

15.59 hrs.

**MOTION RE : PRESENT SITUATION  
IN SOUTH AFRICA**

[English]

**THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE  
MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS  
(SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO) :** I beg to  
move :

"That this House do consider the  
present situation in South Africa".

As the House is aware, the Commonwealth Heads of Government Review Meeting was held in London from August 3 to 5, 1986, in pursuance of the Commonwealth Accord of Nassau on the question of South Africa. The Summit discussed the report of the Eminent Persons' Group and the measures that the Commonwealth should adopt against South Africa for its refusal to heed its call to end apartheid. As per the final communique, known as the 'Malborough House Communique', six of the seven leaders agreed to the following measures and commended them to the rest of the Commonwealth and the wider international community for urgent adoption and implementation :

"(i) All the measures listed in Paragraph 7 of the Nassau Accord namely :

(i) A ban on air links with South Africa;

16.00 hrs.

**[SHRI VAKKOM PURUSHOTHAMAN  
in the Chair]**

(ii) A ban on new investments or reinvestments of profits earned in South Africa; (iii) A ban on the import of agricultural products; (iv) Termination of Double Taxation Agreement with South Africa; (v) the termination of all Government assistance to investment in and trade with South Africa; (vi) A ban on all Government procurement in South Africa; (vii) A ban on Government contracts with majority owned South African companies; and (viii) A ban on promotion of tourism to South Africa.

Secondly, the six leaders agreed to the following additional measures, measures in addition to what the same countries had decided in Nassau : It means that they further agreed, in view of the more serious situation in South Africa, to compel the South African Government to move peacefully towards dismantling the apartheid. These additional measures are : (i) A ban on all new bank loans to South Africa whether to public or private sector; (ii) A ban on the import of uranium, coal, iron and steel from South Africa; and (iii) The withdrawal of all consular facilities in South Africa except for our own nationals and nationals of third countries to whom we render consular services.

As far as the British Government is concerned, they were not a party to the agreement of the Six and they came forward with this declaration that they will (i) put a voluntary ban on new investment in South Africa; (ii) put a voluntary ban on the promotion of tourism to South Africa; and (iii) accept and implement any EEC decision to ban the import of coal, iron and steel and of gold coins from South Africa.

Sanctions, economic measures, resolutions are not an end in themselves but a means to an end. The objective is the dismantling of apartheid.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, Apartheid is an elaborate system of laws and rules applied resolutely by the Government of South Africa to ensure that a small minority of white race retains all political and economic powers while the majority of the people, who belong to other races are totally segregated and reduced to living in misery and human degradation, deprived of all opportunities in terms of education, housing, sanitary facilities and of any real opportunities in improving their conditions of living. It is the Government which decides who resides where, who will go to which school, who will benefit from which facilities and the determining factor is always the racial group to which one belongs. This social and political structure is obviously repugnant to all principles of justice, equity or human dignity. As the 'Eminent Persons' Group has pointed out in its report :

[Shri Eduardo Faleiro]

"as a contrivance of social engineering it is awesome in its cruelty. It is achieved and sustained only through force creating human misery and deprivation and blighting the lives of millions".

India has been in the forefront of the struggle against Apartheid, and this struggle has occupied a pivotal place in the thinking of the leaders of India from Mahatma Gandhi to Jawaharlal Nehru to Shrimati Indira Gandhi. From the time, the people of India led the destinies of our country, the process of severing our relations with South Africa in all areas began. Our campaign to mobilise the international community against apartheid, began with the introduction by India as early as in 1946 in the United Nations General Assembly of the question of racial discrimination in South Africa. This campaign has continued in the United Nations, in the Non-Aligned Movement within the Commonwealth and in all the other international forums available. As a result of increased international opinion, there are now very few protagonists of the apartheid system. Yet some while admitting that apartheid is inadmissible, lend indirect support to the continuance of that regime. In the United Nations during the last two decades, the number of Governments supporting the General Assembly Resolutions calling for an end to apartheid and for the application of economic sanctions against South Africa has consistently and substantially increased. The non-aligned movement remains solidly united in its firm opposition to apartheid. Liberal opinion in all the continents and enlightened Governments all over the world are with leaders like Nelson Mandela and organizations such as the African National Congress in their just and heroic struggle to bring an end to that revolting social and political system.

