

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (PROF K.K. TEWARI): He quoted Mr. Hegde also on a number of occasions. He should mention that also.

S. BUTA SINGH: In almost every section of the press, whether it is in Bangalore or Delhi, these are brought out. If there is a ground, they are free to go to a court of law.

Now, having said that, let me come to...(Interruptions) I have quoted from the press. I am prepared to give it to you. The discussion boils down to this that the Janata Dal and the leaders of the Opposition are angry with the Governor of Karnataka because he could not play their game. He has discharged his duty under the Constitution without fear of favour. This is what the Governor of Karnataka has done.

I think, it is for this august House to uphold the principle that he has mentioned in his report that no party was in a position to form the Government; that the present Government had gone into minority and there was a horse-trading going on in Karnataka. All these facts have been mentioned in the Report of the Governor of Karnataka. Based on that, I will commend to this august House to approve the Proclamation which the President has signed and sent to this House and reject the Motion moved by Shri Dinesh Goswami which is absolutely baseless, which is politically motivated.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: First, I shall put the Motion moved by Shri Dinesh Goswami to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"That this House condemns the blatantly partisan attitude of the Governor of Karnataka in initiating action against the State Government without giving opportunity to the Chief Minister of the State to demonstrate majority support to his Ministry in the Assembly and demands removal of Governor of

Karnataka from his office forthwith."

The motion was negated

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I shall now put the Statutory Resolution moved by Shri Sontosh Dev to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"That this House approves the Proclamation issued by the President on the 21st April, 1989 under Article 356 of the Constitution in relation to the State of Karnataka."

The motion was adopted

15.22 hrs.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS, 1989-90

[English]

Ministry of External Affairs-contd.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The House shall now take up the next item i.e. further discussion and voting on the Demand for Grant under the control of the Ministry of External Affairs.

Shri B.R. Bhagat has explained his position for being absent from the House when he was called to continue his speech last time. As a special case, I shall allow him to continue.

Shri B.R. Bhagat.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT (Arrah): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, on Friday, I had just started. I began by saying that there was a marked improvement in the international climate during the whole of the year 1988 both globally and regionally. This has started...

SHRI THAMPAN THOMAS (Mavelikara): Sir, on Friday at 3.30 p.m. you told us that we would meet on Monday to discuss

this. Other Members were called to speak.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Just I have told that as a special case I am allowing Shri B.R. Bhagat. You cannot question that. On an earlier occasion, I had also allowed one of our Members i.e. Shri Somnath Chatterjee. I had allowed him.

SHRI THAMPAN THOMAS: The question is that on Friday at 3.30 p.m. Shri Bhagat was speaking. His speech over over.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: No. He did not speak. He had only started at that time.

SHRI THAMPAN THOMAS: So many other Members spoke on that day.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: At that time, he did not come. That is why, as a special case, I have allowed him to continue now.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please listen to me. As a special case only, I have allowed him now. At that time, when I called his name, he could not be present. That is why, as explained in the letter, I have allowed him now. He has made a request.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT: This is a courtesy that you have extended to us. Sometimes, we extend the courtesy to them and they extend the courtesy to us. It is done when there is a *bona fide* case.

SHRI THAMPAN THOMAS: They wanted to dismiss that Government. That was done *bona fide*?

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT: Sir, I was saying that during the year 1988, there was a marked improvement in the international climate—both globally and regionally. This started with the *detente* with the Soviet Union and the USA which set in motion a process of conflict resolution in different parts of the world. The Summit Meetings between President Ronald Reagan and President Gorbachev earlier in Reykjavick and Next in

Geneva and in Washington resulted in the INF—Intermediate range nuclear forces—Agreement, which for the first time eliminated a certain class of nuclear weapons.

This was the qualitative change in the climate. The language between the two Super Powers changed from confrontation to working out modalities for seeking cooperation. And then later on, in a meeting in Moscow between the two leaders the President of USA and President Gorbachev decided to extend this to the strategic weapons and to the Conflict Resolution in the various regions. And as a result of all this, there have been positive regional developments. For example, the Geneva Agreement of Afghanistan, a very major Agreement in which not only the countries of the region participated but two Big Powers, the USA and the USSR became the Guarantors of the Agreement.

15.26 hrs.

[SHRI SOMNATH RATH *in the Chair*]

Then Agreement on Angola and Namibia. Then the perspective solution to the Kampuchean issue and the declaration of the withdrawal of forces by Vietnam. Then the cease-fire agreement between Iraq and Iran. As a result of bold initiative by the PLO in recognising Israel and trying to settle the question between them and a direct contact between the PLO and the United States of America and also the restoration of peace in Central America. This is a result of a very bold initiative taken by the Soviet President Mr. Gorbachev and the new thinking in the Soviet foreign policy which was fully reciprocated not only by President Reagan but also by the leaders of the Western countries. In all this, you will find a new thinking in the Soviet Union—the Conflict Resolution, the Detente, the move towards peace and a new climate of peace and reconciliation in the world. The philosophical under-pinning of all this was the New Delhi Declaration of November 1986 between President Gorbachev and Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi where the ideals of non-alignment and the ideals of non-violence were accepted as a conduct to con-

[Sh. B.R. Bhagat]

duct international relations in the world. This is the most important development, qualitatively a new change, which went a long way in creating a climate and making the leaders, the Big Powers towards return to detente. Then also the initiative taken by India in the Delhi Six Agreement—six countries in the five continents—which had also suggested practical steps to promote the process of disarmament. Then, Prime Minister Shri Rajiv Gandhi's stirring call in the U.N. General Assembly in June 1988 in the Third Conference on Disarmament and Development and his action plan calling for eliminating the nuclear weapons by 2010. Then providing a comprehensive verification system. What is more important is that he set out certain basic principles, the doctrines, the policies, the institutions to sustain a world, free from nuclear weapons. These concept of nuclear free weapons and non-violent world are underlined in the New Delhi Declaration. The Prime Minister Shri Rajiv Gandhi's various initiatives which he took during this year, moving around in search of peace, in search of enforcing detente—detente is a beginning but going on to begin a new world which is based on non-violence based on the negotiations and trying to create a situation in which the regional conflicts and confrontations give way to an area of stability and peace. This is the area in which we can as Indians take legitimate credit for the initiative which the Prime Minister Shri Rajiv Gandhi took in trying to create a new world and change the world, although the biggest credit goes to leaders like President Gorbachev; so also to President Reagan. But the role played by India during this year under Prime Minister Shri Rajiv Gandhi is no less important. Particularly in these entire 40 years, right from Prime Minister Nehru and Smt. Indira Gandhi, India's role in the non-alignment movement, in decolonisation, in taking up all the issues of peace and trying to settle the world disputes, is described as the biggest peace movement in the history.

All these ideas now find a place of relevance today. They are of strict relevance today and this is a matter for great pride for

us. Indian Parliament has often times rose to the occasion in sustaining these basic principles. There is a consensus in this country behind the Indian Foreign Policy and this consensus gives the authentic voice of the people of India in sustaining and creating a new world.

I will come to the Soviet initiative for reduction of the conventional forces. Now the momentum goes on. It goes on to the reduction of conventional forces on the principles of defence sufficiency. It has further improve the prospects for turning the swords into the pouches, as has been described in the United Nation's Disarmament and Development Conference. That turned the weapons, swords into the pouches.

The Conference in Paris on Chemical Weapons brought forth a rare degree of unanimity on the steps to prescribe these weapons of mass destruction. India and more particularly Prime Minister Shri Rajiv Gandhi throughout has played a role in helping and accelerating this process of change in international relations which led to the situation of improvement in the international climate as we find today.

In this background, it is necessary to examine these aspects. Globally the situation is improving; in regard to the regional conflicts also the situation is improving. But what about our own region? What is the role that India has played in this region? I think in this the most dramatic initiative of course is the Prime Minister Shri Rajiv Gandhi's visit to China which has completely changed the situation and the climate from disgust into understanding and from confrontation into cooperation. The results of this visit has been most positive. As has been acclaimed by both the sides, this is going to help mutually both the countries. As the two largest countries, their population amount to 40% of the world's total population. If they quarrel, the fall-out is different. But they have decided to cooperate on all matters of improving bilateral relations, trying to solve all problems including the problem of the border through mutual negotiations on the basis of fair and reasonable legitimacy and the mu-

tual interest of the two countries, which is mutually accepted by the two peoples. These are some of the new principles of relationship between the two countries. The most important is mutual acceptance by the two peoples. It is bound to have an effect in the world, in Asia and in this region. But in the world as a whole, it strengthens the climate of peace, strengthens the climate of cooperation and stability in the world. As India has always been saying right from the beginning, we have not proceeded from any point of rigid dogmas. From the beginning, we have rejected the cold-war in the 1950s and 1960s. We do not belong to that. We have an independent foreign policy. We are non-aligned. We want to pursue the policy of independence, which means that we want to pursue a number of social and economic policies that leads to national self-reliance, so that this country is able to have the wherewithal—the economic, social and political wherewithal—without being pressurised by either blocs. That was a new thinking. As I am saying right from the beginning, we have taken independent positions, we have to certain basis or the conduct of international relations. We are against any kind of conflicts. We are for peace. We are for equality of nations. We are for equality of opportunity for all nations, most of all, the developing nations. You know who are left behind in the race for economic development. So, all these led us to a new thinking.

India rejects any immobility in the foreign policy. We have never followed or accepted any dogmas or immobility. This is the time when India's approach to foreign policy has come in very handy. There is a larger and larger acceptability. One of the symptoms that is found for this is in the recent election of Judge of the International Court. It surprises us also to see the number of votes that India got. The people in the whole world have realised not only the values, the right principles by which India has been emphasising the foreign policy, but also its correctness of approach.

Let us examine, in our region. How our basic policies have served the cause of

peace, served other national interests as well. Because we combine these, there is no conflict between our national interest and the interest of peace and cooperation in the world and most probably in this region. Take for example, the SAARC. The last meeting of the SAARC was held in Islamabad. It has provided the much-needed break with a promising start in getting relations with Pakistan restored. It was a chance-meeting between the Pakistan Prime Minister and the Indian Prime Minister. It led to a path of Indo-Pakistan friendship. But we recognise that this friendship lies in the midst of mine-fields. There are not only pit-falls but also mine-fields. Besides all these, Pakistan's involvement in the internal affairs in Punjab, the training and all these, has been discussed. But the point is it was a very refreshing statement from the Pakistan Prime Minister that Pakistan does not want to interfere in India's internal affairs and more particularly in the Punjab.

Similarly another area is this. Despite all this, it has a relation with the United States of America. We believe that this is one of the areas of instability, tension and confrontation that is going on. What has bedeviled the Indo-Pakistan relations was the induction of enormous amount of arms and sophisticated weapons. Pakistan is following the role of nuclear weapons. Pakistan is a few minutes or a screw away from making the bomb and whole programme is being followed clandestinely. In this meeting a beginning was made where we entered into three agreements.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please be brief as a number of other hon. Members have to participate.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT: I will be very brief. I come to the regional aspects. A number of initiatives have been taken by India which have been widely acclaimed. The role of IPKF in Sri Lanka has been acclaimed all over. There was a statement by the Prime Minister this morning that there is possibility of the IPKF being brought back. It has played a glorious role there. Similarly in Maldives

[Sh. B.R. Bhagat]

India was able to save a country from being de-stabilised by outside forces and democracy being subverted.

