

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: I think the hon. Member is totally confused.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: I am not at all confused.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: And he is trying to confuse... Let me complete, please.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: You are trying to confuse the entire Indian people.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: The same confusion which Bhindranwale introduced in the then General Secretary of the Congress.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please hear the Prime Minister.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: What I had said and which I maintain was that it is within the right of anyone to raise the problems of Nepali citizens with the King of Nepal. It does not converge on an anti-Indian activity... Can I finish please? (*Interruptions*). Mr. Chairman, Sir. Mr. Ghising, I believe, is an Indian citizen. Mr. Ghising does not need to ask for Indian citizenship; he is an Indian citizen. So, that question does not arise. He is not asking for his citizenship. The question that was raised in that memorandum, if I remember correctly, was that of Nepali citizens, not Nepali-speaking Indian citizens. There are Nepali-speaking Indian citizens who do not have that problem, but there are in according to them. We believe that article 7 gives them protection and it is not an article which causes them problems but, in fact, gives them protection in their living and being in India. (*Interruptions*).

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is 12.30 now. The Prime Minister will now make a statement... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: It will give them some time to cool off, Sir.

## STATEMENT BY PRIME MINISTER

Re. his visit to Harare, Indonesia, Australia, New Zealand and Thailand.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI RAJIV GANDHI): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I attended the Eighth Conference of Nonaligned Countries at Harare from 1st to 7th September. It was a memorable and historic occasion. The 25th anniversary of the Movement was marked by a Special Commemorative Session recalling the signal contribution of the Nonaligned Movement to world peace and reaffirming the continuing validity of the principles and objectives enunciated by its founding fathers—Nehru, Tito, Soekarno, Nkrumah and Nasser.

Warm tributes were paid at the Summit to the memory of the former Chairperson of the Movement, Smt. Indira Gandhi. India's role as Chairperson of the Movement, in consolidating the unity, strength and cohesion of the Movement, was highly appreciated. Our stewardship had brought to the Movement harmony and stability within, and strength and dynamism externally. Diverse and heterogenous in composition but unified by a common commitment to freedom, peace and justice, the Movement has remained steadfast in its principles.

At Harare, we handed over the Chairmanship of the Movement to Zimbabwe. The focus of the Summit was on three of the most fundamental issues of our times—human rights in South Africa, freedom for Namibia and the right of all humanity to live in a world free from the constant threat of nuclear extinction.

The Conference adopted a special Declaration on South Africa and established a (Fund for Action For Resisting Invasion, Colonialism and Apartheid: the AFRICA Fund). The AFRICA Fund Committee is chaired by India with Zambia as Vice Chair-

[Shri Rajiv Gandhi]

man. The establishment of this Fund reflects the determination of our Movement to give concrete content to our solidarity with our brethren in the Frontline States and liberation movements in Southern Africa. We have commenced preparatory work on the establishment of this Fund, its work programme and the modalities of its operation. We have had intensive consultations with leaders of the Frontline States on measures to strengthen their capability to fight apartheid, to enforce sanctions against the racist Pretoria regime and to cope with that regime's retaliatory actions. A meeting of Senior Officials of the Fund Committee will take place in Lusaka later this month. A Ministerial-level meeting will precede a Summit of Heads of State or Government of Member countries of the Fund Committee which will probably be held in Delhi. I sincerely hope this Fund will receive the full support not only of Governments within and outside the Nonaligned Movement but of all Parliaments, voluntary organisations and individuals concerned at the violation of basic norms of civilisation in South Africa and the threat to peace posed by Pretoria.

The Movement remained firm in its support to the cause of the Palestinians and resolute in the defence of the freedom, independence and sovereignty of nonaligned countries threatened by foreign intervention and interference.

The Harare Appeal on Disarmament adopted by acclamation, reflected our Movement's commitment to peace and disarmament and our concern at the growing threat to human survival. It urged the United States and the Soviet Union to take immediate steps to prevent the outbreak of a nuclear war and to agree to a moratorium on nuclear tests as a first

step towards a comprehensive test ban treaty. The Summit endorsed the Six-Nation Five-Continent Initiative for Peace and Disarmament which was launched in Delhi.

