

[No, hon. Member dissented.]

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:
Permission to remain absent is granted.

There is one more small item.

THE MINISTER OF COMMERCE WITH ADDITIONAL CHARGE OF THE MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY): Madam, we should wish Shri Karanjia speedy recovery.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:
We wish him speedy recovery so that he can come and take oath.

Now, there is a Paper to be laid on the Table.

PAPER LAID ON THE TABLE

The Post Office Recurring Deposit (Amendment) Rules, 1991

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI DIGVIJAY SINGH): Madam, I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (3) of section 15 of the Government Savings Bank Act, 1873, a copy (in English and Hindi) of the Ministry of Finance (Department of Economic Affairs) Notification G.S.R. No. 16(E), dated the 9th January, 1991 publishing the Post Office Recurring Deposit (Amendment), Rules, 1991. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-2119.]

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:
Now, Mr. Shiv Shanker please.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER (Gujarat): Madam Deputy Chairman, at the outset,....

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:
Mr. Shiv Shanker, I am sorry, Mr. Rathwa is there. I thought he was not there. This is because of the change in the seating arrangement. I was looking for him that side and he turns out to be this side.

THE MINISTER OF COMMERCE WITH ADDITIONAL CHARGE OF THE MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY): you are disoriented.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:
The House is disoriented. Not me. Mr. Rathwa to lay the Report of the Railway Convention Committee now.

REPORT OF RAILWAY CONVENTION COMMITTEE

श्री राम सिंह राठवा (गुजरात):
उपसभापति महोदया, मैं आपकी अनुमति से 1991-92 के वर्ष के लिए लाभार्थ की दर तथा अन्य अनुषंगिक मामलों के संबंध में रेलवे अभिसमय समिति (1989) के तीसरे प्रतिवेदन की एक प्रति (अंग्रेजी तथा हिंदी में) सभा पटल पर रखता हूँ।

DISCUSSION ON GULF WAR AND ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION THEREON—Contd.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Madam Deputy Chairman, let me, at the very outset, extend my sincere compliments to President Gorbachev for his eight-point peace plan for the settlement of the Gulf crisis. I also congratulate President Saddam Hussain for having accepted the proposals of the Soviet President. I have no doubt that in the Resolution that we have agreed to pass in the House today, we will make sufficient provision for our compliments and congratulation for these proposals which have found acceptance. I am also confident that the world community at the United Nations will seize this opportunity and see to it that these proposals are accepted by the Allies, particularly, the United States of America.

Having said this, I would like to make one point clear. In fact, it is so obvious. Nobody has any doubt about the result of the war. I am sure, even President Saddam Hussain

knew what was to be the result of the war. This war, no doubt, produces a tremendous economic crisis in its fall out. It will have tremendous repercussions. But I would not like to go into those details at this stage. But we should be concerned about four aspects which I have tried to list out. It should be a matter of concern to all of us. Before making my submissions on these aspects, I would prefer to list them out first. This war has taken a dimension which, in my view, firstly has given an impression that there is an erosion in the effectiveness and the credibility of the role of the United Nations. Secondly, in an emerging unipolar system, in the wake of the cessation of the cold war, an impression is gaining that the United States has become an international policeman. thirdly, an impression is going round that there is erosion in the effectiveness of the non-aligned movement. And lastly, there is a clear impression that we, the Indians, are departing from the well accepted chosen path of our foreign policy.

