

[श्री जसवंत सिंह]

यह भी मैं जानता हूँ कि महोदया कि पंजाब में केन्द्राय सरकार ने ऐसा अनुमति दे दा है। पंजाब में पाना भी है, वहाँ बिजला भी है और वहाँ आतंकवादी भी हैं। राजस्थान में न बिजला है, न पाना है और न आतंकवादी हैं और केवल इसलिये हमको अनुमति न दें और पंजाब को अनुमति दें तो यह राजस्थान के साथ अन्याय होगा। इसलिये मेरा केन्द्राय सरकार से आग्रह है कि वह जल्दा से जल्दा इस योजना को अपने स्वाकृति दे।

### THE PARSİ MARRİAGE AND DIVORCE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1986

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, before we take up the statement by the Foreign Affairs Minister, we will dispose of one very small formal item, that is regarding the Parsi Marriage and Divorce (Amendment) Bill, 1986. Mr. Bhardwaj.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI H. R. BHARDWAJ): Madam, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Parsi Marriage and Divorce Act, 1936.

*The question was put and the motion was adopted.*

SHRI H. R. BHARDWAJ: Sir, I introduce the Bill.

### STATEMENT BY MINISTER

Re. Bilateral discussions at SAARC meeting in Bangalore

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI): Hon'ble Members will recall the statement by PM on 19 November regarding the outcome of the Second SAARC

Summit held in Bangalore. In addition to the meetings which were held in the context of SAARC, Prime Minister also exchanged views with other Heads of State/Government in Bangalore as well as during the retreat at Nandi Hills. I had separate bilateral discussions with Foreign Ministers from the other SAARC countries.

In discussions with the Prime Minister of Pakistan, a serious concern on their nuclear weapon programme, assistance to terrorists and their arms build-up was conveyed. Consequent to the meeting between Prime Minister and the Prime Minister of Pakistan, it was agreed that the two countries would work out detailed measures of cooperation in controlling illicit crossing, drug trafficking, smuggling and terrorism along the border. A meeting of the concerned officials of the two Government at the level of Secretary to Government would be held at Lahore in the first week of December, 1986 for this purpose. It was also agreed that the Foreign Secretary would visit Islamabad before the end of the year to continue discussions with his Pakistani counterpart on various aspects of the normalisation process. This agreements, notwithstanding the series of negative steps taken by Pakistan, reflects India's earnestness in promoting the normalisation of relations between our two countries. Prime Minister Junejo assured our Prime Minister that the trial of hijackers would be expedited. We look forward to concrete manifestations of Pakistan's recognition of our vital concerns. This would facilitate the process of normalisation of relations.

Prime Minister also held extensive discussions with the President of Sri Lanka, Mr. J. R. Jayewardene. The Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu was present in Bangalore and had consultations with our Prime Minister. During the discussions it was reaffirmed once again that the resolution of the ethnic problem in Sri Lanka must be

found on the basis of a negotiated political settlement without compromising the unity and territorial integrity of Sri Lanka. It was also agreed that every effort will be made, within the limits of the Sri Lankan Constitution, to improve/modify the latest set of proposals to try and meet Tamil aspirations to the maximum extent possible. These refer especially to the question of link-age, the powers of the Governors, the question of law and order etc. Discussions were continued in Bangalore on November 18 between the Sri Lankan Foreign Minister Mr. A.C.S. Hameed, and the Indian delegation consisting of Minister of State Shri K. Natwar Singh and the Minister of State for Internal Security Shri P. Chidambaram. The package of proposals was discussed further on November 19, when Mr. Hameed visited Delhi for a day. Since this draft was considered two days back on Saturday, only yesterday night my colleagues, Shri K. Natwar Singh, and the Minister of State, Shri P. Chidambaram, have flown to Colombo and are having discussion with President Jayewardene this afternoon. They will be coming back late tonight. The response of the Sri Lankan Government in this regard is expected to be conveyed shortly.

In Prime Minister's discussions with the President of Bangladesh, there was a general review of developments in the bilateral relations between the two countries since President Ershad's visit to India in July, 1986. It was decided to extend the mandate of the Indo-Bangladesh Joint Committee on River Waters by another six months, namely, upto 21st May, 1986. It was recognised that the work of the Joint Committee of Experts had been carried out at much too slow a pace and this should be completed in a time bound programme.

The Prime Minister had a warm and friendly meeting with the King of Bhutan during the course of which there was an exchange of views on

bilateral and international issues of mutual concern. Prime Minister's tete-a-tete with the King of Nepal was held in a cordial atmosphere and contributed to closer understanding and friendship between the two countries. Prime Minister's talks with the President of Maldives gave the opportunity of reviewing progress in our bilateral cooperation since Prime Minister's visit to Male in February and also on matters relating to SAARC. The discussions with the Heads of State of Bhutan, Nepal and Maldives helped to enlarge the areas of mutual understanding and to further strengthen the traditional friendly ties that exist between India and these countries.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Clarifications by Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy.

**SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY:** (Karnataka): The meeting of the Heads of Governments is always welcome. In that sense I look at the meeting of the seven Heads of Governments of South Asia in Bangalore.

It was a good decision that the SAARC Summit had taken to establish institutional infrastructure for future conduct of activities of SAARC. It was a positive step. It was also a positive step that all the vital issues concerning this region will be periodically reviewed and decisions taken.

The atmosphere when the SAARC meeting was held at Bangalore was not very conducive and I had my own apprehensions about its outcome because there were differences between various Governments in respect of vital matters which could divide the SAARC community. However, it was pleasing that the Heads of Governments had been able to maintain this semblance of unity of this region and created a kind of atmosphere which was necessary to reduce acrimony, controversy, and disputes which are

[Shri M. R. Gurupadaswamy]

there. Having said this, may I say that vital issues have not been settled at the SAARC meeting. I mean the bilateral issues. The ethnic issue on Sri Lanka remains intractable and the so-called good offices of the Government of India have not taken us far enough to bring about settlement on this very vital question. Now, the representatives of the Government of India have gone to Colombo. I do not know what message they are going to bring here. But my fears are after the SAARC meeting, the Government of Sri Lanka has not changed its stance towards the ethnic minorities. They are indulging in violence, terrorism, uprooting of innocent Tamilians killing of people and they have not shown any sign of trying to understand the situation, the psychology of the Tamilians. They have not given any proof that they are very keen in settling this controversial matter. Sir, in this context, may I ask the Minister what were the new proposals given by the Sri Lankan Government? What were the newness of it? I would like to know it, because in the statement he has said categorically that nothing will be done to disturb the Constitution of the Sri Lanka. What are the new things that he has brought up? I would like the Minister to throw some light on this.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** I would request the hon. Members to be very brief in seeking their clarifications, because there are about 10 or 12 Members who wanted to seek clarifications.

**SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY:** I will be brief. I would like to know what are the new proposals that he has brought up before the Sri Lanka Government?

Next, Madam, about Pakistan. It is unfortunate that the President of Pakistan did not come to Bangalore. He has sent his Prime Minister. I have no quarrel. I do not want to make any comments, but if the president had been there it would have

been more useful, profitable to discuss with him about the various things that are dividing this country and Pakistan. For example, the terrorism in the border areas, the training that is being given by the Pakistan Government and the rest of it. So I would like to know whether any change is taking place in the approach, the mood of Pakistan after SAARC meeting? I would like to know whether Pakistan has conceded that they were not harbouring any terrorists or giving any training to the terrorists? I would also like to know whether the Government of Pakistan has assured us about the nuclear weapons. In what way the Government of India would like Pakistan to assure in this vital matter and in respect of supply of sophisticated arms by America to Pakistan? How the Government of India look at this question? that is the reaction of the Government of Pakistan? (Time bell rings) I would like my hon. friend to throw some light on two or three vital matters which I have raised.

