

[कुमारी सईदा खातून]

की जमीन को गिरवी रख कर के प्रशिक्षण लेता है। इसलिए मेरी मांग है कि बी. एड. प्रशिक्षण पर जो रोक लगाई गई है उसको जल्दी से जल्दी हटाया जाए। धन्यवाद।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now we will start the discussion on the working of the Ministry of External Affairs. Yes, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee.

श्री जसवंत सिंह (राजस्थान): लंच ब्रेक अभी से तय कर लीजिये। मत कीजिये।

उपसभापति: नहीं नहीं लंच ब्रेक होगा। आप 15 मिनट के लिए बोल लें फिर लंच के बाद बोल सकते हैं।

If the House so agree we will adjourn for lunch now and you can start after some time.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (मध्य प्रदेश): मेरे भाषण के बाद लंच कर लीजिये।

उपसभापति: वाजपेयी जी आप कितना समय लेंगे

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी: महोदयों मैं ज्यादा समय नहीं बोलूंगा। दो बजे तक बोलूंगा।

उपसभापति: मुझे लगता है कि हम अभी लंच के लिए एड न कर देते हैं। आज स्पेशल मेशन भी बहुत लम्बे हो गये हैं इसलिए आज हाऊस जरा ज्यादा देर तक चलेगा। आज हम थोड़ी ज्यादा देर तक बैठेंगे। We will adjourn for lunch now and shall meet again at 2.15 P.M.

The House then adjourned for lunch at seventeen minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at seventeen minutes past two of the clock.

The Vice-Chairman (Shri Jagesh Desai) in the Chair.

Discussion on the working of the Ministry of External Affairs

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): We shall now take up the discussion on the working of the Ministry of External Affairs. Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee to initiate the discussion.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (मध्य प्रदेश): उसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज जब मैं विदेश मंत्रालय के कार्यक्रम पर चर्चा आरंभ करने के लिए खड़ा हूँ तो मुझे 1964 और 1967 का समय याद आ रहा है। उन दिनों में इसी सदन का सदस्य था। हमारे प्रथम प्रधान मंत्री विदेश मंत्री भी थे, मदन में नियमित रूप से अंतर्राष्ट्रीय परिस्थिति के बारे में चर्चा होती थी। चर्चा का प्रस्ताव स्वयं पंडित जो की तरफ से आता करता था। अब तो वह परम्परा टूट गयी लगती है। अंतर्राष्ट्रीय परिस्थिति और उसमें भारत सरकार की नीति, यह ऐसा विषय है जो राष्ट्रीय हितों के साथ जुड़ा हुआ है और राष्ट्रीय हित काहे हम उधर बैठे हों या इधर बैठे हों, हमें आपस में जोड़ देते हैं। किसी विशेष परिस्थिति में राष्ट्रीय हित क्या है, इसकी परिकल्पना में थोड़ा बहुत मतभेद हो सकता है लेकिन हित जब हमें जोड़ते हैं तो वे विदेश नीति को एक स्थायित्व प्रदान करते हैं; ऐसा स्थायित्व जिसमें जड़त नहीं होती, गतिशीलता होती है, जिसमें निरन्तरता होती है, लेकिन दिशाहीनता नहीं होती। मैं देख रहा हूँ कि विदेश नीति पर चर्चा के अवसर बहुत कम हो गये हैं। केवल सदन में ही चर्चा पर्याप्त नहीं है। यह ऐसा विषय कि सदन के बाहर भी इस पर लगातार विचार-विनिमय होना चाहिए।

इसलिए मैंने विदेश मंत्री, श्री को.वी. नरसिंह राव जी से अनुरोध किया था कि विदेश मंत्रालय से जुड़ी हुई मुद्दों पर

समिति की बैठक भारत और नेपाल के संबंधों में जो संकट पैदा हो गया है— उस पर चर्चा करने के लिए बुलाई जाए। मैं चाहता था कि वह बैठक सदन में मंत्रालय की मांगों आने से पहले और इस सदन में मंत्रालय के कार्यकरण पर चर्चा होने से पहले हो। लेकिन मुझे खेद है कि पी०वी० नरसिंह राव जी ने मेरा अनु-रोध स्वीकार नहीं किया। उन्होंने मुझे जवाब दे दिया कि मंत्रालय के बारे में चर्चा होने जा रही है। सदन में तो चर्चा होगी, लेकिन नेपाल और भारत के संबंध अमानक इस तरह क्यों बिगड़ गये? इसके बारे में अनौपचारिक चर्चा जरूरी है। मुझे नेपाल का पक्ष बताने की कोशिश की गई है। उनकी जो नई दिल्ली में राजदूत महीदया है, वह लोगों से मिल रही है। सबको बता रही है, लेकिन मुझे अपनी सरकार का पूरा पक्ष मालूम नहीं है। यह स्थिति अच्छी नहीं है।

हमें समस्याओं की पृष्ठभूमि चाहिए हमें विदेश नीति के बारे में लगातार संपर्क में रहने की—एक दूसरे के सम्पर्क में रहने की आवश्यकता है। श्री नटवर सिंह जी ने ठीक कहा—मैं उनके भाषण को पढ़ रहा था कि देश में आम तौर पर; मोटे तौर पर विदेश नीति के बारे में एक राष्ट्रीय सहमति रही है। यह ठीक है कि कुछ लोग रहे हैं जो चाहते थे कि हम इस गुट में मिल जाएं, कुछ लोग चाहते थे कि हम उस गुट में मिल जाएं, लेकिन भारत का बहुमत, भारत में चिंतन की मुख्य धारा, इसमें विरोधी दल भी शामिल थे, इस नीति से सहमत था कि हम किसी सैनिक गुट में नहीं मिलेंगे और हमें हर प्रश्न का स्वतंत्र रूप से चिंतन करके फैसला करना है। आज तो उस नीति की एक तरह से विजय हो गई है।

गुट-निरपेक्षता का अर्थ था सन्सार की विभिन्नता को स्वीकार करना; विभिन्न सामाजिक, आर्थिक व्यवस्थाओं को स्वीकार करते हुए उनके सहअस्तित्व की कल्पना करना।

आज अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय परिस्थिति में जो परिवर्तन हुए हैं, बड़े सुखद हैं, बड़े आश्चर्यजनक और बड़े नाटकीय परिवर्तन हुए हैं। कभी-कभी तो बदली हुई दुनिया पहचान में नहीं आती, लेकिन दुनिया बदली है। दो महाशक्तियों में समझौता हो गया, पहली बार ऐसा समझौता हो गया, जिसमें एक विशेष तरह के अणु अस्त्रों का नियंत्रण करने की नहीं, घटाने की बात की गई है और शस्त्र घटाये जा रहे हैं। इसके लिए निरीक्षण है की व्यवस्था की गई है। रूस के प्रतिनिधि अमरीका में जाकर देख रहे हैं कि इंटर-कांटेनेंटल बैलिस्टिक मिसाइल डिसेमंटल कर दी गई हैं या नहीं और अमरीका वाले रूस में जाकर देख रहे हैं। कुछ समय पहले इसकी कल्पना भी नहीं होती थी।

सोवियत संघ ने एकतरफा अपनी सेना में कटौती की घोषणा की है और कटौती पर वह अमल कर रहा है। आई०एन० एफ० का समझौता एक ऐतिहासिक समझौता है और सचमुच में विचित्र बात यह है कि उस समझौते पर दस्तखत किये प्रेजीडेंट रीगन ने, जो यह कहते थे कि सोवियत संघ इज इन इविल इपाथ और उस समझौते पर दस्तखत किये सोवियत संघ के नेता ने जो सोवियत संघ सोचता था कि हमें सारी दुनिया की लाख रंग में रंगना है। जिस तरह से श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने गुट-निरपेक्षता की नीति की परिकल्पना करके उस शीत युद्ध से हमारे विश्व में बड़े साहस और दूरदर्शिता का काम किया था, राष्ट्रपति गेरबाचेव भी बड़ी हिम्मत का काम कर रहे हैं। इस समझौते की दुनिया में और भी परिणाम हुआ है क्षेत्रीय विवाद झूल हुए हैं। ईरान और ईराक की लड़ाई बंद हो गई। खाड़ी में बड़ी शांति है। अफगानिस्तान से सोवियत सेना खली गई अफगानिस्तान में सोवियत हस्तक्षेप नहीं होना चाहिए था। अब मैं सारे इतिहास में जाना नहीं चाहता। उन दिनों मैं न्यूयार्क में था। सैनिक हस्तक्षेप की आवश्यकता भी नहीं थी, लेकिन उस समय सोवियत संघ ने एक फैसला किया और बाद में उन्हें लगा कि यह गलती हो

[श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी]

गई। अब क्यूबा की सेनाएं अंगोला से जा रही हैं। कंपूचिया से विद्यतनाम की सेनाएं हट जाएं इस संबंध में सार्थक बातचीत हो रही है। पी०एल०ओ० ने इजरायल के अस्तित्व को स्वीकार कर लिया है। अमरीका ने पी०एल०ओ० के साथ बातचीत शुरू कर दी है। यह ठीक है कि जरायल अड़ा हुआ है। उसके रवैये में परिवर्तन होना चाहिए। इजरायल अरबों के जिस भू-भाग पर अधिकार करके बैठा है, उसका कोई औचित्य नहीं है। उससे इजरायल को जाना पड़ेगा। अगर पश्चिम-एशिया के सवाल पर कोई अंतराष्ट्रीय सम्मेलन हो जिसके लिए भारत जोर दे रहा है तो इस संबंध में रास्ता निकल सकता है। संसार में नए समीकरण उत्पन्न हो रहे हैं, पुराने भेद-भाव भुलाए जा रहे हैं, नए स्नेह-सुख जोड़े जा रहे हैं। इन बदलते हुए समीकरणों में हमारी विदेश नीति भी और हमारी कूटनीति भी बड़ी गतिवात्मक चाहिए। कभी-कभी लगता है कि हमारी कूटनीति इस चुनौती का ठीक तरह से जवाब नहीं दे पा रही है। अफगानिस्तान से रूस की सेनाएं चली जाएंगी तब क्या होगा क्या इस पर गहराई से सोचा गया और था। मैं मानता अमरीका ने जो जनेवा समझौता किया था उसका ईमानदारी से पालन नहीं कर रहा है। जिस तरह से मुजाहिदों को मदद दी जा रही है वह तो अफगानिस्तान में कोई शांति पाने का, अफगानिस्तान को एक गुट-निरपेक्ष देश के रूप में निखारने का तरीका नहीं है। मगर कोई कुछ कर नहीं पा रहा है। हम भी असहाय बने हैं, सिवाय इसके कि सैक्युरिटी कौंसिल में हम अपनी बात जोर से कह दें। हमारी भूमिका क्या है? शायद हमने सोचा होगा कि सोवियत संघ इतनी जल्दी नहीं जायेगा। श्री नटवर सिंह जी अफगानिस्तान के पुराने शाह से मिलते रहे हैं, लेकिन मुझे नहीं लगता कि हम इस समय अफगानिस्तान में कोई ऐसी सार्थक भूमिका निभा पा रहे हैं। ठीक है, हम अफगानिस्तान की सरकार को समर्थन दे, मगर हम यह भी मांग कर रहे हैं कि वह सरकार ब्रॉड-बेस्ड होनी चाहिए, तो ब्रॉड-बेस्ड सर-

कार में जो और तत्व शामिल होंगे, जो और गुट शामिल होंगे या उनसे हमारे कोई संबंध हैं? वे भारत विरोधी नहीं हैं, मगर हम उन्हें अतः विरोधी गिन रहे हैं यह उचित नहीं है। इसी तरह से कल सोवियत-संघ और चीन के संबंध सुधर सकते हैं। सुधरने चाहिए। हमारे लिए एक नई परिस्थिति पैदा होती है आज सारे गुट निरपेक्ष आंदोलन के सामने एक नई परिस्थिति पैदा हो गई है। जब तक शीत युद्ध था महाशक्तियों में अंतर में होड़ थी, विरोध था। हमें लगता था कि हमारे पास एक मिशन है। अब तो लगता है कि जैसे करने के लिए कुछ काम ही नहीं है। मैं हाल में यूनाइटेड नेशंस में था। जनरल असेंबली की बैठक में मैं देख रहा था कि गुट निरपेक्ष राष्ट्र नई भूमिका की तलाश कर रहे थे। अब भारत को पहल करनी है कि गुट-निरपेक्षता को एक नई रेलवेस, एक नई प्रासंगिकता दें। गुट-निरपेक्षता कोई मंत्र नहीं है, एक ढांचा है, एक निदेश-निर्देश है।

दक्षिण-दक्षिण में जितना सहयोग होना चाहिए, सहयोग नहीं है। एक नई अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय व्यवस्था के लिए जितना प्रयत्न होना चाहिए उतना प्रयत्न नहीं है। कभी-कभी ऐसा लगता है कि जो शांति के तकाजे हैं, शांति की बात करने वाले, जब शांति सचमुच में आ जाती है तो उन तकाजों को पूरा करते हुए नहीं दिखाई देते।

मुझे याद है, सोवियत संघ के नेता आए थे, 1980 की बात है। उन्होंने भाषण दिया। उनको यह कहना पड़ा कि यह अफवाहें फैल गईं जा रही हैं कि सोवियत संघ भारत का साथ छोड़ देगा यह अफवाहें गलत हैं, हमारी और आपकी मित्रता कुछ स्थायी पाँदशों के आधार पर कायम हुई है। सोवियत संघ कुछ क्षेत्रों में यह प्रश्न पूछा जा रहा है कि नीति बदल रही है, हमारा क्या होगा? अब सोवियत रूस अगर चीन का मित्र हो जाएगा तो हमारा क्या होगा? पहले से हम इस बात पर जोर दे रहे हैं और इसमें सच्चाई है कि हमें अपने पैरों पर खड़ा होना होगा। हमें भी नए समीकरण

खोजने हैं। इस बदलाती हुई दुनिया में अपनी कूटनीति को ऐसा गतमात्रा में देना होगी कि यह जो बदलाती हुई समांतरण है, यह हमारे लिए अक्सर भी बन जाय और चुनौती के रूप में हम इनका उपयोग करके जैसा विश्व बन जा चहते हैं और जिन तरह के भारत के राष्ट्रीय उद्देश्यों को पूरा करना चाहते हैं, उनको पूरा कर सकें। उपाध्यक्ष जी! अखिर में तो वदेश-नीति का लक्ष्य राष्ट्र की स्वतंत्रता की रक्षा करना है, सामाग्री को अधुषण रखना है और देश के विकास के लिए जो रास्ता हमने चुना है, उस रास्ते पर अवरोध बढ़ने की परिस्थिति पैदा करना है। इन उद्देश्यों में कोई मतभेद नहीं हो सकता।

प्रधानमंत्री जी चीन गए थे, पाकिस्तान गए थे। ये देश हमारे पड़ोसी हैं। चीन के साथ हमारे संबंधों का एक बड़ा कटु अध्याय है। मैं स्वयं 1979 में चीन गया था, बातचीत अच्छी हुई, मगर उन्होंने उसी बीच वियतनाम पर हमला करके सारी यात्रा पर पानी फेर दिया। इस बार इस तरह को कोई दुर्घटना नहीं हुई है, मुझे संतोष है। लेकिन कितनी विदेश-यात्रा की सकलता की कसौटी यह नहीं हो सकती कि किस नेता का हाथ किस नेता के हाथ में कितने मिनट था। जहां हाथ ही नहीं मिलाया गया, अदब-अर्ज किया गया, या हम वहां मान लें कि बातचीत, यात्रा बिल्कुल विफल हो गई। संबंधों की सार्थकता की यह भी कसौटी नहीं है कि दो देशों के प्रधान, राष्ट्राध्यक्ष, प्रधानमंत्री एक-दूसरे को फस्टु नाम से संबोधित करते हैं। अगर मैं पी०वी० नरसिंहराव जी की जगह कहां—

How are you, Nursimaha?

और फिर नरसिंहराव जी कहें—
Atal, I am fine. How are you?

SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA (Uttar Pradesh): He is not nursing properly.

