

[Shri Khurshed Alam Khan]

for the handloom sector. Being the weakest segment in the textile industry, on which a very large portion of the country's population depends for employment, Government has to take special steps to protect it. It was against this background, that this August House had last year passed the new legislation. The very survival of handlooms, depends on the scope of reservation and how effectively these reservation orders are enforced. The objections raised by the Powerloom Sector against reservation order have to be viewed in this light.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Prime Minister will make a statement.

STATEMENT BY PRIME MINISTER—

Regarding his visit to London and Mexico on 14th August, 1986

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI RAJIV GANDHI): Sir, I attended the Commonwealth Heads of Government Review Meeting in London from 3rd to 5th August, the Summit Meeting of the Six Nation Five Continent Initiative at Ixtapa in Mexico from 6th to 7th August, I also paid an official visit to Mexico from 7th to 9th August.

2. The Commonwealth Heads of Government Review Meeting took place in the light of our decision at Nassau last October that concerted pressure must be brought to bear on the Pretoria regime to dismantle apartheid. Our aim is to facilitate a peaceful transition to majority rule in a united and non-fragmented South Africa on the basis of universal adult franchise.

3. We had decided at Nassau to form an Eminent Persons Group to facilitate a political dialogue on South Africa. The broad-based Group included Sardar Swaran Singh. As many of us has anticipated, the Group could not make the Pretoria regime see reason. But its work represents a significant step in the fight against apartheid. Its report is a moving and authoritative portrayal of the horrors of apartheid. It has stirred the conscience of all nations.

4. We were personally briefed in London on this report by the two Co-Chirman of the Group—General Obasanjo, former President of Nigeria, and Mr. Malcolm Fraser, former Prime Minister of Australia. This briefing confirmed the clear and unanimous finding of the EPG Report, namely, that only concerted pressure by the international community can forestall a bloodbath in South Africa.

5. At Nassau, we had unanimously decided upon a common programme of action which included a number of economic measures against South Africa. We had agreed that if these measures and the efforts of the Eminent Persons Group failed to promote a dialogue within six months further measures, as envisaged in paragraphs 7 and 8 of the Accord, would be considered.

6. In London, all except Britain, decided to adopt the measures listed in paragraph 7 of the Nassau Accord and three additional measures. The British Government dissociated itself from the measures agreed to by the others. It was willing to implement only a few limited measures, one of which would be subject to a future EEC decision. Because of Britain's unfortunate stand, the rest of us decided to go ahead with sanctions rather than compromise on a diluted package which would destroy the credibility of the Commonwealth and go against the wishes of the overwhelming majority of its members.

7. India was one of the first countries to break off all relations with racist South Africa. We are of the firm view that sanctions, properly enforced, will compel South Africa to adopt the path of dialogue. We sincerely hope that the lead given by the Commonwealth will be followed by others.

8. The Communique issued after our meeting in London recognises that the Pretoria regime might take retaliatory steps against neighbouring States, which would only strengthen our resolve to take further measures. According to news reports, the racist regime has already displayed its defiance by enhancing customs tariffs and creating other difficulties for Frontline States. It has also carried out a raid on

Angola. The next step for us in the Commonwealth and international community would be to take collective action in extending a helping hand to countries which are vulnerable to the South African is in our power to assist these countries and to mobilise international support for this effort.

9. I joined my colleagues from Argentina, Greece, Mexico, Sweden and Tanzania at Ixtapa in Mexico from 6th to 7th August for the Summit meeting of leaders of the Six-Nation Five-Continent Initiative for peace and disarmament. This meeting took place on the 41st anniversary of the Hiroshima tragedy. The Mexico Declaration expressed deep concern at the lack of progress in nuclear disarmament since the New Delhi Declaration of January 1985. We emphasised the crucial importance of immediate suspension of nuclear tests, followed by negotiations leading to a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. We urged that what had so far been a unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests by the Soviet Union should at least become a bilateral moratorium between the United States and Soviet Union. Since we have the geographical spread and the technical expertise, we presented a separate document containing a concrete offer for verifying the suspension of nuclear tests by the United States and the Soviet Union. We firmly believe that verification is not an insurmountable technical problem. A nuclear test ban requires only the political will.

