

बाद भाव कम होने के स्थान पर क्यों बढ़ रहे हैं। महोदय, मैं आपके माध्यम से लेबर मिनिस्टर साहब से कहूंगा कि एक साल पहले जो वर्कर्स फेडरेशन ने स्ट्राइक का नोटिस दिया था उस समय हमारे मजदूर मंत्री ने उसमें इंटरवीन किया था और उस समय करीब 100 रुपये का एडवाक राईज मिल चुकी थी। लेकिन उसका बाद पचासों मीटिंगें होने के बाद भी यह मामला आज तक तय नहीं किया गया है। महोदय सीमेंट वर्कर्स वेज बोर्ड लेबर मिनिस्ट्री के ग्रैंडर आता है। हमारे लेबर के डिप्टी मिनिस्टर यहां पर उपस्थित हैं। उनसे मैं विनती करूंगा कि लाखों मजदूर सीमेंट इंडस्ट्री में काम करते हैं। लेकिन आबिडूशन में, इस प्रकार से जो हमारी मीटिंगें बन्द कर दी हैं इसके कारण ऐसी परिस्थिति पैदा हो गई है। मेरी मांग है कि सरकार वर्कर्स के रिप्रजेंटेटिव्स और मैनेजमेंट के रिप्रजेंटेटिव्स दोनों को बुलाये और लेबर मिनिस्ट्री का कोई बड़ा ऑफिसर उनके साथ बैठकर इस मामले को जल्दी से जल्दी हल कराये। मैं उम्मीद करता हूँ कि वर्कर्स के इंटरैस्ट में, जिन्होंने देश में इतने बड़े पैमाने पर सीमेंट का उत्पादन किया है, उन वर्कर्स को न्याय दिलाने के लिये केन्द्रीय मजदूर मंत्रालय जल्दी से जल्दी काम उठायेगा। मैं यह भी कहना चाहूंगा कि अगर अने वाले दिनों में आप ऐसा नहीं करेंगे तो सीमेंट मैन्युफैक्चरर्स एसोसिएशन के लोग इस ओर कुछ भी नहीं करेंगे क्यों ये नहीं चाहते हैं कि वर्कर्स को रिवाइज्ड रेट पर सैलरी मिले। अतः इस बात को ध्यान में रखकर केन्द्रीय मजदूर मंत्रालय इस विषय को टाप प्रायोरिटी देकर इसका कोई रास्ता निकाले।

DISCUSSION ON THE WORKING OF THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—Contd.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA): Now, we revert to the discussion on the working of the Ministry of External Affairs. Prof. Sourendra Bhattacharjee.

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE (West Bengal): Sir, so far as our foreign policy is concerned, it is difficult to have just one preception regarding the entire gamut of it. In the discussion at this stage perhaps all the aspects of the foreign policy with all its subtlety and niceties and their scrutiny cannot be discussed. I will concentrate on a few aspects over which much discussion has already taken place. As for example, Sino-Indian policy. It was good of the Prime Minister to visit People's Republic of China overriding, perhaps, any objection on account of the pending border issues. Those were raised to the effect that the visit should not take place. That the visit did take place was no doubt good. But apart from the visit what actual improvement has come about? Even after the visit instead of some well-defined improvement in our mutual relationship, some treaty in cultural or commercial fields, the real issue over which the two great countries of Asia had serious divergence has not been touched. It may be said that such negotiations are very delicate matters and have to be tackled very delicately and cannot be spelt out even on the floor of Parliament. Even granting that, there must be some indication that substantive issues between the two countries are being sought to be solved without allowing a stalemate to continue which may at any time erupt into something worse depending on who is in responsibility where. The relations between these two countries are very important.

As for our current, perhaps I may be excused if I use the term which is mild "dispute" between our country and Nepal, it is openly said that in our Press and foreign Press also that Nepal's dealings with China particularly purchase of some missiles from China was responsible for our present stiff attitude towards Nepal. To me, it seems if such an attitude is really there, perhaps, that won't be proper, I am not sure. Sometimes some inexplicable actions even on our part have given some credence to such points. In our country definitely we won't like any particular country to dictate to us from where we should purchase our military hardware. If the USA says that you cannot

[Prof. Surendra Bhattacharjee]

get it from the USSR or if the USSR says that you cannot get from the USA, it may not be acceptable to us. That will be against our national interest. We should be our own masters and free to take our own decision. In this connection, about our sudden deterioration in relations or sudden problems in our relationship with Nepal, a country with which we have age-old relations, we had a very good neighbourly relations, special relationships. Why do we not try our best to restore those relations? Even if it becomes our lot to fall foul of all our neighbours, Bangladesh or Pakistan, we have no reason to fall foul of Nepal. Nepal is a country which is culturally tied to us from ancient times so to say. When their democratic movement was going on, our national movement and Nepal's democratic movement were tied up together. Many great names in our national struggle used to be associated notwithstanding objections to it. In this background therefore my appeal would be that our relations with Nepal should be restored. Regarding Sri Lanka also, there is every reason to take a fresh look into our policy there. The IPKF even though it is to enforce peace, it still seems to be an army on a alien land, not just to help them. Their leadership or all of them do not accept it like that. Whether we have created more problems in trying to solve Sri Lanka problem is something which should be given a serious thought. Thank you.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO): Sir, I am grateful to you for these few minutes you are giving to me. (*Interruptions*).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA): He wants to say something. Reply will be afterwards.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: This debate has become rather a perforated a broken one, just being resumed and again broken and my reply is already under the grave threat of postponement to Tuesday. I submit to the wish of the House, but there is one matter which I

consider is of great urgency because in respect of Nepal, we find ourselves in a constantly evolving situation. So, I would like, with your permission, Sir, to go on record in this House, without waiting for the next three or four days to say the same thing I would like to go on record to tell this House what the Government of India stands for, in a sense the operative portion which I think is important and which needs to be noted so that we steer clear of any distortions or misinterpretations during the next three or four days. Sir, whatever has been the spate of statements and the variety of the statement that has emanated from the Nepalese side, I can say that on many occasions, they have said that they are happy with the Indo-Nepal treaty of 1950. So far as we are concerned, we have always stood by it and we have never asked for any change in the treaty. What we have said is that over the years, the working of the treaty has been rather lopsided and therefore what I have to say to this House, with all respect, is that it would be clear from this common ground that both the 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 between the two countries. I would like to go on record in respect of this very vital, important stand of the Government of India, at this moment, Sir. About the general points raised in the debate, I shall have the occasion to deal with them on Tuesday. Thank you.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Madhya Pradesh): The statement is all right. But what happens in the meantime? If the treaty has to be considered and the entire gamut of relationship is to be taken into consideration, that will take time. But the situation needs some remedial measures now. The hon. Minister has not given any indication of that.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: At this moment, it would not be proper for me or for Atalji to go into these details. I have made my statement because I wanted the stand of the Government to be noted clearly and unequivocally. The

other points that could be raised from both sides when there is a discussion, when there is any talk about these relations, cannot be anticipated now. We have made our position clear and we will have to take the next step only depending on the response from the other side.

SHRI VISHWA BANDHU GUPTA (Delhi): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I thank the hon. Minister for having stated a clear position as far as the Government of India is concerned. This intervention. I am aware of the fact that sometimes the record straight. Sir, in the debate on the Demands for Grants for the External Affairs Ministry, the most notable point has been the almost total absence of any acrimony and near consensus on most issues. This is as it should be and perhaps it is a tribute to the manner in which our foreign policy has been conducted. That policy, Sir, has never lacked direction because it has been founded ever since we became free forty years ago on rocklike principles which not only India but over a hundred other countries accept and try to adhere to. That policy has taken note of the changing developments and leaderships in world affairs in these four decades and yet has remained steadfast to the basic assumption and therefore infallible. Even during the Janata regime, after initial hesitations and wavering, the ruling party understood that any major deviation or reversal would gravely jeopardise our interests in the world. I know that now in their draft manifesto our friends on the other side have felt it incumbent not to tamper with our foreign policy as such. Sir, while we have much reason for self-congratulation, we must nevertheless stop short of complacency. I know that those responsible for our policies and decisions are ever on guard and ready for fine-tuning at all times. Nonetheless, hon. Members on both sides of the House have rightly expressed concern at some unhappy developments. Sir, even though the world press and regrettably, some of our own mediamen, using the availability of free movement and free observation and freedom to meet and talk to whoever they like... whether here in India or through India into the neighbouring States. They mounted strident criticism of our country

in relation to our neighbours. I accept that the world media, controlled and influenced by the West, have had an inbuilt hostility towards India. This has manifested itself over many years and in many ways. Perhaps it is a challenge to our determination to be independent in our thinking and action. Perhaps we have not only practised but in turn influenced many friendly nations not to look at world affairs in terms of black and white, in terms of foreclosing all options and siding with one or the other super power or their ideologies. Nevertheless this is one aspect that must seriously be looked into and rectified to the best of our ability. To suggest that India harbours any hegemonistic designs against her neighbours is nonsense because with each one of them she has long and strong bonds emotionally, culturally and geographically and even by blood relation. The vast size of India does not bring in any feeling of wanting to bear down on them nor have we ever tried to act according to our interests and not theirs. This should be patent to all. I do not think in spite of all incessant drumming up to the contrary that we have gone anywhere save when we were invited. I agree with the honourable Shri Vajpayee that a smile cannot be a bench mark of relations. That is surely better than having a scowl as a stench mark. Now, when we are talking about foreign policy I would like to say—now that Mr. Vajpayee is present here—this matter has been coming up again and again and I thought I would quote once from the resolution of Anandpur Sahib of October 16-17, 1973. This resolution on which we have had no reaction from the Opposition parties...

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:
No, no; that is not correct.

SHRI VISHWA BANDHU GUPTA:
Please bear with me for a moment.

"The Panthic political aim is definitely based on the directives of the Tenth Guru, which is engraved on the pages of Sikh history and is in the mind of the Khalsa Panth—Its aim is **KHALSA JI KA BOL BALA**.

