observation. I would like to have the reaction of the Prime Minister.

There are indications. Everybody reads newspapers and magazines. So many stories are being circulated, some in whisper and some in print, that certain

powers want us went India to remain bottled within the South Asia. Their definition of South Asia is SAARC countries plus Afghanistan. India is not supposed to play any role beyond this. Therefore, India is being advised what to do, what not to do, how to fashion its defence apparatus, how to shape its foreign policy, etc. We are being told as to what we should do in Kashmir. We are being told as to how our Information and Broadcasting Ministry should draft its Bill. This kind of things are visible. I ask you, why is it happening? Do I not live in an independent country? After seeing all this, should we believe that we are not under pressure, under interference? On top of it, a very suffocating atmosphere is created by our leaders. They are not revealing the names of the people who are putting pressure on us. Those who are putting pressure on us are very courageous people. They do not mind their names being spoken out. But our leaders are hiding their names from us and the very same leaders will tell us from the house-tops about the necessity of transparency in running the Government, in an open society and in a democratic society. Why don't you tell the people of India who are the people who are against us, who want us to be doing something which we don't like our Government to do? Tell us that these are the people, these are the powers and they are saying like this. If you say this, you will see how India will respond to your call. The entire people will be with you. China goes ahead. They give their messages not only in words but also in action. Whenever there is an NPT Conference, they come to it after a nuclear blast. There is a message given through action. The Chinese have made up their mind. They know where they are going to reach. They have a goal to reach. They are carrying out their programmes accordingly. What is happening to fellow India, an equally important country, an equally learned country, a country with such a tremendous heritage, a country which is destined to play a great role in

the world? Now everybody thinks that we are doomed to be a third-grade power in the world.

Is this India Jawaharlal Nehru dreamt of? This is what I ask the hon. Prime Minister today. If this is the India you are going to lead, well, I for one, as a Member of Parliament, do not belong to that India. My India is different. This is not the India our freedom fighters dreamt of. This is not the India the Father of the Nation dreamt of. And, this is not the India which many of the illustrious sons of India who contributed their mite in building up of a nation, visualised. So, we have got our strategic interests, our strategic requirements beyond that definition of South-Asia. My question to the hon Prime Minister is, are we conducting our foreign policy, shaping our foreign policy, so that India can play — in fact, it should have played a role by now — a role beyond the definition of South-Asia given by certain powers? It is in the Southern-Asian region. Beyond Afghanistan, in Central Asia, we have got a role to play. This area is coming up with a lot of messages and the power-play started there. The great game that was played in the 19th century between the Great Britain and Russia, is on. No longer would the missionaries come before imperialist forces come. Now-a-days, the multinationals come before the other powers come. The multinationals have been set to that area and they have started their bids. What about India? Do you not require oil? Do you not require gas? Should you not look for solution to our problems because we are deficit in that count? Does not the strategic requirements, like these, shape the foreign policy of the country? What is the foreign policy of the so called super-powers in the Middle-East and other parts of the world? Madam, I do not like to elaborate much, but I tell you, I, for one, feel very much frustrated when as a Member of Parliament we find that we do not get enough information, enough analysis on various strategic aspects on what actually