Sir, I would like to deal with at a little length the serious concern of the House and the country on Indo-Nepalese situation. Before I touch upon that as far as Afghanistan is concerned everybody is agreed that Geneva Accord is the basis. The matter should be solved politically. Confrontation should end. Outside interference should end and the people there should be allowed to elect their own government without outside interference. Unfortunately, what is happening now is that there is an internal strife or war and with Pakistan's greater and greater involvement it may become a regular war. Our interest is in the emergence of a non-aligned, independent and peaceful Afghanistan determined peacefully by their own people. This is the spirit of the Geneva Accord and we expect both the guarantors—USA and USSR—to guarantee that the internal war which is threatening that area must end and Afghanistan evolves because we are vitally concerned with what happens there.

Finally I would like to deal with Indo-Nepalese relationship which is the concern of the House. It is very unfortunate that India and Nepal the two countries bound by history, culture, religion and everything and the signing of the 1950 treaty of friendship and cooperation that relationship is being allowed to be changed. The perception of the Nepalese ruling circle is that that special relationship provided in the 1950 treaty of peace and friendship should be changed. This is most unfortunate. I have personal interest because this agreement of trade and transit was signed by me twenty years ago in March, 1969. It is a sudden lapse leaving a complete vacuum. It must go to the credit of the Indian Government that despite all this they tried their best. A canard is being spread all over that India is strangulating Nepal. So, it is not that easy. Now, we are doing everything possible inspite of the situ-

ation which has emerged in Nepal. We know and we are aware that the people are suffering there. But it is entirely because of the Nepalese Government. One feels that the assertion of the voice of the people of Nepal should never happen. Under the old arrangement, there were about 15 to 16 transit points.

SHRI C. MADHAV REDDI (Adilabad): Is it the view of the Government you are expressing or is it your own view?

SHRIB.R. BHAGAT: The Government's views will be expressed by the Minister. I am expressing my own views as you will express your own views. But remember that there were 15 to 16 points of entry. I do not know why they have done like that now. I fail to understand as to why they have allowed this situation. The Government of India was willing; they were willing and actually many visits have taken place. This matter could have been discussed much before and settled much before. There is absolutely no point of conflict between Nepal and India on this issue. But the only thing is that there seems to be some suspicion on the other side. As I said, there were 16 points of entry. As a result of this, India has now been forced to keep only two points. One point is at Raxaul and the other is at Jogbani. Every effort is being made to provide all facilities, whatever goods they require and whatever essential commodities they require. Even the Nepalese Press and other have come out with a statement that India is strangulating Nepal. What interest India could have in this? Therefore, it appears to me as unfair. What is important is that it is very unfortunate that the relationship between the two countries is taking a bad turn. Some quick efforts should be made. They have agreed for talks. They are saying that they will start the talks. But the talks must start and the problem must be less. If they want to end their special relationship, they will have to go for a new relationship. It is their choice. But the new relationship will be on the basis of international principles, basic principles of internationalism. It may be the reciprocity, the mutual interest or the most favoured treatment of

nations in trade matters but it should be on the basis of those accepted principles of internationalism. India is prepared for anything which is acceptable to the Nepalese Government. But the only thing, is that this canard should stop in Nepal and India is not against Nepal. This can never be. This suspicion appears to be from the Nepalese Monarchy. That is the basic thing behind this. There is no suspicion from the Nepalese people or the Indian people. India has proved it. I know that in the 1985 elections, His Majesty of Nepal said that India has not interfered in their elections which is on record. India has no interest to interfere in the internal affairs of Nepal. But what is the matter? The world is changing. If the Nepalese Monarchy has any suspicion about the Indian democracy, we cannot help it and we cannot change it into a monarchy. What I am saying is that it is not as a result of any interference as it is alleged but it is because of the fear that the situation in Nepal has changed. It is that the people are changing as development takes place, as education takes place. People demand more and more democratic rights. This is happening everywhere. It is happening in USSR. It is happening in China. There the students are agitating for their democratic rights. If the people there are demanding more rights, then it is a matter between the people of Nepal and the monarchy. It is the relationship between the people and the monarchy there. It is not a question of fear from India that we want to interfere. That is the basic thing.

I think, the earlier we get through this, the better it would be. The basic thing is that we must disabuse them from any fear. We have all the best interest of Nepal. I do not see any reason that this question is not solved at the earliest.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri E Ayyapu Reddy. Please be brief, as the time is very short.

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY (Kurnool): I will try to be brief.

SHRI C. MADHAV REDDI: As many Members have spoken from the ruling party,

only Members from the opposition may be called.

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY: Sir, I shall try to be brief. We expected that the Government would give us some statement on Nepal because the report is not the latest. The report contains some statement relating to signing or initialling of the trade agreement.

It pains me to express my disenchantment with the foreign policy formulated and pursued by us. Our foreign policy in my humble opinion has never been pragmatic and result-oriented. Somewhere on the way, we lost our initiative and maneuverability and we became prisoners of our own high sounding slogans.

PROF N.G. RANGA (Guntur): Very surprising.

SHRI AJAY MUSHRAN (Jabalpur): Your statement has surprised even Prof Ranga.

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY: Unfortunately, I do not have the time. Otherwise I would draw a balance sheet itemwise and we could have a look as it dispassionately.

My first cause for disenchantment is that our foreign policy has been out-maneuvered, outflanked and outwitted by that of Pakistan and China. We have necessarily to compare our foreign policy with that of our immediate neighbours. Foreign policy's assessment cannot be made in isolation. If we compare the results of our foreign policy with that of Pakistan and China, I have necessarily to say that they have out-maneuvered us.

My second cause is that for the first time during the last forty years, our relationship with Nepal has become quite alarming. Why has the relationship deteriorated to such an extent? Where has been the mishandling of it? Why were we not able to anticipate Nepal's reaction and think of right actions? Just now, Shri Bhagat mentioned of the monar-

[Sh. E. Ayyapu Reddy]

chy's fears about our interference in their domestic affairs, and that the monarchy was trying to draw itself away from India. Shri Bhagat does not seem to have read the statement of Shri Koirala which has appeared in the Indian Express today.

My next submission is that our relations with Bangladesh and Ceylon, though apparently cordial, are really not so. Our immediate neighbors in our immediate neighbourhood in spite of what we have done for them, there is an anti-India phyché developing in our neighbouring countries.

My third cause is that the security environment of India continues to be as tense as before. There is marked escalation in the military capabilities of Pakistan and China. That is clearly admitted. The destabilising and subversive activities on the borders especially in Punjab and Kashmir are unabated and on the other hand they continue to escalate; they continue to accentuate. Why I am saying this is, I have prefaced my submission saying that our foreign policy had never been pragmatic and result-oriented. We have been deluding ourselves as one of the leaders of the non-aligned movement and trying to use peace and all that. So, from the security point of view also, I am sorry to say that our foreign policy did not yield concrete results.

Then, my next cause for disenchantment is that our American policy continues to be dragging and halting and the relationship still continues to be uncordial. There is a pronounced tilt of America in giving military capabilities far beyond the requirements of Pakistan. We have not been able to do anything on this aspect also. We have never been able to dissuade the Anglo-American policies to see that there is equilibrium between India and Pakistan or at least we have failed to prevent the anti-Indian card being played in Pakistan and anti-Pakistan card being played in India. We have failed there.

Again, my another concern is that In-

dia's stand on Afghanistan appears to be set with dangerous consequences. The consequences of the civil war in Afghanistan and the outcome of the present conflict in Afghanistan may find India on the wrong side. Them even on the financial and economic side, international trade, commerce and aid and development, even there in the NAM we have failed to organise the developing countries. The South-South dialogue which was spoken about into an effective instrument so as to prevent the exploitation of the developing countries and undeveloped countries by the highly industrialised countries.

With regard to Fiji, we were not even able to protect the legitimate democratic rights of the ethnic Indians there. As I stated earlier, our foreign policy has never been result oriented and has never been pragmatic. We have been floating in thin air. The only point which is in favour of our foreign policy is our good relationship with USSR and the leadership provided by Mr. Gorbachev in defusing the international tension. That is the only good point or the only bright point which has come out in the implementation of the foreign policy of the India.

16.00 hrs.

Now, let me take up our relationship with China. As I said, both the Pakistan and China have out-witted and out-manoeuvred India. Bhagatji has said that we have been able to achieve a break-through in our relations because of the Prime Minister's visit to Beijing. I do not think so. On the other hand, if you draw a balance sheet, we have conceded to much. I admire the Chinese foreign policy. They are totally self-oriented. They do not act emotionally or sentimentally. The facts that when Japan invaded China, India stood by China and India fought for the admission of China into the UNO and into the Security Council count very little so far as China is concerned. They do not think of the past. They think of the present only and they are totally result-oriented. So far as our relation with China is concerned, the Prime Minister has made a concession with regard to Tibet. It is stated in the communique that

India will not allow any anti-China agitation by the Tibetans in India. That concession has been given by us. But reciprocal concession from China is totally absent. Has China recognised Sikkim as part of India? Has it renounced its denouncement about Arunachal Pradesh? When Arunachal Pradesh was declared a State, China came forward with a statement denouncing it. Has it retraced its steps? Do they stand for autonomy for Tibetans? They have gone back on their commitment for autonomy for Tibetans. Also, we have not been able to raise even our little finger or our voice against the brutal suppression of human rights in Tibet. We have accepted their stand. Rather, we have been made to accept it.

No doubt, the gap between the two big countries, according to some people, has become somewhat narrower. How did it happen? It has become narrower because of India's going towards the Chinese stand and not by their coming to us or conceding anything in favour of us. So, we have accepted their stand.

All along, we have been contending that before we normalise our relationship, the border dispute must also be settled simultaneously. This has been the consistent stand of India that normalisation of relations with China must be simultaneous and coterminous with the solution of border problem. But now we have given up that stand. We have now accepted that we can enter into agreements, so-called trade and science and technology agreements which come to nothing practically. Now we have agreed to normalise our relationship first and then, after normalising our relations, we want to settle the disputes! On what grounds? On what terms? It is based on terms which are just and mutually acceptable by appointing a joint working group and meanwhile by maintaining peace and tranquility on the border. This is the concession made by us.

PROF. N. G. RANGA: No. no. This is done by both the sides.

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY: By giving this concession, we accept China's actual

line of control. This means we accept their occupation of Sumdorong Chu Valley in Arunachal. This means we do not actually attempt to make them evict from or give up our territory occupied by them. If you see carefully the recent visit of the Prime Minister, it has in no way helped or in no way achieved any break-through. The recent deterioration of relationship of Nepal with India has something to do with the Chinese supplying them arm—especially the anti-aircraft guns. They are also trying to supply them the essential commodities. The Nepalese on the one hand are playing the China card also against India. This is the balance-sheet so far as the so-called agreements between India and China are concerned.