[Shri Vishwa Bandhu Gupta]

To this end in view, the Shiromani Akali Dal will strive and wage struggles for the following:

The areas which have been taken away from Punjab or have been intentionally kept apart e.g. Dalhousie from district Gurdaspur, Chandigarh, Pinjore, Kalka and Ambala City in district Ambala, the whole of Unna Tehsil of Hoshiarpur district, Desh ilaga of Nalagarh, Shahabad block of district Karnal, Sub-Tehsil of Guhla and Tohana, Rattia block of district Hissar and Sirsa Tehsil, 6 Tehsils of district Ganganagar of Rajasthan and the contiguous Punjabi-speaking Sikh-populated areas, should be immediately merged with Punjab under one administrative unit."

It goes on to say:

"In this new Punjab, the Central intervention should be restricted to Defence, Foreign Affairs, Posts & Telegraphs, Currency and Railways. The rest of the departments should be under the direct control of Punjab.

Effective arrangements should be made to safeguard the interests of the minority Sikh community living outside Punjab so that they do not fall a prey to any discrimination."

It also goes on to say:

"The Akali Dal stands for removal of disparity between the rich and the poor, both in urban and rural areas. It, however, wants that the first attack on the concentration of wealth should be made on those who really control the economy..."

And so on. Even on this matter of Anandpur Sahib Resolution and the foreign policy stance taken by the Anandpur Sahib Resolution to date we do not have any specific positioning of the Opposition parties. Now, the leaders of the parties are present here. As far as I know, there has been no clear enunciation of what their stand is with regard to this matter.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Sir, this is not fair. It is not fair.

SHRI VISHWA BANDHU GUPTA: Atalji, you are well aware of this matter. The point is that the Opposition parties have been debating the foreign policy of our country and this matter refers to a foreign policy matter. If they have made clear their position... (Interruptions)...

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: This is not a foreign policy matter. Don't make it a foreign policy matter. It is an internal matter.

SHRI E. BALANANDAN: This is an internal question.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: We have taken a clear stand. The BJP has taken a clear stand and we have described it as a charter of disintegration. You ought to know it. You claim to be an Editor.

SHRI VISHWA BANDHU GUPTA: Vajpayeeji, I will concede the point as far as the BJP is concerned. But I am referring to all the Opposition parties and I have not singled out the BJP in this matter.

SHRI E. BALANANDAN: Not only the BJP, but all other parties also.

SHRI VISHWA BANDHU GUPTA: Sir, the time has come when there should be a clear enunciation by the Opposition parties as far as this Anandpur Sahib Resolution is concerned and I think it will be good for the country and for the people to know where they stand with regard to this kind of a resolution that has been passed by these people I say this because this matter has been hanging on. It was done in 1983 and we have now come to 1989 and they have to say where they stand.

SHRIMATI BIJOYA CHAKRAVARTY: (Assam); Sir, the External Affairs Minister is not here now.

SHRI VISHWA BANDHU GUPTA: Anyway, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I thank you for bearing with me on this matter. Among our priorities must be a conscious and sustained effort to show an

understanding of our neighbours whom we wish to respect and with whom we wish to live in peace and harmony and, God willing, to assist one another to prosper and progress, and also to be seen by all the world that this is our intention and this is our aim.

Sir, I would like to make only one further point. The world climate has changed radically since the fateful days of the cold war. Although there are cold warriors still fighting around and engaged in a rear-guard action, we must examine in what constructive and responsible ways we can help in bringing the contending parties closer and help in achieving durable world peace. In this, we should use all the available means and forums and try to strengthen the United Nations as an instrument of world peace. This is not only India's responsibility, but it is also an obligation to help in this since we have always been in the vanguard of the struggle of the once-deprived people to find a place under the sun. Thank you very much, Sir.

SHRI KRISHNA KUMAR BIRLA (Rajasthan): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am grateful to you for having given me this opportunity to participate in the discussion on the working of the Ministry of External Affairs.

Sir, I would like, at the outset, to pay compliments to the Prime Minister for having carried out a very wise and sagacious foreign policy. Extensive tours by the Prime Minister in spite of the fact that some people have criticised him for the same, have in my opinion, done a lot of good in promoting friendship between India and the other countries.

Sir, Turkey is an example of this and from all that I know, after the Prime Minister's visit to Turkey, our relations have very much improved and whatever misgivings there were in the minds of the people of Turkey and the Government of Turkey, have been very much removed.

Sir, the aim of a good foreign policy should be to widen the country's influence. And looking to the size of our country and the importance that it enjoys, it has to endeavour for universal harmony.

Sir, a country like India has other duties also. It is also our duty to ensure stability in case we are required to do so. The policy that we have followed in respect of Sri Lanka and Maldives is in accordance with that. I would also like to compliment the Prime Minister for the good relationship which he has been able to maintain with the two super powers. With Russia our friendship has, ever since Pt. Nehru took over the prime ministership, been a traditional friendship. I would like to mention that with Mr. Gorbachev at the helm of affairs—Mr. Gorbachev, the like of whom are born only once in a century, Mr. Gorbachev who, in my opinion, is the greatest Russian leader after Lenin—with Mr. Gorbachev at the helm of affairs, I have no doubt that our relations will further improve.

Sir, even with the United States our relations have improved. But side by side I would also like to mention that it is a cause of concern to us, the way the United States is supplying arms to Pakistan. It also concerns us when we consider that the ambition of the United States is that Pakistan should be a front-line State as far as this part of the world is concerned. But in spite of that I would like to say in compliment to our foreign policy that even Washington has realised that India has to play a major role in this part of the region.

Sir, there is one particular point which may turn out to be very serious as far as our economy is concerned. I would like to draw the attention of the Minister towards that. Incidentally, it was also discussed in Rajya Sabha when a question was put. And that is regarding the United States Omnibus Trade Act which has recently been passed in the United States. Under this Trade Act, the United States has reserved the right and the power to retaliate whenever they find that the market access to US goods is being denied or wherever they feel that the Patents Act of the United States is being infringed, to provide resources for our development project.

No, Sir, take the case of our customs duties. They are high United States feels that because our customs duties are high,

[Shri Krishna Kumar Birla]

to impede the market access to US goods to India. This is a wrong thinking. There is no discrimination of any type as far as the US goods are concerned. This has to be explained to the Government of United States. Side by side, the charges are that our pharmaceutical companies are infringing the Patent Act, of the drugs patented in the United States. Sir, we are all aware of the fact that the businessmen in the United States are very powerful. I would like to assure our government that as far as the businessmen of this country are concerned, they are always at the disposal of the Government of India. And in case the Government so desire, our businessmen will be happy to take up this matter with the businessmen in the United States in trying to resolve this matter.

I would only like to mention that the whole matter requires a lot of tact, diplomacy and persuasion to convince the Government of the United States that there is no violation of any type as far as the U.S. laws are concerned.

Sir, I am also very happy that our Prime Minister has developed personal relationship with President Bush and I have no doubt that as a result of that it should be possible for us to convince the United States that developing countries like India should not be put to any hardship. Sir, as far as the E.E.C. is concerned, I would like to mention that within a period of probably three years, E.E.C., with the concept of a well built Europe is going to become a very powerful union and the Minister of External Affairs may kindly keep this at the back of his mind.

Something about China. The visit of the Prime Minister to China was an act of statesmanship. I do remember that at that time certain misgivings were expressed as to whether the Prime Minister should undertake such a trip or not. In my opinion, the trip was certainly justified. It is the first time in 34 years, after the trip that was undertaken by Indian Prime Minister has visited China. It is again the first time after the India-China war that serious efforts have been made towards normalisation of the

relations between China and India. Sir, I would like to concede immediately that where big problems like border disputes are concerned, it is not possible to resolve them overnight. But then side by side I would like to mention that the ice has been broken and I hope that as a result of continuous talks, something will come out of them. Meanwhile I would like to mention that we should certainly make efforts so that trade relationship between the two countries is commenced as early as possible.

Regarding Nepal, all the problems could have happened in Pakistan was restoration of democracy after so many years. My own feelings is that as a result of this, better relationship and better understanding will emerge between Pakistan and India. Here I would like to plead that efforts should be made so that the trade negotiations between Pakistan and India are started as early as possible. I am aware of the fact that some times goods from India are exported to Pakistan not by direct route, but first they are sent to Singapore and from Singapore they are re-exported to Pakistan. All this is silly and I would certainly suggest to our Minister of External Affairs that he should take up this matter at a senior level with the Government of Pakistan.

Regarding Nepal, all the problems that we are facing with Nepal are undoubtedly Nepal's own creation. The permit system that they have started for the Indian nationals, discriminatory tariff against Indian goods, prohibiting Indians from entering Nepali territory bordering China and yet permitting Chinese to enter Nepali territory bordering India are things which hurt our pride. Sir, Nepal cannot treat Indians at par with other foreigners. After all, there are millions of Nepalese working in India without any permit system. We have ethnic, cultural, religious and kinship ties with Nepal and these ties are very strong. Nepal is the only country, barring perhaps Bhutan, where no passport is needed as far as Indian citizens are concerned. I would, therefore, plead with the Government of Nepal and I will address them that they

should not stand on a false sense of prestige and that they should start a dialogue with India. I would also like to mention that any delay in these dialogues may lead to riots in Nepal and to its instability. Side by side, I would also like to make one plea to the hon. Minister and that is that before this trouble started, there were 15 entry points between India and Nepal. I would say that at least on humanitarian grounds this matter should be reconsidered. These 15 entry points have been reduced to 2. I would strongly plead that looking at the geographical position of Nepal, it is a mountainous and land-locked country, let such entry points be increased to at least 4 or 6.

There have also been historical associations with Nepal. The world knows Prince Gautam also called Prince Siddhartha as an Indian Prince. When he attained Buddhism, he was called Lord Buddha, the saviour from India. And, Sir, he is regarded as an Indian.

Very few people perhaps, know 6 P.M. that Kapilvastu where he was born is in Nepal. And from that angle nobody could say today that he was a Nepalese and not an Indian.

Sir, we have got our sentiments towards Nepal, sentiments of warmth. And in view of such deep and close association, I would plead that efforts should be made for an early dialogue with Nepal. We could either use our own diplomatic channels or we could request any friendly country for intervention. With these words, Sir, I conclude.

Thank you, Sir.

SHRI GHULAM RASOOL MATTO (Jammu and Kashmir): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA): Next time.