The last few years have seen a deepening of the world economic crisis. An action Programme for Economic Cooperation was adopted at Harare and a Ministerial Committee set up for harmonising and coordinating action on global and economic issues. A Political Declaration reflected the Movement's consensus on most of the difficult issues confronting the world today.

The Summit was a watershed. It coincided with the 25th anniversary of the founding of the Movement. We reaffirmed our faith in the Movement and in our vision of a world community, united for peace, disarmament and development. We wish Prime Minister Mugabe success in facing the challenges ahead and pledge him our full support and co-operation.

During the course of the Harare Summit I had the opportunity of making the acquaintance of a number of leaders and renewing my friendship with those whom I had the privilege of meeting on earlier occasions. We had a very useful exchange of views on various international issues and on strengthening our bilateral relationship with a number of countries.

I also paid official visits to Indonesia, Australia, New Zealand and Thailand from 13th to 20th October.

We share with Indonesia a common cultural heritage, a similar struggle against colonialism, and partnership in the Nonaligned Movement. My talks with President Soeharto reflected shared perceptions on major international issues. We recognized that the level of our trade and economic relations was not commensu-

rate with our political ties. We agreed to work out long term arrangements to add greater economic and commercial content to our relationship and to intensify interaction in the field of science and technology. We look forward to the further consolidation and strengthening of our traditional ties with Indonesia.

Our relations with Australia and New Zealand have been friendly but with little interaction in political and economic terms. Our countries belong to the Asia Pacific region but we have looked more to the West and elsewhere rather than at our own region. This process is being reversed. I hope my visits have given this process a further impetus.

I worked closely with Prime Minister Hawke within the Commonwealth at Nassau and in London to force a consensus on sanctions against the Pretoria regime. During my visit to Australia we reviewed the progress in consolidating this consensus and building world opinion. We also reviewed our trade and economic relations and agreed that exchanges must be intensified. A Joint Business Council was established to stimulate trade and economic relations. A Science and Technology Agreement was also signed during the visit. We agreed on the need for **greater interaction on expanding our cooperation in the fields of agriculture, space, meteorology and other areas.**

My talks with Prime Minister Lange during my visit to New Zealand underlined a close identity of views on many international issues and our common desire to strengthen bilateral cooperation. Agriculture and afforestation were identified as promising areas of cooperation. Agreements on trade and the Avoidance of Double Taxation were also signed during my visit.

My brief visit to Thailand was the first ever official visit by an Indian Prime Minister. We were accorded a warm welcome in a country with

which we have deep and abiding cultural links. I had interesting discussions with the King and a useful exchange of views with Prime Minister Prem. A Protocol on Science and Technology was signed during the visit. We agreed to look into the possibility of establishing a Joint Commission. I am sure that in the years to come we will realise the untapped potential for the development of our bilateral relationship with Thailand.

My visits to these four countries of South East Asia and the Pacific provided the opportunity for translating the good will that exists for India in this region into more substantive political relationships and expanding trade and economic cooperation. Though these visits were necessarily of a very short duration, we have good reason to be happy with their outcome.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sukomal Sen will ask clarifications.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA alias V. ARUNACHALAM (Tamil Nadu): That is in the library.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN (West Bengal): I would like to draw the attention of the Prime Minister to his statement particularly on the Harare appeal on disarmament. This appeal on disarmament, that was effected in the Harare meeting, was presented to both the US and the Soviet Governments. I would like to know from the Prime Minister what was the official reaction of the Soviet Union as well as the US Government to this appeal on disarmament?

Secondly, it is also welcome that a Fund has been established and the Fund Committee meeting will be held in Delhi to assist those African States who will be economically losers because of the mandatory sanctions against the apartheid Government of South Africa. While it is welcome, I would also like to know one more thing. The front-line States were bombed just before the non-

[Shri Sukomal Sen]

aligned meeting by the South African Government. In that context I would like to know whether the question of any guarantee of the protection of these States from the recurrence of any invasion from the South African Government was discussed at the Harare meeting. If so, what are the details?