Regarding Pakistan, it appears that we are happy that Pakistan has become a democratic polity. My own assessment today is that America's wit runs far more effectively than they used to during Mr. Zia's regime. Mr. Zia was a very tough man. He was able to dictate terms to the Americans. But it is not so now. Now, the position has changed. The American lobby in Pakistan has become very powerful because they are able to play militarily against the democratically elected Government. The recent Congress Committee's statement clearly shows that they are very happy with the present set up. They say that they want to set up democracy and therefore they are giving 631 million dollar aid. They have also given 60 new aircraft on specious plan because the Chinese aircraft have become old. Their effort to militarise Pakistan is no consolation to India. What is more important is Pakistan's military Budget? It has accelerated by 10 per cent more this year. It is admitted by us that Pakistan is very actively assisting and aiding the terrorists in Kashmir as well as in Punjab. This has been admitted in your Report. Now, I will read out a para to show that the security environment there continues to be very tense.

On the Nepalese issue, we say that they have violated the spirit of 1950 Treaty. They say 'No'.

Now, you see the statement of Mr. Koirala. He made a critical on slaughter on the

[Sh. E. Ayyapu Reddy]

India Government. This statement of Mr. Koirala has to be taken very seriously and it is absolutely necessary that at least immediate steps must be taken to see that our relationship with Nepal is sustained.

Now, I will come to Bangladesh. Here there is only the entry of debits and there is not credits. The Chakma refugees and the Islamisation of Bangladesh only shows the anti-India attitude that is being developed there.

And apart from that, the number of refugees who were purring into India every day from Bangladesh and the smuggling that is taking place on the border of Bangladesh as well as NEFA, there are continuing to be very alarming.

Last but not the least, what is the position today with regard to our relationship with Ceylon? Now, we have shed our blood in Bangladesh, in Ceylon and in Pakistan, but we have not been able to get any gratitude in return. The IPKF was sent with all good intension, but both the ethnic groups in Ceylon including the Ceylonese Government as well as Ceylonese common man want IPKF is withdrawn. The sooner the IPKF is withdrawn the better. Though the Prime Minister has made a Statement, I expect the hon. Minister to make a positive statement that IPKF will be withdrawn as soon as possible and with the maximum care that is possible in the circumstances of the case or otherwise we are likely to lose the goodwill and the good name of India among the Ceylonese common man.

SHRISURESHKURUP (Kottayam): Mr. Chairman, our foreign policy was founded during those years of our freedom struggle and is based on the principle of non-alignment and anti-imperialism. So, this policy has remained intact; its basic features have remained intact inspite of my cngages that have taken place during the last 40 years. The basic features of non-alignment have stood the test of time and its distinct anti-

imperial and anti-colonial thrust has always kept India on the side of the oppressed nations of the world. It is because of these basic features that we have given our overall support to this policy of our Government; this is not a policy of any political party; even when we have opposed anti-people policy of this government, we have given an overall support to this foreign policy.

Now, with the bold imaginative initiative of the Soviet leader Mr. Gorbachev, there is an ease in the tension in the world situation. With the INF Treaty and the unilateral declaration about withdrawal of the Soviet forces from the Eastern Europe and so many other measures, the Soviet Union has created this atmosphere. No other country in the world can remain unmoved in the face of this friendship. The imperial powers are responding to this peace initiative because such is the pressure and positive reaction from the world public opinion. About this move, our country, as one of the leaders of the NAM, has played an important role in the struggle for making this world nuclear free world. The most important feature of our foreign policy was the visit of our Prime Minister to China which took place last year; it was the first of its kind in the last 36 years. This is particularly heartening to us, who have been advocating all these years against all sorts of adverse criticism for an amicable settlement of outstanding issues between India and China. The decision to set up a Joint Working Group on the boundary question and also a Joint Committee headed by senior Ministers to promote trade and economic relations, scientific and technological cooperation and issuing of the Joint Communique at the end of the visit, stressin the common points, clearly shows that the visit is a major breakthrough in finding out an amicable and peaceful settlement regarding the outstanding dispute between the two countries. This process of normalisation in the India China dispute must continue. There are vested interests inside and outside the country to wreck this process of normalisation. At the same time all the peace-loving and progressive forces in this country will render their wholehearted support to this move. We

genuinely hope that an era of peace and friendship will come to India-China relations.

Then coming to our most immediate neighbour, Pakistan, in spite of the fact that a democratic government has come to the help of affairs there, it is a fact that the military still retains its hold on the forces of the Government there. They have got a tremendous influence over the Government. The new Government in Pakistan has to take this into consideration on each and every move it takes.

Pakistan still occupies the most important part in the American strategic perspective of this area. America pumps millions of dollars into Pakistan. They help them to pile huge arms and ammunition and the USA is eager to supply whatever arms they want. They were supplying all these arms till now under the pretext that they were helping the Afghan rebels. Now they cannot advance that sort of flimsy reasons. Because once the Soviet presence is not there, they cannot put forward this reasoning. But again, they are continuing to help the Afghan rebels and also they are piling up arms in Pakistan. It has been proved beyond doubt that these arms which they are supply to Pakistan are coming to Punjab, either through the Afghan rebels or through so many other ways, and they are being used by the terrorists in Punjab to disintegrate our country. This is the destabilisation process which the Americans are doing in our country. Our criticism is that the Government is not exposing it. You are not ready to expose them. You use this destabilisation theory whenever you are in trouble to wriggle out of any unpleasant situation. For you the imperialists and their machinations are a convenient weapon to use against us in the Opposition. This, you should understand, will only help the people who are out to destabilise our country. Why do you not come out openly against the American machinations in this area? Instead, our country is thrown open to multi-national companies. You are so eager to enter into every sort of collaboration including Defence, with the Americans and even a company like Pepsi Cola which is quite well-known all over

the world for its role in killing Allende of Chile is now being allowed to do whatever they like in our country.

Sir, this sort of soft-peddling with regard to multi-nationals; eagerness to get arms from USA and the large foreign debt that we have—all these things will dilute the anti-imperialist thrust of our foreign policy. That you should understand. The Government should take into consideration this warning given by the democratic public opinion in our country.

While speaking about the terrorist, it is mentioned in the report that we have entered into some sort of an understanding with Canada. But in the whole report, nothing is mentioned about Great Britain. It was widely reported about the visit of the British Foreign Secretary of State to our country; the agreement that we have entered into with Britain and the understanding we have reached regarding terrorist, but nothing is mentioned in this report. I would like to know what the position is.

Another thing is about our longstanding demand, which we are of course now soft-peddling, regarding making Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. Nothing is mentioned about Diego Garcia. Why are we now keeping mum regarding our demand of making the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace?

About Nepal, the report gives a very rosy picture. But we know that now the relations are very strained. I request the Government to use every possible means to make the our relations with Nepal normal.

About Sri Lanka, the Government should force the Sri Lanka Government to give the powers that they are supposed to give under the Indo-Sri Lanka Agreement, to the Provincial Council, and also conditions should be created so that the IPKF can make an early withdrawal or phased withdrawal, whatever it is.

With these words, I conclude.

SHRI BIPIN PAL DAS (Tezpur): Sir, when one looks around at the overall scenario of the world today, one feels little relaxed and a sense of relief tends to overcome a long spell of tension, worry and fear. Confrontation is giving way to cooperation and the sky appears to be slowly being cleared of the clouds of doubts and suspicions. A new era of peace and detente looks like dawning on mankind.

A number of factors and forces have brought about this transformation of the world scene. But there is no doubt that the initiatives taken by President Gorbachev have played a decisive role and set the ball into motion. The INF Treaty between USA and USSR was the first major positive result of Gorbachev initiative and it has opened up further prospectus for peace in the world.

The Delhi Declaration of November 1986 and the ideals of Non-alignment provided the philosophical base for the new thinking in several parts of the world. The "Delhi Six" had also made their contribution towards initiating the process of disarmament. Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi made a personal contribution at the Third Special Session on Disarmament of the U.N. General Assembly in June 1988, where he presented a positive Action Plan to eliminate nuclear weapons by the year 2010.

It is significant to note that the INF Treaty was followed quickly by the Geneva Accord on Afghanistan, the Agreements on Angola and Namibia and the positive moves to solve the problem of Kampuchea. The ceasefire in the war between Iran and Iraq caused a pleasant surprise throughout the world. There are developments that took place. The bold initiative of the PLO has raised hopes of an early solution of the Palestine problem. There are encouraging signs of restoration of peace in Central America and five nations have signed a treaty there. We welcome all these positive developments and trends in the international scene as these are vindicative of the stand taken by India and the Non-Aligned Movement for the last twenty-five years or more. I

wanted to say this to Mr. Ayyapu Reddy who does not see anything good in our foreign policy. All these happenings are taking place in the Centenary Celebration Year of Pandit Nehru. It is as though the history itself is paying homage to the great son of India in his centenary year. The U.N. Secretary-General also played a positive role in these matters, in these developments and we must appreciate that.

While I am saying all this, I am conscious of the fact that the sky is not yet wholly clear and there are still some hurdles in the way. The crusaders of peace have yet miles and miles to go before they can sleep. In Afghanistan, the Soviet Union honoured their commitment before time by withdrawing their troops. But external interference continues from USA and Pakistan and the Mujahideens have been instigated and fully armed to carry on their war against the Kabul regime, and that is in complete violation of the Geneva Accord. This is most unfortunate and we cannot deplore the policy of USA and Pakistan in this regard. There cannot be any military solution to the problem of Afghanistan, there has to be a political solution. I understand that President Najib has made some proposals and others should respond to those proposals.

On the issue of Palestinians' inalienable right to their own homeland, it is a matter of deep regret that Israel has not responded positively to the initiative of the PLO. Peace is still far away in that region.

In Southern Africa, in spite of the Brazzaville Protocol laying down a definite time frame for Namibian independence, fighting still goes on and complete independence of Namibia is yet to be a reality. In any case, the Africans in that region cannot feel the true pulse of freedom, until and unless South Africa itself is freed from White minority rule and apartheid is given a firm burial, never to appear again.

We are happy that the world is slowly moving towards disarmament. But the other most serious problem continues to pose a

serious threat to world peace and that is the ever-widening economic imbalance or disparity between the developed one-third and the developing two-thirds of humanity. Debt burden of the developing nations is mounting with every passing year and there is no definite move on the part of the developed world for a reasonable and equitable solution of this problem. The North-South dialogue ceased to make any headway because the North continues to be rigid and obstinate in its attitude to this problem.