The Commonwealth of nations has been increasingly preoccupied with the question of South Africa. Increasingly, Members of the Commonwealth have ranged on the side of those supporting change in that country. The question of apartheid has been the central preoccupation of the

Commonwealth since its decision in Nassau in 1985 to promote dismantling of apartheid, to ask for the release of political prisoners in that country, and unbanning of the African National Congress and such other political organizations. The Nassau Accord marked a major advance in the struggle against apartheid in that the Commonwealth committed itself to bring about the end of the system through persuasion if possible, but through peaceful coercion, if necessary. This is the perspective through which we see the Nassau Accord.

As envisaged in the Nassau Accord, an Eminent Persons' Group was formed and an eminent Indian, Sardar Swaran Singh, was a member of that Group. The Group worked for the achievement of the task assigned to it, which was to promote dialogue in South Africa. The document that the Group produced is a most dispassionate study of the system of apartheid, in addition to being the most thorough condemnation of the senseless intransigence of the Botha regime.

As the hon. Members are aware, the Nassau Accord comprised a package of measures to be adopted by the members of the Commonwealth immediately, and allowed the Botha regime six months during which it could, in cooperation with the Eminent Persons Group, initiate a process of dialogue and liberalisation which, it was hoped, would lead to the dismantling of apartheid. The Accord then provided for further measures—which matters are contained in paragraphs 7 and 8—to be adopted by the Commonwealth if, within six months, the South African Government failed to make any concrete progress towards a dialogue. The Eminent Persons Group reported that it had failed to initiate that dialogue.

At the Commonwealth Heads of Government Review Meeting held in London from August 3 to 5 last, six of the seven leaders came to an unanimous view on further action to be taken by them. The British Government set its face from the beginning against the very principle of sanctions, but eventually accepted the principle of some measures which were to my mind, and to the minds of all

Governments, almost insignificant in terms of their economic or political impact.

While regretting the absence of an unanimous agreement at London, we do believe that the anti-apartheid cause emerged stronger inasmuch as six of the participants preferred to adopt effective measures against South Africa, rather than make doubtful compromises in order to keep up the pretence of unanimity.

The role played by Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi in the difficult negotiations that led to the unanimous resolve of the Six in imposing measures, even beyond those agreed at Nassau, was crucial. As the Prime Minister pointed out, the Commonwealth is the first international organization to impose specific economic measures against South Africa. We are confident that the rest of the Commonwealth countries will support and implement the decisions taken in London, and the world community must now work towards the larger area of agreement on sanctions, so that apartheid is effectively dismantled, and dismantled soon.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Motion moved :

"That this House do consider the present situation in South Africa".

SHRI B.B. RAMAIAH (Eluru) : Sir, this is a very important subject to which the whole world's attention is now drawn. In fact, in the last few months, we were always discussing this issue; and as our hon. Minister put it, at the Bahamas, somehow our Prime Minister was able to bring about some unanimity among the whole Commonwealth countries, to appoint an eight-member committee called the Eminent Persons' Group. They have done some work; and as our Minister says, they visited South Africa and they also tried their best to see what they can do to implement the sanctions they were all trying to seek. Unfortunately, as the recent Mini Commonwealth Summit has shown, not much result has come out of it.

They also had a discussion with Nelson Mandela, a very reasonable person with whom the South African Government should have taken a chance to bring that normalcy

within the country even though he was in jail for 20 years; still he was not very much prejudiced; he still feels that the country can be able to maintain it and even the minority whites can live together and have equal rights. We can also see Kenya where for the last 25 years the minority whites are able to maintain a very reasonable, decent life. Probably, recently, Rhodesia had the same experience; they are the largest community engaged in agriculture and whites are able to have equal rights and they are able to maintain democracy without any problems whatsoever. These are the various things under which the South African Government still feels that they can be able to somehow teach these blacks in a very unreasonable, indecent type of attitude. As I had just now explained, the way in which the blacks' livelihood has become so discriminative, schools in which they have to go and the places where they can live, everything has been so crucially limited that there is no alternative except they have to take alternative measures; and there is no necessity for them at all to impose an emergency; and they can recognise the present system of various organisations very reasonable, amicable, and they are willing to support democracy. The only thing is that they are asking for equal rights just like any other nation does where democracy exists each individual has one vote—and they elect their own people who run the country.

