STATEMENT BY MINISTER

III. Racism and Apartheid in South Africa

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAI AFFAIRS AND THE MINISTER OF COIU:VIERCE (SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER): Madam, India has consistently opposed the policy of racialism and apartheid practised by the Government of South Africa. Over 80 yean; ago Mahatma Gandhi raised his voice .- against the immorality, inhumanity an;i injustice of apartheid. Pt. Jawa harlal Nehru spearheaded the international struggle for racial equlity and majority rule in South Africa. This tradition has remained the sheel anchor of India's policy agains[1] apartheid.

From the very moment the people of India gained control over the hides tiny, the opposition to apartheid began to be manifested in specific decisions of Government of India. The Interior! Govt-ii'iTH'tit of Indie in July, 1943 banned all tr;ide with South Africa •even though it meant a loss of 5 per cent of India's export trade at that time. We withdrew our High Commissioner in the same year and finally closed down our trade office in South Africa. This was followed by other decisions such as banning of overflights of its territory by South Africa registered aircraft, severance of shipping links cutting of economic, cultural, and consular links. In 1977 India acceded to the Convention or the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid and in 1981 enacted the Anti-Apartheid Act.

Our national actions against apartheid have been matched by our efforts to mobilise the-international comrau nity against Pretoria's policies. India was the first country to take the issue of racial discrimination in South Africa to the United Nations as early a$_s$ 1946. W$_e$ sponsored, alongwith other countries, the first Resolution in the UN General Assembly in 198? calling for sanctions against South Africa. Similarly India has consistently compaigned in other fora notably the Non-Aligned Movement and the Commonwealth. The Non-Alig :<ed Movement today stands solidly behind the call for universal, comprehensive mandatory sanctions. Within the Commonwealth, largely due to efforts of India and other like-minded countries, some progress has been made towards the acceptance of the principle of sanctions, even though the progress is slower then We would hav$_e$ wished.

At their meeting in the Bahamas in October, 1935, the Commonwealth Heads of Government adopted the Nassau Accord which calls upon the Pretoria Government to declare tha'. it would dismantle the system of apartheid, terminate the existing stat$_e$ of emergency, release immediately and unconditionally Nelson Mandela and others, establish political freedom and to initiate a process of dialogue across lines of colour, politics ar>d religion Besides, the Accord prescribed a certain number of economic and other measures against South Africa to *tx* adopted and applied by all the members of the Commonwealth. In pursuance of the Accord, the President of Zambia and the Prime Ministers of Australia, the Bahamas, Canada, India, U. K. and Zimbabwe appointed a 7-member group known as 'Eminent Persons Group' It included distinguished individuals from India, Aus+ ralia U. K. Canada, Nigeria, *Tfraaatda* and Barbados. Its specific task was to contact all the parties in South Africa an 1 initiate a process of dialogue which might eventually lead to the dismantlement of apartheid. This group visited South Africa and a number of Frontline State$_s$ and submitted its report in June this yea" The report was unanimous. It admitted failure to initiate the process of dialogue and concluded that 8w Government of South Africa was not genuinely interested in dismantling the system of apartheid. The report clearly bring out the intransigence o? the Pretoria regime and its rejection*

ol tile reasonable suggestions, made by the EPG to initiate the process of negotiations.

After the publication of the Eminent Persons' Group report, public opinion all over the world has become convinced that stronger measures against Pretoria are the only peaceful alternative to violence in South Africa. In May the EEC Summit discussed this question and decided, inspite of the desire of several members to apply sanctions, to send its Council President Sir Geoffrey Howe to South Africa and some neighbouring countries. This step has led to serious disappointment and apprehensions among the leaders of the Frontline States and the liberation movements in South Africa. President Reagan in his latest statement, as the British Prime Minister earlier, has taken a clear position against sanctions characterising them as ineffective.

At the mini summit of the Commonwealth in London from August 3-5, 1986, which is being held in pursuance of the Nassau Accord, the Eminent Persons' Group report will be discussed. The Nassau Accord stipulates that in the event of lack of progress towards any of the objectives mentioned in the Accord, the leaders will meet to discuss the next stage of action. 1^ is therefore, inevitable that the question of application of further measures and sanctions against South Africa will come up.

India's opposition to apartheid, her belief in the imperative of mandatory comprehensive sanctions against South Africa in order to pressurise it to dismantle the system and her support for the struggle of the people of South Africa is constant, steadfast and unwavering. "'Apartheid" as our Prime Minister has said "cannot be reformed. It must be eliminated." The peaceful means to do it is to apply comprehensive universal mandatory sanction[1] against the South African Government, The alternative is violence, bloodshed and destruction in the re gion. Elimination of apartheid is an article of faith with us. We hope that we shall succeed in persuading all the nations of the world that sanctions against the racist regime of South Africa are imperative and urgent.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN [DR. (SHRIMATI) SAROJINI MAHISHI]: There are a large number of Members seeking clarifications. Mr. Gopal samy.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH (West Bengal): I have given the name. You go party-wise.

SHRI J AS WANT SINGH (Rajas-than): As far as clarifications are concerned, we go in accordance with the time when the request for clarification is given. It is not party-wise.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN [DR. (SHRIMATI) SAROJINI MAHISHTJ: That is all right. At No. 1 is Mr. V. Gopalsamy. He is not here. Therefore, I am calling the other person—Shri Dipen Ghosh.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: If Mr. Gopalsamy is at number one, you will have to call the person at No. 2.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN [DR. (SHRIMATI) SAROJINI MAHISH1J: We shall follow it up next time.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Either we follow the custom, the system or we do not follow it. My objection is not to the individuals concerned. My objection is to the principle involved. So, who is No. 2?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN [DR. (SHRIMATI) SAROJINI MAHISHI.1: No. 2 is Mr. A. G. Kulkarni.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH; Then Mr. Kulkarni should be called.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN [DR. (SHRIMATI) SAROJINI MAHISHI]: J have no objection. He can speak afterwards. I have called Mr. Dipen Ghosh.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH; This is in accordance with the names given.

SHRI SANKAR PRASAD MITRA (West Bengal): This is according to the time when the name is given.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN [DR. JCSHRIMATI) SAROJINI MAHISHI]: The time is not given here. Here, No. l is Mr. V. Gopalsamy. He is absent. No. 2 is Mr. A. G. Kulkarni. Now, he can make his point.

SHRi pARVATHANENI UPENDRA (Andhra Pradesh); Generally, the custom is that as far as clarifiations are concerned, we are going party-wise starting with the largest party. But only in the Calling Attention, as per the notice given, the people are called That is the custom. You can refer to ♦he record.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN [DR. (SHRIMATI) SAROJINI MAHISHI]: Yes, Mr. A. G. Kulkarni.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI (Maharashtra): Madam, at the outset, I want to support what Mr. Jaswant Singh has said. The convention in this House up to 1984 is that the clarifications, the special Mentions and the other things go as per the individual Members' desire. That is the convention of the House. Time-factor was also previously mentioned. Whoever gave earlier was taken as No. 1. Madam, this was the system. But, unfortunately, it has been changed between 1984 and 1966.

AN HON: MEMBER; It has not been changed.

SHRI A. G. Kulkarni: I am told that it has been changed. You believe me because in the Business Advisory committee this was discussed and the Chairman has taken the view that he should call party-wise. I do not want to claim that I should he called because why should I he called when my Party is a small party?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN [DR. (SHRIMATI SAROJINI MAHISH] : Mr. Kulkarni will now seek clarifications.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI; Madam, now that you have called me, I hope this system, would be henceforth wor ked out in the House because this gives justice to all the Members on the basis of their notices being sub mitted in the Notice Office.....

SHRI JAGESH DESAI (Maharashtra): Both the sides.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: How can it be only the Opposition side? you are a Member. Whether a Congress (I) Member or a Janata Party Member, a Member is a Member.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN [DR. (SHRIMATI SAROJINI MAHISHI]: Mr. Kulkarni, it may be discussed in the Business Advisory Committee. You please continue.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: Please convey the wishes of the House to the Chairman. I do not want to add anything or subtract anything.

Madam, as you have called me to seek clarifications on this, I want to say this is a very sensitive subject particularly in the interest of 4 P.M. this country's foreign policy which is for the last 35 years moulded by Pandit Nehru followed by Smt. Indira Gandhi and further now being pursued by the new Prime Minister, Rajiv Gandhi.

Madam Vice-Chairman, this country's total approach to the African problems is that South Africa is acting against the interests of the black people and that has to be broken down at some level. But I do feel that before asking one or two clarifications that

**he Government of India's dithering particularly on these commonwealth games has created a little but of unhappiness in the minds of the Indians, because the Indians thought that the Government along with the frontline countries, of whatever it is, should have taken an early decision BO that it should not have been understood or it should not have been interpreted, otherwise.

Then, Mr. Minister I want to know irom you what is our approach to the Commonwealth countries now, because I remember we, in the last fifteen years discussed this problem and we were all praising the Government for withdrawing from the Commonwealth because of the various acts of omission and commission done by the British, Government, which is the jbead of the Commonwealth?

SHRI SAT PAUL MITTAL (Punjab): Why should we withdraw? We should expel them.

SHRi A. G. KULKARNI: What I have said, was the view that we were taking for the last 15 years. You were also with me for six to eight years. You know what we told Smt. Indira Gandhi, let us withdraw. Now what you are saying is a new young view, namely, that we should expel Margaret Thatcher or the British etc.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN [DR. (SHRIMATI) SAROJINI MAHISHI]: You are asking clarifications from the Minister,

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: Yes, Madam, I am asking him. But when an intervention comes, I have to take care, because this is also a part of clarifications and as a senior Member Mr. Mittal, as he is, recently he atten ded the Apartheid Conference in the Vigyan Bhavan.....

SHRI P. SHTV SHANKER: Madam, Joe can also deal with clarifications. *Unterruptions).*

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI; Now, Madam, what I want to ask is whether in view of our stand taken in the Commonwealth Games, there is any possibility of the Government of India withdrawing from the Commoa-wealth. I do not desire that we should be amatureish, to expel the U. K. of Margaret Thatcher. I do not think that is the stage or that is a proper thing to do far a self-respecting country like India, and a country like India which is mature which has got a well-set foreign policy of Non-Alignment. We do not think) like that. This is *one* thing. Secondly, Mr. Minister, I want to know from you whether it is true that in all your effort* of persuading the bigger nations to apply sanctions, I do not think ever America or a country like England will ever agree to this. For that purpose the African and other Commonwealth countries or the Group of 77 or whatever it is, they should have a strategy to deal with South Africa. A* present already South Africa is under-going some type of sanctions and it is having its impact on their economy Unless this further screwed down and South Africa is brought to a position wherefrom it will have more respect for the World opinion, for that purpose what steps the Government of Indie desires to take.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH; After the hon. Minister's statement, the clarifications that we seek which amount almost to a discussion, are not about indulging in a competitive condemnation of the barbarity and inhumanity that racism and apartheid in South Africa represent. It is essentially to establish whether the Government of India's policy in this context has been a success dr a failure and what, if anything, has it contributed towards affecting events in South Africa. It is not—and here I would like to clarify to the hon Minister the intent which is the detel' mining factor. Not for a moment do we doubt your intentions and your approach to apartheid, indeed, of any member of this or the other House, It is not your good or bad intention*

[Shri Jaswant Singh]

that are under discussion, because it i3 not your subjective intentions which are the determining criteria. It is rather the effectiveness of the policy that you brought to bear on the whole question of South Africa, which is under consideration.

