

SHRI K.P. SINGH DEO: Sir, since he has got information, I shall profit by it. I will have to collect from official sources whether there is at all an application for *dahi* or not. how can I just give a hypothetical answer to a hypothetical question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You collect and give the information.

SHRI K.P. SINGH DEO: But charity begins at home, Sir, in West Bengal.

NAM Summit in Columbia

*42. SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Will the Minister of EXTERNAL AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) what are the subjects discussed at the Eleventh Summit of Non-Aligned Movement held at Cartagena in Columbia;

(b) the details of the resolutions passed or declaration adopted at the end of the Summit meeting; and

(c) what is the future role envisaged for NAM in international relations?

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE): (a) to (c) The Eleventh Conference of Heads of State/Government of Non-Aligned Countries held in Cartagena, Colombia from 14-20 October, 1995, focussed on the continuing relevance and role of NAM in changed international situation and NAM's priorities, goals and response to new challenges. The Final Document and a short declaration entitled "Call from Colombia" adopted at the conclusion of the NAM Summit pronounced on a range of issues including the review of international situation, role of the Movement, international security and disarmament including nuclear disarmament, question of UN reforms, development, human rights, social issues and South-South Cooperation. The Summit documents, adopted after in-depth deliberations, reaffirm the continuing validity and relevance of the principles and objectives of NAM and

stress that the Movement should work towards cooperation and a sense of full partnership in the international field for the promotion of peace and social and economic development. The Movement has a major role in shaping the future of international relations as it provides an important platform to its 113 member states to project their collective positions on issues of interest to the Movement.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Mr. Chairman, I agree with the hon. Minister that the relevance of NAM is very much there in the world because there is disparity between the developed and the developing countries. Sir, to my mind and also from the information which I gathered, bilateral issues should not be raised in the NAM Summit. But, to my surprise, I find, Sir, that one of our neighbouring countries, Pakistan raised bilateral issues. Only multilateral issues have to be raised according to NAM's Charter. And India gave a fitting reply. The Prime Minister and the Foreign Affairs Minister gave a fitting reply. Sir, I would like to know from the hon. Minister, when there is a specific understanding among the member-countries of NAM that bilateral issues should not be raised, why those issues were raised and why those issues were allowed to be raised by the countries and why India had to go and reply to those issues.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Sir, there are norms in NAM and other international organisations which are basically meant for discussing multilateral issues concerning all countries. But if somebody raises it, there is no way you can get out of it. While making observations if a Prime Minister or the head of a delegation makes a point, then the only way left is to reply because there is no mechanism by which you can gag a member or stop or prevent him from making his observation. The norms have to be followed and observed, but if somebody does not follow the norms, he only incurs the displeasure of others, as it

happened in other international conferences. When this issue was raised, the Chairman had to intervene and say that bilateral issues should not be raised.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Sir, at the Jakarta NAM Conference in 1992, as well as at the recent Columbia Conference, a Resolution relating to a ban on nuclear tests by all countries was adopted unanimously. At the same time, we find that China and France have conducted nuclear tests. Therefore, the question arises as to the relevance of NAM. While some countries have a moratorium on nuclear tests, some other countries—for example, our neighbouring country as well as France—have conducted nuclear tests. When this is the position, what would be the effect of passing these Resolutions? How are we going to implement it effectively?

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Sir, what the hon. Member has said is correct. Even when the question of indefinite extension of the NPT was being discussed at New York, even at that point of time, a particular country resorted to nuclear tests. Again, after the decision to extend the NPT indefinitely was taken, another country carried out nuclear tests. International protests were recorded against these tests.

Now, all the NAM countries are not signatories to the NPT; like India, for example. We are not a signatory, but quite a few others are signatories to the NPT. Between the Jakarta Summit and the Columbia Conference, the difference was this. At the time of the Jakarta Summit, there was no decision in regard to the indefinite extension of the NPT. The issue was still open at that point of time. But in the middle of the current year, the decision was taken at New York. There too, despite the efforts, unfortunately, the Member-States of NAM, when they participated at the New York Conference as Member-States of the NPT, could not formulate a common position.