10. We have addressed a joint letter to President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev proposing that experts from the Six Nations meet with their Soviet and American counterparts to discuss our offer for facilitating a test ban verification. We await their response. In the past the Soviet Union has responded positively to our proposals. We have that the American response will be helpful.

11. At Ixtapa we also reiterated our call for the prevention of an arms race in outer space and emphasised the urgency of halting the development of anti-satellite weapons.

12. Our meeting was enriched by the participation of several eminent personalities from a number of countries. All of them endorsed the spirit and content of the Mexico Declaration. We had occasion to exchange views with several of these eminent people, including Prof. Carl Sagan, Dr. Alfonso Garcia Robles, Prof. John Kenneth Galbraith, Mr. Allan Boesak, Madame Silvia Mernandez, Prof. Aleksandar Grlichkov and Prof. Jerome Wiesner. Public opinion and governments in a number of countries are becoming increasingly aware of the import of our message. There is a greater need to enlist the support of Parliaments, the media, universities and other organisations to give active support to our initiative. They could help in mobilising public opinion, particularly Nuclear Weapon States. Prior to our next meeting we shall also consider other measures to enable us to project an independent viewpoint on issues related to nuclear disarmament and prevention of an arms race in space, by compiling and disseminating unbiased data and studies.

13. My visit to Mexico from 7-9 August was the first bilateral Prime Ministerial visit, since my grandfather's visit to that country in November 1961. We were received with great warmth and cordiality. My talks with President de la Madrid reflected shared perceptions on major international issues and our common concern for peace, disarmament and development.

14. We recognised that the level of our economic relations was not commensurate with our close political ties. Both of us decided to give more content to our relationship through a time-bound programme of enhancing trade and economic collaboration. We exchanged lists of items of export interest to each country and decided on reciprocal commercial credits of \$ 20 million to facilitate trade exchanges. The fields identified for industrial collaboration include textile machinery, machine tools, pharmaceuticals and railway equipment. The possibilities of collaboration in the oil sector would be explored during the visit of a Mexican delegation to India after this year. We also decided to have annual consultations at the Ministerial level on bilateral matters and international issues.

[Shri Rajiv Gandhi]

15. At the conclusion of these visits, I made a transit halt for about two and a half hours in Prague on Sunday, 10th August. We were warmly received. I had usefultalks with Prime Minister Lubomir Strougal. These revealed an identity of views on a number of interantional issues of mutual concern. The Czechoslovak Prime Minister reminded me of the pending invaitaion for me to pay an official visit to Czecholsovaka and I invited him to vist India.

16. On my return journey from Prague, the aircraft had some engine trouble and we were forced to make an unscheiuled halt in Moscow, we spent over six hours at the airport shortly after midnight on 11th August. The Soviet Government graciously provided us with an aircraft for my return journey to Delhi and extended all courtesies. The first Deputy Prime Minister Geodar Aliyev was good enough to come to the airport. We had a useful exchange of views.

17. We have good reason to be satisfied with the results of the Commonwealth meeting in London, the Ixtrapa Summit and the visit to Mexico.

18. The Communique of the Commonwealth Heads of Government Review Meeting has been laid on the Table of the House earlier. I now place the Mexico Declaration and the Document on Verification Measures on the Table of the House, for the perusal of Hon'ble Members.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA
(West Bengal): Sir, I welcome the statement of the Prime Minister and I believe that the visit of Mr. Rajiv Gandhi as Prime Minister of this country has been fruitful from many aspects. I should also say that the statement just now made by him is also a matter of satisfaction because it categorically denounces Britain for holding up sanctions against South Africa. I also welcome the statement because it categorically states that it is because of the role of the United States of America that the disarmament