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV (Maharashtra): Nursing should be atal.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : यह पर्याप्त नहीं है, इसका लाभ है एक सीमा तक। मगर देश के हितों में अगर टकराव होता है और स्वायत्त में सारा समझ नहीं बैठाया जा सकता तो संबंध बिगड़ते हैं। प्रधान मंत्रियों की चीन यात्रा के संबंध में अभी तक एक प्रश्न अनुत्तरित है। मैंने उस दिन सलाहकार समिति में भी यह प्रश्न उठाया था कि जब प्रधान मंत्री चीन गए और चीन के नेताओं ने तिब्बत का सवाल उठा दिया तो उन्होंने तिब्बत के बारे में हमें कुछ कहने का मौका दे दिया था। मैं नेहरू जी का प्रशंसक हूं, मगर तिब्बत को चीन का अंग मानकर नेहरू जी ने हिमालय जैसी भूल की थी। यह भूल किस कारण हुई, इसमें मैं विस्तार से जानना नहीं चाहता तिब्बत को भी स्वतंत्र होने का अधिकार है। लेकिन भूल हो गई। तिब्बत को चीन का आटोनोमस रोजन माना गया था। आज कहां है— आटोनोमी? मानवाधिकारों का उल्लंघन हो रहा है, मार्शल-ला घोषित कर दिया गया, बड़े पैमाने पर दमन है, आतंक है। अब जब चीन के नेताओं ने स्वयं तिब्बत का मामला उठाकर हमें मौका दे दिया था कि हम तिब्बत में मानवाधिकारों के उल्लंघन का सवाल उठाएं, उस तरफ चीनी-नेताओं का ध्यान खोचें और मित्रता के वातावरण में यह चर्चा करें। हमने उस अवसर का लाभ नहीं उठाया? श्री दलाई लामा के दृष्टिकोण में परिवर्तन हुआ है, उस परिवर्तन का पीछा में स्वागत होना चाहिए। लेकिन तिब्बती अपनी पहचान के लिए, अपनी अस्तित्व के लिए लड़ रहे हैं। चीन में अत्यन्त रिवोल्यूशन के दिनों में जो गलतियां हुई थीं, घरेलू मामलों में जो भूलें हुई थीं उनको सुधारने का प्रयत्न हो रहा है। चीन को चाहिए कि विदेशी मामलों में उन्होंने जो गलतियां की थीं, उनसे सुधार करें। इस ओर हमें उन्हें प्रवृत्त करना चाहिए। लेकिन अगर हम तिब्बत के बारे में मौन धारण कर के बैठे रहे तो न हम तिब्बत के साथ न्याय करेंगे और न अपने साथ न्याय करेंगे।

[श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी]

महोदय, मानवधिकारों का सवाल एक सवाल एक देश तक सीमित नहीं है। पाकिस्तान में लोकतंत्र आ गया हम काफी खुश हैं। हमारे सम्बंधों में और सुधार हो, आनंद की बात है, लेकिन सम्बंधों में सुधार हुआ या नहीं—मेरी दृष्टि में इसको एक ही कसौटी है कि क्या पाकिस्तान ने भारत के घरेलू मामलों में, जिनमें पंजाब और जम्मू काश्मीर शामिल हैं, हस्तक्षेप करना बंद कर दिया है। यह बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आती कि पाकिस्तान का पंजाब में हस्तक्षेप जारी है, मगर कम हो गया है। क्या मतलब है इसका? फिर कहा जाता है कि बेगम बेनबीर तो कम करना चाहती है मगर और तब वह कम नहीं करने देते। तो हम पाकिस्तान की सरकार से सम्बंध रखें या और तबों की खोज करते फिरें? और फिर जम्मू काश्मीर में तो नयी घुसपैठ शुरू हुई है। पंजाब में पाकिस्तान की आतंकवादियों को मदद जारी है। जम्मू काश्मीर में जारी गति-विधियों के बारे में, आपको याद है प्रश्नकाल में आज एक सवाल पर कितना हंगामा मचा था। यह बात पाकिस्तान के सामने दृढ़ता से रखने की सूरत है।

सभापति जी, अब मैं नेपाल पर आना चाहता हूँ। नेपाल हमारा पड़ोसी है। विदेश मंत्री ने ठीक कहा कि हमारे उनके सम्बंध यूनिक हैं, अद्वितीय हैं। दुनिया के कोण देश इतने निकट नहीं हो सकते जितने भारत और नेपाल हैं। इतिहास ने भूगोल ने, परम्परा ने, संस्कृति ने, धर्म ने, नदियों ने हमें बांधा है। 1700 मिलोमीटर की सीमा खुली है न पासपोर्ट की जरूरत है, न वीसा की जरूरत है। भारतीय वहाँ काम करते हैं। लाखों नेपाली यहाँ काम करते हैं। गोरखा हमारी सेना से सम्बद्ध रहे हैं, अभी भी जुड़े हैं। अब अचानक यह क्या हो गया? मेरे पास एक चिट्ठी आई है काठमांडू से। यह 10 अप्रैल की लिखी हुई है। चिट्ठी आठवाणी जी की सम्बोधित की गयी है।

मुझे भी उन्होंने इसी आशय की चिट्ठी लिखी है। मैं एक अंश उद्धृत कर रहा हूँ—

“Nepal is facing an acute shortage of essential commodities after the expiry of trade and transit treaty on March 23. Nepal feels that India has put economic blockade against it. People in the Kingdom are not getting salt, kerosene, sugar, petrol, diesel, cooking gas, medicines and other items. Rationing has been introduced and whatever is available is being distributed among people standing in big queues in each ward of the town Panchayat.”

यह वहाँ रहने वाले एक भारतीय का पत्र है। अब भारत सरकार का यह कहना ठीक है कि नेपाल तब करले और जब हम नेपाल की बात कहते हैं तो नेपाल की सरकार से हमारा मतलब होता है, नेपाल की सरकार तब करले कि वह भारत के साथ क्या सम्बंध चाहती है? कठिन ई यह हो रही है कि इसमें नेपाल की जनता पीड़ित हो रही है। हमारे यहाँ तो सरकारी कामों के लिए जनता को भागीदार होना पड़ेगा क्योंकि लोकतंत्र है। अगर सरकार अच्छी नहीं है तो चूंकि लोगों ने चुनी है, उन्हें भुगतना है। मगर नेपाल में हम यह नहीं कह सकते। वहाँ राजतंत्र है। शासन में नेपाली जनता को आवाज नहीं है। वह पूछ रही है, वह अपने शासकों से पूछेगी, वह हम से भी पूछती है कि यह क्या हुआ? यह नौबत क्यों आई? कहा जाता है कि 1987 से ही नेपाल ने भारत के साथ भेदभाव शुरू कर दिया था। उन्होंने भारतीयों को विदेशी माना जाए, इस तरह का नोटिफिकेशन जारी कर दिया था। जो तीसरे देशों की कम्पनियाँ भारतीयों को रखती हैं, उनमें भी भारतीयों को रखने पर आपत्ति की जा रही थी। फिर कहा जा रहा है कि 1988 में कुछ और हुआ। फिर यह मामला इतने साल तक लटकने क्यों दिया गया? 23 मार्च को व्यापार और परिगमन संधियाँ खतम हो गईं। उसके बाद मैं

श्री नरसिंह राव का वक्तव्य देख रहा था कि एक पैकेज तैयार करने में पांच महीने लगे। मैं नहीं जानता किसकी गलती है? हो सकता है नेपाल की गलती हो। फिर पैकेज के अनुसार नेपाल के मंत्री जो वादा करके गए थे, उसपर अमल नहीं हुआ। बात और बिगड़ गई। मुझे लगता है कहीं न कहीं इसमें कुछ कमो रह गई है। पूरे तथ्य मेरे सामने नहीं हैं। हाँ, एक बात मैं जानता हूँ कि नेपाल स सफलता की कूटनीति के निर्वाह का एक ही तरीका है कि नेपाल नरेश के साथ संबंध होना चाहिए। वे सर्वोपरि हैं। नेपाल नरेश के महल में हमेशा ऐसा तत्व रहा है, जो भारत गिरोधी रहा है। जो भारत और नेपाल के बीच में किसी तीसरे देश को लाकर खड़ा कर देता है। इस समय जो संकट है उसमें भी तीसरे देश को छाया है। हमारी गलती यह हुई पहले हम काठमाण्डू में राजदूत भेजते थे तो कोई अंचा राजनीतिक नेता होता था, कोई सम्मान प्राप्त अधिकारी होता था जो नेपाल नरेश के साथ सीधा संबंध स्थापित करने में सफल होता था, इस बार ऐसा नहीं हुआ। जो इस समय राजदूत है व मेरे साथ काम कर चुके हैं, वे एक योग्य अधिकारी हैं। मगर, महल के तकाजे अलग हैं, दरबार की मांग अलग है और अगर राजा का दरबार है तो उसकी स्थिति भिन्न है। अब तो लोकतंत्र में भी दरबार लगने लगे। वहाँ तक किसी की पहुँच है यह देखता होता है? नेपाल में यह नहीं हुआ। यह ठीक है कि 1950 की संधि हमारे जो परम्परागत संबंध थे, उनको कानूनी जामा पहनाने का एक तरीका था, संबंध तो पुराने थे। मुझे नेपाल की राजदूत महोदया मिली थीं, वे कह रही थीं कि हम तो 1950 की संधि का पालन करना चाहते हैं, हम तो 1950 की संधि से बंधे हुए हैं, हमने तो कहा ही नहीं कि हम 1950 की संधि पर पुनर्विचार करना चाहते हैं। यह ठीक है कि नेपाल को तय करना होता कि वे हमारे साथ विशेष संबंध चाहते हैं या मोस्ट फेवर्ड नेशन टीट्रमेंट चाहते हैं।

मैं श्री नरसिंह राव का वक्तव्य देख रहा था कि कानूनी स्थिति यह है कि हमने उन अंतर्राष्ट्रीय हमलों का रेटिफाई नहीं किया है जिनके अंतर्गत एक लैंडाइज कंटरो होने के नाते नेपाल लाभ उठा सके। नेपाल गैट का नहीं है। भारत ने इन्टरनेशनल कन्वेंशन ऑन ट्रांजिट ट्रेड आफ लैंडलॉर्ड्स कंट्रोल को पुष्ट नहीं किया है। भारत ने यू० एन० कन्वेंशन ऑन दि ला आफ सो को भी पुष्ट नहीं किया है। इसलिए भारत का कोई कानूनी दायित्व नहीं है। लेकिन यह मामला इतना कानूनी नहीं है, इतना संकीर्ण नहीं है। इसमें हमारा दायित्व है। नेपाल की जनता के प्रति हमारा दायित्व है और उस दायित्व का हमें पालन करना चाहिए। यह गतिरोध जल्दी से जल्दी हल हो, इस बात की आवश्यकता है। जैसा मैंने कहा, नेपाल को दो टूक फैसला करना पड़ेगा कि वह क्या चाहता है? अगर वह हमारे साथ विशेष सम्बन्ध नहीं रखना चाहता तो सामान्य संबंधों के लिए उनको तैयार होना पड़ेगा। लेकिन हमारा कूटनीति यहाँ कसौटी पर कसी जा रही है। और उसकी सफलता व्यवहार से देखी जाएगी। अब दुनिया में प्रचार हो रहा है—अभी एक यूरोप से सज्जन आए वह बता रहे थे कि यह प्रचार हो रहा है—कि हिन्दुस्तान ने नेपाल का इकानामिक ब्लॉकेड कर दिया है। उन्हें तथ्यों का ज्ञान नहीं है। तथ्य यह है कि भारत चाहे इकानामिक ब्लॉकेड कर दे तो भी कर नहीं सकता क्योंकि हमारी और उनकी सीमा खुली हुई है। धड़ाधड़ तस्करी हो रही है, व्यापारी लाभ उठा रहे हैं और महंगाई उड़ गई है, लोग दुखी हैं। लोगों का विचार करके कोई रास्ता निकालने की आवश्यकता है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री जगेश बेसाई) :
वाजपेयी जी आप और कितना समय लेंगे ?

श्री अटलबिहारी वाजपेयी: दो तीन मुद्दे छोटे छोटे और हैं।

[श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी]

महोदया, पश्चिमी जर्मनी के साथ हमारे संबंध बड़े मैत्रीपूर्ण रहे हैं, हमारा उनका आर्थिक क्षेत्र में सहयोग है, सांस्कृतिक आदान प्रदान है, लेकिन कुछ घटनाएँ ऐसी हो रही हैं जो पश्चिमी जर्मनी के बारे में प्रश्न खड़े कर देती है। पहले तो पनडुब्बी का मामला आया था। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, आपको याद होगा। यूनाइटेड नेशंस का एक कमेटी इसकी जांच कर रही है कि पश्चिमी जर्मनी ने पनडुब्बियों का ब्लू प्रिंट—जिसके आधार पर हमने पनडुब्बियाँ खरीदी हैं, अपने दक्षिण अफ्रीका को कैसे दे दिया दक्षिण अफ्रीका को कोई देश ऐसी सामग्री दे नहीं सकता। पश्चिमी जर्मनी ने उनका उल्लंघन किया और परोक्ष रूप से हम भी उसकी जेब में आ गए।

लोबिया में नैनिकरल की फैक्टरी बनाने का सवाल आया, कैमिकल मैच की फैक्टरी बनाने का सवाल आया तो पश्चिमी जर्मनी का नाम आया। अथ जो खबर आई है वाल स्टूट अर्नल की खबर है, उसमें कहा गया है:

"The West German companies have admitted supplying the nuclear weapons related material, the material being Zirconium to Pakistan and disclosed that one of their unwitting sources was India."

आज भारत सरकार के एक प्रवक्ता ने मान लिया है कि इस तरह का पदार्थ गया था:

"It has been officially stated here today that the Nuclear Fuel Complex in Hyderabad sent a small quantity of zinc alloy tubes to a company in West Germany in 1983-84. The West German firm said that they needed the

tubes for certain tests and gave an undertaking that these would neither be re-exported nor resold.

भरकर उन्हें पाकिस्तान को दे दिया। यह गंभीर मामला है। पश्चिमी जर्मनी ने बड़ी दुबला के साथ और उच्च स्तर पर इस बात को उठाने की आवश्यकता है। देशों के बीच आदान-प्रदान तो होंगे, लेकिन अगर वह हमारे पड़ोस में और हमारी सुरक्षा के लिए संकट पैदा करने वाले मामला दे रहे हैं तो उनके साथ अपने संबंधों पर हमें फिर से विचार करने के लिए तैयार रहना चाहिए।

श्रीलंका में चुनाव हो गए हैं, राष्ट्रपति चुन लिए गए हैं, संसद का गठन हुआ है नार्थ ईस्ट काउन्सिल का निर्माण हो गया है। अब भारत को सेना को वहाँ ज्यादा देर रखने का कोई औचित्य नहीं है, कोई आवश्यकता नहीं है। कोई किना भी निकटस्थ पड़ोसी हो, कोई किना भी गहरा मित्र हो, अगर उसके यहाँ सेना भजने की आवश्यकता पड़ती है तो सेना जल्दी से जल्दी वापस आए इस बात का प्रबंध करना आवश्यक है। अगर कोई विदेशी सेना किसी देश में रहती है जो जन भावना उस देश के खिलाफ बढ़ती है। महाशक्तियों को भी इस बात का अनुभव हो गया है, मगर बड़ी कीमत अदा करने के बाद अमरीका ने विषयनाम में हस्तक्षेप किया था, अमरीका को बेइज्जत होकर जाना पड़ा। हमने हस्तक्षेप नहीं किया, यह ठीक है, हम उनके निमंत्रण पर गए थे।

हमारे जवानों ने अपना बलिदान देकर उनकी सहायता करने की कोशिश की है लेकिन अगर श्रीलंका के लोग शान्ति पाने के लिए तैयार नहीं हैं तो हमारी तो वहाँ हमेशा के लिए शान्ति कायम नहीं कर सकती। हमारी जो भूमिका थी

उसको हमने अदा किया । वैसे भी अब जवान पुलिस का काम कर रहे हैं । उसके लिए फौज की आवश्यकता नहीं है ।

बंगला देश में अब से इस भिन्न राज्य की घोषणा हुई है वहाँ अल्पसंख्यकों में बेचैनी है । घुसपैठ के नाम पर एहले से वहाँ से लोग आ रहे थे और बड़े संख्या में हिन्दू आ रहे हैं । इसके परिणाम अच्छे नहीं होंगे ।