The hon. Minister's statement is quite a detailed account of the historical context development of the country's pfolicy against racism and apartheid. But it is not entirely con-textually relevant to once again go over the historical context of where India stood about apartheid during Mahatama Gandhiji's days or during late Pandit Jawaharlal Neh'ru's days. We really have to start from the Nassau Accord. And the Nassau Accord was something that was discussed in this House, when We did have occasion to mention even then that the overriding impression that was created after the Nassau Accord and that was the determining factor for considering whether the Government of India's policy was going to effect events in South Africa Or noti or be a meaningful influence— the impression then created was that the Prime Minister of India had become an interpreter of and an apologist for the British policy in South Africa Nassau Accord was put across to us here in the country as a major diplomatic achievement. By that however, our policy on South Africa had been reduced to merely sending signals to South Africa rather than taking firm and deliberate action. And this what we pointed out even when Nassau Accord was discussed in this House. Why do I say that the Nassau Accord was more involved with sending signals to South Africa than to dealing headlong with the question of apartheid and racism? My hon. friend Mr. Murli Bhan-dare has just stepped into the House. I recollect that even on that occasion he said, whereas there is something in what you say, perhaps, a movement towards eliminating apartheid has been made by the Nassau Accord. What, however, has actually taken place after that Accord was signed in Nassau? More than 2500 people have been killed since the signing of that Accord. Secondly, South Africa since the signing of that Accord has launched aggression against three Commonwealth regimes, even to the extent of launching this agression when the Eminent Persons Group was itself in Pretoria. Thirdly, thousands have been detained without trial. Fourthly, there have been two declarations of emergency and there has been an unprecedented repressioa in that coutry. Fifthly, as cumulative of all this, we have recently the witnessed the question—and the Com-monwealth particularly has been subjected to a lecture on the question of morality— what is moral and what is immoral—by the British Prime Minister. This then is the catalogue of what has taken place after Nassau and I would leave it open to the House and for you to determine whether as an objective criterion of determination, the Gov-ernment of India's policies have at all affected events in South Africa. If these events are to be taken, can we really consider that Government of India's policies have been a success? A word, or a brief word, about the Eminent Persons' Group. Now this was an attempt which was put across to us as if the very constitution and sending of that Eminent Persons' Group was, by itself a major anti-apartheid step. The report that the eminent per-sons' group has come up with is a j good, wise and humane report. But it is not an alternative to effective action. The setting up of the group was by itself, a compromise and we in India, would be making a mistake if we think that the report i_s in itself an alternative to action because one of the overriding impressions of the report is that all these eminent gentlemen, all these elder statesmen, —some more elder than statesmen— have actually, for the first time, sud-denly discovered the evils of racism

1»«ne suddenly come to know what apartheid stood for. We would, therefore, be gravely mistaken if we tieat this report as the only document Ahich we can treat as our anti-a theid plan.

Sir, I will come to some specific suggestions. To my mind, no Minister in the Government of India is setter equipped than my esteemed colleague, the hon. Minister of External Affairs, to put across a bad ta^e m a good light.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Don't hand in a Ivft-handed compliment. I will be in trouble.

SHRI SANKAR PRASAD MI-TRA: That was his profession.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I am heartened by a sentence atribut>xi to the Prim* Minister, which is really not that of the Prime Minister. Whoever has drafted this statement has picked it out of. .- I would not go int_0 the details. This is the only aspect where I agree with the staun-chest opponents of apartheid within South Africa. The sentence is: 'You cannot refom apartheid. You can only eliminate it.' I do wish the Government of India had approached this question, this whole question, in this very light from Nassau onwards. The who!-? question of EPG, getting Madam Thatcher to move an inch- - 'No; I do not move; the Commonwealth moves'- - the Prime Minister becoming a rationalist ana an explainer of what the British Prime Minister actually meant or said, when «he said what she said etc. etc., makes the whole question of our approach to apartheid totally wrong. The only question is, you cannot reform apartheid, you can only eliminate *Wi.* I am saying this because before this discussion and clarifications started the hon. Minister sug-geted that he would appreciate if we came forward with what we had as suggestions. I would also mention to the hon. Minister that a change in South Africa will not come through negotiations. You must recognise this fact. Whatever chanee is inevl- *i* table, whatever) change will com* about within that country, will not come about through negotiations: least of all—this is where the question of Commonwealth comes in—* with what countries within the Com* monwealth might try to do or not do. The instrument of Commonwealth has already been proven ineffective as far as the fight against rpnrtl is concerned. Please recognise this. Our central fight is against apartheid and not against the Com-monwealtih. The whole thrust and the whole direction of our struggle seems to be shifting as if $_a$ great victory against apartheid would achieved merely if the Commonwealth were dismantled. The Com-monwealth is a limited and an ineffective instrument in the struggle against apartheid. Please recognise that. Here again, I would request the hon. Minister to reflect very deeply. Please recogn that sanctions, comprehensive, universal, mandatory economic sanctions, against South Africa are only means to an end. They are not the end by themselves. The end is the elimination of racism and apartheid. Therefore, when you build the Government of India's policy plank, as if comprehensive, universal, mandatory sanctions, economic sanctions against South Africa is all that India is, at the moment, proposing, it is a very limited and very poo'r policy plank, although it may appear to be an easily digestible one. Therefore, please reflect de-(plv on what I am saying about limiting our options only to sanctions. I have just one or two brief queries. The hon. Minister, I $_a$m sure, has this report in its original authorised version with him. So, I shall not take the time of the House by quoting from it. The tasks given to this eminent persons group; f won't repeat each of th<» tasks because that takes time of the! House. About dismantling apartheid, the group says that after examining the programme of the Government of PretoVia and they find that their programme of reform, is not contributing towards dismantling apartheid. Similar is the conclusion about termina-

[Shri Jaswant Singh]

:iing emergency, about releasing Nelson Mandela, about political freedom, suspension of violence etc. That was in relation to clause 6, I think of the NASSAU Declaration. Where do you, therefore, now stand on clause 6, particularly when clause 7 of NASSAU Declaration went a bit further? I am sure the hon. Minister knows all about clause 7 of the NASSAU Declaration. Neither clause 2, nor clause 6 nor clause 7 of the NASSAU Declaration, has been fulfilled. So, I would like to know where does the NASSAU Declaration now actually ştend? And where does the Government of India stand in relation to the NASSU 'Declaration? There are certain actions which were inbuilt into these paragraphs 2, 6 and 7 of the NASSAU Declaration. Please don't tell us that this six-month limit that has been placed as part 7 of the NASSAU Declaration is going to be fulfilled because 18 months after NASSAU now between the third and the fifth of August you are going to meet in Ijondon in this mini Commonwealth.

Just three or four very short clarifications.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN P^R .(SHRIMATI S^ROJINT MAHISHI]: You yourself would be giving the clarifications.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I would like to ask these questions because the whole question of this state of emergency within South Africa has become endemic. It is no longer a technical question of emergency or non-emergency. It has become endemic and, therefore, I would appeal to the Government of India to really even devise a new phraseology because we seem to be trapped into cliches of yesterday. Just three questions, Madam. Firstly, about Indians in South Africa. This is a much vexed question. The Government of India always avoids this question. We also always avoid it. W« all know that the three-tier system, which has been created there, has been created in a manner which creates separations between the coloured and the non-coloured. As far as Indians in South Africa are concerned because this is a matter which. the Government of India should pay very close attention to, whenever there is trouble in any part of Africa the first people to be affected, the flr*l people to be evicted, are the Indian expatriates or people of Indian origin. The Government of India cannot wash its hands of the responsibility of such a potential, or possibilities about such developments. I would remind the hon. Minister that in 1969 there had been riots in Durban when over 100 Indians were killed very recently. Mahatma Gandhi's memorabilia and some essential items connected with Mahatme Gandhi were destroyed in Phoenix Ashram and at Tolstoy Farm. Here is a concern which everybody shares bu* which we do not voice. I would like to take this opportunity to say that this is the real state of Indians in South Africa. Africans are apt to look upon Indians as cheeky traders, out to exploit the customers. African intellectuals often censure the Indians for their cultural arrogance and their proclivity for self-segregation. We do not have any diplomatic relations with South Africa. There are over a million Indians or of Indian origin who are in South Africa. What is the Government of India doing to influence those Indians so that they too work purposefully for the earliest dismantling Of the racist regime in Pretoria? It does n_0 good to say, because there *i** no diplomatic recognition, therefore it is an excuse for diplomatic, ineffectiveness or inaction.

Finally, from here where does the Government of India now intend, contemplate moving? The NASSAU Declaration which had been put across to us in this House and to the country as a good diplomatic victory of the Government of India is now a greal document. Therefore, I would like to know from the hon. Minister, froat here where do we go?

SHRI SUSHIL CHAND MOHUNTA (Haryana). Madam, there is no doubt. *(Interruptions)* I am extremely sorry for giving that impression. This matter is likely to come up again. I may be here, I may not be bere in this House. But there are certain matters in which the individual rights of the Members can be asserted. For instance, we have the Calling Attention Motion

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN [DR. (SHRIMATI) SAROJINI MAHISHI] Mr. Mohunta, we need not discuss this.

SHRI SUSHIL CHAND MOHUNTA: | An impression has gone round that the rights of Members can be compromised in the Business Advisory Committee. I do not know of such a decision.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA; You should ask your leader.

SHRI SUSHIL CHAND MOHUNTA: Well, I don't know. My leader never reported to rne never informed me about it. never advised me about this.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN [DR. (SHRIMATI) SAROJINI MAHISHI] I request the hon. Member to please ask his clarifications. And I would like him to be brief.

SHRI SUSHIL CHAND MOHUNTA: I shall be brief. But I cannot help taking noje of this aspect because it is not our intention to derieve the importance of leaders. In any case how can we do it at all? But there are certain points, certain matters hi which each individual Member exercises his right to say something—as you have the Calling Attention, as there are Special Mentions, as we have the seeking of clarifications because it is not necessary that clarifications should be confined to one Member from each party. There may be three members from a party seeking clarifications. They have been given an option to seek clarifications; normally they will be allowed.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN TDR. (SHRIMATI) SAROJINI MAHISHI: You need not answer the hon. Mem-

bers. You please cotinue with your clarifications.