we are going to do, what we are actually doing? The hon. Prime Minister speaks only of transparency? He has been doing very well. I have no doubt about it. Some media people described the thrust given to our foreign policy, by the hon. Prime Minister and it has been given a name — the Gujaral Doctrine. Someone has compared it with the Munroe Doctrine. I do not know what the similarities are. I do not know whether the doctrine will capture the imagination and affection of the people of India. I do not know about all these things. But, I know he has been doing well on some fronts. In the South-Asian region, at the sub-regional level, he has made some moves along with Nepal, Bangladesh and at the Sub-Regional grouping itself with Sri Lanka, he had made marvellous moves. But, I have got reservation about one country — Pakistan. In the last debate on external affairs in the Rajya Sabha, Gujaralji said, — in his inaugural speech while enunciating his main principles of foreign policy said — "I am going to follow a policy with my immediate neighbours without the principle of reciprocity. We will do good to them. Whatever they do to us, I do not bother. We will share their miseries," as he told last time. "Let us share the sufferings and go ahead. India being a bigger partner, we take more share of sufferings." Fine. This is an excellent principle and we fully endorse it. But, regarding our country this is hardly applies. Recently, there is a euphoria about improvement of relations between India and Pakistan. Now, this euphoria is only from the India's side. You reciprocate warmly to any gesture of goodwill, there is no harm. But the question is, in foreign policy, we have to be very careful with a neighbour like Pakistan only because on one count and that is, the existing regime, the successive regimes, whoever be the Prime Minister, has got a character. That character is informed by a combination of military and fundamentalists. They dictate terms. Their one-point programme is: how to harass India, how to take away Kashmir, how to make

some inroads not only into the North-west, in Kashmir, but also into the North-East; and, if possible, into other parts of the country also. This is their one-point programme from the very beginning. (Time-bell)

Madam, I would like to remind the Prime Minister about one thing. We should not be carried away by emotions. I say this because we find that our Prime Minister, our External Affairs Minister, and our Defence Minister, are capable of being carried away by emotions. Emotions, you leave it to us. We may dance because there is a new policy. We believe something wonderful is going to happen. But you being what you are, you should not be carried away by emotions. There must be hard bargaining.

THE DEPUTY CHARIMAN: They are also human beings.

DR. B.B. DUTTA: But they are Prime Ministers, External Affairs Ministers and Defence Ministers. Madam, I will tell you why.

PROF. RAM KAPSE (Maharashtra): He wants them not to be carried away by emotions.

DR. B.B. DUTTA: They can be touched by emotions, but they should not be carried away by emotions.

Why do I say so? In 1948, we had the first example of Pakistan's behaviour in Kashmir. We know what they did there. Again, what happened? Immediately after 1962, after the conflict with the Chinese, when we had to seek some help from the United States, the United States dictated terms to us, to Nehru. The United States said: 'Pakistan is our ally; you have to settle your dispute with Pakistan; otherwise, what you want you are not getting'. Nehru conceded a lot to the greed of the Pakistan regime. But Pakistan wanted the entire Kashmir; up to Ladakh, up to the border with China. That is how the whole thing fell off. That is how the whole thing could not materialise. (Time-bell)

Madam, I am saying this because we have to learn a lesson from our past. Immediately after that, after the 1962 conflict, what happened? In 1965, we had the Rann of Kutch battle. The Indian defence forces were ill-prepared. They were not well-prepared for this. Earlier also, the same thing happened. At that time, Nehru believed in cultural politics. He did not believe that India would be involved in a war. He did not even try to remember the 1948 experience in Kashmir. He thought that this could be forgotten. In this case also, the Indian Army was ill-prepared. As a result of this, more than 19,000 sq. km. area was captured by Pakistan. Subsequently, the then Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, had to concede that territory, as a goodwill gesture to Pakistan. The then President of Pakistan, Ayub Khan, reciprocated very warmly, praising the Indian Government and the Indian leaders and said: 'There are not basic differences between India and Pakistan; we are friends'. But two-and-a-half months or three months later, they started their 'Operation Gibraltar' in Kashmir. On 1st September, India had to create fronts to keep up the offensive. I remember, as a college student, Radhakrishnan speaking over the Radio. Dr. Radhakrishnan said in a broadcast to the nation: 'Offence is defence'. That was the situation. We were plunged into such a situation.

After that, what happened? Mrs. Gandhi did not forget the lessons of 1948 and 1965. That is why when we were facing the problem in the eastern wing of Pakistan, she, as the Prime Minister, got ready even before the war started so that when the eventuality arose, she knew what was to be done. Then, it was done and that is how our policy objectives were achieved. This is preparedness. Of course, Nehru was such an illustrious Prime Minister. Otherwise, a great man on all counts. (Time-bell) A great man on all counts. But he had to change his theme of cultural politics after the 1962 experience. He had to turn to the Soviet

Union and go in for the MIG-21 and other things. They were willing to sell weapons to us and we were willing to buy from them. That is how the journey of our friendship started on very concrete terms.