साँक का गठन एक सही दिशा में गठन था । यह भूखण्ड जुड़ा हुआ है । इसको प्रकृति ने जोड़ा है । इसे इतिहास ने जोड़ा है । इसे पर्यावरण जोड़ रहा है । अधिक आवश्यकताएं जोड़ रही हैं । लेकिन अगर द्विपक्षी सम्बन्धों में कड़ुवाहट आ जाती है तो बहुपक्षीय सहयोग में भी बाधाएं उत्पन्न होती हैं । बंगला देश को यह बताना आवश्यक है कि आप अपना बोझा हमारे सिर पर नहीं डाल सकते आप अपनी समस्याओं से जूझिये । आप अपने यहां ऐसी परिस्थितियां पैदा करिये जिसमें सभी लोग सम्मान के साथ रह सकें । भारत ने ऐसी परिस्थितियां पैदा की हैं । बंगला देश में ऐसी परिस्थितियां नहीं हैं ।

आपने मुझे समय दिया इसके लिए मैं आपको धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ । मेरे मित्र वर्मा जी याद दिला रहे हैं कि मेरे भाषण के प्रवाह में नामीबिया छूट गया ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री जगेश बेलाई) : ज़ादा मत दोहराइये ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : अब पकड़ में आ गया अब तो मैं छोड़ नहीं सकता ।

नामीबिया की स्वतंत्रता के लिए सारी दुनियां झगड़ती रही है । सारे देश इस सम्बन्ध में आवाज उठाते रहे हैं । हम आशा करते हैं कि नामीबिया स्वतंत्रता की दिशा में तेजी से आगे बढ़ रहा है ।

एक बात में कहाँ कर खतम करूंगा । भारत एक महान देश है । हमारी एक स्थिति है और उस स्थिति के अनुरूप हमारे दायित्व है और उस स्थिति के अनुरूप हमारी प्रतिष्ठा भी है । उसी स्थिति के अनुरूप हमने अपने विदेश नीति का संचालन भी किया है । विदेश नीति के मामलों में एक तो कांसेप्ट है और एक कांटेक्ट है । कांटेक्ट में कहीं-कहीं गड़बड़ी हुई है । बेसिक कांसेप्ट ठीक है और हमारी जो विदेश सेवा है इसलिए नहीं कि मैं विदेश सेवा से सम्बद्ध रहा था, वह एक योग्य कर्तव्यिक सेवा है । लेकिन इन्हें नई दिल्ली से सही दिशा निर्देश होना चाहिए । नई दिल्ली में कभी-कभी मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि विदेश नीति कहाँ बनती है ? कौन इसका निर्धारण करता है ? फैसले कहाँ किये जाते हैं ? यह देर क्यों हो जाती है ? कभी-कभी उसमें अपरिपक्वता क्यों दिखाई देती है ?

श्री सत्य प्रकाश साँलवीय : विदेश नीति में भी विदेशी हाथ है ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : विदेश नीति का मामला ऐसा मामला है जो सारे राष्ट्र की सभी दलों को राष्ट्रीय हितों के साथ जोड़ देता है । हम सब मिल कर राष्ट्रीय हितों की रक्षा करें इस बात की आवश्यकता है । वैसे चुनाव के साल में यह काम है तो बहुत कठिन, लेकिन इस कठिन काम को भी हमें करके दिखाना पड़गा ।

SHRHI BHUVNESH CHATURVEDI (Rajasthan): Mr. Vive-Chairman, Sir, I am grateful to you for granting me this opportunity. But it is a very difficult situation when a senior Member like Shri Vajpayte, who was once the Foreign Minister of this country, has spoken before me.

The subject is very vital and extensive. Therefore within the limited time it will not be possible for me to touch all the issues concerning us. I would like to touch three or four important issue which concern us in particular and tht

[Shri Bhuvnesh Chaturvedi]

world peace in general. Sir, we very heartily welcome the initiative taken by our Prime Minister Shri Rajiv Gandhi for opening a dialogue with China. As a matter of fact, this was in continuation of the initiative taken by my Mrs. Indira Gandhi long back by appointing an Ambassador, Mr. Narayanan then. At that time we were not having our Ambassador. At the same time official level talks with China also started that time. Therefore, whatever the initiative taken by our Prime Minister to open a dialogue with the Chinese leaders, it was in continuation of and in conformity with the policies earlier. As Shri Vajpayee has also said, the world scene is changing very fast and we cannot stop a dialogue with anybody, even with a country which is not friendly to us. Therefore, it was a very wise, very courageous and very statesmanlike step which Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi had taken to go to China though many of us in this country were critical, apprehensive, about the visit. But we cannot also forget that Shri Vajpayee also took courage to visit China then. I have gone through his speech which he gave in Rajya Sabha in 1962, a very extensive speech, on the resolution and I am deeply impressed by it. Even after that speech, as a Foreign Minister he decided to go to China to open a dialogue. Now, certainly it is discouraging that they did not behave properly at that time. It was the decision of China, whether they wanted to have a dialogue with a Government which was almost a caretaker government at that time and they did not want to enter into any serious dialogue with Vajpayeeji or the then representative of the Janata Party Government—Shri Vajpayee will pardon me for that. But at the same time when Mrs. Gandhi took over South Block, at that time they were interested in entering into a dialogue and that is why a serious dialogue at official level started and appointment of an Ambassador took place. In regard to China I would like to refresh the memory of our friends about the resolution which was passed unanimously at that time on 17th November and I will only read the last portion of it.

[The Vice-Chairman (Shri Satya Prakesh Malaviya in the Chair.)]

"We think and feel that this House affirm the firm resolve of the Indian people to push out the aggressor from the scared soil of India. However long and hard the struggle may be" We must appreciate and try to understand the climate at that time, the emotionally surcharged atmosphere in our country. When this resolution was passed unanimously, almost 165 Members of Lok Sabha participated in the discussion. At the same time I will also invite your attention to a few lines spoken by Panditji while replying to the debate:

"We have nothing against the Chinese people. We regret many things that their Government has done. We think that their Government has acted unfriendly towards us. We cannot help them. Anyhow, we must always distinguish between the people of any country, much more so of a great country, great in size, great in history, and, therefore, we should not transfer somehow our anger, bitterness, at what has been done by the Government to the people."

Therefore, we must always distinguish between what the Government has then done in China and what now the people of China desire. As our estimate goes, they want to be friendly with us and they want to open a dialogue and settle all the disputes and we will have to show all the patience and tact and diplomatic skill in negotiations. But this is a very, very significant step which our Government has taken that we have entered into a serious dialogue with China. Therefore, we must back up this step and we hope that the Chinese will also respond to that.

I would also like to say a few words about Pakistan. We welcome a democratically elected Government in Pakistan, though it is their internal affair as to whether they want to strengthen the democratically elected leadership whether they want to support it; but at the same

time I would also like to mention that we should not create a situation which might embarrass the democratically elected Government. We have tolerated many dictators in Pakistan and many unfavourable decisions taken by them against our interests. We should try to appreciate the difficulties in which the Pakistani Government is working and a democratically elected Government has taken over in Pakistan for the first time after a very very long time. We should try to avoid any pitfalls. We should try not to embarrass the Pakistani Government.

3.00 P.M.

Sir, as Shri Vajpayeeji has said, we also appreciate the dialogue opened between the U.S.A. and the Soviet Union. We are happy that they have come to a dialogue and that they have started talking seriously about world peace. At the same time, we must not forget that the six-nation initiative and the non-aligned movement have created a climate all over the world in which even the giants have been forced to come to some understanding. Whether it is favourable to them or whether it is a compulsion for them, it is better for them to realise. At the same time, the forces of peace in their own countries, in the Soviet Union and in the U.S.A., have also persuaded their leadership to come to terms and make a serious effort for creating peace in the whole world. But it is a very very delicate affair. We shall be happy if the Soviet Union and the U.S.A. come to terms in the interests of world peace. But at the same time we should also safeguard our interests. We are a big country. We have our own role to play in our region and also in the world at large. When these new bridges are being constructed and all the old misunderstandings are being removed, we should also have our options open. We should also try to construct bridges where they are not and we should strengthen our friendship with many other countries with which we are vitally concerned. Therefore, it is time to exercise our options in making friendship with those countries with whom we do not have that intimacy at present.

Sir, there is a very special situation in Afghanistan. We are vitally concerned with it. We appreciate the withdrawal of forces by the Soviet Union. We do not want to go into the details and the compulsions as to why the Soviet Union had sent their forces at that time. But let us appreciate their efforts. They might have taken this step under any compulsions. Our interest with Afghanistan is very vital. We should not allow anybody to come to our borders, destabilise our frontiers and disturb our tranquility. Therefore, we are interested only in a neutral, non-aligned and secular Afghanistan. We are having very friendly relations with the present Government of Afghanistan. Historically also, we are very close to Afghans. Therefore, it will be appreciated if we also open some sort of a dialogue with the Mujahideens and try to influence them. We should not take it for granted that they are very close to Pakistan or that they are untouchables because they are getting arms from Pakistan. We should also try to persuade them to come to terms with the Afghan Government. We should try for an all-party or an all-group Government in Afghanistan. Sir, the other concerned issue is our initiative taken on this Kampuchea. We do appreciate these efforts and a climate has been created when those countries who were not prepared to talk to each other, who were not prepared to tolerate each other, have started talking. And we hope our initiatives will bear fruits. And we congratulate the Government for taking such diplomatic steps, such very silent steps which have brought us near to peace in the South-East Asia.

Sir, coming back to China, I only wish that the Resolution which was passed unanimously by the Parliament should be reviewed, not reviewed in the spirit only, but it should be reviewed because 35 years back the whole country was emotionally surcharged and we had passed that Resolution. We do not deviate where our position is that we shall not secede the territory to China nor we will agree that their aggression will continue. But at the same time, in the whole Resolution or even in Vajpayeeji's speech at that time, it was never mentioned that

[Shri Bhawan Chaturvedi]

we will commit aggression to vacate the territory. Therefore there is only the other alternative left, and that is a dialogue with China. Vajpayeeji has said that the foreign policy is a consensus by the whole nation. And, therefore, the whole nation should beg this move to dialogue with China and beg this Government to come to an understanding. Otherwise also the Constitution does not permit the seceding of a territory. And that is why a small one bigha of land could not be transferred to Bangladesh and the Constitution does not permit it. But, at the same time, how to vacate the aggression? If you cannot enter into a dialogue, how will the other party be persuaded or forced or made to agree to vacate the aggression?

With these words, Sir, I will not take much of your time. I thank you very much for giving me an opportunity.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY (Karnataka): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the foreign policy debate should be an exercise during every session of Parliament. For the last few years, foreign policy issues have come before Parliament in fragments, in bits and pieces, rather in isolation. Parliament, by and large, has confined itself to clarifications. I would like the debate on various major foreign policy issues to take place during every session. My colleague, Mr. Vainayee, has drawn the attention of the Minister to this matter and has reminded him of the very old practice. Sir, many changes have happened in the world. Many more changes have happened and are happening in our own neighbourhood. We do not have an integrated view of foreign affairs with a view to have and to evolve a systematic, co-ordinated approach on the basic foreign policy issues. I would like the Government to come forward with a White Paper. We have not had a White Paper on foreign policy for a long time. This White Paper should be comprehensive enough, precise enough, to include the omissions and commissions of the past, the various new developments and our own approach to the various pressing problems facing India and facing the world. This White Paper should also

contain the approach, the views of the Ministry in regard to the functioning of our diplomatic missions, embassies, in the various countries of the world. A review has got to be undertaken regarding the functioning of our embassies and the White Paper should contain the thinking of the Ministry in regard to the embassies and the working of our embassies.

Having said this, I would now say that the world is familiar with the various formulations regarding international affairs in the past. We have been talking about the basic principles which should form the cornerstone of our foreign policy. We have said that the foreign policy should be based on the inviolability of the independence and the sovereignty of nations. We have said that there should be no interference in the affairs of other countries. We have said that war should not be the arbiter of international disputes and that these disputes should be settled, solved, through peaceful means. We have said also that there should be respect for human rights and respect for the United Nations. Even today, these principles can be regarded—and should be regarded—as laudable and valuable. But there have been violations of these noble principles committed by the various countries of the world. Nations have been unequal though we believe in the equality of nations. There has been, in the past, gunboat diplomacy pursued by the superpowers and the same old, outdated balance of power and block politics pursued by them. This has led to conflicts. This has led to various types of tensions. But of late, this climate has changed considerably mainly because there is a thaw in the relations between two super powers which in turn has set in motion healthy changes in various parts of the world. It looks as if after a good deal of tension, conflict, violence in international affairs peace is breaking out in many parts of the globe. There seems to be a peace offensive as it were, and we are caught up in this peace offensive. That is welcome. This process has got to be carried forward by all the countries if there has got to be international peace and security. India has been a member of the non-aligned movement for long and still is and it is

a member of the Commonwealth of Nations. As a member India has sometimes taken initiative, lent a helping hand to solve or resolve regional disputes but India has also sometimes failed in the international field, partly because we are not a major power yet. Foreign policy of a nation, Mr. Vice-Chairman, derives its strength from the domestic policy and internal strength of the country itself. If a country is not strong enough, its foreign policy whatever may be its objectivity or its value will not be able to achieve its ends. We are still in a world where money power and muscle power count. Muscle power means military power. Therefore, India has suffered on account of this. In certain respects, because of lack of vision and lack of fore thought we have not been able to pursue our policies effectively. I am not overlooking some of the achievements. In the field of apartheid we have taken initiative. In South Asia and Middle East we have been making some effort to resolve the disputes between various countries in those regions, but in many areas, especially in our own neighbourhood we are not in a happy position. Already the question of Nepal has been raised by my friend here. Unfortunately, this has come as a surprise and shock to me. For ages and for centuries, India and Nepal were known for friendship. Now there is a threat to this friendship and understanding between these two countries. We should, as a big neighbour, pursue a very generous and lenient policy towards Nepal. Nepal might have committed mistakes, but those mistakes should not be blown up beyond certain limits. The future relations between India and Nepal should be guided by perfect understanding between us. We are tied down by mutuality of interests and that should help us resolve the temporary tensions created, for what reasons I do not know. It is very necessary that Indo-Nepal relationship should be re-established on a firmer footing. Government of India should take initiative in the matter and should not wait for Nepal to come to us with their suggestions. We should go to them, try to understand their difficulties, their problems, their perceptions. So Indo-Nepal relationship has got to be

once again restored to its original framework.

Sir, there is the question of China which has been referred to in the debate. All of us are aware about the border situation, border conflict. My own view is that unless the border issue is settled situation, border conflict. My own view friendly and permanent good relation between India and China, China recognises it. We in India do recognise it. I thought the Prime Minister's visit to China would bring about some change in the attitude of China towards the border. And I also expected that the level of talks would be changed to ministerial level. Till now I am not seeing that at all. I expected that. That was the assurance given and China and India relationship stands where it was during the pre-visit of our Prime Minister to China. I would like my friend, Mr. Natwar Singh, to throw some light on this, if there is a change at all and whether there are going to be talks at the ministerial level on the border issue. But it was somewhat surprising that after this visit, China took some steps in Tibet which have, in a way, created a new situation. The Chinese attitude, after Dalai Lama gave a new proposal before the European Parliament, came to me as a bigger surprise. There have been since last year violations of human rights there, and we have been talking about human rights for long. We are spearheading attack on racism in South Africa and we are pleading for the rights of the Palestinians. This is our record. But on the rights of Tibetans we seem to have developed cold feet. Why? I am not for military confrontation between China and India, I am not for military solution to the border problem. I am for peaceful settlement of the border problem. I want a time-frame. At the same time, I am thinking of the future, long distance future in which both India and China have got to co-exist peacefully. For that purpose the Tibet issue, the Tibetan question has got to be solved.

The Prime Minister, when he was in China, could have avoided the mention of Tibet at least. But, if he wanted to talk about Tibet, he should have talked about

[Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy]

human rights. On the contrary, he talked about Tibet as an autonomous regions of China. What prompted him to talk like that, I am not sure. But, my feeling is that he must have unwittingly surrendered the basic interests of Tibetans, and that is detrimental to India itself in the long run.

We do require a buffer zone. Tibet was a buffer zone between India and China for centuries. When we mentioned about autonomous province of Tibet or autonomous region of Tibet in China, it means it was autonomous. They had rights, they should have rights. Therefore, the border question, when it is settled between India and China, should also take into consideration the situation in Tibet. I have no solution to offer. It is for the two Governments to ponder over this question for mutual benefit. The rights of Tibetans should be ensured, should be protected. Tibet should be a zone of peace.