SHRI SUSHIL CHAND MOHUNTA: This vexed problem of South Africa has been engaging the attention of the people all around the world. It is a State terrorist programme unleashed in South Africa. Innocent people are harmed, they are exposed to terrorist activities by the Government itself and this fact has been recognised by people all around the world whether they have become parties to the issue of sanctions being imposed against South Africa or not. This fact is equally recognised by the British Government as well as by the Americans and other people and all around the world public opinion is gaining ground, even in countries like the USA, that this sort of thing must end. I agree with Mr. Jaswant Singh that you cannst convince, you cannot bring round South African Government to the view that apartheid must be abolished, democratic institutions and democratic-rights must be restored to the people and State terrorism must end. You cannot convince them ; you cannot negotiate with them; It cannot *bv* done. The only way '« that it must be ended. And how an it be ended? As long as there are even two or three countries of the world— powerful countries, economically well off countries like the USA, leaders of the economic movement in the world like the USA, Germany and now Great Britain— which do not want to impose sanctions against South Africa, then no matter howsoever much tbi underdeveloped countries may ta[1]k of sanctions, it will not yield results. Therefore, some tangible and dynamic programme must be drawn up either to make thosp countries fall in lirif with us so that the effect of sanctions is so great that the Pretoria regiime will find it difficult to stand it or break it because of the sanctions. That should be one of the purposes. Unless proper sanctions can be imposed, the South African Government is not going t_0 relent. Then the question

[Shri Sushil Chand MohantaJ arises, what else snould we do? So, I want to ask the honourable Minister for External Affairs, if you do not succeed in imposing proper sanctions against the South African l-egime, then what other course is open to you or what other course would you advocate for seeing that the South African Government relents? One possible way could be that the people of South Africa must be able to resist the aggression by the Pretoria regime, and then the question arires, in what manner and what would be the role of the front-line States—because they can also play a very vital role in this matter—and to what extent India will be in a position to streng'hen the activities of the frontline States and all the black majority of South Africa to resist aggression by the Pretoria regime. This is an important question that I would like the honourable Minister to reply to-If your thrust at sanctions against South Africa fails—because if even the three States, the United States, Great Britain and West Germany, do not come in line with you on the point of sanctions, no matter how much you may b-> takmg about Sane, tions, it would not have any effect— then what is the alternative to it and how do you propose to solve it? Be-cau^, now the time-lag—we took the stand in 1946 and now it is 1986— has been so great and taking into consideration the fact that since Mahatmaii started the agi-taMon in South Africa Ions years have passed and these people have been subjected to inhuman treatment ment for such l°ⁿ? time and generations have naᵃsed I would just request the honourable Minister to reply to these questions. Thank you.

SHRI ALADI ARUN *alias* V. ARTTNACHALAM .Tamil Madu): Madam Vice-Chairman, the apartheid ool'cv of South Africa for nearly forty yeans has almost-, challenged th« civilised nations. Unfovtunai Western Europe which always claims *to* be the champion for the establish-ment of liberty, equality, fraternity and democracy is, inarm, uitoteauy ana vauviat-ng in laiong strong actions against the apariheidist South African minority Wiute Government. They talk too much about tne emancipation of the human race, but do very little. They beasc colourfuhy but bewilder everybody. It has been exposed to the world that the White race is always black in heart and mind.

Madam, this House may b$_e$ aware of the fact that India is the harbinger of the movement against apartheid, racial discrimination, segregation, separation and suppression in South Africa. Gandhiji, the Father of our Nation, was the first leader who started the movement against apartheid. As his services were greatly needed for India during the freedom movement, he consequen-tly shifted his battle from Natal to Delhi. So the end of apartheid is still not in sight.

Madam, despite the United Nations' declarations on decolonization and despite the pronouncement of the International Court of Justice and also unanimous resolutions against the policy of aparthid and condemnation of the policy of South Africa and also unanimous resolutions for the immediate grant of independence of Namibia, still apartheid continues and Namibia still re-mains enslaved. Regarding independence of Namibia, the resolution passed bv the United Nat'ons Security Council in 1978 has been wrongly interpreted by most of the Western Powers. Mil'tary offensives are made ruthlessly. Great national leaders like Nelson Mandela W'nnie and Oliver Tambia are still in rtr'-son And the peohle are beint killed at thfl rate of 150 per months as against 70 last year.

The Conference of the Commonwealth countries held in Bahamas *'n* last October unanimously parsed resolutions for limited sanctions against

the apartheid regime of South Africa. More than that, an Eminent Persons Croup was set up to discuss the matter in detail. Our former Foreign Minister has been included in the EPCi. Now, the next Commonwealth Conference scheduled to be held in August, is going to examine the report of the EPG in detail. But there is a report in the press that the EPG is also heading-towards iaiiure.

To mobilise the support of the various countries for sanctions, the World Conference on Sanctions Against South Africa was held in Pari from July 16 to 20. It was well attended by many countries. Our Prime Minister, in his message to the Conference, has stated**:**

> "Freedom and racial equality cannot be sacrificed at the alter of economic and commercial interest. The peaceful way to end apartheid is to enforce mandatory sanctions against Pretoria. The alternative is v^ence and bloodshed."

The International Conference on Immedihte Grant of Independence to Namib'fc held in Vienna on July 17, was inaugurated by the Secretary General, of UNO, Mr. Culler. It was attended by various freedom fighters and di£>utaries.

The fi\ e-day tour of our hon. Prime Ministei to the frontline African co-untries was immensely successful. In Zambia, Zimbabwe, Angola and Tanzani'i our Prime Minister has been received with, rousing welcome and av*\.anch$_{e}$ of falicitations.

During his tour, everywhere he has undoubtedly reaffirmed our solidarity for sanction and against the policy of South Africa. The questions of independence to Namibia, *the* ending of colonialism and racialism were deenly (iscussed with the President of Zambia, Ih\ Kenneth David Kau-nda, Mr. Robert Mugabe, Prime Mnistei of Zimbabwe and Mr. Ali Hassan Muifiyj President of Tanzania.

Madam, our Prime Minister, alone with other front line African leaders, has requested the world communities to impose mandatory, comprehensive economic sanctions against Pretoria and unconditional grant of independence to Namibia and end of colonial -fern in South Africa.

The leading role taken by our country ha$_{s}$ caused enemi$_{es}$ and jealousy among the Whites. Therefore, three days after the vfeit of our hon. Prime Minister, the South African forces ruthlessly attacked the National Congress bases in Harare, Ga-banne and Lusaka. More than 12 helicopter^ have been used. Mercilessly bombs were dropped. Many people have been killed. Of course, most of the Western countries have criticised the attack by South Africa. The$_{v}$ include the USA and the UK. But still South Africa justifies inaction and its policy**.**

Th$_{e}$ prime object of the attack is to oindo the tremendous benefits occurred by the visit of our Prime Minister to the frontline African states. No doubt the attacks of South Africa have been criticised: It has created credibility to our country. It is unfortunate that Mrs. Thatcher, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, is having a soft corner towards South Africa. She is going against the decision of th$_{e}$ Commonwealth Nations. More than that, she is increasing her relationshin in com-merce and trade witti South Africa. So, suspicion is being created in our mind. What is the act'on that is going to he taken bv other Commonwealth countries? Madam, womg to the unyielding attitudte of Mrs. Thatcher, more than half of the countries have boycotted the Common-wealth Games. Mrs Thatcher is still underestimating the boycott by ■Che Commonwealth countries. She is not. serious about it. In fact, we too admit, that th* bovcotting of the Commonwealth Gam»R is in no way helpful to the boycotting countries. Nor is it going to affect the South

[Shri Aladi Aruna *alias* V. Aruna-chalam]

African countries nor the United Kingdom. But at the same time it as helpful to demonstrate the solidarity of India and other countries that we are against the apartheid policv of South Africa.

Now, the question before *u,s* is England is refusing to fall in line with the other Commonwealth countries. It is still supporting the White Government of South Africa." So, what is the initiative that is to be taken by India hereafter to give effect to the sanctions. That is more important. I would like to know whether we are going to withdraw from the Commonwealth or we are going to ask the United Kingdom to dissolve the Commonwealth. Here I would like to remind the House that in 1961 all the Commonwealth countries forced South Africa to withdraw from the Commonwealth. Now the time has come to comply England to withdraw from the Commonwealth.

With these words I conclude.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN T^DR^- (SHRIMATI) SAROJXNI MAHISHI] I would request the Member^ to be ibrief.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH (West Bengal): Only in my case you are requesting. Already it has taken the shape of debate. In that case it should have gone according to the party time. However, I have taken note of your direction and want to abide by the Chair.

Madam, Vice-Chairman, I completely agree with the Statement made by the Union External Affairs Minister that a« the situation obtains today, a comprehensive universal mandatory sanction against South Africa is imparative and urgent. I also agree that this Apartheid policy, which is termed as a crime again'.;! humanity by the UNA, has to be dismantled, not reformed, as some ideas have been floated in South Africa and outside. But the question is how it has to be done. That. I think, is a million dollar question and the answer to fhe million dollar question Js absent in this Statement.

The Botha regime of South Africa has been pursuing the most ihated racial discriminatory policy on the basis of colour of skin. It has been made out in this Statement thai the South African Government stands isolated, but the question is wherefrom doev; the South African Government draw the strength to defy the international community which are the forces behind the South African Government? The forces behind it are the US imperialism and the United Kingdom Government. But simply one sentence has been mentioned here and that too like a damp squib. Mr. Reagan had the cheek to say that it wats immo-.ral to think of the question of enforcing sanctions. A person who is heading an Administration which is indulging in all sorts of immoral activities throughout the world has the cheek to say that the talk of sanctions was immoral. Mrs. Mandela and Bishop Desmond Tutu 'have also said that it was nauseating to hear from Reagon's mouth that it was 'immoral'.

SHRI SAT PAUL MITTAL: Yes.. Mr. Reagan has said.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH; That is very nauseating to listen from him The other day Reagan termed himself as a Contra. He allowed thesoi! of New York to host a Contra summit attended by the representatives of counter 1 evol utionary agencie* qpterfatinlg throughout the world. This summit was addressed by the U.S. Defence Secretary, Mr. Casper Weinberger. Madam, the U.S., U.K., West Germany and one or two other West European countries -are supporting South Africa. What interest they are having in South Africa? Their staka3 are very high. It is reported that U.S. has invested in South Africa to the extent of $ 14billion; and U.K. £ 11 billion. About

*° per "er"- of ^e total oversea, in

U s A[P] ,° mmCraJs *> t° U.K. and | U.S.A. from South Africa. *Even* they import uranium from that coun- ! try. On the basis of this, U S is now making designs of 'star wars* programme. They are preparing a war against the humanity. They get most of the uranium from Namibia and South Africa. These two Governments cannot afford t0 lose South | Africa. That is why tfiese two Governments are supporting the aparthid Policy of both regime. Madam, in every clear terms these two Governments needwi to be condemned But in the Minister's statement it is I absent. The question is how to en- , force these comprehensive universal mandatory sanctions against the Botha regime? The South African people and the front-line African countries are fighting the apartheid and racist policy practised by the Government of South Africa. We have expressed our solidarity with those people simply through a statement. But have we got no responsibility to mobilise not only the Indian people, but also the international community in sending material help to those people fighting against the Botha regime? Where is that expression in this statement? There is no expression. But a time has come not only to say that comprehensive universal mandatory sanctions is imperative and the crime against humanity has to he dismantled, but also a time has come to ensure all kinds of material and diplomatic help to the people of South Africa and the frontline States who are fighting against the Government of South Africa. That declaration is absent in this statement here. I thought at least what Mr. Shiv Shanker had stated in Hyderabad yesterday or day before which has come cart possibly in some newspapers would have appeared in this statement But that is also absent. r do not know, why? Whether Mr. Shiv Shanker outside this Housejs one and Mr. Shiv Shanker Inside this House is the other. I do not know whether he is presiding over the Ministry of External Affairs witn such split personality.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: This .statement was completed by me on Friday, that is, before I left for Hyderabad.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH; This Was prepared, before you made your speech in Hyderabad. But the fact is that there are two aspects. One is that the time has come to give all material.and diplomatic help to the South African people and th.e front-lines States fighting against fnis apartheid policy. This is 0ru» aspect. My question is—whether Government *Ms* prepared to declare that all material and diplomatic help would be rendered to them? This is my first question. My second question is that somebody may like it or may not like it, the question will come that what role we have to play inside the Commonwealth to force the Bri[1] Government to accede to the majority views inside the Commonwealth? There was a time when Great Britain used to dictate terms to other States but today, the situation has changed. The greatest coloniser of the world has reduced herself to a colony of the U.S. Even that Government is allowing "her British soi[1]-foi-U.S. aircrafts to take bombs and attack Libyan Headquarters. the President's Palace. But the point is that now the time has come to tell the British Government cither to mend or to get out of it and whether the Government of India is prepared to say it or create a situation whereby either British Government mends or British Government is expelled from the Commonwealth? *I* would like to know whether the Government of India will be preparing a ground for that situation and thirdly. Madam, we cannot do anything jf we simply mak* a statements against apartheid. Anti-Apartheid is not only the property of the *Q*r-*

[Shri Dipen Ghosh]

ernment, or the Prime Minister or the External Affairs Minister. *(Interruption)* .