I would, therefore, submit, Madam, that we must learn our lessons from history. When we show the olive branch, Pakistan does not reciprocate. Here, I am not talking about the Muslims of Pakistan. They are our brothers and sisters. We have no quarrel with them. They have no quarrel with us. But the Pakistani regime has to be watched. This is their one-point programme. You cannot take them on their words. What is the situation today? Infiltration into Kashmir. Mercenaries are coming from Afghanistan, from Saudi Arabia, from Sudan and other countries—how many countries, I do not know. Yesterday the Home Minister, Mr. Indrajit Gupta, was telling us the names of some countries from where mercenary fighters have come and are present in Kashmir. They say it is a jihad, a holy war. This is going on, and they are not telling us that they will stop it. They are not telling us that they will stop infiltration, they are not telling us that they will reduce their Defence budget. They have come to financial bankruptcy in Pakistan today because of their overspending. Unofficially, I tell you, about 25 per cent of their GDP is being spent on Defence. Officially it is nearly seven per cent. And because of that they are facing some problems. And their Interim Prime Minister—such a good man he is—was telling the press the other day that Pakistan is a failed State. Now it is struggling for survival. Why is Pakistan's tone soft today? Because they are having terrible problems at home. That is why now the Prime Minister, Nawaz Sharif, wanted to have a talks with India, even without Kashmir being discussed. But what happened? General Jehangir Khan gave a warning: "No, the core issue cannot be missed; it has to come." And the Prime Minister of Pakistan had to

change his posture. So the core issue has come.

What is the core issue? Referring to Kashmir. Now, we go by the Simla Agreement. One part of the Simla Agreement is written. There is another part of it which is unwritten and very important. That is known to everybody. The unwritten part of the Simla Agreement is that all things should be settled along the line of actual control, with minor adjustments.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Dr. Dutta, we have a line of control about time.

DR. B.B. DUTTA: I will finish within two minutes, Madam.

...(Interruptions)...

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI: There is the Chairman's dinner.

SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA: Madam, the line will have to be drawn by you.

DR. B.B. DUTTA: Madam, I am summing up. My only submission is, why do you fail to say things right in the face of the people who have been playing these games bluntly and openly—that if they want friendship, it has to be built on truth, it has to be built on objective facts, it has to be built on confidence generated in the perspective of what has transpired before? All these things must be made clear. I do not understand somebody else committing wrong deeds and our feeling shy of talking about it. We feel shy to take a very courageous stand while the misdeeds are being done by others. I think we have this congenital defect in India, and this kind of policy the nation does not approve of today, the upcoming generations will not approve of today. We want to see India as a strong, resurgent India, a powerful India, and its power being utilised for the good of the people. The significance of power lies in the strength being there, not in its being used. We do not like to be war-

mongering nation or a conquering nation. But these are the few things I have to say...*(Time-bell)*...

Madam, now that you have rung the bell, I will reconcile myself to this. But my only submission to the hon. Prime Minister is this: Kindly restore the prestige, the dignity, of the nation. We have lost dignity, we have lost prestige. In the eyes of the world today, India is nothing. We have gone to many countries, in delegations and otherwise also. We have seen—let us be very frank—what prestige India enjoys today. You do not enjoy any prestige if you are not economically powerful, if you are not well-equipped in terms of Defence preparedness and if you do not take foreign policy options in a very hard way, in an independent way. We are not, we do not. That is why we are not the leader of the NAM today, that is why we are not a member of the Security Council today. Who will follow a leader who does not know how to protect others, does not know how to retain the independence of his own nation? Who will follow him?