In Tibet there should not be any concentration of weapons of war by China. My information is that Chinese are concentrating heavily their troops, they are sending their arms, missiles and so on. For what purpose? And Tibet should not become a dumping ground for Chinese weapons. And Tibet should not be a zone, a region from which Chinese should threaten our sovereignty.

Therefore, the Minister should tell us where we stand on the Tibetan issue.

Next is Afghanistan which has been referred to. On this I would only say, we believe in an independent Afghanistan, a non-aligned Afghanistan, and the people of Afghanistan themselves should decide their future, their fate. We are happy the Soviet Union has withdrawn their forces, but unfortunately it has not led to a settlement. The Geneva Accord has not been implemented fully, partly because Pakistan is not interested and partly because America is not interested. Pakistan seems to be not interested, because if there is peace in Afghanistan, Pakistan loses the bargaining point with America. If the conflict goes on in Afghanistan, Pakistan can get military aid from America and

also Pakistan can provide more budget to its military and to its defence. Military in Pakistan is still powerful. They are not prepared to forgo their privileges. They want a large budget and keeping conflict with Afghanistan will provide this reason for Pakistan to spend more money on its defence and to get American aid. Therefore, it is in our interest to see that India takes more initiative to see that the Afghan situation is settled more expeditiously and more peacefully.

While I am on Pakistan, may I say the Pakistan Government is still training people who threaten our own interests in our border States. Sometime back the Government came with a map where training is being given to the separatists, terrorists and the like. But I want to know what has happened to that. Why has this matter not been taken up with the Pakistan Government? A new Government has come in. It is a democratic Government which has taken over the affairs of Pakistan now. Why does not our Government talk to them and request them to dismantle all these training facilities? Or if they do not do so, we should evolve a policy to meet the situation.

A reference has been made to Sri Lanka. Sri Lanka has become a very long drawn problem facing both Sri Lankan Government and our Government. We are involved there and our military is also involved there. I would like the hon. Minister to tell us whether he has drawn up an agenda or a programme for withdrawing our forces from there. What is the situation in Sri Lanka? What is the view of the Sri Lanka Government in regard to our troops being stationed there? Have adequate powers been given to provincial councils after the elections are over? What is the stage of talks between the Sri Lanka Government and the LTTE? Is the Sri Lanka Government talking to other groups also? What is the agenda and what is the programme? All these things are wrapped up in vagueness and in uncertainty. Many of our soldiers have been killed. Many Tamils have been killed. This situation cannot go on for a long time. I would like the Minister to throw adequate light on the

number of troops we are having there in Sri Lanka the kind of political settlement that is going to come about, if at all it is going to come about and when are we withdrawing our Forces from Sri Lanka?

Lastly, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Kampuchea. Kampuchea is your neighbour. We have been taking interest and Vietnam has announced that it will withdraw its forces by September or so and there was a meeting at Jakarta regarding this problem and India is playing a positive role. I welcome this role but we would like to be told when this is going to be settled. South-East Asia is very important for us. It is our neighbourhood. Peace in South-East Asia is to be a pre-condition for development and India has got a vital stake in South Asia. In this context may I say that India should look more towards our own neighbourhood South-Asia and South-East Asia, more and more in future for development, for security and for interchange of people at the Government and at the non-Government level. SAARC is already there but unfortunately SAARC has received a set-back because of developments in Sri Lanka and Nepal. Now, we hear something about Bhutan also. Things are not happy in Bhutan either. Therefore, I would like the Minister to throw some light about the developments in SAARC, how we are going to build up this organisation which is somewhat broken. It seems a sort of fragmented mirror and SAARC has got to be rebuilt if it is not already a solid structure. There should be, may I suggest, a multi-national monitoring agency. There is a Secretariat already I know but there should be a multi-national agency or agencies to monitor various developments and events in SAARC area. We have an example already in European Parliament. Sometime back European Parliamentarians came to India too. Apart from Governmental level relationships which are necessary, may I suggest there should be Parliamentary level relationships also before you go to people-to-people relationship. Till now no effort has been made by SAARC countries to develop this concept of interchange of Parliamentarians, visit of Parliamentarians.

There has got to be a continuous dialogue between all Parliamentarians of SAARC countries. Later on this can be taken to the level of people. Therefore, SAARC has got to be built or rebuilt and firm foundations have got to be laid. All the tensions, conflicts and differences which have arisen now have got to be resolved peacefully and South-East Asia has got to be given its due. I reiterate what I said earlier that our Embassies wherever they are in the world have got to function very effectively. The image of India in foreign countries is measured in terms of the effectiveness of the Embassies. Unfortunately, in many countries, Embassies are not properly and fully equipped. The budget provided for the Embassies is too little, perhaps, there is shortage of personnel, there is paucity of talent. This has got to be looked into. That is why when I referred to White Paper in the beginning of my speech, I made a reference to this. May I also say, of late, the Government of India has given up the practice of appointing politicians and political leaders as ambassadors? Why this practice has been given up? Now bureaucrats are being sent. In the past when Jawaharlal Nehru was the Prime Minister of India, there was a good mixture of politicians and bureaucrats. Foreign policy experts were to be sent along with them. Politicians who were involved in the foreign policy issues, who were knowledgeable were also sent as envoys and as ambassadors. This practice has been given up and I would like the Minister to ponder over this issue that in future we should revive the practice of appointing well-known public figures as ambassadors, as envoys; and that will go a long way because there is a difference in the style of a bureaucrat and the style of a politician functioning on the foreign soil. That is why I want this to be done and it should be pursued. May I say that when we debate foreign policy issues in Parliament, there has got to be a paper prepared on the issues. It is very necessary. There is a Consultative Committee of Parliament, I know. But whenever there is a debate in Parliament, the issues raised by Members of Parliament have got to be analysed. There is no system now. When I raise an issue, you

[Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy]

reply or you may not reply and it is forgotten. There is a sort of hiatus between the secretariat running foreign policy matters and Parliament and therefore, I would suggest that there should be a new approach to this whole question. Members of Parliament have got to be more and more involved in various ways; and issues raised in Parliament have got to be analysed for our own benefit and answers have to be found and we should be taken into confidence regarding the various approaches, the solutions and the thinking of the Government in this matter. Thank you very much.

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR (Bihar): Thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir for giving me this time. I have listened to Vajpayee Ji with great attention and respect and I share his sentiments. On many facts I agree with him but not necessarily with all the interpretations that he very carefully and intelligently brought in. Engels said long back 'it is necessary to change the world', and fortunately it is currently changing and for the better and that too rather fast. We are in the midst of a great historic process. Vajpayee Ji took note of that. There is a ferment in the major regions of the world, in different politico-economic systems, and in the minds of million of people, new thought patterns are emerging. Sir, I would like to submit here that Indian foreign policy has tried to relate dynamically its own national aspirations and an internationalism of a unique order. Today, world communities are increasingly conforming to our thinking and stand howsoever belatedly. Our voice is being sought on issues in most regions of the world.

Sir India's concern with regard to external affairs relate to many areas but five such areas need to be identified. Our concern with regard to peace and disarmament, strengthening of the non-aligned movement, our relationships with our neighbours, our under-

standing and relations with the super-powers, interactions, and lastly, the U.N. system as well as other multi-lateral systems which work in different areas. I would like to submit humbly that we have made substantial contributions in each of these areas and we have brought benefit to those systems as well as to ourselves. Of course, things can further be improved and there is no evidence of any sort of abatement in those areas. Happily Mr. Vajpayee took note, a welcome note, of certain positive developments--the INF Treaty, the Soviet pull-out and the accord on Afghanistan, cessation of Iran-Iraq war, the developments around Namibia and the current state of Israel and PLO relationship. These together indicate that there is a big push towards a more promising era of peace and amity I would like to submit, Sir, that India has made contributions in no small measure in creating this world peace which we are welcoming. However it is said to note that the arms race is yet to abate and the nuclear notoriety has acquired global respectability. One can simply see that the Security Council today is in the hands of nuclear powers. There is not a single non-nuclear country which is a permanent member of the Security Council about which Pandit Nehru mentioned long back in his early efforts towards promotion of the world system. Sir, the non-aligned movement has emerged out of our vision. Nobody can deny that. Of course, Nasser and Tito were partners along with Pandit Nehru. A new vision emerged and it helped evolve the movement over a period. Today it is a global movement of unparalleled dimensions. However, there is some evidence that the movement is suffering from over-stretch, as it were. And, perhaps, there is scope for added dynamism and fresher initiatives. It is encouraging to note that India has taken discrete steps first towards bringing course correction in the somewhat derailed non-alignment movement in recent years. There is also evidence that India is trying to contribute to-

wards freshness in the agenda and newer areas of initiative. We hope that our efforts are supported by all the Members and we will get something out of that.

Shri Vajpayeeji commented with warmth as well as his usual sarcasm on the state of relationship with our neighbours. Sir no nation can ignore the demands of neighbours whether they are pleasant demands or unpleasant ones. We have had our share of unpleasant experiences with some neighbours. But, perhaps, with a degree of optimism, one can say that better days are ahead and particularly so, in the historically most difficult areas. With the emergence of democratic process in Pakistan under a youthful leadership, Indo-Pakistan relations have taken a new course. But to ignore the fetters which Begum Benazir Bhutto is facing would be naive. We will have to wait and watch how she is able to assert and realign the course of foreign relationship with the world at large and with India in particular.

Sir, after nearly three and a half decades, an initiative has been taken by India on the China front. There had been diplomatic contracts talks of several rounds, but without much progress, at least evident progress. But the step taken by the visit of the Prime Minister to China has created a new situation. Vajpayeeji talked about shaking of hands or whatever. There have been press comments whether the Prime Minister has returned with full hands or empty hands. Vajpayeeji also mentioned about the 1979 visit of his own. Of course, the facts are right. But the interpretation is that when as Foreign Minister he was in Beijing, what Beijing was doing to Vietnam was not known to him. I would not like to dilate on this. It is a fact of history. But this time, we find that the intractable border issue has been brought on the agenda paper. A joint committee has been identified. And perhaps a time-bound programme would emerge. There have been con-

tacts between the two countries at the level of scientists and technologists, in the area of agricultural management, at cultural and political levels and we hope that this widening contact will strengthen our relationship to a welcome kind. I would like to mention here and particularly draw the attention of our Government that China is changing at a very fast pace. Prof. Subramanian Swamy is an expert on China...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA): On Pakistan also.

PROF. CHNDRESH P. THAKUR: On Pakistan he is a political expert while on China he is an economic expert. What I am trying to suggest is that economic growth in China is rapid and, we must take note at a much faster pace than what India is experiencing. The system of economic management there is undergoing a radical shift. I would like to submit here that a political fallout of this is inevitable which will have ramifications for the rest of the world and certainly for us. We have to think through their ramifications for us, for the region, and for the new pattern, the new possible pattern, of realignment in global relations. China and Pakistan related initiatives are most promising. This has perhaps encouraged a marginal cut in our Defence expenses and diversion of those resources towards developmental purposes. We would like to think that this revival of positive thinking on the part of the concerned countries alongwith our own will help us further in moving in that direction.

The pursuit of a purposive and dynamic foreign policy requires strategic thinking and action around emerging parameters. I totally agree with Vajpayeeji on that. The Ministry is led by men of vision and considerable professional experience around the corridors of diplomatic world, formal as well as informal. Our foreign office and

[Prof. Chandresh P. Thakur]

the diplomatic missions constitute a well-structured network, perhaps one of the most extensive, so far as developing countries are concerned. However I am curious with regard to the fact as to who is doing this strategic thinking. Foreign Office is the focal point, no doubt. What kind of a supporting network has been set up and to what extent has such network contributed and with what effect; I have read the annual report of the Ministry carefully. It is a light reading, perhaps because it is thin. There is reference to contact with our area study centres, and some seminars are listed. Are they sufficient? Are their contributions rich enough to strengthen the Foreign Office or does something more need to be done? I want evidence. When India became independent, Pandit Nehru took the first step to create a Department of African Studies in the University of Delhi. Forty years after the creation of that department—I teach at the University of Delhi—I do not see much work or sufficient interest in that department. Has the Ministry of External Affairs forgotten that such a department was created? If that is the evidence of the support to and quality of such institutions, there is scope for improvement. I would like to draw the attention of the Government in this regard and I would like to suggest that more such facilities should be created and there should be a creative involvement of a larger stream of people and certainly of such Members of Parliament who have interest and perhaps in their own judgement with some capability to contribute. Nothing will be lost, something might be gained in the process so far as enrichment of the foreign policy pursuit is concerned. In this context I would like to make a concrete suggestion. Would the Government consider creating strategic thinking groups to undertake studies on some given areas of concern to India; What are India's interests in the context of the new Soviet scheme of thinking, whether it is going to take the same world view whether its con-

cern with regard to the different parts of the world would remain the same or whether it will change? If it changes, where do we figure and with what consequences? Different scenarios will have to be considered and we will have to think through our own interest and take corresponding steps that need to be taken at our level. Secondly, Europe is undergoing major changes. There is the possibility of a fortress in western Europe, and so far as eastern Europe is concerned it is going through a turmoil. Each country is facing its own problems. Its relationship with the Soviet Union is changing and its relationship with the U.S. is taking a new course. Now, what is there for us to look for? In what direction our interests are likely to be hurt or promoted, and what is that we can do in terms of strategic, planning, needs to be examined through a group of competent minds. Similarly Japan, particularly its economic powers and its recent decision to cross the 1 per cent GNP barrier on its defence expenditure and further the US view of the Japanese role in the defence strategy in different parts of the World require thinking for its ramifications so far as India and its relationship with the world is concerned—Asian or South-East Asian.

The fourth area I would like to suggest is that if we are looking to a long-term perspective on economic parameters what is the ratio of net investment to GNP, what is the ratio of consumption to GNP, what is the ratio of investment in defence to GNP, and how do they relate with our plan and performances with such countries whose thinking and steps in this area is likely to be of interest to us? I would like to think that the correspondence of our concerns in this area with those which are of relevance to

us should be brought within the framework of thinking in the Ministry of External Affairs. (*Time bell rings*)

Sir, I am just making a few points. I would like to take note here that Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi has more than once said that our success or failure in external affairs will depend how strong our economy is. The nexus between the investment consumption and defence expenditure and prospective view on that will determine how strong economic support is likely to be available for the purpose of an effective foreign policy, and some thinking, some forethought, must come in this regard.

Sir the last area I would like to suggest is that India has a package of economic aid. The twenty crores we are spending certainly is five hundred times more compared to a particular year. Seventy countries are involved; 358 trainees are undergoing some training in India and we have made 90 experts available to different countries. For a country of our size, a country of the vision of our kind in international affairs, this amount is not good enough. It needs to be substantially increased in terms of total money value, in terms of involvement of people in training or our own experts going here. And this will have a long-term pay-off as the big powers have discovered.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, in the end I would like to say that in the world affairs it must be noted that we are on the side, of peace not war, we are on the side of disarmament, not militarism, we are on the side of the poor, not the rich. However, if we are looking at the world scene through the perspective of the black and the coloured person, an african, a citizen of the third world country, a primary producer or one who is looking for access to new technology or a citizen of a debt-ridden country, the picture is dismal and distressing. Something needs to be done, and done fast. We are proud to have lent our voice and

efforts in ameliorating this grim state of reality and we have reasons to retain a robust optimism ahead.

Thank you very much.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN (West Bengal): Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman.

Today we are discussing a very important subject, the foreign policy of our country. Indeed there are many facets of foreign or our country, and particularly in a country like India. But it is not possible for me to dilate on all these points within the limited time. I will simply confine myself to crucial

4.00 P.M. issues and I would also like to seek certain clarifications from the hon. Minister in regard to certain aspects of our foreign policy. Sir, what I mean is that the foreign policy of a country, particularly of a country like India, has to be examined in the context of sharpening contradictions between imperialism on the one side and the third-world countries on the other and more particularly in the context of the nuclear holocaust by the imperialist powers, mainly the U.S.A. In this background, you have to judge the effectiveness and the meaningfulness of our foreign policy. Although from our party we by and large endorse the main points of the foreign policy of the Government, I would like to make certain comments and I would like to have certain clarifications also from the hon. Minister.