The people who talk about human rights like the United States and Britain, I do not know what has happened to these people in spite of the whole world opposing to it. In the United States, several times this issue has come up, as our hon. Minister has put it, its momentum is increasing more and more to support the stand that we have all to take about the system in South Africa. Even in the United States, there are so many blacks. You can see a number of Chicagos. For example, the Corporation of Chicago has got a mayor who is a black man. But there is no difficulty at all for them to live together. They are also equally human people; there is no difference at all; and in spite of all that, they talk about these things that all over the world there are people who are trying to support the South African regime. Even though Mrs. Margaret Thatcher and Mr.

[Sbri B.B. Ramaiab]

Reagan are supporting South Africa, you can see that people of these countries are not in favour of it. In the Senate recently a committee was appointed which opposed what Reagan had been preaching. They are trying to support this sanctions which were imposed for the system that is going on; and these sanctions, as he has mentioned, are not only about banking system but for trade and various other methods also by which we should be able to squeeze South Africa and bring them to a level where they should come to terms and understand with the rest of the world. The only way in which they can be able to do is tighten even our independent zone countries and can be able to impose a ban on the things that are moving to South Africa; probably that may also give some effect. But I do not know how far other countries will be able to take that position and will be able to come to that level and restrict the movement of the vessels that go to South Africa. But this is only one of the things that we can think about. As our Minister says, many Commonwealth Nations in which our Prime Minister played an important role, these six nations willingly supported our point of view except Britain, as he said, which is going to make a very minor concession which is in no way useful. Even Queen Elizabeth is not in favour of what is being done by the British Government. Mrs. Margaret Thatcher is thinking entirely different.

And the people of Britain also, probably if you take any majority voting at this stage, they may have a different attitude. But if the South African system is allowed to continue, then it is going to be a very dangerous thing. You can see that recently there were raids on neighbouring countries which is very harmful and it is aggression, and though we should have taken a serious view of it, still we are trying to see whether we will be able to negotiate and bring this to a reasonable level so that we can bring it to the table for discussion and understanding. And so far, even these efforts have not helped us. There may be another alternative, I feel, by controlling the gold price. If the big countries can offer to cooperate, and the gold price can be reduced substantially low, but I do not

situation. That is the major item which South Africa has been able to control and their position is strong. If the price of gold comes down, what is going to happen? What happened to oil prices? Oil prices have come down; oil and coal had come down. If you can make it with the oil Prices, why not with gold. If you can make the position tight, or if we can impose an embargo, then the things may be different. Even then there are other trading channels.

There is another thinking. There are people who think that if Britain agrees and if there is a ban, then their trade will be changed to Asian countries like Korea, Japan and some other countries. I do not think that this will happen. Because, the world is changing. Of course, there are others who think that that will not happen. Whatever they think about it, if you think that this business will be shifted to somebody else, it will not be a correct attitude for this cause. But while we have so many other methods, whatever it is possible we are using very reasonable methods, and very moderate type of system that we are following and we are not able to come to any understanding. I do not know whether this OAU organisation or the NAM organisation can also do something and even though the non-aligned countries are unanimously supporting our point of view, and Mahatma Gandhi was the person who had started the struggle about the conditions in South Africa, even after more than fifty years we are not able to get any successful outcome out of it.