Earlier they believed Nehru because he was a defiant leader, a courageous man, an inspiring man. He was talking those things, he was reflecting the values of Asia and Africa in his foreign policy formulations. Those values are missing today.

With these words, Madam, I thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is confirmed that Dr. Dutta is a Professor, because he spoke so well on it.

SHRI BHUVNESH CHATURVEDI: So well or so long?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Prime Minister.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI I.K. GUJRAL): Madam Deputy Chairman, I am grateful to you for calling me to speak. I do not know if all the few

Members that are left will leave by the time I finish.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: At least I can assure you, Mr. Prime Minister, that I will be sitting here.

SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA: We will also be here, Sir.

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI: All those who are sitting at this point of time, will continue to sit.

SHRI I.K. GUJARAL: To begin with, I want to address myself to Prof. Dutta who was the last speaker. I want to do so before he leaves. All those who spoke before me, except one or two, have gone. Anyhow, since Dr. Dutta is here, let me talk to him.

It was very interesting speech that Prof. Dutta made. I have great respect for him, for his knowledge and for his expertise. But, at some point of time, I also lost my way when he was speaking. He says the great things that India has done, but, unfortunately, he came to the conclusion that India was not respected anywhere. I am surprised to hear this. I think that shows either a lack of assessment or a lack of belief in this great nation.

As I have said in a meeting of the Bangladesh Friendship Association, which he was chairing a while ago, India today stands on the threshold of greatness. In this 50th year of the Indian Republic, I say with great pride, not because I am Prime Minister but because I am a humble Indian, that we feel that we have many things to feel proud of. We are proud of the fact that we won our freedom and defeated the mightiest colonial empire. We feel proud of the fact that in these fifty years we have constructed our independent foreign policy. The test came in this sphere also. The CTBT was a test. Did India not stand up and defeat those designs? Did India not stand up whenever an issue arose of doing something, and did we not do

anything? We did. I do not say so because I was Foreign Minister and today I am Prime Minister. I have great faith in this nation.

India has been following a policy regarding South Asia also as a part of a great venture, and that great venture has been that, 50 years ago, when India became free, the entire sub-continent became free. Unfortunately the machinations of the imperial rulers were such that things happened the way it should not have happened. But, I don't want to go into that past. All the same, I say with a great deal of confidence that today we are going and seeing beyond these fifty years.

The SAARC Meeting that I attended three days ago gave me a great courage and a great hope because all the seven countries in the sub-continent got together to have a vision of the next half-a-century, up to 2020. What do we want this sub-continent to be? If India today occupies nearly 80 per cent of the land mass and if the Indian economy is really 80 per cent of the collective GDP of the seven nations, naturally India plays a big role in this also. India plays a big role, and it spells itself out in what is being assigned as my doctrine.

We do not want reciprocity because if we have a trade balance with Bangladesh, if our exports to them are Rs. 3,600 crores and we get from them petty Rs. 200 crores or Rs. 300 crores or Rs. 700 crores, what reciprocity should I ask for? Should I ask for reciprocity from Bhutan; Should I ask for reciprocity from Nepal? Should I ask for reciprocity from Maldives? I think it will be a wrong policy to look at reciprocity in that sense. The main point is that basically India has reached a stage of growth and development, economically and otherwise, when India can afford to be great and gracious. Therefore, we are a self-confident nation. We face the world today as a self-confident nation.

I think Prof. Dutta said that we are

confining ourselves to South Asia. We are not. In this year alone, we have made new relationships with the entire ASEAN. We are full-dialogue partners. We are Members of the ARF. We have gone to Africa, and we have opened a new era by the Indian Ocean Rim Association. Today our relations with Central Asia are remarkably different. The other day I went to Iran, and we signed the tripartite treaty with Turkmenistan and Iran which opens a new way for me to get into Central Asia. Is it confining ourselves?

