

Yadav, Shri Ram Saran

Yadav, Shri Satya Pal Singh

Z

Zainal Abedin, Shri

NOES

MR. SPEAKER: Subject to correction*,
the result of the division is:

Ayes : 349

Noes Nil

The motion is carried by a majority of the
total membership of the House and by a
majority of not less than two-thirds of the
members present and voting.

The Bill, as amended, is passed by the
requisite majority, in accordance with the
provisions of Article 368 of the Constitution.

The motion was adopted.

12.44 hrs.

STATEMENT BY PRIME MINISTER

**Commonwealth summit in Harare, the
G-15 Summit in Caracas and the visit of
the Prime Ministers of Nepal and
People's Republic of China**

MR. SPEAKER: Now, as agreed be-

tween ourselves, I may request the hon.
Prime Minister to make a statement on his
visit to foreign countries.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI HARI KISHORE SINGH
(Sheohar): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to
raise a point of propriety. The Hon. Prime
Minister went to attend the Commonwealth
summit much earlier, he should have made
the statement at the time. What is the reason
that the Government is hesitating on the
foreign policy. No discussions were held on
the demands of External Affairs Ministry in
the last session too. It has been the first
occasion in the entire history that the state-
ment which should have been made much
earlier, is being made today. *(Interruptions)*

[English]

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI P. V.
NARASIMHARAO): Mr. Speaker Sir, Events
in the world have continued to move at a
rapid pace since I intervened in the discus-
sion on the international situation in the Lok
Sabha on 18 September 1991. I had, on that
occasion, recalled the congress Party mani-
festo and Jawaharlal Nehru's vision of a
world without competing blocs, a world of
detente, a world moving towards disarmament.
And yet, the lowering and elimination of
East-West tensions and the renewed quest
for solutions to sub-regional and regional
conflicts, have not brought solutions to the

*The following Members also recorded their votes for Ayes:

Dr. Chinta Mohan, Shri B.M. Mujahid, Smt. Maragatham Chandrasekhar Sarvashri Bhawani
Lal Verma, Thulasi K. Vandyar, Surya Narayan Singh M. Ramanna-Rai, G.M.C. Balayogi,
Yaima Singh Yumnam Ramchandra Marotrao Ghangare, K.P. Reddaiah Yadav, K.V.R.
Chowdary, Ram Sunder Das, Pratap Singh, Manjay Lal, Smt. Girija Devi, Sarvashri Braja
Kishore Tripathi, Mohammed Ali Ashraf Fatmi, Sarvashri Virendera Singh, Sushil Chandra
Verma, Ram Tahal Coudhary, Dwaraka Nath Das, Ramkrishna Kusmaria, Kunjee Lal, Ram
Narain Berwa, Chhotey Lal, Mohan Singh, Sharad Yadav, Nitish Kumar.

basic and fundamental problems of development faced by the large majority of countries.

The world today is in a state of ferment and in metamorphosis. The bewildering pace of developments, the reorientation of ideologies governing societies and their interaction constitute problems and pose challenges. My Government stands ready to both adapt to the changing international environment and to utilise foreign policy as an instrument to further our national interests in a dynamic manner.

The last three months have been eventful. In overall terms, the three overriding priorities of our foreign policy are: (i) preventing any threat to the unity and territorial integrity of India, (ii) ensuring geo-political security by creating a durable environment of stability and peace in our region, (iii) creating a framework conducive for the economic well being of our people by encouraging a healthy external economic environment, and (iv) trying to restore, internationally, the centrality and criticality of development in the evolution of political and economic policies all over the world. We have addressed these by carefully nurturing and strengthening our bilateral relations with other countries, and by participating consciously and effectively in multi-lateral forums in whose work and success we have a critical stake. We participated in the meeting of the Commonwealth Heads of Government in Harare in October and the second G-15 summit in Caracas in November. We received the Prie Ministers of Nepal and China in December. This eventful interaction deserves, in my opinion, a comprehensive statement to this House.

