

dred of processions are taken out in the city. Thousands of people congregate at temples and offer Puja in the capital on this day. If it is not done, the Government would be responsible for not discharging its religious responsibility. I demand that Ram Navami be declared a holiday.

SHRIB.L. SHARMAPREM (East Delhi): In 1985, a representation with ten lakh signatures was submitted to the President. As a result of that Gyani Zali Singh gave an assurance to declare it a holiday. I am of the view that Sikhism, Jainism, Buddhism, Arya Samaj and Sanatan Dharm are all parts of Hindu society. Hindus are in majority in this country. As such holidays should be decided on the basis of majority. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI KALKA DAS (Karolbagh): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, it is a serious matter. I condemn the Government for this. It is also against secularism. Holidays on the birth-days of prophets are being observed for all religions but it is unwarranted that Ram Navami has been deleted from the list of holidays. I request the Government to think seriously and take a decision to continue this holiday not only in Delhi but all over India as has been the practice therefore.

[*English*]

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN (Kishanganj): Mr Deputy Speaker, Sir, on 31st March, the United Nations Security Council adopted a Resolution importing sanctions against Libya with effect from April 15, 1992.

This Resolution was adopted by a note of 10 to 0 with five abstentions. The Resolution was sponsored by the United States, the United Kingdom and France. This Resolution is nothing more than an assertion of dominance by a Super Power. It is an imposition of Pax Americana under which the entire world is being forced into subjection.

As a State, we are totally opposed to international terrorism, and we have always opposed a State-sponsored and State-sup-

ported terrorism. However, we felt and it was expressed on the Floor of the Security Council by our permanent representative that this sudden imposition of sanction without waiting for the judicial process to run its course, without corrupting the diplomatic process, without allowing multi-dimensional and multi-faceted efforts to succeed was premature. Our permanent representative objected to it and said that this had Resolution had already complicated a very complex situation; and he pleaded that this Resolution is vague and should be made more precise in order to establish the condition for imposing sanction and for lifting them. He also referred to the judicial process going on in the International Court of Justice; and he wanted the council to slow.

India is the coordinator of the Non-Aligned Group in the United Nations today; and we held a meeting of the Non-Aligned Group; and it was pleaded on behalf of the Non-Aligned Group that just 15 days should be allowed for these processes and these efforts to be completed. But the Super Power could not accept even this plea. We feel absolutely hurt and we feel agonised at the behavior of this Super Power, the United States. However, finally, India was over whened by this pressure and it abstained on this Resolution.

Having led the battle against the Resolution, we do not have the courage, we do not have the moral stamina to stand up to the Bully and to oppose the Resolution. Two other States, I am sorry to say, Venezuela and Equador, which are Members of the Non-Aligned Group, which are geographically and perhaps economically very close to the United States and therefore much more under the pressure, supported the Resolution. Had these two Non-Aligned countries, not broken rank, the Resolution would not have been adopted. This is a critical situation, a moment for consideration of the effectiveness of the Non-Aligned Movement.

I hope and believe that our representative in the United Nations and our Foreign office shall continue to plead for restraint, for

caution and not taking this Resolution to its logical conclusion and imposing a war-like situation over the world.

SHRI MOHAMMAD YUNUS SALEEM (Katiyar): I want to support this point raised by Mr. Shahabuddin Syed. (*Interruptions*) You know that I very seldom request for time. Now this is such an important matter that I want to say something.

Whatever Mr. Shahabuddin Syed has said and a very important question that he has raised goes to the root of our foreign policy. We have been claiming to be a Non-Aligned country. Whatever has happened in UNO, India, as has been rightly pointed out by Mr. Shahabuddin Syed, should have voted against this Resolution, which is a conspiracy of Big Power, Western Power against the Arab countries and Muslim countries.

The first target was Saddam Hussein. How the second target is Libya; and I do not know which is going to be the third target. The sanction which has been imposed on Libya is most inhuman; and India cannot tolerate such highhandedness of Big Power.