विदेश मंत्री (श्री पी० वी० नरसिंह राव) : सहोदय, डिप्टी चेयरमैन साहिब ने मुझ से कहा था कि मंगलवार को जब हम मिलेंगे तो केवल मेरा उत्तर होगा। यह उनका कहना था। अब आप देख लीजिये कि समय कितना है।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : अगर जवाब मंगलवार को होता है तो बची हुई बहस भी मंगलवार को हो सकती है।

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI M. M. JACOB): We should finish the speakers today as far as possible.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA): There are so many speakers.

SHRI DHARAM PAL (Jammu and Kashmir): Please protect our rights also. Let us sit for another half an hour or we should be allowed to speak on Tuesday.

SHRI M. M. JACOB: Actually, the time allotted is over. Only some time is left. So, give that time. (Interruptions) Actually the time given to the Opposition is consumed. And the casualty is always the ruling party. Now since there are two or three Members whose names are listed have been present, I think we can give some time to these Members who are present here and then we can close the debate, and the reply can be on Tuesday.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA): There are four speakers, Shri G. R. Matto.

SHRI GHULAM RASOOL MATTO: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, while speaking on the subject of External Affairs, I would like to mention that as the Prime Minister's envoy, I had an occasion to visit Libya last year...

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: You were the envoy?

SHRI GHULAM RASOOL MATTO: I was the representative of India to participate on the Palestine situation....

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: So, you were the trouble-shooter.

SHRI GHULAM RASOOL MATTO: Sir, the goodwill of India amongst the Arab countries, amongst the Middle-East countries is to be seen to be believed. I

[Shri Ghulam Rasool Matto]

was invited as a representative of India at the podium, I spoke on behalf of the Prime Minister. And speaker after speaker expressed and extolled the magnificent contribution of India towards the Middle East. The situation in Palestine was considered in that conference, and the Indian position was expressed by me. I would like the hon. Minister to say something in his reply about the Palestine situation because no speaker has said on that issue and we could reiterate our position with regard to that.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, after my visit to China in 1985, I was of the firm view that our relations with China must improve. I had, at that point of time, even gone to the extent of saying that we should have a dialogue with China because the situation was such and I found a lot of opportunity for us in China. And I am very glad and I compliment the Minister, I compliment the Government for our Chinese policy because the Chinese dialogue that has started is in the right direction. And I have only one thing to say, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, in that connection. While we are aware that many speakers have said that it will take time for us to improve the relations with China because of the border dispute, my contention is, and I would solicit the favour of the hon. Minister's attention..

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: He is listening to you.

SHRI GHULAM RASOOL MATTO: Sir, I was saying that after my 1985 visit to China, I have been a very great exponent of improving our relations with China.

Now many people have stated that we have a dispute with them, which is the border dispute. But one thing has to be taken into consideration and I must say what I feel and it is for the Government of India to think about it. In a dialogue in a situation where there is a dispute, where there is a border dispute, there has always to be a spirit of give and take. Our country must be prepared that when we want to improve our relations with China, we must be prepared for a spirit of give and take. I say this with all the sense of responsibility at my com-

mand that if we do this, we are bound to improve our relations with China.

The second point with regard to China that I would like the hon. Minister to take into consideration is that I had been to China and I had seen a lot of hope and scope for the Shenzhen free trade zone and the other free trade zones that are there. There I had seen the multinationals like the Pepsi Cola and many other concerns over there and I was told by well-wishers, Chinese well-wishers, who had visited India and who told me in confidence that India has a tremendous scope in the Shenzhen free trade zone and they explicitly mentioned the HMT and the BHEL in this connection and such other organisations. I would like the hon. Minister to react in his reply and tell us whether any dialogue has taken place for the opening in the Shenzhen free trade zone and what is the progress of this dialogue.

I compliment the hon. Minister and the Government on our Pakistan policy. There has been a real definite change with regard to Pakistan. A Minister of the Cabinet is on record as having said only two days back that we need to have a fresh look on the Kashmir issue and we need not stick on that issue. I have only one request to make that the hon. Minister of State yesterday said that we are going to have a Home Secretaries conference shortly with regard to incursions and intrusions into India through Punjab and Kashmir. I would request the hon. Minister that due to the situation in Kashmir that has recently erupted when the people were caught, they told us that they were trained in Pakistan and some arms were also smuggled, but one of them has given an interview to Kashmir Times and he has stated that after Ms. Benazir Bhutto came into power the camps there stopped functioning. But I have my doubts about it and I would request the hon. Minister that at the highest level this matter should be taken up so that the infiltration across the border from Pakistan is stopped so that we are saved and our tourist industry does not suffer. Because whenever there is a bomb blast, the papers come out with the news. Although there is absolutely calm

there. I had been there only two days back. There is absolute calm and quite there. But the simple mention of a bomb drives away many tourists or intending tourists to Kashmir. So, I would request apart from the Home Secretaries level, this matter should be taken into consideration.

Sir, the hon. Minister has just now intervened with regard to Nepal. There is no doubt that our stand on Nepal is based on facts. But here I came only three days back and there I found in the Arab News another news, which is date-lined Brussels and it states that Nepal asks the European Community to help settle a trade dispute with India, which it said had led to severe shortages of food, fuel and other goods. The Nepalese Parliamentary Delegation made a plea during a visit to the European Economic Commission. The delegation was led by Navraj Subedi, Chairman of the Rashtriya Panchayat, Nepalese Parliament. It claimed that India has unilaterally ended its 99-year treaty of friendship signed in 1950 with Nepal and has not renewed the free trade and transit treaty with the Himalayan Kingdom. It goes on to say many other things. I have only to say one thing. The Minister also has intervened and said something about the treaty. I would request the hon. Minister that while he replies to the debate he should give a complete picture and background of the Indo-Nepalese...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA): That he has already promised.

SHRI GHULAM RASOOL MATTO: I say this because those people who have been born after 1950, or those who do not know the exact situation, it will benefit them. Right now, I do not know personally, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, that we are not only giving fuel to Nepal, but we are subsidising in that. I hope the Minister will come out with full details so that the country and the world knows that it is not India that is to be blamed but there are other things also that have to be taken into account.

I also bring to the notice of the hon. Minister that there was a news item of which I gave a copy to the hon. Minister with regard to Bhutan. It said that the tiny Himalayan kingdom of Bhutan had adopted measures to force Indians to leave as part of its new policy to rein in Indian economic influence, newspaper report said yesterday. Government officials carried out house to house inspections in Bhutan to remove antennas to prevent television viewers from receiving Indian broadcast, the report said I would like the hon. Minister to apprise us in his reply what the exact position is with regard to Indians in Bhutan and our relations with Bhutan. Our country is such that we should not have any misgivings. No country should have any misgivings. Our policy is straight. We believe in *ahimsa*. We believe in good neighbourly relations. We have no territorial ambitions. And these have to be brought home to all our countrymen and to the world at large. I would request the hon. Minister to throw some light on this aspect in his reply.

My last point is with regard to SAARC. SAARC has tremendous potentialities and I would request the hon. Minister to let us know with regard to the trade relations between SAARC countries. Is there any formula to have trade relation between SAARC countries just on the basis of rupee payment trade? Just as we have got our trade relations with European countries and Russia on the basis of rupee payment where no foreign exchange is involved. If such a formula could be evolved among SAARC countries as such where no country may be forced to part with its foreign exchange or may have to pay in foreign exchange but in the currency of this country, if some such thing could be managed, a working group could be constituted of the SAARC countries who could finally adopt such a course. I think this will be beneficial to us and this would go a long way in improving our trade.

In the end I have to say only one thing. While I was having 'Saheri' at about 3.30 in the morning these days, I was fiddling with my radio. I do not

[Shri Ghulam Rasool Matto]
know; I may have heard it wrong and I stand corrected. While fiddling with the radio at 3.30, I came across a BBC broadcast and I came to know from that broadcast that LTTE is having negotiations with the Colombo Government in Colombo but they have put two major conditions for the talks with Sri Lanka Government. Condition number one is that Sri Lanka Government must agree with LTTE for the pullout of the IPKF immediately. Second condition is that in the negotiations that will take place, India will not be taken into consideration nor any Indian representative will be taken into consideration. I do not know whether I heard it wrong. But I want to know whether the Government of India is aware of it or if it is known to them. I would like the Minister to let us know because there are many doubts on this point and I want to know whether it is a fact and what is the reaction of the Government of India on this issue.

With these observations I compliment the Government of India. I have been to Saudi Arabia recently and there is a tremendous fund of goodwill for India in the Middle-East countries and I must compliment the Minister for External Affairs for a good foreign policy adopted by the Government of India.

श्री धर्मपाल : माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, भारत की विदेश नीति का आज्ञादी के बाद ही नहीं बल्कि जब हमारी फ्रीडम स्ट्रगल चल रही थी उसी दौरान पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू जी ने नक्शा बनाया। हमारी विदेश नीति की तीन मोटी बातें आधार रही हैं एक नान-एलाइनमेंट, दूसरा वर्ल्ड पीस एंड डिसआरममेंट और तीसरा नौवा-दियाती निजाम का जहां भी हो खात्मा करना और जो आज्ञादी की लड़ाई लड़ रहे हैं उनकी मदद करना यह तीन मोटे आधार थे। पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने पंचशील का सिद्धांत अपनाया, पांच प्रिंसिपल को इंग्लिस-टेंट्स तब से लेकर अब तक इनमें कान्टीन्यूटी रही है इस देश में चाहे राइटिस्ट ताकतें हों या वामपंथी दल हो सबने हमारी विदेश नीति की सराहना की है। एक वक्त आया जब यहां जनता पार्टी की सरकार बनी तो उन्होंने एक बात जेन्यून नान-एलाइनमेंट की ज़रूर कही लेकिन आम जनता भी