talks have come to a deadlock. This is a categorical submission and this categorical submission is consistent with the mood and aspirations of the Indian masses fighting against imperialism, apartheid and for world peace. Therefore, there is no reason why I should not congratulate him for making such a statement. While doing so, let me enquire from our Prime Minister whether, in the course of his talks with the world leaders, the question of putting more pressure on Britain had figured because South Africa cannot be brought to sense if Britain cannot be brought to sense. And it has been the consistent position of Britain and America that emboldens the racist rulers of South Africa. Therefore, I would like to know what specific suggestions were evolved or are likely to evolve or the Prime Minister discussed with the other members of the Commonwealth to bring Britain to sense, at least to restrain the madness of Margaret Thatcher. That is my first query to him. Secondly, I would like to know whether the Prime Minister, in the course of his discussions, had drawn the attention of the friendly countries to the role of Pakistan and its efforts to destabilise our country, its help and aid to the terrorists. It was definitely not part of the general agenda, I understand. But I would like to know whether, in the course of the informal discussions, the question of Pakistan and its role had figured and whether there is any response or mood from the other countries to restrain Pakistan from what it is doing now.

Thirdly, as everybody is aware, there is American intervention in Nicaragua. I would like to know whether our Prime Minister discussed with other countries certain steps to restrain the madness of Reagan and Reaganism from interfering in the internal affairs of Nicaragua, especially after the recent decision of the American Senate to give more money to the rebel there. These are my three questions to him. Once again I should say that he has done very well during this visit.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN (West Bengal): On behalf of my party I welcome the Mexico Declaration and also the efforts of the Indian Government in mobilising international opinion against apartheid and for taking action against the apartheid regime. But after going through the statement made by the Prime Minister I find that the Prime Minister also had admitted about the role of Britain. After the Nassau Accord there was an assurance from the Prime Minister himself in the House that we succeeded in Nassau and we hoped that Britain would agree to what had been decided in Nassau. But after that Britain refused to agree to what they had agreed in Nassau. After the experience with Britain—they are persistently supporting the apartheid regime, they are refusing to abide by the decisions of the majority in the Commonwealth—in view of this attitude and posture of the British Government, I would like to know from the Prime Minister whether the time has not come to take some action against Britain, whether it is worthwhile to keep Britain in the Commonwealth, what purpose it will serve to keep Britain in the Commonwealth. I would like to know whether you are contemplating any action against the British Government, to expel them from the Commonwealth.

About the summit declaration, on behalf of my party, CPI(M), I welcome it. The statement has admitted and it is also a fact that after the Delhi Declaration of the sixth summit, Soviet Union responded positively; not only did they respond before that and after that, they made certain proposals to their counterpart in the US Government and they declared a unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests; also, Mr. Gorbachev, after coming into power, made a set of proposals for a complete nuclear disarmament within this century. Even after these comprehensive proposals made by Mr. Gorbachev, the US Government is not responding at all. Not only that; they are insisting on and

persisting with going ahead with their nuclear programmes, going into the space, going ahead with their star-war programmes. Since there is no positive response from the US Government after this Mexico Declaration, as has been stated here also, I would like to know whether the Government of India thinks that this persistent attitude of the US Government is actually for war and not for peace, because frequently we hear the talk of super powers—as has been admitted by the Prime Minister, one super power is for peace, it is positively responding to the appeals of the six-nation summit, viz. the Delhi Declaration, while the other super power is not responding at all, whether that super power is against peace and for war. What is the perception of the Indian Government? I would also like to be enlightened by the Prime Minister why such attitude is being taken by the US Government ...

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE (West Bengal): Is it because of an objectual necessity that imperialism means war, or is it because of some independent proclivities of a particular President?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Prompting is not allowed in Parliament.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: It is, therefore, I addressed you.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: ... Since the Prime Minister is moving around the world, I would like to be enlightened by him whether it is his perception that it is capitalist economy, imperialist policy, that is leading the US Government to such a position that without war they cannot survive. Is it so? Is that the reason why they are preparing for war, they are going into the outer space?

