

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Let it be on record that only first motion is moved: "I seek leave of the house to move the following Adjournment Motion." Leave is granted. Now he will move the motion and start speaking. That is the procedure. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Mr. Speaker, as I said, I would like to know from you whether this particular direction given by the President under Article 112 of the Constitution, which in pursuance of Rule 204 you have informed us; has it been formally rescinded or is it still there? Has any formal communication been given to you that hereafter this requirement made by the President under the Constitution is no longer there? This is a very pertinent question which the House would like to know. Because, I am, along with the entire Opposition, of the view that this particular decision taken by the Government is going to hurt the economy very badly, that it will accentuate the climate of political uncertainty and instability which has been there ever since the formation of this Government and therefore on the whole this is a decision which is against the interests of the country. It should not have been taken. If the Government has any explanation, I would be happy to listen to it.

SHRI A.K. ROY (Dhanbad): Allow me to speak, Sir. (*Interruptions*)

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not want to enter into this controversy. But I do not want that any misgivings should be created on this ground. When the notice was issued, subsequently, the President was informed of the changed situation and what has been done, has been done, with the knowledge and consent of the President.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. A.K. Roy.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE

(Bolpur): We have something to say on this. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: The Lok Sabha Secretariat received a communication in this regard on February 14. One day after that this Bulletin was issued. Had that particular communication been rescinded?

---

12.22 hrs.

### MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

**Failure of Government to take timely decision about stoppage of refuelling of U.S. Planes and proper initiatives in regard to Gulf War compatible with pronounced national foreign policy**

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. A.K. Roy, will you please move the Adjournment Motion?

SHRI A.K. ROY (Dhanbad): I have already moved.

MR. SPEAKER: You are to move that "The House do now adjourn." You have not said that. You should know the procedure of the House.

(*Interruptions*)

MRSPEAKER: Mr. A.K. Roy, you should know the Rules. You must say "That the House do now adjourn".

SHRI A.K. ROY: I have already said. I have already said it.

I beg to move:

"That the House do now adjourn".

We are in the midst of a very serious

situation and my elderly colleagues have rightly pointed out certain serious developments in the country and there were definitely reasons for being agitated on that. I do support them on the question of abandoning the Budget, Harijan murder and all sorts of things have been said. But today the biggest problem to which attention has been drawn which is of concern to us and also to the world outside, is the Gulf War. And we, the people of India are very much concerned with that. We are concerned not only with the big devastation which is taking place there. Every day we are reading all sorts of miseries and destruction and death. It appears that all those things have ceased to be new now. Obviously, people used to be agitated even for a very fraction of that. But now we are also getting immune to the routine of information of how many people are dying and about their miseries. Blatant aggression is being committed with from outside in the name of liberation. But, it appears, some times I feel that we are helpless to the sick tragedy which is taking place openly. More than one lakh sorties have been taken and more than one lakh tonnes of TNT have been dropped which is six to seven times more than whatever was dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and people died.

Only a few days back we have seen how women and children are being killed within the safest bunkers and ultimately the U.S. Government, the so-called leader of the allied forces, had to agree that it was a mistake and their information had to be up-dated. But that was not being done. And in this we are witnessing helplessly the crime which is being committed in the name of liberation and justice.

I like to say here that we, the Indians are agitating on two fronts...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Bolpur): Who is the Foreign Minister of this Government?...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: The Prime Minister, Sir. He just went out with my permission.

*(Interruptions)*

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: The Parliamentary Affairs Minister is here. He will depute for the Prime Minister.

*(Interruptions)*

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE (Dumdum): Sir, every ounce of fuel is given to U.S. Airforce. Therefore, the generator is not functioning...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI A.K. ROY: We know the seriousness of the Government towards this issue. But atleast we want that the seriousness should not be demonstrated in this way in the House itself. They are exposing their callousness to the entire tragedy. It is being manifested in the House. When they are taking up this debate on Gulf war in this House, atleast I desire that some of the senior Ministers and the Prime Minister should have been present to hear what we say on the policy they were pursuing so far.

Sir, the Gulf war affects us in various ways. It affects us economically, it effects us politically and it affects us culturally. India was tied to the Arab world since long time in the history. And after that also, in the recent time also, our relationship with the Arab people especially the Iraqi people, is very good. On every occasion, in every crisis, the Iraqi Government has shown its respect towards secularism and it has been supporting the cause of India in every affair, and not to encourage the communal forces and other things, which have always been playing mischief in this continent.

Sir, now our friendly country in the friendly region is in trouble and they are

[Sh. A.K. Roy]

being bombarded every day and our people are agitated over it. But the Government is callously watching the scene. Not only that but conniving with aggression in different ways. This is the first thing.

Secondly we are economically connected with the Gulf war also. Nearly fourteen lakh Indians live in the Gulf region. More than Rs. 200 crores are being remitted from that place. After the breakout of the Gulf war, our entire economy is in trouble because most of the petroleum products are in short supply. The Gulf war has created scarcity of the petroleum products. This crisis is affecting our entire economy and our Budget. Today itself, in the answer to one of the questions, which could not be taken up, the Minister had to agree that the Gulf war had affected all the aspects of our economy. So, when the Gulf war is affecting us economically, politically socially and culturally and when our trusted friends are in distress, it was the responsibility of the Government to take initiative to enforce peace and peace with honour so that the people of the Gulf, especially the Arab world, would remember the contribution of India in bringing peace to them.

Some people are trying to equate the Iraq's annexation of Kuwait with the American intervention in the Gulf. The two cannot be compared. We must have some sense of responsibility in doing that. It was an intra-Arab affair. I have always held so. If you go through the history, you will find that all those small countries were created by the imperialist machinations because they were all under the Ottoman Empire in the beginning. Now after 1920 when the Ottoman Empire collapsed, those countries were created. The Iraq also came into being as an independent nation at that time. And also, the Saudi Arabia and other countries actually divided the Arab world. Lebanon and Syria went to French and the rest of the countries went to

England. After US granting independence to Iraq which became independent in 1932, Kuwait was kept under their control because of their oil wells and other economic interests. Ultimately Kuwait, which was always a part of Iraq culturally, politically and in every respect and a district of Basra—it was a small area of hardly 20 lakh of people and that too mostly outsiders and some 18000 square miles area—was made independent in 1961 by the British after keeping its economic interests there. Iraq at that time objected. Not only that but at that time also those who were ruling Kuwait, the feudal rulers, brought Britishers there for their safety. So it must be observed and realised that this was a dispute inherited from the history. So annexation of Kuwait by Iraq may not be supportable in that way, but it must be understood that there are certain historical reasons behind that. It is a legacy of the history. It is the same continuing process. It was a dispute which was continuing and the hands of the imperialists were always there in creating all those small States in order to further their exploitation. It was something like balkanisation of the Arab world which they did after the First World War.

The fight between Kuwait and Iraq is something, between Iraq and Syria and between Iraq and Iran is something but jumping of America with the entire NATO strength is something else. If some wrong was done to Kuwait, Kuwait people and Arab people were free to fight that and in that way we could have decided on which side the justice belonged. But Arab people are silent. You have not seen any resistance in Kuwait. You have never heard any people's agitation in any of the Arab countries including Iran against Iraq's annexation of Kuwait. That means, there are certain profound reasons for those actions which, of course, may not be supportable in that form. But why are the Americans being agitated? It is not because they have great love for the liberty and freedom of smaller nations but because of their oil in-

terests there—the entire oil of Kuwait, the entire oil of Saudi Arabia and entire oil of other people including previously Iraq also which has now been removed after the nationalisation of Iraq petroleum companies where the Britishers were to hold the entire share. Because of that, they have to keep their puppets in the entire region and at the ruling place. So it is nothing but a blatant aggression by one of the so-called super powers of the world against an Arab country. So the intra-Arab conflict which was historically descended is one thing but the aggression from outside, from the super powers with this ruthless bombing is something else. So it is the duty of the country, of our Government and also of our people to protest against this aggression and against

12.34 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

this type of naked attack on a country.

Here from the very beginning we have seen that the Government has taken a decision in the name of neutrality of actually appeasing, actually supporting, actually condoning, actually approving all those naked crimes of the US imperialist on a small country like Iraq. It has equated Iraq's withdrawal with American withdrawal. It is not so America with its entire NATO force must withdraw unconditionally. They have no business there. If there is some element of grievance among the Arab countries. The Arabs should fight it out in whatever way they like but the Americans and the NATO powers have no business to interfere. So, that must be condemned first. Secondly, we should tell Iraq that theirs also is not a proper way of settling the inter-Arab dispute. But our Government has not acted in that way. I had also sent a telegram asking the Government to call a special session of the Parliament to decide this issue but nothing has been done. Not only that, what is more shameful is the

continuation of the refuelling of the American combat planes at the Bombay airport. Every party, including their godfather, their mentor, the Congress(I) party, warned them that this is something where we are moving away from our policy of non-alignment, but they did not listen. Ultimately perhaps some secret dealings took place to save their face and the America had to stop the refuelling. America stopping the refuelling at the Bombay airport shows something more. It shows that the U.S. Government is more intimately and secretly linked with the present Government. That is why to save this Government and to save their face, they have themselves stopped refuelling at the Bombay airport. It shows that there is a collusion between the two Governments, which is a shame to us. You remember, Sir, that when the Korean war took place, there also Americans played the same role. I was reading a book on Radhakrishnan by his son Mr. S. Gopal. He says that when the news came that the Resolution on the Korean war was supported by India, he reacted sharply. He said that this Resolution should not have been supported by the Indian Government in that way because that would have tarnished the Indian Government's non-aligned posture. After his great efforts, the relationship was corrected and ultimately India took a position which was appreciated by all. But now it is something even more horrible, more criminal. In this way we are giving support to the American aggression which has no basis. Nobody in the world has authorised America to act as a policeman for the entire world. Who has authorised America to act like that? It is not a United Nations' force, it is American-led allied force. It is beyond the ambit of the so-called Resolution No. 678 of the United nations which did not authorise America to go and bomb Baghdad and that too to kill the women and children. It has authorised any country, if they can, to liberate Kuwait. But here, they could not move an inch. They do not have the courage to move an inch into Kuwait and that is why they are

[Sh. A.K. Roy]

bombing Baghdad. These are the super powers which have come not to liberate Kuwait, not to liberate Saudi Arabia but to save their puppets ruling in those areas so that their oil interests may continue.

Here I would like to say that it has been reasonably raised here that if the United Nation's Resolution No. 678 is to be accepted and respected, why not the two Resolutions of the UNO also which call for withdrawal of Israel from the Golan Heights, the West Bank of Gaza Strip and all those places which they occupied? There is no reasons why it should not be done. I would like to ask how many U.N. Resolutions have not been honoured where the allied forces have not come. Their conscience did not prick at that time. For example, the implementation of Security Council Resolution No. 242 of 1987 calling for the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the territories (West Bank, Gaza Strip) occupied after the 1967 conflict, of Resolution No. 465 of 1980 demanding an end to Israeli settlements in occupied Arab lands and of Resolution No. 478 to 1980 again condemning legislation in Israeli Parliament that declared Jerusalem an indivisible capital of Israel. Thus you will find that nowhere the conscience of Americans and all those Western people has pricked them and their desire for keeping freedom is never there. But here it comes. Why? because the fear is there that 1000 billion barrels of oil is in the Gulf area and the people are coming up against their governments, against those Amirs, Sheikhs and Sultans, who have still kept up their grip on the Government maintaining a total feudal and neo-colonial rule. So, the people's movement is there now. The American aggressors, therefore, came there and you know how many places have been bombed. More than one lakh tonnes of TNT bombs were dropped there. Many people died. I would like to know if America will accept the logic that if America has a right

to bomb Baghdad and if the Soviet Union has the same right to bomb Tel Aviv to enforce the U.N. Resolution No. 242, what would have been the reaction of the entire world today? So, Sir, it is nothing but a naked aggression on the Arab countries by the Imperialist West and intimidation on the Arab aspirations. Even with the neutral position India should stand solidly with the Arab people, the aggressed people of Iraq. Sometimes I feel such type of aggression could not have been possible earlier. Everybody is silent including the Soviet Russia. If the Socialist world did not get weakened, America could not have dared to attack the Arab lands. They have done it because the socialist world became weak. If the world was in the position of 1950, they could not have dared to attack the Arab lands. So, this is also something which the entire world should know. The socialist weakness gives them the courage to attack the Arab lands. These have also brought to light certain other aspects. We have always criticised fundamentalists or the religious politicians who mix religion with politics. They are the agents of big bourgeois class and big landlords and capitalists of the country. Similarly, in the Gulf war it is demonstrated that all those who used to export politics mixed with religion like Saudi Arabia and Pakistan posing as the embodiment of Islam, are nothing but the puppet agents of US imperialism sheltering the Americans to bomb their fellow Muslims in Iraq. This is the character of these people who mix religion with politics.

A few days back we are hearing the speeches of the Pakistan Prime Minister. His position has become shaky because people have gone in revolt against him. Not only that. The Prime Minister of Pakistan has become so shaky that he had to telephone to our shaky Prime Minister. He has come to such a position to ask as to what to do in this Matter. Pakistan has taken its forces to support America which the people of Pakistan are resenting and they are revolting against

it. Those are very good lessons for all the people. All those people who mix religion with politics are nothing but agents of the imperialist and capitalist forces and they cannot represent the aspirations of the people in my hour of crisis. This is what we have seen in the name of Ram Janambhoomi-Babri Masjid in India and we are seeing it in the Middle East now. So, in the present circumstances, India should take a positive move; India should condemn the American aggression of Iraq and India should take a peace initiative connecting the withdrawal of Iraq from Kuwait with the withdrawal of Israel from the entire Arab territory. India should stop the refuelling also. They say, it is stopped but it is continuing. I think the other speakers will expose it. But I would like to know one thing. Even if that was continuing it would have been continuing in the normal time, but once the war has broken out, once our friendly country is attacked, India has every right to review all the past agreements and contracts and suspend the same in this abnormal period. Iran also has not taken a very correct position. All the Iraqi planes have landed there. They have immobilised them saying that so long as the war continues they will not be allowed to be used. India should have come out with a statement that whatever contracts might have been there earlier, they are meant for normal times and not for the war time. But they have not done that. They are afraid that our IMF loan will be affected. This is an invisible conditionality of the IMF loan and it has dishonored our nation before the Arab world. I would like to say that this Government stands condemned for approving this blatant US imperialist aggression on a friendly Arab country who stood by us in all our hour of crises. This American aggression on Iraq cannot be equated with Iraq's annexation of Kuwait because it was a continuation of historical dispute. Kuwait has unilaterally reduced the price of oil thereby suddenly putting Iraq and other countries to loss. So, the entire Arab conflict should be solved by the Arab people

themselves. America and NATO have no business to come and act as policemen for the whole world.

We censure this Government strongly for its failure to rise up to the occasion in this hour of crisis and to uphold the honour of this country. With these words, I conclude my remarks.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Today being Friday, the House is to take up Private Members' Bills at 3-30 p.m. as usual. Since the House is discussing adjournment motion which may go up to 4 p.m. or beyond that, if the House agrees the Private Members' business may be taken up after the disposal of the adjournment motion and some other business also.

SHRI IBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT (Manjeri): The House must adjourn at one O'clock for lunch. Today is Friday.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: As per the decision, on Friday, there will be lunch hour. But if you agree, we can continue this discussion.

SHRI IBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT: We must have lunch hour to go for Namaaz.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: We will have Lunch hour.

AN HON. MEMBER: At what time voting will take place?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It will be around 5 O'clock. Motion moved:

"That the House do now adjourn".

Now, Shri M.J. Akbar.

SHRI M.J. AKBAR (Kishanganj): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, the motion on which I rise to take part today in my view is a very simple

[Sh. M.J. Akbar]

one—whether India shall be a nation—State or municipality; whether the foreign policy of the nation shall be guided by independent morality or by somebody else; whether India shall be a municipality which runs at the behest of foreign powers, particularly those powers which have controlled us in the past which had subjugated us to the colonialism which we thought left us on 15th August, 1947.

Sir, we are today also discussing this issue when we have heard this morning news that President Gorbachev and President Saddam Hussein have agreed on a particular peace policy. It is a 8-point peace policy, which I think, all of us in the House, readily welcome it. All of us in the House would, in fact, only regret that it did not come sooner. But the reasons why it did not come earlier, have been briefly hinted by my colleague, Shri A.K. Roy when he said that the Socialist world to an extent has abdicated its responsibility. But for me, the sadness is not whether the Soviet Union has abdicated the responsibility or the Socialist world has abdicated the responsibility. What I feel sad about it is, to a large extent, I think, we have also abdicated our responsibility in responding to a very serious situation in the Gulf.

Today we hear of the Soviet Peace policy. I know on the date of war began, President Gorbachev sent the message to the Government of India saying that India and Soviet Union should have regular, perhaps even daily discussion, on how to bring about peace. If the Soviet initiative, Gorbachev initiative had been followed through with the kind of promptitude—I think only belatedly we have responded now—today we would have Indo-Soviet peace initiative rather than merely the Soviet initiative. That saddens me.

I think, the reason why there is a debate,

anguish today is partly to what we have done with the popular response, popular anger, as we seemed to shift from the distinctive deep ideological commitment to our popular value, in a sense, a shift from ideology of this nation called India. Policies, particularly foreign policies are not made by Budgets alone. Government of India cannot be an accountant manipulating profit and loss which is a very illusory arithmetic in any case. Policy, particularly foreign policy, if it does not evolve out of ideology, it leads to confusion and to betrayal. If we need any example of this, then we have to look no farther than at our neighbour, Pakistan. If you look at the history of the last 40 years, almost consistently Pakistan's policy has been completely at variance with the declared wishes of its people. Mr. Nawaz Sheriff, being a good little tail of Mr. Rambo Bush, sent 10,000 soldiers towards the Gulf and today he does not know how to get out of that muddle because the people of Pakistan have risen virtually unanimously, I can say. If Mr. Nawaz Sheriff goes and checks the opinion of the people, he will realise what they will do to him

Pakistan is built on false ideologies. Therefore, if its Government bows to that false ideology and takes up essentially false policy, there is not very much we can say. That is expected. If we do that, then we are betraying something very deep and fundamental to our very existence.

I believe that the shift, the abdication of our foreign policy commitments began a long time ago, at least a year ago. I hope that Mr. Gujral will reciprocate the affection that I have for him. But I cannot have said that the refuelling issue which we are debating today is not something that was done in isolation. The refuelling decision was preceded by, something even worse, by a larger and a bigger sell-out of the Indian interests and that sell out took place in August and that sell-out took place in September and that sell out took place by the V.P. Singh Govern-

ment when it, by an unprecedented decision, allowed the use of air corridor for US military planes.

A lot of dust is being sought to be thrown upon this whole issue of refuelling. People who have a great deal to hide are trying to mislead the nation. One of the ways in which they are trying to mislead the nation is by saying "Oh! there is nothing wrong. This refuelling, this and that, this has been going on for the last 40 years.

SHRI TARIT BARAN TOPDAR (Barrackpore): Are you referring to your own party?

SHRI M.J. AKBAR: No. I am not referring to my own Party. I am referring to your particular politics on this issue. I have absolutely no hesitation in saying that foreign policy in this country was run by certain consensus. Within that consensus, bilateral relations between friendly nations of refuelling was allowed. That refuelling was allowed in peace time. There is nothing wrong with it. We still insist there is absolutely nothing wrong with refuelling our planes. I do not know the details of it. But I am absolutely sure that our military aircraft must have taken fuel from countries either hostile, friendly, in between or wherever, in the past. Refueling is always done. But, there is a fundamental and a very formidable difference between refuelling in peace time and refuelling on support basis during war time.

The situation that arose in the Gulf did not arise and did not begin on 17th January. On 17th January, something called Operation desert storm began. Before Operation desert storm, there was something Operation desert shield. In case you do not know about it, I would only advise you to check up with Mr. Gujral and with Prof. Madhu Dandavate. They will tell you all about desert shield.

America declared its intentions. America had openly and publicly over and over again declared its intentions about what it was going to do in the Gulf. There is one thing about the Americans. This is the difference between the Americans and the British. The British put it in a more sophisticated way. Let us at least thank the Americans for this much, that they say everything they want to say quite bluntly. If they want President Saddam Hussein dead, then the President of America publicly says "I want him dead." (*Interruptions*)

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Midnapore): What were you doing. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI M.J. AKBAR: When the crisis in the Gulf began in August, in this House I was sitting there, Prof. Madhu Dandavate and Shri Gujral were sitting here. At that time we were all seized of that issue. (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

SHRI YAMUNA PRASAD SHASTRI (Rewa): At that time only the point of issuing economic sanctions was under consideration. When the question of refuelling their A.F. planes was taken up....

[*English*]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Shastri, you can make your speech later on.