**SHRI CHITTA BASU** (West Bengal): Madam Deputy Chairman, I want to seek a clarification pointedly on three aspects of the statements. The first point is Indo-Pak relations. Now, from the statement, it appears that the Government have been shifting assessment regarding the bilateral relations between India and Pakistan as for example, the Prime Minister was on record to say that the relations between India and Pakistan of late have not improved but deteriorated and on the basis of that statement, I presume the Government of India choose to postpone the visit of our Prime Minister to Pakistan which was itself kept long pending. Now on this point, may I know whether during the Bangalore session of SAARC or after the bilateral talks between the Foreign Ministers of the two countries, the Government has come to a conclusion that there has been a reverse direction of the Indo-Pak relations and whether

the situation has improved instead of deteriorating as mentioned by the Prime Minister? Secondly, in this connection, whether it is also not the fact that Pakistan sought to raise certain bilateral issues on the forum of SAARC and also beyond the forum of SAARC which has contributed, according to me, to the further souring of relations? Would the hon. Minister clarify the position and the Government assessment in that regard?

My second point relates to the development or rather extension of mandate of Indo-Bangladesh Joint Committee on River by another six months. Madam, the House is quite aware that the sharing of Ganga water between India and Bangladesh has all along been considered to be strictly, exclusively a bilateral issue. Now, of late, the Government decision has taken it to such a position that Nepal has also been involved thereby transforming a bilateral issue into a trilateral issue and as far as we can understand the world situation, many foreign countries are also interested in the matter of managing the waters of the Ganga because of their own interests. That is there is every possibility of internationalisation of the dispute regarding the Ganga water between Bangladesh and India. As a matter of fact, Bangladesh has sought for the internationalisation of the dispute. *(Interruption).*

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Please come to your third point soon.

**SHRI CHITTA BASU:** My second point is why, under what circumstances, on whose advice and on what reference this Indo-Bangladesh bipartite issue has been converted into a trilateral issue with the potential of being an international issue? Whether the hon. Minister is in a position to clarify it?

My third point is Mr. Chidambaram, whose name has also been mentioned.. he is on record to say in

Madras that the proposal, which has lately emerged after SAARC discussions and discussion with you and Mr. Hamid, is of improved variety. I do not know whether he is in a position to tell the House and take the House into confidence as to what is that improvement in the package proposal?

Lastly, I would like to know whether the Government of India would be continuing to adhere to the stand for a political solution of the Sri Lankan ethnic problem. All militants groups of Sri Lanka should be associated before finalising the package proposal.

**SHRI V. GOPALSAMY (Tamil Nadu):** Madam Deputy Chairman, at the very outset, I condemn the vacillating oscillating and bungling policy of this Government towards the ethnic problem of Tamils in Sri Lanka: You have completely deviated from the policy adopted by Mrs. Indira Gandhi, which was stated by one other than the President of Sri Lanka, Mr. Jayewardene, when he gave a press interview to *India Today* some months back. The other day when the Prime Minister made a statement, I sought a clarification about the proposals which were stated by the Prime Minister to be good, that is; fragmenting the eastern province into three parts, which has not at all been accepted either by the militants or by the moderates, even by the TULF. Under the guise of negotiations, when they were brought to Thimpu and when they were continuing the talks, the Tamils of Sri Lanka have been continuously attacked. Even today Tamils in Sri Lanka face attacks, shelling from the sea, strafing from war-planes and also ground attack. They have been thrown into the death arena of annihilation and decimation by the blood-thirsty regime of Sri Lanka. When the blood of Tamils is flowing in parts of Jaffna, you have shaken hands with the head of the racist regime whose hands are tainted with the blood of Tamils.

[Shri V. Gopalsamy]

Mr. Foreign Minister, the visit of Chaim Herzog from Israel was kept a total secret. You have been continuously hoodwinked. This Government has been continuously hoodwinked and deceived by the Sri Lankan Government. Mr. Chaim Herzog from Israel has visited Sri Lanka. Also they have opened a Special Interests Section attached to the US Embassy. They are going to have a full-fledged diplomatic mission. Pakistan pilots are operating war-planes to kill our people there. And Sri Lanka is getting arms from the racist regime of Pretoria clandestinely. Even after all these happenings, you are playing into the hands of the racist regime there. What for? To boost up the image of your Prime Minister as if you are trying to get success in the accord or something like that. *(Interruptions)* Yes, I have got the right to say it. *(Interruptions)* I am not yielding. I have got every right to express my view. This is a democratic forum. *(Interruptions)* I am not yielding. You cannot pressurise me or browbeat me. Madam, this is a very pertinent question. You wish to have friendship with Sri Lanka at the cost of Tamils. That is why I ask why you stated that the proposals were good, which have been totally rejected by the Tamils. At the same time, Madam Mr. Jayewardene has declared, "This is the last opportunity I am giving. Unless you accept these proposals, you will face war." "There will be war", he has declared. Then he came to Bangalore, and you said the proposals were good. Your High Commissioner has also said that the proposals are good. Why are you pressurising the Tamils? Why are you blackmailing them? *(Time bell rings)* I would only take two more minutes. Mr. Foreign Minister, I would like to get a categorical, specific reply for a specific question. What happened on the 8th November? Militant leaders were arrested and detained under house-arrest in Madras. I would

like to know whether the External Affairs Ministry, this Government gave instructions to the Tamil Nadu Government because the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu has said, "It is due to the direction of the Central Government". So you should put the record straight, whether you gave instructions to the Tamil Nadu Government to arrest those persons on November 8. Again two days back, wireless sets were seized from them and an official from the Central Government has expressed his concern, that what happened in Tamil Nadu has totally distressed the Central Government. I would like to know from the Central Government: what happened two days back in Tamil Nadu, is it due to your direction? Is it due to your compulsion? Mr. Foreign Minister, you will be shocked to know what Mr. Premadasa stated in Parliament in Sri Lanka just two days back. He stated: "We should be thankful not to the Government of India but we should be thankful to the Inspector-General of Tamil Nadu Police." I want to know whether Tamil Nadu is still on the map of India or not, whether you are running the Government or not. You are putting the blame on the Tamil Nadu Government and the Tamil Nadu Government is putting the blame on you. Why? And Premadasa says 'We should be thankful to the Inspector General of Police of Tamil Nadu'. Why? Because, when they were arrested, and they were humiliated; video cassettes were taken and they were sold for a premium to Sri Lankan agents. And the video cassettes had reached Sri Lanka too. Four years ago when the militant leaders were interrogated in the IGP's office, whatever deposition they gave, their depositions and their photographs appeared in the Sri Lankan press after a fortnight. I had said this on the floor of the House because the Inspector General of Police of Tamil Nadu Mr. Mohan Doss, has become a Boria of Tamil Nadu. He is a planted agent of Sri Lanka and of

Mussad. That is why they say 'We are thankful to the Inspector General of Police'. Therefore, I say even now whatever happens in Madras it reaches their doors in no time. We have been betrayed. Therefore, I would like to know from the External Affairs Minister whether he gave instructions for the November 8 episode and again for the episode which took place two days back. I want a categorical answer from the Foreign Affairs Minister.

**SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY** (Andhra Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairman, the Minister stated in his statement about the negotiations with Pakistan—

"...a serious concern on their nuclear weapon programme, assistance to terrorists and their arms build-up, was conveyed. Consequent to the meeting....it was agreed that the two countries would work out detailed measures of co-operation in controlling illicit crossing, drug trafficking; smuggling and terrorism along the border."

I would like to know from the Minister when this very important SAARC meeting took place, whether there was an opportunity to discuss with the Pakistani Prime Minister in details the danger that is being posed towards India. They have failed to bring to the notice of the Pakistani Government the great danger that is facing us. I would like to know from the Foreign Minister whether the issue of American bases on Pakistani soil has been discussed. Not only that. The United States is clandestinely operating highly sophisticated P-3 fighter planes from Pakistan under a secret understanding between the two countries. I would like to know whether this issue has been discussed with the Prime Minister of Pakistan and, if so; what his reaction was, whether our Government strongly condemned it and whether our Government conveyed to the Pakistani Government that it is an unfriendly

act, that it amounts to a declaration of war against India. Did you bring this to the notice of Pakistan?

Secondly, there was a proposal in the past by Pakistan for a no-war pact and India proposed a treaty of peace and friendship. What happened to that? Nothing has been heard of it, not a single word is said about it either in this statement or in that meeting. One proposal was by Pakistan for a no-war declaration and the other proposal was by India for a treaty of peace and friendship between these two countries. What happened to them?

Thirdly, under the Simla Agreement the bilateral issues and other which are to be decided bilaterally, by bilateral talks, need not be taken to international forums. But Pakistan time and again is taking the Kashmir issue to the United Nations; whenever it is proper, it wants to drag this issue to the international forum. What action has the Government of India taken on it? What the Government of India is doing in this respect? Pakistan is indulging in this kind of a thing time and again and is raising bilateral issues in the international forums. Therefore, I would like to know whether this issue also has been discussed with the Prime Minister of Pakistan.

Then, so far as Sri Lanka issue is concerned, I would like to seek only one clarification. We have been discussing some concrete proposals given by the Sri Lankan Government to solve the ethnic problem. On the one hand, they are having discussions and they want Indian intervention and they want that India should take interest in solving this problem and, at the same time they are killing the innocent people in Sri Lanka. The army has been posted against them and it is launching attacks against the innocent people. I would like to know whether the Prime Minister has brought this to the notice of the Sri Lankan President and whether he

[Shri B. Satyanarayan Reddy] has asked him to stop these killings, the genocide on the Tamil people. Unless and until this is done, I do not think that any proposal will be accepted by the militants. I do not think that this has as yet happened. Not only that. *(Time bell rings)*.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Jaswant Singh.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: Madam, the Prime Minister of Israel has visited Sri Lanka. Now, Pakistan and Sri Lanka are the members of the Non-Aligned Group and they are also members of the SAARC. I would like to know whether the Government of India has brought to the notice of these Governments the latest developments and asked Sri Lanka not to have anything to do with Israel from whom they are getting military assistance and are trying to have other types of co-operation. Otherwise, what is the meaning of their being the member of the Non-Aligned Group? I do not think that the Government of India has taken a serious view of these things. Thank you, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Jaswant Singh.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): Madam Deputy Chairman, we have spoken earlier about bilateral issues dominating the Second SAARC Summit. Now, it is only to re-emphasise an essential point that I would like to say that unless India, as the only country with borders adjoining all the other member countries works out an effective mechanism for resolving bilateral issues, they will continue to dominate SAARC and my fear is—I hope it does not materialise—that some day perhaps SAARC itself may be compromised. I will now come straight to my clarifications.

First, about Indo-Sri Lankan discussions. The Indo-Sri Lankan dis-

cussion was sandwiched between post—and pre-SAARC developments, on-the-eve-of SAARC developments and the post SAARC development, it is of these developments like the arrest of the various Tamil refugees etc. that dominated. The Prime Minister continued to call them refugees in his Press statement and he did not call them as terrorists and yet they come for negotiations. Now, Madam, the pre-SAARC development: you arrest all of them, and the post-SAARC development: you take away their wireless sets etc. etc. Really, this is tantamount to the Government of India playing its last effective administrative card meaningfully to influence the situation. Now, I also cannot help reflecting that all this has really brought Indo-Sri Lankan relations to possibly a very critical point and the Government of India has actually played its last card as far as resolving the ethnic issue in Sri Lanka is concerned. Please allay that fear of mine.

I will now come to the Indo-Pakistan question. I am really perplexed by the references to the Joint Commission etc. because the honourable Minister's statement would suggest that this is an Indian programme for working out detailed measures of co-operation in controlling illicit border crossing, drug trafficking, terrorism, etc. The statement itself reads as if this was a proposal made by the Government of India, as if India made this proposal to Pakistan. And, Madam, then the Minister goes on to say that an agreement was arrived at and this agreement is despite the negative attitude of Pakistan, which is a very worth while and a very suitable gesture on the part of India. I am really perplexed and I cannot understand really as to who made this proposal. When a direct question was asked of our Prime Minister in Bangalore; "What do you have to say about this proposal to Pakistan?" the Prime Minister replied, "This is quite

a good suggestion and a lot of technical details need to be worked out." Therefore I would like to seek a clarification from the honourable Minister because facts do not seem to be matching his own statement or they do not match what the Prime Minister has said. Therefore please clarify who actually made this proposal. Is it the Government of India's proposal which has been accepted by Pakistan or perhaps, Pakistan made the proposal which you have accepted, in which case about what proposal the Prime Minister was talking? We know that the Prime Minister is given to talking through his hat; not all of us talk through our hats. But what I would refer to is the fact that all his really leads to a confusing situation. Anyway, what are the technical details to which the Prime Minister was referring in his Press Conference in Bangalore when he was dabbling in the situation? Before I came to Bangladesh, I have three simple questions to ask. The Prime Minister in Bangalore has put forward a new thesis that the three problems which confront Indo-Pakistan relations now are Pakistan's nuclear programme, Pakistani assistance to terrorism and drug trafficking. Madam I recollect repeatedly the Government of India coming forward and saying that one of the difficulties that we faced in Indo-Pakistan relating is foreign bases in Pakistan. Therefore, am I to understand from the Minister that the question of foreign bases in Pakistan has now evaporated vanished?

Finally, I have to ask three clarifications on Bangladesh, and then, Madam, I conclude. I am not taking more than a minute. You talked to the President of Bangladesh. Did you talk about Assam-Bangladesh border fencing which has been pending for so many years and which continues to bedevil Assam? Did you talk about the Chakma refugees who continue to come into India even till today, which is a critical, boiling issue of Indo-Bangladesh relating? Did you talk about Moore Islands?

Then, what is the point in coming up with confusing coy phrases? In paragraph 5 of the statement in reference to talks with the King of Nepal there is a coy phrase used:

"Prime Minister's tete-a-tete.."

In the Collins English Dictionary, "tete-a-tete" means "a small sofa for two..." It also goes on to define "tete-a-tete" as a private, confidential conversation, etc. This is a very funny way of drafting—whoever has drafted this statement—because the Collins Dictionary also goes on to say, and there is also a word called... "tete folle," which means 'scatter-brain'. Are we to assume that the whole foreign policy of the Government is so scatter-brained that they cannot even draft statements properly?

Thank you very much.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Satya Prakash Malaviya.