Then, as regards the last portion of the statement—of course, it is not a part of Mexico Declaration,—about

[Shri Sukomal Sen]

some engine trouble having developed in the plane which carried the Prime Minister, it causes worry to everybody. It is a matter of worry to everybody that a plane carrying the Prime Minister should have developed some engine trouble. Is that a reflection of the level of Government's efficiency that even the plane carrying the Prime Minister also develops some trouble in the air and the Prime Minister is forced to land somewhere at an unscheduled spot? Is that how the Government is functioning? This is what I would like to know.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY (Karnataka): I will be very brief indeed. Both the summits which the Prime Minister attended, from our point of view, are important. They are important because they dealt with two very vital and burning problems of the day. One: the problem of apartheid; another: the problem of moratorium on nuclear tests and nuclear disarmament. I am happy that the Prime Minister is making his own effort that sufficient international pressure is created regarding these two vital issues. Apartheid is as important, its abolition is as important, as moratorium on nuclear tests leading to nuclear disarmament and general disarmament. In this the world is very much disappointed with the developments taking place among most advanced countries, especially the Soviet Union and the United States. In regard to apartheid the London Summit has taken good decisions. Perhaps they have gone one step further than the decision taken in Nassau. The decision at London Summit has been very firm, decisive and has not yielded to the pressure or the view of the Government of England in this matter. The Government of England has been isolated. The Prime Minister has said something about the measures he and other Governments would be taking in future to help the front-line States in case the South African Government

were to take retaliatory steps. I would like him to elaborate this one. I would like him to tell us whether he has discussed the measures that he is going to take along with other friendly countries whenever in future the Botha Government adopts retaliatory, aggressive, posture and makes inroads attacks, against the front-line States. In respect of moratorium on nuclear tests and nuclear disarmament Sir, I would like to know from the Prime Minister whether he and the other heads of Governments who met in Mexico have obtained detailed reports from the nuclear powers, especially from the Government of the United States and the Government of the Soviet Union regarding their positions, their difficulties and their problems. I would like to know whether these things have been considered by the Mexico Summit. I would also like to know what the real difficulties are which they are facing in agreeing to a moratorium in the first instance followed by nuclear disarmament later.

Sir, we all wish that the movement in regard to these two aspects two vital problems, assumes more strength as the years go by. So, I think we cannot rest on our oars because the fate of the nations, the fate of mankind, is dependent on these two vital issues, two vital problems, which are very burning problems. Therefore, Sir, I would like the Prime Minister to tell us whether the Summit in Mexico has taken into consideration the future measures that are necessary to meet the difficulties, the problems and the challenge which may arise in future.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Satyanarayan Reddy.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I welcome the statement of the Prime Minister. So far as South Africa is concerned, I would like to know from the Prime Minister only

two things. Sir, they at Nassau had agreed unanimously to a common programme of action against South Africa, including Britain. But, after six months, they have changed. Britain is not coming forward. Of course, it is gratifying to note that the rest of the Commonwealth is behind the South African people and against the policy of apartheid. In this connection, I would like to know from the Prime Minister whether Britain, which has gone against the common interests of the Commonwealth countries so far as its policy with regard to apartheid is concerned, is being influenced by the public opinion there since the Prime Minister was there. I would like to know whether the British policy has been changed in view of the British — on taking any steps against South Africa or the British Prime Minister has taken these steps even inspite of the public opinion there. This I would like to know from the Prime Minister so far as this question is concerned.

Then, Sir, so far as this policy is concerned, South Africa is taking certain steps, retaliatory steps, against the neighbouring countries. In view of this, how are the Commonwealth countries and the non-aligned countries going to help the frontline countries in Africa to face this situation? Sir, so far as the Mexico Summit is concerned, I welcome the declaration. So far as the Soviet Union is concerned, it has accepted and it has responded to the call. But the USA is not yet prepared. I would like to know whether the Prime Minister, in view of his wide-ranging consultations with the world leaders, he has come to the conclusion that the US, in the near future, is going to fall in line with others.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, L. K. Jha.

SHRI LAKSHMI KANT JHA (Bihar):
Mr Chairman, Sir, I only want to make two brief observations.

First of all, while joining the other Members who have congratulated the Prime Minister on his achievements, I

should like to add that the credit for the achievements, particularly in crystallising, formulating and strengthening the public opinion against South Africa, goes to him in a far greater measure than is generally realised. I was told by no less a person than the Prime Minister of Australia about the role he played at Nassau and how he not only gave a great lead at Nassau, but in consequence the kind of admiration which he won has paved the way for a new chapter in Indo-Australian relations.