[*Translation*]

SHRI YAMUNA PRASAD SHASTRI: It is not proper to make such wrong statements here. he should not level such type of charges here.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER. You can speak latter on.

SHRI M.J. AKBAR: Please do not be afraid of the truth. Truth is a very great thing.



[Sh. M.J. Akbar]

More such things will come to fore. You cannot escape it.

SHRI YAMUNA PRASAD SHASTRI:  
The Janata Dal and the people all over the country condemned the question of refuelling A.F. planes of the V.S.A. Only the Congress (I) is supporting this move. This action on the part of the Government has tarnished the image of the Government.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Shastriji, if you want to make a speech, I will give you time.

[English]

Don't disturb.

SHRI M.J. AKBAR: At that time, we were in the House. We were all seized of the Gulf issue for very immediate reasons apart from the reasons of foreign policy. When there was a difficult situation, our people in the Gulf wanted to come back and so on and so forth. I do remember sitting there, hearing the Foreign Minister of Shri V.P. Singh who stood up and said certain things.

SHRI IBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT: Sir, let us adjourn for Lunch.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Let him finish his speech and then we will adjourn.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Midnapore): He will not finish now.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Akbar, will you continue after Lunch?

SHRI M.J. AKBAR: Yes.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: All right. The

House stands adjourned for Lunch to meet at 2 p.m.

13.02 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned for Lunch  
till Fourteen of the Clock*

*The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch  
at Five minutes past Fourteen of the Clock*

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

[English]

DR. THAMBI DURAI (Karur): Sir, I want a clarification from the Chair. So many speculations are going on regarding the time factor as to whether the voting is going to take place at 4 p.m. 4.30 p.m. or 5.30 p.m. because today the Private Members' Business is going to be there at 3.30 p.m. I would like to know whether you are going to extend this debate till 4 O'clock or 4.30 p.m. and carry on with the Private Members' Business in the remaining time. Otherwise are you going to take up the Private members' Business at 3.30 p.m, finish it and then resume the debate on the adjournment motion?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have already made a statement in the House that the Private Members' Business will be taken up after the adjournment motion is disposed of. I have said that between 4 p.m. and 5 p.m. Members should be here for reply also.

DR. THAMBI DURAI: When the voting is taken up we have to be here. That is why I raised this point.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Shri M.J. Akbar to continue his speech.

14.06 hrs.

### MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

**Failure of Government to take timely decision about stoppage of refuelling of U.S. Planes and proper initiatives in regard to Gulf War Compatible with the Pronounced National Foreign Policy**

[English]

SHRI M.J. AKBAR (Kishanganj): Sir, I would like to pick up from where I stopped and that is in the origin of the whole refuelling controversy. Once again I repeat that an unnecessary amount of dust and confusion is being created. We repeat that there is nothing wrong in refuelling as long as it is peace time. The issue before us, is what is the purpose of refuelling, what is the purpose of the permission that was sought by the America as it was granted by them. I want to revive the memory of this House that there is now today—in February—a feeling that the war has started only on the 17th January or that the situation in the Gulf started post United Nations Security Council Resolution. It must be remembered that the situation in the Gulf began to deteriorate and turned into a war situation as early as August last year I quote from a caption in Life magazine—and I seek your permission to quote it—in order to give the background of what exactly was the situation.

SHRI MALLIKARJUN (Mahbubnagar): There is no Defence Minister present here Sir.

THE MINISTER OF PETROLEUM AND CHEMICALS AND MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALVIYA): I am present here Sir. (Interruptions)

SHRI M.J. AKBAR: I think these facts are extremely relevant to our understanding

of what the situation was in August. Not since D-day World War-II has the United States moved its military so swiftly and so decisively within days of Iraq's August 2 lightning attack on the oil rich Kuwait. American men, women and material were poured into the inhospitable Saudi Arabia's desert at a rate of one plane load every seven minutes. I repeat, one plane load every seven minutes, forming a crescent shaped bulwark against the aggression. By the end of November, US military capability of Saudi Arabia had grown from two Generals armed with a single pocket knife—I trust there is an element of journalistic exaggeration here; but I can convey what I am saying—to a quarter million soldiers and reservists equipped with one hundred tanks, fifteen hundred planes and fifty warships.

About the Operation Desert Shield—I repeat that Operation Desert Shield is the father of the Operation Desert Storm

[Translation]

SHRI SHOPAT SINGH MAKKASAR: You start from 15th January.

[English]

SHRI M.J. AKBAR: The combat situation started when the American military build up started in August. At that time the House was in session. We were then very much agitated about the situation because of the refugees problem and all sections of the House were also agitated.

Mr. Gujral is here now, I remember, one sentence was etched deeply in my mind when talking about it, maybe it came out inadvertently, when he said that how can I talk to Saddam Hussain, we have no policy. I repeat, it is not true that there was no policy. There was a policy except that it was a secret policy. There was a policy except that it was a secret deal. It was in August that the

[Sh. M.J. Akbar]

Americans asked for an air corridor, for a space in order to build its military build-up that we have just heard about—a plane load every seven minutes. These planes were coming from all directions of the world, including the bases in Manila and I understand from Thailand also. At this moment, I may add that we must know the technicality of the refuelling in the past. Refuelling in peacetime has been acceptable to everybody and there is no debate about that. Even then, refuelling has been given, I think, on a flight to flight basis. For the first time in August, an omnibus permission was given to the air-corridor and I would say that, that is even more dangerous because those planes were not halting. When a plane halts, in our country, we have our sovereign right to examine those planes and see whether they are carrying the things inside, which they have allegedly said that they are carrying such and such things. That free air-corridor was an open sanction to the American build-up. I would also say firmly that Parliament was in Session and the Government of the day, despite the fact that discussions regarding Gulf came up day-after-day, did not take this House into confidence about its secret deal. The question is, why did it not take the House into confidence, if it was not guilty? If it was not guilty, if it was firm about its decision, if it did not have any reservation about it, it should have come and said, "We have allowed this; this is the secret deal which has come about; and this is the deal which we have made in the interest of India's policy or national interest or whatever you may call it.

Why did they not come and tell this House? It is because of the guilt; because they wanted to hide; because they know and I can say this that the Communist friends would not have supported this policy. I am right about that. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Midnapore):

why are you raising it only now? What were you doing all the time? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI M. J. AKBAR: Because we did not know; because it was secret. (*Interruptions*) Sir, the August decision was (a) secret decision; the country was not told about it by the last Government. I believe that certainly more than a hundred planes used the air-corridor. I raised this outside Parliament. It was not a peacetime; it was a combat situation. (*Interruptions*) If you still think that it was not a combat situation, I cannot help it. But, it was a combat situation; it was a war situation it was a situation when the Americans were building up the military strength. And you allowed the air-corridor then. When I raise it first, outside the House, immediately on behalf of Janata Dal, there were immediate denials. My good friend, Shri Satya Pal Malik said,

[*Translation*]

A very ridiculous thing.

[*English*]

Shri Gujral also said effectively and denied it; it was broadcast all over. I would like to ask this and this is a very good point to clarify. Shri Gujral is sitting here.

SHRI I. K GUJRAL (Jalandhar): I will speak afterwards.

SHRI M. J. AKBAR: May I know whether air-corridor was allowed in August/September or not. 'Yes', or 'no' will clarify the position. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE (Damdum): You talk about refuelling. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI M. J. AKBAR: Refuelling is the child of air-corridor. The genesis, the father of the decision lies in air-corridor given and

It there was sub-services, that sub-servience took place in the Government of Shri V. P. Singh and Shri Gujral. This is an opportunity and 'yes' or 'no' would clarify the position. I ask them. (*Interruptions*)

**SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE**  
(*Bolpur*): Why don't you give your views on the present situation?

(*Interruptions*)

**PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE**  
(*Rajapur*): You put some questions to the present Government also. (*Interruptions*)

**SHRI M. J. AKBAR**: Sir, I am seeking an answer from the. (*Interruptions*)

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER**: Mr. Akbar, answers will not be given like this; he will reply when he speaks; you may continue now (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

**SHRI M. J. AKBAR**: He is not replying. It is very sad that he is not replying.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER**: No. it should not be so.

[*English*]

**SHRI M. J. AKBAR**: Sir, I am still waiting because the country must know.

(*Interruptions*)

**PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE**: He will put the records straight. You put some questions to the present Government. (*Interruptions*)

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER**: Mr. Akbar, you may continue now.

**SHRI M. J. AKBAR**: Sir, I suppose that

silence would imply consent. (*Interruptions*) I would now like to turn to the reason why refuelling was stopped. Our party has made its position clear on the subject. From the moment the news broke out, we have been against refuelling. We have conveyed our views to the Government. Very categorically, our leader, the Congress President, has written to the Prime Minister. After an exchange of views, refuelling has been stopped. We are relieved. (*Interruptions*) We raised the voice first. The moment *The Times of India* published the news in the morning, my colleague Shri V. N. Gadgil from the AICC office denounced it by 4 O'clock at the first briefing.

[*Translation*]

They have been a little bit late in the matter.

[*English*]

**PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE**: I think, your statement came before refuelling.

**SHRI M. J. AKBAR**: Sir, it is not a substitute for an answer. We shall await Mr. Gujral's answer when the time comes. (*Interruptions*) Sir, the Prime Minister said that he would listen to public opinion. He did not want the country divided on this issue. (*Interruptions*)

**SHRI ANIL BASU** (*Arambagh*): Why did you not take any cognisance of the refuelling issue? (*Interruptions*)

**SHRI M. J. AKBAR**: I am afraid that the friends of Shri V. P. Singh are a little more loyal than the Raja. (*Interruptions*) I would like to draw the attention to one fact which, I think, is very important to our country. There has been an effort in the country to try and label the reaction into a communal problem. Some parties have sought to do that. One of the happiest facts of this whole crisis is that

[Sh. M.J. Akbar]

be a little subsidiary-is the fact that the country has reacted not in the least of Hindu-Muslim problems. The country has reacted as a country. The country has reacted without falling into the trap of any fundamentalists whether it was Shri Ashok Singhal or whether it was Shahi Imam. One of the most heartening things that I find in the response is not just this but in this silence of those particularly among our Muslim community who make them-selves self-appointed guardians of so-called Muslim interests. I mentioned Shahi Imam by name. Shahi Imam is dear friend. His men have been made MPs. He has been awarded status and so on by the last Government.

[Translation]

Today, there were Friday prayers and he did not raise his voice in today's congregation. When it comes to the real issues, when it comes to people's issues, these fundamentalists do not represent anything but their own interests and their interests have been purchased by Government, have been purchased by vested interests inside and outside.

[Translation]

Today Shri Imam is silent, because he has been purchased.

[English]

They have been bought either by dollars or petro-dollars. I do not know but they have been bought. (*Interruptions*) I hope you will send some measure of desperation in the irrelevance of the comments. (*Interruptions*)

Sir, returning to the specifics of the Gulf situation, we would again like to clarify that we are not and we cannot be for the usurpa-

tion of any country by another country. When Iraq invaded Kuwait, which was an independent country and a Member of the United Nations, we have made it clear that we cannot support the invasion. From the very beginning, our point is clear. Our point is, whether the Resolution of the United Nations is asking for vacation of Kuwait by Iraq or whether it has been usurped by a larger fact, that is, the USA military aid, this in fact far exceeds the jurisdiction and the mandate of the United Nations Security Council Resolution 678. We believe that the American led alliance, in particular, exceeded the mandate of the United Nations Security Council Resolution. And when peace is still very much an option, this is now no longer, I may say, a commentary. It is now, after the transcript of the talks between De Ceullar and Saddam Hussein has been released, that we still have an opportunity, when the American led alliance launched into a murderous and even barbaric assault on Iraq Sir, I do not want to take much time by going into the details of the UN Security Council's Resolution and their consequences. I am sure other speakers will discuss it in more detail. But I want to end on two points.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please try to complete. Time is short.

SHRI M. J. AKBAR: I would like to say one thing and I cannot help saying it. I am extremely impressed and amused by the dedication with which the United Nations has sought to impose the United Nations Security Council's Resolution as if they have never been in the history of United Nations Security Council's Resolutions before. Leave aside South Africa. Were were their great troops? Sir, the palestinian issue is there with us. Its linkage with the whole situation in the Middle East is quite obvious. Those who deny that linkage, I think, are doing injustice to the Palestinian cause.

To sum up, I would like to end with what

might be called the origin of Indian foreign policy. I think it is not widely appreciated that India's foreign policy, in fact, is a little older than even India's freedom. In 1946, when Jawaharlal Nehru became what could be the equivalent of the Prime Minister but not quite so, he took the Foreign Relations portfolio with him and even before freedom, he chartered the cause for India's foreign policy. One of his very first speech that he made after joining the interim Government in 1946 was his speech on foreign policy. It was made in September 1946..... (*Interruptions*) .....Sir, the Asian Relations Conference was a landmark....

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Akbar, you have taken more than half an-hour. Please try to complete.

SHRI M. J. AKBAR: I will just end by two quotations which I hope are relevant on 23rd march, 1947, he said:

"For too long, we, of Asia, have been petitioners in Western Courts and Chancelleries. That story must now belong to the past. We propose to stand on our own feet and cooperate with all others who are prepared to cooperate with us. We do not intend to be the plaything of others."

On his very first visit to the United States, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, in fact, showed that he how to implement what he said. At that time there was a very serious food crisis. And America was awash with food and there was a lot of pressure from the Government and from the bureaucrats that Shri Jawaharlal Nehru went and asked for it. There are very interesting stories about it how Shri Jawaharlal Nehru reacted to this.....(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please conclude now.

SHRI M. J. AKBAR: I would just like to end up with one sentence. When Shri Jawaharlal Nehru was summing up his visit, he spoke on this issue and said that Americans expected something more than gratitude and that more he could not supply. I think this is extremely relevant and extremely important as we continue to charter the course of our national and international policy.

I thank you, Sir, for having given me the opportunity to speak on this.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: You have forgotten to tell the House whether you support the Adjournment Motion or oppose it.

SHRI M. J. AKBAR: You shall know a little more after Shri Gujral's clarifications.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER; Shri Jaswant Singh.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Jodhpur): I request you to permit Shri Gujral to speak first. I would be obliged if you permit me to speak soon after that, because that would be more relevant.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: All right.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Shri Akbar had said that he would reply to me question at the end, namely why they are supporting the Government, which he says, has abdicated its responsibility.....(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He will reply to your question outside the House.

SHR' SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: He will tell that after he heard Shri Gujral.....(*Interruptions*)

SHRI M. J. AKBAR: The Prime Minister was here when I was making the point regarding refuelling of USA planes. After our

[Sh. M.J. Akbar]

discussions, the refuelling was stopped.....(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am not going to allow this question answer.

Shri Gujral.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL (Jalandhar): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, it is not very pleasant for me to speak on an Adjournment Motion on a vital issue like the Gulf because I feel that foreign policy is one such sphere where we have over the years built a national consensus. It would have been more pleasant for me to talk about the Gulf crisis as such, to talk about the new scene that is emerging, to talk about the new scenario that is coming up and then try to see if India unitedly can respond to the situation or not.

Our foreign policy was not made yesterday, nor was it made day before yesterday, nor was it made by those who preceded us in the Government. The principles of India's foreign policy, one could say with pride, were spelt by the freedom struggle and one could say with equal satisfaction that after freedom, Nehru worked out its details and placed it on a firm ground. Very often in this House and outside, we have discussed those postulates. Very often here, we have tried to remind ourselves of the famous speech of Nehru after freedom wherein he said that India woke up as a nation when the whole world was sleeping on that particular night. I say with concern that today what we witness is that Government of India is sleeping, when the whole world is awake. This is a sad aspect of the situation that we have come to.

It is important for us to know that the fore of events is close to us. The Gulf is not far away from us, that anything happening in the Gulf not affect us. But for several reasons and several counts, one could say that

whatever happens there, ultimately affects us. There is a long history of it. It happened in the days when the colonizers were coming via that side. We also can recall what effect the Gulf region had on us then. We have close relations with people who live in that area, Cultural relations, relations of religion, relations of common bonds, relations of should History of colonial eras and relations forged during our freedom struggles. Therefore, whatever happens there ultimately affects us and vice versa.

This mini-world war which was unleashed a month ago shattered many dreams. One of the shattered dreams pertained to the new situation that emerging at the end of the Gulf War. We were hoping and expecting that this new epoch would be an period of cooperation, where in issues would be settled by discussion and mutual cooperation. But unfortunately, the war which was unleashed has shattered such dreams.

Here, on one point I agree with Mr Akbar. The war was neither sanctioned by the United Nations, nor was it ever fought under the auspices of the United Nations. The Secretary General of the United Nations is on record, having said so. I feel that unfortunately in the sweep of events and also because of the barrage of propaganda of disinformation, war was not be avoided.

We feel that there were four occasions at least when the war could have been averted.

The war could have been avoided when the Gulf Countries met in Riyadh soon after 2nd of August. There was every prospect and there is enough evidence available that Mr. Saddam Hussain was not only willing to withdraw but had actually started withdrawing. But this may not be the occasion for me to tell you in detail what I was told by the King of Jordan himself, who confirmed to me that but for strident attitude taken by a par-

ticular power that was extremely keen on war, the war would have been avoided.

The war could have been evaded second time too during the Cairo meeting of the Arab nations. There also it was possible, the discussions could have been led in that way. But again, the way the President of Egypt conducted the meeting all such possibilities were neutralised. That was about the 12th of August; At that time as I have said it was possible to avoid war.

It was again possible in January itself when the United Nations Secretary General went to Baghdad and had meetings with both the Foreign Minister and Saddam Hussain. I do not know why his report was not made public then. This report clearly states that Saddam Hussain was willing to listen. And that was my impression also, when I met Saddam Hussain in August as well, I did not think that Saddam Hussain was inflexible. All those who now project that war was foreseeable all that time live in a world, that is far away from reality. All of those who were dealing with diplomacy at one level or the other were not only hoping but also believing that war could be avoided and the lingering problem could be sorted out peacefully. Now we seen that it is the peaceful citizens who have suffered and are in the midst of misery.

Saying this, I do not mean that in any way India at any stage condoned the occupation of Kuwait by Iraq. We were in step with the rest of the world. Very frequently in this House, I had myself presented and enunciated details of other policies as the Gulf Crisis was developed.

I had stated that our policy was three-pronged rather four-pronged. One we were against the occupation of Kuwait. We wanted Kuwait to be evacuated. We were keen that this problem should be sorted over peace-

fully. That is why, even while voting in the United Nations every time we said it.

Last time when I addressed the United Nations at the end of September, I insisted on it. I said that the problem could be and should be sorted out peacefully. The third aspect that persistently emphasised was that it should be possible to work out a solution of entire problem of West Asia. This is the three-pronged policy.

Then there was a fourth dimension of it. That dimension was very close to our hearts, it was the fate and lot of our fellow citizens living in Kuwait and in Iraq.

My hon. friend Shri M. J. Akbar whom I respect a great deal knows it. Very often, I had talked to him about it those days. He would also kindly recall that while I am a very humble person who went to these countries, to Baghdad and to Kuwait on my return. I was done a unique honour in this House and in the Rajya Sabha by all sides of the Houses have applauded the pursuit of my foreign policy at that time. It might not suit Mr. Akbar now to remember it. It might not suit Mr. Akbar's party to think that anybody else can also understand the policies of foreign affairs apart from those who are his patrons and chiefs. There are also people who have dedication to the foreign policy. There are some people who have spent a life time studying foreign policies. There are also people like me who may be humble who may not have been born in a particular family they also have tried to understand Nehru's heritage. Nehru's heritage is not meant for one family nor for one party and therefore the policy that we pursued was consistent with that legacy. Mr. Akbar has been very keen to know about all these things. I have a great respect for him because he is an intellectual but unfortunately his political qualities are somewhat different. Therefore, unfortunately I would say, when he mixes his fact, he does not want to stick to truth because truth is a



[Sh. I.K. Gujral]

calamity in the policies that his party presents.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi-with whom I had the privilege of working as a junior Minister-was a very remarkable lady in many ways. She gave all her time and attention to the foreign affairs. She has added some new dimensions to it and one such dimension was to try to improve relations with China. She also tried to improve relations with America. She also tried to improve relations with all those countries which were not on our side in the part and I must say, to a large extent, she succeeded. Her policies also initiated some processes. One of the decisions that she took to let alien ships and aeroplanes pass across the skies and the seas. They were also provided facilities rest, recreation and re-fuelling. This was done in 80s. Mr. Akbar's Leader pursued same policies. I agree with those policies as well.

