

एकड़ से ऊपर जितनी भी जमीन है, ए०वी०सी०डी० किसी की भी हो, वह ले ली जाय। जितने बड़े-बड़े फार्म हैं—टाटा, बिरला के, डालमिया के, रजवाड़ों के और बड़े-बड़े अफसरों के, जैसे बिजवासन में हैं, जो लोग सीलिंग वी डिफीट करने की बात करते हैं, किसी ने अपने नाम पर बना रखा है, किसी ने बीबी के नाम पर बना रखा है, किसी ने आचर्ड नाम रखा हुआ है और लोगों को लूट रहे हैं, उन सब को ले लिया जाय। इसके अलावा जितनी जमीन गवर्नमेन्ट की है—फोरेस्ट की है जो इस्तेमाल में नहीं आती है, नहरों के साथ-साथ है, नजूल की जमीन है या ऐसी जमीनें हैं जो गवर्नमेन्ट के पास पड़ी हुई हैं—मिलिट्री ने बहुत सी जमीनों को एक्वायर किया हुआ है, लेकिन इस्तेमाल में नहीं आ रही हैं, उन सब जमीनों को इन भाइयों को एलाट किया जाय। यह काम एक-दो दिन में नहीं होगा, इस में टाइम लगेगा, महीना, दो महीना, तीन महीना ले लें, लेकिन काम होना चाहिये, लफकाजी बातें नहीं होनी चाहिये।

मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ—अगर गवर्नमेन्ट ने यह बात नहीं की, तो ज्यादा अर्सा कोई इंतजार नहीं करेगा। अब वक्त आ गया है, कोई न कोई बात इस सिलसिले में होनी ही चाहिये—सीलिंग मुकर्रि की जाय, सारे देश में तमाम सरप्लस जमीन को लिया जाय, इस के लिये वक्त मुकर्रि किया जाय, तीन महीने के अन्दर-अन्दर सारी जमीनें इन भाइयों को एलाट कर दी जाय।

लेकिन एक बात और कहना चाहता हूँ—सिर्फ जमीनों से ही 25-30 करोड़ आदमियों का बन्दोबस्त नहीं हो सकता, सिर्फ 1 एकड़ जमीन या 2 एकड़ जमीन या चार बीघे जमीन से काम चलनेवाला नहीं है। देहात के गरीब किसानों या गरीब मेहनतकश मजदूरों में कोई लम्बा चौड़ा फर्क नहीं है, दोनों के दोनों बंगले हैं। किसान के बदन पर लंगोटी है और मजदूर

के बदन पर लंगोटी भी नहीं है। मेरे ये भाई जो मदारी बैठे हैं इन्होंने उस बेचारे नंगे मजदूर को लंगोटी वाले छोटे किसान के चिमटा दिया है, उस की लंगोटी उतार लो। कोई लम्बा चौड़ा फर्क नहीं है, उस की लंगोटी उतार जाएगी तो एक या दो एकड़ वाला भी नंगा और ये नंगे हैं ही। उस के बाद दिल्ली, बम्बई या कलकत्ते में जा कर ये लोग एक तरफ मुंह में सिगरेट लगा कर दूसरी तरफ से धुआ निकालेंगे—खूब इन भाइयों को बेबकूफ बाया, चन्दा इकट्ठा करेंगे, पार्टी के लिये मेम्बर भरती करेंगे, जलूस निकालेंगे, माला बगैरह पड़ेंगी और उस बेचारे मजदूर या किसान पर 20-20 मुकदमें चलेंगे और ये लोग हंसेंगे, कैसा पागल बनाया। मेरे जितने हरिजन और बैंकवर्ड भाई हैं, वे आप को खूब मझते हैं।

सन्नापति महोदय : आप इस को फिर जारी रखियेगा।

17.29 hrs.

ARREST OF MEMBER

(Shri Sarjoo Pandey)

MR. CHAIRMAN : I have to inform the House that the Speaker has received the following wireless message, dated the 11th August, 1970, from the Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Jaunpur :

"Shri Sarjoo Pandey, member, Lok Sabha, arrested today at Jaunpur at 10.30 P. M., under Section 114, Criminal Procedure Code, and lodged in District Jail, Jaunpur, under order of Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Jaunpur."