I submit before you that when there is a question of the extradition under international law and law of the land, some procedure has got to be observed for seeking extradition of some accused persons. It is common knowledge that suppose a country wants the citizen of another country to be extradited, that country has got to submit all the prima facie evidence in support of all the charges against that person and when that evidence is satisfactory and is approved by the other country, only then extradition proceedings can take place.

We know that Shri Salman Rushdie is a person who has become notorious. Suppose, India wants the United Kingdom to extradite him to prosecute him, then the U.K. will not agree without any evidence.

Therefore, I submit with great respect, that the Government of India should revise its policy. I have been very carefully watching

that there is a substantial change in the foreign policy of the Government of India and now the Government is slowly succumbing to the pressures of the Western Powers. We raise our voice against this policy and this matter will not be left here. If this is going to be imposed, everybody will come out of this House and we will raise our voice against this high-handedness. Libya is not just one matter. It is a matter of the entire world from the humanitarian point of view.

What is happening in Iraq? The sanctions have been imposed. Children are dying for want of food. They are not getting milk. People are dying for want of medicines. They are not getting medicines. Is this the way the big powers are going to treat the developing countries?

I fully support the points which have been raised by Shri Syed Shahabuddin.

[*Translation*]

SHRI RAM PRASAD SINGH (Bikramganj): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, through you, I would like to raise a very important matter with a sad heart. Today the House is discussing the spread of terrorism in the whole country, but the Government is taking no steps to curb terrorism in time. I want to say that the inaccessible Vindhya and Camoor Mills where the borders of Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh and Bihar meet are becoming terrorist bases. Terrorists from Orissa, Bihar, and West Bengal take refuge there after committing crimes. It was reported in the newspapers in December that criminals of Bara incident took refuge in these hills. Terrorists of U.P. and M.P. take refuge there. So, I want that the Central Government should set up Army Cantonnments in these hills and link them with highways so as to curb the terrorist menace and stop hills being used as terrorist hide outs.

[*English*]

SHRIMATI MALINI BHATTACHARAYA (Jadavpur): Sir, while supporting what the hon. Shri Shahabuddin has said, on India's stand on Libya, I would

refer to another instance of such attempted inroads of imperialism into the developing countries. The United Nations Convention on Environment and Development is going to start in Riode Janeiro between the 1st and the 12th of June and this will centre around many controversial issues affecting the developing countries. One issue is that of global environment facility which is a fund proposed to be floated by the World Bank and such other agencies of the United Nations.

India has always opposed this proposal because they feel that in this proposal because they feel that in this proposal there is a bias towards the donor countries and to accept this would mean to hamper both development and environment protection in the developing countries.

India has also taken the stand that since the contribution of the developed countries in global pollution and ozone depletion is much greater, their share in this fund should be obligatory. There should be a separate fund for this. Pollution causing technology should be administered by the countries concerned and not by the donors and also while implementing change over to pollution free technologies, the necessary technology should be provided to the developing countries. India has also opposed the Bio-diversity Convention which is going to open up our genetic resources, our genetic riches to commercial interests in the developed countries.

This question was raised in the Question Hour a couple of days back. Since the Minister of State of the Ministry of Environment and Forests was not present, the hon. Minister of State in the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs and Minister of State in the Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs—who unfortunately does not know a thing about it - answered on the subject. The answer was no answer. This is a very important issue. As there are not going to be discussions on the Ministry of Environment during the discussion on Demands for Grants, we would like to know whether the Govern-