Sir, in this contradiction between imperialism and the third-world countries we find that American imperialism is adopting a more and more militant and aggressive posture because of their actions in Libya, in Granada, by their intervention in the Iran-Iraq conflict, by their invasion of the Gulf, by the downing of the civilian plane of Iran and lastly by their role in Afghanistan. All these things show that the U.S. imperialism has not abandoned its policy of dominating the world. Now they are doing so not by direct

[Shri Sukomal Sen]

tervention, but by indirect interference and intervention in various parts of the world. This poses an inevitable danger to the third-world countries in particular. These countries may be in Latin America or in Africa or in Asia. All the third-world countries are becoming victims of American imperialism and the aggressiveness of America and its allies. It is in this background that the fruitfulness and effectiveness of the policy of our country has to be examined. What we find is that the Soviet Union has taken peace initiatives. They unilaterally accepted the Geneva Accord on the INF Treaty. It became fruitful because of the persistent efforts of the Soviet Union. It materialised because of the persistent efforts of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union did not stop even after the INF Treaty. They decided to stop all nuclear tests unilaterally. They decided even to pull out their arms and ammunitions from Eastern Europe and also from certain parts of Asia. They unilaterally decided to reduce their armaments and their Army. All these things go to show that the Soviet Union is there for peace while the American Government is not responding to the peace gestures of the Soviet Union. It is in this context that we have to see what role our country can play as a big partner of the non-aligned. In the past, we were the Chairperson of the non-aligned movement. Now, although we do not head the non-aligned movement, still, as a very big country and a very big and powerful country, our role in the non-aligned movement is quite significant. It is also seen that we are fighting from the non-aligned movement and our country is playing a very significant role against *apartheid*, for the independence of Namibian people. We find how the Namibian independence was sabotaged by South Africa at the last moment. It was done with the help of the American Gov-

ernment. What role can our country play so that the Namibian independence can be achieved, so that Namibia can be saved, so that apartheid can be fought fruitfully? These are the aspects on which our foreign policy has to go round. Now, it is also seen that it is not only in South Africa or in Namibia. Even in the Asian arena, we find that whether it is the PLO conflict between the Israelis and the Palestinians or whether it is in Libya, or whether it is in Labanon, or whether it is Iran and Iraq, the role of the American Government is the most aggressive role which is responsible for creating trouble in all these areas. And in all these local conflicts whether it is Iran-Iraq war or whether it is Afghanistan or whether it is in Angola, everywhere the role played by the American imperialism is the most notorious role against which the entire Non-alignment movement has to fight and India has to take a leading role.

Now, Sir, if we look at the Afghanis-tan situation, India has to play a very significant role. I am not fully satisfied with the role played by India in regard to Afghanistan. After all the Accord on Afghanistan was signed at Geneva, and it was signed in the last year, perhaps, on the 4th April, and more than one year has passed. What do we see now? All the 13 instruments of the Accord on Afghanistan reached in Geneva have been flagrantly violated both by Pakistan as well as by the US Government. Now Afghanistan is our neighbour. If the local conflicts escalate in Afghanistan, it will be very difficult. The local conflict is not only escalating at a very fast rate but the rebels based in Pakistan are also forming an interim Government. They have formed a Government in exile. Now they want to capture Jalalabad anyhow militarily and impose a Government there of their own. And if they can capture Jalalabad, the seat of the Government can be Jalalabad and they can immediately ask for recognition by various countries—America, Pakistan and other countries who are going to help the rebels in

Afghanistan, who are interested in seeing a fundamentalist Government being seated in Afghanistan. Here, Sir, both Pakistan and America are playing a mischievous role. What are we doing? Our Government is supporting the Najibullah Government. Our Government has announced that they will give moral and material support to Najibullah Government. But I feel that is not sufficient. When the fire has broken out on our border, at that time, what initiative have we taken, what steps have we taken to mobilise the entire Non-aligned world to pressurise the American Government, to pressurise the Pakistan Government so that they too follow the instruments of Geneva Accord? Otherwise, Sir, what is happening there? With the backing of the Pakistan army, with the backing of the Saudi-Arabian intelligence service and military advisors, with the help of the American military advisors, the rebels are launching attacks on Jalalabad and other parts of Afghanistan, and they are launching rocket attacks also on Kabul. And civilian population is being destroyed. Now, recently the Kaoul Government has also declared that if this situation continues, they will also retaliate and that rocket attacks can be launched on the territory of Pakistan also as a retaliatory measure. If that really happens, it means there will be a serious conflagration in Afghanistan where both Afghanistan and Pakistan will be directly involved. This situation is not at all favourable for the security environment of India. Sir, our security environment is being seriously jeopardized by the conflict that is escalating in Afghanistan and by the role Pakistan is playing towards Afghanistan as well as India.

Now, Sir, I want to say that recently, in last December, our Prime Minister visited Pakistan on the occasion of the SAARC meeting. And after the visit we were told that the visit was fruitful and that the dialogue between the two Prime Ministers were fruitful. And I am inclined to believe it. I am inclined to believe that the new elected Prime Minister of Pakistan is

interested in having good relations and improved relations with India. I believe it. But, at the same time, I feel that the matter is not as simple as it seems to be because Pakistan's army and intelligence service are fully in the grip of American imperialism. Their army is dominated by Pentagon, their intelligence services are dominated by the CIA. So, is it possible for Mrs. Benazir Bhutto to immediately come out of the clutches of the Pentagon and the CIA? It may not be possible immediately. And reports say that a contradiction is developing between the Pakistani Prime Minister and the CIA and the Pakistani military and the Intelligence Service in Pakistan. What will be the ultimate result of this conflict, nobody knows. While we welcome the gestures made by the Prime Minister of Pakistan, at the same time, there is no room for complacency. Behind Pakistan is America. It is pouring arms, modern and sophisticated arms, into Pakistan. Not only into Pakistan. The U.S.A. is supplying sophisticated arms to the Afghan rebels also. Even today there is a report. In the 'Hindustan Times', there is a despatch from London. The report says that most of the sophisticated arms that America has supplied to the Afghan rebels have found their way, have come, to the terrorists in Punjab. It means, India's security is endangered by the conflict that is taking place on the Pakistan-Afghanistan border. I feel that the Indian Government has to play a more positive role than what they have been doing all along because the danger would not remain confined to the Pak-Afghan border only but it may also escalate to our border. Of course, I would like the Government to take all steps to improve our relations with Pakistan. But at the same time, I want to repeat that they should be careful about the manoeuvrings of American imperialism which wants to play with fire, in Pakistan, in Afghanistan; and against India.

Another problem is our border dispute with China. This is a very vexed problem. Our Prime Minister visited.

[Shri Sukomal Sen]

China the second visit by an Indian Prime, Prime Minister to China. There was a lobby, political lobby, in India which was vociferously propagating against the Prime Minister's visit to China. But our Party and the other leftist parties strongly supported the visit. We wanted that the Prime Minister should visit China and that his visit should be fruitful so that an atmosphere, a favourable atmosphere, could be created in which this vexed problem could be settled amicably and satisfactorily. After coming back from China, the Prime Minister wanted us to believe that the situation has become more favourable and that he expects a solution to the border problem. Now, Sir, certain agreements have been made. A working group has been set up. I would like to know from the hon. Minister, how far this working group has advanced. Where do we stand now? Already, eight rounds of discussions have taken place on this border question. The working group is functioning. Three-four months have elapsed since the formation of the working group. How far we have advanced? I would like to know from the hon. Minister. Solution of the border problem with China is an urgent necessity. We cannot afford to play with fire. On the one side, through Pakistan, America is playing a game against us. America is rendering all support to the military regime in Bangladesh. It is giving all kinds of support to the rebels in Afghanistan. All these things are endangering the security environment around India. Therefore, it is imperative and it is in India's interest, in the interest of the eighty million people of this country, that we resolve the border problem with China as early as possible.

There is another problem in relation to China. Some political parties in our country say that our policy in the case of Tibet was a Himalayan mistake. They say that the policy in the case of Tibet enunciated by Pandit Nehru was a Himalayan blunder and that we should revise our policy. I would like

to utter a word of caution in this regard. Our Tibetan policy since the time of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru is a very correct and the only correct policy. If we want to change it, we will only be playing into the hands of imperialists. Another hotspot will be created, in Tibet. Some examples have been given. It has been said that demonstrations have taken place in Tibet, that martial law has been imposed in Tibet, that the Tibetan people are aggrieved and that, therefore, we should support the Tibetan people are against Chinese domination. This is their plea. But the same arguments can be used against us also. Historically, Tibet belongs to China. There is no dispute about it. Since the time of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru this has been recognised. They say there are demonstrations. But what is happening in our country? In Mizoram, in Nagaland, there are insurgency movements for secession from India. Now we are finding in Kashmir terrorist activities against India, for Pakistan. In Punjab we have been seeing terrorist activities going on for formation of a separate country, secession from India. Now it will be very wrong on our part if we extended support to Tibet against China. It is a very very wrong proposition that we should support the Tibetan demonstrators who want to fight China. We should try to change our Tibetan policy. That is entirely wrong and that will be another Himalayan blunder on our part.

Sir, I would like to caution the Government of India not to fall in the trap of such advices because these advices are against the interest not only of the people of China but our own people.

The other point that has been made by earlier speaker is about our treaty with the Soviet Union. Now, if the Soviet Union changes its policy, what will happen to us? Soviet Union is really changing its policy. They are trying to have good relations with their neighbours. There are attempts to have improved relations between the Soviet Union and China. If the Soviet Union and China came closer

and became friends to each other, now are we going to be affected, how is our interest affected? Our interest will be affected if, on the other side, we could have good relations with China also as we have with the Soviet Union. If China and Soviet Union have good relations, if we three countries come in a bond of friendship, no power on earth can forestall the prosperity, improvement and advancement of the third world countries, of the millions of the people of the world. No power on earth can come in our way. Imperialism will be in danger. If these three countries could come together, imperialism will be in danger. That is why there is no cause of alarm if China and Soviet Union came closer. On the contrary we should wish that they came closer so that the three countries could come closer and form a very powerful force of democracy, of advancement, of peace, so that peace could be established in the World and imperialism could be forestalled.

My last point is about world peace. It is not a moral or ethical issue that we want peace and peace. Not that. I have certain criticism in regard to Government of India's policy towards peace. Non-alignment movement is basically a movement for peace. I believe it and the Government of India's action plan that they placed before the special session of the UN General Assembly on disarmament last year, it is good, but the Government stopped there only. My complaint against the Government of India is that they are not seriously appreciating the necessity of building a powerful peace movement inside our country. Fortunately or unfortunately, our country has not experience the horrors of world wars. It is the Europe and Japan who felt the horror of the first or the second world war. That is why the people of Japan, the people of European countries feel what is war and that is why even an ordinary worker in industry or a politician or a doctor or a scientist in Europe in America and Japan have come forward

to fight against war and to work for protecting peace, but that sort of urge is not there among our people. It does not exist. Different parties have tried to form committees in our country, but the Government of India, the ruling party or many of the political parties in our country do not understand the reality so as to forestall war, establish peace and stability in the whole world. That is why I would suggest that while the Government of India through non-alignment movement, through the action plan in the UN Assembly is fighting for peace, at the same time they should come down to the masses to the people, they should mobilise the people, they should take them into confidence, take into confidence the different political parties, different institutions, people from all walks of life so that they are mobilised and a powerful peace movement develops in India which is the only guarantee for protecting peace and fighting against war. Not only in India if such forces develop throughout the world, then the war-mongers will be afraid to launch another war. It will not be easy for them to unleash another nuclear holocaust in the whole world and destroy the whole world. Therefore, I would request Government of India to consider this aspect also.

Sir, I forgot to mention another point—about Sri Lanka. Now time has come when Government of India should see to it that IPKF is withdrawn gradually because there is bitter criticism against the presence of IPKF. Our party supported the presence of IPKF then because that was necessary. But now time has come when Government should see that IPKF is withdrawn from Sri Lanka gradually.

Then about Nepal, our relations with that country have become very sour of late. The two countries have lived together as brothers. Now all of a sudden, the relations have become en-

[Shri Sukomal Sen]

tirely bitter. What is the reason? I find—I am not going into details of it—from Kathmandu they are saying something; from New Delhi we are saying something. But a feeling has been created among the Nepalese people that Nepal has become a victim of a big bully like India. Why should this feeling come to them? The Nepal Government may commit some errors, may commit some mistakes. But we should not offend the common people of Nepal. We are very close together. Why are the people of Nepal feeling that India is acting like a big bully? Why should they feel like that; Perhaps there is something wrong with us. We must introspect, self-criticise and try to improve our relations with Nepal. Maybe as a big brother we can sacrifice something also. We can also persuade them. Otherwise what will happen? America is taking advantage of it. There is a news item in today's newspapers that our Embassy in USA had to issue a rejoinder in the press against the propaganda being made in the Western media, particularly in the US media, against India—that India is trying to bully Nepal. So America is taking advantage of it; other powers are taking advantage of it. It will create confusion in the whole of the SAARC region. I would request Government of India to take into account the whole situation and do something so that the relations that have been soured between our two countries could improve in no time. Otherwise, already our security environment is in danger. If we lose Nepal, if Nepal harbours animosity against us, it will go against the interests of people not only in India but in the whole region. That is why it is imperative that we should improve our relations with Nepal. Our relations with Bhutan are going to be affected. I do not know what will be our relations with the people of Bangladesh.

So, Sir, I conclude with this. In regard to Nepal we should try to take a more realistic view and try to improve the

relations between our two countries. Thank you.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL (Punjab): Sir, Pandit Nehru once said that a foreign policy must be in keeping with the traditional background and temper of the country. It should be idealistic and realistic. This belief of the architect of modern India and a giant amongst the world statesmen of his time has always guided the present Government in its approach to the external affairs. Ever since the day of our Independence, when in the world community fear prevailed over hope, we have consistently followed a foreign policy which has won admiration in different parts of the world. The decision to follow the non-aligned path *vis-a-vis* the two power blocks, was the manifestation of the Congress philosophy articulated long before the dawn of independence. Initially it was the assertion of our sovereignty and independence. But, so potent was its appeal that almost all the newly emerging States were attracted to it. Pandit Nehru's total commitment to this principle and his close working with President Tito and President Nasser transformed it into a major movement that has changed the face of the world today and saved the humanity from the scourge of another world war.

Sir, when India took over the Chairmanship of the NAM, international tensions were on the increase, and unabated proliferation of nuclear weapons was threatening to blow up the world in a matter of a few seconds only on mere pressing of a button.

[The Vice-Chairman (Shri Jagesh Desai) in the Chair.]

Besides this, the developing countries were under severe economic pressures. Even the very essence, the very relevance of the Movement was doubted by some. At that juncture a new determination was imparted to the movement by a series of initiatives, first by Smt. Indira Gandhi and then by Prime

Minister Rajiv Gandhi reaffirming India's high status in the comity of nations.

The six-nation peace initiative launched by Smt. Indira Gandhi together with the leaders of Argentina, Greece, Mexico, Sweden and Tanzania has gone a long way in checking the nuclear weapon race and re-asserting the imperatives of a general and complete disarmament. The Delhi Declaration adopted by the six-nation summit in January, 1985 was a clarion call from the land of Buddha and Gandhi to impress upon the nuclear-weapon states that they were suffering from some sort of a death wish. Concerted efforts during the last four years have yielded results. The leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States have met a number of times. The INF Treaty has been signed and dismantling of the nuclear weapons has begun keeping alive, rather reinforcing, mankind's hope of establishing and maintaining peace on earth.

Last year at a special session of the U.N. Assembly on Disarmament, our Prime Minister presented an action plan calling for a binding commitment by all nations to eliminate nuclear weapons by the year 2010. This, Sir, has had positive effects. It is our firm commitment to the principles of peaceful co-existence among different states, irrespective of their political and socio-economic systems, and to their right of independence sovereignty and territorial integrity that makes us the natural champion of the cause of the oppressed and victims of oppression.

In unambiguous terms we have denounced the barbarous acts of the racist Pretoria regime and expressed our solidarity with the people of Namibia struggling for independence. In recognition of our principled stand, it is we to whom Namibia has now turned for assistance in matters relating to the transition to independence and holding of elections.

Our opposition to the inhuman system of apartheid and call for a complete boycott and comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the racist South African regime has been widely appreciated. though, of course, narrow commercial interests of a few countries have led them to turn to a blind eye to these important issues of our time. It was at the initiative of India that the non-aligned summit at Harare set up the Action For Resisting Invasion Colonialism and Apartheid i.e. the AFRICA Fund to assist the front-line States and freedom movements in South Africa and Namibia. Our role as the Chairman of AFRICA Fund has been lauded at various forums of the UN and also by the Organisation of African Unity.