17.30 hrs.

HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION

Indo-Nepal Trade Talks

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE (Betul) : Mr, Chairman, Sir, our present Treaty with Nepal on Trade and Transit is to terminate on the

[Shri N. K. P. Salve]

31st October, 1970. From the press reports, it appears that the people negotiating the Treaty which is now to commence from the 1st November, 1970, are having anxious time.

Sir, the cordial relations which have existed between the people of Nepal and India dating back to the dawn of history, as it were, are not on account of purely geographical factors or physical proximity of the two countries. These may have been the contributing factors. But they are not the determinant or conclusive factors. The reason is deeper. There have been very intimate and deep bonds between the people of Nepal and India, because we share a common heritage; we share a common culture and we also share a common religion.

That is the reason why even today we continue to share with them the same trials and tribulations which we are facing in the bitter struggle, inch by inch, for the economic emancipation of the down-trodden and the poverty-stricken people of Nepal and of India. Therefore, for anyone who is capable of bringing a modicum of objectivity and who is not dispossessed of his rational faculty, I am unable to see, how one could think there is not an identity of economic aspirations of the two countries. In fact, I submit, there is mutuality in the economic aspirations of the two countries. One would not be very far from truth if one said that the economic development of one country and the economic development of the other country are not mutually exclusive. That is why I was very distressed to read in the papers that an unwarranted, unnecessary, misunderstanding has come about which is impeding the negotiations which are going on to have the next Trade and Transit Treaty between Nepal and India.

It would be wholly purile and imbecile for anyone to consider that in executing a treaty between countries like India and Nepal it would even remotely be necessary for either of the two countries to damage the economic interests of the other. The Treaty can be made for the larger good of both the people of Nepal and the people of India.

Nepal appears to be anxious for seeking two concessions from India. The first concession which it is seeking from India is that being a landlocked country, it wants free

and unrestricted transit facility to and from Nepal to our ports and the second concession which it is seeking is an unrestricted right for the goods manufactured in Nepal to be marketed in India for one would appreciate and sympathise with the demand or the expectations of the Nepalese in this respect. Naturally, placed as they are and placed as India is, one can understand why they are seeking these two concessions from India in the new Treaty.

The present debate is being held at a very delicate time because the negotiations, I believe, are still going on which are in very able hands. The *Times of India* carried a report of the various difficulties into which the negotiations have come about and that Mr. K. B. Lall, one of the most able men we have in Government of India not only as a diplomat but also as a negotiator, is in command of the whole matter. I hope, he will do a thorough job. He seems to have said, when he found himself in difficulty, that the signing of a Treaty is not as simple as delivering a speech—he is signing a Treaty and I am delivering a speech, have the delicacy. Therefore, I do not want to say a thing which is likely to cause embarrassment or create difficulty to the negotiating parties. But I certainly would venture to suggest that India, situated as it is, should look up to the entire proposal as sympathetically as possible and afford appropriate concessions and show utmost magnanimity that it can to help the people achieve economic prosperity which is the due of the people of Nepal.

17.35 hrs.

[Shri Shri Chand Goyal in the Chair]

And this, I am sure, we are doing. I am suggesting this not in a spirit of very great patronage we are offering to the people of Nepal or a very great favour we are showing to the people of Nepal but in a spirit of co-operation, assistance and association which is expected of a family member. But as reports have appeared in the Press, it is my duty also to point out that it is necessary for Nepal also to realise a few very important things. India's entire political set up is much different from that in Nepal. It is not my business much less the business of this House to discuss what is happening in Nepal

and what is the political set up in Nepal or how they take their decisions. But, we, here, in India are bound by a system of parliamentary democracy and further we are pledged to socialistic ideals which has placed its basic limitations on the entire set up the mechanics of the trade as such. Ours is a very highly controlled and regulated economy. We have regulations on the trade. We have regulations on various goods being imported, We have channelised several good coming as imports and it is impossible for us to accept a proposition in any treaty or otherwise which will either wholly or substantially dilute the basic policy to which the Government is pledged. I do hope that Nepal realises this. Now the existing provisions of the treaty, if one were to analyse, are most unfortunate. But the facts are absolutely clear. Not for a moment do I wish to criticise the Nepalese Government or anybody in authority in Nepal. I am only confining myself to facts which are germane to the debate which has been raised here. It is a very important debate and I do hope the people of Nepal know our reactions here. They know what goodwill we hold for them.