Or do we think that greatness comes only when somebody in Timbuktu recognizes us? I do not want to name those nations, about whom we get stuck sometimes. We think that unless a certificate comes from the people of a far-off land, who speak some language which we like to appreciate, there is no greatness. I think that this is something which we must think about separately and we should think differently now. I have not gone round quoting the certificate from anybody. I have not gone round to so-called unilateral powers to tell me whether we are following a right path or not. We have not and we shall not, because India will live in this world on its own terms. India is living on its own terms. I say with a great deal of satisfaction, and I repeat what I said, that in this 50th year we are trying to visualise the future. Every country of the world today talks globally, but thinks regionally. Is the European Community not a regional cooperation? Are not Canada, America and Mexico a regional cooperation? Are not the three such units in Latin America not a regional cooperation? Is Africa not having those thinks? Yes, the point today is that one has to think globally, but act regionally. That is what is happening in the world and that is what we are doing also. In the region also, we feel that we have a sense of responsibility. That sense of responsibility tells me that not only has India to go ahead, but India has to carry its neighbours also with it. It is not a

good thing for me, if I am a great power tomorrow or a rich power tomorrow, but my neighbours are poor and backward. No, it does not help me. I think it is a great thing for India; and that was Mahatma Gandhi's mission.

The first Asian conference, has been referred to. Why did we talk in that sense? We always talked in that sense, because we thought in terms of a new relationship amongst those who were struggling against the colonial rule.

My friends have talked about NAM. What is it after all? NAM is an association of those countries, which had to fight against colonialism. It is not a bloc. It is not a sort of community. It is a movement—the Non-Aligned Movement. It does not have a secretariat. It does not have office-bearers. It is a movement. The movement is an assertion by those who suffered for centuries under the colonial era. Shall we demolish it? Shall we abolish it? Shall we say that you have no role to play? 113 nations are together and we tell them that we are not friends of yours! In one of those nations Gandhi Ji was politically born. Gandhi Ji was physically born in this nation, but was politically born in South Africa. And, if South Africa and I stand together today, I am also carrying forward that heritage of Gandhi Ji. Therefore, the main point that you may kindly keep in mind is, let us never think of NAM in terms of whether they voted for us or did not vote for us. Let us think in the sense that here are the countries which sometimes do not have options available to them, because of their economic situations, because of the pressures that come on them, but, all the same they came here. We got their Ministers meeting here last month only. What did we say together? Together we said—113 in number “We shall not accept the United Nations reforms that you are spelling out.” We said no. And they had to postpone it. Minus that conference, today you would have seen a new face of the United Nations. There two major powers would have been admitted

and we would have been standing out. They dare not do it now, because 113 nations said so collectively. These 113 nations are now thinking in terms of what I call G-15. G-15 is an extension of the NAM itself. We are now talking in terms of South-South cooperation. Today we are in a better position to have South-South cooperation than ever before because some of us very fortunately have economically developed. Therefore, we are able to lend our support to those who are not so much developed. That is NAM. This is also NAM when the Group of 77 gets together not only once or twice, but two or three times in a year and asserts collectively. That assertion is NAM. This assertion is by all those who suffered for centuries and have stood together. Therefore, please do not get lost on this thing, whether so and so has voted for us or not. This is the game-plan of those who want the NAM to be abolished. Please do not fall in that trap. Once we start judging our own achievements from the eyes of those who do not want us to come together, that will be our inferiority complex. When people tell us that such and such paper wrote this and that point about us, because they write in the English language and we can read it here, we should not feel that our policy must have failed. Our policy's success lies in the roots of this. I personally feel, and feel with a great deal of satisfaction, if not with pride, that in the last few years we have travelled a lot. We have gone forward. The new economic policy, whatever name you give it, has given us strength. It is not because it is new, it is because it is a version of our own economic policy. People talk in terms of India having a large market. This market was not born three years ago.