On the question of decolonisation, India has maintained clearly its traditional position and has continued to extend full support to the cause of Western Sahara and Falkland Islands. At the same time our diplomatic relations with Morocco have been re-established reaffirming the basic strength of our policy.

With the countries of West Asia and South Africa our relations have further strengthened. We were the first non-Arab country to recognise the State of Palestine under Chairman Yasser Arafat. He counts on India's support in the international arena and he gets it in full measure. All the while it has been our endeavour to bring about an international peace conference on the Middle East under the auspices of the United Nations with all parties to the Arab-Israeli dispute, including the PLO, participating therein.

Sir, whenever there is a deterioration in the situation anywhere in the world, Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi who represents a new age of world leadership, is relied upon and is assigned the responsibility of applying the salve where needed. Recently in response to an S.O.S. from President Ghayoom of the Maldives, the Indian

[Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal]

Government acted with alacrity in quelling a mercenary invasion intended to overthrow the democratically elected Government there. This act was hailed as yet another demonstration of our commitment to the sovereignty and integrity of all other nations.

Way back in 1945, the AICC had proclaimed in a resolution that free India would inevitably seek the close and friendly association with neighbouring countries. This mandate has continued to guide the Government of India over the years. Good neighbourliness has been the guiding principle of India's foreign policy.

In three years' time SAARC has burgeoned into a meaningful forum for settling the various problems that may beset the member States from time to time. The SAARC Regional Convention on Suppression of Terrorism holds out hope of collective onslaught against the menace of terrorism. Though the terrorists in Punjab still continue to get foreign support, we do look forward to a change in the Pakistani attitude with the return and consolidation of democracy there after decades of dictatorship. In the true spirit of Simla Agreement signed between Srimati Indira Gandhi and Shri Zulfikar Ali Bhutto India has sought to develop friendly relations with Pakistan. Initiatives in this direction have already been taken, including the support for Pakistan's return to the fold of Commonwealth. But at the same time we have conveyed our concern to Pakistan about its abetment of terrorist activity on Indian soil which would, of course, depend upon Pakistan's response. But as I said earlier we do hope that Shrimati Benazir Bhutto would be able to reassert the democratic values in her country and be in a position to strike a harmonious note and work for solving outstanding problems with us in accordance with the spirit of the Shimla Agreement.

Sir, some difficulties have recently cropped up as far as our trade and transit relations with Nepal are concerned. India on its part has always worked for close Indo-Nepal cooperation and under the Aid Nepal Programme a number of economic and other developmental programmes are being continued by India in Nepal. Given this background, the imposition of certain restrictions and imposition of unreasonably high rates of duty on Indian goods would obviously perturb us. However, our attitude is that of understanding and given the traditional goodwill and amity between the two nations, we do hope that an early solution to the question of trade and transit would be found out to the mutual satisfaction of the two countries.

Sir, our relations with Sri Lanka have continued to improve notwithstanding any opinion of some of our Members on the other side. The recent elections in the North-Eastern province were successfully conducted despite the threat held out by the LTTE. This has assured greater autonomy to the Tamils of Sri Lanka. Tamils can also be assured now in Sri Lanka Tamil has been given the status equal to that of Sinhala. The Indo-Sri Lankan Agreement has paved the way for solving the vexed question of Statelessness of hundreds of thousands of Tamils also. Sir, India's response and reaction to the various developments in Sri Lanka have been guided by the welfare of the Tamils of Sri Lanka. But unfortunately some of our friends here on the other side have always done their best to exploit the situation and misled the people in Tamil Nadu and elsewhere for extremely narrow political ends. The IPKF in Sri Lanka are working under difficult situations and are making extreme sacrifices but sometimes we have not even hesitated to malign them. I agree with Shri Vajpayeeji that the IPKF should be withdrawn from Sri Lanka, as early as possible. Even the Prime Minister has expressed his desire to ensure that the Indian Force

return at an early date in the future. But, Sir, given the situation as it is, we have to leave it to the Government to judge as to what is the appropriate time to withdraw the Forces so that any gain made is not lost. (*Interruptions*).... We have to leave it to the judgment of the Government to see when it is really conducive to withdraw the forces. We have to be in no absolute hurry in that regard. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI (Tamil Nadu): Sir, the LTTE and the JVP, both had opposed the Indo-Sri Lankan Agreement but the IPKF went out shooting only Tamil people.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): No, no. Gopalsamy is there. He is going to speak.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: Sir with due respect I have to say, this is not true and in all fairness, to our brave soldiers who laid down their lives, I would appeal to the hon. Member not to make any insinuation against the forces, who as I said, are working under extremely difficult situation there. (*Interruption*)....

When I refer to SAARC, I do note it with a sense of satisfaction that an agreement has been arrived at whereby Members of Parliament and Judges of the High Courts etc. can visit the SAARC countries without obtaining the prior visas. This is a welcome step to strengthen people-to-people relations between the SAARC countries. But as it has been suggested by an hon. Member before me, I think the Government must take the initiative to start working with the SAARC countries for the formation of some sort of SAARC Parliamentary Forum whereunder Members of Parliament from these States can meet occasionally and discuss things. This suggestion of Shri Gurupadaswamy is indeed a very valuable one and it is only for the sake of putting an additional emphasis on that that I venture to repeat it.

No one can honestly find any fault with India's foreign policy being pursued and nurtured so assiduously by the Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi. By establishing personal rapport with a large number of world leaders, he has generated immense good-will for the country and has enhanced our prestige, our image on the international screen. I had the opportunity to meet Mr. S. S. Ramphal, the Secretary-General of the Commonwealth during his last visit here and it was really heartening to hear him say about the Prime Minister that in the word, he is just fantastic. (*Interruptions*)....

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: What did you expect from him?

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: That is exactly what I expected him to say because of the good-will that the Prime Minister has earned by his various actions in the past four years. He further said that the Prime Minister commanded deep respect in the world community. It is this respect which perhaps upsets sometimes our hon. friends on the other side. They know that respect outside does contribute to consolidation at home and this is what they cannot just digest.

Sir, about China, I do not want to say much except that we must accept this thing that there is an emergence of positive trends after the recent visit of the Prime Minister. I do not want to enter into any sort of controversy but it is a fact that the Prime Minister received an overwhelming reception at his visit recently and I am sure, our hon. friends on the other side would not find any fault with Doordarshan for a big hand-shake that he had with the leaders of China during his visit. Sir, the strength.... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI N. E. BALARAM (Kerala): If it is every day, there will be objections. Even if you show God every day, there will be objections.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: My only observation was that you will not find fault with Doordarshan if the Prime Minister is shown getting a standing ovation, a very warm reception, during his visits abroad. And when he visits, whether it is one visit or ten visits,..... (Interruptions).

श्री धर्मपाल (जम्मू और कश्मीर): इनका कहना है कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी को इतना स्वागत हुआ लेकिन जनता सरकार के विदेश मंत्री भी चाइना गये थे और जिस दिन वह वहाँ थे उसी दिन चाइना ने विपतनाम पर हमला कर दिया। उस वक्त क्या प्रेस्टिज थी और इस वक्त क्या है (व्यवधान)

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : उपसभा-ध्यक्ष महोदय, जब मैं चाइना गया था तो चाइना ने विपतनाम पर हमला किया मगर जब प्रधान मंत्री चाइना गये थे तो चाइनीज जनदूरंग बेली में हमारी जमीन पर बैठे हुए थे।

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: Sir, there is a marked difference. Now since the matter has been dragged into controversy, permit me to say that when Shri Vajpayee visited China, the action of Chinese vis-a-vis Vietnamese was a rebuff to him because we were not aware of what was being done by China and now, when the Prime Minister went, whatever had been the action of Chinese—I am not commenting on that—it was before the visit. The visit has definitely helped in bringing about a sea-change in their attitude. We must not forget that, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Please wind up now.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: Just a minute. Sir, the strength of the sound policies pursued by the Congress in external matters has paid dividends to the country. It was the basic strength

of the foreign policy and the respect commanded by us which ensured that the secessionist declaration of so-called Khalistan from the precincts of the Golden Temple at Amritsar by the self styled Panthic Committee got no recognition from anywhere in the world in spite of the fact that some forces outside continue to support the subversive activities here. Sir, the giving of such support, permit me to say, also demonstrates our strength and expression of bold views on international matters which is anathema to those whose policies of expansion and exploitation and remote control over the weaker countries are frustrated by our actions. It is because of India's image that the UK, Canada and some other countries have assured cooperation and have since taken steps to check the activities of Indians settled abroad who are abetting the terrorist and secessionist activities on our soil.

The recent election of Mr. Justice R. S. Pathak to the International Court of Justice is another instance of India's triumph on the international front. Referring to this in an article in the 'Tribune' a few days back, Inder Jeet quoted some senior diplomats at Delhi and I just repeat:

"India today has a place of its own in the United Nations. Its Chief Justice was bound to get support."

Sir, that is the level of our standing in the international sphere. But, unfortunately, rumours are sometimes floated to induce people to believe that the visits of the Prime Minister abroad do no good to the country. An honourable Member from the other side just got up to say that if the visits of the Prime Minister to foreign countries are shown on the Doordarshan on more than one occasion he would have objection to that. I want to point out here most humbly that the honourable Member here are aware of the positive results flowing from the international exchanges at the highest level. But for their narrow ends they do not

want to concede that.

The world is indeed small, made more so by the recent advancement in science and technology. Any incident, any development, in any part of the world has its repercussions elsewhere. And as such, the role of bilateral relations was never as important as it is today. And it is for all of us to know, for all of us to see, that during the last four years our relations with countries on all the continents of the world have improved and strengthened substantially. While our traditional friendships with the Soviet Union has flowered further, there has been a greater understanding by the United States of the issues facing us here.

To conclude, I just want to point out two things very briefly: There is an urgent need to step up our external publicity. Indians are settled in every remote corner of the world. They must be briefed and equipped to work as veritable ambassadors of goodwill to those countries. Our programmes on culture, on development and even exhibitions on philately, etc. should be increased in those countries to enable their people to know us better. The last point that I would like to make is, to repeat again what has been said, that the Consultative Committee attached to the Ministry should be made more meaningful by assigning different Divisions to different Members of Parliament to make an indepth study about our relations with those countries cutting across all party barriers and to suggest means whereby our relations with those countries can be further strengthened.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, today we are discussing an important subject, the working of the Ministry of External Affairs. This subject has been agitating the minds of the people because of certain developments that are taking place in the immediate neighbourhood of our country. We want to have friendly relations with all countries, whether America or Soviet Union or China

or any other country, small and big. But our experience has been that except a few countries, except Soviet Union, East European countries and some South-Eastern countries and some Arab and African countries, the rest of the world does not seem to be friendly towards India. Something seems to be wrong with the approach of the Indian Government towards our relations with these countries. I do not know. But the Minister of External Affairs must ponder over these things and he must convince the House and must tell the House why these things are going wrong, why when the testing time comes, whether in the UN or any other international forum, they do not come to the rescue of India and they always go and act against this country. I do not know where the wrong lies. I do not know whether the Government of India has failed to convince these countries or it failed to take them into confidence. I do not know. But the Minister must ponder over this and answer this question.

Sir, I do not want to go into the details of all the problems and issues facing the globe. But I would like to confine myself to our relations with our immediate neighbours, whether it is China, Nepal, Pakistan or Sri Lanka or Afghanistan or Bangladesh. It is really very unfortunate that our relations with Nepal have deteriorated and have become strained in recent years, in the last one or two years. I do not know why this should happen. India and Nepal have close relations, cultural, historical, political and religious, and we cannot apprehend any danger from that small country. As a matter of fact, the people of Nepal and the people of India always consider themselves as brothers, feel that they are one, that they are of one stock. I do not know why during the recent days the relations have deteriorated. There is something going on in the minds of the people of both the countries. It is not known why these countries, why these two Governments, have

[Shri B. Satyanarayan Reddy]

failed to come to a real understanding. One of the issues which has come in the way of this to be the treaty of 1950, the Treaty of Peace and Friendship. We do not know how this treaty worked. But it has been stated by our External Affairs Minister himself, by Mr. P. V. Narasimha Rao, in the Rajya Sabha on 2nd November 1988, that the Government believed that the 1950 treaty has not always been observed in all respects by the Government of Nepal. He has made this statement. The External Affairs Minister has further stated that steps were being taken to improve Indo-Nepal relations, all aspects of bilateral relations. This was the first information that has been given to Parliament and the country. But what is the view of the Foreign Minister of Nepal? He visited this country on the 25th December 1988 and he suggested that both the Governments should address themselves to the basic problem. Mr. Narasimha Rao was, however, not in favour of a review. I do not know why, when the Nepal Government wanted to review the whole situation and wanted to discuss with India, our External Affairs Minister was not prepared to review. The Nepalese Foreign Minister is on record as having said publicly that as far as Nepal was concerned, the 1950 treaty was working satisfactorily, but if India wanted any review, it was up to it to make suggestions. But we do not know whether the Government of India has made any suggestions in this regard. In 1978, India and Nepal had signed a separate treaty. Since the treaty of transit and trade.... (Interruptions)

5 P. M.

AN HON. MEMBER: Bifurcated.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: Bifurcated instead of one. Since the two treaties were separated 11 years ago, now working back to the old arrangement at this stage with seemingly no convincing justification would just like putting the hands of the clock 11 years back. I do not under-

stand. Such small thing should have been discussed with the Nepalese Government and the Government of India could have come to some understanding with that country. Like that other issues were there like purchase of arms by the Nepalese Government from China. When the Nepalese Government requested the Government of India to supply some arms for security purposes, to satisfy the people, the Government of India refused to do anything in this connection and they remained silent. What could the Nepalese Government do. They have gone to some other country to secure arms, not to injure our country. Likewise, so far as projects are concerned, there was some construction work going on. This is entrusted to the Chinese because the Chinese were the lowest bidders and we were the highest bidders. As per the rules and as per conventions because the World Bank has given aid, they gave the contract to the lowest bidder. What is wrong in it? We would also do the same thing. If the Government of India were to think that the Government of Nepal is a security problem, I am really sorry how these things have come in their mind of the Foreign Minister and the Government. I think we must have friendly relations with Nepal. Our people are one. And there is no security problem as far as Nepal is concerned. We want friendly relations with that country. We must be liberal because we are bigger. So we must show our sincerity and large-heartedness so far as these problems are concerned.

We are members of the SAARC. Nepal, Sri Lanka and Pakistan are also members of the SAARC. If you are not able to create confidence in the minds of the members of the SAARC, how are you going to convince the world? If this is the attitude of our Government with another member, a small country like Nepal, I do not know whether the Government will do anything convincing so far as other problems are concerned. Taking this issue, even the powers

like the USA and China, have requested the Government of India to solve this problem to the satisfaction of both the countries. China has issued a statement. It is in today's papers. China has called upon Nepal and India to iron out their differences through consultations and resume their normal trade. So we could have solved this problem. Where is the need for China or America to advise us? We have given an opportunity to the other countries, other powers, to advise us. I request that our Foreign Minister should give a serious thought over it and should not allow other countries to middle in these things. So far as our relations with China and Pakistan are concerned, we always thought that our relations should improve, whether it is China or Paistan. China is a big neighbour. Unfortunately, there was a conflict between India and China in 1962 due to the Chinese invasion of India. I do not know the real reasons at that time. But it took place. As a matter of fact, people really wanted friendship between India and China. As a matter of fact, people came out in streets wherever these meetings were held shouting "Hindi Chini Bhai Bhai". But suddenly this unfortunate development took place and as a result of the Chinese attack, there was a lot of resentment and anger in the minds of the people. At that time, when this matter was being discussed in this Parliament, this is what happened and I quote:

"When Nehru made exceptional statement after the Chinese invasion in 1962, describing Aksai Chin as a place where 'not a blade of grass grows', the entire House rose in protest. The treasury benches joined the opposition in protest. Amid pandemonium, Mr. Mahavir Tyagi stood up and holding his bald pate exclaimed: 'Sir, here is my bald head where not a hair grows; does the Prime Minister propose to cut it off?'"

This will show how the people felt at that time when the Chinese invaded this country. We do not want that the friendly atmosphere should be spoiled. It must be restored.