The Non-Alignment Movement has raised a demand for a new world economic order, based on equality and justice, in order to reduce the gap or imbalance between the developed and the developing world. The Non-Alignment Movement has to be much more active and vigorous in this regard. I believe that the most effective way to go about it is to activate the South-South dialogue. That will not only further strengthen the base of the Non-Aligned Movement and create a momentum for self-reliance but also give it enough manoeuvring capacity to compel the North to come back to the negotiating table for a really meaningful dialogue with the South to produce positive results. In this matter, I think India is in a most advantageous position and it should play a leading role and a dynamic role.

Sir, the current developments in the world have amply justified the principles and philosophy of the Non-Aligned Movement. The new trends have also provided that non-alignment is very much relevant even today and will continue to be so for decades to come. To build a new world order is a gigantic task and the Non Aligned Movement has to be fully equipped for that task. Here again India will have to continue to play a leading role. A leading role does not mean a domineering role but a role of the first among equals. The basic objective of our foreign policy is achievement of world peace through cooperation among nations based on equity and mutual respect for independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity.

Sir, I will not get time to explain further.

I would be brief now. Sir, in foreign policy, the first priority of any country is naturally the neighbourhood. India is, therefore, very vigilant about the situation in South Asia region and conscious about our role in it. Our recent action in Maldives in response to their friendly call was wholly justified on principles and from the point of view of ensuring the independence, sovereignty and integrity of that friendly nation which was seriously threatened by external forces of destabilisation. I must congratulate our Prime Minister for the prompt action he took in this particular matter.

Sir, much criticism had been made and even today they are criticising the Indo-Sri Lanka Agreement. I do not understand their basis for criticising the Agreement. The Indo-Sri Lanka Agreement had three main objective—first fulfilment of legitimate aspirations of the Tamils of Sri Lanka, second, safeguarding the unity and integrity of Sri Lanka and third ensuring our legitimate security interests in that region. This Agreement is being successfully implemented phase by phase and it has turned out to be a correct and successful policy in tackling a difficult situation in that country. It has further strengthened our ties of friendship with Sri Lanka.

Sir, the formation of SAARC was a correct move and this forum should be made more effective and purposeful. Sir, I must take this opportunity to pay a warm tribute to the IPKF for their very high degree of competence and for the sacrifices they have made with a smiling face to serve a noble cause of this region. I must pay my homage to those who laid down their lives in discharge of their duties. I must also pay a tribute to the leadership and statesmanship shown by our Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi and the former President, Shri Jayawardene of Sri Lanka for setting an example before others.

Sir, I do not want to say much about Nepal because I think some kind of negotiations would take place very soon and both the countries would sort the problems. Therefore, I do not want to go into these issues now arising between the two countries. I hope,

[Sh. Bipin Pal Das]

Nepal will keep in mind not only our long historical and cultural relationship but also the geographical compulsion of the region. Nothing should be said which may create unnecessary irritation or misunderstanding in India and Nepal. The supreme need of the hour is to create a climate of mutual trust and confidence so that the issues can be sorted out for mutual benefit and advantage. Therefore, I cannot say anything more on this subject.

About other problems, Sir, particularly about Pakistan, I may state that we have welcomed the restoration of democratic process and emergence of the newly elected Government there. We welcome that. But I must say, everything is not well in Pakistan. The nexus between the Afghan rebels and the Indian terrorists through the Inter-Service Intelligence of Pakistan is very unfortunate. Pakistan still gets physically involved in the Afghan problem and that must be stopped and therefore, I am happy about everything that is going on in Pakistan. I do not want to say anything more.

About China, it is absolutely a historical fact that the Prime Minister's visits to China was a breakthrough, there is no doubt about it. You cannot expect results over-night, it will take time and things are moving in the right direction, I have absolutely no doubt about it. That is about China.

Sir, another area where we are not doing much, to which I would draw the attention of the Minister, is the South-East Asian region. We have not done much in that area. What we should have done, we have not done in that area. We should give due attention to that area.

Before I conclude, I would like to emphasise that Indo-Soviet friendship should continue to be the sheet anchor of our overall policy of peace, friendship and cooperation. It is based on equality and mutual respect for each other's sovereignty. It has also stood the test of time. The Delhi Declaration has

added a new dimension to it and elevated it to ideological and philosophical level. This friendship is not at the cost of the friendship with other countries. We want to develop our friendship with USA and West German countries, but Indo-Soviet friendship is the sheet anchor of our foreign policy.

SHRI H.M. PATEL (Sabarkantha): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would like to say only a few words on the Demands for Grants of the External Affairs Ministry. I was surprised to read in a paper called *Economist* of London which is usually friendly to India, that India is behaving like an imperial country. It wants to dominate over all its neighbours, neighbouring countries. They are small, India is big. It starts off with the way in which Nepal is being treated, seige is being laid on the Nepal, Nepal is to be starved into submission and it goes on in that way referring to the way in which the neighbouring countries of India are being treated by India. Now, why has a friendly paper like *The Economist*—normally friendly, normally very well informed, why has it suddenly turned against India? There must be some reason for India to have created that impression abroad that India is behaving in an unreasonably dictatorial manner towards a small land-locked country like Nepal. There were two agreements, they were terminated, maybe I do not want to go into the history of this thing or who was in the right and who was not. But could it not be that the whole situation could have been handled in a different way so that such an impression would not be created in other countries outside India? Could not some way have been found for informing other countries what the facts are? Why should Nepal want to do something that is against its own interests? Why is it forced to do so? After all, today who suffers most because only two entry points have been permitted? It is the ordinary people of Nepal who are suffering. Why should Nepal, therefore, take such a suicidal step? That is a question which naturally anybody would ask; certainly every citizen of this country asks. Now, the answer is that it is favouring China. It wants to negotiate with China. Despite treating China in a certain manner, it is black-mailing

India. This, I must say, is an extraordinary way of putting things. Nepal has been blackmailing India. Except for those who are putting that argument, I do not think it carries any conviction to anybody. Yes, the word blackmail may be wrong, but it is taking full advantage of India. It is getting all the benefits, but when it comes to returning some of those benefits in a proper way, it refuses to do. What does it refuse? In fact, it has been cooperating with us on the irrigation problems of Kosi and other rivers. You want to Nepal to behave in a cooperative way. Where has it not cooperated with you in any important matter? It is rather unfortunate that this situation has been allowed to develop so far as Nepal is concerned. In so far as Maldives is concerned, everybody says "yes; we went to its help very speedily, readily and it was a good thing done. But in so far as Ceylon is concerned, have we really done the right thing all the way? I think the onus of proving that our policy is right lies with the External Affairs Ministry. It is by no means so obvious, as my predecessor Shri Bipin Pal Das has said, it is a magnificent policy, etc. etc. I think merely saying those words does not make the policy magnificent. What object has been achieved? What price had you paid? Could it not have been done in some different way? There are so many questions which arise. I think a full, thorough answer is called for. When you come for Demands for Grants, it is up to you to satisfy. Fortunately, because of your majority you do not have to do it; but otherwise, it would be most essential for you to have done so. When you say that this is something which justified the fact that thousands of our soldiers have been killed, has some corresponding gain been achieved? What is the economic cost? How many crores of rupees have been spent? You can treat it as a training ground, if you like. Then it is understandable. But certainly I cannot say it is justified. Was it the justification for sending our forces there? It is said that it is we, who trained the LTTE. Is that not correct? Is that not a fact? Nobody has yet told us that. Why? It is undoubtedly a fact, but that fact has not been confirmed officially. But you have trained them so well, that they, as guerillas, are able to cope with our well-trained armed forces

most effectively. They are capable of ambushing them successfully. How has it become possible? I hope, on these things, in your reply you will try and enlighten us to some extent. Then again, why is it nothing is said about Burma? It is as if Burma does not exist. Burma is an important neighbour of ours. What have you done? Thousands of our people were earning regular livelihood in that country. Now, almost everybody is out of that country and nobody goes back. Do you not feel that there ought to be some relationship between Burma and India? What relationship do you have with that country? If so, why? It is not very clear what exactly our policy towards that neighbour of ours is. And then, I come to Bangladesh. Bangladesh is a small country. We certainly helped its emancipation, to make it an independent country. But when it is in distress, how much help have we rendered to it? We claim to have rendered help whenever they had floods etc. But I would like to know know much, because we find that they do not accept our request in regard to certain economic policies, certain irrigation policies—containment of the *Brahmaputra* river, the *Ganges* river problem etc. All these problems are still outstanding. Have you settled them? Why have we not made the kind of progress which we ought to have in this respect? It is a country which certainly was not ungrateful.

16.46 hrs.

[SHRIMATI BASAVARAJESWARI *in the Chair*]

At the moment, Bangladesh is very badly situated. About one-third or more than one-third of its area is suffering from very severe drought. The people are even starving of food. What assistance have we rendered to them? There is no mention of anything of that kind, except to say that our relationship with Bangladesh is "satisfactory". It is as if the world "satisfactory" explains everything. "Satisfactory" means, we are not at war with each other. But more than that, is it not our duty as a larger country to help small countries. Certainly, last year, we had to face severe drought and because we have made

[Sh. H.M. Patel]

progress in various directions, we were able to cope with that drought very satisfactorily. This year, however, we have a very satisfactory situation. We could have assisted them, we could have done it. We ought to have assisted Bangladesh. If we have not assisted them, I would like to know why. Why has there not been any reference about that in regard to Bangladesh? In what way, you are assisting neighbouring countries? What ought to be our attitude towards our neighbouring countries, those smaller ones.

Then, you come to the larger one and more trouble some one—China and Pakistan. Now with Pakistan, the question of nuclear weapons comes. They are developing them. What is your policy in regard to nuclear weapons? Is it not time that we should decide about it? You keep on saying that if they do this, we will do this. But do you know what they have done? It is a matter of fact known to everybody as to what stage their nuclear development is and you know, what they are doing. If there is any doubt, the United States of America has made a positive statement as to what exactly is the situation in Pakistan and they want to balance it with development in nuclear weapons in India. But what are we going to do about it? You praise Gorbachev and others for their efforts towards nuclear disarmament. Between United States of America and Soviet Russia there has been discussion about nuclear weapons and they have adopted a policy as a result of which there is going to be progressive disarmament in that direction. That may all be very well. But what about us and Pakistan? What is our positive policy? We know that America is definitely assisting Pakistan in a major way for its own reasons. We also ought to have a policy of our own for our reasons, in our interest. We only talk of containing our Defence expenditure. But we should not contain the Defence expenditure, if our security is in danger. Certainly you economise in that direction. You could not explain your approach because there was no discussion on the Defence Grants. But I think, it is very relevant for

me to point out that we ought to see to it that whatever the necessity for reducing the Defence expenditure, we should not do so, at the cost of ensuring maximum efficiency in terms of equipment, in our capacity to hit back or to defend. That should not be the case. So, I think Defence expenditure reduction is important but it should certainly not be at the cost of efficiency, at the cost of our fighting efficiency.