**श्री चतुरानन मिश्र (बिहार) :**

सभापति महोदय, हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने विश्व शान्ति के लिये तिश्तरीकरण के लिये और जो निर्गट देश है, उनकी आजादी की रक्षा के लिये जिस तरह से अभी हमारे में और उसके पहले भी काम किया है, उसका मैं पूर्णतया समर्थन करता हूँ। हमारे प्रधानमंत्री जी ने दक्षिण अफ्रीका की आजादी के लिये एक विश्व जनमत बनाने के लिये जो काम किया है वह भी प्रशंसनीय काम है और हम उसकी भी तारीफ करते हैं, लेकिन सभापति महोदय, कुछ बातें हमारा समझ में नहीं आई इसलिये मैं स्पष्टता के लिये प्रधान मंत्री के सामने कुछ प्रश्न रखना चाहता हूँ।

पहली बात यह कि हमारे की स्पीच में लीबिया पर जो अमेरिका द्वारा बमबारी हुई, तो प्रधानमंत्री जी ने उसमें इसकी चर्चा क्यों नहीं की? इससे लीबिया और अन्य देश के प्रति भ्रम फैला है और हमारी आलोचना हुई है।

दूसरा प्रश्न यह है कि मैं प्रधानमंत्री जी से जानना चाहूँगा कि अंगोला में और जो हमारे अपने पड़ोसी देश अफगानिस्तान में जिस तरह से अमेरिका साम्राज्यवादी हस्तक्षेप कर रहा है इसकी भी निन्दा आपने अपनी स्पीच में क्यों नहीं की? मुझे को ऐसा लगता है भारत को अमेरिका और भी डराने की बात सोच रहा है। इस प्रसंग में अभी पाकिस्तान को जो हथियार दिये जा रहे हैं वे हमारे लिये घातक हो रहे हैं। इसलिये मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि जितना डटकर इसका विरोध करना चाहिये, उसमें भारत कुछ हिचकिचा रहा है।

आखिरी प्रश्न जो इससे सीधा संबंधित तो नहीं है लेकिन क्योंकि घटना घट गई इसलिये मैं आपसे पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जितना दंग से लीबिया के प्रश्न पर

हमारे विदेश मंत्री ने राष्ट्र संघ में भाषण किया, अमेरिका की नीतियों के खिलाफ भाषण किया उसके तुरन्त बाद उन को जिस तरह से केंजुअल लेबर की तरह हठाया गया मुझे यह कुछ अच्छा नहीं लगा। इसलिये मैं इन तीन बिन्दुओं पर सफाई चाहता हूँ।

**SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA (Andhra Pradesh):** The Prime Minister mentioned about the Harare appeal for nuclear disarmament and the Test Ban Treaty. As we all know, this was discussed in the Reykjavic Summit and one of the participants in the Summit, the United States, has outright rejected the Test Ban Treaty proposals. Even though the Soviet Union has unilaterally extended the moratorium on tests, the United States is not coming forward. I would like to know from the hon. Prime Minister what further initiative the Government of India would like to take, either on its own or as a Member of the six-nation-five-continent team, to convince the United States to come forward for a test ban treaty and for general disarmament. The second point is he mentioned about the Africa fund. It is good move. Members in this House and the other House also have been pressing not only to extend moral support to the frontline States, but pleading for more material support to freedom fighters in South Africa. I would like to know what has been the response of the countries contacted by the Prime Minister and the Minister of State for External Affairs with regard to contributions to this fund? Whether it is only confined to the monetary contributions or it will include material help, particularly in the form of armaments, to meet the threat from South Africa?

Thirdly, Sir, the Prime Minister has mentioned about the closer co-operation between the countries in Asia Pacific region. He has rightly pointed out all along that they have been looking towards the West including the countries in the neigh-

bourhood. But they have also made a common cause with us in the Commonwealth when the question of sanctions against South Africa came. I would also like to know from the Prime Minister, whether these countries are willing to come forward a little more to pressurise the Great Britain in changing its mind to impose sanctions against South Africa. Thank you.

**SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY** (Karnataka): Sir, the Prime Minister has made a statement covering the non-aligned conference at Harare and his visits to South Asian countries and Australia. Sir, I jointly endorse the decisions taken by the Harare conference with regard to three vital issues which the Prime Minister has referred to. In this context, I would like to know from him, why all the front-line States are not included? Take for example Swaziland and Lesotho it is my information that these two States are staying out. These are also front-line States. Why these two States are staying away from this decision.

Secondly, Sir, whether there is any division among the ranks of the front-line States. I would like to know from the Prime Minister. He referred to the Africa fund. We welcome the creation of the Africa fund, but the House will be interested to know the modalities and operation of this fund. I would like to know whether an assessment has been made regarding the requirement of the States; and whether the fund will be adequate for that purpose? Sir, I was given to understand that these front-line States do not have access to see, as I said, the other day. So, if assistance has got to be given to these States, how to give it? Whether the Governments are thinking of air-lifting material assistance to these States? Whether Africa fund also contemplates creating infrastructure by which the assistance can be reached quickly to

these States in case they are under pressure from the South African Government?

Thirdly, Sir, I would like to know from the Prime Minister whether important issues like assistance by the U.S. to rebels in Nicaragua and withdrawal of Russian troops from Afghanistan were discussed and whether war between Iran and Iraq was also discussed there? If so, what were the conclusions and the consensus arrived at in the Non-aligned Summit?

Coming to his visit to South East Asian countries, I would like to ask only one question, that is, whether the security problems facing these countries and also the Indian Ocean were discussed with these countries when the Prime Minister visited? If so, what was the agreement and the consensus arrived at?

**SHRI GHULAM RASOOL MATTO** (Jammu and Kashmir): Sir, on behalf of the Jammu and Kashmir National Conference, I congratulate the Prime Minister for the consistent stand he has taken with regard to South Africa. I would like to ask only two questions from the hon'ble Prime Minister. 1. That apart from other countries he had visited Indonesia, Australia, New Zealand and Thailand. I want to ask if these countries have any specific problems in aligning themselves with embargo to South Africa, will they participate in the Fund of which an onerous responsibility fall on India? This is a very important question. Whether the hon'ble Prime Minister has taken up this question of contribution, by these countries, to the Fund which he visited and the second question I would like to ask is that apart from the embargo to the front-line States there is a military threat to these States by vested interests? What steps have been thought of to counter those threats? Thank you.

**SHRI V. GOPALSAMY** (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Chairman, Sir, while our hon'ble Prime Minister played his

[Shri V. Gopalsamy]

role in harnessing the opinion of many countries to toe our policy with regard to South Africa, I would like to know from the hon'ble Prime Minister, some of the countries, which are Member countries of the Non-aligned Movement are having clandestine, Surreptitious trade relations with the Racist Regime of Pretoria. I would like to know from the hon'ble Prime Minister whether this was taken up for discussion? If so, what was the reaction? Sir, when I was watching the T. V. which did telecast our Prime Minister's press interview in Australia, I remember, a question which was put by one of the correspondents. That question was more or less like this:

"Whether Indian troops involved in helping the Afghanistan Government?"

For that question, the answer of the Prime Minister was like this:

"I am not aware of any such thing."

I would like to know from the Prime Minister what did he reply because that answer seems to be ambiguous & it is not definite. (*Interruptions*). Because he said, I am not aware of any such thing. (*Interruptions*).

SOME HON'BLE MEMBERS: it is only a diplomatic answer.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): Mr. Chairman, Sir. I would like to ask two clarifications about the Harare meet and three about the other travels. Now, Sir, firstly, about universal comprehensive mandatory economic sanctions. It is common enough knowledge by now that there was a certain amount of controversy on this and some difficulty is being faced by the Frontline States. Mauritius has gone to the extent of saying that 20 per cent of our tourism income comes from South African tourists, it is all very well for you Indian to say, give up doing anything with them. We live next door to South Africa. We cannot afford to loose that 20 per cent. Now a similar apprehension is voiced

by other frontline States. Therefore, there is a certain dilution of this originally stated and eminently worthwhile proposition about universal, comprehensive, mandatory economic sanctions. Will the Prime Minister please enlighten us about the reservations that frontline or other States might have expressed about the effectiveness or otherwise of this proposition?