समझ नहीं पाई कि जेन्यून नान-एलाइनमेंट का मतलब क्या है हमने जो नान-एलाइनमेंट की पालिसी बनाई और जिस पर हम चल रहे हैं उसमें देश के हित को सामने रखा। एक वक्त था जब रशियन और अमेरिकन दोनों पावर ब्लाक्स थे और हरेक देश समझता था कि एक या दूसरे ब्लाक में रहने से ही वह जिंदा रह सकता है, लेकिन भारत ने उस वक्त जब यह पालिसी बनाई मार्शल टीटो से मिल कर और कर्नल नासिर से मिलकर और जो पहली कांफ्रेंस हुई जिसमें सिर्फ 25 देश थे। उसके बाद यह ताकत बढ़ती गई और आज 104 के करीब देश हैं और इससे शक्ति प्रदान होती रही, पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू जी के बाद इंदिरा जी ने ताकत दी और जब "नाम" की यहां दिल्ली में कांफ्रेंस हुई तब वहां एक नई शक्ति मिली और दुनिया में अमन कायम करने के लिए और एटमी हथियारों के फैलाव को रोकने के लिए भारत ने जितनी ज़रूरत से और बेबाकी से बातें उठाई और उसके नतीजे बरामद हुए दिल्ली घोषणा जो गोबाचिव जी और प्रधान मंत्री श्री राजीव गांधी जी के दरम्यान हुई या यू.एन. इटेड नेशनज में एक्शन प्लान जिन्होंने पेश किया और उनके नतीजे निकले। जब इतनी ज़रूरत से हमने यह बातें कही हैं। तीसरे यह जो दुनिया है नान-एलाइनमेंट मूवमेंट की ताकत इतनी बड़ी है कि चाहे एक ब्लाक था या दूसरा था वह हमारी बात को मानने लगा और हमारी पालिसी का असर इंटरनेशनल पोलिटिक्स पर होता रहा। हमने देखा गोबाचिव जी की लीडरशिप में रशिया ने जो एफ़दामात दिए एटमी हथियारों के फैलाव को रोकने के, आई.एन.ए. ट्रीटी की शकल में और विदेशों से चाहे हंगरी हो, चाहे चाइना की सरहद हो वहां से फौज को बम करने की बात हो तो ये सब बातें मैं समझता हूं कि भारत की विदेश नीति की कामयाबी या नतीजा है। तमाम दुनिया में अब रूस जैसा देश भी नान-एलाइनमेंट की बात करता है और यह बात हमने एग्रीमेंट में कही और जो पालिसी भारत ने शुरू से आज्ञादी के वक्त से रखी वह दुनिया में अब मानी जा रही है। हमारी विदेश नीति जो है मैं समझता हूं कि भारत और रूस के जो ताल्लुकात हैं और खास कर इंडो सोवियत फ्रेंडशिप और कोओपरेशन की जो ट्रीटी इंदिरा जी ने

की उससे जो भी वक्त आया था वह 1965 का जमाना था या 1971 का था ज सातवें बरी बेड़े के आने की धमकी अमरीका ने दी उस वक्त भी रूस हमारी मदद को आया। चाहे बड़े-बड़े स्टील प्लांट लगाने की बात हो, आर्थिक सहायता की बात हो या फौजी साजो-सामान देने की बात हो हर वक्त जिसने बड़-बड़े पावर प्रोजेक्ट्स दिए हैं उसमें रूस ने हमेशा हमारी मदद की है। हमें और यहां भारत में जो दाएं बाजू की ताकतें हैं हमेशा यह कहती रही कि भारत अपनी विदेश नीति रूस के कहने पर बनाता है तो हमारे जितने नेता रहे जवाहर लाल नेहरूजी, इंदिराजी और राजीव गांधी जी ने बाजे तौर पर कहा कि जहां तक देश का हित है हमने उसको नहीं छोड़ा है चाहे भारत-रूस की दोस्ती का सवाल है और चाहे अमरीका से ताल्लुकात सुधारने का सवाल है। तो मैं कहूंगा कि भारत और रूस दोस्ती जो है वह सही साबित हुई और दोनों देश के लोगों में भी अपनेपन और मोहब्बत का जजबा कायम रहा। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी की कोशिश है कि अमरीका से हमारे ताल्लुकात सुधरे रैगन जी के वक्त भी और बुश साहब के वक्त भी और टेक्नोलोजी ट्रांसफर चाहे सुपर कंप्यूटर की बात हो जरूर हमें मिले लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहूंगा विदेश मंत्रीजी को कि अमरीका किसी न किसी बहाने हमारे पड़ोस में पाकिस्तान में यदीद हथियार दे रहा है। अभी बात चल रही है 60, एफ-16 देने की टैंक देने की, यदीद रडार देने की तो यह किसलिए? एक वक्त कहा जाता था रशियन फौजें अफगानिस्तान में है वह किस लिए हैं असल बात यह है कि भारत ने जो आजादाना विदेश नीति बनाई उससे कुछ लोगों और जो तरक्की भारत ने आर्थिक क्षेत्र में की चाहे कृषि हो, चाहे डिफेंस हो, चाहे साइंस एंड टेक्नोलोजी की बात हो, चाहे डिफेंस प्रोडक्शन की बात हो और चाहे कोई बात हो, चाहे कैंनेडा पर हमला होता है, चाहे दिल्ली में वहां के लीडर को खत्म करने की बात होती है। चाहे अपाथाइड की बात हो, पर वक्त भारत ने अपनी पालिसी की जो सही सूरत है, उसको आगे रखा और देश के हित को ध्यान में रखकर रखा।

सर, मैं दो तीन मिनट में खतम कर रहा हूं। तो इसलिए कुछ देश जलते हैं कि भारत साइंस-टेक्नोलोजी में, एग्रीकल्चर में,

इंडस्ट्रीज, डिफेंस में एक ताकत के रूप में उभर रहा है तथा विदेशों से मुकाबला करके यह अपनी चीजें दुनिया में परोख्त करता है, भारत के इंजीनियर और डाक्टर दुनिया के दूसरे देशों में जाते हैं और इंटरनेशनल ठकों में भी भारत भाग लेता है, इसलिए कुछ देश सोचते हैं कि किसी तरह से इसको कमजोर किया जाय। मैं बड़ी बातों में न आते हुए इतना कहना चाहता हूं कि वे साजिश करते हैं भारत में अंदरूनी तौर पर गड़बड़ कराई जाए, हमारे पड़ोसी देश को मजबूत किया जाय या फिर मूनाफरत फैलाई जाय। कुछ जो विदेशी ताकतें हैं, उनको हमारी तरक्की और आजादगी पालिसी भारती नहीं है। तो मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि अमरीका को साफ बहना चाहिए कि अब उनकी पालिसी कुछ जेनेवा एग्रीमेंट की तरह अफगानिस्तान से चलेगी। इसका क्या जवाब है पाकिस्तान को मजबूत करने का?

सर, पाकिस्तान की पालिसी के मुताबिक मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि हम बड़ी मुबारकवाद देते हैं कि वहां जम्हूरियत बहाल हुई, बेनजीर भुट्टो जी वहां आई। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी वहां गए, बड़ी अच्छी बात हुई, हमने सोचा कि यह जो टेरारिज्म पंजाब में है, पूरी ताकत जैसे यह हमारे जम्मू-कश्मीर में है, उनकी ट्रेनिंग की है, लोग हथियार लाते हैं, उन पर बंदिश होगी। खुद शाबिरम शाह का बयान है, जो पी.पुल्स के हैड हैं, वहां यह तीन जो आफिस हैं—पी.पुल्स लिबरेशन फ्रंट, इस्लामिक स्टुडेंट यूनियन और पी.पुल्स लीग, उन्होंने बयान दिया है कि वह तीनों के लीडर बनने वाले हैं उन्होंने यह माना कि याहिया खां मदद करते थे और यह हमें प्रोत्साहन देते थे। उन्होंने यह भी कहा कि जो ट्रेनिंग कैप बंद थे, अब खुल गए हैं। इसके लिए आपको पाकिस्तान से कहना पड़ेगा। ठीक है, उनकी दिक्कतें हैं, पाकिस्तान के प्राइम-मिनिस्टर की कि वहां इंटेलिजेंस सविसेज भी चलाते हैं और अफगानिस्तान और कश्मीर में भी, लेकिन उनकी उस पर हावी होना पड़ेगा। जो उन्होंने कमेटी बनाई है, उसकी रपोर्ट आ जाय तो बाकी यह है कि हम अपनी आजादी और इंटिग्रेटिव यूनिटी के लिए बड़ी से बड़ी कुर्बानी दे सकते हैं। फौजी अलफाज में तो होम-सेक्रेटरी की बात शायद हो रही है और विदेश सचिव भी बात करेंगे। उनको यह बाजब तौर पर कहना चाहिए कि रिपोर्ट दें सबूत हैं

[श्री धर्मपाल]

हमारे पास, कि वह मदद कर रहे हैं और पूरी तबज्जुह अपनी कश्मीर में रखी है कि वहां हालात बहुत खराब किए जाय। जब अगर कश्मीर में हालात खराब होते हैं तो उसका पूरे देश पर असर पड़ेगा। तो यह पाकिस्तान को भी कहना पड़ेगा।

बांग्ला देश, जो हमारा पड़ोसी है, उससे पानी का झगड़ा है। हम आर्वि-ट्रेशन समझौते करते रहते हैं, वह इंट-रेस्टेड ही नहीं कि कोई मसाला हल हो। एरिगेशन मिनिस्टर हमारे जाते हैं, बातें होती हैं, कमिशन बना, लेकिन कोई पक्का हल नहीं हुआ। इसके साथ ही जब से इस्लामिक जम्हूरी हुकूमत का उन्होंने कहा, वहां से माइग्रेशन हो रही है हमारे त्रिपुरा में, पश्चिमी बंगाल में और चक्मा रिफ्यूजी यहां बैठे हैं। इन बातों के लिए हमको उनसे कहना पड़ेगा कि उनको इन लोगों को वापस लेना चाहिए, हालात को सुधारना चाहिए और यह हिजरात जो शुरू हो गई माइनोरिटीज की, उसको बन्द करना पड़ेगा।

मेरे साथी डी.एम.के. के श्री गोपालसामी तथा बी. सत्यनारायण रेड्डी जी ने कल वहां भारत और श्रीलंका के मुतालिक कि हमारी इतनी फौज का तुकमान हुआ, इतना पैसा खर्च हो गया। मैं समझता हूं कि आप वहां के हालात जानते हैं, वहां श्रीलंका में दूसरे देशों की फौजें आने वाली थीं, इटेलीजेन्स एजेंसियां वहां थीं और फिर यहां एक तरफ इंडियन ओरिजन में 700-800 से ज्यादा जंगी जहाज हैं.. (समय की घंटी)....