I did not agree with the policies of his Leader regarding neighbours. It was in the neighbourhood, that much harm was done. It in this area that we tried to apply correctives. Now, much is being talked about the over-flying. Mr. Akbar might have known that August itself that was coming. I was trying upto the last moment to see that War was averted. That was also effort of the United Nations, I went to all corners of the world, everywhere in that pursuit. We activated the in several ways. We went to the United Nations. I went to Moscow and to various countries of Europe and elsewhere in quest for only one objective and that was to keep war at bay. Therefore, when you view a policy of the over-flying or anything else we did not assume that war was inevitable, therefore, we took all steps in this direction. May I tell you one thing more? He is very keen to hear my views that continuity or the foreign policy being a major asset of India's diplomacy. We were all the time also keen to

see that, our anti-warism does not mean anti-Americanism. We were not anti-America and we are not anti-America, even today. We were anti-war then and we are anti-war even today and will be so tomorrow. That has been a good policy that I want to pursue. It was not in August.....(*Interruptions*)

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I agree with my hon. friend Mr. Gujral that India's foreign policy has been on the basis of national consensus. I shall like to say that we do not rake up the past because it will give a very bad name to this country. (*Interruptions*)

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA (Calcutta South): You had also done it.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Everybody is doing. All right, if one has one it, the others should not follow it. I think we should restrain somewhere. Criticise the present Government as much as you like; but why do you go into the past? Otherwise, it will not present a very happy picture. This much I can say, (*Interruptions*)

SHRIM. J. AKBAR: The reply has come. How does this allowing of the military planes help the cause of peace, is something that I cannot understand. (*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Sir: I am very sorry that when our friend Mr. Akbar was referring to the past and—according to us he was making some distortions—the Prime Minister did not get up and give the advice to Mr. Akbar; the advice is coming only when Mr. Gujral is trying to remove the misunderstanding. And I am sure Mr. Gujral will say nothing that will actually harm the past. On the contrary, we will draw upon the glorious past, for a glorious future. (*Interruptions*) I said, 'according to us'.

SHRI M. J. AKBAR: I stand by that,

because Mr. Gujral has just confirmed that he allowed air flights. He also said he did not believe in anti-Americanism. He said so. He allowed air flights, because he did not believe in anti-Americanism. He said that allowing them, according to him, helped the cause of peace; and he was trying to bring peace to the Middle East and the Gulf by allowing American military planes and air corridor. He said it just now. I would like some comments from my friend. I would like to have some comments. How long are you going to defend it? How long can he go on defending this? I would like him to comment on this policy: How long can he carry on this Policy of pro-Americanism? He has admitted it on the floor of the House. Let him answer. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The time is very very short. Please help us, because if there is cross talk going on, it will be very difficult. The present subject is also very big. To the extent it is necessary, you can refer to the past policy also, and you have to. Otherwise, you will be totally without any roots; but the time is very limited, and the subject is very vast. May I request all of you to cooperate? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: Sir, I have a great deal of respect for what you have said.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am not precluding your referring to the past.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: I have great respect to what the Prime Minister has said. Particularly because I have great regard for the views of Mr. Chandra Shekhar, not today, not yesterday, but all these years. If he says that I should not go into the past, I shall refrain, except to put the record straight. Since Mr. Akbar is very keen to find an talic for his own policies, I will only try to correct that. Therefore, I am not in any way trying to defy what the Prime Minister wants me to do.

I will definitely talk about the present, but I would prefer to go even to the future.

But so far as over-flights were concerned, one aspect must be kept in mind: and that is that overflights did not start in India in 1990. They started in 1984, and the overflights were going on during all the peacetimes. That was the policy which continued. The only regret that I have—and that is what I submitted personally to the Prime Minister also—relates to my feeling that all policies in foreign affairs, in peace time, should be reviewed when even a war comes. Therefore, when war came, it should have been reviewed. If at all I have a grievance about refuelling, it is on that account. If Government, in its wisdom which they will possibly tell us, thought that they were serving India's interests by permitting refuelling, I will be glad to hear that. But so far as we are concerned, I can only tell you that a request for refuelling came to us also which we rejected for reasons that we have already given. (*Interruptions*)

I have said that, and I resume my own trail viz. that the policies we were following had four prongs: (1) Kuwait must be evacuated; (2) The issues must be settled peacefully; (3) the West Asia crisis must be looked into: the occupation of the Arab lands; Golan Heights and elsewhere should not be condoned either. At the same time, Palestinian people's cause must be kept in the fore.

Fourthly, another policy prong was how to get our people out from that difficult area. I hope this House will recall and I would like again to say with gratitude that the way nearly 50,000 people came out was something which very few countries have achieved. I do not want to claim any personal glory for it; it was India's effort; it was Indian Government's effort; it was the effort of those who worked for the Government of India that we succeeded and I think in that context India should take pride in that.

[Sh. I.K. Gujral]

The bombing of Iraq has been going on for more than a month now. I will not take your time to tell you what havoc it has played. Our media has told us how many people have died, how many houses have been destroyed and how many lives have been lost.

Unfortunately, from the every beginning, we saw that wheres the United Nations was all the time were talking in terms of evacuation of Kuwait, the United States had different policy objectives, and if you kindly recall. President Bush's first speech, after the war on January 17, you would see that he was changing the war aims and conveyed that destruction of Iraqi power had come to be a very important part of the American Policy. Neither the United Nations nor any of the United Nations' resolutions ever endorsed I also learnt it during my visit to U. S. Capital. But since I need not go in detail, I can only say this that we are feeling very much worried that the war aims should be this changing. When we talk of refuelling, we have to keep this aspect in mind as well. If the war objectives were this changing, and if the diplomats in our Ministry has noticed that the objectives were the destruction of the Iraqi power then this dimension would acquire far more difficult position II. I would like to say what some of the Media has said that the refuelling facility given because of the IMF loan and what not. I do not go with that. I hope, when the Prime Minister or his any other Minister replies to the debate, he will clarify it.

When the Americans were bombing Vietnam and Hon. Mrs. Gandhi knew full well the its condemnation could mean a lot. It was at that time, you will kindly recall, that we were facing a famine and PL-480 was the issue. But MRs. Gandhi took the risk and this had brought pride to India. She condemned the bombing of Vietnam and Hanoi, this is

the tradition of India's Foreign Policy that we have tried to work out.

Mr. meeting with Saddam Hussein gave me an impression. You will kindly recall that I met him twice last year. I had met him in June on bilateral visit and again during the crisis I met him. If I recall correctly, I think on the 20th August or so, about 18 days after the crisis began, I had met him. I did not get an impression that his stand was inflexible; I did not get an impression that given an opportunity, issue could not be sorted out peacefully and that was why I was trying to persuade NAM to take the initiative; it was because of this that I was trying to approach other Powers to persuade them to see that it could be sorted out peacefully and effectively. When I went to the United Nations, I met the Secretary-General of the United Nations also. When I spoke in the United Nations, I emphasised the same point again. Unfortunately, the powers that were, were trying to push things in a different direction.

I mentioned a while ago about the U.N Secretary General's report after meeting President Saddam Hussain. Why was that report not circulated? What was circulated was keep to secret. Why was it not made an open document? Why were the verbatim records, of the talks between the Secretary-General and Mr. Saddam Hussein not circulated us U. N. documents? There are some questions which still remain unreplied.

When the war began, we saw that the Government's drift here began. Whereas all of us, including Mr. Akbar's party and ourselves-we all-demanded straightaway a cease-fire, because that again has been a tradition of India's foreign policy that whenever a war breaks out we try first to have a cease-fire and then only think of other things but on the 18th the Government of India's policy was evacuate Kuwait first and everything else would follow. There was a shift on the 20th the Government of India,s policy

was evacuate Kuwait first and everything else would follow. There was a shift on the 20th, again a shift on the 21st, and again another shift on the 22nd, and yet again a shift when the Foreign Minister went to the NAM group meeting in Belgrade. This created different impressions. I am not asking them to condemn, nor am I asking them to denigrate anybody. But I think this drift has done a great deal of harm. If, from the very beginning the united voice of India would have been in favour of a cease-fire, then perhaps the result would have been different. The NAM's voice could have been different. Unfortunately, the NAM's voice was not heard for several reasons. May be for reasons historical. The fact is that the NAM powers themselves were divided in the Arab lands and due to the fact that all of us were functioning through the United Nations. I am one of those who believe firmly and strongly that the Non-Aligned Movement has a great deal of relevance and a great deal of force. And I think particularly today when there is a great pressure coming on all of us, the Non-Aligned Movement provides an umbrella for all of us to come together. Therefore, nobody should be under the impression that because the cold war has ended the role of NAM has ended. What is under attack today? When the NAM was formulated in Mr. Nehru's time, at that time our political sovereignties were under attack. Now our economic sovereignties are under attack. And, therefore, only collectively we can safeguard ourselves. Otherwise, we see the new scene emerging in Europe. We see the new condominiums emerging to pressurise us, sometimes in the name of Uruguay rounds and sometimes in the name of protection and what not. The NAM is a protection, a collective protection for all of us and therefore I think we must not let anybody make us believe that NAM has become irrelevant or something that can be disposed of.

Now, I come to a new situation that is emerging. If the news given this morning by

the Radio is correct that the initiative taken by the Soviet Union is getting some results and there is a Possibility of sorting this out, this would be a new situation helpful for us.

A few days ago Mr. Baker gave a testimony before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Congress of the United States. And he tried to spell out his security perceptions for the West Asia. I hope this House and particularly the Government will read it carefully, because it is very ominous for us. The way it is begin spilt out, it is going to affect our security very adversely and this is something which we have to sort out. That also spells out the possibility of the foreign powers not withdrawing from this area.

This morning I saw in the Times of India a statement by the Kuwait Crown Prince in which he has said and I quote,

"If I believe that the security of my country needs to have some troops from foreign countries I would not hesitate to use them so."

Well, from Kuwait's point of view, one may say it may be right or wrong. From the point of view of the region it means that now a methodology is being discovered whereby these forces, both naval and air may not be withdrawn. And if they do not withdraw we should in that situation particularly, try to understand security implications for India, should try to work out responses. I hope that the Government will try to build up an all party consensus on that basis. This adds to our anxiety. I think the time has come when India must clearly and categorically re-state and loudly India's Arab policy. We must re-state where we stand. We stand for the Arab unity. We stand for the sovereignties of those nations. We stand for the rights of the Palestinian people. We stand for the evacuation of the occupied lands. We also at the same time say that Iraq's state structure, its Army, its integrity, its unity must not be disturbed.

[Sh. I.K. Gujral]

And I think that is something which we must state categorically. We must state categorically also that if any forces are needed to see to it that Kuwait is peacefully evacuated then these forces should be UN forces and these forces should not be supplied by one power or the other. If one super power stays there, then the entire region will see a new situation, which we cannot possibly tolerate. Also we must see to it that no punitive actions are taken against Iraq because in the name of punitive actions, we have seen as to how the countries have been destroyed. We must also see to it that the monitoring of the future West Asian security is the responsibility of the region itself. And if non-regional powers are to be invited, then India has an interest. India's interest must be safeguarded this time not because we want to go in another's land. But if any other countries with whom our security interests do not coincide are brought and sucked into this thing, then India has to see to it that the issues are settled not by outside powers. They are not imposed from elsewhere. All security arrangements for the region must be voluntary. They must not be imposed from outside and they must be with him is the region itself, without any exceptions. No country should be kept out. Iraq should not be kept out of it. Iran should not be kept of it. These are the issues which are not receiving our attention.

Much is being talked about the nuclear weapons and the poisonous gas weapons. India has been correctly and, I think, continuously opposing the nuclear weapons. India is also opposed to all those weapons who have prospects of mass alienation. Then, when we decide that the Iraq should abstain from this, we must also look and see that Israel does it. If Israel's nuclear weaponry is kept in tact and that fact remains, that adds a new dimension for us. In these issues, I think, India can play a role. India should play a role. I believe that India has a capacity to

play a role on these issues. I think, one thing is to be decided. I do not mean any disrespect. I hope the decision must be known as to who is taking the decision—the Government or some extra constitutional authorities who would dictate from outside. Those extra constitutional authorities should not dictate and let the Government function on its own. (*Interruptions*) I am not blaming you. Why are you worried?....(*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANAVATE: The guilty conscious is always vocal.... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI M. J. AKBAR: In your case, it was silent.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: The perception of Indian interests should not be viewed in terms of petty contracts. The perception of the Indian interests is far more vital and far bigger. We have security interest. We have interests for the future of peace in this region and those interests have to be safeguarded. We must help and assist the Arabs to get out of their psychological injuries. We must help in securing peace in the Arab land and we must help in consolidating our relations with the Arab world. We must see to it that the new economic order that we are thinking of does not spell doom for any country. The Secretary-General of the United Nations is on record having said that he could have done it. But he did not do it. Therefore, now a time has come. We must formally and clearly state our policy. I do hope that the Government of India will get out of this slumber and will not do what it did in the last one month.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Jodhpur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I have heard with rapt attention the intervention of my friend, the former Minister of External Affairs. He attempted to correct a wrong that had taken place.

Sir, I believe, a much wider subject of profound importance to us has unfortunately been reduced to an issue of adversarial contention of approval or disapproval or censure of this Government. We sit in Opposition to this Government. The leader of my Party is the leader of the Opposition.

15.00 hrs.

I am, therefore, struck by the sense of irony that participants in this governance ought to be attempting to censure the Government. In effect what has happened is that a major international development, a development that affects India's economy and hence our domestic policy, a development which has very close nexus with our national security both short and long-term, has been limited in focus. Because we have limited it in focus instead of examining the much broader canvas of our total foreign policy perception, then in the context of the Gulf or of the conceptualisation of examining and re-examining the relevance of that concept, we as Parliament will limit ourselves to a view of just one aspect and that too not of the totality of policy perceptions but merely of the conduct of policy in just one regard.

I had before the beginning of the discussion when the motion for adjournment was taken up, suggested to the hon. Speaker that instead of taking up this particular subject as a motion of adjournment it would be far more beneficial if we engage ourselves in an examination of the totality of the Gulf policy, of the totality of the situation as exists in the Gulf today. That is why, we cannot go entirely or totally with the Mover of this adjournment motion or the subsequent hon. Members from the Congress party who have supported this motion for adjournment.

Since the whole aspect has been focussed only on the question of refuelling let me make it clear where the BJP stands on this particular point. But before making it

clear let me very briefly try to draw the attention of this House to what happened in 1962. I then had the honour of wearing the uniform. And what happened in 1962 need not be recounted less. What happened in 1972 is also relevant. What happened in 1972 because of the developing relations between the People's Republic of China and the United States of America and what it amounted to us as India also need not be recounted. In the contest of 1979-80 Afghanistan, I need not remind this House as to what happened thereafter. But I would lend support to what my previous speaker had said.

It is in 1984 when the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan was still continuing and when late Mrs. Gandhi was the Prime Minister, if I am not mistaken, in August, 1984 that re-berthing facility, the facility for refuelling, overflight etc. were extended yet again to the United States of America. Of course, that has been existing on the basis of non-alignment. But non-alignment, as my previous speaker mentioned, cannot be reduced merely and blindly to anti-Americanism or anti-Sovietism.

The present phase starts really-and there I share the hon. Member from Kishanganj talking of 2nd of August as the decisive date. Though I hold him in very high regard and as a personal friend, if 2nd of August was the date on which there was aggression caused on Kuwait, then 2nd, 3rd or 4th of August was also the date when re-examination or review of the refuelling facilities ought to have taken place. It is all very well for my good friend, hon. Mr. Inder Gujral to say that once hostilities broke out, a review ought to have been conducted on that particular facility. I believe that in the situation that emerged after 2nd of August when Government knew that refuelling facilities existed then such a review must have been conducted. I wish to put it to you that the one overriding impression is that the Central

[Sh. Jaswant Singh]

persuasion in whatever we wish to do in terms of foreign policy or in examining or re-examining the conduct of one or another Government, must be a rational examination, clinical and objective, of national interests, our national interests and only our national interests, and those national interests in a rapidly changing world. In the context of changes, its perceptions remain static, then we will have to pay a price as a nation. That is why in the context of refuelling, BJP stated clearly on 19th January and subsequently on the 1st of February in Jaipur that:

- (i) Refuelling, berthing, hospitality is a routine courtesy shared between and extended to sovereign nations.
- (ii) If refuelling was granted to the United States of America, that was an act in consonance with all earlier practices and also an extension of India's national interests.
- (iii) India enjoys and benefits from such reciprocal courtesy from at least fifteen countries. Routinely, Indian Air Force/Indian Navy has an opportunity to berth in various countries of the world and IAF aircrafts have a facility to refuel at least in fifteen other countries of the world.
- (iv) The first review of this refuelling facility ought to have been made by the Government on or soon after 2nd of August, 1990.

We have further stated, and explicitly, that such a review should have included a process of consultations with all political leaders and all political parties in Parliament.

BJP has further and explicitly stated that it stands for strengthening of U.N. efforts in regard to the Gulf conflict. I am somewhat intrigued by the intervention of my good friend hon. Inder Gujral when he was referring to UNSCR 678, or perhaps UNSCR 660 to 678. Of course, the stated war aims of United States of America- to which I will come in a moment- and the stated Resolution of the United Nations Security Council do not harmonise and I share this perception. But the entire process of UNSCR 660 to 678 is, if I am not mistaken, under Chapter 51 of the United Nations Charter, and that Chapter in relation to Kuwait gives the totality of these Resolutions a much wider coverage. So, the BJP has stated clearly that we stand for full implementation of all U. N. Resolutions for the entire West Asia. We have stated clearly that to this purpose, we recommend an early convening of a comprehensive conference on West Asia; that we believe and stand for the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, just as we believe that Israel has its right too to co-exist in a comity of nations. We have further said that we are opposed to the extension of this conflict, either geographically or conceptually, in other dimensions, whether atomic, chemical or biological, whether by Iraq or by Vice-President Quayle when he talks of the possibility of the use of tactical nuclear weapons. The BJP has also explicitly stated that we do not subscribe to a division of the globe in blocs, either of super power or of just one powers. We do not believe or accept regional security systems imposed from outside, of one or the other variety. That is why the BJP stated that we stand for and wish to encourage all efforts that are directed towards peace.

All this the BJP has stated clearly and I just reiterate. It is necessary for me to make clear our perception on the strategic underpinnings of this conflict-the respective war aims of the two principal combatants. I believe, Sir, that the underpinning of this is

control over a strategic raw material-oil-and the control over a strategic raw material, oil, is a desire pursued by not just the United States, but also Iraq. That is the aim. There were subsidiary aims and those subsidiary aims of Iraq are the hegemony or primacy in the Arab world and just as the subsidiary war aims stated by President Bush, go to the extent of talking of the destruction of Iraq war machine, of the industrial capacity of Iraq or of its nuclear capacity. We are unable to convince ourselves that these subsidiary aims are the aims that were moved in the United Nations in the resolutions which it has passed, from Resolutions 660 to 678. But before I come to the specifics of what ought to be done now, I do wish to share with you, Sir, and this House, and take a minute to say what ought to have been or what are our national interests, hence aims, in the context of this present conflict. I believe, Sir, that in the debate that has taken place, in the often stated protest that we saw of the Congress Party on this limited aspect of refuelling, what have gone as a casualty and what have been put aside are national interests and national aims. I would like to very briefly state about this. We must primarily protect and preserve Indian economic interests flowing from the Gulf War. Secondly, we must try and ensure the presence of our voice as a nation in the Gulf. Thirdly, we must shield against adverse impact on our national security during the continuation of this conflict and after this conflict. Fourthly, we must, at all costs, prevent the importation of this conflict on Indian soil, particularly as a factor in our domestic polity. These three or four very briefly stated national aims or national goals could be subscribed to. Then it will be for us to assess whether this re-fuelling was a correct step or was not a correct step. It is in that context that we have to examine our policy and then only we can examine initiation of the Gulf policy and after that, the conduct of our diplomacy in the context of the Gulf.

A very brief word, Sir, about non-alignment. I do wish to make it very clear, Sir, that the BJP stands for a re-examination of what is commonly understood by non-alignment. We have got into the habit of paying lip service to a perception merely because it is 40 years old. I would happily engage in a debate with my friend, Inder Gujral, to examine the role and relevance and continued importance of non-alignment as a concept that we are practising and as a concept that can be applied relevantly to India's national interests. Sir, I do wish to, and in saying that I know that perhaps I will earn the ire of many many in this House. The BJP does not subscribe to the continuance of Nehruvian non-alignment. It would hurt a great many, but I do believe, Sir, that what was held as relevant 40 years ago need not automatically be treated as continuing to hold relevance for perpetuity. Unless we examine the dogma, the doctrine, purely outside the sentiment, we will be committing very grave error not just for today, but for coming years. I do not have time to elaborate this. But I want to make it clear where we stand. So far as the moves for restoration of peace are concerned, we welcome the initiative taken by the Soviet Union and President Gorbachev. I would like to share with the House and with you that I have just been informed had-an-hour back that the United States has rejected the Soviet initiative. I believe that in the rejection of the initiative taken by President Gorbachev, India should obtain an opportunity to make its presence felt. I did not believe that the Gorbachev initiative was a final document. What Mr. Gorbachev has set in motion is a process and its acceptance precisely at this moment by President Bush would have surprised me and indeed the fact that the United States of America has not found it convenient to accept that initiative need not discourage the process of peace. I believe that in the eight point formulation that President Gorbachev has put across, there is a useful blueprint for continuance of nego-



[Sh. Jaswant Singh]

tiations, for continuance of talks. That is where I believe the present Government ought to play a positive and meaningful role. I do not again have time to elaborate this in details. But I would like to leave that thought with the present Government.