Secondly, about the AFRICA Fund, I would like to say that the very able and energetic Minister of State, Mr. Eduardo Faleiro, who is entrusted with this responsibility, has taken some very worthwhile initiatives and has taken the trouble to brief us on all such matters. But there is one aspect which I continue to be somewhat unconvinced about, and that is in the light of the fate that came to be met by the "Save Namibia Fund". I would like to know how precisely, as Chairman of this Fund—now India is the Chairman of this Fund—do we intend collecting this fund and how administering it. These two questions were about the Harare summit.

About Australia and New Zealand, I am really at a loss to find out precisely what pressing national interests or quite what great international event persuaded the Prime Minister to undertake what is otherwise a really every interesting journey to Oceania. I would, however, like to have one clarification about the Australian visit. Considering that the Prime Minister discovered something new about the backwardness of Australia, did he also consider signing a cultural agreement with Australia and the immediate posting of a cultural attache to New Delhi from Australia? This much about Australia.

About New Zealand, I am not sufficiently convinced that the purpose of the visit to New Zealand was the signing of a treaty for avoidance of double taxation. Surely that can be done even by a Member of the Board of Direct Taxes. It did not require the Prime Minister to go and do it.

The most worthwhile, the most significant and, I think, the most long-lasting thing, if it is followed up, was certainly the visit to Thailand, and here I would seek a clarification on a complex issue which somewhat isolates us from Oceania from the rest of South-East Asia and that is about Kampuchea.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Time up.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Would the Government enlighten us about any new initiative that they are taking on the subject of Kampuchea because that would really be the most significant initiative that this Government could be taking?

SHRI M. KADHARSHA (Tamil Nadu): Sir, first I would like to thank the hon. Prime Minister for undertaking this tour at an appropriate time and at a time when Parliament was not in session. Sir, I had an opportunity to visit New Zealand on an official delegation under the leadership of our hon. Parliamentary Affairs Minister, Mr. Bhagat and we even had an opportunity to meet Prime Minister Lange at Wellington. The Prime Minister of New Zealand gave a very high opinion of our Prime Minister...

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is the clarification you are seeking?

SHRI M. KADHARSHA: ..... of which every Indian can be proud. Both New Zealand and India are agricultural countries. So, I would like to know what steps were taken to increase our relationship with New Zealand.

Regarding Australia, there is a wide trade gap between import and export. What steps were taken to increase our export to Australia?

Thirdly, there are more than 2,00,000 Indian citizens in Bangkok. On our way back, we had an opportunity to visit all these countries. Australia, Indonesia and Thailand, just a few days before our hon. Prime Minister visited. Indian citizens in all those places have a grievance that

the attitude of the Indian Embassy officials is not helpful.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. Mr. Virendra Verma.

SHRI M. KADHARSHA: Just one minute. The Indian Ocean has become a place for super power activities. So I would like to know 1 P.M. whether any discussion was held with the Indonesian President to curtail the Super-power activities in the Indian Ocean. These are my humble questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Very good. You have put at least one question.

श्री वीरेंद्र वर्मा (उत्तर प्रदेश) : सभापति महोदय, निकारागुआ निर्गुट देशों का एक सदस्य है। संयुक्त राज्य अमरीका उसकी गवर्नमेंट को गिराने और हटाने के लिये विद्रोहियों को आर्थिक और हथियारों से सहायता कर रहा है। मुझे विश्वास है कि हरारे में निश्चित ही उस इश्यू पर बातचीत होगी। उस पर क्या निर्णय हुआ? माननीय प्रधानमंत्री जी इस पर भी कुछ प्रकाश डालने की कृपा करें।

दूसरा मेरा प्रश्न, अफ्रीका फण्ड, जो उन्होंने मूव किया है, जिसके वे प्रेसीडेंट है हमारे प्रधानमंत्री जी, जो निर्गुट देश 101 है, संभवतः सबका इन्कीजिंग सहयोग उसके लिये मिला होगा। मैं क्या पूछ सकता हूँ कि उन 101 देशों में से कोई ऐसा भी देश है, जो सहायता नहीं करना चाहता या नहीं कर रहा?