The Central theme of the Commonwealth Heads of Government meeting in Harare was the future role of the Commonwealth in the 1990s and beyond. The objective of this exercise was to identify the

strengths of the Commonwealth, examine its relevance in a changing world and determine priorities for the future. There were naturally divergences between developed and developing countries regarding their perception and priorities for the future. Some of the developed countries are keen to see the multilateral agenda concentrating on emphasis on political pluralism, human rights and democratic practices. these are sought to be integrated under the umbrella concept of 'good governance'. India has a proud track record in the area of political pluralism and democratic functioning. Our society cherishes, and is in turn structured on, these basic human rights and values. we support an international focus on such issues. However, this cannot be at the expense of basic issues relating to development and economic cooperation. More important, given the cultural specificities of individual countries, norms and standards developed over decades in one part of the world cannot be mechanically applied to another. Also, the desire to pursue such values should not result in the imposition of non-economic conditionalities to development assistance. The Harare Declaration reflects this view of India, which emerged eventually as the accepted commonwealth consensus.

At the G-15 Summit in Caracas, our objective similarly was to ensure that there is a convergence of opinion, at least amongst the members of the G-15, on the need to restore the emphasis on development cooperation on the multilateral agenda. I was invited to be the lead speaker on the need for a new international consensus on development. The joint communique adopted by the Heads of State/Government fully reflects such a need. The second G-15 Summit was also significant because it resulted in the adoption, and directives for implementation, of a number of specific South-South cooperation projects. These include two Indian projects relating to the establishment of gene

banks and solar energy application. These projects will give economic and technological content to South-South cooperation which will be further enhanced through annual gatherings of business representatives. The parallel meeting of businessmen in Caracas brought together over 250 senior representatives from the G-15 countries.

We have reason to be satisfied with the outcome of the second G-15 Summit. We were invited to host the 1993 Summit in New Delhi, and we have accepted it.

The visit to India of Prime Minister Koirala of Nepal earlier this month ushers in a qualitatively new era of cooperation between India and Nepal. The discussions held and agreements reached addressed many mutual concerns and cleared many issues. All the meetings were held in an atmosphere of great warmth, cordiality and sincerity. They resulted in a number of important decisions aimed at deepening and expanding mutually beneficial cooperation between Nepal and India.

An Indo-Nepal Treaty of Trade, an Indo-Nepal Treaty of Transit and an agreement for cooperation in controlling unauthorised trade have been signed. The Trade Treaty includes several new facilities and concessions which should substantially boost Nepalese exports to India if fully exploited by Nepalese trade and industry. The Transit Treaty further simplifies customs and other procedures for Nepal's transit cargo. Both sides have committed themselves to cooperating fully to control the growing menace of smuggling that seriously affects the Indian economy.

Water resources development has the maximum potential for revolutionising the Nepalese economy and also benefitting India. We hope that the number of decisions that have been taken concerning the Karnali,

Pancheswar and Kosi hydel projects, the medium sized projects like the Burhi Gandaki, flood forecasting and flood protection schemes, power exchange etc. will lead to early and substantial progress in this sector. What is significant is that these projects are, and will be, equally beneficial to the peoples of Nepal and India.

A specially favourable access regime to the Indian market has been provided for the products of approved Indo-Nepal joint ventures. This should help promote industrial cooperation and also the industrialisation of Nepal. At the same time, the causes for the stagnation or failure of the existing Indo-Nepal joint ventures will be studied and necessary corrective measures taken.

As requested by the Government of Nepal, a number of new Indian aid projects, in the fields of health, roads, railways and telecommunications will be taken up within the availability of our own financial resources. This represents a continuation of our long-standing tradition of assisting Nepal with its economic development to the best of our ability.

Again in response to a Nepalese request, agreement has been reached on cooperation in agricultural science and technology, research, processing of cash crops and agro-based industries among other areas. These programmes would help promote rural development and rural employment in Nepal. Specific measures have also been identified for promoting cooperation in civil aviation and tourism.