SHRI MOHAMMED AFZAL alias MEEM AFZAL (Uttar Pradesh): Not Indians, but the Indian Government.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: You do not say 'Indians'

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: I am saying this because you should not forget an issue which had been raised sometime back. I am not going into it. I never wanted to go into it but the order that was passed was in the wake of the occupation of Kuwait by Iraq and the preparation by the United States for the military action started since then, and we have allowed the refuelling of those transport systems which were carrying the military weapons. Let us not forget all these things. I am not going into it, let us not go into those issues. That is why generally, I said let us not blame this or that Government. Where the Government of the day has to be

blamed, I am certainly going to blame it.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: It is not the question of refuelling. If the question is deviation from the policy of peace and non-alignment, obviously a Government has to be blamed, not the people of the country. You used the words 'we, Indians', but the Indians are not deviating, Thousands of Indians are parading on the streets of our country.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: My friends will agree with me that whatever 'A' Government does, impression abroad will be *qua* India. That impression, sophisticated impression will not go that Indians are different from the Indian Government. Let us be very clear about it. I have put it in a generic term. Let us not stand on the technicalities.

SHRI MOHAMMAD AFZAL alias MEEM AFZAL: What is going on in Pakistan? Whatever the Pakistan Government is going, people of Pakistan are not with the acts of the Government. (Interruptions) Similarly, whatever Saudi Arabia is doing, Arabs are not agreeing with that.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: I will substantiate every word that I have said. I would stick to my gun.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: Will you yield for a minute? I will only say that when this request came for refuelling before, the Prime Minister, V. P. Singh, it was rejected.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: I said, the impression is going round. I very categorically said, an impression is going down.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Do not use the word 'Indians'. The other day there was a news item ...

(Interruptions). During the Vietnam war, US warships were allowed for refuelling, repairs, etc., at the Cochin shipyard during Mrs. Gandhi's regime.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: So what?

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: It is on record.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: I am saying something and you are saying something else... (Interruptions)...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: It is only breeding darkness. He is doing a tightrope walk. I understand his difficulty but, despite his difficulty he should be categorical and he should not be doing this tightrope walking.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: I have never done it. I am sorry that my friend says so, but whatever I have said, I have not done any tightrope walking. I have made my position clear.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: US warships were allowed during Mrs. Gandhi's regime ... (Interruptions)...

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: So many things happened ... (Interruptions)...

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Mr. Moynihan has gone on record.. (Interruptions). Electronic equipment was allowed to be set up during the Indo-China war ... (Interruptions)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Dipen Ghosh, you will also be getting your time to speak and air your viewpoints. Let the discussion go on in a harmonious atmosphere, very orderly.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: But Indians cannot be blamed. The Indian Government, yes, whether Indira Gandhi's Government, Rajiv Gandhi's Government or this Government.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can wait. You are permitted to air your views when your time comes. Let Mr. Shiv Shanker speak now.

श्री मोहम्मद अफ़्जल उर्फ़ मीन अफ़्जल : मैडम, मैं एक बात शिक्कर साहब से कहूंगा। जो कुछ भी बात उन्होंने कही है उससे... (अवधान)

उपसभापति : आपको समय मिलना, जब आपका टाइम आएगा, आप बोल लीजिएगा। वह यीश्व नहीं कर रहे हैं। यह आपकी ही पार्टी का समय है। आपको जो कुछ बोलना है, आप जरूर बोलिए लेकिन अभी उन्हें तो बोलने दीजिए। ज़रा टाइम से चलना चाहिए।

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER. Madam I do not like people trying to say that at no point of time anybody has not made mistakes, including those who are pleading here... (Interruptions)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now he is throwing a lot of light!
... (Interruptions)...

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Not me! I have never thrown my light on anyone. My colour is such that it cannot throw any light!
... (Interruptions)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is always in the limelight!

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER Madam, therefore, no purpose will be served by trying to blame each other on a serious issue like this. I was speaking in the context of the Gulf crisis and the impression that is going round. I refer to it and would like to expatiate these issues in greater detail.

Madam, in this crisis one thing has emerged as how forcical the international system is: One set of morals is superseded by yet another set of morals which stare in the face of the United Nations, and, in my submission, the United Nations has become a verry helpless spectator. Nobody justifies the occupation of Kuwait by Iraq. But the question that has to be

asked is has not this war transgressed the contents of Resolution 678 of the Security Council? In simple terms, the Security Council had ordained that it should be the vacation of Kuwait *per se*, but now the war has spread to entire Iraq. What all is happening today is what the United States desires to destroy the Iraqi power.