It has been found, very unfortunately, that the existing treaty, instead of helping the people of Nepal as a whole, helping them towards industrialisation, helping its trade, has only helped a few unscrupulous traders on that side of the border and a few unscrupulous traders on this side of the border. Taking advantage of treaty these unscrupulous traders, some of them Indians and some of them Nepalese, motivated by considerations of get-rich-quick attitude have been able to make fantastic and fabulous profits as a result of the treaty. It is well known that these people are putting up some sort of a pseudo industry and that that industry is run by goods which are imported into Nepal at a very cheap cost; they are cheap because Nepal has very negligible import duty.

These goods are ultimately sent to India at a fabulous profit. The net result is that it does not cater to the commerce or trade of Nepal as a whole. It only benefits very few people. Ultimately it is the profit on imports only which is being made in this type of business.

Further the next extremely pernicious effect which this treaty had is the export of Indian goods *via* Nepal. It has been found unfortunately that Indian mica, jute, leopard

skin, goat skin, pulses of Indian origin are routed *via* Nepal. Purpose? Because Nepal has what they call a bonus voucher scheme. They give a certain bonus in respect of the foreign exchange earnings to the exporter. Nepal does not produce even a tonne of mica. It is produced in India, but it is routed *via* Nepal solely for the purpose of getting this benefit of foreign exchange entitlement. I am unable to understand how it is ever going to benefit Nepal in the long run, it is going to benefit a few people here and there. Surely, whatever the treaty might contemplate, it is not going to contemplate a patronage for the benefit of a few. This is exactly what we want to fight at least on this side of the border, if not on that side. I submit, therefore, that it is absolutely necessary that if Nepal needs greater and greater assistance, we should willingly take that burden on us. A direct burden of assistance is much better than this type of burden as a result of which only some and not the entire people of Nepal benefit. I submit this type of treaty which has the trappings of the economic welfare of Nepal, which has the pretence of catering to the industrialisation of Nepal but in reality benefits only a very few is a treaty which is solely pernicious for the people of Nepal and it is disastrous so far as we are concerned.

And, I do hope our people will be taking care of all these aspects when the new Treaty is entered into.

There is one more aspect to which I would like to make a reference before I sit down. It is, Sir, the political aspect of the entire matter with Nepal. It is most unfortunate that the Sino-Indian relationship has been far from satisfactory. We have tried our best to improve relations with China but without success. It is, however, most unfortunate that Nepal is trying to take advantage of the situation in which it is so handling the balance of power that at times it is apt to politically pressurise India. This will never help Nepal. Whatever else way help, this will never help Nepal and it will only bring about an unfortunate situation between Nepal and India. I only do hope that this situation will never worsen.

Finally, I submit: The Nepalese authorities would be committing the greatest of political blunders if they continue to flirt with the present Chinese regime forgetting the bitter lesson of history which we ourselves

[Shri N. K. P. Salve]

have learnt, as a result of the indiscretion we committed, in flitting with the Chinese in the fifties and earlier. That is all my submission. Thank you.