On the question of Indo-Arab relationship, a great deal is spoken in sentimental terms of traditional Indo-Arab friendship. When my good friend Mr. Gujral was referring to Indo-Arab traditional friendship, I do not know to which historical period he was going. But during the First World War, Indian troops have fought in Mesopotamia and defeated the forces of the Ottoman Empire. We have fought in West Asia in the Second World War. So, when he talks of the traditional Indo-Arab relationship, perhaps he means Non-Alignment, that the initiative that was taken after the Non-Alignment concept came into being and he is talking of traditional Indo-Arab relationship, the post-Nehruvian or Non-Alignment period. Even then, the centre point of that was Indo-Egypt friendship and you cannot forget it. If you do it, you cause grievous injury to our long-term interests by merely making it an Indo-Iraq equation. Yet again, Sir, I do not have time to enaborate all the points. I will conclude after leaving two or three thoughts.

Firstly, the mistakes of foreign policy—unlike mistakes in domestic policy which can be corrected quickly—afflict successive generations and the consequences of mistakes in foreign policy have to be paid by many generations to come. I need only Jammu and Kashmir and our China policy to point out the mistakes in foreign policy which have left us with the legacy. Therefore, whatever we decide today, let us reflect on the fact that mistakes on foreign policy, particularly when you take them with sentiments uppermost in your mind will afflict succeeding generations of Indians to come. The second thought is

that yesterday's idols cannot continue to be validated for ever. (Interruptions) I wish to reiterate that mistakes of foreign policy will continue to afflict succeeding generations. Therefore, when you think of foreign policy, think of it outside of the sentimentality. We cannot continue to worship yesterday's idols for ever and perpetuating them in our 'temples' of South Block.

A great deal is being spoken of consensus on the issue of foreign policy. Try and build that consensus Mr. Prime Minister, not on sentimentality but on the reality of national interests.

That is all that I would like to say.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO (Marmugao): I believe that allowing refuelling of the American aircraft at this point of time when they were going to Gulf region and participating in the Gulf war, what does it indicate? There has been a statement of the American Embassy in Delhi where the American Embassy has come out clearly saying that these aircrafts were carrying spareparts for their military hardware. It is clear, whatever the nature of these aircraft, it in some manner, they were involved in the war efforts, then we should not have allowed them to refuel because the international law is very clear. This type of facilities, whatever designation they may go, can only be given to allies and we are not allies of the coalition forces. We are not allies of the United States at this point of time. Therefore, this refuelling is not a very correct step. It goes without saying, while these aircrafts would be there in the airport for one or two hours, inspection of what type of materials they were carrying actually could not take place less than 24 hours. That is what the experts say. Therefore, there is no weight in saying that these aircrafts were not carrying military hardware.

It is true that our approach to this whole question has not been within the tradition of

Indian foreign policy or within the tradition of Non-aligned policy. There may be many reasons for this. There might be the fact that this Government took over quite recently and they are concerned with so many major issues. It may also be, as has been said, that we are in the deep economic crisis which is not the creation of this Government. Now those who can help us in this crisis may be putting pressure. They are doing to all other countries which are much more powerful than our own country. They are exerting pressure for changing the foreign policy. But then, whatever difficulties may be there, but the message from this House, the message from this Government has got to go loud and clear that India is not for sale; that Indian foreign policy is not for sale on dollars or otherwise. Indian foreign policy is not for sales and whatever difficulties we are facing, let us face them bravely let us face them on principles. Therefore, this should be our approach.

I would like to say, I would not support the adjournment-motion. I do not see ground for this House supporting this adjournment-motion. It is because, compared to what the previous Government policy on the very Gulf crisis has been, the performance of this Government has in any manner be less creditable. I have the highest regard for Mr. Gujral as a very capable, intelligent and pleasant person. Now that he has thought it fit to make some reference to the past and has waxed more eloquence on the successes of his own policy, let me use his own words to set the record straight.

I along with my colleague here, Mr. Basheer—we have been the only two Indian citizens, including all citizens, politicians and officials—who had the opportunity to go to Kuwait after the take-over by Iraq, apart from Mr. Gujral himself. I must inform this House what transpired in our meeting with the Deputy Prime Minister of Kuwait, Mr. Ramadan. He was very unhappy with our

Government because when Mr. Gujral had a meeting with Mr. Gujral, he has repeatedly mentioned to us in our meeting with him in Baghdad. Mr. Gujral has promised that India would supply food stuff and medicines in the planes that would come to take back our citizens in Kuwait mainly and to some extent in Iraq. The Deputy prime Minister of Kuwait has made it very clear: "We never asked for foodstuffs and medicines. It was your Foreign Minister who offered this facility." And having offered, we are very sad and very surprised and, in fact, certainly disillusioned, by the fact that though the UN embargo does not and cannot be against supply of medicine and foodstuffs, Indian planes are coming without the see essential things for our men, women and children.

This reflected down the line in the Iraqi administration with the result that there was an unpleasant feeling towards Indians that while, I a Member of Parliament and my colleague, another member of Parliament were allowed into Baghdad, not only Baghdad but even Kuwait, a Union Minister like Shri Unnikrishnan and other Ministers of the State Governments of Kerala and Goa were not allowed, in fact, even anywhere in side Iraq. They were not given visas.

This shows that the previous Government foreign policy antagonised Iraq and what was unprecedented achievement-with utmost respect I am saying this, but this is what transpired the foreign policy of the previous Government managed this unprecedented achievement of antagonising both the parties, both Iraq and Kuwait.

I will tell you what happened when Mr. Gujral went to Kuwait. We went to Kuwait and we had a meeting with the Indian citizens there. They were wholly disappointed by the performance of our own Government when Ministers went there. That related particularly to the public meeting that Mr. Gujral had in Kuwait. At this public meeting, Mr.

[Sh. Eduardo Faleiro]

Gujral was eloquent again on our friendship with Iraq, with the Iraqis and justified all sorts of things. This was a public meeting. Lakhs of people were there, not only Indians but also Kuwaitis and the result was that a backlash of the Kuwaitis against Indians started. At that time, the slogan on the walls of Kuwait was "One Dinar for a Palestinian killed." After that day, a slogan was added to that "One fil for every Indian killed." A fil is a hundredth part of a Dinar. That was really the humiliation and the trouble that Mr. Gujral, in his enthusiasm, has created for the people.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: I wish he had spoken before I did. Then I would have had adequate time to reply. But since he has made some allegations, I hope he will kindly let me respond to them. Of course, he has one advantage and, that is he can say anything because he does not have to back it up. Therefore, all the talk that he is talking of two or three months after coming from Iraq, absolutely loses its relevance. At no stage during my visit to Baghdad, did I meet the Deputy Prime Minister he is referring to. The question of my talking to him did not arise. I did not talk.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: The Deputy Prime Minister in charge of Kuwait.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: I did not talk to him. President Saddam Hussein neither asked me nor did I promise supply of food and medicines. All the same, as a humanitarian nation, we did send medicines later on. Also, you will kindly recall that both for our nationals and also for the people of other nationalities who were stuck there, we sent a food ship and India was the only country which succeeded in getting UN approval for sending food ship. Even after the food had been distributed some 5,000 tonnes were left un-

used, at that time again, Iraq was asking us to give it to them. We told them that we could do it only after UN approves and UN did approve it and the food was left there. I am very sorry he has flung all the Fifth on my talks in Kuwait. He is a friend of mine. But it is untrue and I totally and strongly contradict it.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: Mr. Gujral, it is very easy to say that it is untrue. I was there. Mr. Basheer was there. My talk with Mr. Ramadan is already there. There is a record of it and there are all the Indian citizens on the Committee. Who will say what actually happened?

I mention this only to say that this is not merely a fault of this Government. The distortion of foreign policy began by the previous Government and that is my submission based on my personal knowledge and personal experience of my going to that part of the world, that very few people, hardly a dozen, have been allowed to go. It remains a matter which is really not very good but it is almost a regret for the Government of India that while private members of Parliament were allowed by the Government of Iraq to go to Baghdad not merely, but to Kuwait, Union Minister like Mr. Unnikrishnan of that Government to which you belong, Mr. Gujral and, Ministers of the State Government that accompanied him, were not allowed. Would you explain why this unpleasant and such an unfortunate situation arose? I will just make a point that we must correct those distortions on the ground. It has been mentioned here by Shri Gujral that about 150000 Indian citizens who have come from there went through a lot of troubles, they went through enormous troubles in the desert, Whilst the Americans, whilst the Britons, whilst the Germans who are the coalition forces were allowed to go straight from Kuwait to Frankfurt, to New York, to London but the Indian friends of Iraq who were allowed to go were made to go through the desert suffering so many indignities.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: How many were there?

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: It is a large number. There is not talk about that. The point is this. I have mentioned that the Embassy in Baghdad at that point of time was not merely effective. It is a matter of great sadness and shock which this Government must correct that. Even at this point of time, our Ambassador in Baghdad has deserted his post, he is not there while so many other Ambassadors are there. The Ambassador of Cuba-Cuba is a small country-is not only there but he is also reporting to the outside world, he is reporting to his own Government. Further, it is not merely the Ambassador of Cuba who is there but doctors, nurses and other people of Cuba are there to help the civilians there. But our people, the leader of Non-Aligned Movement, leader of the third world have deserted and the responsibility goes to the Head of the Mission in Baghdad about whom I have already in a letter to Shri Gujral at that point of time pointed out that he was not really doing what was required of him.

Sir, I would, therefore, like to submit that our policies on that region have to be corrected. The Coalition Forces are undoubtedly violating the mandate given to them by the Resolution of the Security Council, No. 678. The Resolution of the Security Council is to liberate Kuwait. But what the Coalition Forces are doing is they are destroying Iraq. They are not merely destroying the military installations but also destroying and killing civilians and that is what is actually happening at this point of time. What is happening is not liberation of Kuwait but it is the destruction of Iraq. This is against all canons of international law and this is against the Resolution No. 678 specifically which permit, them to engage in a conflict with Iraq.

In this context, I cannot get in better witness than one of the most eminent citi-

zens of the United States, a former Attorney-General of the United States, a leading light of the World Peace Movement Justice Ramsey Clark. He has written a letter to the Secretary-General of the United Nations on 12th of this Month reporting his visit of Baghdad during the period from February 2 to February 8, 1991. I will just quote the points that he made.

Sir, permit me to quote this. This has come from a very impartial source, a man who is not an India, who is a citizen of the United States, who is a legal mind, a judicial mind highly respected all over the world. I will quote from Mr. Ramsey Clark's letter to the Secretary-General of U. N. dated 12th of this month:

".....No UN resolution authorizes any military assault on Iraq, except as is necessary to drive Iraqi forces from Kuwait. The bombing that has occurred throughout Iraq is the clearest violation of international law and norms for armed conflict, including the Hague and Geneva Conventions and the Nuremberg Charter. It is uncivilised, brutal and racist any moral standard. With few if any exceptions we witnessed, the destruction is not conceivably within the language or contemplation of Security Council Resolution 678/44.

I urge you to immediately notify the Member States of the General Assembly and the Security Council of the information herein provided. I urge you to ask for the creation of an investigative body to examine the effect of U. S. bombing of Iraq on the civilian life of the country. Most urgent, I ask you to do everything within your power to stop the bombing of cities, civilian population, public utilities, public highways, bridges and all other civilians areas and facilities in Iraq, and elsewhere. If there is no cease fire, bombing must be limited to

[Sh. Eduardo Faleiro]

military targets in Kuwait, concentrations of military forces in Iraq near the border of Kuwait, operational military air fields or identified Scud launching.....”

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: There is no time for all these things. You have made your point.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: Should I lay it on the Table of the House?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It is not necessary. It is not allowed according to the rules also.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: Right, Sir. I am making this point that it is a violation of international law the way the destruction of Iraq is being conducted. And, therefore, our Deputy Minister now, who goes to join the Non-aligned Ministerial Team, he should be requested and he is required to go to Iraq to call and urge the United Nations to form an investigative team to investigate into these violations of the United Nations mandate. Also, our approach should be that Iraq must undoubtedly withdraw from Kuwait. Use of force in international relations and take over of another sovereign State is not permissible. But at the same time, the Resolutions that had been violated, are not merely the Resolutions concerning the Kuwait but other Resolutions of the Security Council have also been violated. Peace it is said is indivisible so in international legitimacy. It is necessary, at this point of time immediately to go in for cease fire. What is immediately required is cease fire. It is also necessary at this point of time to have a time-bound programme for convening international conference so that there is stable peace in the Middle East and Palestine State is created.

I would just take one minute to mention something which is crucial and will be shock-

ing and unfair to our people if this is not referred to today, namely, the plight of the Indian citizens who have come from that area. It is most unfortunate that our national committee for the rehabilitation of these people, which was an assurance given by the Government in this House, has not yet been constituted. The national relief fund for these people is also an assurance given to this House. But after six months, it has not yet been constituted. An important point of concern to them is, there has been a stoppage of passport service. There was a bond entered into by them for their repatriation, that bond was cancelled by the previous Government. Now having been cancelled, the Government now is asking for the refund of that money. This is a humanitarian point. I feel very strongly about it.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please be brief.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: This bond which has been cancelled is most unfair to our people who have contributed their money to our reserves. NRI deposits of the gulf people are more than the reserves of the Government of India at this point of time. They have been stopped from getting any passport service. So they cannot get absorbed in India. They cannot go abroad because the passport services have been stopped for them. Bond should be truly cancelled and passport services to returnees from Kuwait and the gulf should be immediately restored.

Secondly, NRI status of these people and all the attached privileges must be maintained until normalisation of the situation in that area.

Thirdly, their children must be allowed to have their births registered in India because the Indian registration authorities are asking them to register their births in Kuwait. Can you imagine the insanity of the situation?

**521 Motion for Adjournment PHALGUNA 3, 1912 (SAKA) timely decision about 522  
Failure of Govt. to take stoppage of refuelling of U.S. Planes**

These things must be done immediately. These are the difficult times for the South. East-West confrontation is over. North-South confrontation may begin. (Interruptions)

Let us once again courageously and bravely assert the leadership of non-aligned movement, assert our right and our duty to work to maintain the sovereignty of the smaller countries of the poorer countries and the integrity of the third world with the world. With these words of greater and greater needs of South-South cooperation in this difficult times of confrontation, I end my speech.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: On the 9th of February a meeting of the Consultative Committee of the Foreign Affairs Ministry was held. It was a very well attended meeting. The meeting put on record the good services rendered by the ambassador and the officials in Baghdad. Therefore it is highly unfair on his part to try to attack those people who worked under very difficult circumstances and therefore put themselves in a very admirable and remarkable position.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: I have a right for personal explanation.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no allegation against you.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: I have produced the evidence to the Member. How can he raise this issue in this manner? (Interruptions)

SHRISRIKANTA JENA (Cuttack): About the refuelling issue the Congress spokesman is silent. Why is he silent about it?

THE MINISTER OF COMMERCE AND MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY): We also know what you did. (Interruptions)

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA: Mr. Swamy

and Mr. Khashoggi both are responsible for that.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: About Mr. Khashoggi, BJP knows more.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This is really going out of control. Please Let Mr. Indrajit Gupta to speak.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Midnapore): Mr. Deputy Speaker Sir, I don't know why Mr. Subramaniam Swamy is getting so agitated. There is no doubt of the fact that on this issue of refuelling of the American aircrafts this Government was totally isolated from public opinion in this country. There was not a single party or a single section of the Press which supported it. Because it was so blatantly and crudely a violation by this Government of the entire traditional foreign policy which is wedded to non-alignment, peace and against war. It was an effort and a behind-the-scene attempt to make this country involved in the war efforts on the side of the Americans-something which cannot be tolerated.

Therefore, as Mr. Akbar said, some alleged air corridor at the time of Mr. Gujral's Government was kept a secret, this refuelling also was kept a secret until he learnt about it from the Times of India. How this refuelling was stopped is also being kept a secret! It was not declared by this Government. First it came from Washington. It was the United States Government which I think has good information as to what is the atmosphere in this country, what is the public opinion, how people are reacting, how embarrassed or not this Government is getting, which has announced that it has decided to make alternative arrangement for fuel, to bail these people out from the difficulty into which they have got.

Therefore there is no doubt of the fact that this refuelling incident that has taken

[Sh. Indrajit Gupta]

place has sullied the image of India throughout the world. Our reputation, our record of the past, our ties with the Arab countries, our ties with the non-aligned movement, everything have been jeopardised and endangered by this refuelling. So it is a good thing it is over now.

Now I want to know only one thing. I am not going to make a long speech. What is going to be the outcome of this debate in this House? The Press report everywhere says that more and more countries are supporting President Gorbachev's proposal which Saddam Hussain is supposed to have accepted. I don't know what the exact position is. More and more Governments are welcoming it, supporting it and pressurising everybody concerned that this Gorbachev's proposal should be made the basis for bringing about a cease-fire and an end to the hostilities and for a peacefully negotiated solution. But what is over Government's attitude towards this Gorbachev's proposal, I don't know upto now.

They may say that we do not know as to what is the content of it. We were told a little while ago that a month or two ago, President Gorbachev had made a proposal to our Government that we should have a day-to-day contact and day-to-day consultation in this situation. Now, we are supposed to believe that they do not know; that the Government of India has not been informed; we have not got an Emissary in Moscow; our relations with the Soviet Union no longer exist; we do not know as to what are the contents of that Resolution. I do not believe it for a single moment. But we are keeping quiet. Governments which are on the side of the so-called coalition, the United States led coalition have reported in the Press-Government of Italy, Government of Egypt, Government of Belgium, Government of Iran, so many Governments and some

more of them. Even the authorities of the Federal Republic of Germany, Chancellor Helmut Kohl is reported to have said that this is the only chance that you will get; get hold of the Gorbachev proposal and use it in order to bring about an end to the hostilities, because the war has been going on for a month. We must note the fact that this is for the first time that Saddam Hussein has agreed to talk directly to a Government which is a member of the Security Council. His attitude was that all the members of the Security Council who have voted for the Resolution 678 are the enemies of Iraq; they passed that Resolution in order to destroy Iraq. But, here a time has come, whatever the reasons may be; we need not have to go into all that now when he has agreed to send his emissary directly to Moscow to talk with the Soviet Government which was very much a supporter of Resolution 678 and it was permanent of the Security Council. This shows a big shift. I think it shows a big shift in Saddam Hussein's position. Maybe some people may say it is because of his weakness now; because his country has been bombarded for one month, and therefore he is felling shaky. It may not be that. We know what the UN Secretary-General has said. He has gone on record as saying that Saddam Hussein told him that what I have been demanding-that the Kuwait is part of Iraq and I will not leave Kuwait-is not something which is irreversible. This is what UN Secretary-General was quoted as saying. He was told by Saddam Hussein that his insistence on holding on to Kuwait is not an irreversible decision. Even though he was saying that. Of course, the bombers were up in the sky already and Saddam Hussein a part from the aggression he committed against Kuwait for which the whole world is condemning and there is no doubt about it. Kuwait was an independent country; a member of the United Nation in its own right; a sovereign States with its own Government. He sent troops there and took over Kuwait and I would blame him more for the fact that because of

the action of his-indefensible action-he gave an opportunity, he gave an excuse to President Bush to mobilise its huge concentration of military power in the middle-east region. They wanted such an excuse; they got it because of Saddam Hussein. Now we can see what is going on. Americans have not defined clearly their war aims. President Bush should be asked by our Government also to define his war aims. Is it limited to the question of the liberation of Kuwait? Or does it go beyond that? Does he want-as some of the American spokesmen are asking—that we should have a new order; and a new world order has to be created? British Government has said it more openly that the war should be followed by a new order to be set up in the middle-east which means that they want to have a permanent presence there, to dominate that whole region, to dominate the Arab countries of that region, to dominate the oil resources of that region. That is their war aim; not simply the liberation of Kuwait, for which they are saying that they are shedding tears which they never shed before, in case of Panama or Granada or Nicaragua or anyone else. They never shed any tear at that time.

