

been created. But it is a matter of satisfaction that both Burma and Bangladesh have agreed and there is a settlement. Those who had come from Burma are going back. Some of these unfortunate people also try to migrate to our areas and they are to be stopped.

SHRI AMARPROSAD CHAKRABORTY (West Bengal): Migrated?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Some of them. Now, they have been asked to leave and we hope that they will go back. So, it will not be correct to say that Bangladesh is not prepared to take them, to take the refugees back. Sir, I have been reminded of what happened in 1947 and I wish my honourable friend did not do so. But again, Sir, I am functioning under constraints. Fortunately or unfortunately, I happen to be the Foreign Minister of this country. So, I cannot say many things. Wild accusations are made and unnecessary provocations are being created. This is not a party matter. I will never play politics with national interests. Who does not want that the North-Eastern Region should be fully secured and fully safeguarded? Now, my friend, Shri Pranab Mukherjee, referred to 200 freedom fighters being forced to go to Bangladesh at the point of bayonet. Has this got anything to do with Calling-Attention Motion? I emphatically say that not a single freedom fighter has been asked to leave India forcibly. We gave them an offer and it was an open offer. We were prepared to give political asylum to those who wanted to seek political asylum. But we told them that we would not allow them to remain on the border and create incidents. That might have been the policy of the Congress Government. That is not the policy of the Janata Government. If they want to fight for freedom, let them go to Bangladesh. But we would not allow our territory to be used against any country. We have given political asylum to Dalai Lama. But we do not allow him to indulge in any

political activity. But this allegation is also being repeated all the time that people were forced at the point of bayonet. Not a single person has been forced.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let us now take up next item.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE TO SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have to inform Members that the following letter dated 15th August 1978 has been received from Shri U. K. Lakshmana Gowda:

"I am leaving today on a visit abroad to Europe and United States of America and expect to be away till about the first week of December 1978. Consequently, it will not be possible for me to attend the rest of the current Session of Rajya Sabha.

"I shall be grateful if the House grants me leave of absence for the rest of the current session."

Is it the pleasure of the House that permission be granted to Shri U. K. Lakshmana Gowda for remaining absent from all meetings of the House during the current Session?

(No hon. Member dissented)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Permission to remain absent is granted. Now, Special Mention. Mr. Bhattacharya.

REFERENCE TO THE TREATY OF PEACE AND FRIENDSHIP SIGNED BY JAPAN AND CHINA

SHRI G. C. BHATTACHARYA (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I am very happy that our Foreign Minister is here today when I am making this mention.

Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee, Minister of External Affairs, is reported to have supported the Japan-China

[Shri G. C. Bhattacharya]

Treaty of Peace and Amity which is mainly directed against the Soviet Union, a great and trusted friend of India, during his visit of Japan. As a result of this, not only friendly relation between India and the USSR is likely to be affected but also the country's basic foreign policy of non-alignment is likely to be tampered with and the country is likely to be dragged into the cold war situation which is fast developing in the world and the country may become friendless. Sir, I have to mention this because there is an editorial comment on his visit in a very important Japanese daily newspaper, which says:

"For Japanese diplomacy, it was a big success that India's understanding was obtained..."

I am emphasizing the word "obtained".

"...on the just concluded Japan-China treaty of peace and amity at the regular Foreign Ministers' conference in Tokyo..."

Sir, "obtaining understanding" is a very objectionable thing. But, fortunately, as soon as Mr. Vajpayee, our hon. External Affairs Minister returned to this country, he said that he neither supported nor opposed the treaty. It gave us some satisfaction. But his statement gives rise to certain apprehensions. Kindly see what it says:

"He (Mr. Vajpayee) denied Press reports that he had either welcomed or condemned the treaty of peace and friendship signed by Japan and China earlier this month. Mr. Vajpayee said it was a coincidence that he had reached Tokyo one day after the return of the Japanese Foreign Minister from Peking where he had signed the treaty. He said that the Japanese Foreign Minister had given him the background of the negotiations held by

Tokyo with Peking and had emphasised that the treaty was not directed against any third country."

Then, this is important;

"After having said that the treaty was essentially a bilateral matter I expressed the hope that this new development will strengthen peace and stability in the region without creating any new tensions..."

Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, our External Affairs Minister, I must say, is a very wise man and he is tackling the problems very competently. But since somebody says that it is bilateral and it is not directed against any third country, our Foreign Minister should not immediately say: Because of that I welcome it. But kindly see that if it were a bilateral matter, then the Japan-China friendship treaty would not have been delayed so long. That was going on for years. It is within the knowledge of Mr. Vajpayee that this was because of the hegemony clause. Whether this hegemony clause will be included or not in the treaty was the subject matter of intense discussions and also subject matter of intense diplomatic activities between China, Japan and Soviet Union for many years. Further, Sir, when a world super power, changed its attitude towards China, then the hegemony clause was included. The word 'hegemony' now a days is used against Soviet Union. Sir, it is not correct that because somebody says that it is not against any third country and because it is bilateral, he welcomed it. It is a serious matter. I have given the consequences of it. The External Affairs Minister should take the people of this country and the Parliament into confidence. Steps should be taken to clear the doubts.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE): Sir, I would be making a comprehensive statement on my visit to Tokyo and Seoul in the House tomorrow. I will try to deal with this matter then.