महोदय, दो-तीन मिनट में कनक्लूड कर रहा हूं। अगर हम अपनी फौजें उनके बहने पर वहां न भेजते तो स्थिति कुछ और हो सकती थी। आज हालात वहां सुधरे हैं, इलेक्शन वहां हुए हैं प्रेसी-डेंट के हुए, प्रोविशियल कौंसिल के हुए, पार्लियामेंट के हुए और अब हालात ऐसे बन गए हैं कि लिटे को मजबूर होकर प्रेमदासा जी से बात करने को तैयार होना पड़ा है। हम भी चाहते हैं कि

जैसे ही वहां काम खत्म हो जाय, हमारी फौज वापस आ जाय और उन्होंने भी कहा है कि वे आने को तैयार हैं।

नेपाल के मुतालिक मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि कुछ शक्तियां हैं, फिर यह मामूली बात नहीं कि नेपाल जो ज्योग्राफिया तौर पर हिन्दुस्तान के नजदीक है, सदियों से हमारे ताल्लुकात रहे हैं, चाहे एरिगेशन प्रोजेक्ट की बात हो, चाहे पावर की बात हो, चाहे ट्रेड और ट्रांजिट की बात हो। लेकिन जनता सरकार ने उस वकत दो बातें कर दीं।.... (व्यवधान).... सर, कल ही वहां के स्पोक्समेन बिस्ता जी ने, हमारे विदेश मंत्री साहब द्वारा बुधवार को लोकसभा में दिए गए बयान पर, कहा है और यह दोष लगाया है कि भारत ने यूनिटेरली दो एग््रीमेंट खत्म कर दिए और साइन नहीं किए। उन्होंने यह भी कहा कि अक्टूबर में जो हमने एग््रीमेंट किया था, उस पर हम स्टैंड करते हैं और भारत नहीं मानता। तो उसके पीछे कोई शक्ति है जिससे ताल्लुकात सुधर रहे हैं। मैं नहीं कहूंगा, लेकिन है। भूटान जैसा देश जो हिन्दुस्तान पर निर्भर है, हमारी सहायता पर निर्भर है, वहां अगर ऐसी बातें हो रही हैं जैसा कि मट्टू सहब कह रहे हैं दो जो शक्ति है उसे आप भी पहचानते हैं और हम भी पहचानते हैं।

महोदय, जहां तक भारत की प्रभु-सत्ता का सवाल है, प्रेस्टिज का सवाल है वह बड़ी है। हमारे मौजूदा प्रधान मंत्री श्री राजीव गांधी जी ने जब से चार साल से शासन संभाला है, विदेश में हमारी प्रेस्टिज बड़ी है। आज चाहे अमेरिका हो, चाहे यू.एस.एस.आर. हो या दूसरे देश हों उनमें हमारी आवाज है। चाहे असम कायम करने के मुतालिक हो या एटमी हथियारों के फैलाव को रोकने की बात हो, या कोई भी मसला हो, चाहे कंपूचिया में कोई झगड़ा है तो उसको निपटाने के लिए भारत योगदान दे रहा है। चाहे श्रीलंका हो या मालदीव में रिवोल्ट हो तो उसको दबाने में भी भारत एक शक्तिशाली देश

साबित हुआ है। हर लिहाज से हमारी विदेश नीति सफल रही है। प्रधान मंत्री श्री राजीव गांधी जिस तरह से इस पालिसी को चला रहे हैं उसकी सभी ने तारीफ की है। इसे भले अपोजीशन के लोग न मानें लेकिन जो बेसिक मुद्दे हैं, मोटे मुद्दे हैं उनमें सभी हमारी विदेश नीति का समर्थन करते हैं। चाहे विपक्ष के लोग हों, चाहे दाएं बाजू के हों या बाएं बाजू के हों सभी तारीफ करते हैं। महोदय, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि ये जो छोटी-छोटी बातें हैं चाहे पाकिस्तान से टेररिस्ट्स को हथियार या दूसरी मदद मिलने की बात हो। आज अमेरिका पाकिस्तान को मदद किस लिए बन्द कर रहा है? चाहे बांग्लादेश से चरमा रिपयूज के वापिस भेजने का सवाल हो, उनसे बात करने की जरूरत है। नेपाल में भी हमें इनीशियेटिव लेना चाहिए और बात करनी चाहिए। हमारी सलह तो यह है कि ब्यूरोक्रेट्स से जो हम बात करते हैं उसके बजाय सीधे बात करें। उसी तरह से भूटान में शाह से हमारी सीधी बातचीत हो जाय, विदेश मंत्रों की बात हो जाय तो जो हालात वहां बन रहे हैं या नेपाल में जो एंटी इंडियन विदेशी प्रचार चल रहा है वह खत्म हो सकता है। जो मदद, जो सुविधा हमने दी है वह बात साफ हो सकती है। भारत ने हमेशा हक की आवाज को उठाया है। चाहे फिलिस्तीनी की हुकमत को रिकग्नाइज करने का सवाल हो, वहां के लोगों की मदद करने का सवाल था, हमने हमेशा साथ दिया है। चाहे नामीबिया हो या कोई भी महत्वपूर्ण देश हो सबके हक की आवाज हिन्दुस्तान उठाता रहा है।

महोदय, इस तरह से भारत की विदेश नीति हर टेस्ट पर खरी उतरी है। जिस तरह से हमारे विदेश मंत्री जो इस पालिसी को चला रहे हैं, उससे भारत की प्रिस्टीज बढ़ रही है और इसकी क्रेडिट हमारे विदेश मंत्री और प्रधान मंत्री को जाती है। आपने मुझे अपनी बात कहने का मौका दिया इसके लिए शुक्रिया।

SHRI VALAMPURI JOHN (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the hon. 288 RS—12.

Prime Minister has said a few days back that IPKF is going to be withdrawn and withdrawn shortly. He has said that Government of India is seriously considering its withdrawal. We heaved a sigh of relief because in the same House some 18 months back it was we who were demanding that the Indian Army should march over to save the Tamil people who were facing a kind of internal massacre, a total conflagration in the island. We thought, when we demanded that Government of India should send its army to Sri Lanka, that the Tamil people who were facing such a massacre would be saved permanently and it is going to be established in the island. But today in consternation, in a paralysing sense of calamity, we are the same people who demand, who exhort this Government that it is right time that Government of India withdrew its Peace Keeping force. They are not actually a peace keeping force. Without casting any aspersion on the Indian Army, I would like to say—what I say may be bitter, but truth is always bitter—that more Tamil people have been killed by the IPKF than by the Sinhalese army. I am not casting any aspersion on the Indian Army. I do not blame any Indian soldier. I salute him. But I do blame, squarely, the Government of India. The Government of India has to answer. Because of this wrong decision, because they were dragging their cold feet on a positive decision that should have been arrived at earlier, today it has come to pass that without achieving anything excepting their colossal failure, with their failures and fumbblings the Government of India are now going to withdraw their army from Sri Lanka.

Sir, when we were demanding, we thought that they were going to save our people. But today we demand that the army has to come back. It is high time that the Government of India withdrew its army. It is only because we know for certain in how many cases the Tamil people have been massacred. In the name of putting down terrorists—who were not terrorists at all but were only freedom fighters—and in the name of putting down LTTE in the Vavuniya forests, more Tamil people have

[Shri Valampuri John]

been massacred, I can understand a Government which spends Rs. 4 crores in a day for the IPKF and win over people. I can understand if our Government spends money to win over people. But this Government is spending India's money, the tax-payer's money to estrange the bulk of the population in Sri Lanka. You are spending money not to win over your neighbours but to estrange the whole spectrum of people in Sri Lanka. Today, Sinhalese are against you, Tamils are against you. You have played into the hands of Mr. Premadasa. Only on the promise that as soon as he was elected, on his election, he would see that the IPKF would be out of Sri Lanka that Mr. Premadasa was elected. So, the entire Sinhalese population was thinking that the IPKF was going to be withdrawn. It was your wish. Basically you have committed a kind of historic blunder by estranging the whole population out, time and again, down from the Prime Minister and the External Affairs Minister, most of the people in the Treasury Benches have been saying that we have to keep foreign powers, Super Powers, off the Indian Ocean. Is it only with his consent that you have entered? It is not so. When you have estranged the whole population, Tamils as well as Sinhalese in the Island, that the Indian Ocean is not safe. You have totally failed, you have fumbled and you are withdrawing now in shame. It is a kind of criminal slur on this nation that you make a claim that you are the fourth largest military power on earth. Is it not a criminal slur on your face? You are answerable.

You have wounded the Tamil psyche deeply. It is not that we are fulminating with anger. I may tell you today for your concern, for your consideration. You may think that I am making some kind of an extra claim, but it is not so. You have wounded the Tamil psyche deeply. You simply think that Tamil Nadu is not reacting. It is not so. You see only the ripples on the surface. Because we have more access to the people than you, we tell you, we warn you. As a writer I speak for my people. I tell you today that you have wounded the psyche of my people so deeply, because all along you have

been shifting your stand. Some day you say that Prabhakaran is an emancipator, some other day you say he is a traitor. Some day you come and say he is a freedom fighter, some other day you say he is an extremist. I know that your mind is overexercised because of Punjab. Even Mahatma Gandhi was a traitor to the British. And then, LTTE Prabhakaran is still supported by the people; he is an emancipator. I have seen hundreds of affidavits. People who signed the affidavits have sent them to me, wherein they say that the IPKF has behaved in the treacherous possible way. Can it happen ever? Is it because it is the Indian Army, because it is my army, that I should accept all their blunders against my sisters in Sri Lanka? It has happened. Today you may say that you are withdrawing everything. But you cannot withdraw the wound that you have inflicted on the Tamil psyche. I speak for them, we stand for them. You may say, for election purposes, for our political organization, for political purposes we say a lot of things. Thereby again you are committing a blunder, because you have refused to think, you have refused to understand, because you are sitting here in Delhi—it is a Moghul capital—far away, and whatever we raise on reason, never reaches your ears.