In homage to the memory of the great Nepalese patriot, freedom fighter and statesman, the late Bishweshwar Prasad Koirala, who was also deeply involved with the Indian struggle for independence, both countries have decided to jointly establish a B P Koirala India-Nepal Foundation. This foundation will

work to promote not only educational and cultural exchanges but also cooperation in science and technology, agriculture and other development oriented fields. The Government of Nepal and India will contribute equally to the trust Fund for this Foundation, to the extent of Rs. 2 crores each.

Thus, a durable framework has been established for cooperation between the two countries. Our objective is to truly revolutionise our bilateral cooperation. We stand at the threshold of a new era in our relations with Nepal, full of new possibilities. It is for us, the two Governments, to ensure that we do not deprive our peoples of the benefits of such cooperation, which are their due. From our side, there will be no lack either of efforts or commitment. I am certain that our approach will be fully reciprocated. Here again, I submit, a conscious effort has been made to concentrate on areas of development.

As the House is aware, the Premier of the State Council of the People's Republic of China, Mr. Li Peng, visited India from December 11 to 16. This visit by a Chinese Premier taking place after a gap of more than 31 years has naturally generated interest in the House as well as in the country in terms of its impact on Sino-Indian relations and on regional developments. The interaction between two important Asian countries like China and India also has significant implications in the international sphere. I wish to take the House into consideration about the discussions held during the visit.

Premier Li Peng was accompanied by Foreign Minister Gian Gichen and Foreign Economic Relations and Trade Minister Li Langing and other senior officials of the Chinese Government.

Mr. Li Peng's visiting our country and the detailed exchange of views which we had with him on matters of mutual interest

and concern gained added significance because the visit has taken place in the context of the on-going rapid changes in international relations involving a fundamental transformation of States and societies in Eastern Europe, progress towards integration taking place in western Europe and the changing equations in international political and economic relations. We had wideranging discussions on bilateral, regional and global issues.

Mr. Li Peng availed of the opportunity of his visit to call on the President Shri R. Venkataraman and the Vice-President Dr. Shankar Dayal Sharma. The Foreign Minister of China had detailed discussions with our Minister of External Affairs Shri Madhavsingh Solanki. There were also separate meetings between officials of the two sides. I am glad also that the Prime Minister of China, like the Prime Minister of Nepal, had opportunity to meet leaders from our political parties and several Members of Parliament.

In our discussions on the international situation, Premier Li Peng and I agreed that the five principles of peaceful co-existence, jointly initiated by India and China in 1954, were essential norms for the conduct of international relations and that all countries, regardless of their size, strength or stage of development, were equal members of the international community. It was our common position that the use of force or threat of force as a means of settlement of disputes should be firmly abjured in international relations. The economic imbalance between the developed and developing world had become more serious. Developing countries would not only need to take a common stand in their dialogue with the North, but become more collectively self-reliant. The role of the United Nations should be strengthened.

On the outstanding question of the

boundary between our two countries, both the Chinese Premier and I were agreed that efforts should be intensified to find an early, fair, reasonable and mutually acceptable solution to this question. We expressed our satisfaction that peace and tranquillity had been maintained in the border areas. We stressed that our differences on the boundary question should be reduced and that we should maintain our contacts with each other in order to provide directions to the Joint Working Group that was set up to deal with this question in 1988. I expressed the conviction that the resolution of this question would be a signal achievement for the two countries and a vindication of the five principles of peaceful co-existence. The next meeting of the Joint Working Group will be held as early as possible in 1992 and meetings between the military personnel in the border areas to sort out local issues will be held on a regular basis.

This was not the case in 1988. Now, these meetings will be held on a regular basis thus making it much easier and much more certain that there will be no breach of peace by any mistake or misunderstanding on the border.

A number of bilateral agreements have been signed during the visit. These include the agreement on restoration of the Consulates General in Shanghai and Bombay and the Memorandums on the resumption of border trade and on cooperation in the field of outer space sciences. We have agreed to intensify our cooperation in such fields as agriculture, public health, energy and education. It has been agreed to hold a Festival of India in China. A Festival of China will also be held in India.