ment would allow us a separate discussion on the coming Earth Summit at Riode Janeiro.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI RANGARAJAN KUMARAMANGALAM): Sir, I have a lot of respect for Shrimati Malini Bhattacharya. But, I think, sweeping allegation between Members of the House is not fair. I would like to inform her that if she would have heard me out carefully in the Question Hour, I categorically stated that our stand on the World Environment Global facility has not changed. I have stated categorically. I think she has heard me. I had also told her that was the facility which really is a fund being created is an international monetary establishment that is being created and at the moment our stand has not changed. We have said that we consult all the non-governmental organisations and we would take their opinion and it is only after that the situation would arise; the Government would have to take a stand. We are very clear that on the Earth Summit Convention, we would go with the consensus views of NGOs as well as Members of Parliament who are interested. The Committee on Environment and Forests, which is headed by hon. Shri Jaswant Singh, would discuss this in depth. I think the Members of the Consultative Committee are aware that a detailed note on the position, raising the question has been circulated to the Members. Therefore, I want to assuage the feelings and tell her not to get worried. We would be very clear in seeing that the interests of the developing countries, especially the interests of India would be looked after and we would ensure that in no way the developed countries, in any manner, damage or be permitted to damage our development in this process.

SHRIMATIMALINIBHATTACHARAYA: I am sorry, if I have hurt Shri Rangarajan Kumaramangalam. But, we would like the response of the Minister of State of the Ministry of Environment and Forests on this. (Interruptions)

SHRI KUMARAMANGALAM: Shrimati Malini Bhattacharya, I am extremely sorry. I am not saying I am hurt. But, I am sorry that there are certain courtesies. You are not so younger Member, you should have known it. But, one thing I could tell you that we would raise this question. If you wanted the Environment Minister's response, you should have waited for the Environment Minister to be available. It is not correct.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH(Chittorgarh): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I wish to make just a brief comment on my good and learned friends Shri Syed Shahabuddin's intervention on the question of UN sanction on Libya. I was encouraged to do this only because the hon. Minister of State in the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs promptly sprang to his own protection and proceeded somewhat ungallantly to react to what Shrimati Malini Bhattacharya had said. It was my expectation that the Treasury would stand up and support its own action and because I am standing, we are again going to be charged of looking after the Treasury Benches interests. It is not because of that. (*Interruptions*)

13.00 hrs.

Anyway, Sir, but we all have to bear our respective crosses. I have great regard and respect for the hon. Syed Shahabuddin. He is a former diplomat, a learned man and a man of some experience in the field of diplomacy. I am afraid, I could not help reflecting, when he said what he did, that all the idioms and thoughts seem to be frozen not just in yesterday's speech but frozen as it were in day before yesterday. The world has moved very far. As far as the UN sanctions on Libya are concerned. I do not want to anticipate the discussion on the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of External Affairs but there are three or four separate aspects of it. There is the aspect of the sanctions and the domination of the United Nations by one particular country. How long that domination can go on and how long can that country continue to manage the affairs in the United Nations, in the manner in which it is presently

attempting to do, very shortly we will come to learn. And here is the speech which says that the Government of United States or of the U.K. or France, in response to the Lockerbie incident, which was a ghastly incident, have gone to the extent of seeking extradition of two Libyans. Because the moot point is terrorism, then it should be my expectation, both of the Government of United States of America as also of the United Nations, that - to use an over used cliché phrase - it will be a level playing-field that all nations would have, on which to play, and that the United States of America or the United Kingdom or France would have an equally stringent approach, for example, when it comes to incidents of terrorism in Punjab or Jammu and Kashmir... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI EBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT(Ponnani): Syed Shahabuddin has categorically said that he will never support the terrorism of any State or individual. (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Maulana Sahab, why are you getting angry.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI EBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT: I am not getting angry.

I am just reminding you.

[*English*]

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: As I was saying, it would be our expectation that the United States of America would be equally stringent when incidents of terrorism perpetrated by Pakistan, for example, in Punjab or Jammu and Kashmir, come to light. That is one aspect.

The other aspect is terrorism. I do not want to go into the terrorism of the Lockerbie incident or the fact that Libya is, in fact, one of the countries that supported Pakistan's nuclear programme. You cannot just look at

the totality of the changing world — forgive me Maulana Sahib - through yesterday's lenses. You cannot continue to do that.