This impression is clearly confirmed by the State of the Union Address dated 29th January by President George Bush when he said, and I quote:

"We do not seek destruction of Iraq, its culture or its people. Rather we seek an Iraq that uses its great resources not to destroy, not to serve the ambitions of a tyrant, but to build a better life for itself and its neighbours."

The British, in my submission, had been more candid. It was on the 27 of January that the Defence Secretary, Tom King, told the BBC that the coalition parties' aim went beyond the liberation of Kuwait. Naturally, it means that the United States and its allies seek to re-impose the control over the Middle-East. The war is not confined to vacation by Iraq of Kuwait itself. There seem to be certain farther designs. Those designs are to see that the entire control is gained in the Middle-East so that the oil economy could be at the behest of the United States and its allies.

I have no manner of doubt that after this war the monarchies in the Middle-East will ever continue, and the situation will develop in such a form that perhaps the international community will have to face much more problems than what confront us today. That is why, when I started I said that the United States was usurping the position of an international policeman. Unfortunately, there seems to be no adequate or there seems to be inadequate protest from any quarter whatsoever against this action on the part of the United States.

If we slightly go into the background, Madam, we will find that the American design to intervene in the Gulf was not the result of the vote by the Security Council or the international community. It was Washington which decided the date, rhythm, bottom-line of the attack itself. If we, usefully recall, it was on the 7th of November that President George Bush went to the extent of even asserting that they could take action against Iraq under Article 51 of the United Nations Charter on the representation made by the Emir of Kuwait. I am not very clear how, after three months of the occupation of Kuwait, Article 51 could have been invoked by George Bush.

And if I correctly recall, on the next day the Secretary-General of the United Nations repudiated this claim. He said when the Security Council is seized of the entire issue, the United States unilaterally cannot take action in any form. But, unfortunately, the situation, as it has emerged, has ultimately come to a pass where the United States which was obviously preparing itself to punish Iraq right from the 2nd of August of 1990, has seized the opportunity and gone ahead based on the Resolution 678. The Secretary-General in his press interview to the Italian Weekly, *PANORAMA*, which was published on 28th January, had to go on record to say that the war was not the war of the United Nations against Iraq, but added that they only gave the permission for the war and the Security Council had merely gone on record to give the permission. It is a very strange position. If this is the state of affairs where the Security Council has to merely give permission for the purpose of the war particularly in the developing unipolar system, which has emerged in the wake of the cessation of the cold war, I have a fear that one nation will assume the position of an international policeman and would bully any nation in

[Shri P. Shiv Shanker]

the world and will dictate everything. Now, what happens is that even the technologies will have to be received from one nation. This is a very peculiar situation to which we have come to and it is this situation which has side-tracked the Soviet Union and is making the non-aligned movement totally helpless and the world situation to fall in the grip of one nation. (Interruptions) I said one nation. I have not used any bad word. This, in my view, should be a concern for the world community. It is not just the question of Iraq today. As I said, I have grave doubts about the very existence of various Governments in the Middle East itself. This is going to be the fallout. And the manner in which the Indian Government has cowed down itself gives an impression as to where do we stand. What has happened to our non-aligned policy? The assertiveness with which we used to approach the international community in resolving the issues was not seen. We used to seize the opportunity for the purpose of resolving the issues. Now, where are we today? I am just asking myself. Is it because the United Nations has assumed the position of an international policeman that we are coming down on our knees? What has happened? This is a matter of introspection for us. It is a matter of great concern. With slight details which I will give at a later stage, if India could behave in this form, I am sure no nation in the third world can stand up. In the developing world the nations look at us, not that we would like to usurp the leadership, but we certainly had been guiding the destinies of the various nations for a world order which reigned in peace on this hemisphere. But if this is not going to happen, I am sorry to say that things will be much worse. As I said this question or this situation raises serious problems in the unipolar world which might ultimately negative the entire alternative sources of supply of technology system itself. What had been