What are the other alternatives? You think about it. If the nations are not going to implement the sanctions, some people think that even though the sanctions are there they may not be implemented, properly. But what happened in some other countries? What happened in Libya, Poland and other countries? If the situation can work well in those countries why is it not possible in South Africa? That is where the question of sanctions comes. Some are saying that it is difficult to impose these sanctions and theoretically they may not appear to be successful, but when they were successful in some other place, then why can they not be successful in this particular case also? These are the various points on which we have to do something effectively. If the imposition of these sanctions which



is a major thing is done sincerely then we will be able to bring them down and they have to agree for the conditions of other nations, and they will follow. And I hope with our good support and with our good intentions from the beginning and all that we have been doing in this area, we may be able to come out successful one day or the other, not too long—we do not know how long it will take. But we once again turn, to the countries which are responsible for this situation, which are those countries? Britain, United States, and to some extent may be Germany these are the major countries responsible for it. Some of these countries are openly supporting South Africa. But only few people are going behind these people and they are still continuing with their support to South Africa. More and more people are agreeing that the sanctions will be successfully implemented and things will go against South Africa. Those people who talk about human rights should realise and see sincerely what they are doing. They are theoretically talking about it.

I hope that we will be able to do something and our country will be able to achieve the results, what we aim.

**SHRI DINESH SINGH (Pratapgarh) :** In its long history, the world has been many forms of domination and many forms of oppression but none as abominable as the racial discrimination. In our life time, we have seen racial discrimination practised in two countries—one was Germany of Adolf Hitler and the second is South Africa of President Botha. To get rid of racial discrimination in Germany, the world had to go through the Second World War. Millions of people lost their lives and the loss of property cannot be calculated. The question that is before us is what will cost to end the second racial discrimination that we see amongst ourselves today.

India has played a very important role in an effort to eliminate racial discrimination in South Africa beginning from the Father of our Nation, Mahatma Gandhi, who started the struggle in South Africa, to the successive Governments and the present Government of Mr. Rajiv Gandhi, who is continuing the struggle from outside South Africa. The answer to racial discrimination

is only one and that is its abolition. There can be no compromise. There can be no adjustment. To abolish racial discrimination the question is whether the world will find a peaceful method or whether a more violent method will have to be adopted to get rid of this crime against humanity. The effort of India and many other countries has been to try to find a peaceful method to transform the racist minority Government in South Africa into a majority democratic Government, because it is only in this manner that we can bring about an end to apartheid.

I am happy that the world community has been actively engaged in this process to find an end to this form of racial discrimination. The United Nations has taken an active part and has tried to find a peaceful solution to this problem. The whole Non-Aligned Movement as well as many other countries in the world have actively engaged in this process. What is the method by which we can find a peaceful solution? Mrs. Thatcher said that the peaceful solution should be a dialogue. We are for a dialogue. We accept that dialogue is necessary to find a peaceful solution. It is towards this objective that the Commonwealth countries' meeting in Nassau set up the Eminent Persons Group to try to have a dialogue with the Government of South Africa. Their recommendations are embodied in the text of the Commonwealth Group that has met in London recently. And it says :

“At present, there is no genuine intention on the part of the South African Government to dismantle apartheid and no present prospect of a process of a dialogue leading to the establishment of a non-racial and representative government.”

It is this dialogue which Mrs. Thatcher recommends, in which we have been exploring the possibility of progress including the labourers of the Eminent Persons Group. But the dialogue in South Africa has come again to a deadlock. They say that South Africa is not interested in a dialogue, it has no desire to change the present system of apartheid. Now, what is the recommendation of this Eminent Persons Group itself? The Eminent

[Shri Dinesh Singh]

Persons Group's conclusion is that the absence of effective economic pressure on South Africa and the belief of the South African authorities that it need not be feared reactually deferring change. What they have found is that South African Government is unlikely to change this system unless there is economic pressure on South Africa, and there is a belief in South Africa that this economic pressure will be applied. And this is all that we are asking for at this stage. We know that it is not an end in itself but it is an essential beginning. It is to continue this dialogue, to put force behind this dialogue that we seek economic sanctions.

I am very happy that the Commonwealth Group meeting in London has come out with an unanimous communique except for the disagreement of the British Government represented by Mrs. Thatcher. Mrs. Thatcher calls economic sanctions 'immoral'. The other day reading a newspaper, I came across an interesting letter written to the editor which I would wish to share with this august House. I will read out only small portions of it. It says and I quote :

"Paul Kruger once said that one who would create the future must not forget the past; we have conveniently forgotten our part in the crimes against humanity committed in South Africa. Compromise with the Boers and their policies towards the blacks became entrenched in treaties and constitutions; it suited our exploitation of mineral and agricultural wealth and provided cheap labour controlled by crushing force. It led inexorably to segregation of all the races, to the evil system of apartheid, to white supremacy for profit and a totalitarian state that now threatens the profit it was meant to defend and the peace and prosperity of the whole of southern Africa, if not the world.