I recollect, not too long ago - I am glad that the hon. former Prime Minister is here - there was a certain action that became necessary during the Gulf War and we had no difficulty whatsoever in saying that what the hon. former Prime Minister, Shri Chandra Shekhar Ji then did was in the interests of India. And there were accusations then made. It would be my hope that the Treasury Bench would at least stand up and support the action that is taken by their own Government. But it falls to my lot to do so, Sir. And I know that we will have to pay a price. We will be told that we are colluding with the Congress party if we are supporting that.

Finally, so far as the abstention is concerned, there is a third aspect. Some nostalgic references were made to the disarray in the camp of the Non-Aligned. The disarray is not in the ranks and the files, the disarray is conceptual. If there is a conceptual disarray, then necessarily the ranks will be out of alignment and the files will not be drawn up straight. That has to be recognised.

Finally, so far as abstention by India in the crucial U.N. vote is concerned, I cannot really find fault on the abstention because abstention has - in diplomatic terms - inherent in it a certain degree of restraint combined with dis-approval. I do not see - under the circumstances - what is the difficulty in disapproving of the action with restraint. I thought I need to say that. *(Interruptions)*
Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is already one p.m.

(Interruptions)

SHRI RANGARAJAN KUMARAMANGALAM: I was under the impression....*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY (Katwa): Sir, I have one thing to say.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (Bankura): It will take only one minute. *(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Normally the Zero hour comes to an end at the stroke of one o'clock..

(Interruptions)

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: Sir, I want to speak on this subject. *(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is also important to know that there are so many Members who would like to ventilate their grievances. Now Prof. Savithri Lakshmanan.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: Sir, you should follow certain principles. If you allow other parties to speak on a particular subject, you should give time to all other parties also.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: But, Shrimati Malini Bhattacharya has already spoken.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: Sir, kindly forgive me. Certain things on the question of Libya have not been clarified properly. You have to need to everybody.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have called Prof. Savithri Lakshmanan. After her Shri Saifuddin Choudhury may speak.

(Interruptions)

PROF. SAVITHRI LAKSHMANAN (Mukundapuram): Sir, I am upon another subject, not on this subject.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: O.K. Please start.

SHRI RANGARAJAN KUMARAMANGALAM: Sir, if I may be per-

mitted.. ..(Interruptions) One second please...(Interruptions) It is not fair. (Interruptions) I am obliged that Shri Jaswant Singh took it on himself to respond to the point. But I see and you would have noticed yourself that there are many Members from various parties who still want to voice their voices.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE:
Why do you not wait?

SHRI RANGARAJAN KUMARAMANGALAM: On Government side, it is not necessary to wait for everybody to speak, for the round to finish. I notice that Prof. Savithri Lakshmanan, whom you called, is on another subject. That is why I want to speak for a minute.

I would like to categorically say that the charge is that we have succumbed, but we have not. We have not voted along, at all, with the sanctions. We have abstained. We had definitely discouraged. We had taken a very clear stand on the issue. We had abstained. We had made it clear that - as Shri Jaswant Singh Said - we wanted a level treatment on this. This is not the only case of terrorism that is there in the world or it is also not the only case where plans have been blown up on ground by terrorists. There have been other cases. Our country itself has been a victim. We have been in trouble over getting hold of terrorists who are in various countries, not just in Pakistan or in other countries. We had this issue raised; we had it discussed. Finally we decided to abstain as a matter of principle to point out that we disapprove this discriminatory attitude.

At the present moment, the detailed discussion on the subject is going to come up when the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of External Affairs are going to be discussed. At that point the Ministry of External Affairs would come out with the full stand. If the Members wish to have a statement on the issue we can definitely have it. But I do not think it is necessary when the discussion on the Demands for Grants of Ministry of External Affairs is just round the corner. We can

have the discussion at that time. Thank you.