So, we have to understand this. We have to work seriously as a major country of the third-world for bringing about a speedy end to the war and for a peaceful solution. Otherwise, if the war continues, if the war is allowed to continue, we will be faced with a pax-Americana. The war will end with a pax-American in that whole region and it will be a threat, a standing threat not only to the middle-east; it will be a threat to India. It will be a threat to the Soviet Union. It will be a threat to all the countries round-about in this area. Therefore, it is a country which now feels that it is the only super power left in this world. The other super powers for various reasons have become weakened and one super power exists. They are showing it every day in this huge concentration of armies, of new technology in weapons, of

planes and tanks, of everything, that they are capable of doing whatever they like. Everybody will have to kneel down before them. The continuation of the war of hostilities will be disastrous not only for all this region but for us also. Therefore, I would like to state clearly here whether they will add their voice here and now to that comity of nations which is saying that Gorbachev proposal must be taken hold of and made the immediate instrument for bringing about a cease-fire and an opening to a negotiated settlement. Mr. Chandra Shekhar should not keep quiet on it. What is his attitude towards this Gorbachev proposal, we want to know. If the Governments of the FRG, of Italy, of Egypt, of Belgium can speak out, why the Government of India can't speak out? (*Interruptions*) It is too late in the day to try to indulge in jokes. The country has already been taken for a ride by your policy. Kindly do not try to leave it off now. It is too serious a matter.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: I am quite serious about it.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: All right, very good.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: If you want my response on that, I shall give it.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: The response has, of course, to come at the end of this debate. (*Interruptions*) I only want to say is that Resolution 678 never sanctions the use of force. It said that if he does not vacate Kuwait by the 15th of January, any means that are required or considered necessary to make him vacate will be undertaken. It does not say that as soon as the deadline of 15th January is over, from the 16th or 17th, you should begin an all-out military assault on Iraq. This is what they did. Therefore, everybody is now understanding that they were very eager to carry on this war until, as they say, they can destroy Iraq, perhaps dis-



[Sh. Indrajit Gupta]

member Iraq as a country, finish off Saddam Hussein, finish off all his military strength. They have said. They are saying it every day in different ways. But that was not the war objective. That was not the objective of the United Nations Security Council resolution. Therefore, we must not allow people to run amuck. This whole war has gone absolutely contrary to the world developments of the last two or three years. It is a tragic fact. The whole world was moving in a different direction for the last two to three years. The people had begun to think that there will be no more wars perhaps—a world free from wars. All kinds of declarations were signed and announced in different parts of the world—Gorbachev-Rajiv Gandhi, somebody and somebody and all that—based on this hope that a new era has opened of disarmament of reduction of troops, all kinds of security arrangements, no more wars, no more wars. Here something has happened which has run contrary completely to the whole development of these last two or three years. It is a serious matter which we should talk about.

Even in a country like Pakistan now demonstrations are taking place every day in every town and city. Those 10,000 Pakistan troops there, who have been sent, they say, should not fight on the side of the Americans but to defend the holy shrines of Mecca and Medina. Now Mr. Nawaz Sharif's problem has begun: How to bring back those troops? People are demanding it and saying why have they been sent. Demonstrations are taking place all over American cities and towns because the bodies of the dead American soldiers have not yet begun to arrive in America as they used to arrive from Vietnam in those wooden coffins and created so much trouble in the USA. They will come if the land war begins, if President Bush is determined to launch the land war. Up to now, he has had one-way traffic raining bombs from the skies when there is no Iraqi

Air Force to counter it. Saddam Hussein has got some land army, we believe. Every military expert has said it, written about it. They have experienced troops who have fought for eight to nine years in the war against Iran whereas the majority of the US troops in Iraq are people who have never seen active combat or warfare in their lives.

It is not going to be a joke. And then the casualties will come. The American casualties will mount up. Mr. Bush may not care about it but the American people do care. They do not want to see their brother, sons and fathers butchered in the sands of Arabia in order to defend a country called Kuwait. So Sir, we must see which way the wind is blowing in the world. Nobody wants war except a few mad men. What is required now is that the voice of India should be heard loud and strong. This Parliament of India, if possible, should speak out. I do not know whether it is possible or not. You consider it. I am told that in the other House they are trying to do something. You better find out as to what is going on. I do not know whether it can be done or not. You people are running the Government. You should decide what to do. You find out whether anything more can be done from here in favour of a cease-fire and a settlement in this regard... (*Interruptions*)... Sir, you are in the Chair. You can also consider it. But why the Parliament of India, only after one month of this barbarous bombing is coming out on this issue? Sir, the city of Baghdad is going without water, electricity and food. People are being bombed round the clock. I doubt whether any other Arab country could have stood up to this kind of a thing. I doubt whether any country of the third world could have stood up to this kind of a situation. Do not talk about Vietnam. That was different case. They had Ho-chi-minh and they had fought against the French and the Americans before that. But which are the countries of the third world which can stand this situation? I am really surprised at the way the Iraqis are standing up to this thing.

Their children have no milk. Water is polluted in the city of Baghdad and epidemics will break out any day. Perhaps, they have already broken out. There is no electricity. Houses are being destroyed everyday and they are standing up to it. Merciless bowling is going on. Therefore, it is high time to act.

SHRI VASANT SATHE (Wardha): I agree with you. Let the entire House adopt an identical resolution as in Rajya Sabha. Let us pass a resolution unanimously here and show our total support and solidarity for secession of this war. Why not we do that? We support you.... (*Interruptions*)... We will ask the Government to do it. Let us all ask together. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: We ask you to do it.... (*Interruptions*)... This is a Government about which Mr. Akbar has said that it has abdicated its responsibility and even then, you are supporting this Government. It is existing only because of you. You cannot get them have a resolution. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Let us convert the Adjournment Motion into an unanimous resolution. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: The worst thing of all is that by this action of the Government, the United States for the first time got an opportunity to tell the whole world. 'Look! a great champion of peace and non—alignment like the Republic of India is supporting us in this war.'... (*Interruptions*).... It is a matter of shame. Our self-respect is lost.... (*Interruptions*).... You always are worried about August and January. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI M.J. AKBAR: It has been accepted by Mr. Gujral (*Interruptions*)

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: We have heard Mr. Akbar's hair—splitting distinction

between Operation Desert Storm and the other Operation. In any case, once the war broke out openly, why did not you come out with your stand and stop it?

SHRI M.J. Akbar: It is because you were in power. You might have stopped it. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: When the war broke out on the 17th January, you were in power and not ourselves... (*Interruptions*)... If we go harping only on what happened before the war, then I withdraw my suggestion. I do not think that any agreed resolution will be brought out.... (*Interruptions*)...

I think you are more interested in that and not in what you should do now to stop the war. I do not know the Government's intention or purpose. They will have to consult with their friends. Let them do it. There is no Minister of External Affairs and there is no Minister of Defence here. Mr. Subramaniam Swamy is holding the fort. (*Interruptions*)

16.00 hrs

In spite of what Shri Gujral said, he goes on saying no, no..... (*Interruptions*). The whole thing started with Shrimati Indira Gandhi..... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL: Shri Akbar, true to his style, as his party's spokesman, thinks that repetition of lies makes it a truth. He has been repeating..... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI M.J. AKBAR: Shri Gujral can check up the text of his own speech. He has admitted that he could not afford to be anti-America..... (*Interruptions*)

Sir, he has used the word\*\*. I object to it. He must withdraw it right away. He has said that\*\* ..... (*Interruptions*)

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** I know that some unparliamentary words have been used. All the unparliamentary words which have been used will not form part of the record. It will be examined and such words will be removed from the record.

**SHRI M.J. AKBAR:** What is there to be examined. He has admitted himself during the course of his speech....(*Interruptions*)

**PROFMADHUDANDAVATE:** The word \*\* is unparliamentary, but \*\* is parliamentary. There is a distinction between the two..... (*Interruptions*)

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** I will examine that. I have already said that it will not form part of the record, if it is unparliamentary. There is no point in saying anything further. It is not only the words which have been said against you, but against any other Member also.

Now, Shri Sudarsan Raychaudhuri.

**SHRI SUDARSAN RAYCHAUDHURI** (Serampore): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, at the outset, I must say one thing that today we are discussing a very serious matter, the Gulf war and the India's role in it, from a particular angle. We should have discussed it much earlier in this House, so that we could have arrived at some at some sort of a decision for ending the war, maybe some consensus also. May be, be because Now, the Congress (I) Members are trying to delink the refuelling issue from the adjournment motion, and I am afraid, when the time of voting comes, they would delink themselves from supporting the adjournment motion also. In fact, all the Left parties had asked for convening an emergency session of Parliament to voice the demand of our people for an immediate end to this war, but the Government did not care to listen to our sug-

gestion. Maybe this Government does not want even a regular, normal session to be held, not to speak of any emergency session. We cannot expect anything otherwise from this minority government.

Since the 17th of January, when the United States started war against Iraq; what was this Government doing? Is this Government observing silence most of time as if to mourn the death of our foreign policy of non-alignment? But when our Prime Minister, who most of the times speaks in a sermonising tone as if he commands two-thirds majority in the House, has declared that the issue of Kuwait cannot be linked with the Palestinian issue, in fact it was George Bush speaking through our Prime Minister. The US imperialists want Israel to continue to occupy the Arab Territories, West Bank, Gaza, Golan Heights and the South of Lebanon. Nobody can step them. Israel knows that its regime would continue its acts of aggression in the entire West Asia with impunity, because it is backed by the US imperialists. Since it is representing the interests of the US not only in West Asia but throughout the world, even in Central America, no one can condemn Israel. It would be a sacrilege to say that unless Israel withdraws from the Arab territories, no peace, on order and no stability is possible in the Middle East.

Our Prime Minister being a man of principles declared therefore that the Palestinian question should be delinked from that of Kuwait. But Sir, is this the way of upholding our policy of non-alignment? Allowing the US warplanes refuelling facilities is just a manifestation of the distinct policy of this Government. This is policy of abject surrender to US imperialism. This is the policy of naked of make appeasement of US imperialism, of destroying our policy of non-alignment.

Mr. Deputy Speaker Sir, historically, ideologically and even realistically, non-alignment is basically anti-imperialist in character. It has developed that way since Independence, since the time of Freedom Struggle. Nobody can distort it because this is the policy of people, not of a particular party, nor that of a particular leader and nor that of a particular family. But this Government which had its birth in political expediency, which thrives and survives in politics expediency thinks otherwise. This Government thinks that the days of non-alignment are over in this so called unit-polar world. Is this the reality? Has imperialism changed its character as some gullible people fondly believe? Don't you find the contradictions between the imperialists and the people of third world countries accentuating day by day? Are you not able to recognise the predatory nature of US imperialism? Then, why did this Government do nothing against this country? Why did they feel shy of speaking against the US? Do you think that liberation of Kuwait is the real objective of US? Is it not a fact that the US really wants to destroy Iraq, to kill even Saddam Hussain? And Saddam Hussein was not inflexible as was pointed out by Shri Gujral.

The United States always tries to thrust its word on West Asia. I must say that no one can support Iraq's action against Kuwait. It is indefensible and it cannot be condoned. But who is this United States to work as the world's policeman? Is it known for its respect for international law? Can we forget the case of Vietnam, Panama, Granda, Nicaragua and Chile? Sir, the ultimate objective of the United States is to subjugate the entire world, particularly the Third World countries. It wants to subjugate their people and their resources. This is the American concept of new international order-Pax Americana! What is the interest of the United States in the Gulf? It wants to control the oil of the entire region, to have puppet government in those Gulf countries who would allow the US and its oil

companies to amass huge profits at the cost of the poor Arab people. Our own Government find fault in it but Iraq has stood against it for more than a month. The US and its allies are pulverising Iraq. Thousands of civilians have been killed. Hospitals, water works, power projects, places of worship, places that represent ancient Mesopotamian Civilisation and everything has been destroyed. Even people, including women and children in underground shelter are not being spared. But Iraq has not surrendered. It is fighting valiantly. The Iraqi people are not alone, the entire people of the third world countries, even of the Western countries, in America and in every other places are with them. Rallies are being held, demonstrations are being held against these war machinations, against this war game of the US. In Bonn, in Berlin, in Tokyo, in Spain, in Italy, in America and in cities after cities, we are seeing that rallies are being held because people know that this is not an UN War. The Resolution-678 calls for using all necessary means but it did not mean, use of force only. All peaceful means should have been exhausted before going in for war. The Resolution neither permits destruction of Iraq. America is clearly violating the UN mandate. Let me refer to Para 4 of the Resolution-678.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No. For this quotation, there is no time. There are many other hon. Members who want speak.

SHRI SUDRASAN RAYCHAUDHURI: It says: "Requests the States concerned to keep the Security Council regularly informed on the progress of actions." What did the US and its allied forces do to inform the U.N?

What about Resolutions of UN against Israel? The Resolution 242 asks Israel to leave occupied Arab territories, to stop atrocities there. America did nothing to restrain Israel. In fact, it abetted Israel. This is the true picture of American justice. Our Government too is following that canon of

[Sh. Sudarsan Raychaudhuri]

justice, i.e. the Palestine issue should be delinked. This is our newly interpreted Non-Alignment. Therefore, it was just natural that this Government allowed re-fuelling facilities to US warplanes, even though, the domestic consumption had been curtailed, domestic flights had been cancelled, *Kisans* were not getting diesel, trains had been cancelled. These US warplanes could have this refuelling facility in Karachi or in Singapore, but they preferred India just to show the world that NAM country is also supporting it. By doing so, our Government had offered credibility to this war, a justification to US war. In spite of demonstrations and appeals from all the major parties, this Government went on giving such facilities. The Prime Minister had told that this action was based on humanitarian grounds. What is this humanitarian ground? The US had destroyed even the only one babyfood factory that was there in Iraq. This Government has brought absolute unmitigated disgrace to our nation, to our foreign policy. Mr. Rajiv Gandhi tells that this Government had acted as a hapless spectator in the course of this war. It is not a fact. This Government has actually acted as an abettor, a collaborator to this US war. Now, the Government of US has come forward to save this Government by telling that it will have some other alternative arrangement and it does not need refuelling facility from India. Mr. Chandra Shekhar did not stop this refuelling. Mr. Bush did it. At least this puppeteer is sensible. Here, the domestic puppeteer directs the Government to topple an elected Government in Tamil Nadu and then to suspend the presentation of the Budget.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I want that, you should be a little more discreet in using the words and phrases.

SHRI SUDARSAN RAYCHAUDHURI: Fresh loans from the IMF are in pipeline. The

puppet Government is grateful and perhaps from this sense of gratitude, it appears today—even in today's Paper, I do not know whether it is *Indian Express* or *The Hindu*—that it is going to allow South Korean warplanes to overfly to Gulf. What is South Korea? They are the collaborator of the US. They would hold one joint military exercise this year, 1991. This Government is allowing South Korea, though appeasing South Korea to appease United States.

Thanks to a great ruling of the hon. Speaker we have got rid of the defector Foreign Minister. Now, we should find means for getting rid of this Government. This Government should go lock, stock and barrel.

SHRI IBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT (Manjeri): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir: I thank you for giving permission to participate in the discussion on the adjournment motion. All of us know that India is the biggest democracy in the East. Together with this, India is the biggest democracy in the East. Together with this, India is the leader of NAM and also a member of the Security Council at present. But India, I must say, and has abdicated its responsibility, under the Chandra Shekhar Government by not daring initiative to stop war. India must have taken a strong stand to see that this war is stopped, and the entire humanity is saved from misery and destruction. This was not done. This was the biggest failure.

The bloody war is going on now, in the Gulf for more than a month. It has got a potential for great catastrophe for the entire mankind. Therefore it is, that all of us desire that the war should end, and there should be a cease-fire, so the concerned parties can settle the dispute around a table, through peaceful negotiations.

As far as invasion of Kuwait by Iraq is concerned, all have condemned it. We do

not condone invasion and occupation of Kuwait by Iraq. But one thing must be understood, about the situation today. With the linkage of evacuation of Kuwait, with the evacuation of the occupied areas of Palestine by Israel, the entire situation has changed. It is here, we support the attitude of Iraq, because we cannot allow aggression from any quarter, and in any part of the world. As you all know, the American policy has been very partisan. It has been an imperialist policy, a policy which treated different countries of the world according to America's own whims and fancies. Zionist Israel occupied certain areas through aggression. Israel occupied various areas of Palestine. It occupied the West Bank, Golan Heights and also the Gaza strip. No doubt, at that time the Security Council had passed resolutions condemning the aggression of Zionist Israel accepting certain proposals. If Palestine but those resolutions were always vetoed by the USA. Therefore what we say is that the USA has always adopted double standards. There has been complete discrimination. Therefore, we cannot accept the policy adopted by USA, where USA is out to destroy Iraq and not liberate Kuwait. Further we have to say that the bombardment is going on day and night against Iraq while talks are going on for cease-fire, to settle matters. At the same time, barbaric bombardment is going on, cruel bombardment is going on. By whom? By the imperialistic USA and European countries, all put together against one country, viz. Iraq. What sort of bombardment is it? All of us know it full well: bombing of civil areas, hospitals, schools and along with it, places of worship and civilian safety shelters are also being bombarded where thousands and thousands of people died and suffered grievous injuries. Therefore in this background I welcome the initiative taken by President Gorbachev of USSR to end the war where. The initiative of NAM was very late. NAM delegation is now thinking of going to Washington, and of going to Baghdad for negotiating a cease-fire. They must have

taken the initiative much earlier. India, a great country, as the leader of NAM, as a member of the Security Council must have taken the lead in the matter. But India failed; and, therefore, we have lost the initiative, and we have abdicated our responsibility. I demand that the Prime Minister should now come out clearly on what is his stand, with regard to the peace proposals of Mr. Gorbachev, the President of U.S.S.R.

As regards refuelling facilities, it is said that we were giving refuelling facilities during peace time. But during war time, you cannot have the same yardstick: you cannot have the same perceptions as during peace time. We must understand that there is a difference between war time and peace time. Therefore, I say that the refuelling facilities given to U.S. warplanes were completely unjustified and they were partisan. These facilities should have been stopped much earlier. They were against all principles of non-alignment. I am very happy that refuelling has been stopped now.

The talks are going on for a ceasefire. We are told that Iraq has accepted the proposal presented by Gorbachev, President of U.S.S.R. for a cease-fire and evacuation of Kuwait. Mr. Bush, President of U.S.A. rejected the proposal and is adamant in continuing the war. He has gone mad being an imperialist power. It is highly essential now to spell out clearly our attitude towards the initiative taken by the President of USSR. I must say very clearly that we must take a stand for Arab unity; we must stand for the integrity and the sovereignty of the Arab world and we must stand for the integrity of Iraq.

If we now demand vacation of aggression from Kuwait and Iraq, then why not say that simultaneously the American troops also should be withdrawn from the soil of Saudi Arabia. Shri Gujral, our former Minister of External Affairs has said, there should be a

[Sh. Ibrahim Sulaiman Sait]

U.N. force to supervise all withdrawals and to see that peace is established and the security and integrity of Arab land is maintained. Together with this, we should also see that our friendship with our Arab brothers is established on more firm basis and I wish that all of them live in peace in decades to come .

SHRI CHITTA BASU (Barasat): I rise to demand from the Government that there should be a forthright condemnation of the United States' aggression on Iraq. I don't think it is necessary for me to recapitulate the events which have ultimately led to the war. It has always been the obstinate attitude of the United States of America which has foiled all attempts for averting this war. Therefore, it is necessary for us, as a country, whose foreign policy is based on peace and NAM, who wants to see that the third world should not be assaulted upon, should have taken a positive measure to avert the war. In this case, the Government of India has miserably failed. The Government of India has also miserably failed to understand the intentions of the United States of America for unleashing such kind of a war in that region, the Gulf region.

For the benefit of the House, I want to quote a small paragraph from the speech of the U.S. Defence Secretary, just to make it known to the House what have been their war aims, what has been their global strategy, etc. He said, as follows:

"The United States has enduring requirements. We have the need to maintain our capacity to control the world's oceans and keep our commitments both in Europe and Pacific, in South West Asia, and Panama, to continue to protect American lives and interests."

Again on February 4, Mr. Bush made it clear as follows:

"There would be no need to fight another one because of the new world order."

Now the question is what is the new world order? This new world order, which they want to impose upon the people, particularly the third world countries, Arab countries, is to exploit the oil wells, to permanently perpetuate their political, economic and cultural hold over these areas and to control the entire world.

Their idea or their intention is to perform the role of international police. If this is the intention behind the war, if this is the aim, if this is the global strategy of the United States of America, India which is committed to the policy of peace and non-alignment, to the policy of prosperity of the advancement of the third world countries, and which is committed always to take a stand against imperialism, should have taken a policy decision to combat this kind of attitude and intentional war efforts of the United States of America. On the other hand, we have allowed the American aircraft to be fuelled in our airports. By these acts we have not only departed from our traditional foreign policy, but wily-nilly we have made ourselves a party to this war. We are no longer non-aligned. We have become aligned with the United States of America and the multi-national forces. And, therefore, this is a great mistake committed by the Government of India.

Our Prime Minister at the very initial stage of the war made a very damaging statement. The statement was that there cannot be any linkage between this issue of Kuwait and other West Asian peace issue. As it is known, we cannot conceive of the West Asian problem without the question of Palestinian liberation movement and other important issues which are very much a part of the West Asian problem.