Now what has happened? Varadaraja Perumal has come. Now, you are pampering the EPRLF Government there. Throughout the world you claimed that you had conducted an election there. Was it an election. You called it an election on election at all, not even the semblance of an election. You called it an election on your Doordarshan and your All-India Radio. People were switching off the TV and radio sets in Tamil Nadu and, but for the fact they purchased these communications sets out of their hard-earned money, they would have simply thrown them away. Such white lies had been doled out throughout India. What a claim did you make—You said that you had conducted an election. It was not an election. It was an election without contestants, it was an election without ballot boxes. You said throughout the world that the Indian Army had marched and upon their march they established democracy. After three months,

Varadaraja Perumal, whom you pampered—it is a puppet Government! that he is presiding over—came here and said that he was not satisfied with what Mr. Premadasa did. He gave you three points. What are the three points? He said, “Before our very eyes, under the very nose of the IPKF, colonisation is on.” Did you answer that? Colonisation was on in the North-East Province. The Chief Minister Mr. Varadaraja Perumal, came here and accused. What was your answer? Then he said, “You spoke of democratisation, decentralisation of the political structure, administrative structure, but nothing has happened.” In one statement that has been published everywhere in Sri Lanka and in India, he said, “If you are not conceding these powers to me, I will take powers.” Why has he told this? Because nothing has happened. India has been trapped in the wrong path. We have played into the hands of a neighbour, such a great military power, because of the wrong decision of the Government. I do not blame any soldier because I cannot blame him for your wrong decision. I may be for my nation. If I am against your Government, you cannot raise that and say, “If you are against the Government, you are against the nation.” No, the nation is different, and the Government is different. Now I speak against the Government, not against the nation, not against my soldier. What I would like to say again is, Mr. Varadaraja Perumal insistently said, “A lot of money has come only for the rehabilitation of the Tamil people in Sri Lanka. But the Central Government in Sri Lanka is sitting over the funds. They are not giving.” This was the accusation he publicly made. What kind of action are you taking? He was saying everything only because he wanted to prove that he was more revolutionary than the LTTE leader, Mr. Prabhakaran.

But you must remember that it is not because of the IPKF, it is not because of the treaty that we entered into with the Sri Lankan Government, but it is because of the LTTE leader, Mr. Prabhakaran, the great emancipator of the Tamil people and who was fighting the mightiest army in the Vavuniya forest that they should concede at least the local self-govern-

ment in the North-Eastern Province. But now, I would like to say that unless the Government of India goes and declares a kind of unilateral ceasefire, nothing could be achieved.

Now my friend says, “You have turned to the BBC radio.” He is right. This is going to happen because the Government of India is not wanted anywhere. Mr. Premadasa says, “Because I am being attacked from all the sides, the Government of India should help me, that this army may continue here.” But the LTTE says, “The Government of India has no stake here, it has no role here, to talk to them whether in Singapore or in any other capital. They are going to concede, the Sri Lankan Government is going to concede.” If they concede, it is a loss of face. By spending Rs. 4 crores you have estranged the whole population, and the Tamil psyche in India you have deeply wounded. You may not see any reaction today. What I am trying to say is that you see only ripples today, but you have deeply wounded us. Some day or the other you will reap this reaction. In history there are umpteen number of examples. For a year there will be nothing, for two years there will be nothing. After a decade a man will come and say, “India has been responsible. We are treated as foreigners, as strangers in this country. You should understand our feelings.”

I would like to make a request through you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, to the hon. Minister and the Government that you have to go for a unilateral ceasefire. You may say, we have not declared war. Then, why have you asked for a ceasefire? This is all a semantic play. But I am not interested in this at all. You have to withdraw your army, you have to call for a ceasefire, and then you have to go for a permanent solution. But even then you will not be healing the wounds that you have inflicted on the Tamil psyche.

Only one submission I have to make on Tibet. Time and again we have read from all the newspapers that the Buddhist Monasteries are uprooted. Our Minister is a great scholar, I know for certain. When I hear him on very many podiums, I understand that he has got great scholarship. But I ask him, “Can you not in cate-

[Shri Valampuri John]

rical terms say that this kind of thing should not happen?" Monasteries are being uprooted, sacred texts, Buddhist texts are being torn, and they are being burnt. The other day I was told by Tibetans themselves, "There are sacred texts, tantra texts, Buddhist, Geeta and Lore. Rahul Sankritain, one of the greatest writers possible, went bare-foot, walked for 33 days for these sacred texts and arrived at Tibet. Such wonderful tantra texts are being burnt because they do not believe in them. The Tibetan children are forced to learn Chinese.

The entire Tibet is being trampled under beastly feet. Their culture is totally shattered, and all their beliefs have been belied. But the Government of India is sitting on the fence. Why is it that we are not commenting on that? Are we afraid of China? The fear psychosis has overtaken the whole nation. Before our own very eyes the land of Buddha is being totally massacred. Why have we not done anything? Why have we not said anything? Are we still interested in that hair-split, semantic play of suzerainty and sovereignty?

Thank you.

SHRIMATI BIJOYA CHAKRAVARTY: India is a very vast country having mighty neighbours like China and others like Nepal, Bangladesh, Pakistan and Sri Lanka. It is, of course, important to develop global relationship but it is more important to see what type of relationship we have with our neighbours with whom we have got borders. It is very unfortunate that our relationship with our neighbours having common border is not at all cordial. It is rather getting strained day by day. It directly affects not only our internal affairs, but our external situation also. India cannot of course, pursue a policy that is throughout non-economical, because since 42 years of our Independence, the situation in the world has undergone a tremendous change. It is true with Nepal also. There is also a change in Nepal from its geo-political point of view. As such there should be an adjustment in our dealings with Nepal. The Hon. Min-

ister says that India is ready to have talks with Nepal. I have also seen reports appearing in newspapers that Nepal is also ready to have good relationship with India. India is a mighty country. So, one step forward will be necessary to help ease the situation. It is possible that the External Affairs Ministry might be irritated by certain actions taken by the Nepal Government, but that should not influence while forming our policy towards Nepal. Petulant reactions should have no place in the international relationship. India is straining this relationship slowly and gradually. But it will also affect Bhutan. In today's newspapers a news item has appeared that Indians in Bhutan are living in constant fear. I come from a district bordering Bhutan. I know personally that our strained relationship with Nepal will affect the people doing petty business with Bhutan. They are now living in constant fear. Therefore, I urge upon the Hon. Minister to follow a realistic policy instead of following a chicken-hearted policy.

Both India and Nepal are members of the SAARC and it is imperative that the present deadlock between them is broken as early as possible. It is better for both the countries. Move and counter-move of retaliatory nature will simply worsen any prospect of reconciliation. Of course, as reported in papers Nepal imports sophisticated arms from China. It has evolved a new system of work permit and Nepal is not awarding industrial permits to the Indians. Probably that irritates the Hon. Minister. In spite of all these factors, this kind of pressure will not help to arrive at a solution that is urgently needed. India cannot afford to be censured by the adverse world opinion because Nepal is propagating that India has imposed an economic blockade. Since India is a bigger country, naturally India should not behave that way.

In Afghanistan, a full-scale war has been going on. According to reports two Divisions of Pakistan's Army with sophisticated arms from America are in Afghanistan. India is a neutral force. It can try to ease the situation by trying to mould the international opinion against the violation of the Geneva Agreement.

One major concern to our foreign policy is the relationship with Pakistan. We have got a love-hate relationship with Pakistan. It is true that Kashmir is the bone of contention between the two countries. A dialogue between the two should start instead of worrying about the position of nuclear bomb. There are people in both the countries having goodwill for the people living on the other side of the border.

Lakhs of people have come from Bangladesh in the North-Eastern region of India. The people coming from Bangladesh are a burden on Assam especially. I think up till now there was a serious dialogue between the two countries. (Time bell) Sir, I will finish after two minutes. I want to know from the hon. Minister what attitude the Government is adopting regarding Chakma refugees and the infiltrators who have come into the entire North-Eastern region including Assam.

So far as our policy on Sri Lanka is concerned, India's image has been badly damaged. Immature handling of Sri Lanka issue is evident in every move. The Indo-Sri Lanka Accord has been a liability and a sort of burden to all of us. Recently their Prime Minister declared that the IPKF will be withdrawn from Sri Lanka but I do not know when, Sir, I would like to know from the hon. Minister, by sending our IPKF what India has achieved. It simply proved counter-productive and we simply allowed some of our precious soldiers to die in Sri Lanka. Sir, there is now constant friend or foe in the international relationship which is more so in today's world. I feel that a realistic and a rational approach should be adopted in our foreign policy towards China, USA and Iran. China has not yet recognised Sikkim as part of India. On the other hand, recently India has given many concessions to China without getting anything in returns. Finally, I want to say that our policy will be successive only when you provide full security and protect our national interests to the fullest extent. I also want to know from the hon. Minister what action the Government proposes to take to ease the strained relationships with almost all the neighbouring countries. Thank you, Sir.

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह (बिहार) : माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, आपने मुझे समय दिया, इसके लिए बहुत आभारी हूँ। भारत की विदेश नीति के संबंध में जब आदमी बोलना शुरू करता है या सोचना शुरू करता है तो किसी भी विवेकशील व्यक्ति के लिए यह कहना मुश्किल होता है कि भारत की कोई विदेश नीति भी है या नहीं, क्योंकि किसी भी देश की जो विदेश नीति होती है तो उस विदेश नीति का एक सपना होता है और उसमें लगता है कि कोई दुर्गामी दृष्टि है और कुछ दूर तक वह दृष्टि चलने वाली है। वह नीति किसी देश के साथ या किसी ब्लाक के साथ चलती है तो कितनी दूर तक चलेगी, कम से कम दो साल, चार साल, दस साल, कुछ तो यह दृष्टि होनी चाहिए। लेकिन भारत की जो विदेश नीति है, आप देखेंगे कि यह बैलून की तरह से उड़ती है और उसमें सुरख हो जाता है तो बैलून नीचे आ जाता है। ठीक उसी तरह से यह भारत की विदेश नीति है। जब देश आजाद हुआ था तो छोटे छोटे राष्ट्रों को यह उम्मीद थी, तीसरी दुनिया के राष्ट्रों को उम्मीद थी कि भारत एक महान राष्ट्र है, बड़े देशों से, साम्राज्यवादी मुल्कों से इसको छुटकारा मिला है तो यह छोटे राष्ट्रों की अगुआई करेगा और सही मायनों में उनको विश्वास देगा, उनको आशा देगा। लेकिन जिस ढंग से हमारी विदेश नीति गुटनिरपेक्षता के नाम पर चली उसमें असल में जिस ढंग से इसकी सबल दृष्टि होनी चाहिए थी उस ढंग से दृष्टि नहीं हुई है, बल्कि नपुंसक की तरह से काम करते रहे। भारत की विदेश नीति, अगर कहा जाय तो हम एक शब्द में कह सकते हैं कि भारत की विदेश नीति नपुंसक की नीति है। भारत देखता रहता है अगर किसी बमजोर राष्ट्र की हत्या हो रही हो अगर कोई ताकतवर राष्ट्र किसी दूसरे कमजोर राष्ट्र का गला बसाता है तो भारत को गुट-निरपेक्ष राष्ट्र का एक सहजपूर्ण सदस्य होने के नाते कहना चाहिये और यह कहना चाहिये कि आपका गलती है। अगर कुछ ऐसा कहता है तो हम कह सकते हैं कि हम किसी गुट में नहीं हैं। लेकिन किसी गुट का ताकतवर राष्ट्र अगर किसी राष्ट्र के शत्रु प्रवृत्ति खोलता है तो भारत चुप हो जाता है और नपुंसक की तरह, तमाशबीन की तरह देखता रहता है। कभी भी ऐसा इतिहास नहीं है कभी भी उसने उचित ढंग से इसकी अगुवाई की हो, कहा