the behaviour of this international policeman? Has America not acted every time to suit for its own interests? Let us just go into the past. Why is it when Gaza strip was occupied by Israel action was not taken? What happened to the resolutions of the United Nations at that time? What happened to the West Bank portion, Madam, at that time? Why did not the United States seize the opportunity for the purpose of acting and seeing to it that the balance is maintained in the Middle East? Why is it that the moment Kuwait was occupied by Iraq, the preparations for teaching lessons to Iraq were taken up. As I said, I am not for a moment justifying the occupation of Kuwait by Iraq. All of us are very clear in our minds that whatever may be the past, whatever may be the claims of Iraq, Iraq should not have occupied Kuwait. If we just go into a little past the United States of America invaded Panama. With what justification? Equally Granada. They toppled Allende and supported the apartheid regime of Africa. They got Mandela arrested. This is a matter of history. They supported the corrupt dictatorship regime of Maroos in Philippines and Pinochet in Chile. This very United States of America supported Saddam Hussein in the war against Iran. What is the rationale? To me it appears that there is no other rationale except their own interests. That is why I said I have a fear that a time might come when every country in the world may have to live at the mercy of the United States. A situation might develop in that form and it is this which must cause more concern to us. If we have to learn any lesson from Gulf crisis, it is this which is most important.

Just hardly about two years in office, President Bush has committed the United States forces to intervene in the foreign countries on quite a few occasions. Let us remember on this occasion, the deployment of U.S. planes over Philippine's air bases to

protect President Aquino from a military coup, in an almost casual deployment when George Bush was discussing much more serious matter with President Gorbachev in Malta. Let us recall, the invasion of Panama, the landing of U.S. marines in Liberia, to free the western civilians; and a similar exercise in Somalia; all within two years. Have there not been military incursions by the United States in these countries during the regime of President George Bush? What is their record? Are they fighting for justice? And they call it the new international order. What type of new international order, they would like to have in this world—the world at their dictates, the weak countries to totally subjugate themselves at the will and pleasure of the United States? As I said—I will repeat it again—I am not, for a moment, supporting, in any form, the action of Iraq in occupying Kuwait, notwithstanding the fact that Iraq and President Saddam Hussein had been consistent friends of India. Let us remember how he supported us even during the Bangladesh war. He had been consistently with us and so much so that in spite of this Government committing the mistakes—which I am going to refer—deviating from our chosen path, Iraq has requested that we should protect their interests in Egypt. What a great confidence! (Interruptions).

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: At the same time, Iraq protested against the refuelling. Please refer to that also.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: I will come to it in a different form. (Interruptions).

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY (Tamil Nadu): Running with the hare and hunting with the hound is the policy of the Government and of your party.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: That is all right. What had been your policy? Do you want me to say that?

I am sorry, don't provoke me. I refuse to be provoked. (Interruptions).

Madam, I was trying to say about the ineffectiveness of the NAM. I am sure the non-aligned countries could have unitedly stood up immediately after the 2nd of August to exert our pressure on both Iraq and the United States. I have no manner of doubt that we would not have faced, the situation which has now come to pass and which we have to face. I am not blaming anyone. But history is replete with instances when we Indians took the initiative on all the occasions when there were problems in the international community. What is it that we have done? I am not blaming X Government or Y Government. But after the 2nd of August 1990, as was said by my friend Mr. Gurupadaswamy. Having regard to national interests, we have seen that our people are repatriated from there. Are we satisfied to perform our duties to that extent?

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA (Andhra Pradesh): One and a half lakhs were repatriated: Unprecedented.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Even if you say five lakhs or ten lakhs. Are you satisfied on the mere repatriation? Could we not have been more active? Could we not have mobilised the entire non-aligned movement? Could we not have raised our voice?