Lastly, I want to say that as we have seen it, it has been all along the obstinate attitude of the United States of America which has unleashed the war. Even when Mr. Saddam Hussein was agreeing to a proposal for withdrawal from Kuwait, the United States President characterised it as a cruel hoax. Look at the language! What an obstinate attitude!

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Points which have been already made may not be repeated.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: That means there will be no negotiations, there will be no concessions, and there is nothing to give. What can you expect? I heard today as some of my predecessors were saying, the United States of America has also rejected the Gorbachev peace plan. Therefore, it would be in the fitness of things that this Parliament which is committed to uphold the principle of non-alignment and peace, should condemn the attitude of the United States of America and take an immediate initiative so far as the cessation of the war is concerned.

We also want the Prime Minister to tell the House and the nation what the Government's attitude is towards Mr. Gorbachev, peace Plans, which is now being discussed all over the world. If we fail this time I think that the country will not forgive us. I think that the Government will make its position clear on this aspect also.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: All the points which have been made may please be not repeated.

DR. THAMBI DURAI (Karur): My name has already been given.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: If you want to make any fresh points, I will give you time.

DR. THAMBI DURAI: My name has

already been given, as I have said.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Okay. I will give you time. But please do not repeat. We have continued for a such a Long time.

Prof. Soz.

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ (Baramulla): Although I am not in support of this Adjournment Motion, my feelings on refuelling of the American war planes have been very strong. I voiced my feelings outside the House through a statement and now in the House I feel that the refuelling of the American war planes has been a mistake.

I am happy that the Prime Minister has already taken measures to stop the refuelling of the American planes. But, of course, Shri Indrajit Gupta has said that the American Government itself had decided to stop getting their planes refuelled in India.

Now, on the very question of the situation in the Gulf, initially the Prime Minister came very close to our perception. The Prime Minister's perception was that Iraq should withdraw from Kuwait and he also wanted cessation of hostilities. But the war has continued. We have yet take a position on the question of Palestine. Sir, rightly or wrongly an impression has been created that there was some pressure from the United States on our Government. So, when the Prime Minister rises to answer to this debate, he will kindly dispell those fears and remove that misunderstanding.

We have no quarrel with the people of America. We must hold friendship, further friendship with the people of America. But we must take notice of one thing. The feelings of the American people on the situation in the Gulf are the same as we have. In America, there is a powerful movement which says that America should not involve in the Gulf confrontation because it is no holy war



[Prof. Saif-ud-din Soz]

for them. Sir, we must be conscious of one thing India has very rich past. India gave leadership to the NAM countries. India was the first founder of the Non-aligned Movement. It lies in India's mouth to inform America that it is not in its interest to perform a policing role in the Gulf because in this age it is not possible to do so. No country in the Gulf wants a school master to teach them as to how they should behave. They do not want to see America, a policeman, around them.

Now, Mr. George Bush has not even mentioned Saddam Hussein's name properly. An arrogant memsahib, who is no more on the U.K. scene as the Prime Minister, Mrs. Margaret Thatcher was referring Saddam as the bully. What about the bullies in America? What about the bullies in Europe? Forget about the past in Italy, Germany and France. But in present day world, we see many more bullies in Europe and America. That arrogant memsahib had gone.

So, Mr. George Bush will have to come forward to understand the perceptions of the people of his great country on the situation in the Gulf.

Sir, as the Prime Minister has initially said, I am for the withdrawal of Iraq from Kuwait because the sovereignty of Kuwait must be respected. But India has yet to come forward with a plan, for a consolidated effort. It is a painful for me to say that on the question of Palestine, India at this moment is not performing well according to its tradition of supporting the Arab cause and supporting the Palestinians.

Now, America is so much exercised on the U.N. Resolution No. 678. What about numerous resolutions that were passed by U.N. and particularly the resolution on the question of Palestine? So now at this moment, India has very excellent chance of coming

forward to perform its role. Of course, I am happy that India's Foreign Minister went abroad so many times. So our Ministry of External Affairs did try to find a solution of this problem. But I feel that we have not put in substantial effort commensurate with the status of India. But now we have a very brilliant chance. And that will be a friendship with Americans also. India must give total support to Gorbachev formula for peace. The House must not be told by the Prime Minister that Government of India has yet to see the peace plan. The Prime Minister should assure this House that Gorbachev's peace proposal will be accepted. Government of India must try and plead with the US Government and With Mr. George Bush that he should see the reason in not destroying Iraq. So I feel that if the Government will try, Mr. Bush will see the reason in accepting Gorbachev's plan. Otherwise, I am confident that America will be totally isolated on the question of the situation in the Gulf.

SHRIMATI J. JAMUNA (Rajamundry): Iraq has offered to withdraw its troops unconditionally from Kuwait. That was the news at 1 O' clock.

SHRI INDER JIT (Darjeeling): I would like to make two brief comments and ask some clarifications from the Prime Minister.

Firstly, we seem to be indulging once again in our national pastime of self-condemnation of a policy of our own policies.

Secondly, I get the feeling that we are making a mountain of a mole-hill. And I say this with good reason. I would like to ask the Prime Minister: Is it or is it not a fact that Iraq and President Saddam after the refuelling was being done and notwithstanding the criticism and attack of the Iraqi Ambassador against our policy, approached us and requested us to look after their embassies in Egypt and in Turkey? Therefore, it seems to me that when a routine facility has been

**545 Motion for Adjournment PHALGUNA 3, 1912 (SAKA) timely decision about 546  
Failure of Govt. to take stoppage of refuelling of U.S. Planes**

provided to which Iraq has no objection, we seem to be unnecessarily going all out to condemn-refuelling.

I would also like to ask the Prime Minister in the light of his recent contact with the leader of the PLO Movement, Col. Gadaffi and other leaders and also President Gorbachev, whether any Arab nation has objected to the provision of this facility. My own information is that no such protest has been received.... (Interruptions)

Secondly, I want to ask the Prime Minister: Are we supporting the UN Security Council's resolutions or are we not supporting? Do we have any mental reservation? Resolution 678 specifically requests all member-nations to extend help in the operation. If we are not supporting them, we can take a particular line. But if we are supporting the UN Security Council resolution, then I cannot see how we can object to this facility

Thirdly, I would like to ask the Prime Minister: Is non-alignment neutrality? I do not think, it is neutrality. Therefore, we have to judge every issue on merit. Non-alignment only means extension of our independence at home to independence abroad. Therefore, the issue is: Was it done in the best national interest or was it not done in the best national interest? Earlier in the day, we heard Mr. Inder Gujral tell us that during Mrs. Gandhi's time it had been decided that we should try and build friendly relation with the Americans. Now I want to know whether this is still a part of the policy or not?

Every one has been talking in terms of the condition exceeding forces the U.N. mandate. As far as I know, the U.N. mandate is very clear and authorises all necessary means. Therefore, I also want to know whether there is any magic formula by which Kuwait could be liberated without attacking the Iraq bases. All I say is we are for Iraq but

what is the point? The point simple is are we going to stand up for some principles or are we going to allow everyone to turn populist and allow our own judgement to be confused and clouded by political considerations at home?

DR. THAMBIDURAI (Karur): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, we are today discussing about the Gulf situation. We are discussing this subject not only now but we have discussed it in previous sessions also on different occasions. At that time we discussed about the problems of Indians held up there and about how to evacuate them from that country. We evacuated all Indians from Kuwait and Iraq anticipating the war, but our friend Mr. Gujral said in his speech that he could not anticipate such kind of a war. That is why he could not say whether the USA planes were getting refuelled for their military operations. I want to know from our Prime Minister-because he may be well-informed-whether the US Air Force, during the period when they used the refuelling facilities in India, misused the permission which they got for refuelling purpose. I also differ from Mr. Inder Jit on what he said just now. It is not the matter whether Iraq objected or not, what matters is what are we for-are we for for giving refuelling facilities to U.S. planes here or not. Secondly, the prime Minister only has to explain whether we differ from our Arab cause. I think still we are for Arab cause. We have never deviated from that. We have always been fighting for the Palestinians. We have always been against the Israel for what they have been doing.

Most of the Members have said about the U.A. Resolution. We also do not approve of the Iraq's action of occupying Kuwait. We are also against that. But whether we want this kind of a war or we want to solve everything in a peaceful manner, that is important. India's effort has always been to see that this kind of problems are solved in a peaceful manner. We know about the U.S.

[Dr. Thambi Durai]

imperialist attitude. We need not necessarily discuss that. We have suffered a lot from the U.S. imperialism every body knows that. Therefore, if at all they are trying to use the U.N. Resolution, it is only for their own ends. In that case we have to see whether we have to allow the U.S. Air Force planes to get refuelling facilities at the Indian airports. We have read in the newspapers that so many planes came at Madras Airport also and they have got some facilities there. We are also annoyed on that. After seeing the newspaper reports that the Congress Party and others passed Resolutions in their Party, objecting this kind of refueling facilities, we also felt it because the whole nation in feeling that this kind of facility must not be allowed. But the Prime Minister came forward at that time and explained that this was a continuation of the policy which the previous Government also followed. Therefore, I want to know whether is said is correct or not because the nation expects it. Even though the Prime Minister said we cannot open the past events but sometimes it is essential to know our Indian policy. Therefore, once again I would request our Prime Minister to see that these refuelling facilities must be stopped. Already he has announced that it has already been stopped. Whether USA announces it first or our Government announces it first, the is immaterial..... (*Interruptions*).

AN HON. MEMBER: Why?

DR. THAMBI DURAI: I am telling. Because we saw it in the Press also that before the USA announced its decision, our Prime Minister had already announced that it has been stopped.... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE (Dumdum): When the Prime Minister made the statement, it was not stopped.

DR. THAMBI DURAI: Therefore, even

though we also respect the sentiments of the Left Parties and others who raised this issue, yet I am not this Adjournment Motion. (*Interruptions*). Whatever it is, I request that let the Prime Minister come forward and answer all the points raised.

[*Translation*]

SHRI YADVENDRE DATT (Jaunpur): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I am grateful to you for giving me time to speak, but I am distressed to see that the Prime Minister is not present in the House.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You have to make your submission within a short time as others from your party are also on the list of speakers.

SHRI YADVENDRE DATT: I shall abide by your orders and shall not take much of your time. The first question is whether government have made a thorough study of the United Nation's resolution No. 6-7-8 or the one that was adopted earlier and tried to get to the bottom? If such an attempt was made, was any reservation expressed at the U.N. to the points which went contrary to the declared policies of the Government of India? If not, we should take it that you accepted that measure in its totality. Will the prime Minister kindly clarify whether he took the nation and the leaders of various political parties into confidence before accepting that measure? Much hue and cry is being raised today on the question of refueling, etc. Let me say that Government should also keep in mind the stand taken by India during the Korean war. Without going into the past, I would like to say that our policy should be based on immutable law of the of the needs and it should be flexible so as to change according to the conditions, time and needs. Can it be said with certainty, that the policy which we pursued between fifties and seventies and which was correct policy judging the conditions obtaining during that period,

is correct in today's context? The world at that was bi-polar but today's international politics has become multi-polar. Much has been said about Non-Aligned, but as the events have turned in the Gulf war, the entire concept of non-aligned has been demolished. Arab nations are a divided lot. Non aligned countries including Yugoslavia are also divided on the issue. If we attach that much importance to non-aligned movement, I want to know whether India gave consideration to the peace proposal put forward Algeria? I do not think, Government of India even gave a thought to it. Did India know what the peace initiative was; did our Minister of Foreign Affairs, Shri Gujral know about the Algerian peace proposal? The Government of India should have supported the peace initiative, especially when India had friendly relations with both Iraq and U.S.A. Shri Gujral had given a clear hint:

[English]

Saddam was flexible. What was the flexibility?

[Translation]

Why did not Shri Gujral take initiative on the basis of that flexibility, why did he wait for others to take such an initiative. What was the flexibility? Is it not a fact that Saddam wanted to have Iraqi control over Rumillia Oil Fields and Buaniyan islands? If that was the flexibility, Kuwait would have been left with nothing but desert. Is it not a fact that Kuwait has been invaded. Today when we raise hue and cry over the invasion, why do we forget that China too invaded India and the Chinese continue to occupy our land? Our Government convenient by forgot that invasion. Since all your declarations are against invasion, you will have to adopt one yardstick. What is most urgently needed today is that war should come to an end. If this region remains peaceful, it will have good effect on us. At the same time, it is also necessary that

power equation should not be imbalanced in that retain. Therefore, Iraq too should not be allowed to go unpunished. There is need to destroy the aggressive tendency of Iraq. The same treatment needs to be given to Israel also. After the Gulf war comes to an end, the Israel- Pelestine problem should also be solved. India should think in terms of creating strategic frontiers with a view to providing security to both Israel and Pelestine and take initiative accordingly. India should take initiative to restore peace and a resolution to this effect should be moved because it will be in our interest. It will be detrimental to our interests if a foreign power establishes its supremacy in the gulf and tries to usurp smaller countries of the region. Since Saddam Hussein committed aggression against Kuwait and annexed it, he must quit Kuwait. At the same time, Ira-qi should be asked to pay compensation to Kuwait for the damage it caused to that country. Both sides should agree to release prisoners of war. Kuwaiti prisoners should also be released forthwith lest they should be entangled in cases of treason. It should be ensured that U.S.A. does not estalish its military base in the gulf. There is yet another impending danger to which I must point out. A new axis is developing in that part of the world. Turkey, Iran and Pakistan are trying to project themselves as the saviours. This is not in our interest. Therefore, the Government of India must think in this direction.

In the end, I would like to reiterate one point. My colleague Shri Jaswant Singh has said that the policy should be integrated. I would say that we should formulate our policy by giving due consideration to strategic and economic security of the country. There is need to make an intensive study of the changes taking place in Europe, America, Japan and China before we frame our foreign policy. Our old policy has become ineffective in view of the changed environment and, as such, there are no takers; Hence there is a need to formulate a new policy as that would

[Sh. Yadvendra Datt]

be in the national interest. We can express a clear cut view in favour or against it only after the Hon. Prime Minister clarifies all these points.

[English]

SHRIM.J. AKBAR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I want to make a submission. I think all sections of the House will be pleased to learn that our leader, the Congress President Shri Rajiv Gandhi is going to Tehran tomorrow at the invitation to Iran to participate and to help in the peace process. I hope that all sections of the House will help in what is a serious peace effort and I am sure it will reflect the consensus apart from may be the extreme options. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE: Is he the new External Affairs Minister of the present Government? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI M.J. AKBAR: Sir, for our Leftist friends, I would like to correct it. He will be going via Moscow where he is likely to meet President Gorbachev. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI A.K. ROY: I want to know on what authority he is going? Is he extra-Constitutional authority? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE: They should also know that Mr. Rajiv Gandhi and Mr. Bush are quite intimate friends? (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: MR. Roy, you will have a right to reply and you can the point which you want to make.

If anybody is going to any place, he can go as a citizen of the world, as a citizen of India and if he is able to contribute towards peace, it should be welcome.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Is it the place to make announcement? Is it the Congress office? Why is he announcing it here?

SHRI AMAR ROYPRADHAN (Cooch Behar): Is he going there as a Member of Parliament or he is going s Congress-I Chief? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SAIUDDIN CHOWDHURY (Katwa): If the Iranian Government has invited him, then he must go! (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Samarendra Kundu.

SHRI SAMARENDRA KUNDU (Balasore): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I thank you at the fag end of the debate, you have been kind enough to look at me and give me some time. I am filled with anguish and anger that India is taking a back seat in the peace negotiation to stop the Gulf war which is one of the worst disasters that has been wrought on Iraq. When I open TV, the peace negotiation is either at Tehertan or Moscow and not New Delhi. I feel very sad to kind that the Congress-I and J.D.(S) has brought this country this sorry pass.

If you look into the whole matter, the important thrust of the Non-aligned movement is not neutrality but dynamic neutrality to work for peace, to work for freedom, to work for development and to work for disarmament. Now when the negotiation for peace is going on, we are taking a back seat. This is too much a sorry state of affairs to bear with.

How do we retrieve from this situation? Is there any chance? It was said here in this House that the foreign policy should be based on consensus. We have seen how the foriegn policy has been made a Party policy repeatedly by the Congress regime and the present Government is following that. The

present Prime Minister has further diluted this policy. Otherwise, Mr. Akbar would not have dared to announce here a Party decision about Mr. Rajiv Gandhi's visit to Teheran.

PROF. MADHU DANDVATE: It is part of the daily briefings.

SHRI SAMARENDRA KUNDU: It is urged here that the Security Council Resolution gave full mandate to America and allied forces to wage a war against Iraq. That is not true. To go to war is at the bottom of the meaning of the Security Council resolution. In the Security Council meeting, why didn't our country's representative work and fight to the last to have peace in Iraq and Kuwait? I am told sanctions which were operating against Iraq earlier were giving the result. So, they could have waited for six months, another one or two years. It is a ghastly act to see poor children are being killed in Baghdad; there is no milk. Water is polluted. Mahatma Gandhi never thought of this, when at the Asian relations, conference in 1946, Non-aligned movement got a new direction. This is a situation to which our representatives who are in the UN Security Council have brought this country.

17.00 hrs

It is not corrected to say that Security Council has given a mandate to go and finish Saddam. I was shocked the other day when I heard Mr. Bush saying that Mr. Saddam must go. Has the Security Council resolution authorised it? No.

Coming back to the refuelling question, it is really shocking. It is a very sad thing that India being a champion of non-aligned movement and peace, warplanes are allowed to be fuelled in India when war has broken out and they are going to be used in the war.

I was at Kanpur and I read in a newspaper that Mr. Akbar said that V.P. Singh Govern-

ment was responsible for allowing refuelling of American planes. I was shocked. The next day I found that Mr. Akbar said it was a joke.

Some press man asked what would have happened to India if Akbar would have been another Jehangir. I paused for a moment and said "Look, come to Lok Sabha and see for yourself what would have happened to India."

This sort of cliches do not pay. Playing to the gallery and gimmicks frustrate the hopes of millions of people of India where non-alignment is their faith. We should be very serious. We should not start having politicking on matters which we all agree and which is own faith and on which our image is likely to be furnished.

I will just make a proposal. Now an hon. lady member said that Iraq has agreed to withdraw unconditionally. I am very happy if Saddam Hussein has really done it. But that is not an end of the matter.

Post-war reconstruction of Iraq and Kuwait must be planned and the Palestinian question and the Arabs question must be solved. Hon. Members must know that after World War II 122 wars have been fought in the developing countries alone and not a single war was fought in America Canada, Europe or any other developed country. We must also seriously think how to check future wars in the developing countries

I have a suggestion to offer. To implement the ideas of peace and development, let this Parliament unanimously elect a body of persons who will go to Kuwait and Iraq and America and Moscow and work out the post-war reconstruction programme and see that war never comes to this country.

Since you are pressed with time and are pressing the bell, I do not want to speak more.

[Translation]

SHRI GUMAN MAL LODHA (Pali): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I am grateful to you for giving me an opportunity to speak. My senior colleague, Shri Jaswant Singh has already touched the basic points, but I would like to put a few questions to the hon. Prime Minister, because it is not simply a question of refuelling. I would like to point out that as per newspapers report five thousand tonnes of mutton including 500 tonnes of beef is shipped daily for U.S. armed forces from Bombay port with the permission of the Government of India. This decision was taken by the Prime Minister in consultation with Shri Rajiv Gandhi and Sharad Pawar. Not only that, shipments of eatables are also sent daily from thereto the U.S. armed forces. Such items have been detected in the ships which come to the port for docking. This has resulted in a great resentment among the people. I would like the Prime Minister to clarify this point when the replies to the debate and comment on the veracity of these news reports. I would also like to say that the Government of India should endeavour to fully implement the U.N. resolution on this question. When we talk about Palestine or any other nations, we should not forget that our Parliament has unanimously adopted a Resolution that we have to liberate the area of our country which has been unauthorisedly occupied by the China. Today when we talk of the liberation of other nations we should also try to liberate our areas which have been occupied by other countries. (Inter-  
...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Yadav, please sit down. If you speak on all the subjects, other Members of big political parties will not get opportunity to speak. Why are you rising again and again. Best efforts are made to give opportunity to all Members to speak but that would be of no use if you go on repeating the same points.

SHRI RAM KRISHAN YADAV (Azamgarh): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, on behalf of my party I would like to make my submission within two minutes.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: When big political parties are not getting time, how I can allot time to small parties.

[English]

This is not correct. I am allowing you this time. Next time, don't repeat it.

[Translation]

SHRI RAM KRISHAN YADAV: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, we had attained our freedom from imperialism and colonialism through 'Ahimsa' and that is why our foreign policy is also based on peace and it is anti imperialism and anti colonialism. We have strongly opposed all those imperialistic forces who have tried to capture other countries.