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त (दिल्ली सदर) : सभापति महोदय, जो कुछ भेरे माननीय मित्र श्री साल्वे न कृपा में उसको दोहराना नहीं चाहता। यह बात सही है कि प्राज जो स्थिति है उसके कारण वह हमारे देश की सुरक्षा और डिफेंस के लिए स्ट्रेटेजिक इम्पार्टेंस की जगह बन गई है। नेपाल के साथ जो हमारे सम्बन्ध है वह केवल सरकारी लेवल पर ही नहीं है, वह पीपल टु पीपल लेवल पर इतने गहरे हैं कि शायद और किसी देश के साथ नहीं है और हो भी नहीं सकते। आज हम सुनते हैं कि भारत और नेपाल के बीच में कुछ हित है और उसमें जैसा अभी बतलाया गया, दो ही बातें आती हैं। हमने नेपाल को काफी आर्थिक सहायता भी दी है और वहाँ हम सड़क भी बना रहे हैं। मैं स्वयं पिछले महीने जा कर देखा कि भारत सरकार ने जो प्रोजेक्ट्स बनाये हैं वह काफी अच्छे हैं और उससे वहाँ के लोगों को काफी लाभ भी होगा और हो भी रहा है। आज सरकार इतनी सहायता नेपाल को दे रही है क्योंकि हमारे देश को विश्वास है, और मैं आशा करता हूँ कि नेपाल के लोगों को भी विश्वास होगा, कि हिन्दुस्तान और नेपाल अलग अलग नहीं हैं और न चल सकते हैं। वह साथ ही डूबेंगे और साथ ही तिरेंगे।

उनका जैसा सेंट थप है उसके बारे में न हमारे अन्दर कोई खास फीलिंग है और न उसमें हम दखल देना चाहते हैं, लेकिन हम यह आशा जरूर करते हैं कि नेपाल भारत और चीन में भेद करेगा, और करना भी चाहिए। हम यह भी आशा करते हैं कि जो स्मॉलिंग होती है उसमें भारतीय दोषी हों या नेपाल के लोग दोषी हों, लेकिन भारत के साथ नेपाल सरकार को भी सहयोग करना चाहिए और वह करेगा।

इस आशा को रखते हुए क्या मैं मंत्री महोदय से पूछ सकता हूँ कि वह इस बात का ऐश्वोरेष देने के लिए तैयार हैं या नहीं कि अगर भारत सरकार को ट्रेड पॅकट में उनके साथ कुछ लिब्रल भी होना पड़े, और उनको लिब्रल होना चाहिए उनको सुविधायें देनी चाहिए ताकि उनमें यह फीलिंग न हो कि भारत सरकार उसके साथ सख्ती कर रहा है, तो वह लिब्रल होगा।

कई बार भारत सरकार ब्लडर कर जाती है, जो कि मुझको पसन्द नहीं है, जैसा अभी राजनीतिक दृष्टि से लिया गया। हमने बी० पी० काइराला का बाहर भजवा दिया जिसका नेपाल गवर्नमेंट ने पासपाट नहीं दिया, और यह हमने उनकी मर्जी के खिलाफ किया। यह वाइ अच्ची चीज नहीं है। भल हा यह ह्यूमानटायन प्राउड की बात है, लावन चूक वह आदमा नेपाल का वाशन्दा है इसलिए यह सब कारवाइ हमको नेपाल सरकार से बता करके करनी चाहिए था। (श्वबधान) मरा कहना यह है, और अपनी सरकार से भी हम यह अपक्षा रखत है, कि हम उनक आन्तारिक मामला में हस्तक्षेप न करे और नेपाल सरकार से भा हम यह आशा रखत है कि वह इस प्रकार से एसा व्यवहार न कर जिससे हमारे दूध सम्बन्धा में फर्क पड़े।

मैं मंत्री महोदय से जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या वह इस सदन को इस बात का आश्वासन दिलायेंगे कि चाहे हमको मंत्री के लेवल पर ट्रेड पॅकट करना पड़े चाहे प्रधान मंत्री के लेवल पर ही क्यों न करना पड़े, लेकिन हम लिब्रल हों कर उनके साथ इस प्रकार का समझौता करेंगे? मैं यह भी पूछना चाहूँगा कि नेपाल गवर्नमेंट का इस सम्बन्ध में क्या ऐटिट्यूट है?