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: You are a Member of Parliament.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: It has to be made a property of people of our country and people of other countries against the apartheid. You know that already an attempt have been made in India by the Parliamen-tarions. Only a few days ago a declaration for action has been made from there and my fourth question is: what positive steps the Government of India is going to take to mobilise the Indian people and the inernational communi-ty to create a situation whereby this imperative is really made an imperative? Thak you

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: (Karnataka): Madam Vice-Chairman, there is no second opinion in Parliament or outside about apartheid. Our position has been made well-known long ago. It is only reassertion or reiteration that we are making about our stand in regard to this mtters. Madam, I feel rather sorry that the statement of my friend does not go very far. We are all concerned about the practice of aparthid racialism in South Africa, we want that to be ended and various forms have been used for this purpose in the past. The United Nations passed resolution in the year 1962 and advocate universal sanctions against South Africa. The non-aligned movement was uniani-mous in condemning apartheid. The whole non-aiigned movement stands firm behind the demand for mandatory sanctions against South Africa. Various non-official organisations in world have also criticised the pretoria regime. In the oCmmonwealth, itself we tried hard to accommodate the views of the United Kingdom in the Nassau conference. There instead of using, the word "sanctions" we used the words "economic" measures or other measures' to dismantle racialism in South Africa. So the question is: where do we stand now? Ail th things have been done. A mini summit is also going to take place shortly In London. The Eminent persons' Group has also reported. That will come up for discussion. The stand of the United Kingdom is known, is made known to us. We stand of the Reagan administra tion is also known to us. Then where do we stand? As my colleague just now said, America and England do not want to forgo the advantages they poses now in be friending the White regime in South Africa because many strategic minerals are in South Africa. Their investments are there Investments of America and England and other countries are there in large quantities. They do not want to end these investments. So we know all this. I do not know now where to go from here. Various things have been said. But I really do not know how to go about to end this regime. In international law, my friend knows very well, all measures short of war can be taken. Economic sanctions is only one measure. It is a very effective measure. There are several measures which can be taken simultaneously to pressurise the Pretoria regime to end this racialism there—I mean to say, all measures short of war. I am not advocating war. I konw the prevalent situation now. All measures short of war which are permissible under inter-national law, which the comity of nations have accepted, should be applied against South Africa. In the 18th and 19th centuries, England used to apply economic blockade, military blockade, political diplomatic boycott everything against small countries on minor pretexts, small pretexts. Now is the time to think of various measures, not only economic sanctions but various things, .a package of measures which can exert a tremendouc pressure on the Pretoria regime. We should make the White regime in . South Africa feel that it is impossible to go on with the present policy of apartheid. Unless they are made to

understand I am afraid, mere condemnation and taking up the matter in variou$_s$ councils of the world may not ihelp us. Up to now it is all ri$_6$ht. The country stands firm, solid, very solid indeed, in respect of condemnation of racialism. Therefore, my only question to my friend is whether ne will take up this question of taking all measure short of war agamst South Africa, whether this question is going, to be discussed in the mini summit in London, whether he is going to take up the matter with the other Commonwealth countries, and if some nations do not participate or do not subscribe to this theory or disapprove of it, what measures he is going to take within the Commonwealth and outside the Commonwealth.

5HRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Madam Vice-Chairman, the statement of the honourable Minister of External Affairs reiterates the stand India has been taking in this regard, a stand which is well known to all of us and to which all of us subscribe. I expected the Minister to give an indication ho$_w$ he wants to proceed in this matter of applying economic sanctions, comprehensive, effective, economic sanctions, aginst South Africa, because South Africa is no alone today. It is supported by big powers, powerful nations, mainly the United State*, Britain, West Germany and even Israel. It is getting arms from various countries. It has a nuclear agreement also with Israel and it has been consistently flouting the world opinion in various matters. • Apartheid ha$_s$ been its policy, its official policy, since 1948. It has uprooted nearly three miPion people from their homes and removed them to new habitats. It has held $_a$ farcical election in 1984 in the name of constitutional reforms which the United Nations itself has rejected. It has been following repressive measures against the population ^nd hundreds have killed. Nearly 800 to 900 people were killed only during the last one year. A state of emergency is still in operation there. It was lifted and again re-imposed. In spite of requests from world leaders and against worM public opinion, it has excuted a great poet, Benjamin. Moloise, i$_n$ October 1935 and has held in prison a great national leader, Nelson Mondeia; for the last, I think, twenty five years he has been in jail. And the height of it is the aggression on the front-line African States. A country with only 15 per cent white population jg not only supressing 85 per cent of the majority population in that country but has the temerity to defy world public opinion, commit-aggression on the African States. But how is it emboldened to do all this? It is because of the powerful support given by the Western nations in their own interest. They have a vested interest as my other colleagues have pointed out. Therefore, it is very ne-cessary to take action against the abetors also. Whatever we had to do against South Africa in the world for we have done it. Now the question is how to cut off this support which the South African regime is getting from 5 P.M. the major powers. My friends have suggested that Britain should be expelled from the Commonwealth. That is one of the suggestions which we have been offering and On which perhaps there is a unanimous agreement by all the- parties. Recently in a conference, just three or four days before, many parliamentarians discussed this subject and there was unaimiy on the stand that India should go a little forward in this regard and should not mine words because the British policy in this respect is very clear. The British Prime Minister is not mincing words and she has been very vocal in advocating that economic sancions are no solution to the South African problem. Not only that. She called it immoral and repugnant and all that and she gabe a provocative interview to the "Guardian" earlier this month in which she criticised all the nations which are opposed to South Africa and its apartheid policy and ridiculed many and even about the Mini-commonwealth sh$_e$ had some very nasty things to say. When the correspondent asked ber what the

[Shri Parvathaneai Upcudra] prospects of the Mini-Commonwealth were she is reported to have said—and I quote—

"Emotions will lie riming high". She predicted this, and then said:

"When that happens you must have to let them run high and keep very clant yourself." This means that she has given the indication of her stand in the Mini-commonwealth also. If the issue is raised, she is not going to bother about it and she is not going to bother about what others will say. Her attitude seems to be: 'Let them shout and I will stick to my own stand." If that is the attitude of the British Prime Minister. is there any purpose in attending such a meeting? I would request the honourable Minister of External Affairs to think over the matter also. What is the purpose of attending this conference? What are MI going to say if this is the attitude of the British Prime Minister which she is not going to change? Will it be fruitful? Or, if at all you are going to attend this conference and if you find that she refuses to hudge from her declared stand, then yon must give her notice that India will not lag behind in initiating action for the expulsion of Britain from the Commonwealth. You must have this determination. Unless you go there with this determination. I Jo not think thai any useful purpose will he served.

Now, the opposition to apartheid has reached a certain stage as compared to the past. Today, the British Prime Minister herself is under pressure in her own country. The public opinion is against her and the British Labour Party has already opposed her stand. Even the Queen supposed to be advising her to change her stand. So, I feel that this is the right time to push forward our view and bring greater pressure on her to change her stand. Unless we change the attitude of the British Prime Minister, I do not think that the proposals for economic sanctions against South Africa will be fruitful.

T would also like to know from the honourable Minister of Externa! Affairs whether India would take the initiative to convene a special meeting of the NAM ami other countries who are opposed to the Siinfh African racist regime to discuss this issue and lake a positive stand in this matter, us the last-ditch battle: not only in respect of economic sanctions, but also in the matter of giving material support to the South African freedom fighters and the frontline States so that this apartheid can be dismantled, as the Minister SC fondly hopes, to which the Government of India is committed.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN [DR. (SHRI-M.VII) SARO.IINI MAHISHI]: Now, Mi Chitta Basu.

SHRI P. SH1V SHANKER; If I fondly hope, what about you? What about your fond hopes"?

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: That you will tell now.

Mil VIC'"!>< HAIRMAN [DR. (SHRI MAT! I SAROJ1NI MAHTSH1]: Now, Mi. Chitta Basu. f would request the Member[5] to be brief since there is a statement to he made by the Home Minister again.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (West Bengal): I will be very brief if you do not interr-upt me.

Madam, 1 am in full agreement with the statement made by the honourable Minister.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]:

In the statement, Sir, he has quoted the Prime Minister as having said that apartheid cannot be reformed, it must be dismantled. Having regard to these very brave statements. 1 am sorry to tell the House that Ihe statement read out by the Minister of External Affairs has disappointed this House, disappointed the country and disappointed those African people who arc fighting heroically to dismantle the Apartheid. I say so, because this statement lacks the firmness the changed situation in South Africa demands. The statement, I say, is nothing but a milk and water statement. It does not sharply effect our wrath, nation's wrath, and indignation ist the policy of connivance and collaboration of the USA and U.K. for the activities of the Pretoria Government, not only now but for several years, and it does noi also reflect our hopes that India is again the decision or stance taken by the *V.* K. with regard to Pretoria. Whether the Nassau accord *or* a declaration, 1 do not know. To me, it is more a declaration than an accord. The declaration

was there, but this is not the national declaration. If it is an accord, it has no action programme. At best, it can be taken to be a mission. And what has been the result of the mission? He admits in hii own statement. The statement says:

> "The report (of EPG) was unanimous. It admitted failure to initiate the process of dialogue and concluded that the Government of South Africa was not genuinely interested in dismantling the system of apartheid— ."

This is the result of one of the follow-up measures of Nassau Accord or, according to me, the Declaration. Then he says:

> 1 he Nassau Accord stipulates that in the event of lack of progress towards any of the objectives mentioned in the Accord, the leaders will meet to discuss the next stage of action."

Sir, here comes in my specific question: Has India the courage to take or suggest some action? Or is India waiting for what other African States say as in the case Asian or Commonwealth Games? You could speak earlier. You could not tell the world that you are not participating in the Games as an expression of our wrath and indignation about the policy of the United Kingdom reagrding Pretoria. Am I to understand that you are also following that course? You want to haven signal from other African countries and then decide on a middle course and tell: we are very much against the principle of apartheid and we want to dismantle it,

Mr. Upendra was right when he was saying - I do not know whether he said this is that vein—but I want to make it clear or will the Government make it clear today what is the purpose of joining the Mini-Commonwealth? What is the purpose? Our position is clear. India's position is clear. African counrties' position is clear. And the role of the USA is as clear as day-light. Mr. Reagan has got the courage to say that to apply the economic sanctions is immoral. What is moral there? To send army to other countries, to suppress people and to have global domination? Therefore, Sir, r would like to know from tbe hon. Minister whether they would consider this propsal of not attending this Mini-Commonwealth and make India's position clear so that other African countries can appreciate our feelings and take to that course.