I would now like only to say one word about one aspect. There is certain amount of static nature of external policy. We seem to have made up our minds that whatever the situation in the world in regard to Israel and Palestine, our policy in regard to Israel shall remain the same. Palestinians have thought, it advisable, to change their policy, change it to the extent of saying that they recognise Israel as a State, completely revolutionising their stand. But, we will have nothing to do with Israel. It is as if that country does not exist. It is a country which can help us in many directions in the most beneficial way and why should we ignore it? We have nothing to do with that country. Why must we take up a stand of this extra-ordinary and utterly absurd nature? Show me another country which behaves with Israel in the way in which we are behaving, only in order to see that our attitude towards Palestine is not affected. Certainly you can go on supporting Palestine. Who says 'No'? There is need for reconsidering our attitude towards Israel. Why must we have nothing to do with Israel and treat it as untouchable? We must reconsider even if it means some change in our policy. What change we have made in all these years?

Our teams have to play competitive matches with Israel in tennis and such other games. But, we even go to the length of saying that we shall not play our Davis Cup Tennis Match. Why should we do so? Our attitude towards South Africa is understandable. But, I do not see how this attitude is justifiable in regard to Israel, and, if it is justifiable, I think it is the time that we consider it. I hope that the External Affairs Minister will explain in simple words our policy so

that all of us in this country can understand.

We are prepared to have them in our Conferences. But, if the Conference is of a major nature like the International Dairy Conference, International Science Conference, then the representative of Israel cannot come here. What crime has Israel committed? I think there are certain directions in which we continue to shut our eyes and do not want to open them again.

MR CHAIRMAN: Please conclude.

SHRI H.M. PATEL: All right. Now that you have given the bell, I will conclude.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You try to conclude soon, Mr. Patel.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Basirhat): He is chivalrous to you, Madam!

SHRI H.M. PATEL: Anyhow, I am quite content to conclude with the request that we have do take the trouble to restate our policy in regard to our neighbours, Bangladesh, Nepal and Israel. I do think it is necessary for us to explain why we still consider that whatever line we have adopted continue to be satisfactory said is on the right lines and what if any further developments should take place. Just to say this is our policy is not enough. But, I feel that in addition to saying what our policy is, it is desirable that you justify it to the people of this country. Because you have a massive majority, it is not enough that you merely say this is our policy and that it is very sound. That is not the point. It should be assumed that the Government is following that policy because it considers the policy to be sound. But surely, something more is necessary. Please explain why the policy is sound. The hon. Minister should be prepared to do it. As I said earlier, in regard to Nepal for instance, the hon. Minister realises what wrong impression it is creating in this country and what great prejudices they are creating against the ordinary people of India, what prejudices they are creating between the ordinary people of India and Nepal. It is time that the hon. Minister really

took to the trouble to explain the policy in great detail and satisfy the people of Nepal as well as the people of India that our policy, whatever we are following, is in the right direction and it is now directed against the ordinary people of India and Nepal.

With these words, I conclude.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Basirhat): Madam, I think the hon. Foreign Minister will be hard put to it try to reply to various points raised here by hon. Members in view of the fact of the guillotine which is imminent. So, I will also restrict myself only to two or three points because many things are there to be said. But this dismal Budget discussion that we are now about to conclude at 6 O' Clock, does not give us much opportunity.

The two truisms bear some repetition, though very briefly, one which is well known to the Government of India that as far as we are concerned, the general parameters of our foreign policy which have been evolving ever since the days of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and actually even prior to that during the days of our national Independence movement, have always enjoyed our general support and will continue to do so because we belief that that policy is ultimately the only policy which could be in the interest of our own country and its interests. The second factor is that it is a fact that there is a very radical change in the international climate. Other Members have already referred to the factors which have generated a new thinking in international affairs which have brought about developments which really could not have been imagined even a couple of years ago and which have generated hope in the minds of millions of people in all countries that the danger and the threat of a nuclear holocaust may be avoided and that even smaller conflicts and regional conflicts may be settled not on the battle-field but at the Conference table. There are so many examples which can be cited but I have no time to go into all those things. It is because of this background that I just want to concentrate on one or two issues which I am afraid this time they could give us some slight

[Sh. Indrajit Gupta]

feeling of disappointment. Why? Because on these issues it seems to us that our Government and its policies are not in harmony with this new international climate which we are talking so much about. That means the opportunities provided for some new initiatives to be taken, some new dynamism to be shown, some thrust on our part—not just going on in the old routine humdrum way—seem to be lacking, which we have expected more because so many problems are there in this region. These regional problems would directly or indirectly affect India's national interest. I think the new situation in the world gives an opportunity to take new initiatives, greater initiatives, to improve relations with other countries, especially as so many Members have emphasised this time, our neighbouring countries and thereby to strengthen our security environment in our own favour.

17.00 hrs.

Now, Sir, Nepal, I am sure, the hon. Minister will deal with. He cannot avoid it. I am sure he has no desire to avoid it.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO): That is right.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: That is right. Mr. Narasimha Rao, it is high time than an official statement of the Government of India on this Nepal deadlock or imbroglio, whatever you call it, is made and if this truncated debate serves no other purpose but to elicit an official statement on the Floor of the House, I think, it will serve its purpose. Everybody is wondering about what is happening. Nobody knows the full truth, the facts. We have to depend on the press for so many types of reports everyday. And, frankly speaking, I do not know what are the full facts either. How suddenly has this crisis developed? It could not be so sudden, after all. Now something has happened. I have been hearing from some of our members who work and live in districts which are bordering

Nepal. And you know, in that area, it is very easy to come and go. People come and go. There are people of the same ethnic origins living on both sides of the border. There are very disquieting reports. I do not think that it is just a question of trade and tariff. Trade and Tariff Treaty is a part of that, how they are to be implemented, whether they are to be renewed in any way or whether they are not being carried out and so on and so forth. But so many other issues are being posed. The question of citizenship rights—whether some system of work permit has been sought to be introduced in Nepal for Indians working there and whether there is some question of any reciprocal action on this side, I do not know. I know that people from Nepal who work in our country in large numbers, never required any permits to do so. I also remember that in recent years, a large number of Nepali workers, poor people, the ordinary manual labourers have been driven out from Meghalaya, have been driven out from Assam. And this factor was one of the main issues which Mr. Subash Ghising took up in his agitation for Gorkhaland in my State. And the whole question arises as to how the two countries should treat the citizens of the other country who are working there. What is the position now. I do not know.

Then there is the whole question of Nepal having suddenly imposed new duties, very heavy duties, import duties on Indian goods—perhaps in violation of some treaty or the other. I do not know what is the position. whatever it may be these difficulties have to be solved. There is a question of anti-aircraft guns being purchased from China. I do not know whether it is a fact or not. I know that in the 1951 Treaty on Peace and Friendship between our two countries, there is a clause which said, at that time, that if Nepal want to purchase any arms and ammunition, it must be brought to Nepal through India. But that was long long ago. Many things have changed in the world. I think, in those days, there was no road from China to Nepal. In the North of Nepal, road had not been constructed which is there now. And surely, if we consider Nepal to be a sovereign country—I hope we do, however, small it may

be—we cannot, I suppose, legitimately question their rights to purchase from any other country. We would prefer it they purchase it from India, no doubt. But suppose, they want to purchase from some other country, you cannot question their rights, I suppose. Whether our security interest in that Himalayan region are in any way threatened or prejudiced by some Nepali action, I do not know. We should be told. Anyway, I do not want to go into further details because a great deal of it all is a speculation as far as we are concerned, lot of guess work in it. We do not have any official version which I hope, we will get today to some extent.

My main point is, we are very much worried for political reasons and not for the technical parameters of these treaties. Politically, in the long run, if this deadlock is allowed to continue or if the relations are allowed to deteriorate, it is not Nepal which will suffer; but it is India which will have to suffer. That is the whole trouble and that is how the world is constituted. That is how the international community reacts to this type of event.

This picture which is depicted of India as a big country trying to twist the arm of a small country or trying to bully it or something is a picture which will find support in many quarters. Some people do it mischievously, deliberately; but some may also be taken in by this whole idea.

We are both members of the SAARC. There was such a successful SAARC meeting only the other day in Islamabad where the King of Nepal and our Prime Minister met and had cordial talks and all that, when new agreements of cooperation between all these countries were envisaged. Now, suddenly, what has happened?

All I wish to say is that the Hon. Minister will kindly throw as much light as it possible for him to do. I think we should not just sit and wait for something to happen. Even if the Nepali side is now moving or does not want to take any initiative, we being the bigger country and wanting these traditional ties of

friendship not to be damaged in any way, should in our opinion be much more up and doing.

It is strange that no Government to Government discussions have taken place so far. We should insist on it. We said that we are willing to talk and all that. And they have said sitting there that they welcome the Indian Government's expression of desire to talk. But are we going to just limit it to desires and intentions? Some action must be taken, some steps must be taken before it is too late. Because there are many forces in this region which would like to fish in troubled waters. There are many people who would like to see anti-India sentiments being worked up among the Nepalese people and that would be a tragedy for us.

The second point I want to briefly deal with is with regard to Afghanistan. On the 16th February, as everybody knows, the last Soviet soldier has left Afghan soil as per the terms of the Geneva Accord, leaving behind some 13000 or 14000 of their soldiers who died in the last ten years. Whether the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan was correct or not correct, justified or not justified, history will show. But after all that was the one ostensible reason given all these years for the arming by the Americans of Pakistan which was supposed to be threatened by the presence of the Soviet army on its borders. And always we are reassured that these are not meant for use against us. That was the reason given for the massive support for the rebel Mujahiddins in Afghanistan. All these people concerned signed a treaty in Geneva under the auspices of the United Nations. Only one side is scrupulously carried it out and the other side is blatantly, flagrantly violating the terms of that treaty.

Are we not interested much more than we are showing at the moment? It was always our stand—and I believe it is still our stand—that we do not want an Islamic type of fundamentalist Government to come to power in Kabul which will be a threat to this whole region and to us also, to peace and stability. That is not what was proposed by

[Sh. Indrajit Gupta]

the Najibulla Government in Kabul itself which has made this proposal that all the different forces and parties involved should set up a coalition Government. But one side say nothing doing, the present Government in Kabul must be finished off, must be liquidated, wiped out and then they will set up a Government there.

What is happening now? The New York Times of all the papers has published a report which I am sure our Foreign Office has seen. Quoting the instance of the meeting that took place, attended not by anybody from Afghanistan, no Mujah-ideen or anybody was present there; only high Pakistani military and civil officials and the United States Ambassador to Pakistan were present. In that meeting, a plan was elaborated on the attack, the offensive, on Jalalabad which has been going on for the last several weeks. I hope our Government at no time shared the hope that some people have. We could not have hoped, I am sure. But I hope you did not share that assessment that the Government in Kabul and its army would collapse within two weeks. Well, they have not collapsed. I do not know whether they will succeed in holding on or whether they will be overwhelmed. But the fact remains that the Americans are fully in this game of violating the Geneva Agreement and the Pakistan army—now two divisions of the Pakistan army—are on the Afghan soil, backing up the Mujah-ideens. Now, it is not a civil war any more. It was a civil war so long as the rebels were fighting the Government of Kabul. How will you call it a civil war now, when the Pakistan army has intruded into Afghanistan? A full-scale war is being launched; rockets and missiles are being used to kill mostly the civilian population. Are we not vitally concerned about the developments which may follow? But I do not find our Government here. This is my complaint. What can our Government do, you will say we are not in a position perhaps to do much. But India, in the past, had a reputation for using its moral pressure, its prentige—its international prestige—on the side of the

causes of peace and justice. Therefore, here is an agreement which was made under the auspices of the United Nations which we had warmly welcomed at that time and correctly and which is now being blatantly violated. At least we should speak out more vigorously; we should say something; we should demand that the agreement should be properly observed and implemented by all the parties to it. We should try to move the United Nations much more in this matter than what we have done. I know the hon. Minister made a statement in the Plenary Session of the United Nations. But after that who listened? The situation has become much more critical now.