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: We have protected the lives of one and a half lakhs of people. ... (Interruptions) ...

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Mr. Gurupadaswamy has very rightly said—and I have noted his words—"that our voice is not heard anywhere today," very rightly so. It is not heard today because of the pursuit of wrong policies. ... (Interruption) ... I will say from November, 1989. You misdirected yourself. You became air-

[Shri P. Shiv Shanker]

actionless. The entire foreign policy has been misconstrued, misapplied and misimplemented. We were not interested in the world order that emerged in the wake of the guidance that was given by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, should continue. You were not interested in it. Some distortions you wanted to develop. And that is why the Government of India became directionless for practically more than a year.

SHRI T. A. MOHAMMED SAQH Y (Tamil Nadu): Now you are the director. You have a director, an actor and an actress. ... (Interruptions) ...

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Since you are provoking me, you have to listen to me. It is only when Shri Rajiv Gandhi as Congress President started raising the matter and he stirred the conscience of the Government, it is only then that the Government started acting, otherwise the Government was not acting.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Washington had taken the decision not to pursue it.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: No, I never wanted to be provoked. A question was asked of me...

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Have you noted the statement of the External Affairs Ministry 'spokesman' that Washington has decided to stop refuelling? Washington-Rajiv Gandhi-Chandra Shekhar is it a triangle?

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Mr. Dipen Ghosh, the difficulty with you is that you look at it from a narrow party angle. ... (Interruption) ... You provoked me... (Interruption) ...

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Ask the Government which you are supporting. The External Affairs Ministry spokesman stated that Washington had taken the decision. I will repeat...

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: It is only the pressure of public opinion, and not Rajiv Gandhi, which made them take the decision.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: On the contrary, I would say that you are a docile people. It is only when Shri Rajiv Gandhi raised the issue and fought back, it is only then that the Government started taking action. And I would like to say that because of this crisis and the developments that have taken place after this crisis, the impression has gone down that we are no more non-aligned. This impression is there because of certain reasons which I am trying to put forth and I expect the Government to clearly come out with a statement to repudiate their actions and to reassert the well-accepted non-aligned policy of India. ... (Interruption) ...

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: I am asking the Government and you also ask them to make an apology. ... (Interruption) ... You also ask them to apologise. Because of them we have been humiliated in the world.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: No, this is not the case.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Ask the Government which you are supporting, which is denigrating the country.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Our views are well known on this issue. The Congress Working Committee has passed a resolution categorically and more than once the Congress President has made the matter clear. Now, the point is that, as Mr. Gurudas Das Gupta has very rightly raised, the refuelling of the military transport aircraft has given rise to a lot of doubts in the minds of the Indian people and the international community. This is the most shameless thing that could happen. This has undoubtedly brought down our prestige, our honour in the international community. I would expect the Government to categorically repudiate their action as honest people, because it has often come in the newspapers and the magazines that the Prime Minister is a forthright person. I expect of him to repudiate and, as Mr. Mishra said, offer apologies to the nation. Secondly...

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: the Prime Minister said...

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: You say whatever you want to say.

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: The Prime Minister should come to the Parliament and offer apologies.

SHRI M. M. JACOB (Kerala): It was the decision of the V. P. Singh Government at that time.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Secondly, we would also like to say that these are the incidents which had sent very wrong messages. I referred to the first incident. The second incident is, on or about 13th of this month in the wake of the heavy civilian casualties in Iraq, when a meeting of the Security Council was summoned and the issue was whether the Security Council should have the discussions in a closed-door meeting, on such an occasion why India abstained from voting. Why is it that they did not vote for an open discussion? Why did they clandestinely agree for the closed-door meeting of the Security Council by abstaining from voting? Thirdly, all of us might usefully recall that vice-President Quayle had gone on record that, "In an event of necessity we will not shirk the use of nuclear weapons". And Mr. George Bush is also reported to have said that the United States reserves the right to have recourse to limited nuclear weapons. Why is it that India has not raised its voice against it? Why is it that we have not condemned this statement? Have we succumbed to a situation where the nuclear weapons have to be used on this hemisphere? What has happened? All our efforts that we had been making, all our proposals...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: The negotiations were done by Mr. Subramanian Swamy.