श्री सत्यप्रकाश मालवीय (उत्तर प्रदेश) : माननीय वररावर इस प्रकार के समाचार आते रहते हैं कि इस देश में जो आतंकवाद है इसको मदद विदेशी शक्तियों से मिलती है और हमारी सीमा जो पंजाब, जम्मू, काश्मीर की ओर है वहां से भी आतंकवादी आते हैं और उनको कुछ विदेशी मुल्कों से सहायता मिलती है। सरकार ने यह भी स्वीकार किया है कि उनको हथियार भी ऐसे मुल्कों से सप्लाई किये जाते हैं। यह भी बताया गया है मंत्री जी के बक्तव्य में कि पाकिस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री से भी उनकी कुछ वार्ता हुई है तो मैं सरकार से यह स्पष्टीकरण चाहता हूं कि जो आरोप भारत सरकार समय-समय पर लगाती रहती है कि पाकिस्तान की सरकार हिंदुस्तान में जो आतंकवादी हैं उनका समर्थन कर रही है और समर्थन ही नहीं कर रही है बल्कि उनको हथियार भी सप्लाई कर रही है। तो मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि इस सिलसिले में भारत के प्रधान मंत्री ने पाकिस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री से कोई बातचीत



[श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय]

की है? अगर की है तो उन्होंने भारत की शिकायत को उनके सामने रखा या नहीं? अगर रखा तो उनकी क्या प्रतिक्रिया थी और पाकिस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री ने इस सम्बन्ध में क्या आश्वासन दिया है कि भारत के साथ मित्रतापूर्ण व्यवहार वे रखेंगे और जो भारत के शत्रु हैं उनको सहायता नहीं देंगे?

SHRI M. A. BABY (Kerala): Madam Deputy Chairman, the geo-political position of our country and other member countries in the SAARC is of crucial importance in the geo-political map, as all of us know. So, only in the back-drop of the overall developments in the world today one can look at the SAARC meeting which we have recently had at Bangalore. Madam, in this background, firstly, I would like to get a clarification from the hon. Minister whether they did seriously discuss about the involvement of foreign, imperialist powers in our area, in aiding and abetting various terrorist forces, including within our country. Recently two countries of this South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation, two member-countries, were visited by the Defence Secretary of USA. I do not want to call him world burglar but if I go by the activities of USA like attacking Libya, attacking Granada, and so on, one has to admit that a kind of world burglary is being practised by US imperialism. He did visit two countries. Now, did you discuss the outcome of his visit to Pakistan? Again, going by the activities of US imperialism, I would like to ask. With what confidence and with what illusion of reliability did we receive Casper Weinberger into our country? Did this issue figure in Bangalore? We all understand that in international diplomacy we may have to handshake even with those whose hands are blood-stained, as has been emotionally mentioned by my colleague. That is a kind of sacrifice in

international diplomacy. But once we do that sacrifice, we should see whether that sacrifice could yield meaningful results commensurate with the sacrifice that we make. In this context, without ignoring the minor achievements of the SAARC meeting at Bangalore, I feel that the outcome of this SAARC meeting at Bangalore is not commensurate with the sacrifices that we have made by going and sitting along with people like Jayewardene and representatives of Pakistan. Madam, I would also like to ask whether you could concretely discuss with Pakistani authorities regarding the kind of help that they are getting from the United States of America, whether they are entertaining the US bases in Pakistan and whether they are allowing Pakistani soil, as is fully known to us, to train terrorists who are trying to wage an undeclared war against our country.

Another important aspect which I would like to get clarified is regarding the economic dependence of most of these countries of this region on Western powers. Almost all countries of this region who sat in the SAARC at Bangalore, are dependent on Western countries. We have been hearing something about the South-South cooperation and things like that. I would like to know whether apart from discussing very vital and burning political issues relating to this area, you could discuss any aspect of economic co-operation within this region so that the dependence on Western powers could be lessened. Almost all the countries in the SAARC meeting are economically dependent on Western imperialism we know the economic aid from countries like America brings not only economic aid but the other dreaded AIDS also. From that angle also, I want to know whether we could discuss something concretely in relation to economic cooperation among the countries of this region so that dependence on the imperialist countries can be lessened.

SHRI GHULAM RASOOL MATTO (Jammu and Kashmir): Madam Deputy Chairman, mention has been made here that the Prime Minister has said that our relations with Pakistan have deteriorated. It has also been mentioned here, "Notwithstanding the series of negative steps taken by Pakistan...but in international relations, relations between two countries can become smooth overnight provided the parties behave properly. So, I don't think there is any contradiction in it that if Pakistan behaves properly, we cannot improve relations with Pakistan."

My specific question, Madam Deputy Chairman, is with regard to the meeting that is going to take place in December between our Foreign Secretary and their Foreign Secretary regarding detailed measures of co-operation in controlling illegal crossing, drug trafficking, smuggling and terrorism along the border. Madam, in Kashmir, consequent upon the political change there and the impending elections that are going to take place, I think, we will have to give some priority to the points to be discussed in the December meeting. There are four or five very important points—illegal crossing, drug trafficking, smuggling and terrorism. May I request the hon. Minister, may I hope that he will assure me that as a measure of priority, terrorism will be discussed first in the December meeting so that we in Jammu and Kashmir and in Punjab are spared the agonies of terrorists in the impending elections that are going to take place in Kashmir.

Madam, my second point is with regard to the statement made by the hon. Prime Minister in Bangalore. Mr. Junejo had said that America was not giving any AWACS to Pakistan. I want to know whether the statement with the Government of India? I want to know whether the statement made by Mr. Junejo is correct or the

information available with the Government of India is correct.

My third and the last point is with regard to Bangladesh. I do not want to go into the points that Mr. Jaswant Singh and the others made. But I have got one small point. I was amused to find that when Bengal was a composite territory, we in Kashmir used to have very good business relations with Bengal for shawls. What is the position now? Now the Bangladesh is are buying Kashmir shawls in Jeddah and not importing from India. Will the Government of India assure us that there will be trade relations with Bangladesh? Apart from the political aspect of it, I am talking of the trade relations. Have trade relations been discussed with Bangladesh? Are the Government of India in a position to have trade relations with Bangladesh so that the commodities that we can supply to them are easily available to them? Thank you.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA alias V. ARUNACHALAM (Tamil Nadu): Madam, this statement deals about bilateral talks with three countries—Pakistan, Sri Lanka and Bangladesh. In this context, I would like to thank the hon. Prime Minister for making his earnest efforts to settle the Sri Lanka Tamil issues. Our Chief Minister also has co-operated to the maximum level to settle this issue without further casualties. Unfortunately, Mr. Jayewardene is still following an obnoxious policy. He is not at all co-operating in the same spirit with which the Tamil leaders of Sri Lanka are co-operating. Madam, in the beginning it was said that the solution must be found within the unity of Sri Lanka. Now, the leaders of Tamil group have come forward to find a solution keeping the identity and the linguistic unity of Tamils within the Union of Sri Lanka. This is a drastic change, a revolutionary change on the part of Tamil leaders. When the Tamil leaders have relaxed their rigidity, when they

have come forward to find a solution without ramaging the unity of Sri Lanka, Mr. Jaywardna has shifted his ground to destroy the unity of Tamils by bifurcating the eastern provinces into three divisions. Then, there is another thing. Whatever he may say, still the attack is going on. Madam on the one side negotiations are going on and our hon. Ministers are visiting Sri Lanka. At the same time the attacks on the Tamils are also taking place. I would like to know whether our Government have taken any concrete steps to stop the killing of innocent Tamils in Sri Lanka. That is more important before we find a permanent solution.