So far as I know we have friendly relations with Iraq. Our friendship was not only to get oil from Iraq but lakhs of Indians are also working there and earning foreign exchange. If we had not to stand by the Iraq we should have atleast criticised US action. USA wants to interfere not only in the internal matters of India but in the matters of whole world and intend to trap the entire world in its economic imperialism. The present Government provided fueling facility to US planes which according to me was a wrong step. Instead of remaining neutral and non-aligned we have created a suspicion that India is not a non-aligned country and India has inclined towards U.S.A. In this regard I would say that India should have remained neutral and raised her voice but India obliged USA. USA never stood for us and contrary to that Iraq and socialist countries always stood by us. Therefore, the Government should explain whether its foreign policy have any inclina-

tion toward USA or not. With these words I conclude.

[English]

**SHRIP. V. NARASIMHARAO (Ramtek):** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, it was my understanding that this Adjournment Motion is specifically on a single issue of refuelling facilities. But we have seen that the debate has gone far afield and it has more or less covered all the aspects of the Gulf crisis and perhaps the decision to have another debate on the Gulf crisis generally is almost obviated. So, I would first specifically refer to the subject matter of the Adjournment Motion and then go on to make a few comments very briefly on the Gulf situation on which commentary has been very elaborate from all sections of the House and I don't have to repeat what all these friends have said.

Sir, the debate has become a little acrimonious because of the fact that we concentrated on who did what, which decision was taken in which regime. This, according to me, is subsidiary—in fact not quite relevant to what we are discussing today. I would concentrate my attention on what you, Mr. Prime Minister, are landed with today. Never mind who took the decisions, when they were taken and how they were taken. The first point is about the question of refuelling. Peace time, as everyone has said, is totally different and in normal times, landing facilities, refuelling facilities—these are the order of the day. We get them, we give them to others. There is no dispute about that at all.

Now there is another question of over-flights. Over-flights are also, in normal times, very common. We have been given permission to over-fly several countries when we were going to a far off destination. We give similar facilities to other countries. In fact, when a VVIP is over-flying, a President of the country or the Prime Minister of a country over-flying India, we do not even take the

matter to the Secretary concerned or the Minister concerned. A Deputy Secretary in the Ministry of External Affairs or whatever Ministry is the nodal Ministry, is authorised to automatically give permission. But the fact remains that permission is given whether it is given by the Prime Minister of India or by a Deputy Secretary. Every over-flight is permitted individually. That is a part of our sovereignty.

But Mr. Prime Minister, you are landed with a decision today that any over-flight made by a particular country from a particular area to the gulf, needs no permission at all from you, needs no permission from the Government of India. Is this correct or not correct? If permission on a permanent basis, permission on a cumulative basis, not an individual basis, for an indefinite number of flights, night or day, has been given, a blanket permission, an omnibus permission like this has been given, how is the Government of India going to cope with this? Is the decision going to continue, is it going to be modified? How are we going to deal with this? Or is there no such permission? We would certainly like to know because this is important. Where there is a landing facility, if an aircraft lands, according to our sovereignty, at least in theory, we are empowered to search the aircraft if we have any suspicion. This has not happened. I agree. This has not happened for 15 years, 20 years and 25 years. Our aircraft has not been searched. We have not searched other's aircraft. But it is a part of our sovereignty that we can search if we wish to. But if someone is over-flying, over-flying without permission, over-flying at any time, day or night, taking anything he wants along with him, is this not even a more serious matter to deal with than landing, searching or not searching, deliberately not choosing to search and giving them the permission to refuel and go? It is not a question of posing one against the another. Let us be very clear about it. It is one plus the other. There are two kinds of situation you



[Sh. P.V. Narasimha Rao]

are facing. It is not that one situation cancels the other out. So, we would like to know whether this permission which was granted earlier—no matter by whom—will stand. Even in peace time if you had granted a permission like this that: "You do not have to land, you can go straight across, here is a corridor". I would say that that would not be in conformity with national sovereignty. It does not matter which time. If each over-flight was being technically permitted, there was no question at all, there was no delay at all and it was being done as a matter of course, why was the permission on an omnibus basis asked for? It was not for nothing that it was asked for. It was asked for a particular area; it was asked for a particular destination. Now, why was it asked for? Did we examine why it was asked for when there was no need? If there are a hundred flights, a hundred permissions can be given. Within minutes it is given. Has this aspect been examined and if it has been examined has it been found eminently in the interest of the country or in conformity with the sovereignty of the country to have permitted that? We would certainly like to know and would be grateful for any response from the Prime Minister on this point.

So far as refuelling is concerned, yes, there has been some wobbling in between. There have been different signals coming; but finally I am glad that the Prime Minister has decided, the Government has decided to fall in line with the national consensus. I take it as the triumph of the national consensus, after all the wobbling. I look at it that way. I don't look at it as who did what, who said what, why this was done and why that was not done. I say that ultimately the consensus that has inhered in our foreign policy, has asserted itself. That is the triumph of India's foreign policy and we should continue this. There is no question of changing it, there is no question of going back on it.

Foreign policy is a very big basket. It consists of lots of things. We have to go into it, into the fine print as to what is to be done in a particular situation. What is to be done in the non-aligned movement for instance? As Mr. Gujral pointed out, the non-aligned movement is even more relevant today than ever before. But it cannot be doing the same as it was doing before. It has to do something different because the context is different, the forces are different, the requirements are different and the aspirations of the people are different. Therefore the non-aligned movement, while it is still very very relevant, has to change its tactics, it has to change the immediate destination, immediate emphasis, methodologies and lots of things.

Well, successive Governments have been trying to do whatever they could. If I say I did whatever I could, it only means that I am admitting my own limited capacity. That is all there is to it. There is nothing more to comment on that. So I am sure that any Government, one Government succeeded by the next, will have to do the same thing. The results will be different according to the capacities of the persons or the Governments concerned. That is a fact of life which everyone has to agree and admit.

Today we have to concentrate on a cease-fire. Withdrawal has been agreed to, that too unconditional withdrawal. This word, unconditional can be interpreted differently by different people in different contexts. What really has to be brought about is a package. If there is one issue, there is another issue and there is a third issue. We don't say that we go in for one issue being solved while other issues are still simmering or still continue to simmer. That is not a package. That is an isolated solution. We are not for an isolated solution. We have been talking about linkages. Someone says there should be linkages, someone else says there should be no linkages. This linkage has again be-

come a word being played with different interpretations.

There has been a resolution of today, there has been a resolution of 20 years back. The same Security Council has passed both resolutions. Why shall one resolution be more sacrosanct than the other? Why should one resolution be implemented to the hilt forthwith while the 20 year old standing resolution has to go on standing there on the records of the Security Council for all time to come? It is not clear. Now, today a situation has arisen where—whether you call it a linkage or not, whether you call it a quid pro quo or not, whether you call it a precedent or not—the fact remains that the criticality of the Palestinian question, the centrality of the Palestinian question in the entire gamut of West-Asian relations cannot be denied. The time has come when the realisation of this criticality, of this centrality has to be given a shape, as a part of the peace process in West-Asia. This is how we have to look at it. There is no use of making statements which only trade charges against one another, particularly where we are concerned with a national consensus. This would be my appeal to all the sections of the House. The Prime Minister will have to look into this kind of a consensus; he will have to create it and in that, any party can certainly do its best, whatever it can, in order to exert its influence, exert its old relationships, exert its old friendships. All this should be done. There is no question of someone feeling bad about someone else doing some good. It is a contradiction in terms. If some good is done, everyone should feel good about it and that is how, I think, the good of all this effort will come about.

Sir, there is one question which has been nagging me for some time, for which I have not got really a satisfactory answer so far. There has been a bilateral understanding between India and the United States. Why should it be bilateral? I have not been

able to understand why the United States Government as a part of a 28 nation-force, should call it bilateral, if they ask for some permission from the Government of India and the Government of India gives it. To me, it does not look bilateral at all. It looks as if in pursuance of Resolution 678 or in anticipation of something going to happen in the Gulf, we gave them some permission. They were not going somewhere else; they were not going to the North Pole; or they were not over-flying our country to go to some other destination. They have to go to a particular place which, they knew, we knew and everyone knew, was going to be a scene of conflict, unless the conflict was resolved earlier. When they ask for the permission, the possibility of conflict was there; and when we gave permission it was there. So, that contingency was at the back of their mind, our mind and everyone's mind. In that view, there was no need for us to make it a purely and simply bilateral issue. Today, we do not have to resort to the rhetoric of our being anti-this or anti-that, anti-this country or anti-that country. No, if it is in pursuance of a Resolution. We have every right to comment on the Resolution and co-operate with it accordingly. Those who are parties to the Resolution are commenting on the Resolution. They are saying that what is being done today in Iraq is, far in excess of that Resolution. They are saying that the Resolution in turn did not intend this result, intend this action. That is good enough for us to say that if this is so, then, we do not think that we should give facilities in order to do something which is not in line with the spirit of the Resolution. We could have done that. Why should we make it an Indo-US matter? I really do not know. United States is friendly to us; we are friendly to the United States; we are friendly to the Soviet Union. India itself being a non-aligned country, for ages and ages, we have never considered any country as enemy. We wanted friendly relations with all countries; we tried to establish friendly relations, maintain friendly relations,

[Sh. P.V. Narasimha Rao]

strengthen friendly relations with all countries. That being our case, may be it was not quite in order to make this a bilateral issue. Never mind. You made it a bilateral issue. But I interpret it as something between India and US. I am entitled to interpret this arrangement or agreement or understanding, as something connected with what is happening in the Gulf today. In that view, the moment the Gulf war ends, the Gulf situation calms down, it comes back to normal, all these arrangements become unnecessary. If you want to conclude something with U.S. on the basis of national interest, that is a different story, that is a different chapter. But that need not be confused with this present Gulf situation. This is what I would like to say. So please make this distinction. Having made this distinction, treat them differently. What US and India do in order to help each other is bilateral. But this is not strictly bilateral as I see it. As I have said the matter has ended and all is well that ends well. But the question of over-flights, omnibus permission for over-flights would remain and you will have to deal with this.

With these words, I say that the adjournment motion has lost its punch. It is just like flogging a dead horse, not even a horse. So, it is totally out of place and I oppose it.

17.27 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR): Mr. Speaker, Sir, we had a long debate. The matter concerns the whole nation. Not only the whole nation, the whole world is looking to our nation on this issue.

I also know that some of our Hon. Members are exercised over this problem. I can well understand their sentiments and emo-

tions. I shall not like to go into all the details of the questions that have been raised. I shall try to refrain myself from going into the past. I shall not like to apportion blame to any other person or any other regime. I think that what has happened is the responsibility of this Government. The only thing is that I shall like to clarify certain points that have been raised by important Members. Otherwise, it will be considered as if I am trying to conceal something.

First, I shall take the speech made by Hon. Shri Narasimha Rao. About the free corridor given to US planes in this country, I tell this House that since this Government came, there is no free corridor to any Government anywhere. Why this free corridor was given at that time, I cannot answer. And I am not entitled to say about the past.

I shall like to tell my friend, Shri Gujral. He knows that it is customary in the international norms that every over-flight has to have a transit landing. Some Hon. Members said, transit landing gives the facility to the country concerned to check what is going in this particular aeroplane. This point was emphasised by Hon. Shri Narasimha Rao. If you give a free corridor and transit landing is not compulsory, in my opinion, that is not a very happy situation. Free corridor is given only to the VIPs, Heads of State, Heads of Government or very important military personnel whose movement is notified beforehand. This is the custom. I am not very much conversant with the traditions and nuances of diplomacy but this has been the routine practice all over the world. And this is being done not only in relation to US but to many other countries. We have been allowing such facilities to almost every country—whether of one bloc or the other bloc. It has nothing to do with our non-alignment. It is the tradition which this country has been following for quite sometime. Mr. Speaker, Sir, whenever we allow a plane to go on our air space, we make it compulsory to land at one place,

what we call as 'transit landing'. It becomes compulsory also to give them the refuelling facility because if a plane lands, refuelling is a must and every country gives it. Our planes and Air force planes are perhaps flying, even at this moment, over 24 or 20 countries and we are getting that facility. There are bilateral arrangements with some of the countries that we do not ask them for having this transit landing but not with the USA. I want to make it clear. Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is true that a situation was developing in the Gulf and everybody knew that a war-like situation was there. We also knew that the situation may deteriorate and war may take place. And this is why when we gave them the permission— we took from them the guarantee that no lethal weapon will go. It is for the first time that the Government of India has insisted for this type of guarantee. I do not want to make tall claims. But this was done and the Government of the United States of America agreed to this.

The other question which is very relevant and I agree with Mr. Narsimha Rao that it was in the normal times and times of peace. When the war started, at that time, it should have been stopped. Mr. Speaker, I may very frankly say that I did not see any serious departure from our old policies; I did not see even any departure from the old traditions or the old practices which have been followed during the last 40 years. I also did not see any threat to our non-alignment nor we got from any quarter any whispering doubt about our tilting to one side or the other. It has nothing to do with our policy of non-alignment. I say that the Government of India, as of the old, is sticking to non-alignment, of course, with certain amount of flexibility depending on our national interests and that has been the practice again from the very beginning. My friend, Mr. Jaswant Singh told what happened in 1962 and 1971. He was in the war theatre. He knows more about it. I do not know. That is why, I shall not like to talk about it. Mr. Dinesh Singh was at

the helm of affairs in those days. He might be knowing about it. So, it will not be proper to say that at that time there were not certain adjustability or adjustment in our policy in allowing people to fly or to refuel or to do things. But there was no agreement with any Government at any time. It was just a tradition that was being maintained and has been maintained. Mr. Speaker, when I saw the opinion developing in this country that this refuelling facility should not be given, I convened a meeting of the Opposition parties immediately. And I told them, "If you want, I can ask them to stop it today itself." But this is again not done in international dealings. My friend, Mr. I.K. Gujral knows, Mr. Narasimha Rao knows and Mr. Dinesh Singh knows. It is just not like saying "I allow you", "I do not allow you", because national interest is again involved. The only thing we can say is that "the situation is such that if this facility cannot be used by you, it will be better". Immediately, when I came to know about the opinion, not of all sections of the House but important sections of the House, I immediately conveyed to the US Government that they should discontinue it. It takes some time. If I am at fault on that, you can blame me. But some of my friends have been trying to point an accusing finger and I feel sad, Mr. Speaker, when Mr. Gujral said whether the decision is being taken by this Government or by some extra-Constitutional authorities directing this Government. Mr. Gujral and myself have been friends for a long time. Mr. Speaker, you know that Mr. Gujral might have been getting directions from extra-Constitutional authorities at one time or the other. Never in my life I have taken any instructions from any extra-Constitutional authority. I shall not like to bring personal matters in this House..... (Interruptions) I would not have taken up this personal matter if it would not have come from Shri I.K. Gujral. I would have ignored any other comment, but not from Shri I.K. Gujral, whom I know for a long time and for whom I have got great regard and respect,

[Sh. Chandra Shekhar]

and he at least knows me for quite some time. I may be lacking in anything, may not have his wisdom, or his nuances of foreign policy, but one thing I do not lack is courage and that is why when somebody asked whether we have given this facility, I said, yes. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I shall leave that matter there.

The other question was raised, and a very important question, by my friend, Shri Indrajit Gupta. He said whether the Government of India was doing something about the Gorbachev formula or whether they were sleeping over it. Shri Gujral also said that—he was very much awake and we were sleeping. But I do not know that. During the last one month, I have exchanged views with Mr. Gorbachev five times. Even today, at this moment, we are in constant touch with him. It does not mean him personally, but with the Government of USSR. Our permanent representative in the United Nations since yesterday or day before yesterday has been contacting all the members of the Security Council and of the nations of the non-aligned movement to see that we are able to restore the authority of the Security Council and the peace proposal is not left to certain people. We have said it clearly and categorically that we support the move made by the President of USSR. Not only this, we have been taking all measures, all initiatives; I shall not go into the details of that. During the last one month, envoys from all important countries who are supporting Saddam Hussein have visited Delhi and had discussions with me. None of them was as exercised as my friend, Shri Gujral is exercised.

AN HON. MEMBER: You met Khashoggi also.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Yes, Khashoggi also. He is a diplomat in your eyes, not in my eyes. I meet so many

Khashoggis. But I am not talking of Khashoggis, I am talking of Arafat, I am talking of Algerian President's envoy, I am talking of the Chinese Prime Minister, I am talking of the Iranian President and I am talking of the people who are concerned about the matter and who matter in this problem.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, everybody says that we have gone against Saddam Hussein and we have destroyed our relations with Saddam Hussein. I categorically want to say that our stand on the Palestinian question remains the same and I told everybody that on the Palestinian question there cannot be any compromise. We also said that our friendship with Iraq is there. Mr. Speaker, Sir, you will be pleased to know that in Egypt when the Iraq Embassy was closed, the President of Iraq, Saddam Hussein, chose none else but India, the inimical country, to look after Iraq's interest! This is the situation. But if people think that giving statements or trying to find bold words or pointing accusing fingers is part of the international politics, I do not know that.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about Shri Rajiv Gandhi?

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: I do not know what you mean by Shri Rajiv Gandhi. Shri Rajiv Gandhi has been helping in finding a solution to this problem and I have been in constant touch and dialogue and consultation with Shri Rajiv Gandhi. Even today I say that while the Government is making efforts, I was talking of our permanent representative and I was talking of our Deputy Foreign Minister who is going to Tehran and Baghdad. Shri Rajiv Gandhi, along with Shri Narsimharao and others, is going tomorrow to Moscow enroute to Tehran in order to find a solution to this problem. It is not only Shri Rajiv Gandhi, I shall request Shri Gujral also, because he seems to have cordial relations with Saddam Hussein and others. I shall be

ready to get his support. The efforts of anybody who is ready to contribute to establish peace in that area will be appreciated. When I said that I did not want to divide this nation on this issue, I sincerely meant it. We have many problems... (*Interruptions*)

Sir, if I cannot make myself intelligible to them, I cannot help it because I can give arguments and I can give facts, but I cannot give the brains to understand. (*Interruptions*)

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Shri Narasimha Rao asked a question. And the same question was asked, in a different language, by my friend Shri Indrajit Gupta. I assure you on the questions of policy, non-alignment is still relevant. It is relevant because we do not want that any power, whether one or the other, should take the responsibility of restoring peace in a particular region. If it is allowed in one region, it will affect us also. We are conscious of our interests.

Shri Chitta Basu said that we should condemn the United States. I have not run the politics of condemnation. It is his government which does it. I do not condemn people. I condemn the action of particular people and of particular nations. He would know it if he has tried to read the newspapers. The day when there was a statement by the U.S. Vice-President that he would have to keep his options open to use nuclear weapons, I said that it was a crime against humanity. I said any talk of using nuclear weapons and any talk of chemical war would be a crime against humanity. Mr. Speaker, Sir, we oppose it. But there are certain methods in dealing with the situation. Some people feel that they should talk very boldly against some people. And some people have the instinct of self-condemnation and self-pity. They say that India has not been able to do anything and that India has been relegated to background. What has happened to France? What has happened to China? What

has happened to Iran? What has happened to USSR?

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA (Bankura):  
Shri Rajiv Gandhi said so (*Interruptions*)

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: If Shri Rajiv Gandhi has said so, he has also been doing something... (*Interruptions*) But some people are only saying all these things and doing nothing. That is the difference. If you do something, then you can say something. (*Interruptions*)

Mr. Speaker, Sir, my friend Shri Indrajit Gupta wanted to know whether the Government of India has any knowledge about the Soviet move or not. We have some knowledge. But there are limitations. If the Government concerned say that this is a secret thing, a confidential thing, then the Prime Minister of another country howsoever insignificant he may be, has not got the liberty to express it to the press. This is the limitation. But now, the Soviets themselves have come out through Tass today.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: Not today, it was yesterday.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Yesterday? The details of their proposals are with me. I shall just read out the points

1. Iraq announces a full and unconditional withdrawal of its forces from Kuwait.
2. Withdrawal begins on the second day after the cessation of hostilities.
3. Withdrawal of forces will take place in a fixed time frame.
4. After withdrawal of two-thirds of all Iraqi forces from Kuwait, the eco-

[Sh. Chandra Shekhar]

conomic sanctions imposed by the UN will cease to apply to Iraq.

5. At the end of the withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait, the causes would cease to exist, as also the causes for the corresponding resolutions, so those resolutions would cease to be in effect.
6. Right after the cease-fire, all the prisoners of war would be immediately released.
7. Withdrawal of forces would be monitored by countries not directly involved in the conflict, being so entrusted by the Security Council.
8. The work on determining the details and specifications continues. The final outcome of this work will be made public today to member countries of the UN Security Council.

This is what has come.