Therefore, the Resolution we have

adopted has relevance in this sense. If we want to have a nuclear-war-free world, if that is our ultimate objective, the elimination of nuclear weapons is essential. The thesis that the possession of nuclear weapons by some countries would act as a deterrent to others is not valid. We do not accept it. Even in respect of those countries which are not resorting to nuclear tests, we cannot come to the conclusion that they would not add to their nuclear arsenal. Some of them are conducting tests on computers. The sophisticated technology which they have developed helps them to improve and refine their weapons without resorting to physical tests. Some of the nuclear weapon States which do not have this technology are conducting physical tests. None of the nuclear weapon States have committed themselves that they would not make any vertical expansion. That is the reason why we are persistently opposing that this Treaty is inadequate, it is discriminatory and it is unequal, and that it cannot prevent the nuclear proliferation, at least, vertically.

Still, the Resolutions by NAM have relevance. This is a large body. Out of the 185 countries in the United Nations, 113 countries are in the non-aligned movement. In addition, a large number of countries are enjoying observer status, guest status. This is the largest forum. Therefore, what they say has some influence over the decision-making.

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र: सभापति महोदय, मैं मंत्री महोदय से जानना चाहता हूँ कि इंडिया का जो स्ट्रॉंग पॉइंट है जैसे सेकुलरिज्म है, यह क्यों नहीं रेज किया जाता है कि दुनिया में हर जगह सेकुलरिज्म रहना चाहिए क्योंकि हमारे पड़ोस के देश में लोग धार्मिक राज्य के आधार पर हम से टकराते हैं और सेकुलरिज्म मानव जाति को मानना चाहिए, तो सेकुलरिज्म का सवाल क्यों नहीं उठाया जाता है? दूसरा उसी तरह का सवाल है कि अमेरिका में "क्लर प्रिजुडिस" है। अभी ओवर ए मिलियन पीपुल्स ने वहां डिमॉन्स्ट्रेशन किया था। तो हमारी सरकार इस बात को क्यों नहीं उठाती है कि "क्लर प्रिजुडिस" दुनिया में समाप्त होना चाहिए। और घरेलू मामले में अमेरिकी इंटरवेंशन होता है, अभी हमारे यहां

एक सिख नेता की गिरफ्तारी हुई और प्रेसिडेंट क्लिंटन विरोध करते हैं कि यहां एक आदमी की गिरफ्तारी हुई, अमेरिका में बहुतों की गिरफ्तारी हुई, आप क्यों नहीं उठाते हैं? एक यह भावना हो रही है कि हमारी सरकार नॉन अलाइनमेंट मूवमेंट को जो लीड करती थी, अब घुटने टेकू नीति अख्तियार कर रही है। तो इससे हम लोगों को बचना चाहिए, यह राष्ट्रीय प्रतिष्ठा का सवाल है। इसलिए हम मंत्री महोदय से कहेंगे कि यह कलर प्रिजुडिस और सेकुलरिज्म का क्वेश्चन and the question of American intervention in the domestic affairs of another country—why are these questions not being raised by India as they used to be earlier? Indian prestige is going down: people abroad think that India is surrendering.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Sir, I do not understand what the hon. Member tried to convey. If the role of the Non-Aligned Movement against apartheid....

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: I can repeat it.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: I have understood, but he has brought in everything—colour prejudice, secularism and India's prestige going down. The point is, if the hon. Member wanted to ask whether the Non-Aligned Movement has only role to play in the fight against apartheid, I would say that it is only this Movement which took it up. We have achieved that objective. And India is the country which....

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: That was not my question. I have made it clear.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Then please repeat your question.