जो दो शिकायतें हैं, उसके बारे में मंत्री महोदय बतलायें। एक तो यह कि जो स्मॉलिंग होती है उसके बारे में नेपाल ने क्या विश्वास दिलाया है और दूसरी चीज यह कि जो यह

फीलिंग है कि चाइना के साथ उनका खास रबैया है उसके बारे में उनका क्या खयाल है। सरकार यह भी बतलाये कि कितना स्मॉलिंग होने का अन्दजा है नेपाल के जरिये हिन्दुस्तान में और हिन्दुस्तान के बाहर चाइना में तथा इसको रोकने के लिए अभी तक हमने क्या कदम उठाये हैं और कितना सहयोग नेपाल सरकार ने दिया है।

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai) : There is no doubt and it is an accepted fact that India and Nepal are inseparably tied up with one another historically, socially, economically, culturally and even from the standpoint of religious affiliation. But it is also a fact that it is with the blood of the Indian revolutionaries that now the new regime is working in Nepal, and on the basis of the sacrifice of the Nepali Congress, the royal regime is there.

Naturally, our fate is interlinked with that of Nepal and *vice versa*. But, unfortunately, I should say, the Nepal royal rule is going to a point of a limit so far as the trickery of diplomacy that is being played with India is concerned. India has been very soft and has always been silent about the developments inside Nepal. But the recent politics and the economic attitude of the Government of Nepal has brought at least—I do not know whether it has done so with the Government, but—the real people of India friendly towards Nepal to a point of a sense of exasperated toleration. Nepal is flirting with China on one side and with Pakistan of the other.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Let the hon. Member come to trade relations.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : I am coming to that. You will remember that Mr. Chou-En-lai visited Nepal and President Yahya Khan is going to visit Nepal. Nepal is Nepal so much sensitive that if we accord any welcome to our former comrades of the Socialist Party, the Koirala Brothers or any socialist Congress members, immediately a row is created in Nepal. But it is our information that the Naxalite headquarters are being operated from Nepal.

MR. CHAIRMAN : He should not go beyond the scope of the question.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : I am giving the background because economic relations are not outside the purview of political relations.

There was a report recently—it must be with our intelligence—that Charu Mazumdar and Kanu Sanyal were in Nepal; they operated from Nepal and are still operating from Nepal. Nepal is the hopping ground to Tibet. I also say this—report must also be with our intelligence—that two or three months ago Charu Mazumdar and Kanu Sanyal went to Lhasa through Nepal with the help of the Nepal Government.

I have used the words 'exasperated toleration'. The limit of that toleration has reached. Not only that Goods from China and Pakistan are smuggled to India through Nepal. You know there is a Dacca-Khatmandu air link. Goods come directly from Tibet to Nepal and then find their way to India. It is easier for smuggled goods to be brought to India from Pakistan via Nepal. Our Indian market is being flooded with such goods.

I want to know whether during the talks with the Government of Nepal this very important point that Nepal is being used as a headquarter of anti-Indian extremist forces which is bound to have its impact on trade and economic relations with India was brought up, and what steps the Government of Nepal are going to take to stop the smuggling of Chinese and Pakistani goods through Nepal to India. I want also to impress on Government that that state of silent spectator and soft friendly attitude to Nepal should be given up. It is time Nepal knew that the politics of flirtation has its limit, and if it is crossed, then India, for her own interest will have also to react for the benefit of the people of Nepal, may be possibly against their royal ruling family.

श्री बेणो शंकर शर्मा (बांका) : अभी मेरे मित्र श्री समर गुह ने कहा कि हमारे यहां के कुछ लोगों और कुछ नेपाली लोगों ने मिलकर नेपाल को स्वतंत्रता प्राप्त करने में मदद दी। यह बात सही है। किन्तु नेपाल आज एक स्वतंत्र राष्ट्र है और उसकी भावना का आदर हमें उसको एक स्वतंत्र राष्ट्र मानकर ही करना होगा। अभी सभापति महोदय आपने कहा कि व्यापारिक सम्बन्धों पर विचार करते समय दुं

[श्री वेणी शंकर शर्मा]

राजनैतिक सम्बन्धों को बीच में नहीं लाना चाहिए। लेकिन व्यापारिक और राजनीतिक सम्बन्ध इतने जुड़े हुए हैं कि उनको एक दूसरे से अलग नहीं किया जा सकता है। नेपाल के साथ हमारे धार्मिक और सांस्कृतिक सम्बन्ध बहुत प्रबल हैं। भारत और नेपाल एक ही जिगर के दो टुकड़े हैं।