Mr. Speaker, it may be just a coincidence. I do not want to claim any credit. Out of these eight points, four points have been taken up by our U.N. Representative from the very beginning for the consensus in the Security Council and outside. It must be just a coincidence or it must be just a luck for the Government of India... (*Interruptions*)... That is what you may be saying.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA (Calcutta South): Certainly.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: So, this is what you have been doing.

If you want our reactions, we are for supporting this move. I have been told that

the President of the United States of America has certain reservations on this. Though I am told that at one stage, they said that they will be discussing with their allies and they will come to some decision but at the lower level, somebody has said that they would reject this formula for this proposal by the Soviet Union. It will be a grave mistake. I may make an appeal from this House that Mr. George Bush should take this opportunity—should not miss this opportunity—in order to establish peace in that area. It provides a beginning for a meaningful dialogue, for a talk, to come to some conclusions. I have got certain information about his reservations but I do not think it will be prudent to talk about reservations of the President of the United States of America. I hope and trust that he will be able to discuss with allies and come to some understanding because in war nobody triumphs. In war only humanity is defeated. It is the agony, it is the suffering of the people that makes us think about it. We are more concerned about it. Mr. Faleiro told perhaps that we have special concern because our citizens are involved in it. More than 5,000 of our people even today are in Kuwait and we feel concerned about it. These were the people who refused to come out of Kuwait even till this last moment. I shall not like to go into the details, as to what initiatives we have taken; how we tried to see that the deadline should be postponed, something should be done. Repeatedly, we tried but when the stubbornness comes in the minds of certain people, not only the voice of India was not heard, the voice of USSR, the voice of China, the voice of Iran, the voice of even very friendly persons like Mr. Yasser Arafat and others and even the French voice did not carry any conviction with them. I do hope and trust that now the atmosphere has changed and I agree that India has to play a very important role because we are concerned with the developments in the Arab world. We have our relations for a long time. I shall not like to go into the history, otherwise, again I shall jump into the controversy raised by Mr.

Jaswant Singh and Mr. Gujral. I am not that good a student of history but our recent history with the Arab world and especially with Iraq has been that of cordiality and friendship. We shall never like to see that dismemberment of Iraq. We want that their political unity and integrity should be maintained. My friend Mr. Indrajit Gupta wanted to know whether we stand by the U.N. Resolution or not. If we have to remain in U.N., then we will have to stand by U.N. Resolution but the question is that of interpretation, that of its area, how long it can be stretched in order to find convenience to have your move. It is a delicate issue. I shall appeal to Members that they should give some concession to the Prime Minister who has never been in the Government and has never been in the international affairs.

All other Members seem to be more knowledgeable about the international affairs and the happenings in the world. But what little I know through the good offices of our Ambassador, our Foreign Office and brilliant statements, sometimes issued by all of you, I have tried to take them into consideration and I have tried to live upto your expectations. If there any faults why do you divide the country on this issue? Are there not enough problems? I shall appeal to the Members—I am told that in the other House, there has been a unanimous Resolution—through you, Mr. Speaker, that let us remain united on this problem, in the interest of world peace, in the interest of the rights of humanity, especially of the down-trodden, of the exploited, of the developing world, of the poor nations of the world, because they look towards us with expectations and hope.

SHRI A.K. ROY: Mr. Speaker, Sir: The Government's action has already demoralized the country; and the Prime Minister's speech will demoralize Parliament. (*Interruptions*)

Sir: Nobody would be convinced by the

Prime Minister's argument, which clarifies none of the points raised in the House. It is aimed at confusing the confused, (*Interruptions*) and expecting that there should not be any person having a clear thinking on the issue.

There are two basic points. It is not simply a question of technicalities. Two basic points have been raised on which a country like India should react, and react with conviction. The first point is whether USA would be permitted to act as the international policeman; the second: whether the Monroe Doctrine should be applicable on this side of the Atlantic. These two basic points are there. Thirdly, his explanation on the question of refuelling will equal all the arguments against it. It has been said that it was continued. The point was made, that it was there as an old practice, during peacetimes. A question was asked whether it should continue during times of war also. There, no answer was given. The Government did not show guts to stop it, but it only appealed to that Government to discontinue this. Because of this spineless attitude of the Government of the biggest democracy in the world, and one of the staunchest supporters and a friend of the Arab world, India would cut a very sorry figure outside.

I would also like to say this: what my friend from the BJP said, also deserves some comment. He said that we have some special reasons for backing Saddam Hussain. Only a few days back, I was listening to the speech of the Prime Minister of Pakistan, as broadcast by the Pakistan Radio. It was justifying his taking sides with America, and said that Saddam Hussain had, on important issues like Babri Masjid and Kashmir, sided with India. So, he cannot be on Pakistan's side.

We are now finding a peculiar spectacle, wherein the fundamentalists of the Hindu variety and of the Muslim variety are in



[Sh. A.K. Roy]

one boat, and are acting as approvers of the most heinous crime on the Arab world. It is very peculiar. They are sailing in the same boat. It is Saudi Arabia, it is Pakistan which exported communal politics. In India, it is this honourable party which is practising communal politics within the country.

They are now one. They are birds of the same feather flying together. This is the point. Many members have raised a question whether bombing of Kuwait was under the jurisdiction of the U.N. vague Resolution No. 678. Similarly, many members have raised a question whether anything speaking outside the question of refuelling is within the ambit of this Adjournment Motion. I like to say it is definitely within the ambit of this Adjournment Motion. After refuelling, the Adjournment Motion says: "And proper initiatives in regard to the Gulf war compatible with the longstanding national foreign policy." So, the Adjournment Motion itself contains the scope of dealing with and viewing the issue in a wider perspective.

It is true that the Prime Minister has said something about that particular Resolution of the U.N. But what I emphasised in the beginning, I would like to repeat it here again: Iraq's annexation of Kuwait is a legacy of history. When Kuwait was created in 1961, at that time also, Iraq objected to that because it was a part of district Basra and was having the same culture, everything of that area. After the Ottoman Empire, in 1920, the Imperialists tried to divide the Arab countries, to balkanise the Arab countries and to get control over the oil pockets like Kuwait, which would boost their oil reserves, which would last for more than 100 years; while the American oil reserves would last only for 10 years if they use their own oil reserves. Today, in order to control all these oil reserves, they have created so many small States headed by Sultans, headed by Amirs,

headed by Sheikhs and headed by Kings. But that does not mean that it can be annexed in that way; that argument may be there. But it is Arabs' affair; it is an internal affair which can be settled by themselves. But aggressing across the Atlantic with all sort of sophisticated weapons to test their accuracy is treating it as guinea-pig. This is how the bombings are going on there. They are also taking some photographs for all sorts of enjoyment. It is a naked aggression; it should be condemned lock, stock and barrel. Are we to approve the American policemenhip of the world and jump over the Arab world? This sort of spirit must not be there. But here in the speech of the Prime Minister nothing is there.

NAM is just not a neutral point; it has a purpose; it has a political purpose; and NAM is tied, was tied and has always been tied with the constant struggle against imperialism and colonialism. Some people have tried to make it equi-distant between USA and USSR. Should that be a policy? During our entire freedom struggle, USA did not back us; USSR backed us. (*Interruptions*) And even today the secessionists of Kashmir and Punjab are getting shelter in the USA, not in USSR. One of the extremist leaders, Mr. Mann offered to send his Khalistani commando to fight on the side of America. So, America presents all sorts of subversive elements whether in India or in the Arab world. The Muslim fundamentalists are trying to subjugate the Arab world. (*Interruptions*) We must know their politics and their politics must be kept in mind. Those who are fighting against Iraq are enemies of India, basically the enemies of India.

18.00 hrs.

So, India's sympathy, even keeping neutrality apart,—neutrality is a flexible thing which can be twisted in favour of even the imperialist countries as it has been twisted today—should be twisted always in favour of

**577 Motion for Adjournment PHALGUNA 3, 1912 (SAKA) timely decision about 578  
Failure of Govt. to take stoppage of refuelling of U.S. Planes**

the subjugated people and the suffering people. So, our neutrality and non-alignment should be twisted in such a way that it serves positive neutrality and it serves the suffering people of Baghdad and not the United States policy of imperialism.

It is true that Mr. Gorbachov has given a proposal. It is not a final one. India can go a step ahead of Mr. Gorbachov. But the proposal of India should be that of peace. Here we should come out with a proposal that first there should be a cease-fire immediately. Secondly America and the other multi-national forces must withdraw.

Next, the third point is Iraq must start quitting Kuwait. At the same time Israel must start quitting the Arab lands and fourthly, with the help of Mr. Gorbachov we should decide on the future course of the entire Arab world. That should be the approach. It is not that Iraq should withdraw and the U.S. Army imposes its imperialist policy and spreads its tentacles in the Third World.

At the end I would like to say that the Gulf War has created a gulf between the people and the governments in each country and in India also it is very natural it will increase the gulf between the people and the Government. And, it is very surprising and very unfortunate that it looks as though it has become a part of the every day life to tolerate the crimes that are being committed in the Gulf. The days of elder statesmen ruling the country are gone and some preferred people are ruling the country. In a sense India was a land of Suns and galaxies and we can also say that now it is being governed by some satellites.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That the House do now adjourn".

Those in favour will please say 'Aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: 'Aye'.

MR. SPEAKER: Those against will please say 'No'.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: 'No'.

MR. SPEAKER: I think the 'Noes' have it. The 'Noes' have it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: The 'Ayes' have it.

MR. SPEAKER: Let the Lobbies be cleared—

MR. SPEAKER: Now the Lobbies have been cleared.

The question is:

"That the House do now adjourn".

*The Lok Sabha divided*

18.07 hrs.

Division No.-1

## AYES

Acharia, Shri Basudeb

Ahmed, Shri Anwar

Ali, Shrimati Subhashini

Baitha, Shri Mahendra

Bala, Dr. Asim

Barman, Shri Palas

Basu, Shri Anil

Basu, Shri Chitta

Beg, Shri Yusuf

Bhartiya, Shri Santosh

Kundu, Shri Samarendra

Bhattacharya, Shrimati Malini

Mahata, Shri Chitta

Brahmbhatt, Shri Prakash Koko

Mahato, Shri Shailendra

Chakravorty, Shri Susanta

Malik, Shri Purna Chandra

Chatterjee, Shri Nirmal Kanti

Malik, Shri Satya Pal

Chatterji, Shri Somnath

Manjay Lal, Shri

Choudhury, Shri Lokanath

Masudal Hossain, Shri Syed

Choudhury, Shri Saifuddin

Mirdha, Shri Nathu Ram

Dandavate, Prof. Madhu

Misra, Shri Satyagopal

Das, Shri Anadi Charan

Mukhopadhyay, Shri Ajoy

Dasgupta, Dr. Biplab

Negi, Shri C.M.

Datta, Shri Amal

Nitish Kumar, Shri

Dome, Dr. Ram Chandra

Pacherwal, Shri Gopal

Giri, Shri Sudhir

Pal, Shri Rupchand

Gujral, Shri I.K.

Pani, Shri Ravi Narayan

Gupta, Shri Indrajit

Panwar, Shri Harpal Singh

Hannan Mollah, Shri

Paraste, Shri Dalpat Singh

Hansda, Shri Matilal

Paswan, Shri Ram Vilas

Heera Bhai, Shri

Paswan, Shri Sukdeo

Hota, Shri Bhabani Shankar

Patel, Shri Ram Pujan

Jena, Shri Srikanta

Patnaik, Shri Sivaji

Kabde, Dr. Venkatesh

Pramanik, Shri Radhika Ranjan

Kaushik, Shri Purushottam

Prem Pradeep, Shri

Khan, Shri Sukhendu

Rai, Shri Lalbaboo

Rai, Shri, M. Ramanna

Zainal Abedin, Shri

Ray, Dr. Sudhir

## NOES

Raychaudhuri, Shri Sudarsan

Adaikalaraj, Shri L.

Routray, Shri Nilamani

Agarwal, Shri J.P.

Roy, Shri A.K.

Akbar, Shri M.J.

Roy, Shri Haradhan

Anbarasu Era, Shri

Roypradhan, Shri Amar

Antony, Shri P.A.

Sanyal, Shri Manik

Antulay, Shri A.R.

Sayeed, Shri Mufti Mohammad

Arunachalam, Shri M.

Selvarasu, Shri M.

Asokaraj, Shri A.

Shastri, Shri Yamuna Prasad

Atinder Pal Singh, S.

Singh, Shri Har Govind

Bajpai, Dr. Rajendra Kumari

Singh, Shri Mandhata

Bala Goud, Shri T.

Singh, Shri Pratap

Balaraman, Shri L.

Singh, Shri Ram Prasad

Bali, Shrimati Vyjayantimala

Singh, Shri Ramashray Prasad

Bansi Lal, Shri

Sur, Shri Monoranjan

Basavaraj, Shri G.S.

Tyagi, Shri K.C.

Basheer, Shri T.

Vijayaraghavan, Shri A.

Bega Ram, Shri

Yadav, Shri Chun Chun Prasad

Benjamin, Shri S.

Yadav, Shri Devendra Prasad

Bhagat, Shri H.K.L.

Yadav, Shri Mitra Sen

Bhajan Lal, Shri

Yadav, Shri Ramendra Kumar Ravi

Bhakata, Shri Manoranjan

Yadav, Dr. S.P.

Bhardwaj, Shri Parasram

Yadav, Shri Surya Narayan

Bhatia, Shri Ram Sewak

Bhosle, Shri Prataprao Baburao

Dore, Shri Raja Ambanna Nayak

Bhoye, Shri Reshma Motiram

Faleiro, Shri Eduardo

Bhuria, Shri Dileep Singh

Fernandes, Shri Oscar

Birender Singh, Rao

Gadgil, Shri V.N.

Chand Ram, Shri,

Gaikwad, Shri Udaysingrao

Chandrasekhar, Shrimati M.

Gajapathi, Shri Gopi Nath

Chandrashekharapa, Shri T.V.

Gandhi, Shrimati Maneka

Charles, Shri A.

Gandhi, Shri Rajiv

Chaudhary, Shri Kamal

Giriyappa, Shri C.P. Mudala

Chennithala, Shri Ramesh

Gomango, Shri Giridhar

Chennupati, Shrimati Vidya

Gudadinni, Shri B.K.

Chidambaram, Shri P.

Gupta, Shri Janak Raj

Chinta Mohan, Dr.

Handoo, Shri Piyare Lal

Chowdhary, Shri Dasai

Het Ram, Shri

Das, Shri Bhakta Charan

Inder Jit, Shri

Deb Burman, Shri K.B.K.

Jag Pal Singh, Shri

Dennis, Shri N.

Jai Prakash, Shri

Deora, Shri Murlil

Jamuna, Shrimati J.

Dev, Shri Sontosh Mohan

Janardhanan, Shri Kadambur M.R.

Devarajan, Shri B.

Jayamohan, Shri A.

Devi Lal, Shri

Jeevarathinam, Shri R.

Dhakane, Shri Babanrao

Jhikram, Shri Mohanlal

Dhankhar, Ch. Jagdeep

Kalvi, Shri Kalyan Singh

Dhawan, Shri Harmohan

Kamal Nath, Shri

Dinesh Singh, Shri

Kamble, Shri Arvind Tulshiram

Kareddula, Kumari Kamalaji

Murthy, Shri Kusuma Krishna

Kaul, Shrimati Shella

Muthiah, Shri R.

Khan, Shri Zulfiquar Ali

Naikar, Shri D.K.

Kodikkunnil, Shri Suresh

Narayanan, Shri K.R.

Konthala, Shri Rama Krishna

Narayanan, Shri P.G.

Kotadia, Shri Manubhai

Nayak, Shri Nakul

Krishna Kumar, Shri S.

Netam, Shri Arvind

Kumaramangalam, Shri P.R.

Nikam, Shri Govindrao

Kuppuswamy, Shri C.K.

Odeyar, Shri Channaiah

Kurien, Prof. P.J.

Oraon, Shrimati Sumati

Kushwaha, Shri Jagdish Singh

Palanisamy, Shri K.C.

Lakshmanan, Prof. Savithri

Pande, Shri Rajmangal

Mahabir Prasad, Shri

Pandian, Shri D.

Mahadik, Shri Vamanrao

Panja, Shri Ajit

Mahajan, Shri Y.S.

Patel, Shri Arjunbhal

Malik, Shri Mangaraj

Patel, Shri Shantilal Purushottam Das

Mallikarjun, Shri

Patil, Shri Balasaheb Vikhe

Marbaniang, Shri Peter G.

Patil, Shri S.T.

Mathew, Shri Palai K.M.

Patil, Shri Shankarrao

Mishra, Shri Balgopal

Patil, Shri Uttamrao

Mishra, Shri Janeshwar

Penchalliah, Shri P.

Mishra, Shri Raj Mangal

Peruman, Dr. P. Vallal

Mohammad Shafi, Shri

Poojary, Shri Janardhana

Muraleedharan, Shri K.

Pradhani, Shri K.

587 *Motion for Adjournment  
Failure of Govt. to take*

FEBRUARY 22, 1991

*timely decision about 588  
stoppage of refuelling of U.S. Planes*

Prasad, Shri V. Sreenivasa

Reddy, Shri Kotla Vijaya Bhaskara

Purohit, Shri Banwarilal

Reddy, Shri M.G.

Purushothaman, Shri Vakkom

Reddy, Shri P. Narsa

Rahi, Shri Ramlal

Reddy, Shri R. Surender

Rai, Shri Kalp Nath

Reddy, Shri Rajamohan

Rajeshwaran, Dr. V.

Reddy, Shri Y.S. Rajasekhar

Rajeswari, Shrimati Basava

Sadul, Shri Dharmanna Mondayya

Raju, Shri M.M. Pallam

Sahay, Shri Subodh Kant

Raju, Shrimati Uma Gajapathi

Sait, Shri Ibrahim Sulaiman

Ram Babu, Shri A.G.S.

Saran, Shri Daulat Ram

Ram Sagar, Shri (Bara Banki)

Sathe, Shri Vasant

Ramachandran, Shri Mullappally

Save, Shri Moreshwar

Ramamurthy, Shri K.

Sayeed, Shri P.M.

Ranga, Prof. N.G.

Sekhar, Shri M.G.

Rao, Shri J. Chokka

Selvam, Shri Kanci Panner

Rao, Shri J. Vengala

Sema, Shri Shikiho

Rao, Shri K.S.

Shah, Shri Jayantilal Virchandbhai

Rao, Shri P.V. Narasimha

Shakya, Shri Ram Singh

Rao, Shri R. Gundu

Shankaranand, Shri B.

Rao, Shri Srinivas

Shanmugam, Shri P.

Rathva, Shri Narayanbhai Jamlabhai

Sharma, Shri Chiranji Lal

Rathor, Dr. Bhagwan Dass

Sharma, Shri Dharm Pal

Reddy, Shri A. Venkata

Shekhada, Shri Govindbhai Kanjibhai

Reddy, Shri B.N.

Shingada, Shri D.B.

Reddy, Shri Bojja Venkata

Sidnal, Shri S.B.

589 *Motion for Adjournment* PHALGUNA 3, 1912 (SAKA) *timely decision about* 590  
*Failure of Govt. to take* *stoppage of refuelling of U.S. Planes*

Silvera, Dr. C.	Thomas, Shri P.C.
Singaravadivel, Shri S.	Thorat, Shri S.B.
Singh, Shri Anand	Thungon, Shri P.K.
Singh, Shri Dhanraj	Tiwari, Shri Brij Bhushan
Singh, Shri K. Manvendra	Topdar, Shri Tarit Baran
Singh, Shri, Lalit Vijoy	Umbrey, Shri Laeta
Singh, Prof. N. Tombl	Varma, Shri B. Rajaravi
Singh, Shri Uday Pratap	Varma, Shri Dharmesh Prasad
Singh Deo, Shri A.N.	Venkatesan, Shri P.R.S.
Sinha, Shrimati Usha	Viswanatham, Dr.
Solanki, Shri Surajbhanu	Yadav, Shri Chhotey Singh
Sonkar, Shri Kalpnath	Yadav, Shri Hukumdeo Narayan
Soz, Prof. Saif-ud-din	Yadava, Shri Ramjilal
Sukhbuns Kaur, Shrimati	Yazdani, Dr. Golam
Sultanpuri, Shri K.D.	Yuvraj, Shri
Suman, Shri Ramji lal	MR. SPEAKER: Subject to corection, *
Sumbrui, Shri Bagun	the result of the Division is:
Sundararaj, Shri N.	Ayes : 83
Thambi Durai, Dr.	Noes : 206
Thomas, Prof. K.V.	<i>The motion was negatived</i>

\* The following Members also recorded their votes.

**Ayes** : Sarvashree Shopat Singh Makkasar, Ajay Singh, Satyapal Singh Yadav, Taslimudin

**Noes** : Shri Chandra Shekhar, Shri Kapil Dev Shastri, Shri Kamaluddin Ahmed, Shri Nandi Yellaiah, Smt. T. Manemma, Shri Manku Ram Sodhi.