Having said that, I want to make one observation where I feel that Members should have a bit of restraint. I have heard the comments that the time has come to turn Britain out of the Commonwealth. I think we ought to realise that Mrs. Thatcher is not Great Britain and that the people of Great Britain and the people of other democracies have been expressing their support for the kind of things we have stood for, we are arguing for. Now, their national feeling will be hurt if they are told that Britain is going to be turned out of the Commonwealth. I think this is something which we should avoid. This is a delicate and difficult issue and if we aim at only the Government and not the people of these countries, we shall not get the kind of support which we need. Therefore, we should, especially when we are debating the subject as representatives of the people of India, be addressing ourselves much more to the people of those countries and not just their Governments. In this spirit I would only like to hope that the Prime Minister will keep up the great good work he has embarked upon. I hope in this process he will enlist the support of many other countries which might become full supporters in the tradition of these six which might become 50 countries. If they all join in endorsing the document, it will get further strength. Our Embassies should also project this document in the countries including those which are unsympathetic in a manner that will carry the press and the media with it.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Raialasthan):
Mr. Chairman, Sir, my task has been made somewhat difficult as I have to follow in the footsteps of a very eminent Indian, now

[Shri Jaswant Singh]

a distinguished colleague of mine; virtually a walking encyclopaedia of experience. But when from that eminence, he chooses the role of a partisan proponent, naturally the high esteem in which we hold him, has to be tampered with a different viewpoint. This story about Nassau etc., I will come to it in a minute. Really speaking, international visits of the kind that the Prime Minister recently undertook, to my mind, are the outer clothing of policy. Here I would like to take the Prime Minister into confidence and tell him that the irreverents within his own party are whispering in the Central hall that he is overdoing it a bit. It is for you.....
(Interruptions)....

SHRI SAT PAUL MITTAL (Punjab):
It is your own imagination.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He says they are whispering. They are not saying. They are whispering. Whispers can be heard properly or not heard properly.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, I started by saying that my task is difficult as I have followed the intervention by my distinguished colleague, Mr. Jha. And I did say that international visits of the kind recently undertaken by the Prime Minister are like the outer clothing of policy. Therefore, when we have to arrive at the substance of it, we have to remove that clothing. The visit was really concerned with apartheid and nuclear disarmament. And though I will confine myself largely to the question of apartheid, there is one small query I have to make about disarmament also.

I do wish to emphasise that there cannot be any substantial difference of approach on issues as central as racism, as apartheid between the Treasury Benches and us. It is not also a question of determining the intent. Not for a moment do we question the intent. Really speaking, when it comes to the touch-stone, it becomes the effectiveness of the policy that is followed. Here a brief word I venture to make to my distinguished colleague about perceptions and reality in interna-

tional relations. It is the perception of my distinguished colleague that Nassau was a great success. Now that his perception as viewed through the refracted prism of moulded ideas. What however is the reality of Nassau to London. Let us please reflect on what actually happened between Nassau and London. South Africa attacked three Non-aligned countries in that period. A minimum of 2,500 South Africans were killed. Two emergencies were declared. The policy that was followed which my distinguished colleague says was such a great success at Nassau—resulted in all this. Hence I spoke about perceptions and reality. Now, Sir, nobody can possibly disagree about the approach to apartheid because I believe that apartheid has the colour of blood. And you cannot...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Of the skin.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: No, Sir. Apartheid as a policy has the colour of blood.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. I have no quarrel with you. Please go ahead.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: What I said was that we are not indulging in a competitive condemnation of what we all accept as a wrong. It is not that. It is the determination of the effectiveness of our policy. Now, I would like the hon. Prime Minister to therefore, clarify. Firstly, following upon the London Mini-Summit, two proposals were made by the Government of India about a monitoring system for the implementation of the Nassau Accord—paragraphs 7 and 8 and subsequent actions, etc. How exactly do you visualise that monitoring system to be working? Secondly, Sir, and equally important, if not more important which also is a proposal, and a very wise proposal with which we wholly agree, is about assistance to Frontline States. Indeed the Prime Minister's statement also mentions about it. After the London Mini-Summit, there has been attack on Angola. The story between Nassau and London is the story of attack on Commonwealth countries.