On the issue of Tibet, our long standing and consistent position was clearly reiterated. Tibet is an autonomous region of China and we do not allow Tibetans to engage in

anti-China political activities in India. This does not in any way conflict with the religious and cultural affinities we have had with Tibet through the centuries, which I pointed out in our discussion. Our respect for His Holiness the Dalai Lama as a religious and spiritual leader remains constant. The approach to such questions should be consensus oriented through political dialogue. The Chinese Prime Minister indicated that all issues except that of the independence of Tibet are open to negotiation with His Holiness the Dalai Lama.

We conveyed to the Chinese side our concerns about the supply of sophisticated arms and defence technologies to Pakistan and Pakistan's role in fomenting terrorism and subversion in the States of Punjab and Jammu & Kashmir. The Chinese Government is opposed to terrorism since it does not solve problems and only sharpens existing contradictions. They have said that they do not wish to see conflict and are for the peaceful settlement of differences between India and Pakistan. Our concerns about Chinese arms supplies to Myanmar have also been conveyed. We have referred to the fact that the vast majority of world opinion favours the restoration of democratic rule in Myanmar in consonance with the aspirations of its people.

13.00 hrs.

The issue of human rights figured in our dialogue. I stressed our adherence to the concept of the indivisibility of all human rights. At the same time, I expressed the view I had put forth in both Harare and Caracas that no country should be denied assistance in the name of human rights. Norms for human rights cannot be determined unilaterally and externally. Primacy should be given to the task of development. The Chinese Premier was of the opinion that the issue of human rights should not be used as a lever for

interference in the internal affairs of countries.

China is our biggest neighbour and we are drawn to it both by geographical inevitability and by the tradition of historical interaction. We look forward to the future in our relations with China. Our dialogue must strengthen mutual understanding and enable the peaceful resolution of all outstanding issues. I believe the visit of the Chinese Premier has been an important step in that direction. I have invited general secretary Jiang Zemin of the Chinese Communist Party to visit India. Our President has been invited to visit China and Premier Li Peng has also extended an invitation to me to visit his country. Today, in a volatile and changing international situation, I believe that our two countries which represent a third of humanity, can and should play an important role in the promotion of peace and development in the world.

The approach to this visit was to discuss the border on the one hand and, at the same time, cooperation in other areas of mutual interest there are two categories; one bilateral and the second, in the international field in the common interest of humankind. India and China, as two ancient civilisations, can do no less. It is their duty to the world. I fervently believe it. This international aspect has always been important and will always be so. But at the present juncture, when the world is in the throes of unprecedented changes, I think this particular duty to mankind is also urgent. It brooks no delay. I believe that the future of a vast chunk of humanity, living in developing countries and groaning under conditions of poverty and want, is at stake now as perhaps never before. India and China owe this duty to this vast chunk of humanity.

In conclusion, may I share with Honourable Members the linear weave, the logic

which has underpinned the orientation of our foreign policy as reflected in the important events on which I have just reported. It is primarily to maintain the ideological integrity of our secular pluralistic polity. It is to safeguard our national cohesion and territorial integrity in a world in ferment, and against challenges emanating from ethno-religious, economic and segregationist socio-cultural impulses. It is to ensure the basic well being of our people by maintaining the necessary emphasis on the primacy of development the world over, particularly in the developing countries. This leit-motif of our foreign policy, as I conceive of it, is not uni-dimensional in the narrow nationalistic sense. The leit-motif is to restructure the regional and international order based on harmony, consensus, willingness and to strive for peace and readiness to converge on basic issues and needs of mankind. This factor was common to these four events, the tangible result yielded by each of practical measures that can affect, and enhance, the quality of life of peoples.