Madam, during the negotiations our Prime Minister has spent more than six hours. Really we have to thank him much for that. In that discussion it has been reported by the press that there is an identification of area. We would like to know what that identification of area is on the basis of which you are going to find a solution. That is an important thing.

Then, Madam, as quoted by my dear friend, Mr. Gopalsamy Mr. Reddy and others, in the press it was reported that the proposal given by Mr. Jayewardene is very good, but unfortunately Tamil Leaders are not accepting. Madam it is a very damaging statement. India is the mediating authority. It is expected to keep quiet in giving its views till we reach the last point. But it is reported that the proposal given by Jayewardene is good. I would like to know if it is a fact. If the report is false I will be very happy. If the report is genuine, I would like to know under what circumstances and under what principles we are saying Jayewardene's proposal is good.

**SHRI V. GOPAL SAMY:** Because it is given by Jayewardene, it is good.

**SHRI ALADI ARUNA alias V. ARUNACHALAM:** Madam, if we say that the proposal given by Mr. Jayewardene is a good one for the interest of the Tamil people, when does it not amount to say that the Government of India is supporting the proposal of Mr. Jayewardene? Does it not amount to say that the Government of India is acting against the interests of Tamils? We will not give room for such things. That is why I want to have categorical answer from the hon. Minister to these things. With these observation Madam, I concluded.

**श्री चतुरानन मिश्र (बिहार) :**

उपसमापति महोदय, यह अच्छी बात है कि हमारे विदेश मंत्री जी ने सार्क सम्मेलन अवसर पर द्विपक्षीय बातचीतों के लिये और उन देशों के बीच कर्तार करने का इनिशियेटिव लिया । हमारा देश बहुत बड़ा है और हमारे पड़ोसी देश छोटे-छोटे हैं । इसलिये उनको समय-समय पर यह आवश्यक करवा जरूरी है कि हम उनके प्रति कोई बिग ब्रदर एटें-ट्यूट नहीं रखते हैं । इसलिये मैं इसका स्वागत करता हूँ । लेकिन जो बातें स्टेटमेंट में आई हैं उनके बारे में क्लेरी-फिकेशन होना जरूरी है । पाकिस्तान के सम्बन्ध में मंत्री महोदय ने अपने बयान में कहा है कि

This will facilitate the process of normalisation of relations,

क्या अभी कुछ ऐसा हुआ है, पाकिस्तान ने ऐसा कुछ कहा है जिससे हम लोग समझें कि नार्मलाइजेशन का प्रोसेस शुरू होगी, "फर्दर इट विल फॅसिलिटेट" । जहां तक हमारी जानकारी है वहां पर अमे-रिका को सामरिक अड्डे दिये गये हैं और खुद अमेरिकी अखबारों में इसकी चर्चा है कि वहां से जलूसी जहाज उड़ते हैं, दूसरे देशों के नक्शे खींचे हैं और खुफिया काम करते हैं । यह सब हमारे खिलाफ भी होता है । वहां से ट्रेनिंग ले जो टेरोरिस्ट आते हैं वे यहां पर रोज हमारे देशवासियों की हत्या करते हैं । तो क्या यह वक्त नहीं आया है जब कि हम पाकिस्तान से साफ-साफ कहें कि

जब तक टेरोरिस्टों का वहां से आना बन्द नहीं होगा तब तक वार्तालाप का कोई अर्थ नहीं है। एक तरफ हमारे लोग मारे जायें और दूसरी तरफ उनसे मधुर, मधुर, मीठी, मीठी बातें हों, ऐसा नहीं हो सकता है। इससे भ्रम पैदा होता है। इसलिये एक अवसर आया है, उनको अवाकस मिला, जब उन्होंने अमरिका को अड्डा दिया है हम उनसे यह बात कहें। पहले एक बार भारत ने ऐसा किया भी था। पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू के जमाने में उन्होंने पाकिस्तान को कहा था कि जब आप "सीटो" और "सेन्टो" में हैं तो काश्मीर में मतसंग्रह बातें नहीं होंगी। "सेन्टो" में जाने से सारी परिस्थिति बदल गई है। इसलिये मेरा कहना है कि इस सम्बन्ध में आप उनसे स्पष्टीकरण क्यों नहीं ले लेते ?

मेरा दूसरा प्रश्न यह है कि नेपाल के महाराजा ने जो बातचीत हुई है, वह ठीक है। टेरेरेटे वाली बात श्री जसवंत सिंह जी ने उठाई है। लेकिन मैं दो विन्दुओं पर मंत्री महोदय से सफाई चाहता हूँ। हमारी राज्य जो बिहार है वहां की सारी नदियां नेपाल से आती हैं और हम हर साल बरबाद होते हैं। हर साल हजार करोड़ रुपये से ज्यादा का नुकसान बिहार को होता है। 30-40 वर्ष तो आपको बात करते-करते हो गये हैं, आफिसर लेवल पर बात करते हो गये हैं। आप महाराजा लेवल पर अब बात करके देखें और उन नदियों के बारे में कोई रास्ता निकालेंगे या नहीं या फिर हम ऐसे ही बरबाद होते रहेंगे। अगर आपने बातचीत नहीं की हो, कम समय मिला हो, वैसे 40 वर्ष कोई कम समय नहीं है, एक आध वर्ष और ले कर के क्या आप इसका जल्दी से कोई रास्ता निकालने की सोच रहे हैं ? दूसरा यह कि नेपाली सीमा पर तस्करी और अपराध होते रहते हैं, इस बारे में भी आप उनसे बात कर सकें या नहीं ? श्रीलंका बारे में इतना ही कहना है कि हम जिस प्रोजेक्ट को समझते हैं कि वह आधार है जिस आधार पर वार्तालाप किया जाए वह तो हमारा ख्याल है लेकिन क्या श्रीलंका तमिल मिनिस्टर्स का भी वही ख्याल है या नहीं है, अगर ऐसा नहीं है तो

यह भी स्पष्ट होना चाहिये कि वह इस आधार को मानते हैं या नहीं। बाकी बातें आ चुकी हैं, मैं दोहराना नहीं चाहता हूँ। बंगलादेश के बार्डर को घेरने के प्रश्न पर क्या बातें हुई हैं हमारा आप से सुझाव है बंगलादेश से आकर यह लोग जो पाकिस्तान के बार्डर पर पंजाब में मारे जाते हैं बंगलादेश से निकलते हैं वहां आकर मरते हैं तो आप इनका वहां से निकलना ही बन्द कर दीजिये इससे मरना बन्द हो जायेगा। हमारा ख्याल यह है कि इनका बंगलादेश से आना ही बन्द कर दीजिये यह जो रोज-रोज हत्याएं होती हैं इनके विषय में सुन कर के भ्रम पैदा होता है। कहा जाता है कि टेरोरिस्ट मारे गये हैं लेकिन मारे जाते हैं यह गरीब बंगलादेशी।