So, when it comes to assistance to Frontline States, it is not merely assistance in economic terms, it is also assistance in terms of security. Therefore, would the Prime Minister be so good as to elaborate his thinking on this critical aspect?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think, you must stop now.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Just one or two clarifications, Sir.

Sir, I agree with my distinguished colleague, Mr. Jha that the real fight is against apartheid and South Africa. It is not against the Commonwealth. I do believe that the Commonwealth has a continuing role to play because it is perhaps the most effective instrument against apartheid whether you take the example of Glenegles agreements, about sports or others. And, therefore, I would commend to the Government that there is continued effectiveness of the Commonwealth, whether you demonstrate it in Harare, whether you demonstrate it in the lobbying in the United Nations or whether you demonstrate it in its relationship with the EEC. I would also request the Prime Minister to let me know whether there is a proposal to call an emergency meeting of the full Commonwealth so that this issue can be taken up.

One clarification about disarmament aspect, Sir. I find that on pages 4 and 5 there is a very interesting, and, to my mind, exciting innovation, of this approach to nuclear disarmament and the Prime Minister has stated: Prior to our next meeting we shall also consider other measures to enable us to project an independent viewpoint on issues etc. I do not want to read the rest of it. I think this is very worthwhile. Unless there is an independent approach, which is what the sixnation approach is, after all about, independent of the preoccupations of the super-powers; and within that approach if you could, not actually institutionalise, but certainly put into

effect an information system, as sponsored by the six and within which if you could draw a number of agencies worldwide which do a lot of independent work on the subject of nuclear disarmament, this would be very interesting and exciting innovation could the hon. Prime Minister be good enough to elaborate on that.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I welcome the statement of the Hon. Prime Minister. The effort of India for implementing the sanctions against apartheid South Africa is historic. No doubt the pressure of international community one day will make the Government of South Africa to surrender and give freedom to Namibia. When Namibia is freed two personalities will be thanked by the world community. One is Mahatma Gandhi, and another is our hon. Prime Minister. Shri Rajiv Gandhi.

Sir, we are taking more effective steps for sanction. At the same time, apartheid South Africa under Botha is also taking effective steps against the frontline African countries. I would like to know from our hon. Prime Minister that in order to meet the challenge what steps are going to be taken by the Commonwealth of countries. Sir, regarding the ban on nuclear tests, we see immediately some positive response even from the USA. The United States Senate which is at present under the control of the Democratic Party has passed a Resolution to impose a year-long ban on nuclear tests above one-kilogram range starting from the year January—1987, provided the Soviet Union agrees to this limitation. So, immediate steps must be taken for the meeting of the heads of superpowers because during the last six months these superpowers have conducted 16 tests. That is why the meeting of these heads of superpowers is necessary.

With these observations, I conclude, Sir.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: Mr. Chairman, Sir, some clarifications have

[Shri Rajiv Gandhi]

been asked, first on the question of South Africa and whether the Commonwealth meeting in Nassau was very effective or not. Sir, I beg to state that Commonwealth meeting in Nassau was very effective and it was only because of the effectiveness and the force of the Commonwealth, the force of the EPG when it visited South Africa, the effect of EPG's visit in South Africa on the rest of the world, that South Africa has reacted in this manner. The frontline States, the other Africans, the Africans in South Africa, are very clear that if they are to fight for independence, they will have to put up with a certain amount of difficulty and hardship. They are willing to put up with that difficulty and hardship, which is going to be much less than the difficulty and hardship that they are facing today, because of apartheid and because of actions of the Pretoria Government in South Africa.

One Member asked the question whether we were going to expel the U. K. from the Commonwealth. I do not think that situation has come now. The attitude that we took in London was not that of either expelling or forcing or compelling but that we should carry on along the road that we feel is correct, and not to give undue importance to any one country which is not wanting to co-operate with us.

One Member talked about the outer clothing of the policy. Unfortunately, he barred himself and exposed everything he had, maybe his ignorance.

We have talked of assistance to the Frontline States but the discussions are at a very preliminary stage. I have myself talked to leaders of the Frontline States: I have talked to others also and we have got certain ideas in mind of what can be done. We did discuss this among the Six and one of the Six was willing to financial-

ly assist, to a great extent, in meeting the problems of the Frontline States.