This market is a product of fifty years of effort and fifty years of effort has created this market. Sometimes, some people in their myopia think that all this has been created by magic three years ago. No. This has been created by the

effort, by the labour, by the toil of this nation itself. Therefore, we take pride in this. This market also does not make us spell out the rules of the market; no. Today, India doesn't think in terms of market rules because market can be very cruel also. India thinks in terms of people who are Indians and we first want to serve them and then serve anybody else.

I am always conscious of this fact and I have said when I took over my office, and I repeat what I have said: "My first mission, my first commitment, my first charge is those 70 per cent of the people who are still poor, who are still left out, who are still suffering, be they farmers, be they labourers and those who are backward castes and backward classes, whatever they are." When we talk in terms of social justice, we also think in these that whatever wealth we created must be utilised for the social amelioration. Fortunately, now we are thinking in terms of women's rights. I feel proud of the fact that in this nation, now we have reached a stage when we think that women must get their due rights. I hope that within this are we will be able to sort it out.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I expect Members to clap at least on such an issue.

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL: Madam, this is nation of Gandhi. In 1937—I do not know how many people were around but I was—when for the first time the Congress Governments were formed in nine provinces, Gandhiji insisted on two things that there would not be any Government in which a woman was not a Minister and that there would not be any Government in which a member of the Scheduled Castes was not a Minister. That is how we began and this is how we are going to sustain this country. India's foreign policy is not foreign. It is India's policy. Therefore, this policy is rooted in India's it is rooted in India's traditions, it is rooted in India's history and it is rooted in India's pride more than anything else.

Many people have tried to stop us, many people have said about our cryogenic engine programme, our nuclear programme. I do not want to spell out those because I don't think I will get provoked. I don't think my Members will ask me to get provoked and reveal things which I should not reveal. I will not and I will resist and temptation. But I can assure this House on one point and through this House, the nation, that Indian security is my first responsibility and India's security is taken due care of. I hope that you will kindly cooperate with me on this. Please have faith in India. Once you have faith in India, we are quite safe and we are quite secure. How is it happening—is it happening by chance—that those who were till yesterday cursing you, calling you names, today want to make friends with you? Why is it happening? It is happening because India has arrived somewhere and India is arriving somewhere and India had a journey to cover and that journey is a journey which has been spelt out to us by our founding-fathers. Therefore, please think in terms of foreign policy in that context. It is very easy for me to reply to you point by point. I think I have bored you enough. I am not going to do that. But I am going to do one thing and that is, whenever, you think of India, kindly have faith in the 50th year in India's greatness. I am a humble man. You have put me in this office. I am grateful to you. You have also loaded me with this responsibility which I am trying to discharge. You have placed faith in me. I will not let you down. That is the only thing I can promise. One thing that I can promise you more is, when I see you, I mean particularly the poor people of this country, the farmers of this country, the labourers of this country and the women of this country, the suffering sections of society in this country, I always think of India. We must always remember Gandhiji's promise. Gandhiji said, "India would be free that day when there is not a single tear in any eye." That tear is our

vision. That is our future. That is our struggle. Therefore, I am trying to marry India's foreign policy in that context. When I think of India's foreign policy, I do not think theoretically. I do not read India's foreign policy in a textbook. I do not read India's foreign policy in articles that are written by people for or against. People damn me also. People condemn me also. It is their purpose. But I beseech this House, particularly, please don't get carried away if some people write differently about us. That is not the issue. You can dismiss me any day you like. I am a humble man. But never dismiss India, never dismiss India's destiny.

Never dismiss that tryst which that great man made on all our behalf. That tryst has to be carried forward. Thank

you, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Prime Minister. I must announce that all those Members who participated in the debate, except two, are here. The rest of them are others who wanted to hear your views on the foreign policy. All of them who spoke—Mr. Baby gave his name, but he was not there to speak—except two, have sat back this late to hear your views on the foreign policy. Thank you very much for your kind words for women.

With these words, I adjourn the House till 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at forty-one minutes past six of the clock till eleven of the clock on Friday, the 16th May, 1997