**श्री राम चन्द्र विकल (उत्तर प्रदेश) :**  
मैं माननीय विदेश मंत्री जी से जानना चाहता हूँ, इसमें कोई दो राय नहीं है, सभी लोगों ने स्वागत किया है कि भारत के पड़ोसी देशों के साथ अच्छे सम्बन्ध हों। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी से बातचीत हुई तथा जो बंगलौर में सम्मेलन हुआ, उसमें जो वहां समझौते हुए, इरादे हुए, पड़ोसी देशों के साथ अच्छे सम्बन्ध हों, परन्तु आज एक स्पेशल मेशन के दौरान कपिल वर्मा जी ने त्यागी जी ने उठाया था और माननीय सदस्यों ने कहा कि पाकिस्तान में सैनिक अड्डों का स्थापित करना, हवाई जहाजों की ट्रेनिंग तथा हमारी सभी सीमाओं पर खाई खोदा जाना और आए दिन भारत की सीमा में घुसपैठ होना भारत के अन्दर घुसना इन सब बातों के बावजूद फिर पाकिस्तान से जो बात सचिव स्तर पर आपस में दिसम्बर में लाहौर या इस्लामाबाद में होगी मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि बंगलौर में जहां प्रधान मंत्री जी थे, पाकिस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री तथा विदेश मंत्री भी थे क्या सचिव स्तर की वार्ता कुछ सफल हो सकेगी, इसमें कुछ सन्देह पैदा होता है। दूसरा यह कि हमारे विदेश राज्य मंत्री और गृह राज्य मंत्री जी श्रीलंका गये हैं वे भी कुछ इसी तरह से सफलता की ओर जा पायेंगे या नहीं। यह एक चिंता का विषय है। इसमें दो राय नहीं कि पड़ोसी देशों से अच्छे

[श्री राम चन्द्र विकल]

सम्बन्ध हों लेकिन पड़ोसी देश भी अच्छे सम्बन्ध चाहते हैं या नहीं इन बातों पर भी चिन्तित होना चाहिये और उसका कुछ निराकरण भी होना चाहिए।

**SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAV-RAO JADHAV (Maharashtra):** Madam Deputy Chairman first of all, I would like to congratulate you because I am speaking for the first time after you became the Deputy Chairman. Secondly, I would like to congratulate . . .

**SHRI V. GOPALSAMY:** Maharashtra): affinity.

**SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAV RAO JADHAV:** Our hon. Prime Minister has always believed in the settlement of bilateral issues amicably, through peaceful means, through negotiations. Now, the statement says "In discussions with the Prime Minister of Pakistan a serious concern on their nuclear programme, assistance to terrorists and their arms build-up was conveyed". In this connection, I would like to point out that Pakistan has been supplied sophisticated weapons by the USA. They have been supplied with AWACS and other sophisticated aircraft for spying and other purposes. They have also stolen nuclear technology from other countries. The USA has been helping them. I would like to know whether these issues have been discussed with Pakistan?

In the case of Sri Lanka also, we believe in settling the problem through negotiations. This has been our tradition. But we have been reading in the newspapers that a number of Tamils are being brutally killed. I would like to point out here that a settlement cannot be arrived at by only one side. Both sides have to make efforts and co-operate. I would also draw the attention of the hon.

Minister to another disturbing development. Soon after the SAARC summit, there was a news-item to the effect that the President of Israel visited Sri Lanka. It is crystal clear that Israel and the U.K. are supplying arms to Sri Lanka and they are also sending their men for training the Sinhalese in their attacks against the Tamils there. So, is it

2 P.M. interference in their internal matters or is it international killing of the innocent Tamils?

The seven countries which have participated in the Conference, are the neighbouring countries. If there are any bilateral issues, they should be resolved through peaceful negotiations only. If that is not done, none of the countries can make any progress. So, it is better that all the bilateral issues are resolved through peaceful discussions.

Coming to Bangladesh, some of the hon. Members raised the issue, stating that some of the innocent Bangladeshies are found on the Indian border have been killed. I would like to know whether they are really innocent or they are the trained terrorists who infiltrated into our country. What is the fact?

Then there is the Ganga water dispute, there is the border dispute between India and Bangladesh. I would like to know whether these issues were discussed or not. (Time bell rings). Madam our party is the largest party in the House and after one minute you are giving the bell. I am raising some very important issues.

I agree that the peaceful negotiations, peaceful settlement should be there. We are always liberal, too much liberal, in understanding the problems of others but others also should be equally liberal to understand us. Tamil people are being brutally killed. They are of the Indian origin. It is our moral duty to help them and also help those who are being killed in any other party of the world. If

they are not prepared to solve the matters through negotiations, it will be a sheer waste of time to talk to them about any settlement. So, I want clarifications on some of these issues.

**SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY** (Pondicherry): Just one minute, Madam. Thank you for having given me this opportunity. I will confine myself to two issues. The hon. Minister, in his statement, has stated that the package of proposals was discussed further on November 19, when Mr. Hameed visited Delhi for a day.

I would like to know, what are the package of proposals because at the time when the Bangalore summit was on the LTTE leaders had gone there? I would like to know whether the LTTE leaders had gone to Bangalore whether their opinion was sought for the purpose of submitting the package of proposals to Sri Lanka.

Secondly, Madam, I would like to know whether the Government is thinking of just like imposing sanctions against Sri Lanka if the negotiations failed as we have been doing in case of South Africa. Even two days back in Jaffna more than 70 to 80 Tamilians have been bomb-shelled by the Airforce of Sri Lanka, I would like to have a categorical reply. If the negotiations failed.....

**SHRI ALADI ARUNA alias V. ARUNACHALAM**: I think the hon. Members view is that if the talks failed, the sanctions should be imposed. Give stress on that.

**SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY**: What is the Government's reaction on this? If the negotiations failed, what will be the future course of action that the Government is going to take?

Referring to Pakistan, the hon. Minister has stated that it was agreed that the two countries would work out detailed measures of cooperation in controlling illicit crossing, drug trafficking, smuggling and terrorism along the border.

I would like to know whether any preliminary agreement was arrived at and it was signed between the two countries.

I would like the hon. Minister to clarify these points.

**श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय** : एक प्रश्न मैं स्पष्ट करना चाहता हूँ कि मंत्री जी के वक्तव्य में यह कहा गया था कि पाकिस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री जी से बातचीत हुई तो उसमें सीमा पर अवैध औषध द्रव्य व्यापार, तस्करी तथा आतंकवाद को रोकने के लिए सहयोग करने संबंधी व्यापक उपाय तैयार करेंगे। मेरा प्रश्न यह था कि इससे आभास होता है कि भारत की ओर से पाकिस्तान पर या पाकिस्तान की सीमा के अन्दर आतंकवाद हो रहा है। इसलिए मैंने स्पष्ट प्रश्न पूछा था कि जो भारतवर्ष का पूर्व आरोप था, जो बात स्पष्ट हो चुकी है कि भारत वर्ष में जो उग्रवाद और आतंकवाद को बढ़ावा मिल रहा है या पंजाब की ओर से जो सीमा है या जम्मू काश्मीर की ओर से जो सीमा है वहाँ से पाकिस्तान की सरकार आतंकवादियों को सहायता दे रहा है, हथियारों से मदद कर रही है।

तो इस सिलसिले में हमारे देश के प्रधान मंत्री जी ने भारत सरकार की शिकायत पाकिस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री के साथ रखी कि नहीं रखी और दूसरी बात एक छूट गई थी ... (व्यवधान)

**उपसभापति** : कोई नया प्वाइंट हो, तो ... (व्यवधान)

**श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय** : नहीं, यह स्टेटमेंट में ही है कि विदेश मंत्री, बातें करने वालों में श्री लंका के विदेश मंत्री थे हमीद साहब और भारतवर्ष के डेलीगेशन में यहाँ के विदेश राज्य मंत्री श्री नटवर सिंह और स्टेट मिनिस्टर फार इंटरनल सेक्यूरिटी थे श्री पी. चिदम्बरम्।

तो मैं यह भी जानना चाहता हूँ कि जो वहाँ के विदेश मंत्री थे, इस देश में उनके काउंटरपार्ट ने क्यों बातचीत नहीं की?

**SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI:** Madam Deputy Chairman, I am really very thankful to the hon. Members for raising many questions, serious questions regarding policy and programmed formulation and also seeking clarification on important matters. I am one of those who believe that even good questions help you in formulating policies because these are sometimes suggestive questions, leading questions—and I am thankful to all the Members for this type of help. I would request you and all the hon. Members—all are veterans here with knowledge even in diplomacy and external affairs—it is always difficult for a Foreign Minister because he has to be very cautious that the words that he utters should neither say more nor say less. It is an axiom of all diplomacy that diplomacy should not be considered an art of the impossible; it is always considered the art of the possible. And therefore I will seek the indulgence of the hon. Members if I would not be able to give all the details which the hon. Members want and which I would myself have properly wanted as a private member if I would have been in their place. As a Foreign Minister, they would agree, I have to be a little cautious and careful.

I must congratulate Mr. Gurupadaswamy, my old colleague and friend...

**SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA:** Of the Praja Socialist Party.

**SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI:** Even beyond that. Even today we are friends.

**SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA:** Then why did you say "old"?

**SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI:** I consider Mr. S. P. Malaviya also as my old colleague.

What I would say is that during his reference to the importance of SAARC, the basic point he made is that SAARC leads to a situation in which we even bilaterally, reduce

acrimony, controversies and disputes; this is the basis of it—that even we bilaterally we reduce acrimony, disputes and controversies. As Gurupadaswamyji knows very well, SAARC has *ab initio*, from the very beginning, ruled out bilateral matters being discussed on or at the SAARC forum. It is not a political organisation; it is not a political association. Therefore at the SAARC itself, at the SAARC forums, no bilateral issues were discussed at the plenary session. Even though two leaders made references to bilateral matters, yet our Prime Minister did not refer to them, respond to them, being Chairman, because the SAARC procedures rule out any mention of bilateral matters at SAARC forums. But their being at Bangalore the unique occasion of all the Heads of State, SAARC Heads, being at Bangalore, was utilised for bilateral discussions outside the SAARC forum and all these issues which I have referred to in my statement were discussed at discussions held bilaterally in Bangalore, but on an individual basis—two-to-two, bilateral.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Or one-to-one.

**SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI:** One-to-one means sometimes that we discuss one-to-one informally. Two-to-two means you include the Foreign Minister also sometimes. Of course, I would not claim it. But if you say one to one, I exclude myself and say one to one.

Now, we did raise all the matters, mentioned by honourable Members in their queries with the Pakistan Foreign Minister. In my talks with the Pakistan Foreign Minister we mentioned all those points which honourable Members have raised here. No, Pakistan denied most of those matters. They said, no, it is not true, it is not true, this or that press report is not true; they denied. When we mentioned complaints regarding help to terrorism which I have mentioned in my statement—drug trafficking, smuggling, all that—then Pakistan

made a proposal to the Prime Minister and also mentioned about it to me. When we mentioned these facts and we alleged that this is happening, then Pakistan suggested that they were not doing this, they denied that there were any training camps. Then they suggested that we could think of and consider joint border surveillance including control of smuggling, drug trafficking, bandits, dacoits, joint inspection of areas, location of alleged camps and training sites—because, Pakistan also had complained regarding some camps being in India but we were not told about the details—and joint patrolling of border areas. Pakistan was willing to examine any other step proposed by India. When they made this proposal—let us discuss this, we deny this and we are prepared for joint border surveillance and inspections—then we had to respond and, then we agreed, let us discuss these matters in detail, because this also involves technical matters which the Prime Minister referred to. Therefore, we agreed for this Lahore meeting in the first week of December. Then other matters will be discussed, you know what I mentioned in my statement that the Foreign Secretary would be visiting Islamabad to try for normalization. Honourable Members will recollect—Madm, you will recollect—an official stopover in Delhi in December, 1985 and then a six-point programme for improving bilateral relations was agreed upon. That is, the that President Zia-ul-Haq had made Finance Ministers of the two countries would meet in Islamabad in early January to discuss expansion of trade and economic relations. They had met and the outcome of their discussions is well known to the House. They had decided that the Defence Secretaries of the two countries would meet for discussion on the Siachen glacier; Foreign Secretaries of the two countries would meet in Islamabad in the third week of January to continue discussions on a comprehensive treaty and discuss other

confidence-building measures; four Sub-Commissions of Indo-Pakistan Joint Commission will meet in January-February to finalize their work; the full Joint Commission, at foreign Ministers level, would meet thereafter; the two sides would work out an agreement undertaking not to attack the nuclear installations of each other. A cultural agreement would be signed between the two countries. We both began implementation of this programme. Suddenly, after two months, after the Finance Minister's visit and our Foreign Secretary's, while this process was going on according to the six-point programme, after the hijacking incident and even before that, suddenly all this process came to a standstill. So, following the Bangalore discussions, now our Foreign Secretary will visit Islamabad to try whatever is possible, from our point of view, to set the negotiations back on the rails. That would be our view. Therefore, I would say, let us wait and see what happens at Lahore and then what happens when our Foreign Secretary visits Islamabad. Let us hope that whatever negative trends we had witnessed in the past—of which I have mentioned in my statement—will now be reversed and something constructive may come out. As far as priority is concerned, we have to discuss terrorism and other matters together because a terrorist sometimes is also a drug smuggler and he might be a bandit also; sometimes it may happen. All three go together. The first week of December is just before us and let us take all these three points together and let us see how far Pakistan sticks to their offer. Let us see what they have to say and then we will discuss. Regarding Sri Lanka, with all humility and respect I may say that I understand the feelings, the deep emotions of our friends, our colleagues. Some of the Members have spoken about whatever is happening. I would say that Government of India has



[Shri Narayan Datt Tiwari]  
made its stand very clear. Prime Minister himself has made this very clear. Whenever we had exercised our good offices, we had made it very clear to the Government of Sri Lanka that bloodshed must be avoided. Now the negotiations are in a very delicate stage. As I said, there is no finality as yet. The contours are there; the contour which the leader of the AIADMK just mentioned, which Mr. Gopalsamy just mentioned. What has been agreed is, "Within the limits of the Sri Lankan Constitution". Only that has been agreed to.

About the package, of course, it is a step forward compared to the stand that Sri Lanka had taken a year back or two years back; it is a step forward definitely.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM : Excuse me. During the period of Mrs. Gandhi, "Constitution" was not mentioned. Instead, what was mentioned was, "Within the Union of Sri Lanka".

SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI : Unity and integrity of Sri Lanka.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM : But not mentioning the Constitution. The Constitution may be a unitary one. How is it possible?

SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI : Let us see. What I must say is that I have specifically mentioned the question of the linkage which the hon. Members very well know, what the linkage is. The powers of the Governor, the question of law and order—all these points are there. They are being discussed.