PROF. SAVITHRI LAKSHMANAN: Sir, there is a special news telecast, once in a week, from Delhi Doordarshan for the deaf and dumb. Unfortunately, 6 per cent of the people of Kerala are deaf and dumb, according to the Statistics collected by All Kerala Association of the Deaf. There is a request from this particular association to telecast similar programmes from Trivandrum Doordarshan also. Trivandrum Doordarshan has not come out with any kind of entertainment show for these physically retarded people, especially when these people are not mentally retarded people but are only physically retarded people. No step has been taken for the introduction of the news reading in Malayalam for the deaf and dumb people. And this telecast from Trivandrum Doordarshan needs the approval of the Central Ministry for the special news telecast. So, I urge upon the Minister of Information and Broadcasting to take necessary steps...(Interruptions)

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA (Cuttack): Sir, this is a very important issue and it should be discussed. (Interruptions)

PROF. SAVITHRI LAKSHMANAN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am also on a very important subject. (Interruptions)

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY (Katwa): Then you don't call anybody. (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is not that. That Minister has also replied to it. Now, let her have her say.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (Bankura): You follow the convention of the House.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Acharia, Prof. Savithri Lakshmanan is on her legs.

(Interruptions)

PROF. SAVITHRI LAKSHMANAN: I am going to conclude, Sir. My plea is that the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting

should take necessary steps to start the news programme for the deaf and dumb members from Trivandrum Doordarshan immediately.

I think the Reporters might have heard my voice. Thank you, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Each political party will have a chance. We cannot call four or five Members only from one Party.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is why I told you earlier itself that at One o'Clock the Zero Hour can also come to an end.

AN HON. MEMBER: Can you make other speak also? *(Interruptions)*

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA:to regulate the House it will be easier for you also. On an international issue if any Member mentions about any important issue, then all the political parties should also be allowed to speak. So on this Libya issue, once this has been referred to by Shri Shahabuddin and Jaswant Singhji also spoke, then the other parties should also mention about their view points. Then you can take up some other issues. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: After the mention about the deaf and dumb, I don't feel like speaking on that. *(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is true that every political party on an important matter of national importance can also express an opinion.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: I am in favour of not talking after that.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I agree with that. When some of the people spoke, even the Minister also....

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: I told him not to respond.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA: We requested Mr. Kumaramangalam not to respond.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is all right. Well in advance, anticipating your allegiance he has answered it. Secondly, you also want to express your opinion. It is all right, you want to express your opinion about Libya., you have got a chance. Now the question is, how long have we to sit under Zero Hour? Should we extend this?

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: May I help you, Sir? *(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: One minute. I have been seeing a number of points being raised. Almost every Member wants to contribute some of his opinions for the betterment of this country. Therefore, there are so many people who want to speak. Now, this Zero Hour comes to an end at One o'Clock. Are we to extend it? *(Interruptions)*

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: I do not want to speak on Libya. I am to speak on the procedure. The point is that when Shahabuddin Sahib raised it, then after that if you had taken up other matters, I would have no objection. But you have allowed two other Members also. People in the country would like to know what our Party did in the House. I don't like at all to speak in this House and if the Chair is not sensitive, I do not want to speak and the Minister also stood up and said something. Why should I speak on this issue now? I raised the point first in this House not to go along with USA to vote against Libya. I am happy that they did not go along with USA and nothing more than that. *(Interruptions)* Then I have to clarify this. I am totally against any country aiding and abetting terrorism. *(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Sudhit Sawant, are you on the same subject?

SHRI SUDHIR SAWANT (Rajapur): No, Sir, I am on a different subject. Mrs. Malini

Bhattacharya has already spoken from their party. They have got a chance already.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Kindly taken your seat. You will have a change.

SHRI MANORANJAN BHAKTA (Andaman and Nicobar Islands): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I am on a point of procedure. What Mr. Saifuddin Choudhury said is correct that we can take up one item after the other. But since today you have allowed their side maximum, this side could not get much of a chance. You have followed a system what you thought was correct in your wisdom and from tomorrow onwards, you can take up the procedure as he suggested. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is not my idea, even the hon. Speaker also had suggested that such of those Members who want to speak during 'Zero Hour' can come to the office and give a notice before 10 o'clock.