Twenty-five million black people are enslaved by apartheid today, as their forefathers were enslaved by the first Boers to arrive in the Cape in 1652, over 300 years ago. Incompetent and disastrous interventions by a

succession of British governments since 1806 were the direct cause of this".

This is a letter written by one Mr. P.C. Edwards of Surrey to the weekly *Guardian* of July 13, 1986.

If Mrs. Thatcher feels that the earlier action of British Government in supporting apartheid was moral, then of course a change from that would be immoral. But I think that the situation from that time has changed very much. Large sections of the British people including their leaders, for example, Mr. Heath, the former Prime Minister, Mr. Leon Brittan, former Trade and Industry Minister, large number of Members of Parliament, larger number of people's organisations in Britain are against apartheid. They find apartheid immoral, not sanctions against apartheid immoral. Therefore, we find a situation in which regrettably the United Kingdom government led by Mrs. Thatcher is against not only world opinion, the opinion in the Commonwealth, but also a large section of the opinion in her own country. Sir, it is a matter of some satisfaction that the rest of the Commonwealth has held together. In this tragic moment when Britain which was the leaders of the Commonwealth has gone astray, the rest of the commonwealth has got together to give lead to its people and to show to the world that the Commonwealth has a view and a purpose. In that direction also I would like to mention that it also reflects the change in the commonwealth. The Commonwealth is no longer a British commonwealth. It is established as a Commonwealth of 49 members and that even if the United Kingdom takes a different view, the Commonwealth is quite competent to take a view of its own. It has also demonstrated that it is not a racial commonwealth, that it takes a non-racial view, that its membership is non-racial and that it is working on the basis of building a homogenous society. I therefore would greatly welcome the results of the Commonwealth Group Meeting in London, realising that it was regrettable that the United Kingdom Government stood otherwise. I should also like to take this opportunity to congratulate our Prime Minister Mr. Rajiv Gandhi for the very active and constructive role he played in bringing about a Commonwealth view which was different to the

United Kingdom, but which incorporated the wishes of the Commonwealth. There are certain difficulties that certain Members of the Commonwealth would face if there is a total sanction against South Africa. He has come out to say that the rest of the Commonwealth and perhaps the international community as a whole should come to assist to ensure that undue hardship is avoided.

Another point in this connection which is made from time to time by the United Kingdom Government and also by President Reagan and some of his supporters is this. They say that the sanction would harm the black population of South Africa. We had earlier heard such sentiments during our own struggle for independence that the Indians would not be able to govern themselves and independence would only harm them. Mr. Churchill in his infamous speech in the House of Commons said this and I am sure Mr. Indrajit Gupta would remember it; he was probably there at that time. But it is up to the people of South Africa to choose between the hardship that they would have to face under any kind of total embargo or to live under the hateful system of apartheid. They have chosen to bear this hardship and to live in freedom and equality. It is not for us to say that the hardship would not be borne by them. Of course, it would be borne by them. Who are we to deny them the opportunity to live in freedom?

Another point that is made from time to time is that any kind of total sanction against South Africa would cut them off from the rest of the world and would make a dialogue more difficult. I am amazed at such kind of a statement. The British Government should realise that another conservative Prime Minister Mr. Harold Macmillan was one of the votaries to the expulsion of South Africa from the Commonwealth. The Principle of isolating South Africa was accepted, South Africa was thrown out of the commonwealth, it was thrown out of the United Nations Organisation. It is not a question of isolating South Africa, it is a question of telling the racist minority regime in South Africa that its policies are not welcome to the world, that if it persists in its policy,

Blacks it is the Whites who will be the losers; because what do the Blacks have today? Fifteen per cent of the Whites in South Africa have 80 per cent of the best land available in that country and 70 per cent of the wealth and income of South Africa, and 85 per cent of others, the majority of which are Blacks own only 13 per cent of the worst land and enjoy only a negligible portion of the prosperity that they have built. Therefore, they have nothing more to lose than what they already have been dispossessed. I would, therefore, say that the only answer that we have today to have a meaningful dialogue with South Africa to compel it to change its policy of apartheid is to have total economic sanctions against South Africa. Then it will begin to understand that the world community has a view and that it is willing to enforce on it. In this respect, Sir, I whole-heartedly support the action of the Government of India.