These are the things which are yet to crystallise and it will take a little while before that actually happens. It would be premature for me to say anything about that just yet. One thing to try and keep in mind is that the fighting in South Africa is not just an airy-fairy concept that we would like to throw up every now and then to distract attention from other things; it is today one of the fundamental issues of human rights in the world. It is the only place in the world where human dignity, where human rights, where democracy, where any basic concept of humanity, is being violated. And India, starting with Gandhiji, has fought for human rights, for human dignity, for basic freedoms. India cannot today be seen to be faltering in that direction and India will not be seen to be faltering in that direction.

Coming to the Six-Nation meeting in Ixtapa, some of the questions asked were not really something targeted at me, perhaps. When the hon. Member meets the President of the U.S., he can ask him those questions and I will leave those for the President to answer.

SHRI K. MOHANAN (Kerala): What is your perception?

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: We are interested in your perception.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: Even in your supplementaries, you need prompting.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: That is because...

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: Now, you are letting the promoter to take over, Sir, the question of new countries becoming nuclear was discussed, not at the formal meeting but I did discuss this with some of the six in the informal meetings that we had prior to the formal meeting. I believe that both the U.S.A. and the USSR do want to

work for nuclear disarmament, for ultimate peace. The question now is of the route that they want to take. The U.S.A. is of the view that by going via the SDI, they will bring about peace. We do not believe that the route of SDI or Star Wars will bring peace. We believe it will bring more tension; it will bring heightened arms' race and that is why we are against that. We have been in consultation with both the U.S.S.R. and the USA on this question of nuclear testing. In fact, we have had correspondence from the President of the U.S.A. as well as the General Secretary of the U.S.S.R. During this summit, just before the summit, we had a letter from Chancellor Kohl. Therefore, it is not as if we are a sort of doing something absolutely on our own. We are in consultation. We are getting their views on the direction we take. But we also feel that our direction should not be altered by what they say. We will be guided, to a certain extent. But the basic direction we take must remain ours and it will remain ours.

There has been a certain difference in the viewpoints of the two countries, as I mentioned. We are talking about verification of a test ban. That means a system of seeing whether any tests have been conducted after there is an agreement that no tests will be conducted. The U.S.S.R. is, by and large, in agreement with this. In the case of the U.S.A. on the other hand when they talk about verification they talk in terms of verification of a test that is actually carried out. In other words, the monitoring of a test and the yield of a test that has been carried out. There is a basic difference in our approach to this question. We hope this will be rectified.

Due to our efforts—and we believe it is due to our efforts—there has been a tremendous increase in awareness in the countries, nuclear weapon countries, and we have seen certain steps they have taken towards a test ban. For example, there is already a team of American

scientists with American equipment, American control equipment in the U.S.S.R. monitoring and verifying that there is actually no test going on. I believe a similar team of U.S.S.R. scientists with U.S.S.R. equipment will be going to the U.S.A. soon so that it can be done. It is, I believe, not at Government level but at the scientists-to-scientists level. But it is a first step. Therefore, our efforts are not being totally wasted; they are yielding fruit. We hope this will accelerate.

Again, nuclear disarmament is most critical to us in India. It is not just a subject for us to discuss abroad. It is very much a subject for us to discuss in India as well. If we are not able to bring about disarmament, if tensions continue to build as they are building, if technology continues the way it is continuing, there is a very real danger that we will have a nuclear war, accidental, deliberate, by malfunction; no matter which way it comes about, the results of such a war would be equally devastating. We have seen the fallibility of technology in the case of Challenger and Chernobyl. The technology that will be used for firing nuclear weapons, for controlling nuclear weapons, will be no less fallible than this technology. In fact, some of the areas that the new technology is reaching out to are so new and so untried, that most people believe that it will not be possible to have a system which is totally infallible and foolproof, and the only test of the system would be a Third World War. In other words, the very reason for which we are developing it can only be the test which will prove whether it works or it does not work. We do not want to risk such a system. Already, the time difference between the firing of a weapon and the weapon striking the target is being reduced to a minute, sometimes under a minute, depending on where the weapon is situated which means that the decision making process is being taken out of the hands of the political leadership and being put into the hands of, first, the military, and then into the hands of machines, which would have to decide in a matter of few seconds whether a weapon is to be fired