SHRI V. DHANANJAYA KUMAR (Mangalore): Sir, we have given the notice well before 10 o'clock.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Kindly hear me. We can take up a maximum of 10 items in a day and not beyond that. But, if many important items are discussed for hours together, virtually it breaks the conventions and the traditions of this House. If 10 items are taken and if every Member speaks for two or three minutes, then it would be over by 10 minutes to One o'clock and by that time, other subjects can be taken up. So, some sort of a system should be evolved. Even the hon. Speaker is trying his best to express what he feels about it and by this process, I think, a lot of Members will have dissatisfaction and it does not create a healthy atmosphere also.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: Sir, I must say that the two bombings of the USA and French airliners are the most ghastly incidents that could happen. We also had our own experience of 'Kanishka'. We are totally

opposed to this kind of terrorism or State aid to this kind of terrorism. This is our position. But, on this UN Security Council vote, we wanted our country not to go along with the USA, because they were trying to use the Security Council to meet their own arrogant purpose. We are all for recovering the culprits of these bombings and severe punishment has to be given to them. If a country is aiding terrorism, there must be sanctions against that country, no doubt about it. But, the point is whether a fair procedure was followed on this issue and this is what India objected and I am happy for it. But the moral position demands that when you cannot support certain positions taken by certain countries, you cannot abstain but should oppose that. As Mr. Jaswant Singh said, certain phrases are yesterday's phrases, certain people have given up their kind of lenses that they used to see the world through. But there are certain countries who have not reconciled to the changed situation. They want to have their domination over the world, that is the problem. The Cold War has ended, but in some minds it is still prevailing gradually hothing up. so, in order to uphold the dignity of institution of United Nations and the International Court of Justice in The Hague and other neutral organisation, we demanded that this kind of unilateral imposition of the will of any particular country or a group of countries should not be allowed to take place in the changed world. This is the position of our party.

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA: Sir, we do to support the stands that Libya has been taking on many issues and very recently, the Conference of Islamic countries which was held at the instance of Pakistan passed a resolution on the issue of Kashmir. My friend Mr. Shahabuddin said it very correctly. Mr. Jaswant Singh also said that India did not vote along with the UN sanctions and that is appreciated. But in the tense situation, in the present global situation, I wish him also to go one step forward. At present, they are not only as the BJP party but the main Opposition Party in the House. If the Government trembles, if the Government fumbles in the face of pressure, they must also add strength

to our national views. Libya had come to Delhi and expressed regret for its stand in the Islamic Conference. That is a welcome change. That is why, we want the Government of India to declare that we will not join the sanction against Libya, particularly when the matter is *sub judice*. It is pending in the International Court of Justice. In such a situation, the Government of India should say that it will not join the sanction. In voting, India remaining neutral as a leader of the Non-aligned world was a blunder. In future on many occasions, we require wider support. In our national interest, in the international interest and in the interest of justice also, the stand that had been taken was wrong. We have fumbled. That was a mistake. But we must not join the sanction imposed by the United States.

SHRI INDER JIT (Darjeeling): The Libyan affair at the United Nations has to be viewed in two contexts. The first context is the issue of State terrorism. The second context is the sanction. So far as we are concerned, we are already suffering a great deal in this country because of State sponsored terrorism by Pakistan. We want to mobilise the opinion in the world over against State sponsored terrorism. We have to take notice of this and we could not possibly have opposed this Resolution.

So far as the sanctions are concerned, we are against the sanction. Therefore, the only pragmatic policy that we could have adopted at the United Nations was to abstain. We have not gone along with the United States in this particular matter. I think, this needs to be clearly understood. We are against the State sponsored terrorism. We could not have opposed the Resolution and yet demanded support.