1.00 P.M.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Fourthly, there is a dichotomy. The Permanent Representative of India in the United Nations has openly come out in say that this war is the war of the United Nations...

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Madhya Pradesh): No, no.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: He said it. It was telecast here...

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: He said just the opposite.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: The Secretary-General said the opposite...

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: No, please check your facts.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: I am checking my facts. Our Permanent Representative, Mr. Garekhan—I do not want to use his name; it is not fair—had said it, that this is the war of the United Nations...

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Shame, if he had said it.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Thereafter, the Secretary-General—I have already referred to it—said that this was not the war of the United Nations, we had only given permission, that the Security Council had only given permission...

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Authorised.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: What is the foreign policy we are following? What type of approach are we following? Are we that hayware? Is there no cohesion? These are the matters on which the Indian people and the international community expect that there should be a clear approach. And I have no manner of doubt and I would again stress, that the Indian Government must not only offer proper explanations but also apologise to the nation and the international community for the wrongs done to the nation and the international community. Having said that, I would stress that the resolution which we are going to pass has to be a very comprehensive resolution which not only condemns the state of affairs in the Gulf which is the creation of the United States and its allies, but also

[Shri P. Shiv Shanker] takes care of the future of these countries after the war so that a durable peace prevails not only in the Middle-East but all over the world. Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Further discussion on the Gulf situation will be resumed at lunch at 2.30.

The House stands adjourned for lunch.

The House then adjourned for lunch at three minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at thirty-three minutes past two of the clock, THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. A. BABY) in the Chair.

ANNOUNCEMENT RE. GOVERNMENT BUSINESS FOR THE WEEK COMMENCING 25TH FEBRUARY 1991

THE MINISTER OF PETROLEUM AND CHEMICALS AND PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA): With your permission, Sir, I rise to announce that Government Business during the week commencing 25th February, 1991, will consist of:

(1) Consideration of any item of Government Business carried over from today's Order Paper.

(2) Discussion on the Motion of Thanks on the President's Address.

DISCUSSION ON GULF WAR—Contd.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. A. BABY): Shri M. S. Lather.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI DIGVIJAY SINGH): I have to give one clarification. Mr. P. Shiv Shanker said that India's permanent Representative to the UN, Mr. Gare Khen

has said that it is a UN war. As a matter of fact, the Indian representative to the Security Council, has said something contrary. He said that it is not a UN war. I would like that the statement should be expunged from the proceedings of the House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. A. BABY): This is an observation made by a Member. So, as soon as this is clarified, that is contradicted.

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: However, it is good that it is contradicted now. It should have been done earlier. In any case both the versions will be there. You cannot expunge it for that reason.

SHRI DIGVIJAY SINGH: Whatever be the procedure, I am not particular about expunging. Whatever I have put forward is the fact and the record should be corrected.

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: (Bihar): Mr. Shiv Shanker's statement, whatever he observed, should be treated as reported. His observations were on the basis of the press reports. Now, we take note of the Government's clarification that this is the statement of facts.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. A. BABY): That forms part of the record. Now, Shri Sukomal Sen.

SHRI MOHINDER SINGH LATHER (Haryana): Sir, you had called me.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. A. BABY): It was by mistake.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN (West Bengal): many of us were led to believe that imperialism had changed its character, and it is no more belligerent and predatory. But, the Gulf War must have disillusioned us by now of those beliefs. Sir, the United States and the Allies managed to hijack the United Nations and have come down heavily on a very small, third-world nation, Iraq and now they are out to