Sir, the Prime Minister has rightly po-inled out thai either dismantle or blood bath or other actions. As a matter of faci. the black people of South Africa are on the move. They are fighting heroically. *I* I will continue their fight. Could the Government of India extend material help to them in this great task of dismantling *Aparthell* against which the Father of the Nation started the battle and further strengthened by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru? In this text, does the Government of India want to express solidarity only by resolutions or statement or by giving material aid to the people who are fighting for liberation ol the blacks from white domination?

SHRI SAT PAUL MITTAL: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, much has been said on the question of *apartheid.* I would not like to repeal what has been said by my friends. I want to congratulate the Minis ter for External Affairs and endorse tho statement he has made by which he has clearly defined the role India is going to play. I *9*\

In this context, one of my distinguished friends from the opposition has doubted the very efficacy of universal mandatory sanctions. I very much recall that in the same manner there were people who had doubted the efficacy of the weapon of non violence and ridiculted. Mahatma Gandhi when he used it very effectively against the Britishers. I want to remind them that short of war, the only option left to the world community is universal mandatory sanctions against South Africa. I know that very powerful countries like- the U.S.A., the U.K. and F.R.G. are backing the Botha regime. The whole world knows about it. Lei us not forget the people who arc using up against the Governments of those countries. I 00k at the U.S.A. Every other-d ;. some demonstration or the other takes place in New York or Washington. People are rising. They are demonstrating against the American President. Similarly, in the U.K. I have seen with my own eyes thai rallies and rallies of masses are taking place raising a banner against their ows Government. Let us not shut our eyes.

[Shri Sat Paul Mit.al]

Let us not forget that the most powerful weapon that th s world has made is the weapon of world opinion- That is the most powerful weapon. I have no doubt that the world opinion is being mobilised in a much bigger and stronger manner. President Reagan says that mandatory sanctions ill be immoral. I want to tell him and I want to ask him if this is immoral, then is the killing of innocent people moral, is putting Nelson Mendela behind the bars for 25 years moral? Margaret Thatcher says that this is repugnant and that the black majority will be hurt. I want to ask her what they are getting today. Not enough to eat. They have been uprooted from their hearths and homes. The EPG report is there. EPG report has given a very hohrible picture of the things that are happening there, of the state of affairs in South Africa. One of my friends said that why should we go to the Mini-Summit. Why should we not go to the Mini-Summit? Why should we not expose the Brtish Government? Why should we not expose those who are supporting the South African regime, the Botha regime? And somebody said that we should concentrate on *apartheid* and why should we concentrate on Commonwealth. Commonwealth is an association of free nations. It is not the Commonwealth now president over by the British, it is not the Commonwealth that was founded and that was the mainstay of the British. Why can't we expel Britain? I have the mandate of a two-day seminar in which 19 States of i partic'pated, 213 State Legislators i nated, besides the Members of Parliament belonging to all parties and belonging to both the Houses. I have the mandate to request the Minister of External Affairs that if the Government of UK goes back on the Nassau Accord, 1 must take a lead now and it is our boundeu duty to expose the British Government and ask the British Government to go on it. Nehru could bring about such a pressure on the Commonwealth in 1961 that the Bothn regime that the South African Government had to be expelled out of the Commonwealth. There is no reason why ■we cannot expel the UK Government, the Britain Government from the Commonwealth. So, I will urge upon the Government of India, I will urge upon the Minister of External Affairs and ask him that in the light of the categorical statement of the Prime Minister the other day that India will not go back' from the Nassau Accord and that it will stick to the implementation of the Nassau accord and since six months have already passed which was the limit, whether the Government of India will consider the possibility, in the even of non-Implementation of the Nassau Accord, of proposing expulsion of the UK Government from the Commonwealth. This is my quesiton which I want the hon. Minister to reply.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA (West Fengal): Sir, the document produced by the Foreign Ministry is very profound md useful for a student of political sci ence but unsatisfactory from the point of view of the main need of the Indian sit-in. To me it is a document of inde cision and indecisiveness because the len-<rthy statement that our hon. Minister has found time to write it down states at the end that "we hope that we shall succeed in persuading all the nations of the world that sanctions against the racial regime in South Africa is imperative and urgen." Now, still our Foreign Minister believes that he or his delegation can convince Mrs. Margaret Thatcher of the importance of imposing economic sanctions against SouUi Africa. Therefore, this understanding of our Foreign Ministry, maybe of our Gov ernment of India, is a matter of total dis satisfaction, a matter of great disappoint ment to me. My point is that the time has come for us o understand. If you really believe that apartheid cannot be changed but it has to be dismantled, if it it reallv a slogan not on lips but it is the real understanding of the Government of India, then you have to believe that this Com monwealth has to be • dismantled if the British Government does not agree to it. And if you give that threat, that you -,o dismantle the Commonwealth, then it can bring about a change in the understanding of Mrs. Margaret People like Margaret Thatcher only understand, the language of threat. Either Mrs. Margaret Thatcher .changes or yours statement that you will be dismantling the Commonwealth win bring about a boosting up of the critical public opinio*

which is gradually building up in Britain. Therefore, Sir, to my understanding, India as the leader of the anti-$_{u}$partheid movement and being led by the unwavering allegiance towards the philosophy that it cannot be changed but it has to be dismantled, India must take a lead in forcing the British Government, either yoa would agree with us by imposing sanctions or we dismantle the Commonwealth. If we can dismantle the Commonweatlh, she will como to senses. Britain and British imperialism have always believed that they are a very big power in the Comm-onweath. If the Commonwealth is dis-> mantled, she will be forced to change, or if she does not change, the British public opinion will be roused against it. And, secondly, Sir, our unwavering attitude like this. if we speak like this, can bring about a real building up of public opin'on. It is not a question of biulding up of Indian public opinion. It is always there. It is a question of internatonal public opinion. Tf Tndia takes such a strong and positive •ad unwavering position then there is going to be a building up of international public opinion and that international public opinion will be a guarantee for the imposition of such a thing that we desire to bring a racist regime to senses. Therefore, the Indian policy has to be effective, and in order to make the policy effective, you have to be decisive and in order to be decisive you must take a decisive siand in th$_{e}$ Mini-Commonwealth Conference India should go and attend the Conference. You take a decisive stand. But if you go there to make a compromise as you did last time, then there is no use of such a profound document. Then it is only a lip-service that it has to be dismantled, it cannot be changed.

SHRI GHULAM RASOOL MATTO (Jammu and Kashmir): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, as Mr. Mittal has stated, we had a Parliamentarians Conference the other day for two days in which 219 parliamentarians besides Members of Parliament attended. A draft declartaion was presented to the Hon. Prime Minister. The consensus there was that we should rouse the public opinion among Parliamentarians. My question to the External Affairs Mb-ister is what concrete help the Government of India proposes to give 10 this association of Paiiiameniarians which has been span-bored in India to rouse the public opinions of Parliamentarians in the countries, particularly, the USA and Britain and FRG, to rouse the public opinion of those countries.

The second point that I want to ask the hon. Minister is that in a speech yesterday in Hyderabad he has also stated that we can send out Britain from the Commonwealth. He is a legal luminary also. I would like to know from him from the legal point of view what is the status of Commonwealth and if it is constitutionally possible for us to do this to remove Britain from the Commonwealth. These are the two specific questions that I want to ask.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE (Maharashtra): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, it is only approporiate that the statement has been made by the hon. Minister for External Affairs on the eve of the meet in London, which is to take place next week or at the end of this week. I think India has a very special position in regard to Apartheid. I have said it on.-e before, but it is worth repeating, that if Oandhiji had not come to India and stayed back in South Africa, this shameful blot on this planet of Apartheid would have been erased, would have been removed. But then I do not know whether we would have been still struggling for our independence. Therefore, the first voice and the first action against the Apartheid has been raised by the founder of our naron. And the o*her facts n^{r}e mentioned. namely how we took it up first in the United Nations: how we moved the first resolution against that. And it is because of this heritage, because of this legacy and awe of this background that the third world looks upon India as the natural leader in all these problems because we have proved it by our actions and by our conviction and it is. therefore, when there is delay, when we diether in matters of boycotting the Commonwealth Games that one has certain reservations and certain misgivings and one feels that our actions j do not measure up to the expectations i« I (he eyes of the entire third world.

[Shri Murlidhar Chandrakani Bhandare]

1 think when the Americans or when Mrs. Thatcher talks of economic sanctions as ineffective, the cat is out of the hug. It is a clear admission thai economic sanctions will work and will be effective and that is the reason why both of ihem are shouting that they are. Ineffective,

I do not share the views of some of the Members, which have been expressed. I know Chat the Minister wilt he going at a til?::' when the going for this cause is far more difficult than at Nassau meet. Ai that time I myself said that if we could make U.K. move from its position, tt was some progress ami it was an achievement. Now ;!us statement shows that it has gone back: the Britain has gone hack on what it agreed in principle of giving si\ mon time to the Pretoria regime at Nas,a,i meet. And I think it is going to be a very rough weather fir us. What is wo; thai during this period, where the ipople are expressing their doubts about the effi cacy of the economic sanctions and they are changing their stances, particularly the U.S.A. and the U.K., South Africa i; getting ready for facing these sanctions. If mi information is correct, it has now, L- ii.uppcd itself with fairly large stock of essentials, like oil, foodgarins and other t!:»ngs, whereby South .Africa will be in a positron to face these economic sanc tion, Pol quite seme time. The point I am i is thai our enemy is getting ly while we are getting lax and I is why 1 feel that when the Minister of External Affairs goes there - and 1 believe probably the Prime Minister will also he there - be will have to face very hard options and apply sanctions against those who deny using these sanctions against South Africa. T leave this matter of course to be decided on the spot in consultation with other memhers who will be '>:csenl there.

There is one more point which 1 roust say that whatever India has been doing, it Is finding echo in all parts of the world Today one needn't go to America to find out what Ihe public opinion there is. Gov-eminent may not enforce sanctions bu[1] universities like Barkeley, like Harvard, which have millions of dollars of investment in South Africa, are withdrawing :bose investments and have taken a res-solve not to semi any further investments. Public opinion muv. ultimately prevail wherever h is against this inhuman prat-lice of apartheid. But 1 waist an assurance from the hon. Minister th-n luditi-commitment to fight apartheid will no; only be iotn! and complete but will be con linuous. Considering that we have achieved little since Nassau, I hope, some steps will be devised at Ihe ensuing summit to get over the time-lag which we have in the process.