The Americans have also given *de facto* recognition to the so-called rebel Government which has been established in Peshawar. In every way, the Americans are trying to see that this whole area becomes embroiled in another huge clash with the help of their arms. Where do we come into the picture? So, I would like to know what our perception is. I think Jalalabad—which I had the opportunity to visit once and where Khan Abdul Gaffar Khan incidentally is buried. It is his burial place—in the grounds of the house which was given to him by the Afghan Government for his residence—that City is now being destroyed systematically. There are a huge number of people living there; of Indian Origin, they are perhaps not Indian Citizens now, they are living there. They are shopkeepers, traders, farmers and Sikhs. They know that Jalalabad can be captured. Then perhaps the road to Kabul will be opened. I am not asking for any military intervention. We cannot do that obviously. But some political, diplomatic initiatives should be taken much more than at present in this matter to mobilise, to rally public opinion and world opinion against this cynical violation of this Geneva Agreement.

Finally, I would like to say that there is a report that has appeared in a Newspaper, and to which I sought to draw the attention of the hon. Speaker also; the 'Wallstreet Journal' Washington has reported:

"Two West German Companies have admitted supplying nuclear weepers—related materials, the material being Zirconium, to Pakistan and disclosed that one of their unwitting sources was India".

17.16 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

I do not know whether this report is correct or not. But this is an indication of the necessity of the Government to probe this matter and find out from its own sources what is the truth behind this. It is a very alarming report that from Indian source zirconium which is a special corrosion resistant metal used to fuel rods in nuclear reactors—its export is forbidden—is going from Indian source to German companies who are helping to supply Pakistan with this materials. It should be found out whether it is true or not true.

Finally, I would say that now we know in Sri Lanka both LTTE and JVP are pressurising President Premadasa to carry out the pledge that he gave before he was elected. The pledge he gave was that once he became President the IPKF will be told to quit. They say, since he has now become the President, why should the enemy or alien forces be allowed to remain in our country. Well, the Prime Minister has said a couple of days ago that IPKF will ultimately be withdrawn but it must fulfil the tasks for which it was sent. It is now really a policing task. Elections have been held. President has been elected. Provincial councils have been formed. New Parliament has been elected. Policing job is to be done by the IPKF. I understand the compulsions of that. But how long we can go on like that. There will be no end to it.

Therefore, I would suggest that Government takes some political and diplomatic initiatives with the Government of Sri Lanka also to see that a situation is created in which IPKF can be withdrawn in phases at least because I do not think a prolonged stay of

our Army in any foreign country can have anything but counter-productive results. That is what the history of so many countries shows and we do not want to become unpopular unnecessarily.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, first I would like to thank hon. Members who have participated in the debate. May I say that I hope the number of Members present in the House on this debate will gradually go on increasing. There used to be a time when the House used to be full when matters concerning foreign affairs were debated in the Lok Sabha. This is, alas, no longer so.

As Shri Indrajit Gupta has said, there has been for the last 42 years a broad consensus on foreign affairs in this House, in Parliament and in the country. This is a glowing tribute to the foresight of Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru who laid down the broad framework of India's foreign policy even before India became independent and we have not found it necessary to make any basic or fundamental changes in our foreign policy these last 42 years. There have been no 'U' turns in our foreign policy. Our foreign policy is neither opportunistic nor is it episodic. It is based on certain ideals and we have adhered to those and the country has supported us. I would like to respectfully tell Shri H.M. Patel that even when there was a change of government at the Centre in 1977 it was not possible for the then government to make any alterations in India's foreign policy including our relations with Israel. Although Gen. Moyshe Dayan was invited to India at that time, it was found that our foreign policy could not be changed. I shall deal with his intervention a little later.

First of all, I would like to begin with what Shri Bipin Pal Das said that we have not paid enough attention to South-East Asia. He had been a Minister in the Ministry. So, he is well informed. But if you will notice that during the last 5 or 6 years, the frequency of visits to and from South-east Asia, the two way traf-

[Sh. K. Natwar Singh]

fic, has increased very considerably. The Joint Commission with Thailand will be meeting very shortly. The first ever visit of a Thai Prime Minister to India took place a short while ago. I have visited all the ASEAN countries more than once. I have visited Indo-China States. This afternoon and this morning, the External Affairs Minister and I had discussions with the Foreign Minister of Vietnam. He was received by the Prime Minister. I was also present there. Just before coming here, I had an hour long discussion with him on the Kampuchean situation. I would like to inform the House that I will be visiting Thailand and Indonesia in the next few days to have consultations with our colleagues there on Kampuchea. As you know, the three Indo-China States have made an announcement on the 5th of April which says that the 1954 Geneva International Control Commission should be revived and the Members of that Commission were India, Poland and Canada and India was the Chairman. During the discussions that I have had, not only in the ASEAN countries and also in the Indo-China States but also with Prince Sihanouk in Paris, in New York with our American colleagues and French friends and also with a number of other countries, there was general acceptance the fact that India had a role to play. I would like to remind the House that the phrase 'Indo-China' means something. It means that the two civilisations meet there, not necessarily to confront each other. For historical reasons and for contemporary reasons, we cannot be unmindful for what is happening in Indo-China. We are not pushing ourselves for a role but from all sides, indications have been given that India is to play a role in this. I am going to Thailand and Indonesia to discuss these issues, to find out how our colleagues are thinking about it. We have had a very detailed and frank talks with the Foreign Minister and the Prime Minister of Thailand here. I visited Thailand twice and had talks with the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister. I met President Suharto in Jakarta. I had talks with Mr. Ali Alatas, the Foreign Minister. You know that Prince Sihanouk and Prime Minis-

ter Hun Sen are meeting at Jakarta on the 2nd and 3rd and from there we will take off. I would like to assure the House that we are very conscious of our relations with this part of the world and whole of the ASEAN region. There are vast possibilities for increasing our trade and commerce and also our financial relations with these countries, once the Kampuchea is solved. We are cautiously optimistic that after the meeting in Jakarta on the 2nd & the 3rd and the Sino-Soviet Summit at Peking beginning on the 15th May, events will move very rapidly on the Kampuchean issue. Possibly an International Conference could be called. Jim-II could ask for the establishment of a Control Commission. It may be necessary to expand the International Control Commission because in 1954, ASEAN did not exist. There were only 65 or so independent countries or so as the Members of the UN. Today the international beach is very crowded. There are 159 countries now. We have to take all this into account.

Coming to the question of the international scene, I agree with Shri Indrajit Gupta who said that there have been radical changes in the international scene in the last two years. As he said what non happening would have been inconceivable even two years ago. Mr. Sheverdnadze told me about three months ago that in the last 30 months, he and Mr. Shultz had met 32 times. Mr. Gorbachev and Mr. Regan met five times during the last two and a half years. The whole international scenario has changed. Tensions have been reduced. Regional conflicts are being resolved. The fear of nuclear or conventional war is receding. Meaningful steps have been taken on nuclear and committed disarmament. The INF Treaty has been signed and a modest beginning has been made. I would like to say here that the contribution that has been made by India in this regard is not insignificant.

On November, 1986 a historic document was signed in Delhi between the Prime Minister, Rajiv Gandhi and Mr. Gorbachev called the Delhi Declaration which says that both countries are committed to ensuring a

world free of nuclear weapons and a world based on non-violence. This is a very remarkable document and this is the language the world at large is now willing to use. I think, we should without being immodest be proud about our contribution to the easing of tensions and creating a peaceful international climate which exists today.

Now, Sir, on Afghanistan I would like to say that we have not been idle. Shri Indrajit Gupta was good enough to refer to the External Affairs Minister's statement in the General Assembly. But more recently there was a debate in the Security Council and our representative intervened in the Debate. He made a fairly lengthy intervention giving our views. If the House desires I can read it out or I could place it on the Table of the House. I would just quote one or two portions from it.

"We would like a peaceful, negotiated settlement of the Afghanistan problem which will ensure a sovereign, independent, non-aligned Afghanistan. We feel that this can best be achieved through a broad based Government which takes into account the existing realities and the legitimate concern of all the parties and which is evolved by the Afghans themselves without outside interference and intervention."

And he also called that:

"There appears to be a need to give a bigger role to the United Nations with a view to the strict implementation of the Geneva Accord."

We were fortunate to have the Foreign Minister of Afghanistan in Delhi in February and both the External Affairs Minister and I had very extensive discussions with him. Now, we fully agree with Shri Indrajit Gupta that the implementation of the Geneva Accord is absolutely basic and fundamental to the restoration of peace and tranquillity in Afghanistan. Those agreements are being violated. You made a reference to a particular meeting, that is reported in New York Times. I don't want to comment on that but it

is quite obvious that the involvement of our friendly neighbour in the North-West has created problem. Intervention continues even after the Soviets have completely fulfilled their obligation of withdrawing on 15th of February. It was the expectation of certain countries in some part of the world that once the Soviet troops withdrew the Najibullah Government will fall. We have always maintained that this was not the case.

President Najibullah and his colleagues are also Afghans. His friends, relations and colleagues have also shed blood. They have also died. They have as much right to be there as anybody else. President Najibullah on more than one occasion has made very fair propositions to say that he is willing to have a broad based Government of all concern but these offers have been rejected time and again. What is happening is that increasingly sophisticated military aid is going to Mujahiddin. Now, we do not really understand or appreciate this fantastic enthusiasm for a group of people who by no stretch of imagination can be called either democratic or enlightened. We would like to say that what is needed is a Government in Afghanistan that represents its people. That way peace and tranquillity, sovereignty and its non-aligned status can be maintained. If President Najibullah's PDPA Government is dissolved, there will be no lasting peace in Afghanistan. It is unrealistic to seek a solution without the PDPA. We fully morally and practically the Government of Mr. Najibullah. He received our Ambassador yesterday and he said that he is very grateful to the assistance that India is giving internationally and bilaterally. We are giving it through UN and bilaterally and we fully support the present Kabul Government. I would like to conclude by saying that a solution lies in the faithful implementation of the Geneva Accord.