मैं एक छोटा सा उदाहरण देना चाहता हूँ। अभी कंवर लाल जी ने बताया है कि श्री बी० पी० कोइराला हमारे बड़े मित्र हैं। हम सब चाहते हैं कि उनके स्वास्थ्य लाभ या उनके दूसरे और कामों में हम उनकी मदद करें। किन्तु हमें यह भी नहीं भूलना चाहिए कि वह नेपाल के एक नागरिक हैं। इस वास्ते हमको चाहिए था कि हम नेपाल गवर्नमेंट से विचार विमर्श करके उनको पासपोर्ट देते।

सभापति महोदय, गत वर्ष मुझे नेपाल जाने का मौका मिला था। पुष्कर लाल जी कि वहाँ से निर्वागिन किये जा चुके हैं वे भारत में रह कर नेपाल के विरुद्ध बार्बाई कर रहे हैं। नेपाल सरकार ने कुछ विरोध पत्र भी इस सम्बन्ध में दिया था। इस तरह की जो छोटी छोटी बातें हैं इनसे नेपाल और भारत के सम्बन्ध बिगटने जा रहे हैं। इस वास्ते व्यापारिक सम्बन्धों को यदि हमें सुधारना है तो यह आवश्यक है कि हम आपसी राजनीतिक सम्बन्धों को भी सुधारें।

मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि जो सन्धि हो रही है उसमें क्या इसकी व्यवस्था की जाएगी कि नेपाल को अपने देश में खपत के लिए जिन चीजों की आवश्यकता है उनको तो यहाँ से मंगाने की हम उसे इजाजत दे दें लेकिन जिन चीजों को वह एक्सपोर्ट करने के लिए मगाना चाहता है, उनकी इजाजत न दें? मैं जानता हूँ कि नेपाल में बहुत कम जूट पैदा होता है। वहाँ पर 19 हजार टन पैदा होता है। लेकिन 1968 में उसने 32,813 टन जूट एक्सपोर्ट

किया। इसका मतलब है कि वह सारा जूट भारत से वहाँ गया। उसी तरह से माइका, अन्नक की भी समझता हूँ कि उसे आवश्यकता नहीं है। फिर भी अन्नक वह काफी मात्रा में इम्पोर्ट करता है और उसको रिएक्सपोर्ट किया जाता है। इसलिए मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि ऐसी चीजें जो नेपाल हारे यहाँ से मंगा कर बाहर एक्सपोर्ट करता है, उनको रोकने के लिए सन्धि में कोई व्यवस्था आप करने जा रहे हैं?

श्री शिव चन्द्र भ्वा (मधुवनी) : पहले मैं एक बात साफ कहना चाहता हूँ। एक नेपाली भारत के प्रति क्या रख रखा है, यह मैं प्रारो बतलाना चाहता हूँ। श्री बी० पी० कोइराला की सरकार का एक प्रतिनिधि एशियन सोशलिस्ट्स की जुबली कांफ्रेंस में बंबई में 1959 में आया था। उसने वहाँ कहा कि एक नेपाली भारत को अपना देश समझता है। दुख की बात है कि भारत के संसद सदस्य भी नेपाल को एक विदेश मानते हैं और एक नेपाली को विदेशी मानते हैं। श्री बी० पी० काइराला की कुर्गानी की एक लम्बी दास्तान है। अफसोस की बात है कि उनके प्रति भी भिन्न दृष्टिकोण रखा जाता है।

अब तक नेपाल और भारत की ट्रेड और ट्राइट की बातें 1960 की जो सन्धि हुई थी उसके मातहत चल रही थीं। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि उस सन्धि में कौन कौन सी बातें और कौन कौन सी घटनायें ऐसी हुईं जिनको ले कर नेपाल को नाराजगी हुई और नेपाल दूसरी एक सन्धि हमारे साथ करना चाहता है।

उसी तरह से मैं यह भी जानना चाहता हूँ कि भारत को कौन सी नाराजगी हुई कौन सी बात ऐसी हुई या घटना ऐसी घटी कि भारत भी तैयार हो गया है कि उसके स्थान पर एक दूसरी सन्धि की जाए। क्या यह मधुवनी में जो तस्करी का माल पकड़ा गया है या

नेपाल से माल स्मगल हो कर भारत के बाजारों में आकर बिकता है, इसी वजह से नाराजगी हुई है और इसी वजह से यह मांग हो रही है कि दूसरी संधि की जाए ?