SHRt V. GOPALSAMY (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Deputy Chairman. Sir, 1 rise to express my solidarity and support to the struggling black brothers and sisters of South Africa. Of course, some of them may try to beat the drum and boast that India achieved a great success at Bahamas. I doubt very much. When the final accord, when (he final declaration, came from Bahamas, from the Nassau meet, why did they not use the word 'sanction'? Why? Even at that time¡ yon compromised for the sake of Mrs. Margaret Thatcher. This was the feeling of the blacks in South Africa at that time. Blacks in South Africa felt let down by the Nassau declaration of the Commonwealth. The main concern of the leaders seemed to be aimed at avoiding a split and accommodating the British Prime Minister. I would like to quote Mrs. Winnie Mandela, wife of Mr. Nelson Mandela. She said I quote "K Mrs. Thatcher had not intervened, and if the Commonwealth leaders were genuinely determined to oppose Britain, South Africa's white regime would have faced the prospect of mandatory sanctions". This was the feeling of not only Mrs. Winnie Mandela, but the entire black population of South Africa as well. Why are the U. S. A. and the U. K. standing in the way of sanctions? It is well-known, they have their vested interests there, they have their investments there. But a day will come very soon when the economic fabric of South Africa will be destroyed. When the blacks in South Africa rise in arms"the investments of the U.K. and Ihe U.S.A. would be destroyed lock, stock and barrel. It is going to happen. Why do we insist that sanctions should be enforced? Why do we demand sanctions? Not as a substitute for the struggle by the African masses, but as a compleaTent to it. Tf it is properly imprcwe»fed, it may fcetp t®

limit the flow of blood there. Otherwise, if they ate left alone, as Mr. Malcolm leaser once correctly put it, millions may die in the worst blood-bath since the Second World War. Therefore, the time has come. Sir, when Mr. Nelson Mandela was offered conditional release, he refused. He is the great inspiring and guiding spirit for the greatest freedom struggle in the world. J quote Mr. Mandela-" I cherish my own freedom dearly, but I care even more for your freedom. Too many have died since J went to prison. Too many have suffered for the love of freedom. \ owe it to their widows, to their orphans, to their mother-and their fathers who have grieved and wept for them. Not only have 1 suffered during these long, lonely, wasted years. I am no less life-loving than you are. But I cannot sell the birthright of the people to be free. Only free men can negoti Prisoners cannot enter iuto contracts, "Your freedom and mine cannot be separted." So, the time has come when they will rise in arms. Through armed struggle they will overthrow the Botha regime. Mr. Reagan is the self-styled Rambo in White House. He himself attacked Libya and he said hereafter we will follow Rambo. So. he is the s-:if-styled Rambo of White House and lias stated something but that is not the viewpoint of Americans. When he said thai the American ladies will not get diamonds for their jewellery, the American women marched the streets and they have come cut to throw away their jewellery. The public opinion in America, the U.K.. is to enforce sanctions to dismantle apar-liicid. Therefore, Sir, it at Bahama you have bungled and you have compromised for the sake of Mrs, Thatcher. Now what steps are you going to take? The question is whether to be or not to be in Commonwealth. You have become a Ham-Jet. There is one thing more. Apartheid is a oime against humanity but genocide is a worst crime against humanity. You are sheding tears when you are raising your voice against Apartheid in South Africa, but you will not open your mouth against the crimes of genocide of Tamils in Sri Lanka. That is the double standard you are always following.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Kalpnath Rai. lust take two minutes only.

श्री कल्पनाथ राय (उत्तर प्रदेश) : आदरणीय उपसभापति महोदय, मैं सर्व-प्रथम विदेश मंत्री जी को बधाई देना चाहूंगा। उनके विदेश मंत्री बनने के बाद दक्षिण अफ्रीका की रंगभेद नीति के खिलाफ भारत सरकार ने एक निर्णायक और कड़ा कदम उठाया है और खेलों का बहिष्कार किया है। आदरणीय उपसभापति महोदय, हमारे मित्र गोपालसामी कह रहे थे कि घड़ियाली आंसू सरकार रंगभेद की नीति के सवाल पर बहा रही है। मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूं कि दक्षिण अफ्रीका की रंगभेद नीति के खिलाफ . . .

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Since when have you become a *although I did not follow your language?

SHRI KALPNATH RAI: You said that this Government, which is shedding croco-dile tears... (*Interruptions*).

आदरणीय उपसभापति महोदय, इन्होंने कहा सरकार जो घड़ियाली आंसू . . . (**व्यवधान**) . . .

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: I said that in :elation to Margaret Thatcher. That is not my statement, that is the statement, of Winnie Mandela, Have you ever read the name of Winnie Mandela?

श्री कल्पनाथ राय : उपसभापति महोदय, यह बड़े दुख की बात है कि* से बात करना वे समझते हैं कि मेरा निजी अधिकार है। मैं दस वर्ष राजनीति इनको पढ़ा सकता हूं। इनको यह जानकारी होनी चाहिए . . . (**व्यवधान**) . . . मंडेला को मैं नहीं जानता हूं . . . (**व्यवधान**) . . .

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: I am not a * like him, in that camp.

SHRI KALPNATH RAI: I am not a * like you. (*Interruptions*). You are a * You are talking like that. You are* (*Interruptions*).

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: You need not talk anything about Mr. Karunanidhi. What right have you got to speak about Mr. Karunanidhi? (*Interruptions*). This is the culture of the Congress.

*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

SHRI KALPNATH RAI: *

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: You have no business : > tal!< about Mr. Karunanidhi. *(Ituerruptions).* Why don't you speak about Mrs. Indira Gandhi? *(Interruptions).*

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY (Andhra Pradesh): He cannot speak unparliamentary language like that. *(Interruptions).*

SHRI V. GOPALASAMY: You are unnecessarily trying to provoke me. You cannot prov&ke me. I am coming from the land of.. .*(Interruptions).*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Nothing will go on record.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:* Continued speaking.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am on my feet. Please sit down. *(Interruptions).* Mr. Gopalsamy has used a word which is not parliamentary...

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: I never used any unparliamentary word.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It will be expunged. Mr. kalpnath Rai, I have already expunged the word mentioned by Mr. Gopalsamy. It is expunged; so you don't refer to that.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: I did not use any unparliamentary word.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Sir, I am on a point of order.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: I am on a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Upendra first.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Sir, it is urfortunate. We are fighting against South Africa. But we are not here to fight among ourselves. It is unfortunate. You have rightly expunged the word used by Gopalsamy but I request you to expunge the words used by Mr. Kalpnath Rai also. He used the words * They are not parliamentary.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Certainly if it has been used, it will be expunged. The record will be looked into. If it ia used, it will be expunged. There is no do- , ubt about it. Now Mr. Kulkarni.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: Let us be calm and look at this issue in a more responsible way. To my knowledge, I did not follow exactly what Mr. Gopalsamy said. I again corroborated from him as to what did he say. He said: "I never said anything". So what have you expunged. Sir?

SHRI KALPNATH RAI: I am very sorry over what you have said.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: Sir, I am given the floor. I want to ask, what word Mr. Gopalsamy used which was unparliamentary. Please decide that.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA alias V. ARUNACHALAM: On a point of order, Sir.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir...

MR, DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: I am on a point of order. How can you call the Minister? I have not finished yet.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: I am rising. . . . will you kindly let me say?

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: No, I have not nn'shed yet.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: I am raising a point of order to what he is saying. 1 am enticed to say. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: No point of order can stand on a point of order, according to rules.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: It can.

*Not recorded.

′■′*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

♦Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: Let me complete.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN; On the point ef order raised by Mr, Kulkarni, I gave a ruling. Then only Mr. Shiv Shan-Icer stood up.

SHRl A. G. KULKARNI: How can you give a ruling? I have not finished yet.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN; You want two points of order.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: No, I was still making my point.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Let me exactly say what I want to say so that...

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: You may say whatever you want to say. I am not objecting to what you say.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: If in his judgement, what I am going to say is objectionable, I will sit down immediately.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: I am on my point of order. Let me finish my point of order. Then you can call anybody in the House.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: No, he has asked a question. ..

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: I have not asked a question of you.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: No, not to me, that is why I raise he point of order that that cannot be answered ...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kulkarni: You have raised the point about the language used by Mr. Gopalsamy... When I understood you like this, I said: It will be looked into in the records and everything objectionable will be expunged. So then Mr. Shiv Shanker stood up. That meanr Mr Shiv Shanker has the floor. If you I'.ave another point of order, you can come up afterwards. But let him complete.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI; No, Sir, I was yet to complete. What you are interpreting is a little half-way through. I don't wan! to .ittribute any motives to you, but the point of order I was making was, excuse me. . . *(Interruptions)...*

MS. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have not made your point of order?

SHRf A. G. KULKARNI: No, Sir, I have nojt yet made it; I was in the process of making my point of order and you st.'pped me and the Minister got up. So I just sat Jown. That s all. My point of order is, Mr. Gopalsamy is said to have used fomc unparliamentary word. Here, wordr ran only be expunged if they are unparliamentary. It is not the prerogative of Chairman, Deputy Chairman or Vsce-Chaimian or anybody, and unless ii !s un parliamentary It cannot be expunged. Therefore, Sir, what I want to tell you and both of my young friends and other Membcs also, who are very young and making their presence felt, that the point is i heard the word ** Is it parliamentary? *Interruptions)* ... Please tell ms. Thou gh you were very eager to expunge Mr. Ciopalsamy's words, you should have reen 9 hundred times more careful to expunge words l'"ke ** , "sycophant3" or ** Who jb whose irr the country, everybody knows.. . *^Interruptions)* .....And I don't say who is a better ** Ttrtd who is a less-. .. . *(Interruptions)*.. .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Have you flnshed, Mr. Kulkarni? Please sit down.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: The last w.id I am saying, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: T cannot permit it. . . *(Interruptions)*.. . You are making a speech. There is no point of order.

SHRI A. G. KirLKARNI: I only say. rre in-wr- in this country. Let us forget this matter and let us have decorum.

SHRI KALPNATH RAI : Point of order.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No point jf onk; now. Please sit down. It is on

**ExpuUfeed as ordered by the Chair.

[Mr. Deputy Chairman]

ftOtfd and whatever is objectionable and unparliamentary will be expunged. That is all—. . . *{Interruptions)*. . .

SHRI ALADI ARUNA*'alias* V. ARUNACHALAM: Sir, your ruling is still obscure- whether he used an unparliamentary world or not You must give a decision. Instead, your ruling is highly hypothetical — "If it is used."—. . .*{Interruptions.)* —... \ fai as Mr. Gopalsamy is concerned, he has $_{no}$t at all used any unparliamentary wcrd. He was emotional; he questioned the political wisdom of the honourable Member, Mr. Kalpnath. Rai. But Mr. Kal-pnalh Rai, to retort and to refute the argument, unfortunately used an unparliamenlarv word. Your ruling is, "....if there b MI unparliamentary word." Why "if there is?" It is hypothetical, it is unparliamentary and it must be expunged.... *(Interruptions)*.. .

SHRl 1. N. SUKUL (Uttar Pradesh): He said he is a** .... *(Interruptions)*....

SHRiMATl RENUKA CHOWDHURY'** is not upparliamentary. Please refers to the English dictionary and verify

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Sir. I questioned the political wisdom of my honourable friend when he referred to "crocodile tears." But I did not use any unparliamentary word. I raised a question.

Mk. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Honour able Members must understand that what ever is said is on record..... *(Interrup tions)* .... In heat and jn emotion many Members must have said many words and whatever is said is on record—. *(Interruptions)*—...

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: I seek your protection. Sir, This is Parliament. When 1 ask u political question, that should be tied politically. This is not a fish market. This is Parliament. When unparliamentary words were used by ^{m}y honour-ablc friend, they should have been expunge'. They should be expunged. And you •'Whatever objectionable is said by

txpunged as ordered by the Chair.