Now, what is the total area of Indian territory in square kilometres which is under illegal occupation of China as a result of that invasion? I was told that the total area of the Indian territory which is under illegal occupation of China is approximately 3800 square kilometres. This information was given by the Ministry of External Affairs to my Question No. 3418 answered on 29th March, 1989. But when I visited the Indian border areas with Tibet, the military officer who was in charge of that area told me that the total area of the Indian territory under illegal occupation of China is 39555 square kilometres. That is the exact area given by the people there. The total area of the Indian territory under illegal occupation of Pakistan in the State of Jammu and Kashmir is approximately 78000 square kilometres. An additional area of approximately 5120 square kilometres in Pakistan Occupied Kashmir was illegally ceded by Pakistan to China under the so-called Sino-Pakistan 'Agreement' of March 1963. This is the reply given by the External Affairs Ministry to my question. When I visited the border areas, they gave me a different figure which is higher. That means that a larger portion of the Indian territory is under the illegal possession of China. (Time bell rings) I will finish with two minutes.

So far as the Prime Minister's visit to China is concerned, I welcome it because we want friendly relations between China and India. But in order to have friendly relations, certain things which are there have to be considered. They have to be solved. The more important thing is the border issue. So much of area is under the illegal occupation of China. This issue should be solved by peaceful means. I believe in that. How are we going to

[Shri B. Satyanarayan Reddy]

to solve this problem? You have to convince the Chinese people and the Chinese Government. Our Prime Minister visited that country. Has he taken any steps in that direction; Has he told them that this is the problem that is agitating India? Another problem is the Tibetan problem. Sometimes, agitations take place in certain parts of our country. We ask them to solve the problem. We have done it in Assam and in other parts of the country. As agreed to by Pandit Nehru, we admitted that Tibet is a part of China. It is our neighbour. But at the same time, on this problem, the agitation is going on. Thousands of Tibetans are in our country and Dalai Lama is in our country. So, we have to solve the problem one day or the other. So, we have to discuss the problem in a friendly way with the Chinese Government. When the Prime Minister was there, he had a good opportunity to know their mind and he should have given our advice to solve that problem because Dalai Lama has given a formula to the Chinese Government. So, at least he could have known the mind of the Chinese Government as to how this problem is to be solved because the Tibetans are fighting, the Tibetans are agitating for the freedom of Tibet. I do not know what is the Government of India's Policy so far as the proposal put forth by Dalai Lama is concerned. And the Government of India has not so far come forward with its views on this.

Then, Sir, so far as our relations with Pakistan are concerned, I would like to say that our relations deteriorated during Zia-ul Haq's regime because it was a military dictatorship, supported by the American imperialists. Of course, there were elections. And we are happy the people of India are happy to see that Mrs. Benazir Bhutto has been voted to power and she has been elected. But subsequent events will show that she seem to be powerless. Though people have elected her and she formed the Government,

still she is seriously under the pressure of military and other forces. And what is the Government of India's analysis so far as this situation is concerned? Does she really want to do something good or she is under the influence of those forces? Will there be any friendly relations between these two countries as a result of the Prime Minister's visit to Pakistan and will she be bold enough to improve the situation? And as far as Afghanistan is concerned, she is not in a position to express her views because she has committed before she became the Prime Minister that so far as Afghanistan issue is concerned, she will not interfere and that the Army will deal with it. And in spite of the Geneva Accord, American money and sophisticated weapons are being supplied to the Mujahideens through Pakistan. They are fighting from the soil of Pakistan. How is the Government of India going to deal with it? It is the responsibility of the Government of India. The Government of India must take an active part, must play an active role in convincing Pakistan and the United States that no useful purpose will be served by encouraging the Mujahideens because they have to act as per the terms of the Geneva Accord.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Please conclude now.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: This is my last point. So far as this Sri Lankan issue is concerned I would like to say that we have committed the greatest blunder. The subsequent events show that nobody wants our presence in Sri Lanka. From the beginning, our friend, Mr. Gopalsamy was fighting and we were also sharing his views....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Let him say it. You leave it to him. He will speak.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: My point is that we are spending every day Rs. 5 crores on the IPKF. How long should this Indian Peace Keeping Force remain in Sri Lanka? We wanted that there should be an accord...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Don't go into it.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: ...for solving the problem. But the Government has been unable to ensure the implementation of the two important clauses of the India-Sri Lanka Accord. The first one is the unification of the Northern and the Eastern Provinces and the second is the question of devolution of powers to the provinces in the federal set-up. I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether we are serious in regard to these things which are the main points in the agreement. Mr. Premadasa who has been elected as the President of Sri Lanka said in Parliament that he was opposed to the unification of the two provinces. He said this in Parliament. When this is the stand of the Sri Lankan President, how are you going to solve the problem? Our army has been put in Sri Lanka unnecessary. Hundreds of the Indian Peace-Keeping Force personnel have been killed. I do not know whether so many people were killed either in our conflict with Pakistan at the time of liberation of Bangladesh....

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY (Tamil Nadu): Or with China.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: Yes; or with China. It is really painful. When we read it in the newspapers, our heads bow in respect to these brave people who are fighting for nothing, not for safeguarding our territory, our border...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): You please safeguard me now.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: Nobody in Sri Lanka wants the Indian Peace-Keeping Force there. Before the situation deteriorates we should get our force out of Sri Lanka. We should withdraw our force. We should recall our force and leave it to the people of Sri Lanka to decide their fate. As I mentioned, there are two important points in the accord.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Mr. Reddy, you should conclude now. Your time is over.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: One is the unification and the other is the devolution of powers. These two things should be assured and peace should be established in Sri Lanka. Finally, Sir....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Please conclude now.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: We want peace in the world. For the sake of peace we should take all necessary steps to see that all manipulations of imperialist forces are defeated. We should take steps to stop the supply of arms to the different parts of the world by these forces to suppress the people's movements and to overthrow the elected Governments. We should support the people's movements all over the world and defeat the American and other imperialist forces which are working against the interest of peace. Thank you.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, may I at the beginning, thank Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee for initiating this discussion on the working of the Ministry of External Affairs? May I also thank Shri Bhuvnesh Chaturvedi, Shri Gurupadaswamy... (Interruption)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): He is only intervening.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: I am only intervening. The Minister of External Affairs will reply to the discussion tomorrow because there are about 15 Members still to speak. May I also thank Prof. Chandresh Thakur, Shri Sukomal Sen, Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal and Shri Satyahanarayan Reddy?

We welcome this opportunity provided by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee for discussing our foreign policy and also the working of the Ministry of External Affairs. A truncated discussion took place in the other House yesterday. We look forward to a fuller debate here. As he was good enough in his statesman-like manner, since 1947, there has been a broad national consensus on our foreign policy, not only in this House, not only in Parliament but in the country as a whole. This does not mean that we have been following a static or an inactive foreign policy because unless any foreign policy establishment keeps itself abreast of the dynamics of international life, the everchanging dynamics of international life and objectively analyse them, it is likely to fall behind times and will not be able to meet the challenges of the present-day world. As he observed radical changes have taken place in the international scene in the last two years or so. If we were to look at the world as it was in, say, 1985 or 1986, we would find that all the tensions, regional conflicts, failure of disarmament talks, had become a permanent feature of international life and certain positions adopted by the super powers and by other countries had become almost frozen. There was a reflex response to any particular given situation. Now we find that in the last two and a half years there has been unrecognisable almost inconceivable change in the international scene. How has this come about

and what role have we, as a country, played in this new atmosphere of new thinking, new approaches, new formulas? How are we meeting these challenges? This is mainly due to the fact that the two countries, the Soviet Union and the United States have come to have a relationship which did not exist ever since the establishment of the Soviet Union and the recognition of the Soviet Union by the United States in 1933. In the last two and a half years before Mr. Reagan handed over to Mr. Bush, he and Mr. Gorbachev have met five times. Mr. Shevardnadze and Mr. Shultz have met 32 times. This was unprecedented. Because certain initiatives were undertaken by the Soviet Union, they were responded to by the United States, it was possible to defuse tensions. The INF treaty was signed, modest though it was, but it made a real beginning for the first time nuclear weapons were being dismantled. Mr. Vajpayee also referred to this.

Similarly the relationship between the Soviet Union and China is undergoing a basic change. The China-Soviet rapprochement, we welcome it very much. When Mr. Gorbachev was here in November, last year he in his speech at Vigyan Bhawan, accepting the Indira Gandhi International Peace Award, referred to the role the Soviet Union, China and India can play in Asia and the world. So, we welcome this and there is no question of our having any doubts or fears about that. It is a development which we welcome, which strengthens peace in the world and creates a new atmosphere.

Take the situation in Eastern Europe. What is happening in Poland or Hungary. It was inconceivable even two years ago the kind of elections they are having. Solidarity has been recognised. Now let us come to the role that we have played. Mr. Gorbachev was in India for the first time in Novem-

ber 1986. He signed with the Indian Prime Minister the Delhi Declaration. Hon. Members will cast a glance back to 1986 November and recall the Delhi Declaration. It says, I think in paragraph 5, that the two countries will work for the establishment of nuclear weapons free world and that non-violence will be the basis of our life. Mr. Gorbachev again referred to the Delhi Declaration in his famous and historic speech at the United Nations on the 7th December last year. Now we see that this language of the Delhi Declaration has become international legal tender, that Mr. Gorbachev elected to sign the Declaration with the Prime Minister of India is not insignificant. Therefore, we have, not from today or yesterday but for the last 42 years, been trying to impress upon the world that the world should get rid of nuclear weapons and that non-violence should be the way of life. This is a great tribute to the foresight of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru who laid down the framework for the foreign policy of India and he did that not in 1947, he did it many many years before independence and the fact that we have found the foreign policy framework laid down by him so useful, so durable, that it really is remarkable that a man should have such a vision that he had and had fifty to sixty years ago. I cannot really recall the foreign policy of any major country which has not undergone drastic changes, where the pendulum has swung from this end to that end in the most violent fashion. This has not happened in the case of India. That shows the correctness of our policy, that the foreign policy of India has the support of the Parliament and people of India. We have differences of detail, how a particular policy towards a country is being affected, but there is continuity and, if I may respectfully say, so there is no lack of direction. All these questions and issues are analysed from day to day by the Foreign Office.

I will now come to the specific points. With regard to China and Nepal, the External Affairs Minister will make a comprehensive statement when he replies to the discussion tomorrow. I just want to say that...

श्री राम अरविश सिंह : (बिहार) यह जवाब दे रहे हैं या इन्टरवीन कर रहे हैं ?

उप-सभाध्यक्ष (श्री जगेश देसाई) : आप बैठ जाइये । आप हाजिर तो रहते नहीं, मैंने पहले ही कहा था यह इन्टरवीन कर रहे हैं ।

श्री के० नटवर सिंह : आप को शोभा नहीं देता बीच में बोलना । गम्भीर मामले पर बातचीत हो रही है । Three major initiatives were taken by the Prime Minister last year. One was the Action Plan presented to the United Nations in June, 1988, at the special disarmament session of the United Nations in New York. That lays down in detail how we look at the world, especially on the armament side, from now on to the year 2010. This has been welcomed time and again by a number of countries.

The other two initiatives were— Prime Minister's visit to China and Prime Minister's visit to Islamabad. Now it has been asked: What was achieved? Here, again, the External Affairs Minister will respond. I only want to say that we have had eight rounds of talks at the official level. After the Prime Minister's visit, a decision has been taken by China and India to have a Joint Working Group which will deal exclusively with the boundary question and not with any other issue and it will be a joint Working Group. Its responsibilities will include maintenance of peace and tranquillity at the border and if peace and tranquillity is disturbed, it will immediately meet and try and defuse the tension. I am glad to report to the

[Shri K. Natwar Singh]

House that the situation on the border is quiet and peaceful and whenever there has been any occasion for any kind of misunderstanding, it has been cleared on the spot in a friendly and warm manner. That itself is a major change. Now the situation from 1962 to 1988 remained more or less frozen and static. So there has been a big forward movement here, a new flexibility on this particular issue which had been missing for a number of years.

Similarly, with regard to Pakistan, Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru had visited Pakistan in 1960. No other Prime Minister had gone. President Zia-ul-Haq had come to India five or six times. But we thought it inadvisable to have a visit at Prime Minister's level because of the nature of the regime. It was for the people of Pakistan to choose what government they like. It is also for us to decide what policy we have towards it. We consider the **Simla Agreement as the bedrock** of our bilateral relations and we find that the democratically elected Government of Mrs. Benazir Bhutto also feels the same way. And we also signed, as we did in China, three agreements with Pakistan and it is our endeavour to have good neighbourly and friendly relations with Pakistan, as it is with China. At the same time, we have made known our major concern to our Pakistani friends. This is with regard to their nuclear weapons programme, also with regard to their interference in Punjab. With regard to Kashmir and Siachen as well. But, in spite of this, we find that there is tremendous goodwill among the people of Pakistan for India and its people, and we want to respond positively.

We are also worried about the quantum and quality of the military aid being granted to Pakistan by the United States because that becomes a factor. And it also affects Afghanistan, and I

will touch upon this just in a few moments.

What I do want to say is that the improvement of relations between India and China, between India and Pakistan, is a major event in our relations, and it has had its ramifications and effects not only the Indian subcontinent but Asia and the world.

I will just give one instance. I was talking some weeks ago to the Foreign Minister of Indonesia. He said, "We would like to pay a tribute to you and your Prime Minister for the initiative he has taken to improve relations with China. You after all had a war with China. Indonesia did not have a war with China. But we do not have good relations. But your example has encouraged us to make necessary moves." Within a few weeks, when the Chinese and the Indonesian leadership met at Tokyo, they decided to re-establish their relations. So, what we have done has its effect.

I know from personal experience that when I went to the chemicals conference in Paris soon after the Prime Minister's visit to China and Pakistan, I could see the changed atmosphere, the relaxation. People felt free to talk to us, whether they were friends from China or friends from Pakistan. They did not look over the shoulder earlier. Now this is welcome. I had very friendly discussions with the Chinese Foreign Minister in Paris. So, also Mr. Narasimha Rao in Tokyo.

The Home Secretaries of India and Pakistan will be meeting soon. The Defence Secretaries will be meeting soon. The Foreign Secretaries are likely to meet. The Indo-Pakistan Joint Commission which is lying dormant for many, many years, will meet again. There are so many areas in which we can make progress which is mutually beneficial to both our countries.

Sir, with regard to Afghanistan, I would like to say that we have not been inactive. Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee himself pointed out, "It is all right. We have asked for a broad based government. But what is being done about it?" The difficulty is that one side is not implementing the Geneva accord. The Soviet Union fulfilled its obligations and withdrew it on the 15th of February. At that time it was hoped that since they had withdrawn, the intervention from the Pakistan side with American aid and sophisticated weapons would stop. But it did not stop. We recognise the Government of President Najibullah. We have done so when the PDPA came into office. President Najibullah is also an Afghan. The members of the PDPA are also Afghans. Their comrades have fought and died and shed blood. The stout-hearted fight they are giving to the Mujahideens who are helped by outside forces is quite remarkable.

It was said that as soon as the Soviet forces withdrew, Kabul would fall. The Foreign Minister of Afghanistan was in Delhi for about two weeks in February. He told us that around the 15th of February about 175 foreign correspondents and TV cameramen had arrived in Kabul to witness the fall of Kabul. They waited for one week, two weeks, three weeks, four weeks. Then they started returning because Kabul did not fall. We had said that it was not going to be so simple.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: After the snows melt, probably it will fall.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: The snows have melted, now they are melting, and we expect Mujahideen activities will be intensified. I think, the PDPA is prepared for that. (*Interruptions*)

Similarly, Jalalabad was expected to fall. A so-called interim government has been formed which has been recognised by four countries. It has not even been recognised by Pakistan. It has not been recognised by Iran. Pakistan is a signatory to the Geneva Agreement.