नेपाल एक ट्रीटी नहीं चाहता है, दो चाहता है। एक ट्रेड के लिए और दूसरी ट्रांजिट के लिए। क्या यह बात सही है ? यदि यह सही है तो आपके लाल साहब काठमंडू जो बात करने गए थे उनको इसमें कहां तक सफलता मिली है कि दो ट्रीटीज नहीं एक ही ट्रीटी के लिए वह राजी हो जाए ? कहां तक इस वार्ता में प्रगति हुई है और कहां तक बात आगे बढ़ी है ?

नेपाल की सिचुएशन बड़ी स्ट्रेटिजिक है। भूटान और सिक्किम भी हमारी बगल में हैं। भूटान और सिक्किम में भी कुछ नाराजगी पैदा हो भारत के प्रति यह भी कोशिश हो रही है। क्या भारत नेपाल, सिक्किम और भूटान तीनों की एक बँधक करेगा ताकि कम से कम आर्थिक मामलों में एक कन्फेड्रेशन के तौर पर काम चल सके और भविष्य में चल कर पोलिटिकल कन्फेड्रेशन के लिए भी रास्ता साफ हो ?

THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN TRADE (SHRI L. N. MISHRA) : I do not want to go into the political questions raised by some hon. Members except on point referred to by Shri K. L. Gupta, that we should not interfere in the internal affairs of Nepal. I should like to state here and now that we have never interfered in the internal affairs of Nepal nor have we any intention of doing so in the future. Nepal is a sovereign country and is free to choose its own way in the manner it like.

18.00 hrs.

I am glad hon. Member Shri Salve has provided this opportunity for a discussion of the relations between India and Nepal, particularly in the matter of trade and transit. There has been so much said particularly in the Press in Nepal about difficulties in the matter of transit of goods to and from Nepal through Indian territory

and it is useful to have an occasion like this to stand back and look objectively at these matters. Nepal, as we all know, is a land-locked country bounded in the north by Tibet, while the eastern, southern and the western borders are with India. India and Nepal are closely linked up by cultural and historical ties and with an open border between India and Nepal there has been traditionally a very strong economic and social link with India. The flow of people, goods and services has been fairly free and, as a result, over 90 per cent of Nepal's trade has been with India. There has also been considerable movement of labour between the two countries, particularly in the Terai region.

In the early 1950s, a budgetary system, a modest but modern administrative and banking machinery were all introduced in Nepal. In the matter of trade and aid, India and Nepal adopted policies appropriate to the needs of the situation, and I am sure that hon. Members would always be happy to see India playing its humble role in the economic development of Nepal.

It is inevitable that between two sovereign and independent countries, however friendly and traditional their relationship, there might be differences, occasionally, in approach and emphasis. I wish to take the House into confidence and say that it is not in terms of the treaty of trade and transit which cause any difficulties. This is in answer to the point made by Shri Shiva Chandra Jha.

As hon. Members are aware, Sir, a treaty of trade and commerce was concluded in 1950 under which so far as Nepal's trade with countries other than India was concerned, the Government of Nepal levied duties on imports and exports at the same rates as those levied by the Government of India on imports and exports into India. Again, although there was no bar to the Government of Nepal maintaining a separate foreign exchange account, they continued to let foreign exchange earnings be deposited in India and let India provide foreign exchange necessary for Nepal's imports. This was up to 1950.

When the treaty came up for revision in 1960, Nepal's understandable desire to control its own foreign exchange operations was incorporated in the following terms :

श्री नरेन्द्र कुमार साल्वे (बेतूल) : यह तो सब मालूम है। मन्त्री महोदय सिर्फ इतना बता दें कि जो सन्धि हुई थी,...