[श्री राम अवधेश सिंह]

हो और किसी ताकतवर राष्ट्र पर अंगुली उठाई हो और कहा हो कि आपने गलत काम किया है, स्को जब जब देश पर संकट आया, चाहे 1962 का चीन का आक्रमण हो या 1965 में पाकिस्तान के साथ हमारा युद्ध रहा हो, कभी भी किसी राष्ट्र ने आकर खड़े होकर यह नहीं कहा कि भारत सही रास्ते पर है और हम उस का साथ देंगे। यहां तक कि 1965 में कर्नल नासर जैसे नेहरू के मित्र ने भी आकर नहीं कहा कि भारत सही है और हम उसके साथ हैं। उस जमाने में, मुझे याद है कि सारी दुनिया में एक आदमी, एक राष्ट्र मलेशिया ने, और उसके प्रधानमंत्री टुंकु अब्दुल रहमान ने 1965 में कहा कि भारत सही है और हम उसको सहायता देंगे। टुंकु अब्दुल रहमान ने बाद में कुछ चंदा और कुछ सामग्री भारत को दी थी। लेकिन 1962 में और 1965 में कभी भी कोई राष्ट्र भारत के साथ आकर खड़ा नहीं हुआ।

मान्यवर, तिब्बत का जहां तक संवाल है, तिब्बत के संबंध में जो बयान चीन में हमारे प्रधानमंत्री ने दिया उससे बढ़कर बचकाना बयान कोई आदमी नहीं दे सकता है यह इतना बचकाना और नादाना भरा बयान है जिस पर पूरे राष्ट्र को खड़ा होना चाहिए और मैं समझता हूं कि संवेदनशीलता राष्ट्र की सर गई है। नहीं तो राजीव गांधी के इस बयान के खिलाफ पूरे मुल्क में आन्दोलन होना चाहिए था।

SHRI VISHWA BANDHU GUPTA:
What do you mean by BACHKANNA?

... (Interruptions) ...

SHRI RAM AWADHESH SINGH: I
am not yielding, Sir.

SHRI VISHWA BANDHU GUPTA:
May I request you to adhere to the issue?

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : बचकाना मैंने इसलिये कहा कि जैसा बच्चा बोलता है अगर वैसा कोई बोले तो उसको बचकाना कहते हैं इसलिये मैंने बचकाना कहा। बचकाना मैंने इसलिये भी कहा क्योंकि भारत का कोई भी विवेकशील प्रधानमंत्री यह नहीं चाहेगा कि दो शक्तिशाली राष्ट्रों के बीच में जो बफर स्टेट हो वह खतम हो जाय। यह बयान बेजिग में जाकर पता नहीं पालिश मारने के लिये या

मक्खन मारने के लिए किस हिसाब से उन्होंने दिया, यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आ रहा है। आगे आने वाली पीढ़ी इसको समझेगी। उनके नाना पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू ने कहा था कि चीन की सुजरेटी रहेगी और राजीव गांधी ने कहा कि चीन की तिब्बत पर सावरेटी रहेगी। सुजरेटी और सावरेटी में आप जानते हैं कि कितना फर्क है। सुजरेटी में किसी राष्ट्र की आटोनामी उसकी अपनी रहती है और सुजरेटी में उसकी आटोनामी खत्म हो जाती है। तो आप समझ लीजिये कि तिब्बत की असल हत्या राजीव गांधी के हाथों बेजिग में जाकर हो गई यह इतिहास के साथ भारी अपराध है, पाप है और इस पाप को आने वाली पीढ़ी नोट करेगी। और इतिहास भी नोट करेगा कि भारत का प्रधानमंत्री चीन में जाकर, बेजिग में जाकर एक राष्ट्र की हत्या की बचकाने ढंग से हत्या की। यह कोई साधारण अपराध नहीं है और मुझे अफसोस है कि संसद चल रही थी और संसद में इस विषय पर जम कर बहस नहीं हुई। विरोधी पक्ष को भी हम को कहना है कि छोटे-छोटे मुद्दे को लेकर विपक्ष ने यहां बवंडर खड़ा कर दिया लेकिन राष्ट्र की सरहद पर एक विदेशी ताकतों को खड़ा कर दिया तिब्बत को हत्या करने की साजिश कर दी भारत के प्रधानमंत्री ने लेकिन यहां के प्रतिपक्ष के नेताओं ने इस पर संसद में जोरदार ढंग से बहस नहीं उठाई जिस ढंग से उठानी चाहिये थी। इस बात का मुझे सख्त अफसोस है इनके व्यवहार पर भी मुझे अफसोस है (समय की घंटी)

श्री विश्व बन्धु गुप्ता : मैं आप से एग्री करता हूं जहां तक आपने अपोजीशन पार्टीज के बारे में कहा (व्यवधान)

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : उन्होंने अपनी भूमिका ठीक से नहीं निभाई है लेकिन सरकार ने जो हत्या की वह अक्षम्य है। इनका अपराध है कि इन्होंने इस सवाल को संसद में जिस ढंग से उठाना चाहिए था उस ढंग से नहीं उठाया। जहां तक श्रीलंका का सवाल है जिस समय समझौता हो कर आया था और यहां विदेश मंत्री जी का बयान हुआ था मैंने कहा था श्रीलंका का समझौता भारत के गले में हड्डी फंस गई तब नन्वर सिंह जी ने कहा था मुझे कोई हड्डी दिखायी नहीं पड़ती है मैंने कहा कि

तीन महीने के बाद आपको गले में हड्डी दिखाई पड़ेगी और तीन महीने के बाद गले में हड्डी दिखाई पड़ने लगी जब हमारी फौज वहाँ जाकर हमला करने लगी। जिन लोगों की सुरक्षा के लिए मई महीने में बिना लंका को सरकार के कहे हमने हैजोफाएज से, हवाई जहाज से दवाइयाँ भेजने के नाम पर, राहत भेजने के नाम पर हवाई जहाज दौड़ाए थे। उन्हीं लोगों को मारने हम गये तीन महीने के बाद। यह हमारी विदेशी नीति की सबसे बड़ी विफलता का प्रमाण है, अफाटय प्रमाण है। विदेश नीति के बारे में मैंने जैसे शुरू में कहा कि कोई राष्ट्र की विदेश नीति ऐसी बनती है जिससे एक सपना होना चाहिए, 10-20 साल का अन्तराल स्पष्ट दिखाई पड़ना चाहिए लेकिन जिस राष्ट्र की विदेश नीति तीन महीने में अपने पुराने कामों को पलट देना चाहती है और पलट देती है जिनकी रक्षा के लिए गए थे तीन महीने पहले फिर उनको मारने के लिए जाना पड़े उससे बढ़कर विदेश नीति की और क्या विफलता हो सकती है? यहां बेशर्मी से कहते हैं कि हमने बड़ा तीर मार लिया। यहां से फौज लेकर आए गये। आपका जो एम्बेस्डर है दीक्षित, उसको सैक कर देना चाहिए उसको फांसी पर चढ़ा देना चाहिए। ऐसे निकम्मे आदमी ने आपको गलतफहमी में डालकर कहा कि 24 घंटे में जाफना फाल कर जाएगा, 48 घंटे में दूसरा सिटी फाल कर जाएगा और 72 घंटे में हमारी फौज वहां कब्जा कर लेगी लेकिन दो वर्ष से ज्यादा हो गए हम वहां मार खा रहे हैं। विदेश मंत्री जी ने सदन में कबूल किया कि हमारे एक लाख लोग मारे गए, एक लाख लोग मारे गए क्यों मारे गए। यह रिकार्ड में है वन लैक आर्ड फोर्सेज डेड। मैं ऐसे नहीं बोल रहा हूँ।

श्री विश्व बंधु गप्ता : क्या कह रहे हैं आप, एक लाख किन लोगों की बात कर रहे हैं?

श्री पी० वी० नरसिंह राव : आप जरा सोच समझ कर कुछ पढ़-पढ़ कर कहेंगे तो ज्यादा अच्छा होगा। ऐसे हवाई बातें न करें... (व्यवधान)...

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Because Sri Lanka is India's Vietnam.

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : आप रिकार्ड चेक कर लीजिए। नटवर सिंह जी का बयान है (व्यवधान) मैं कोई दूसरी बात नहीं कर रहा हूँ तीन करोड़ रुपया आप खर्च कर रहे हैं। किस बात के लिए खर्च कर रहे हैं? मारने के लिए। किन लोगों को मारने के लिए? जिनके लिए आपको आंख से नहीं छेवड़ा से भी आंसू चलता था।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय) : अब आप समाप्त कीजिए। सात बज चुके हैं, आपको 12 मिनट ही गए हैं।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : पांच, छः मिनट और दे दीजिए।

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: He is dwelling on a very sensitive and serious subject. Kindly permit him to speak.

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI (Tamil Nadu): Kindly give him some more time.