SHRIMATI SHEILA KAUL (Lucknow) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, India's interest in South Africa is very old. Gandhiji started his movement in South Africa against the apartheid. We know how he organised the movement against apartheid for the down-trodden and against racial discrimination.

The first delegation of the Indian National Congress went to South Africa under the leadership of Shrimati Sarojini Naidu and that was long ago, in the year 1925. Since then, the Indian National Congress sustained its interest in the future of the people of South Africa and in this, the Opposition also took a very keen interest along with the rest of the country here. Eighty per cent of the foreign investment in South Africa is held by Italy, Britain, France, West Germany, Japan and the United States, which gives them a profit of 20 per cent. Cheap Black labour is utilised for this purpose, and if these countries withdraw their investments, apartheid would collapse. These powerful countries should understand the equality of the human race and not allow their material gains to overshadow other human interests.

The Commonwealth countries met at

[Shrimati Shella Kaul]

Britain to be one with them in inducing South Africa to do some re-thinking to give a better deal to its people. How long will South Africa continue to defy the world opinion? The United Nations Secretary-General appealed to the South African Government to abandon apartheid and to hold talks with leaders there. Vigorous attempts have been made to persuade President Botha to take notice of international opinion. They also adopted a common programme of action which was conveyed to the authorities in Pretoria. It was expected that perhaps a dialogue will start and there will be suspension of violence but nothing of that sort took place. Instead as they suggested that Nelson Mandela and other political leaders may be released, more repressive measures have been adopted by the Pretoria regime.

Last week, our Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi went to London to attend the 7-Nation Commonwealth Summit to discuss the situation. The British Prime Minister must have felt isolated when six other members agreed on the measures to be taken against South Africa, which were mentioned just now. Among them, the important measures are :

- (a) a ban on new bank loans;
- (b) a ban on import of uranium, iron and steel, coal from South Africa;
- (c) withdrawal of all consular facilities in South Africa except for our own nationals.

All the bans were added, besides the former 8 bans that were already there. South Africa Government insistence on continuing apartheid on the people of the land to which they belong to, and U.K.'s stand at the mini-commonwealth summit is all abhorrent to us.

Mrs. Margaret Thatcher should realise that a generous heat receives more than what it gives. Let her not be a partner to the sufferings in South Africa along with President Botha. The world community must rise to put an end to apartheid in

South Africa by pressing the pretoria regime to see the reason.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY (Katwa) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, today's discussion is about the situation in South Africa. We are seeing in South Africa today that the movement against apartheid of the people in South Africa—Blacks, others and even a section of the Whites—has reached a stage where the indomitable fighters are too forward to attain liberation, attain freedom from the race discrimination. On the other side, what we see is the efforts by many countries in the international forum including the Commonwealth to have a dialogue with the Pretoria regime so that they give up the policy of apartheid and ensure the policy of majority people rule in South Africa that has faced with frustration. Now, what has been said in the London Declaration of the 7 countries is this. It gives us a clear picture about the situation. It says :

“It is thus clear to us that since our meeting in Nassau, there has not been adequate concrete progress that we looked for there. Instead the situation has deteriorated.

Now, it is further said :

“We were profoundly disappointed that Pretoria has taken none of the 5 steps.”