तीसरा, टेरारिस्ट की एक्टिविटीज सारे संसार में है। प्रधानमंत्री जी हरारे में, 101 देशों के सम्मेलन में और दूसरे चार देशों में जहाँ गये, वहाँ उन टेरारिस्ट एक्टिविटीज को किस तरह समाप्त किया जाये, इस संबंध में क्या निर्गुट देशों ने कोई स्टेप्स उठाने का निर्णय किया?

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Non-Aligned made an

[Shri Rajiv Gandhi]

appeal on disarmament. India, through the Non-Aligned, in the Commonwealth, in the United Nations, as a member of the Six-Nation Five-Continent Initiative, and on almost every world forum, has taken a very strong stand on disarmament. I have no doubt that this has contributed to the two world powers, the US and the Soviet Union, getting together in Iceland some time ago. We sent our missions on disarmament, our letters, to the US and the Soviet leaders. As has been the case on almost all previous occasions, we have got a very positive reply from the Soviet Union and a rather indifferent reaction from the US. But in spite of all that, we feel that Iceland was a major turning point even though we are greatly disappointed that a decision could not come through. The positive side is that the two super powers came so close to coming to an agreement which means that an agreement is possible if a real will is there. The positive side is that the papers are still on the table and they have not been closed. So there is still a chance to retrieve that position and to have disarmament. What it will require is statesmanship from all concerned. We feel letting the SDI or starwars come in the way of such a major disarmament agreement is very sad and we hope that star-wars, which we have felt right from the very beginning is not viable, which we believe now has also been retrimmed in its perspectives. It was originally seen as a total shield for the whole of the US. I believe now it is slowly changed into a shield for only certain areas of the US, the whole concept is being changed which is really substantiating the position which we had taken on this, that it is not viable as it has been put forward. And, Sir, it is an extremely dangerous move which will only bring us closer to the precipice which will increase tensions in the world.

The question of military protection for the Southern African States did not come up in the discussions and in

the final papers that we agreed to at the NAM, if you read the terms of reference of the Committee of the Africa Fund, it also does not refer to military assistance.

One Member has mentioned that we did not mention...

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE (West Bengal): Does it mean that it precludes it? You said that the Africa Fund does not make a reference. It means that it precludes it. It means that funds will not be used for military purposes. Does it mean that?

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: Absolutely. It is not in our terms of reference, then, presumably, we cannot do it and that is how I would interpret English. (Interruptions).

Sir, one other Member has raised the question whether we have backtracked from our position on Libya. We have not. We made our position very clear at the meeting of the Non-Aligned Foreign Ministers that took place at Delhi which happened just a few days after the incident in Libya. We have not changed our position. In fact, if you read my speech carefully—it is written in English—you will see that the language is very strong on the action that was taken in Libya. But what we have done—this is what I feel is more important. The fact of what happened in Libya is more important, not just because it was against Libya, but we feel the greater significance is that of a country taking the law into its own hands, going back from everything that we have built into the United Nations system. And, Sir, we felt that it was not enough to limit criticism to the specific question on Libya and we thought that it was more important to take it to the core and root of the problem which is the increasing use of unilateral action by certain countries which is a real danger to the international brotherhood as it is today.



Needless to say, Sir, no country can influence us in our internal decisions. That was referred to by certain Members.

On the question of contributions to the Fund, they have to be raised in various ways. We have not actually come to the point of asking for contributions because how the Fund will be run, what precisely we want to do etc. will be worked out in the meetings which are to take place now, at the official level and, perhaps in December, at the Ministers level and Government level. Only after that, we will actually approach the countries. In our informal talks, in my informal talks with the leaders that I have talked to, in the response to the group of Foreign Ministers that visited the various countries, the initial reaction has been positive. But we will really be able to be more specific once we ourselves know what we want to do, perhaps in December or in January, and only then we will actually officially approach these nations for their contributions.