7 P.M.

श्री लंका में आए गए और बचाने गए तो कौन सा आपका हित हुआ? अगर आपने खर्च किया, हमारी सेनाओं को क्षति पहुंचाई, मार दिलवाई, अगर उसके बाद भी आपको कुछ हाथ लग जाता वहां आपको कोई सफलता मिल जाती, कोई वर्ग आपकी प्रशंसा कर देता, तो सिहली तो पहले से गाली देते हैं लेकिन जो तमिल लोग हैं वे एक और गाली देने लगे, एक और दुश्मन हो गए। बिनके साथ आपकी दोस्ती हुई? तीन करोड़ रुपया प्रति दिन बहाकर राष्ट्र की क्षति करके आपने एक लाख सैनिकों को मरवाकर क्या पाया? आपको वहां जाने की जरूरत क्या थी? आपकी विदेश नीति का दिवालिया निकल गया, और यह सब से बड़ा दिवालिया की पहचान है और इस बिन्दु पर विदेश नीति में परिवर्तन करना चाहिए।

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: It is a policy of blood.

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : अब आप बुला रहे हैं और आपको बुलाना पड़ेगा क्योंकि प्रेमदास वहां का राष्ट्रपति हो गया, आप चाहें या नहीं चाहें, आपको तमाचा मारकर बाहर करेगा। आप वहां रह नहीं सकते। इसलिए

[श्री राम अवधेस सिंह]

इज्जत से जल्दी से जल्दी बाहर आ जाइये। जितना नुकसान राष्ट्र का आपने दिया उतना तो कर ही लिया, हर तरफ से नुकसान किया, धन की, दौलत की, सामान की, स्वाभिमान की सब आपने क्षति पहुंचाई।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय) : बस हो गया।

श्री राम अवधेस सिंह : एक मिनट और।

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: The agreement has blown on their faces.

श्री राम अवधेस सिंह : हां, आप ठीक कह रहे हैं। चीन के साथ जब 1962 में युद्ध हुआ तो इस संसद ने एक प्रस्ताव पास किया संकल्प लिया कि अब तब एक-एक इंच जमीन हम उससे नहीं छुड़ावेंगे तब तक शांत नहीं होगी। लेकिन आज तब एक इंच भी जमीन नहीं छुड़ाई। कहा था कि एक इंच भी जमीन उसके कब्जे में नहीं रहने देंगे। एक-एक इंच छुड़ावेंगे और तब हम उससे समझौता करेंगे। समझौता करेंगे या बात करेंगे और उसने न एक इंच जमीन छोड़ी और न आपने इंच भी उससे जमीन छुड़ाई और जाकर एक-तरफा सरंडर कर दिया। यह राष्ट्र के स्वाभिमान के खिलाफ है, इससे राष्ट्र का स्वाभिमान गिरता है। मैं समझता हूं कि विदेश नीति आप ठीक से बनाइये। खाली यह कहते रहिएगा कि हम गुट-निरपेक्ष हैं, नान-एलाइनमेंट मूवमेंट के लीडर हो गए तो आप अपनी पीठ पुजवाते रहिए, चापलूस लोग आपकी पीठ पुजते रहेंगे। लेकिन पीठ पुजवाते रहने से आपकी विदेश नीति कोई राष्ट्र के हित में अच्छा रिजल्ट देने वाली नहीं है। इसमें मौलिक सुधार करना पड़ेगा। गुटनिरपेक्ष की नपुंसक नीति के बजाय आप दुनिया के तीसरे खेमे के लोग, मतलब कि तीसरी दुनिया के तमाम कमजोर राष्ट्रों का नायक बसिए। उनके हितों की रक्षा के लिए आप एक सबल नेतृत्व दोजिए, जो आप नहीं दे सकते हैं क्योंकि आप तो भिखारी की तरह घूमते फिरते हैं सब के यहाँ बाउल ले करके, बटोरा ले करके, हमको दाता दे दो, हमको दाता दे दो, तो दाता मांगते छल की विदेश नीति कहीं नहीं होती है। किसी भिखारी की विदेश नीति नहीं चल सकती है। न गांव में

किसी भिखारी की जिसके कि अपने घर में खाना नहीं हो, उसकी गांव में कोई बात नहीं सुनता है और दुनिया में भी उसकी कोई बात नहीं सुनेगा, जो अपने हाथ में बटोरा ले कर मांगते फिरते कि इसमें जरा दे दो, इसमें जरा दे दो। सब से आप मांगते फिरते तो सब से पहले अपने देश की जो अर्थ नीति है उसको आप ठीक करिए अर्थ नीति ठीक किए बिना विदेश नीति नहीं हो सकती है। अभी इस पर बहस होनी चाहिए। हमारे यहाँ जितने हम पैस बाहर से लेकर लाते हैं पब्लिक सेक्टर में वह पब्लिक सेक्टर उसको लूट लेते हैं और फिर नया टैक्स लगाना पड़ता है, फिर नया कर्ज लेना पड़ता है और फिर बटोरा ले कर उन्हीं बड़े राष्ट्रों के यहाँ घूमते हैं कि दाता दे दो, दाता दे दो। वह उसमें देते रहते हैं और फिर हम यहाँ से अपनी पीठ पुजवाते फिरते हैं। हम तो तीस मार खाते हैं, हमने उसको पीट दिया, हमने उसको कार दिया ऐसा काम चलने वाला नहीं है। इसलिए तीसरी दुनिया के कमजोर राष्ट्रों का एक नया ब्लाक बनाना होगा। डा. राम मनोहर लोहिया ने कहा था विदेश नीति के बारे में कि नपुंसक गुट-निरपेक्षता देश का स्वाभिमान नहीं दिला सकती। तीसरी दुनिया का नेतृत्व करना होगा, तीसरी दुनिया का गुलबंद करना होगा। खाली नान-एलाइनमेंट मूवमेंट करने से आपकी कोई बात बनने वाली नहीं है। जब किसी कमजोर राष्ट्र पर कोई बड़ा राष्ट्र चढ़ जाता है और फिर आप चुपी साधे रखते हैं तो आपकी कलाई खुल जाती है कि आप कितने गुट-निरपेक्ष हैं। उस समय सब लोग कहते हैं कि यह नपुंसक है। आप याद रखिए नपुंसक का दुनिया में कोई साथ नहीं देता। यह बिल्कुल सीधी और तीखी बात है। यह बात आपको पसंद नहीं आएगी, लेकिन यह बात सच्ची है, कड़वी सच्ची है।

इसके साथ-साथ तिब्बत के संबंध में मैं चाहूंगा कि विदेश मंत्री जी बताएं कि आपकी नीति क्या होगी? क्या आप सुजरेण्टो को मानेंगे। इसको आप स्पष्ट बता दें क्योंकि जबहिरलाल जी ने तो सुजरेण्टो की बात कही थी... (व्यवधान)...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय) : आप रिपिटेशन कर रहे हैं।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : मैं चाहता हूँ, उपाध्यक्ष जी, कि जब माननीय मंत्री इस पर बोलें, अपना जवाब दें तो स्पष्ट जवाब दें कि चीन की तिब्बत पर सुजरेण्टी मानेंगे या सोवरेण्टी मानेंगे ?

नेपाल से संबंध हमारे खराब हुए हैं। उसमें आप किस तरह से सुधार कर सकते हैं ? नेपाल से संबंध बिगड़ने का बहुत खराब मतलब होगा। बिहार की सरहदा नेपाल से मिलती है और हम लोग रात-दिन नेपाल के अमल-बगल में रहते हैं। वैसे तो इसका असर पूरे देश पर पड़ेगा, लेकिन हम लोगों को तत्काल ही इसका असर भुगतना पड़ेगा।

अन्त में मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि पाकिस्तान के साथ हमारी दृष्टि साफ होनी चाहिए। पाकिस्तान के साथ अन्य देशों जैसा भारत का रिश्ता नहीं रह सकता है। पाकिस्तान हमारा भाई है और भाई के साथ भाई जैसा रिश्ता रहना चाहिए। इस संबंध में डा० लोहिया ने कहा था — भारत-पाक महासंघ बनाने की कोई लंबी नीति या बड़ा सपना देखना चाहिए।
... (व्यवधान) ...

श्री विश्व बन्धु गुप्ता : जैसा महाभारत में भाइयों का रिश्ता था, वैसा रहेगा।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : नहीं-नहीं, आप गलती मत करिए।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय) : यह उनका इशारा है कि रिश्तों में सुधार होना चाहिए।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : तो दूसरे राष्ट्रों के साथ भाई चारा और दोस्ती चल सकती है,

लेकिन भाई के साथ तो भाई जैसा रिश्ता रहेगा या दुश्मनी जैसा रहेगा क्योंकि भाई भाई में या तो दुश्मनी होती है, या नहीं तो भाई जैसा रिश्ता रहता है, दोस्ती नहीं हुआ करती और यह विश्वव्यापी सत्य है। तो पाकिस्तान के साथ हमारा रिश्ता या तो भाई भाई का होगा या फिर दुश्मनी का रिश्ता होगा, बीच का रिश्ता नहीं चल सकता। इसलिए हमारी राय है कि पाकिस्तान के साथ हमारा रिश्ता अच्छा होना चाहिए क्योंकि पाकिस्तान जनता और भारत की जनता में बहुत गहरा रिश्ता है, यहां के रिश्तेदार वहां हैं और वहां के रिश्तेदार यहां। मैं मानता हूँ कि हमारा दोस्ती अमरिका से हो सकती है, रूस से हो सकती है चीन से हो सकती है, यूजीयंड और आस्ट्रेलिया से हो सकती है, लेकिन पाकिस्तान से हमारी दृष्टि भिन्न होगी। बांग्ला देश से हमारी दृष्टि भिन्न होगी। इसलिए भारत के विदेश-मंत्रालय को भारत-पाक-बांग्ला महासंघ का सपना देखना चाहिए क्योंकि जब तक कोई एक बड़ा महासंघ नहीं बनेगा, तब तक हमारे बीच में बड़े राष्ट्र और खासकर के साम्राज्यवादी मुल्क कोई न कोई अड़ंगा डालते रहेंगे, कोई न कोई नई चीजें पैदा करते रहेंगे कि हमारे संबंध आपस में बिगड़े रहें और हमारी अर्थ-व्यवस्था पर उसका दबाव रहे। धन्यवाद।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय) : चर्चा समाप्त हुई। अगले कार्य-दिवस में विदेश मंत्री जी इसका उत्तर देंगे। अब उठते हैं।
पुनः मंगलवार, 2 मई 1989 को पूर्वाह्न 11-00 बजे बैठेंगे

The House then adjourned at ten minutes past seven of the clock till eleven of the clock on Tuesday, the 2nd May, 1989.