Now, I come to the Mujahideens. We have nothing against any Afghan. We have had historical ties with Afghanistan. Our language, our culture, our dress, our cuisine, have been affected by them and theirs by us. For centuries, we have had these contacts. We have no illwill for any Afghan. But I do most respectfully submit that the Mujahideens are not exactly a group of people wedded to democracy or to any enlightened thought. Within them also there are so many divisions and factions and one does not know who represents whom. They had their Shcra which lasted a couple of hours. Their differences are fundamental. They are all fired of fighting. What is happening is that there is outside interference. There is now evidence that this assistance is coming from Pakistan. I don't want to go into the newspaper reports which appeared in the New York Times. You have all read it. But the fact remains that this kind of help to Mujahideens will only prolong the agony of Afghans.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGJIT DESAI): But, there was a press report that the US is instigating Pakistan to bombard Afghanistan. This kind of report is there.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (West Bengal): There are also complaints from the Najib Government that there is military presence of Pakistan.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: I am just coming to it. The Government of President Najibullah has made very fair offers. He is a Marxist. He says that he is willing to share power. He said he wants to have a broad-based Government representing all groups—the Mujahideens, the exiles, the refu-

[Shri K. Natwar Singh]

gees, the PDPA—He is willing to do it, but these offers have not been accepted. Now, there was a debate in the Security Council where our representative also spoke and we spoke about the interference from outside. The Foreign Minister of Afghanistan gave details about what is happening and where the aid is coming from. The British Foreign Secretary was here. We spoke to him also. We said that it is not realistic for anybody to imagine that you can have stability or lasting peace in Afghanistan in an arrangement which excludes the PDPA, because they are the Government in power. They have made sacrifices. How can you drive them away?

We have had a number of discussions with President Najibullah and he has said that he welcomes discussion with anybody. He has made repeated offers. We took the initiative. I went to see the former King of Afghanistan in February last year. We had hoped that he would play a role, but this has not happened and he has other problems. But President Najibullah has indicated that he is willing to offer a dignified and a national role to the former King. This has been turned down by the representatives of the Mujahideens. Now, we have an embassy there. We are assisting Afghanistan bilaterally and through the United Nations for humanitarian help, for sugar, for medicines, for clothes and for other requirements that they are asking. But I would like to end on Afghanistan by saying that unless the Geneva Agreements are faithfully observed and adhered to this present situation of a quasi-civil war will, I am sorry to say, continue and the sooner this is realised the better. But I do not see this happening in the near future.

Now, Sir, with regard to Kampuchea, I just would like to mention that while we have not made any song and dance about it for the last two years, Sir, we have been closely associated with this question. I first met Prince Sihanouk in New York in

October 1987. He had asked us to convey an invitation to the Government in Phnom Penh of President Heng Samrin and Prime Minister Hun Sen saying if Prime Minister Hun Sen would come to Paris and meet him. The invitation was conveyed and the response was immediate. The first meeting between the two took place in Paris in December 1987 and there have been frequent meetings. I have met Prince Sihanouk four times. I am meeting him again in Jakarta on the 30th of this month. I am also hoping to meet Prime Minister Hun Sen again. I have also visited all the Indo-China States and all the ASEAN States more than once. We have been in touch with the Soviet Union on this issue. We have had discussions at the highest level. We have met Mr. Shevardnadze. P. M. discussed this with President Gorbachev. We have had discussions with Americans and with Mr. Bush in 1987. We have kept France informed. All round we get the impression that there is a desire that India should play a role. Now, I want to say that the phrase "Indo-China" means something. It means that two civilisations met there no necessarily in confrontation but we met there. Those of the hon. Members who have been there will know the great imprint of Indian culture and civilisation on the life, culture and architecture in this part of the world. We cannot be indifferent. Then in the Fifties, Sixties and Seventies we were in the International Control Commission. We were the Chairman of the Commission. Now, Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia have proposed that the 1954 Commission should be revived and India should be the Chairman. Now, we have also realised that the world has changed a great deal since 1954. ASEAN did not exist. China was not in the U.N. The number of independent countries was about 65-66 but today it is 159. So the international beach is no longer free for us to walk around. The composition may have to be increased. Other groups may have to be represented. But there is a genuine desire on the part of all

countries that India should be a participant. If we are invited to do so, we will certainly do so whether as the Chairman or as a Member and also of the international conference. So I am going to discuss these matters with the Thai leaders in Thailand and then with Indonesia because Indonesia has been representing ASEAN on this particular issue and have been taking a very active role, role which we have appreciated, admired and supported. If there is a Commission, then, certainly Indonesia will have to be included in it among other countries but it is for JIM-2 the Jakarta Informal Meeting No. 2 which shall take initiative but we are in close touch with them, close consultation with them and I am happy to say that things are likely to move quite fast after the meeting between Prince Sihanouk and Prime Minister Hun Sen on the 2nd and 3rd of May in Jakarta and the Sino-Soviet summit between Mr. Gorbachev and Mr. Deng Xiao Ping in Beijing on the 15th of May and we hope that the process for the establishment of a Government of reconciliation, Cease-fire and the appointment of a Control Commission will proceed satisfactorily and fairly at a rapid pace.

Now, Sri Lanka. I must say that while I have great respect for Shri B. Satyanarayan Reddy, I do wish to respectfully say that our sending the IPKF to Sri Lanka was not a blunder. Actually he is the first person whom I have heard saying so. Now, as you recall on the 29th July, 1987 the Indo-Sri Lanka Agreement was signed. It was signed by the President of Sri Lanka and by the Prime Minister of India. There is a clause in it that the Sri Lankan Government can ask for military assistance which they did. We have gone there at the invitation of the Government of Sri Lanka and what has happened in Sri Lanka in the last two years is that the Indo-Sri Lanka Agreement continues to be the basic framework for our relations

with the Sri Lanka. Considerable progress has been achieved in implementing the different provisions of the Agreement as shown by the successful Provincial, Parliamentary and Presidential elections. A Tamil majority Provincial Council and Provincial Government have been established in the North-Eastern province and is steadily becoming effective. Conditions on the ground continue to improve making possible progressive withdrawal of units of the IPKF. The Government will continue its efforts towards implementation of the Indo-Sri Lanka Agreement in all its aspects in order to bring about peace and normalcy in Sri Lanka. Now, we have discussed these matters a number of times. We are daily in touch with the Government of Sri Lanka at the highest level. Our newly appointed High Commissioner had a meeting with President Premadasa. The Foreign Minister of Sri Lanka said that they would not like IPKF to withdraw because there would be a vacuum which they cannot fill. Our Foreign Secretary is going to Sri Lanka in a few days to have discussion on what is happening. The Ministry of Defence is in touch with their counterpart in Sri Lanka. The Prime Minister spoke about the time-table for the withdrawal of IPKF in the next few months. So, it is not our desire to stay there. But I do want to pay a tribute to the wonderful and gallant role played by the Indian Peace Keeping Force in Sri Lanka under difficult circumstances at the call of duty. We regret very much and it is with sorrow and anguish that I say that even one life should have been lost of our armed forces. But they have gone there to ensure the independence, the territorial integrity and the unity of Sri Lanka and this is what this agreement has ensured and also not to allow other power to fish in troubled waters in the Indian Ocean. Now, a mention has been made about MAWL.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY
(Uttar Pradesh): May I ask a small clarification? How can the Government of India welcome the LTTE-Pre-

[Shri Subramanian Swamy]

madasa talks without the participation of the Chief Ministers who are elected there? You are by passing the Provincial Council and now creating a new power centre. You are creating divisions in the Tamil community itself.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: No, no. We are aware of what you said and the Government of Sri Lanka have kept us informed. It is our hope that all concerned will participate in this process because the objective is to see that the Government of North-East function and functions effectively and that the Tamils are not denied any of their rights which have been ensured and which have been made now public as the Constitution has been amended. You are aware of the history. The relationship between the LTTE and President Premadasa was not very friendly. But if within the framework of the agreement, if this leads to finding a solution, I think, we should give it a chance and that is what I want to say at the moment.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee Ji and one other hon. Member referred to the Non-aligned Movement and what we were going to do with the movement in the next decade because he said that a bipolar world has become a multi-polar world. The world is being de-aligned. Our relations between the East and the West have improved. Colonialism has ended, and once the racist regime in Namibia is out of the way, what will the non-aligned movement do? I think, it is a very valid question and this question has been discussed at the meeting of the Foreign Ministers which was held in Cyprus some weeks ago and will again be discussed at the meeting in Harare in the month of May. I think, all members of the Non-aligned Movement should apply their minds to this very serious problem. We have no colonies to liberate. There is rapprochement between the Soviet Union and

the United States. NATO and Warsaw pacts are not looking at each other with blood-shot eyes. There is rapprochement between the Soviet Union and China, between India and China, between India and Pakistan, between Japan and China. What does the Non-aligned Movement do? Now it will have, to my minds, to meet these challenges, new situations in a creative and constructive manner if it has to remain a dynamic and relevant movement as it has been in the past, three decades and more, since the days of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, President Nasser, Tito and Sukarno and N'Kumah. We are applying our minds. What are the problems? The problems are economic: Third World trade, South-South cooperation, science and technology, environment, ecology, new international economic order. If the movement is to be successful and relevant, then it will have to take a very active interest in these questions and come up with initiatives and proposals and suggestions and not leave the field. We do not relish a world in which one or two or three or four or five countries get together over our heads and decide the fate of mankind. We have a role to play and I have full confidence that the non-aligned Movement will meet these challenges and will make a contribution to the issues that I have raised which are not necessarily colonial, imperialistic racist or political but touch issues of economics, environment, ecology, science and technology etc. etc. So, we look forward to this era for the non-aligned movement and hope to play our role as best as we can. Finally, Sir, I would like to just conclude after referring to one or two matters which were not mentioned. No reference was made to our relations with South American and Latin American countries. Our relations with these countries are friendly and warm. Similarly, no reference was made to the Middle-East and to Africa. The Minister of State for Egypt is here.

The Foreign Minister of Syria was here yesterday. We had very good talks with them. We had good talks

also with our colleague from Vietnam. I hoped that some Members would mention Fiji. But it was not mentioned. I just want to say that we cannot condone in Fiji what we have condemned in South Africa and we are doing our best to ensure that the people of Indian origin get a fair deal there. The prospects do not seem to be particularly bright because the Government of President Rabuka is trying to push through a constitution which will be loaded against, for all times, the people of Indian origin. The 1979 Constitution worked well for nearly eighteen years till it was upset. I think they are being rather short-sighted. Even if they do, with majority powers, this new constitution, it is not going to solve the problem. After twenty years this will come up again. The fundamental question is not being addressed. It is to carry the majority of the people with you and not to pass a paper resolution. They will do it because they have majority. But we are not going to give recognition to it. Neither will we accede to their re-entry into the Common wealth.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : उपसभा-ध्यक्ष जी, मुझे खुशी है कि मंत्री महोदय ने स्वर्ग फिजी का नामना उठाया है। आस्ट्रेलिया के प्रधान मंत्री थोड़े ही दिन पहले नहीं मिलनी जाये थे। देश में यह उम्मीद थी कि उक्ति साथ फिजी के बारे में जहाँ सीमा, लेकिन जो तुलना विरक्ति प्रकटित हुई उसमें फिजी का कोई उल्लेख नहीं था किन कारणों से फिजी की समस्या को हल करने का सरकार विचार रखती है।

श्री को० नटवर सिंह : अब देखिये, अटल बिहारी जी, आप तो बहुत ही इन बातों में परित्वित हैं और बड़े अक्षय के साथ मैं कह रहा हूँ कि कामनवेल्थ की जब 1987 में वेदवृत्त में मीटिंग हुई तो यह प्रश्न पारस और वहाँ कोशिश यह थी कि फिजी को कामनवेल्थ से हटाया जाए। बहुत सारे देश थे और कुछ देशों ने तो यह कहा कि साऊथ

अफ्रीका में सफेद रंग के लोग सेटलज हैं, उनके खिलाफ तो हम विद्रोह कर रहे हैं, तो हिन्दुस्तान के लोग भी फिजी में सेटलज हैं।

तो मैंने कहा कि देखिए, यह बिल्कुल गलत चीज है और फिर दो तीन प्रधान मंत्री, खास करके मारीशस के प्रधान मंत्री बोले कि यह आप का गलत खयाल है यह बराबर का खेल नहीं है। सो पहले तो यह कोशिश की गई कि यह कामनवेल्थ से हटाये जाए। फिर हमने जो भी हम त्रिजारा करते थे, वह बद कर दी। आस्ट्रेलिया और न्यूजी लैंड में भी बद कर दी, मगर कुछ देश ऐसे हैं, जिनका नाम मैं लेना नहीं चाहता, वह मौजूदा सरकार को मजबूर कर रहे हैं और इस तरह से वहाँ कोई तरकीब नहीं हो रही है।

अब न्यूजी लैंड और आस्ट्रेलिया ने जो स्टैंड 1987 में लिया था, वह भी थोड़ा बदल गया है। हमने त्रिक्त किया हुआ है, हमारी बातचीत भी ई है। न्यूजी लैंड और आस्ट्रेलिया के प्रधान मंत्री, दोनों से बात करने के लिए मैं खुद गया था।

अब सुरतेहाल यह है कि अब एक लीगल एक्जर्ट इंग्लैंड से वहाँ पहुंच गया है, पहले तो कामन वेल्थ में गया था, लेकिन वह वापस आ गया है। अब दूसरा चला गया है। तो इससे यह है कि यह सरकार फिजी तरह से वहाँ काम जाए और कहा यह गया है कि हम किसी एक सरकार को रेकोगनाईज नहीं करते, हम तो एक स्टेट को रेकोगनाईज करते हैं।

तो वह सवाल जो है, गम्भीर सवाल है और मेरे खयाल से जिस तरह से आज मौजूदा इंसान है, उसका सामना कर रही है। वह हमारी राय में ठीक नहीं है क्योंकि जब तक जो लोग वहाँ हैं, हिन्दुस्तान से गए हुए, पांच छः पीपी से, उनको वही अखितयार न दिये जाएं, दूसरे को दिए जाए, तो यह चलेगा कैसे? आखिर

[श्री के० नटवर सिंह]

फिजी की आवादी कितनी है ? साढ़े छः सात लाख यानि कि हमारी एक कस्टोडियन्सी से भी एक तिहाई लोग वहाँ रहते हैं इतने दिनों से पाँच और यहाँ से हजार मील दूर है । तो सिर्फ यह कह सकते हैं कि जहाँ तहाँ राय बनाई जाय, कामनवैल्व, नान-अलाईड मूवमेंट में और युनाइटेड नेशंस में पूरी कोशिश हो रही है कि उनके साथ कोई अत्याचार न हो ।

I get a very large number of letters from honourable Members from both Houses of Parliament, recommending students for admission to the United States universities. Now, these students get admissions there but the United States Embassy here does not grant visas. This is very embarrassing for us, that the Foreign Office take this up with the United States Embassy and it rebuffs nine out of ten. So I would most respectfully appeal to honourable Members to discourage this practice. Letters come—and I confess—from my ministerial colleagues too, from all parts of India, and I can, Mr. Narasimha Rao can speak once or twice. But I get letters, three to four letters, everyday for admission. I really feel as an Indian quite distressed about this that we should be going there, and get this kind of treatment. No embassy in Delhi should be in a position to say 'no' to us when we go to them. Therefore, I do want to appeal to honourable Members and I would be grateful if they could pass it on.

In the end I just want to thank all honourable Members who have during their interventions spoken about the correctness of the foreign policy. Maybe, they are not in agreement with details. It is quite understandable. But the national consensus on India's foreign policy continues and may it last for ever? Thank you.

ALLOCATION OF TIME FOR GOVERNMENT LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): I have to make an announcement. I have to inform Members that the Business Advisory Committee at its meeting held today has allocated time for Government legislative business as follows:

- 1, Consideration and return of the Finance Bill, 1989 2 days
- 2, Consideration and passing of the Constitution (Sixtyfirst Amendment) Bill, 1989 3 hours

DISCUSSION ON THE WORKING OF THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS Contd

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: I am so thankful to you, Mr. Vice Chairman for giving me this opportunity.

A thorough analysis and assessment of the foreign policy pursued by India since honourable Rajiv Gandhi started handling the reins of the Government has clearly established the fact that what India has achieved, what you have achieved is nothing but lofty declarations with empty slogans. You have poked your nose in unknown areas and unknown territories and you have started sort of pontification. Our honourable Minister, Mr. Natwar Singh, has referred to the Delhi Declaration. What has India gained? What have you achieved? In the President's Address also it is mentioned on page 2:

"The first indication of the dawn of a new era was the adoption by the Soviet Union of the principle of Non-alignment through the Delhi Declaration. Later negotiations between the US and the USSR led to the dismantling of a whole category of nuclear weapons marking the first ever act of nuclear disarmament since the invention of these terrible weapons."