Mr. Gopalsamy will be expunged." It is not a fair ruling. Sir, you said that unparliamentary words used by Mr. Gopalsamy should be expunged. But whatever questions 1 raised politically, they need not be expunged.

श्री कल्पनाथ राय : श्रीमन् . . .

श्री उपसभापति : आप बैठ जाइये ।

Please sit down. Mr. Anand Sharma.

श्री कल्पनाथ राय : क्यों बैठ जाऊं ।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have not finished?

SHRI KALPNATH RA1:

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: One sentence.

SHRI KALPNATH RAI: No, no. I will speak.

MR. DEPUTY' CHAIRMAN: No, no. You make it one sentence.

SHRI KALPNATH RAI; Why one sentence?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: One mmute... . *{Interruptions)*.. .

SHRI KALPNATH RAI: Please donH** *(Interruptions)*

STIIU NIRMAL CHATTERJEE (West Bengal): Sir, I am on a point of order. Has any Member of the House the right to defy the Chair and use this kind of demeanour and language and physical posture? I want a ruling from you. If this has happened, unless that particular Member apologises, you should name him. I want a ruling on that.

1 may point out, Sir, that this will not for the first time that that particular person has been rebuked by the Chair for his behaviour which is not considered parliamentary. And unless you take a firm stand, the situation will deteriorate in future also.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: A Member particularly a ruling party Member, bullying the Chair and defying the Chair.. .

SHRI KALPNATH RAI: I am not defying the Chair.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Sit down. *{Interruptions)*

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA; He should be named.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sit down.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA. He is not only defying the Chair but he is also physically threatening all the Members. He should be named.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, no Member has got the right to hold the entire House to ransom, no Member has got the right to accuse and abuse the Chair. You must give a ruling on what my colleague, Mr. Chatterjee, has wanted.

SHRI P. N. SUKUL: He has not abused.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Yes, he said categorically.

SHRI P. N. SUKUL: He has not abused the Chair.

श्री कल्पनाथ राय : मेरा प्वाईंट आफ आर्डर है ...(व्यवधान)

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: When you said from the Chair, 'Sit down", he replied, *"Kyon baithun"*. He wanted to defy the Chair.

श्री कल्पनाथ राय : माननीय, मेरा प्वाइन्ट आफ आर्डर है (व्यवधान)

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Here is the Parliamentary Affairs Minister. Here is a senior Minister, Mr. Shiv Shankar. Either cause him to mend or cause him to get out of the House. We are not here at his mercy.

श्री कल्पनाथ राय : महोदय, मेरा प्वाइट आफ आर्डर है ....(व्यवधान)

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Either mend him or get him out.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Mr. Chairperson, Sir, as the custodian of th» dignity of the House, as the custodian of the decorum of the House, as the custodian of the parliamentary system of the House, you must put an end to this. The whole proceedings of the House cannot be held up like this. We all abide by your decision and will continue to abide by your decision because we love the pailia-mentary system. If there is anybady who defies, he must be amended, he must bo corrected. If he is not corrected he must be asked to bear the consequences of it.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: He must apologise.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Whatever stated will be on the record. T will certainly look into it. I will examine and expunge it if it is not in order.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: He must apologise. In your presence he said, 'I won't sft down." *(Interruptions)*

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: I am on a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will be taken up separately.

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: A point of order.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: I raised a point of order. Should the Chair not give a ruling on that? I was very specific that either the Member concerned should apologise or you name him because this is not the first time that he is doing that, and the way he has behaved the Chairis an arffont to all of us through the Chair.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Including the Members on the other side.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Prof. Chatterjee, I have taken note of it. I will examine his words which he mentioned in total, and whatever is to be done will be done.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: What about the physical threat, Sir *(Interruptions)*

SHRI ANAND SHARMA (Himachal Pradesh): It is indeed unfortunte Uiat tempers have ran high when the House is discussing an issue on which I always felt that we all are one and that there is a naional consensus in expressing our solidarity with struggling masses in South Affrica, we are one in raising our voice against Apartheid, we all are one in condemning the Botha regime, which is per-petuating barbaric atrocities on the people living there. For our generation it is a terrible tragedy. Certain coun'ries who claim to be civilised, have been giving us lessons about civilisation, lessons of civilised behaviour to the coloured people in Asia and Africa, have adopted an indifferent posture to what has been happening there. "The recent developments like the imposi'ion of emergency or the re-imposition of emergency rather, by the Botha Government, the to'al band on reoorting as to what exactly is happening there, the killing of innocent people and the State terror, which has been unleashed, is a matter of serious concern for all of us. I do not see any reason why there should be any difference of opinion on this issue.

The Government of India deserves to be complemented for the stand it has taken for attracting the attention of the world towards this issue and for mustering and for enlisting support for imposing mandatory sanctions against the Botha regime. Nothing could be farther from truth to describe the Government's reactions as inconsistent, hesitant or apologetic. The entire world knows the support given by India to the African National Congress in South Affrica and to SWAPO and Namibia. The world knows we were the first ones in enforcing sanctions. It was even before we attained our own independence, at the time of the interim Government in !946. Though ii amounts to repetition, yet the aspersions which have been cast, have comn<:1ted me to remind the esteemed Members on the other side that even though th '.y do have a right to differ or to criticise vet there are certain issues on which we have alwavs been one as one nation, as one people in condemning Apartheid. But it is very unfortunate when we find compulsive critics or compulsive criticisms, which are both unjustified and farther from truth. The Government has been consistent and steadfast in its unwai-vering support, and the recent decision of the Government of -India to boycott the Commonwealth Games has been welcomed by the people of this country. The entire world knows, when pandit Jawahailal Nehru become the Prime Minister of India how strongly immediately after India's independence, he raised the issue of Apartheid and repression in South Affrica. Subsequently, ov various international forums India has espoused this cause. Today, the question is not of what India has done. The successive Governments in this country or the successive Prime Ministers of this country require no certificate about their solidarity and sincerety in fighting Apartheid and in supporting SWAPO and the Affrican National Congress.

Mr. Mandela's family name has been brought in. I would like to put the record straight. We all know Mr. Nelson Mandela is a flaming symbol of independence and liberation today. Though he is languishing in jail for more than two decade now, yet his spirit is undaunted. His voice resounds the world °ver. I would like to quote what this great freedom fighter perhaps the greatest in our times—has said. This is a latest statement of letter from the jail. I quote:—

6.00 P.M.

'It would be a grave omission on our part if we fail to mention close bonds that have existed between our peopls and the people of India and to acknowledge the encouragement, the inspiration and the practical ass'stance we have received as a result of the international outlook of the All Tndia Congress."

I have quoted this to put the record straight and to remind my esteemed hon. friends on the other side, that, even Mr. Nelson Mandela and the African National Congress are fully aware about tho stand of India.

Sir, the Bahamas summit was interpreted in a different wav that we were trving to give indirect sunoort to Margaret Thatcher. My hon. friends observations is **very**

unfortunate. I do not know what could be the motive?

Sir, at Nassau it was our hon. Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi who advocated the cause of mandatory sanctions. It was he who took up the issue. He not only took up the issue, but also pressurised an adamant Margaret Thatcher who was not at all prepared to budge from her stand to accept the Nassau Accord. I would not like to go into the details of-this Accord. But so far the U.K. Government has not implemented it, the Government of India is not silent about it. From Bahamas he carried the same crusade to the United Nations in October, 1985. We all know what he said in the United Nations.

Sir, it is a matter of serious concern because the attitude of the Government of U.K. and the Government of U.S. is deplorable. Our Government is clear as far as its own stand is concerned. But this House has to consider one aspect when we discuss South Affrica. *(Time bell rings)* Sir, I would like to take a couple of minutes more.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please try to conclude.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: The attitude of the Botha regime and its continued disrespect for the world opinion needs to be condemned. The contempt it has time and again demonstrated whenever there has been a demand from the rest of the world for an end to Apartheid, it was quite reprehensible.

Last year, Sir, when the Bahamas summit was on, the Commonwealth Heads of Government were demanding sanctions against the South African Government. But at that particular time, there was another issue which had attracted the attention of the world—the hanging of Benjamin Moloise. There was a worldwide appeal and their condemnation of the Botha regime for Benjamin Moloise. But the South African Government hanged him. He was a great revolutionary, a great poet and a great freedom fighter. In such a situation, when there are countries which are party to the Nassau Accord, they failed to implement it. There are some countries, particularly, the U.S.A., their President has described the sanctions as 'immoral'. It is a double standard which we must condemn. They can impose sanctions aganist Poland. It is moral. They can impose sanctions against Nicaragua which is trying to preserve its sovereignty and independence. They support the Contra rebels and send their mercenaries. They can support UNITA rebels in Angola. They can support and send mercenaries to any cornor of the world. But when the issue of the people of South Africa I ../ terms the sanctions against the Botha regime as 'immoral'.

Our hon. Prime Minister when he goes to London for the mini summit of the Commonwealth Heads of Government, we hope he will again take UD effectively not only the non-implement;>t>n of 'he Nassau Accord by the U.K. Government, but also their refusal to accpt the recommendation of the eminent pe-sons groiip I am one, who is of this considered op'non because a friend had mentioned that we should not mix up between sanctions and Commonwealth, we must not forget also that Commonwealth is a multi-racial organization and after what had been happening and the attitude of the United Kingdom, what has happened the boycott of games that was inevitable and a correct decison. But Sir, I will request ihe hon. Minister to enlighten us about one thing. There has been an attack on the frontline States. It was imediately after the visit of our Prime Minister as the Chairman of the NAM to the frontline Slates recently and pressure is mounting on these States and Margaret Thatcher has been saying time and again that formal sanctions will ultimately hurt these countries. What do we propose? Have we worked out any plan of action to bail out these countries which are under consistent pressure of those who are peroetuating apartheid and supporting apartheid? *(Time bell rings')*. I am just concluding Sir. I won't like any clarification as far as what will be our stand at the mini summit is concerned. We all know what it will be. It will be a reiteration of our solidarity with the people of South Africa, with the people of Namibia. But

[Shri Anand Sharma]

since we are the first country in many re spects in imposing sanctions, in taking this matter to the international forum, the United Nations, the Indian Parliamentarians are also seized of this matter and it is quite visible by the keen interest which most of our hon. Members have taken in this subject, will this House consider adopting a resolution condemning the re-imposition of emergency, the atrocities being perpetuated by the Botha regime on the people of South Africa and also urging those who are still reluctant still opposing this world-wide demand for sanctions to impose sanctions? This is my submission, Sir. Thank you.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Let this resolution come, we will support it?