In this particular case, we have also to take notice of the fact that there are certain countries which have joined us in condemning State sponsored terrorism by Pakistan. I would like to add that so far as our country is concerned, according to my information, we have asked the United States, Britain and France and other countries to support our demand for extradition of the terrorists who

are today receiving scour and protection in Pakistan.

One other point I would like to make is that I am rather distressed by the stand taken by my good friend, elder friend, Shri Yunus Saleem. He seems to have posed the issue as though the issue is between Muslims and non-Muslims. It is unfortunate.

SHRI MOHAMMAD YUNUS SALEEM: You are wrong. When Iran is a target, when Afghanistan is a target, they are not Arab countries. What do you say about Afghanistan and Iran?

SHRI INDER JIT: We should view the issue coolly in our best national interest, according to me, we should to have abstained from this Resolution.

SHRI AMAL DATTA (Diamond Harbour): May I have a chance on Bofors?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This cannot be converted into a general discussion. There is a limit for it.

Actually, the House ought to have completed its unlisted business by one O'clock. We should have taken other subjects.

Since many people wanted to participate in the international affairs...

SHRI AMAL DATTA: I am not responsible for that.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Each political party has contributed on this aspect.

SHRI AMAL DATTA: I want to speak without interruptions for only two minutes.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Kindly hear me. If you want to extend the Zero Hour beyond one O'clock, is it a good precedent? Is it a good practice? ON Libya, if every individual wants to contribute, it will take hours together.

SHRI AMAL DATTA: I said, I wanted only two minutes. I can make it one minute.

But I must have that one minute. I have been waiting here for the last one and-a-half hours.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Should it be extended for another one hour?

(Interruptions)

SHRI AMAL DATTA: You allowed Shri George Fernandes to speak. I wanted only one minute. Why shall I not get that one minute? *(Interruptions)*

I want to say something. I want the Government either to confirm or deny it. It is very important issue arising out of yesterday's debate.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There are many other important issues.

SHRI MANORANJAN BHAKTA (Andaman & Nicobar Islands): There are other important issues.

SHRI SUDHIR SAWANT: It cannot be allowed.

SHRI AMAL DATTA: Two questions were asked and we are told by several Ministers including the Prime Minister.

SHRI SUDHIR SAWANT: You do not allow him. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI AMAL DATTA: Why can't you call them to order? I said that I want only one minute. Two questions could not be answered yesterday. What were the contents of the note and who passed on that note.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You wanted only one minute.

SHRI AMAL DATTA: Everybody has got something.

SHRI SUDHIR SAWANT: You have allowed me to speak. He can speak after me.

SHRI AMAL DATTA: Please stop. I have been called.

SHRI SUDHIR SAWANT: He does not have that much of understanding.

SHRI AMAL DATTA: In yesterday's debate, two questions could not be answered from the treasure benches in spite of the fact that four Ministers including the Prime Minister spoke.

One was what was in the note, what are the contents of the note.

The second issue is who passed the note.

Today's papers contain both the informations. One information already Shri George Fernandes has pointed out. It has come in Indian Express under the name of the Editor Mr. Prabhu Chawla himself. Therefore, you have to give it some credence.

Similarly, in this paper, the Business and Political Observer, it has come in the name of the Editor of the paper, Mr. Prithvi Nandy a very well-known name. He said the persons are Hinduja's and the reports to that effect are available in the Prime Minister's Office. They have come from RAW, our Indian Agency based in Zurich and Geneva. I would like the Government to go through this report and either deny or abdicate. That is all. All right. Thank you very much.

SHRI SUDHIR SAWANT: According to the newspaper report, India has entered into an agreement for purchase of artillery guns with America. These guns are of the calibre of Bofors. There is nothing wrong. The gun is good I reiterate.

But there are some issues which must be clarified about this deal.

The first is that, whether in this deal there is an agreement for licensed production.

The second is what is the cost of this gun when compared to other guns in the market.

The third is what is the agreement for technological transfer, whether there has been agreement at all.