or not. With the fallibility of technology we cannot allow this to happen. The only answer is to have a dismantling of nuclear weapons, to have nuclear disarmament. And the first step towards nuclear disarmament is stopping of all nuclear testing, because as long as we are developing new weapons we are improving new weapons, there is no question of actually reducing the weapons and dismantling the weapons. For India, it is important because, as we have seen from the radiation leak, it is not something which remains limited to one country. A leak from Chernobyl affected most of Europe, right from Northern Europe to Southern Europe. Radiation from a nuclear war, whether it is inadvertent or deliberate, will be much worse than the radiation from Chernobyl and it will affect everyone in the world. It will affect all 750 million Indians. The nuclear winter, which is bound to follow such a war, will affect us perhaps even more. Those who survive the radiation will have to face temperatures far below those that they are accustomed to. One report says that temperature on an average in India will drop by approximately 35-40°C. Summer in Delhi will become like winter in Gulmarg. You can imagine what it will do to our people and to our crops, what it will do to our whole system as it is to day. So this struggle for nuclear disarmament is really a struggle for the survival of our own people, for the prosperity of our own people. We have to simultaneously see and try to effect re-deployment of funds, which today are going into nuclear development and into machines of war, into human development, into economic development, for the benefit of mankind.

These two thrusts that we have undertaken in London and Mexico really go home to the heart of our people, go home to the grassroots of India and that is why we give so much importance and time to these two topics.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We now resume discussion on the Calling Attention. Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee.

[Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair.]

**CALLING ATTENTION TO A MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE—
Reported Crisis in Silk and Cotton Powerloom Industry (Contd.)**

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : उपसभा-पति जी कपड़ा मंत्री महोदय ने जो बयान दिया है उससे ऐसा लगता है कि पावर लूम सैक्टर की तस्वीर बड़ी सुख है पावर सैक्टर लूम के बाग में सब कुछ हरा-भरा है। पावर लूम सैक्टर कुल कपड़े का पहले 30 प्रतिशत तैयार करता था अब 45 प्रतिशत तैयार कर रहा है। बिजली के करवों को कच्चा माल मिल रहा है पहले से सस्ता मिल रहा है उनके लिए धागे का भी इंतजाम किया गया है, सिल्क धागा विदेशों से भी मंगवाया गया है।

अगर यह बातें सच हैं और बिजली का कच्चा क्षेत्र में कोई संकट नहीं है, तो क्या कारण है कि जहाँ-जहाँ बिजली करवें लगे हुए हैं, वहाँ एक अनिश्चितता है। 11 मार्च को सरकार ने जो आदेश निकाला था उसके खिलाफ कई प्रदेशों में बिजली करवा वालों ने हड़ताल की। काम बंद रहा। उनके संगठन दिल्ली तक दौड़े। स्मृति-पत्र दिए।

उपसभापति जी, हाल में मुझे कर्नाटक में डाडवल पुरम जाने का मौका मिला। वहाँ लगभग 10 हजार पावरलूम हैं। इस धंधे में लगभग 40 हजार लोग लगे हैं। ये चोपर वैयायटीज की सिल्क साड़ियाँ बना रहे हैं। आर्ट सिल्क साड़ियाँ बन रहा है। वे कलर्ड एवं ब्लीचड सिल्क कलाथ आफ लाइट वेट बना रहे हैं। लेकिन सारे शहर में मैंने एक अनिश्चितता देखी। सिल्क-पावर लूम अगर सारे देश में 50 हजार है तो कर्नाटक में 40 हजार है। उनके मन में आशंकाएँ हैं। मंत्री महोदय ने ठीक कहा कि हैंडलूम का सैक्टर हम से नसबपुरा। परंपरागत सैक्टर है उससे संरक्षण देने की नीति 1950 से चन रही है। हम उस संरक्षण का समर्थन करते रहे हैं। लेकिन मुझे शिकायत है कि जब नई कपड़ा नीति बनी तो उसमें तीनों सैक्टर के बारे में इन्टग्रेड विचार नहीं हुआ।