Lesotho and Swaziland are not part of the Frontline States and they are not recognised as such by OAU neither by the NAM. So, they do not come under that cover. All the Frontline States are not members of the Africa Fund Committee. It is a mixed membership drawn from all the five continents, from all the continents, and it is not necessary that every Frontline States should be on that. Lesotho and Swaziland are members of the SADCE and I do not think there is any problem in that.

Two Members have asked very wide-ranging questions relating more or less specifically to the resolutions that have been passed at the NAM. If I have to go into all the resolutions which I have got, it will take at least two or three hours for me to come forward with specific replies because

they are very carefully worded. If the honourable Members agree, I will send copies of the papers from the NAM to them and they can look into them.

One Member raised the question of clandestine trade relations with south Africa. This did come up. It came up in Harare. It came up earlier in London and before that in Nassau, and we are looking what we can do. I believe that this can fail under the purview of the Africa Fund and perhaps we will be able to see what can be done in this area.

One Member wanted an explanation of what I meant by "I am not aware". I find it very odd that those Members who specialise in speaking in English do not seem to know the language that well. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: I have not gone to Doon School; I come from a village.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: Perhaps I will explain to him in Hindi.

मैं हिन्दी में आप को बता दूँ।  
because he has not understood in English. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Then I will speak in Tamil. "NAN Tamilil psughiren. Piradama mantiri Tamilil than enakku pathil cholla vendum."

SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALA-VIYA (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, let the Prime Minister speak in Hindi and let Mr. Gopalsamy speak in Tamil. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: "I am not aware" implies very clearly that India is not involved in any military involvement in Afghanistan.

Another Member has raised the question, by giving Mauritius as an example, that much of their trade depends on South Africa and they would suffer severely. When I was in Mauritius I talked to all the

[Shri Rajiv Gandhi]

leadership and they did tell me that have made it very clear that they stand by what we did in the Non-Aligned meeting or what we did in the Commonwealth. They have realised that they will have to put up with problems but they see them as part of their contribution to the fight for human rights in South Africa. We on our part will try and see how we can push in that. I have talked solution where anyone from that to a number of Prime Ministers and Presidents about this and perhaps again this could be an area we could discuss in the Africa Fund. But we will have to see that we have a meeting of the Africa Fund.

I do not think it is within my purview to post an Australian Cultural Attache to New Delhi, Sir. (*Interruptions*) I request the hon. Member to pose that question to the leadership in Australia.

Sir, Kampuchea is important and what we have seen during this visit is that India's stand is being more and more vindicated even by those who opposed our stand in the beginning. We have said right from the beginning that we cannot see any solution to this issue if the notorious Pol Pot regime or the members of that regime are involved in that situation. Initially this was opposed by many countries. But now almost every leader I have spoken to has said very clearly that they stand by us and they cannot see a solution and they too do not want to see a notorious Pol Pot regime is involved in a new Government. The only question is only how this has to be brought about. We have not taken any new initiative on this at this stage.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY:**  
He has not answered my questions.

(*Interruptions*) He is standing up. He is answering.

**SHRI RAJIV GANDHI:** In fact, I had answered him, but because he put wide ranging questions he is one Member to whom I will be sending the papers about... (*Interruptions*).

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Now, we resume discussion on the Calling Attention.

### CALLING ATTENTION TO A MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IM- PORTANCE

Agitation Launched by the Gorkha National Liberation Front for a Separate Gorkhaland — Contd.

**SHRI DIPEN GHOSH:** On his statement about the right of one Indian national making a representation to the King of Nepal as anti-national... (*Interruptions*) Sir, before making the Harare statement he was making a statement that it was in respect of those who did not get citizenship Mr. Gheising had made a representation to the King of Nepal. I quote from the Memorandum, the concluding part:

"As such, seriously keeping in view the above mentioned unpardonable historical crimes against humanity or still unresolved questions of the very political existence of future status of the Gorkhas in the Indian Union..."

"...Please confirm accordingly the future status of their ceded land and territories and for this serious burning ethnic issue of the Gorkhas, the Gorkha National Liberation Front submits this memorandum to the true and dynamic leadership of your Majesty to take up a bold step for historical decision and your Majesty's solemn judgment."

Actually the purpose of making this representation to the King of Nepal