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: Over a million people had demonstrated against colour prejudice in the United States—and you don't speak about that. That's why the message goes to the world that India is not leading the Movement. This is the precise question. Don't put it in general. I have particularly mentioned secularism in the context of the present-day world—that is the strongest point of India—and the world is not considering

this question. They are equating Pakistan with India. It is a fact that we stand for secularism whereas Pakistan stands for theocracy. Why don't you raise all these questions and also about American intervention in the domestic affairs of other countries? These are the questions, but don't generalize them and don't preach us. We are old people and we know what India used to stand for.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Sir, the problem is, the hon. Member knows too much! What I was saying is, this conference was basically meant to review global issues, and when we reviewed global issues, surely the question of racial discrimination was an important element, and the Non-Aligned Movement has expressed its views very strongly against racial discrimination. It has expressed its views, very strongly, against racial discrimination, against apartheid and against fundamentalism, and that is why the main point which I referred to in the context of the question was that all these issues were raised and India played a major role in formulating the Draft Declaration, in formulating the Columbia call, where on these important issues the concern of the non-aligned countries was expressed—against racial discrimination, against apartheid, against the new mode of protectionism and against the policies of interventionism. These issues have been raised and we have expressed our concern. We have formulated our views and in the process of drafting the document—which reflects the views of the Member-States—India played a major role.

DR. GOPALRAO VITHALRAO PATIL: Sir, I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether—while an important discussion is going on in the world about the expansion of the Security Council of the UNO during its Golden Jubilee celebrations—the subject of expansion of the Security Council was discussed at NAM. As you know, Sir, there are more than 184 members in the United Nations and representation in the Security

Council as permanent members is limited only to five countries. Therefore, I want to know whether this important subject was discussed at NAM. I think many more NAM countries should be represented in this very important body. More importantly, India has got a very major role to play in the NAM, and the Security Council—where we deserve a seat. So, in that respect I want to know whether any discussion has taken place about India's representation in the Security Council and what was the response from the NAM countries to the proposal of India getting a seat in the Security Council. India is the largest democratic and peace-loving country and a regional power. It has helped the United Nations in peace-keeping operations. It has fulfilled all its obligations. Therefore, it deserves a seat in the Security Council. Has any effort been made in this regard, and what was the response of the NAM countries?

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Sir, in fact, this issue of reform of the United Nation, expansion of the membership of the Security Council, both in the permanent and the non-permanent categories, was raised. The NAM Declaration has clearly spelt out that expansion of the membership in both the categories, the permanent category and the non-permanent category, should take place. The Declaration has gone to the extent of suggesting that any expansion without including the NAM member countries would not be acceptable to the Movement. Specifically, it has been suggested that there should be more representation from Asia, Africa and Latin America.

No country-specific resolution was adopted because that is not the practice. Here, we shall have to work very hard to evolve a consensus among the NAM countries themselves so that we can take a common position. But, the difference between the last summit and this summit is that here we have emphasised that there should be expansion in both the

categories that in the expanded categories, both permanent and non-permanent, members belonging to the NAM should be included and that any expansion without them would not be acceptable to the Movement.

डा० बापू कालदास: सभापति महोदय, नेम में जो सम्मिलित देश हैं उनमें से अधिकांश देश विकासशील देश हैं। हाल ही में कुछ साल पहले जो गेट एग्रीमेंट साईन हुआ है उसका निश्चित असर इन सभी देशों पर पड़ता होगा। क्या इस नेम में औपचारिक रूप से या अनौपचारिक रूप से गेट के बाद होने वाली परिस्थिति में जो आर्थिक प्रक्रिया होगी और परिणाम होंगे उसके बारे में कोई चर्चा हुई है और अगर चर्चा हुई है तो जो अलग-अलग देश हैं खासकर विकासशील देश हैं, उनकी भावनाएं क्या हैं?

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Sir out of 113 member-countries of the NAM, quite a large number of them are also contracting parties to the new WTO, the old GATT.

Therefore, the voice has been expressed in the economic part of the Declaration that in the WTO, in the name of extraneous issues, either in the form of human rights or environment or social clause, new protectionism should not be allowed to come in and that new non-tariff barriers should not be raised.

In addition to that, in regard to two very important organisations of the UNO, which are helpful to developing countries, the UNCTAD and the UNIDO, an attempt was made by industrialised countries to wind up these two organisations. The NAM has reiterated that these two organisations are very relevant and important for developing countries and that they should be strengthened, instead of being wound up.