Now, Sir, to Sri Lanka. The Indo-Sri Lankan Agreement continues to be the basic framework for our relations with Sri Lanka. As hon. members have said, considerable progress has been achieved in implementing the different provisions of the Agreement as shown by the successful provincial, par-

[Sh. K. Natwar Singh]

liamentary and presidential elections. A Tamil-majority Provincial Council and Provincial Government has been established in the North Eastern Province and is steadily becoming effective. Conditions on the ground continue to improve, making possible the progressive withdrawal of the units of the IPKF. Government will continue its efforts towards the implementation of the Indo-Sri Lankan Agreement in all its aspects in order to bring about peace and normalcy in Sri Lanka. Now Sir, almost daily we are in touch with the Government of Sri Lanka, with President Premadasa and his colleagues. There is no difference of opinion with regard to what we are doing there or with regard to the implementation of the Agreement. I just want to say that thousands of officers, as Shri Patel has said, have not died. But it is a matter of regret and great sorrow that some have lost their lives. It is our endeavour that this should be minimised. I would like to pay a tribute to our Peace Keeping Force which under difficult circumstances has answered the call of duty in a magnificent manner in the interest of our bilateral relations and for the peace and security of our region.

Now, with regard to Israel, we have an Israeli Consulate in Bombay which works in a normal ways. Israeli representatives have been participating in international, United Nations and Technical Conferences and also in non-governmental conferences in their individual capacities.

With regard to Tennis, I as President of the All India Tennis Federation, can say that we allowed Israel to come to Delhi and play tennis. But we did not allow our team to play there because of their action in Ghaza. At that time, it was inconceivable for a country like India to send a team to play with Israelis.

Finally on Burma, the Government of Burma has announced elections in May 1990. We are closely watching the situation there. It is a distressing situation. Prime Minister himself had paid a visit there in December 1987. We have been giving all possible

assistance to Burma, whether it is developmental or whether it is on its tribal border. All along, we have shown all possible sympathy. We, of course, cannot be indifferent to the democratic rights in Burma and we have made our views know. We have not gone overboard about this. We are aware of the delicate situation there which is largely an internal matter. But to say that we are alienating all our neighbours is not correct and the hon. Minister of External Affairs will make a detailed announcement of our relations with Nepal and with all our neighbours.

SHRI KADAMBUR JANARTHANAN (Tirunelveli): Mr. Deputy Speaker Sir, we should be very proud of our consistent and continuous foreign policy purely based on the Gandhian way of Ahimsa and Nehruvian way of Non-alignment and Disarmament Principles. On behalf of the AIDMK party, I am very glad to congratulate the Prime Minister for his all efficient efforts to maintain cordial relations with all our neighbouring countries.

Since I have been given only two minutes, I will confine myself to Sri Lankan issue. Sir, the Indo-Sri Lanka Agreement was not made only to make Mr. Premadasa the President. This Agreement was made mainly to stop the killings of the Sri Lankan Tamils. Therefore, I request the hon. Minister to see that the provisions of the Agreement are implemented properly. Many veteran politicians have spoken about the withdrawal of the IPKF. But at the same time, we must be assured that our brothers, the Sri Lankan Tamils are safe. Their lives should not be at stake as in 1986-87.

We all remember the incident that had happened in Sri Lanka during our Prime Minister's visit there. He was not at all perturbed. You see his patience. He is the follower of Gandhian principles. He comes from the Buddhist country. We Indians will not forget that incident. We the people of India and more particularly the people of Tamil Nadu are really very happy in the manner in which he showed his bravery and also his patience. The Sri Lankan Accord

was not signed to bring Mr. Premadasa as the President, but it was signed mainly to stop the killings of the Sri Lankan Tamils. So, the people of Tamil Nadu are praised for their stand but still there is a doubt on the people of Tamil Nadu. It is because one of the MPs of DMK Party—which is a ruling party in Tamil Nadu—had gone to Sri Lanka without any Passport or Visa and came back to India with the help of IPKF people only. The hon. Minister should explain what action has been taken on this particular incident. Dr. Karunanidhi who was once against this Accord is now keeping mum. He was for Eelam a year back and now he is keeping quiet.

I would request the hon. Minister to again think twice or thrice before withdrawing the IPKF. He should also keep in mind that no Sinhalese Tamils will be killed and 1986-87 situation will not be repeated.

We will fully cooperate with the Central Government in regard to foreign policy. Even like our late Leaders Anna and MGR, we will definitely cooperate with the Central Government. This is the policy of our present Leaders Ms. Jayalalitha also.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN AHMED (Mangal-dai): Sir, you please allow me also. So many speakers have already spoken. Why don't you give me some time?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will see.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO): In spite of very short time at our disposal, many hon. Members have made many important points. It is difficult to choose between having a debate with a guillotine hanging over ones head and not having a debate at all. In some respects, not having it seems to be better. But since we are having it we have to make do with the time that is available to us, for no one's fault in particular. We were given to understand that we would have nine hours. We do not seem to have had even 40 per cent of that time.

SHRI AZIZ QURESHI (Satna): After

the demands are passed, we can have a separate discussion on this matter.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: That is what I am proposing. All these matters are not coming before the House for the first time. They have been discussed again and again. They can be discussed and should be discussed because the latest position in respect of each of these issues has to be brought out clearly before the House. It is because we would like to take the House into confidence on each of these issues.

My colleague has dealt with three or four very important issues: Afghanistan, Kampuchea, Sri Lanka and of course, in Passing, Israel. Now, the most important issue which has been exercising the minds of the people of India and perhaps reverberating in other Capitals of the world, each with their own motivation, has been our relations with Nepal. As Mr. Indrajit Gupta has said this is not a sudden development. This has been going on for sometime. One has to go into the history. If we have not made any open official statements so far, it was because, we wanted to exercise restraint on a matter in which restraint is much better than pre mature articulation, howsoever compelling it is. But now the time has come and I think this is the best forum at which I should make the position of the Government of India clear on Indo-Nepal relations.

The recent months have witnessed some strains in the age-old relationship between India and Nepal. This has been a time of a sorrow and regret for us. Indo-Nepal relationship has been truly unique. It cannot be easily summed up in cliches, like, special relationship. No other two countries of the region had anything like it. The open border between India and Nepal is crossed daily by thousands of nationals of both countries without visas for a variety of purposes as an evocative symbol of the Indo-Nepal relationship. Thus the Indo-Nepal border, though a political reality, is also part of a great social and cultural continuity.

Indo-Nepal relations are very old and date from ancient times, long long before

[Sh. P.V. Narasimha Rao]

1950 or the Treaty of Peace and Friendship. However, the 1950 Treaty is a uniquely significant landmark in the relationship because it goes far beyond the standard diplomatic format of relationship and seeks to concretise a grand vision handed down from centuries. This was the vision cherished by the great leaders of both countries, Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru and his Majesty King Tribhuvan. It was a vision of a Nepal and an India, both independent, sovereign and free, but indissolubly linked by unbreakable bonds. It was a vision of two countries which, of their own free will, promised each other's nationals treatment on par with their own in all the vital aspects of life—in residence, in ownership of property, in participation in trade and commerce, in industrial and economic development, in the grant of concessions and contracts related to such development and other similar privileges. It was based on the impeccable logic that if sovereignty gives the power to impose restrictions, it also gives the power to do away with restrictions if the States, in their wisdom, consider it fit to do so.

Over the years and decades that followed, India has sought to live up, both to the letter and the spirit of the 1950 Treaty. Thus it is that while there are very strict regulations against the employment for foreign nationals in India, millions of Nepalese live and work freely in all parts of India. Not many know that Nepalese are eligible to join not only the army, but also Government services in India except the very limited posts of IFS, IAS and the IPS. Nepalese nationals have extensive property holdings in this country. They do business here without let or hindrance. There is no restriction on their remitting any amount of money back to Nepal as their savings or profit.

Besides this, India, despite its financial constraints and its own struggle to raise the living standards of its people while emerging from the long era of colonial stagnation, has done its best to be of assistance to Nepal in the process of its economic development.

India has fully financed and implemented mutual cooperation schemes for the development of Nepal's water resources like the Kosi and the Gandak projects. Our grant assistance for a number of other economic projects totals around Rs. 20-25 crores a year. About 275 seats, including a large number of engineering and medical seats, are offered to Nepalese students every year under various scholarships. Under various Trade and Transit Treaties since 1950, India has given Nepal highly preferential treatment, specially for Nepalese primary products and manufactured goods, on a non-reciprocal basis, plus very extensive transit facilities for Nepal's trade with third countries. The excise duty on Indian goods imported by Nepal is refunded to Nepal in full. A quota of essential commodities such as coal, iron and steel, sugar, foodgrains, baby food, milk products, normally banned for export, were made available to Nepal to preferential prices. India has also invariably responded positively to Nepal's request for emergency supplies of foodgrains, sugar, cement, etc. A revolving credit of Rs. 25 crores was extended to Nepal to meet temporary shortfalls in its Indian currency reserves. At the Calcutta Port, facilities superior even to those extended to Indian importers were extended to Nepalese importers, at a cost of about Rs. 1.5 crores every year incurred by the Government of India. Under the Product Exchange Agreement with Nepal, India took over Nepalese imports of certain refined petroleum products and crude at the port and supplied equivalent amounts of a whole range of other petroleum products at numerous points along the Indo-Nepal border. Nepal was charged only the actual expenses by the Indian Oil Corporation and that too in rupees.

Sir, I am submitting these details merely to show that within our own limitations, we have done our best in investing our relationship with Nepal with a content and spirit in consonance with our age-old man-spangled bonds and with a vision embodied in the 1950 Treaty. All that India sought in return from Nepal was genuine appreciation of our concerns and an open and candid friendship

on par with our own. This was why, though it was perhaps inevitable that the economic relationship between the two countries should tend to be more on the side of India, in 1960 a bold attempt was made, in a new Treaty of Trade and Transit, to establish what amounted to a common market between the two countries. That this grand vision was not realised was not because it was unrealistic or over-ambitious, but because of domestic political changes in Nepal.

Unfortunately, the vision of 1950 has been eroded over the years. Its spirit has been weakened, its content whittled away practically in every sphere of the Indo-Nepal relationship. Sadder still has been the systematic discrimination against the relatively small community of Indians in Nepal, who number only about 150,000, in the important areas of their day-to-day existence. In contrast, the number of Nepalese in India are anywhere between 3 and 4 million, who continue to enjoy all the rights which I have detailed above. Stringent restrictions have been placed on ownership of property by Indians in Nepal. In April 1987 something much more serious happened. His Majesty's Government of Nepal included Indians in the category of foreigners requiring work permits for employment in any organised sector. Beginning with three Districts around Kathmandu, this measure was later extended to the whole of the country in September 1988. While it has not yet been fully implemented on the ground, many Indian professionals including a number of teachers who have for long served the cause of education of Nepalese youth have been given notice of termination of service. There are other reports that Nepalese concerns, some very close to the Indo-Nepal border, are hiring workers only on the basis of Nepali citizenship certificates. There are official reports—these are official reports—that the Government is planning to review all the citizenship certificates granted, largely to people of Indian origin, over the last 12 years. It is said that the number involved in this move is 6.48 million. What is even sadder are the cases in which Indian professionals, employed by third country firms executing contracts in

Nepal, have been refused employment solely because they are Indians. All this adds up to a picture far from happy. It would be difficult to imagine anything further from the vision of Jawaharlal Nehru and His Majesty King Tribhuvan. Our representations against these moves have not received any satisfactory or even a considered response from the Nepalese side. Attempts have been made to dismiss these vital issues by stating, for instance, that the work permit system was introduced for security reasons, again that it was meant to collect statistics and then again that it was meant for fulfilling the Basic Needs Programme. The situation speaks for itself, nothing more needs to be said.