It is my firm conviction that our participation in the two multilateral gatherings in Harare and Caracas and the visits to India of the Prime Ministers of Nepal and China constitute a meaningful and structured approach to the fulfilment of our international objectives and obligations and safeguarding our national interests. The Minister for External Affairs and I shall continue to keep Honourable Members informed about developments on the foreign policy front periodically. I believe that we will continue to need a national consensus on major foreign policy issues. In this, the contribution of Honourable Members can never be over-emphasised. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI CHANDRA JEET YADAV
(Azamgarh): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am not asking any clarification from the Prime Minister.....*(Interruptions)*

SHRI M. R. KADAMBUR JANARTHANAN (Tirunelveli): Sir, I request this august House to join the Tamil Nadu people in congratulating our Chief Minister who has been conferred D. Litt degree by the Madras University..... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: We will take it up later.

SHRI CHANDRA JEET YADAV: Sir, I am not asking any clarification from the Prime Minister. (*Interruptions*).

MR. SPEAKER: I think, we are going to allow the Members to express their views on unlisted matters a little later. But in the Business Advisory Committee, a view was expressed by some senior Members that not many questions, at least one or two questions, very pertinent questions, may be allowed to be put so that they can elicit more information. Now, this is not the practice in the House, yet as an exceptional case, I am allowing it, which will not be a precedent. May I request the hon. Members not to long questions and not to have many questions; not to repeat the questions and to allow ourselves to clinch the issue in as peaceful and meaningful manner as in possible. I am allowing Shri Indrajit Gupta to ask the questions.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI M.R. KADAMBUR JANARTHANAN: Sir, what about my request... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: We will take it up later on.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Midnapore): Mr. Speaker, Sir, while appreciating the very comprehensive statement made by the hon. Prime Minister, I would like, according to your directives, to ask two very brief questions. Firstly, this joint working group which is

to look into the boundary question and which consists of the officers of the two sides and which has of course, been given some sort of an upgradation, as I understand it, for the future, whether this joint working group of officials can produce any meaningful results unless the two Prime Ministers or the two Governments at the highest level give them some sort of directives, some principles on which they should proceed? I would like to know whether any such guidelines or principles have been discussed, agreed, of course, between the two sides which may be conveyed as a guidance to these officials who are in the joint working group.' This is one question.

My other question is what was the significance of the reference it is not contained in the official communique issued at the end of the visit, but, during the course of the visit it was very prominently published in the press and not contradicted as far as I know what is the significance of the reference which was made by both the Prime Ministers to the danger of international oligarchies this was the expression used 'international oligarchies', I would like to know what was meant by this phrase? Does it refer in any way to the danger of unipolar world which, maybe, some powers would like to see established? Is it in this context that this phrase of international oligarchies was used and a caution was given? (*Interruptions*).

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Prime Minister, if you like, I think, I will allow some others also to put questions and you can reply at the end.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, I just want to crave your indulgence on one thing. We did not expect this, we thought that it would be just a statement. So, I had intended to make the same statement in the other House and a time had also been fixed. Now,

if the rule is to be changed, the pattern has to be changed, we should know a little in advance about it. I really do not know how this is going to work out between the two Houses today frankly.

MR. SPEAKER: It should have been discussed with the Parliamentary Affairs Minister. Well, I think, briefly I will just allow one or two questions. Mr. Prime Minister, at what time you have to be there?

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: I am already over due there. Twenty minutes ago I was due. I have sent a message that this may be postponed. But, really I do not know what is happening there. (*Interruptions*)

I am not running away. I am not fighting shy. If in the one House we can give answers, in the other House also we can. But the only thing is I did not expect it. That is the only thing. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI HARI KISHORE SINGH: Any way, we can do it at some other time.

[*Translation*]

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN (Rosera): We had proposed to take it up in the House after 2.00 p.m. so that the Members may have enough time to ask questions. However, the Government wanted it to be taken up before lunch. It is already lunch hour in Rajya Sabha. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI EBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT: We shall have lunch hour.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: Please allow it to be taken up after lunch hour. (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: O.K., I think let the hon.