श्री ल० ना० मिश्र : जो कुछ माननीय सदस्य को मालूम है, मैं सिर्फ उतना ही बताने वाला हूँ, उस से ज्यादा नहीं।

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Salve, kindly let him proceed in his own way.

SHRI L. N. MISHRA : I quote :

"Payment for transactions with third countries will be made in accordance with the respective foreign exchange laws rules and regulations of the two countries. The contracting parties agree to take effective steps, in co-operation with each other, to prevent infringement and circumvention of the laws, rules and regulations of either country in regard to matters relating to foreign exchange."

Transit of Nepalese goods through Indian territory to third countries had not posed any serious problem as long as the import and export duties levied by Nepal were the same as those levied by India and the foreign exchange operations were conducted through India. As I had stated, Sir, even with the provisions of the treaty of 1960, it is not the terms of the treaty which cause difficulties.

However, as hon. Members will readily appreciate, there is a deep interconnection between the existence of a free and open border between India and Nepal and the provision of transit facilities through Indian territory for exports from Nepal to third countries and imports from third countries into Nepal. In terms of the treaty, the Government of India have been providing and will continue to provide facilities for the transit of goods of Nepalese origin to third countries. Nepal's trade with third countries has grown from a little under two million dollars in 1962-63 to over 20 million dollars in 1968-69. While this should be convincing to any impartial observer, of the facilities provided by India, there is a problem created by the deflection of trade by certain unscrupulous elements which lends itself to presentation as a difficulty with regard to transit.

The Government of Nepal operate an Export Exchange Entitlement Scheme, popularly called the Bonus Voucher Scheme, which unfortunately results in diversion of our trade and violation of our import and export control.

While we prohibit the export of raw jute from our country, His Majesty's Government of Nepal provide an export bonus for the export of a primary commodity like raw jute to the extent of 30 to 50 per cent of the f.o.b. value.

Again while we have an export duty on mica, Nepal, while levying some export duty, provides an attractive export bonus for this commodity. In the result, the transit facility is known to have been abused by unscrupulous elements for deflecting Indian export products, like raw jute and mica, into the transit route and for deflecting *via* the transit route imports from third countries of items which are either prohibited by India or are subject to very heavy import duties.

It has been explained by Nepal that the Export Exchange Entitlement Scheme has the sole objective of developing Nepal's own exports and that there is no desire to damage Indian interests or circumvent Indian rules or regulations. It has, however, not been possible so far to agree on procedures for consultation and cooperation to achieve the common ends of India and Nepal, namely, to bring about the export aspirations of Nepal without deflecting Indian trade. It is to be hoped that appropriate measures and necessary procedures will be devised when the new arrangements, beyond October 1970, are negotiated.

A further problem arising out of the pursuit of different policies, particularly with regards to import and export duties is a discrimination in the levy of taxes on Indian goods. While we have no difficulty with Nepal adopting fiscal policies to meet its requirements of a healthy and rapid development of its economy, our concern is with the discrimination against our products and with damage caused to our economic policies and interests.

It will be the endeavour in coming to an arrangement with regard to trade and transit after the expiry of the present treaty on the 31st October, 1970, to agree on mutually acceptable and beneficial arrange-

ments while maximising the export of goods of Nepalese origin and assisting in the import of goods needed for consumption in Nepal or for the development of the economy of Nepal will at the same time safeguard the interests of India also.

I have no reason not to believe that there would be better understanding in Nepal of our approach and of the difficulties which have been caused to both the Governments by unscrupulous elements exploiting the transit facility for individual gain.

I wish to emphasise that the cooperation of India will always be available to Nepal in the development and diversification of its trade. India and Nepal are closely linked by cultural and historical ties and the constant endeavour of the Government of India will be to find mutually acceptable solutions to difficulties so that the common aspirations of both the countries will develop and grow in the long run.

I conclude by saying that we are convinced of the fact that a prosperous Nepal

is a source of stability not only to Nepal but also to us.

18 09 hrs.

BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Fifty-Second Report

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI P. PARTHASARATHY) : Sir, I beg to present the Fifty-second Report of the Business Advisory Committee.

18.10 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, August 13, 1970 (Sravana 22, 1892 (Saka).