Not only are Indians as individuals discriminated against but Indian firms, having won contracts against international bidding, have been deprived of what is due to them through manoeuvres in favour of third countries. Here too, our representatives have received nothing more than assurances that are not fulfilled in practice.

In the field of trade and transit, about which the most recent issues have emerged, India has always been more than accommodating, acknowledging that the Nepalese economy has special needs. As mentioned earlier, the 1960 Treaty of Trade and Transit was based on the subsequently unfulfilled vision of an Indo-Nepalese common market. Even without this, the Indo-Nepal Treaties of Trade and Transit which expired on March 23, 1989, provided an extensive preferential regime for Nepalese exports and Nepal's transit trade with third countries. Nepalese primary products and manufactures with a certain degree of indigenous content were given duty free and quota free access to the Indian market. Trade was conducted on a rupee payment basis. Nepal was given as many as 15 routes through Indian territory for its transit trade. In addition, there were separate transit routes for Nepal's trade with Bangladesh and Bhutan. Nepal was also allowed to move goods from one part of that country to another through Indian territory. As mentioned earlier, Nepalese importers were given special facilities at Calcutta Port.

[Sh. P.V. Narasimha Rao]

Sir, all these extensive facilities were given solely in the spirit of the 1950 Treaty. Otherwise, the strictly legal position is that Nepal is not a member of GATT. India has not ratified either the International Convention on transit Trade of Landlocked countries or the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea. Therefore in matters of transit, India has, strictly speaking, no legal obligations towards Nepal. But India has never sought to take refuge behind this legalistic position.

However, even in the area of trade, there has been no reciprocation of our sentiments. The only concession that India was allowed was a tariff regime for its exports to Nepal superior to those of third countries. This was in return for providing Nepal with a unique preferential access to an extensive market right next door. However, in June 1987, Nepal, through a budgetary exercise of tariff rationalisation, completely removed all these tariff advantages earlier available for Indian exports. Besides basic customs duty, additional customs duty was also imposed on certain categories of Indian goods. As a result, Indian exports to Nepal in 1987-88 dropped to half of the previous year's figures.

When the Indo-Nepal Trade Treaty ended in March, 1988, the new package worked out and initialled in October 1988 included two Nepalese commitments. Those were that, firstly, the additional customs duty on Indian goods would be removed and secondly, this facility would not be extended to any third country. However, Nepal did not live up to either undertaking. After a fruitless wait of five months till February 1989 despite repeated reminders to the Government of Nepal, we were left with no alternative but to ask for a new unified Treaty of trade and transit. It should be noted here that since no new Treaty has been signed, there was no question of our "abrogating" it as has been claimed by some official Nepalese spokesman.

The Government of India have always

wanted, and had until 1978, a single Treaty of Trade and Transit with Nepal. This is because for countries like India and Nepal, with a very long open border of 1700 Kms. trade and transit are indissolubly linked matters. The extensive transit facilities provided to Nepal were being misused for large scale smuggling, which has had a highly negative impact on the Indian economy. In 1978 India, despite reservations, agreed to separate Treaties, but the results have not been happy. That is why, we are now asking for a single Treaty.

The present situation is thus entirely a result of actions both of omission and commission on the Nepalese side. For its part, India made efforts right up to the end, to ensure that Nepal fulfilled the commitments made by it in October 1988. This has not been done.

As a result of the lapse of the Trade Treaty, the highly preferential regime for Nepalese goods has been replaced by the normal export-import regime applicable to India's trade with many other third countries. The Government have further taken steps to see that the problems created by this for the common people of Nepal are minimised. Though the Quota system for supply of essential commodities has lapsed with the Trade Treaty, it has been conveyed to the Nepalese Government that the full quota amounts for 1989 sought by them for commodities such as sugar, baby food, milk products, coconut oil, gur, etc. will be supplied in full. But Sir, on the other side, there has been no response. Their traders have not been asked to lift. They have not been asked to open ICs and therefore, some of these commodities are not moving into Nepal.

In the field of transit, a landlocked country has a right only to one transit route to the sea under International Law. Even without the Transit treaty, Nepal now has the following facilities:

1. Two transit points, Raxaul and Joghani which are the closest to Calcutta Port and which earlier

carried eighty to ninety per cent of the transit cargo.

2. Facilities at Calcutta port as detailed above.
3. Transit routes as earlier for trade with Bangladesh and Bhutan.
4. Nepal-Nepal transit routes through India.

The Nepalese Foreign Minister during his visit to New Delhi on March 26-27, 1989, handed over to us their new draft for a Trade Treaty. This draft is interesting inasmuch as it indicates that the Nepalese Government themselves wish to move away from the earlier regime and now towards MFN status. It is thus evident that the Government of Nepal has desired not to go back to the earlier trade regime with India. This has been made even more clear by the extensive tariff changes implemented by them on April 11, 1989, which have removed any remaining tariff concessions for Indian exports. We do not understand, therefore, why India is being accused of causing hardship to Nepal in the field of trade.

In the transit field, Nepal has sought a revival of the earlier Treaty.

While India seeks a unified Trade and Transit Treaty, the transit facilities are available to Nepal as I have already detailed.

In this New Year's message—to the nation on April 13, 1989, His Majesty King Birendra has expressed his Government's readiness to settle the problems "imposed on us by our geography as a landlocked nation" through "a friendly dialogue and negotiation". Meanwhile the Foreign Minister of Nepal has, in separate interviews to the New York Times and to the BBC, reportedly said that Nepal no longer wants a special relationship with India, that over-dependence on any one country is bad, that what Nepal wants now is inter-dependence. He has also reportedly affirmed that the recent tariff changes introduced on April 11, are irrevocable, reiterating that the unique,

or special or traditional relationship is "now over". Subsequently, there have also been statements attributed to the chief official spokesman of the Government of Nepal affirming that if there was to be one Treaty, Nepal would want it to be a Transit Treaty alone. He also reportedly added that since India apparently felt that Nepal had violated the 1950 Treaty, which Nepal did not accept, Nepal was ready for direct and detailed talks on the whole gamut of Indo-Nepal relations. He also reportedly re-asserted the determination of the Government of Nepal to go ahead with their citizenship and work permit drives for foreign residents in Nepal.

All these years, our only wish has been to continue our relationship with Nepal for the mutual benefit of both countries and peoples. At the same time, we have all along assured them of our respect for their sovereignty, their identity as a nation and our desire for their identity as a nation and our desire for their prosperity now and in the future. The 1950 Treaty determined our mutual relationship on the basis of looking after each other's interests, and conveying to the world the strength of the unity of purpose between our two countries. I would like to assure the House that our overwhelming desire to have to mutually beneficial relationship with Nepal remains undiminished.

India has never, despite assertions to the contrary from Nepal, sought a review of the 1950 Treaty. Indeed our desire has always been, and continues to be, to ensure that both the letter and the spirit of the Treaty are fulfilled. Although no single thrust seems to be discernible in the various recent statements from the Nepalese side, as I have just detailed, they have, on occasions, reiterated that they are happy with the 1950 Treaty. From this it would be clear that both countries could, with profit, go into the working of the Treaty, with a view to ensuring its implementation in letter and spirit. India is ready and willing for this as well as to discuss the whole gamut of relations.

We would like to see the Indo-Nepal relationship continue to be, as before, a

[Sh. P.V. Narasimha Rao]

model. As always, we wish the Government and people of Nepal well. What we desire is to continue our deeply cherished relationship on the basis of sovereignty, mutual trust, mutual benefit and reciprocity in understanding and safeguarding each other's interests and concerns. The people of Nepal will not find us wanting. We harbour nothing but the highest regard for their concerns and the best wishes for their future.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I shall now put all the cut motion moved to the Demand for Grant relating to the Ministry of External Affairs to vote together, unless any hon. Member desires that any of his cut motions may be put separately.

All the Cut Motions were put and negatived

MR. DEPUTY—SPEAKER: I shall now put the Demand for Grant relating to the Ministry of External Affairs to vote.

The question is:

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts on Revenue Account and Capital Account shown in the fourth column of the Order Paper be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1990, in respect of the head of Demand entered in the Second column thereof against Demand No. 24 relating to the Ministry of External Affairs."

The motion was adopted

STATEMENT

Demand for Grant in respect of the Ministry of External Affairs for 1989-90 voted by Lok Sabha

No. of demand	Name of demand	Amount of demand for grant on account voted by the House on 17.3.1989	Amount of demand for grant voted by the House
1	2	3	6
		Revenue Rs.	Revenue Rs.
		Capital Rs.	Capital Rs.
24.	Ministry of External Affairs	82,89,00,000	53,67,00,000
		10,73,00,000	367,69,00,000

18.00 hrs.

[Mr.SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

AN. HON. MEMBER: Guillotine, Sir.

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER: You asked for it and I am doing it.

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: I shall now put the outstanding Demands....

(*Interruptions*)

PROF. SAIFUDDIN SOZ (Baramulla): I am on a point of order, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: There is no pint of order here at the moment.

PROF. SAIFUDDIN SOZ: It is a brief point of order, Sir. In 1985, I remember, you had suggested...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: No, that is no point of order.

PROF. SAIFUDDIN SOZ: Sir, in 1985, you had suggested...(Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER: Overruled...

(*Interruptions*)

PROF. SAIFUDDIN SOZ: It was a ruling that there would be Budget Committees...(Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER: Not now...

(*Interruptions*)

PROF. SAIFUDDIN SOZ: So, this time we shall do it...(Interruptions)

Soz, not now.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Soz, not now.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: I shall now put the outstanding Demands for Grants relating to the Ministries/Departments to vote...

(*Interruptions*)

18.02 hrs.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS, 1989-90-
CONTD

[*English*]

Ministry of Civil Avlation and Tourism; Ministry of Commerce; Ministry of Communications; Ministry of Defence; Ministry of Environment and Forests etc. etc.

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts on Revenue Account on Capital Account shown in the fourth column of the Order Paper be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated /fund of India to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in source of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1990, in respect of the heads of Demands entered in the second column thereof against:-

- (1) Demands Nos. 6 and 7 relating to the Ministry of Civil Aviation and Tourism;
- (2) Demands Nos. 8 and 9 relating to the Ministry of Commerce;
- (3) Demands Nos. 10 to 12 relating to the Ministry of Communication;
- (4) Demands Nos. 13 to 19 relating to the Ministry of Defence;