Prime Minister reply to this question and then we will allow him to go to the other House because the other House also deserves his presence. And if necessary, after discussing with the Parliamentary Affairs Minister, we will see as to how we can do it.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, it is true that any committee composed only of officials can go only up to a point in trying to resolve a border dispute or any other dispute. It happened earlier in 1981; we started with a Government committee. We had as many as seven rounds and until the seventh round, some progress was made from round to round and I had occasion to make statements on the floor of the Houses as to what was that small bit of progress made between one round and another. At the Seventh round, however, they ran out of steam. They needed some political signal and without that signal they could not go ahead. So, those rounds somehow did not produce the result that was expected. This time we have been careful. There has been some idea in the minds of the Joint Working Group. Besides, This is a Joint Working Group which was not the case earlier; it was just a round of meetings across the table between delegates this time So, this is a Joint Working Group working jointly, in the sense that if both agreed, they put it on paper. If neither agreed or one of them did not agree, it was not put on the paper, which means that so far as the Group is concerned, we have jointly made recommendation on any point.

During the present visit it was anticipated that at some point of time, maybe after the second or third round of the Joint Working Group, we would need to give them a fresh political signal. This need was recognised. But I believe that the next meeting of the Joint Working Group is not going to need a fresh signal right now. What we agreed to do was to keep in touch to see how the Joint Working Group is going, and after the sec-

ond meeting in 1992, at our level, by some method which we could devise easily, we would get in touch and feel our way if a political signal is necessary. If it is not necessary and they can still have another round with some result expected, then we would wait for the third round. But otherwise from round to round we have agreed that we should be in touch. That is the answer to the first question.

About 'international oligarchy', this phrase is only to describe what is generally likely to happen—I am not saying that it has already happened or is happening, but it is likely to happen—if one chunk of humanity or one group of countries can have its way to such an extent that their will, right of wrong, can be imposed undemocratically on the rest of the countries. I am not naming countries, I am not naming blocs, but even if in a unipolar world this happens—and this can happen under certain circumstances—we have to be careful. And we have to be careful right from the beginning. From the word 'go' we have to be careful, anticipatory such a thing to happen. But we have another constraint that we have to avoid confrontation. For so many years, so many decades, we had a confrontationalist posture on both sides. We all know what happened. But it is easier to confront that to come to a meaningful conclusion through dialogue. So that task of diplomacy has become much more difficult now. Earlier, we passed a resolution; voted for it and came back. Then we thought that that brought us to the end of our duty. That is not the case now. We have to go on with the process of dialogue, building a consensus internationally and making it acceptable to everybody and making it work. This is going to be much more difficult and, therefore, right from the beginning we have to see that a large chunk of humanity or a large number of countries are not automatically and blindly falling in line with the policy or the idea or programme given by a small number of

countries. Out of helplessness pressure.

I do not say that that line is invariably wrong. It may not be. It may be right. We may follow that policy, but it cannot be imposed on us. It has to be a national decision. This Parliament has to decide in the case of India that we are going to follow the policy. The Government has to decide and it has to be a conscious decision. That is how this word 'international oligarchy' came to be used. This was meant to the descriptive part of it. But actually the substantive part—what is happening in the world—is at least, to some extent, on these times we have to be careful about it. That is how the word came to be used. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: I would allow a few Members to take up the unlisted business and then we will adjourn for lunch.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI EBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT: Sir, it is 1.15 now. The House may adjourned for lunch. Today is Friday.

MR. SPEAKER: We will adjourn after some time.

[*Translation*]

SHRIDIGVJAYA SINGH (Raigarh): Mr. Speaker, Sir, during the last one month.....(*Interruptions*).....about 82 murders have been committed in a village in the Bhand district while a judge was beaten by ruffians when the proceedings in a court are going on and a doctor was beaten in a Hospital premises. Employees of the judiciary as well as the hospital employees and officials are on strike there. After these murders were committed, three members of a family were killed in the evening on De-