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, in response to the statement that has been made by the Government, hon. Members of different shades have been pleased to express their very strong views supporting the policy of the Government on the question of dismantling apartheid. I must express my gratefulness to all the Members of the House who have happily expressed themselves not only in the broad support of the policy that is being purued by the Government of India but also the strong expressions that they have used against aparthe·d. I am saying this because this is undoubtedly gives a very strong moral support to the Gov-ernment when we are proceeding to discuis the issues at the mini-summit in the first week of next month. Sir, while saying so, many Members have tried to say that while the statement does refer to the historical perspective in which the Govt, of India had heen following the policy, while in general terms, the policy that the Govt, of India pursues, it has not come out c'-early about the measures that the Govt, of India has contemplated. Sir, it is not that the hon. Members do not know it. Many of them are very tried politicians. They have much more experience than myself. They obviously do not expect me to say all the measures which we take. But for the sake of the debata, no doubt, they have raised this issue. I would like only to bring to the notice of the hon. Members to this extent that we in our mind are clear. What steps have to be taken, what approach has to be taken from time to time, if in the seven-nation summit one or two dissent what approach has to be taken, what is the blueprint of further action, those proposals are ready with us. But in the very nature of things, hon. Members are aware, it is not possible to disclose them because these are matters about which nobody can unilaterally say, "This is what I am going to do". So far as the Government of India is concerned, in the historical perspective I have explained that as far back as 1946, we had totally put a stop to our trade. That I have submitted in the historical perspective. Now, so far as the ac'ions that we have to take are concerned, on our part there, is nothing further that we can take where the Government of India *qua* the Government is involved. Now anything that has got to be done has got to be done in close association with the o'h=r Governments, Therefore, in keep·nc with our basic ethos and values, namely, the policy of truth and non-violence which projects the concept of negotiations, we have to proceed. We believe that in the international arena, when multilateral issues come up, we have got to negotiate with others and by the necotiat·ng process, we will have to evolve a certain system, a certain policy which policy later on becomes effective in a conjoint manner with the help of others as well. Therefore we have some proposals which have sot to be discussed. We will discuss them in the m·ni summit. If for any reason we fail there, obviouslv it is a case where the entire Commonwealth will have to be reauested to meet. The proposals are there which we will certainly wort out What T am interested to say at this stage is that inherently it was not poss·hlc in he statement UVlf to spell out the measures because vou could not act on your own. And if vou were to act on your own. then obviously vou are no* fol-lowine the principle of the cumula'ive ne-cotin'in™ process. This is where in the very nature of thines. one pets stuck. T would like to assure the hon. Members that we on our nan are verv clear. In fact, some of the hon. M<Tnher<: wre trving to tie un the late decision ahout the Commonwealth Games to the decision-making

process involved in the ultimate culmination of the sanctions being imposed. I would like to bring to the notice of this House that on the question of participation or non-participation in the Commonwealth Games, our mind was absolutely clear. But the Prime Min'ster was also in touch with some of the leaders of the African countries. Particularly he was constantly in touch A'ith Prme Minister Mugabe and Presidem Kaunda.

After all, in a diplomacy of this nature, in matters connected with more than one country, when you are in the consultation process, you would not like to be called, by taking a decision, that you have departed from the confidence that has been sought to be reposed in you by the others. So, it is not as though even in the case of the Commonwealth Games we have decided it at a late stage. It was not so. That is why I am interested at this stage to make only this statement that while the Government of India carved out certain proposals which proposals have got to be discussed with the other countries, in the very nature of things, therefore, it is not possible for me to spell them out at this stage, it would not be in public interest. Honourable Members have, notwithstanding what case I have been able to make out, have raised some really very food points, and some, of course, are points which obviously are slightly unpalatable from my point of view. Some Members have gone to the extent of saying that the Nassau Declaration, where we had taken a very leading part, is an apology for the British policy. I would like to say one thing in this context. It is true that we have played a very prominent part in the Nassau Declaration. I am sure the Honourable House will agree with me that where a body acts in a collective manner, an effort has necessarily to be made to see that everyone is carried along as long as you would like to act in a collective fashion. This is the basic concept of a collective activity. It is true, I am not denying it, some Members have said, that the Nassau Accord expressions are slightly diluted because you wanted to take along Britain. It is true. But then, as long as the substance part remains the same, changing of the language or the dilution of the language in my submission, does not affeet the purpose or the purport which we wanted to achieve. To my mind, measures or sanctions, the meaning remains the same. Some Members were trying to ask why the word 'sanctions* was not used. I do not see what great diiferent it makes between the expression 'sanctions' and the expression 'measures' as long as the purport is conveyed. The meaning of the language which you want to achieve remains the same. Whether you use X or you use Y, it does not make much difference. The submission that 1 want to make is that in a matter like this where South Africa is backed by certain big powers, certain developed countries, everyone has got to conceive of the steps that carefully achieve the objective that we would like ill imately to seek. The position is that Nassau Declaration, in my submission, was a great success. It was a step forward, and when I made the Statement before this House, my submission is, it is a very vibrant document that I have put before the honourable House, shorn of the measures that should be taken. I have spelt out clearly the policy that is being pursued by the Government of India the policy that it did pursue. And I say that the policy has been steadfast, unswerving and unwavering. This position r made absolutely clear. Now then, the details are a different matter. I am sure honourable Members do not expect that the details also should be spelt out. Some Members were pleased to make an observation that India's policies have not been effective. And, Sir, what has been said in this context is that the EPG's report has been termed as wise and only humane. 1 undoubtedly compliment the honourable Member for his deep study that he has made on the subject. But the fact.remains that it was a part of the Nassau accord that the Eminent Persons' Group had to make an effort and that effort has been made and the report has been submitted. Then comes para 7. I am saying this because one of the questions asked was why para 7 is there over para 6 and all that. In fact, paragraph 7 itself says that there will be a meeting for the review and it is in pursuance of that that the mini-summit meeting is taking place in the first week of the next

[Shrj P. Shiv ShaakarJ month and, Sir, hope eternal springs in the human breast and I am not that much of a pessimist to say. "Well, everything is lost.". Let us be hopeful till the last and supposing it becomes a case where we have ^t to become pessimists, then there are measures for it and it is not as though we would just like to leave the matters there. We would also not like to pre-judge at this stage the attitude of Britain notwithstanding the fact that obviously Britain has been saying certain things and has gone to the extent of being a party to what has been decided in the EEC. Notwithstanding that, we would like to pursue the matter and persuade it so that Britain, which is a party to the Nassau accord, goes along the terms of the accord. Well, if we fail, then it is a matter for those would not like to observe the terms of an accord to which they are a party to answer international public opinion. After all, In matters like this, it is the international public opinion which has got to be created and when the interna'ional public opinion is aroused, it then sees the light of the day.

TTi^r-Afrtrrt *in* mv $nHm!«f<in. it wniiM b© doing injustice and injury and harm to the report of the EPG to say that it leads nowhere. I would like to submit that the sanctions part or the measures part is a matter which will be taken up at the review. And, Sir. so far as the Government of India is concerned, the Government of India's position is absolutely clear. When we talk of the measures to be taken, we will stick to the measures that are incorporated in para 7 plus, and no minus in any form, and this is our position. This is the position which we have been taking all these years which is very clear and we would like to advocate it. We would like to persuade the other sister countries to follow this line. So, in regard to this statement, one of the questions that has been asked by one of the honourable Members is a very valid question and the question is what the Government of India is exactly doing, because he was very right in quoting a certain passage and asking what exactly we are doing to influence the Indians in South Africa to be effective. Well, apart from the usual answer which the honourable Member, of course, himself anticipated, I would like to submit that, io the extent possible, we have been advising the Indians in South Africa to wholly fall in line with the struggle of the Black majority people. This has been our advice. I am sure you are not going to ask me how we are going to do it. This is a matter on which I will not be able to answer. And, from here, certainly, we would go to London because a questu-.n was put as to whether we would go to London. We would go to London and it is possible that we will get back to Delhi. In the process of another step towards implementing the accord..,

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: After successfully reforming...

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKAR: I am not that astrologist as the hon. Member is, because my faith has been ending in astrology. His faith seems to be increasing. I leave it to him to judge things.

Sir, I must broadly express my gratefulness to some of the hon. Members who have made some very positive suggestions. Whether we should get out of the Commonwealth, whether we should expel Britain from the Commonwealth are matters which, as I have said even earlier, cannot be the decisions that India could take unilaterally. These are matters of far-reaching consequence and keeping that in view we have, I would like to bring to the notice of the hon. Members, worked out the implications. This is a matter which has got to be discused with others as well; how others are going to react. It will not be posible for us to exactly spell out the steps that we would like to take at this stage.

Sir, some of the hon. Members have also raised very pertinent questions. And this question was raised by the Prime Minister himself at the time when he -was touring the front-line States. Sir, all the front-line States are wholly dependent on South Africa for their economy so much so that some of the land-locked countries in' the front-line have got to depend on South Africa for port facilities even. At the time when the Prime Minister had visi'cd, he had broadly hinted to these countries: you please consider what measures have to be

taken ;o salvage you from ihis situation. And it is true that some of the countries are likely to be economically affected. But I saiu'e the people of those countries that notwithstanding this impending d.fficulty they are very firm on their commitment against apartheid, they are prepared to suffer to dismantle apartheid. And naturally the Commonwealth countries will have to go into this question. They will have to go into the details. They will have to work out the details as to how best to salvage such countries from the difficulties that they are likely to confront. And I assure the hon. Members that so far as India is concorned. it would not leave any stone unturned for the purpose of finding out the best of the solutions that are necessary in order to ultimately achieve the objective of dismantling the apartheid.

Sir, I thought that these particular submissions of mine have not specifically gone into the question that have been raised by the various hon. Members. Some hon. Members have asked a very direct question whether India has got the courage to take stens. India) has only survived on the courage. *(Interruptions)* It is over the years. We have survived. We have faced the odd?. We have tried to stand up on our own. And that shall be our policy. We shall not be swerved by the influence of 'A' country or 'B' country. We would only follow the footsteps of our elders, the ethos ?«nd values to which we stand committed. Thank you.

STATEMENT BY MINISTER

IV. Law and order p-obJem in Darjeeling district Arising out of the agitation by Gorkha National Liberation Front on the 27th July, 1986

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI BUTA SINGH): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the Gorkha National Liberation Front has recently been engaged in a series of agitational activities. Their main demand appear to be the creation of a separate State of Gorkhaland and the abrogation of the Indo-Nepal Friendship Treaty of. 1950**.**

In April 1966 the Gorkha National Liberation Front organised a black fla& agitation in Darjeeling. The Front organised a 72-hour bandh from May 12 to 14, 1986 in Darjeeling District. During the bandh there were several incidents of violence. Agitators at Panighat under Naxalbari police station attacked police forces, who ultimately had to open fire killing one person. Later, on May 25, 1986 following the arrest of some pei accused in certain cases. Gorkha National Liberation Front Supporters took on: a procession at Kurseong violating prohibitory orders and later attacked police personnel, who were forced to fire resulting in the death of 5 persons and injuries to two others. The situation almost came to normal after a few days.

The Central Government made available para-military forces to the State Government as requested by them; in all 5 Companies of CRPF and 3 Companies of BSF were made available.

Again, the Gorkha National Liberation F'ont gave a call for the boycott of '.""" who accepted the literary award to be given by the Nepali Academy on the 13lh July, 1986 which is the birth anniversary of Bhanu Bhakta, a renowned Nepali poet. However, there was not much response to this call.

Meanwhile Gorkha National Liberation Front had planned agitation programme for 27th July which involved public burning of Article 7 of the Indo-Nepal Fri ship Treaty, 1950, in different parts ',f Darjeeling District. In view of this the Government of West Bengal had ext the existing prohibitory orders u/s ! U Cr. P.C. in the town of Darjeeling Kurseong. The prohibitory orders also imposed in Kalimpong town.

On 27th July the Gorkha National ' > Deration Front supporters in large number tried to violate prohibitory orders in K;i limpong when 27 persons were an Subsequently the Police had to interven to prevent fresh attempts to viohte probatory orders which led to confront-ifion between violent mobs armed with Khukriw and Police. The violent mob demaged