Now, one of my friends asked why Foreign Minister was not there. I was busy at the Nandi Hills. Simultaneously their discussions were going on, I had the privilege of accompanying the Prime Minister to the Nandi

Hills. Simultaneously discussions were going on with Natwar Singhji and Chidambaramji down at Bangalore. So, I could not be at two places at the same time. Once the discussions were being held with Mr. Natwar Singh, my colleague, he had to take the thread forward in other meetings. So, he was dealing with the matter for three days continuously.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: May I interrupt for a minute? Why did the Government appreciate the proposals as good when the proposals have been rejected by all sections of Tamils? That was my question.

SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI : I do not know, I am not sure, because I have not met all the Tamil militants. I would think that if the hon. Member has that information, it may be correct. But, I as Foreign Minister cannot say that. I have to take all precautions. I have to caution myself. If I say "Yes", I agree, then...

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Had the Government taken the precaution, the Government would not have stated like this.

SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI: Well, I think, my colleagues who are negotiating...

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: The point is very simple.

SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI: My colleagues who are negotiating, are again stopping at Coimbatore, Madras. They are meeting, they are in touch with our friends and with all other leaders who matter. This is very delicate stage. I would beg humbly, in all humility I would request that we must not say any word which would hamper the success of the negotiation—that is my only prayer—because all of us know that we have a certain stake and what is at

stake. Therefore, we have to be very careful. I would in all humility request all my friends.

**SHRI ALADI ARUNA alias V. ARUNACHALAM :** The query still remains unanswered, whether or not the Government said that the proposals of Sri Lanka were good, whether it was stated or not.

**SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI :** Well, I have a little knowledge of grammar. You have more knowledge. You know, if there is something good; it could be better, and if there is something better, it could be best.

**SHRI V. GOPALSAMY :** But there is a difference between bad and good.

**SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI :** Well, I know; my friend, Mr. Gopalsamy does not look everything as bad, but sometimes he agrees that it is good also, it could be good also.

Again, regarding law and order, my able colleague, Minister of State, Mr. Natwar Singh, on the 11th of November, has already clarified that the action of the 8th of November was taken by the Government of Tamil Nadu as a law-and-order issue. He made it very clear. Then again, in all of today's newspapers it is mentioned that the Home Ministry has expressed surprise over this matter.

**SHRI V. GOPALSAMY :** The other matter, the second episode is about the seizure of the wireless sets. That was my question.

**SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI :** Of course, I would not like to impinge upon the jurisdiction of the Home Minister. But I am informed that this is not so. It does not come within the purview of the Ministry of External Affairs. I would not impinge on what is appropriately the jurisdiction of the Home Ministry. But I am informed that it was not so. They did not have any consultation in this regard.

**SHRI V. GOPALSAMY :** Thank you very much. That answer, I wanted.

**SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI :** Now, as far as Bangladesh is concerned, it could not be possible to negotiate all the bilateral problems within the short span of time that we had. Negotiation is a continuing process. There are different Minister or delegations going to Bangladesh and their Ministers or delegations coming to us. There are different Ministers or delegations would not claim that we discussed all problems at Bangalore. It was not possible, but certainly as mentioned by me this waters issue was discussed bilaterally and the expert group was given six months more to come out with fresh proposals. What Chaturanan Mishra Ji said is more important. What he mentioned is that in Bihar there are big rivers which bring silt, and floods all the time from Nepal. Since, I come from Uttar Pradesh, I know Uttar Pradesh has the same problem. The Government of India has been talking to Nepal on this matter on a bilateral basis. Therefore, it is not only a question of Ganga waters, it is also a question of Bihar, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal so that there could be ultimately an ecological and environmental programme of cooperation between Nepal and India covering all these matters. This should mean a massive afforestation programme by Nepal also. Nepal's proposal is that we should consider all these, not one project of Ganga waters. They mutual benefit. It is not a question say that we should first agree that we shall have projects on the basis of of trilateralisation or internationalisation. It is a question of our agreeing with Nepal for having common projects for which mutual benefits will go both to Nepal and India. That is their proposal. We have to think seriously whether we want any progress in this regard or not. It is not a question of Ganga waters alone. When the proposal came the question

[Shri Narayan Datt Tiwari]

was whether or not we can have reservoirs to augment waters at Farakka Barrage. Then this question came up. So, I would like the hon. Minister to consider this issue whether we are mentally prepared to have such a dialogue with the Nepalese Government so that we could harness all the rivers for our own and their flood protection, to fight silting. That is the Nepalese stand.

Now, Indo-Nepal Joint Commission is going to be set up. That was the decision taken during Rashtrapati Ji's visit to Kathmandu and the modalities are being worked out. I think the Joint Commission will be appropriate for discussing many bilateral, economic and other issues between India and Nepal.

Regarding other matters with Bangladesh, as I said, there are other forums also and we will utilise all those forums for discussions with it.

I think I have dealt with most of the points substantively. I am very thankful to all the Members for giving me a sympathetic hearing.

**SHRI ALADI ARUNA alias V. ARUNACHALAM :** The hon. Minister stated that no instruction was given by the Centre to arrest the Sri Lanka Tamil leaders in Tamil Nadu, but our Chief Minister has clearly stated to the Press that they were arrested because of the instructions for the Centre. This is for the information of the House. (*Interruptions*)

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** The House stands adjourned for Lunch till 3.15 P.M.

The House adjourned for Lunch at twentyfive minutes past two of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at eighteen minutes past three of the clock. **The Vice-Chairman** (Shri G. Swaminathan) in the Chair.

**The Appropriation (Railways) No. 4 Bill, 1986—contd.**

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN):** Now we will take up discussion on the Appropriation (Railways) No. 4 Bill, 1986. Dr. Bapu Kaldate.

**डा० बापू कालदास (महाराष्ट्र) :** उपन्यास्य जी, सही माने में मैं इस विधेयक पर मंत्री जी का अभिनंदन करके ही शुरू करना चाहता था क्योंकि मैं यह बात यहां कहना आवश्यक मानता हूं कि जो भी कुछ इने गिने मंत्रालय हैं जो सेंसरों के सवालों का या पत्रों का जवाब विस्तृत रूप से देते हैं, भले ही हम उनसे सहमत हों या नहीं किन्तु आपका मंत्रालय उनमें से एक रहा। आपके मंत्रालय में हमने देखा है कि आप जवाब भी देते हैं जबकि बहुत से मंत्रालयों का मुझे याद है कि दो तीन साल में भी उनका जवाब नहीं आया। इतनी मेहरबानी वे जरूर कर देते हैं कि एक दो महीने बाद वे हमको ऐकनालेजमेंट भेज देते हैं। महोदय, रेल का मंत्रालय ऐसा मंत्रालय है जिसने न सिर्फ़ ऐकनालेजमेंट ही भेजे हैं, विस्तृत जवाब भी दिए हैं, उनकी बात भले ही हम मानें या नहीं। वह अलग बात है। लेकिन क्या हो गया है। कि आपकी कार्य क्षमता में क्षति हो रही है, यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आ रहा है। मैं इसका सिर्फ़ जिक्र कर देना चाहता हूं और इसको यहीं छोड़ देता हूं। मैं उम्मीद करता हूं कि आपकी कार्यक्षमता जो पीछे रही है, उसको आप आगे भी चलाएंगे। हमने आपको एक चिट्ठी लिखी थी, आपको ही लिखी थी जिसमें आपसे कहा था कि आप एजेन्सियों को नियुक्ति कर रहे हैं, रेलवे प्रवासियों के लिए सर्विस एजेन्सिस नियुक्त कर रहे हैं। इसके लिए हमने एक चिट्ठी लिखी। इसका जवाब आपने दो सितम्बर को