Still, Nelson Mandela is in prison. A new and more widely repressive emergency has been imposed. Political freedom has been curtailed. African National Congress and other parties have been banned. The background of this meeting was the report of the eminent persons group that it was within their responsibility to review, to assess the situation that is prevailing in South Africa and now the proposed sanctions could be enforced. Now what they have said has already been mentioned by Mr. Dinesh Singh. They have said that South Africa is not in a position to dismantle apartheid and there is no prospect of a dialogue. So what we expected from the London Mini-summit? A very stringent measure against not only apartheid regime but also against the British Government who are protecting and abetting



apartheid in that country. There are others also. USA is also responsible. I am happy that out of 7, six are on one side. That is a very good symptom. But what we did there when Mrs. Thatcher virtually refused to accept the propositions of NASSAU ?

AN HON. MEMBER : You cannot pull up their hairs.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : If you send Margaret Alva, she can do it.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : Even when, Prime Minister, before going to London, even in our country, in interviews he said that "We do not rule out expulsion of Britain." We were enthused by that, that something will happen if Mrs. Thatcher denies to impose sanctions against South Africa. Britain is the largest foreign investor in South Africa. What is at stake for Britain in South Africa is 16.5 billion dollars and Britain is the third largest trading partner. We know the history of sanctions against the apartheid regime. What we did in 1946, that was taken by UN General Assembly in 1962 and when UN General Assembly adopted the resolution for sanction against apartheid regime, the Guardian of London wrote :

"If Britain alone were to apply it, South Africa will be in danger of collapse. Clearly the UN expects Britain to give the lead."

It is not the question of today, not the question of meeting in London, but it is a very long-drawn stand taken by Britain to help apartheid regime in South Africa. We knew it and when the meeting was taking place in London, the expectation was that these people who are meeting there will take Britain to task. Any way they ave done a good thing and Britain was isolated. We all know that said that it is not a question of isolating apartheid regime, alone they are isolated from international community but, those who are, in a clandestine method, helping them, the need of the time is to isolate them. How we are going to isolate this lady who is leading that country and which has the tradition of democracy but who is defying

everything and all world opinion so arrogantly ?

What Britain has to say ? They have to adopt something and that is insignificant cosmetic sanction. What have we said ? Mrs. Thatcher has said that the ban on import of coal, steel, iron and gold coins will be decided along with the EEC companies. If they take a decision in this regard, then we will take a decision. Does not it constitute a slap on the face of Commonwealth ? What dignity remains for the Commonwealth when she said "I do not bother about you. I do care a straw for you, for this Commonwealth of 7 or 8 or 9. Everything of mine depends on the conditions of EEC." ? So we have to think about it and how daringly they are defying public opinion. For todays discussion the immediate background is, of course, the mini Commonwealth summit. You have expressed regret. In the Mini Summit declaration the role of Britain has been regretted by the States. I understand Canada is there, Australia is there. But even here the ruling Party Members are not going beyond regretting it. It has to be condemned. The stand taken by Britain has to be condemned. (*Interruptions*) You have condemned it ? Very good. I appreciate.

On the one side we see the role of UK and on another side we see the role of USA and how they are helping the apartheid and apartheid as Samora Machel of Mozambique has said during the NAM summit in Delhi, is the Nazism of our time. What is the situation ? In 1983 US investment in South Africa reached 15,000 million dollars. 400 US companies and out of them 60 are big companies. They are exploiting South African black people, According to UN statistics, in the period of 1970-80, leading Bank of the world supplied 200 loans worth 7000 million dollars to South Africa. Despite UN Arms embargo—Security Council resolution 418 of 1977, it is the USA that is defying this embargo and there are concrete evidences that in the name of supplying arms to other countries, arms are being supplied to South Africa. High nuclear technology is being supplied by USA to South Africa and by this method they are not only helping apartheid to remain in power but also are

[Shri Saifuddin Chowdhary]

trying to see that these countries in Africa which have attained liberation, their economy suffers and that South Africa has become the base of imperialism to attack these newly liberated countries, the frontline countries. In 1981 alone South Africa made on an average five armed attacks on Angola a day. It is occupying more than 50,000 sq. km. of Angolan territory.

Now what should we do in our country? We have got another background. We have suffered and we raised the demand to boycott the Commonwealth Games. Does it suit our country that when Mrs. Thatcher denies and so arrogantly refuses to accept and when we told our players that this is our commitment to certain principles, that after the summit we declare that we are happy that the Commonwealth will remain together and we declare that we have no objection to Queen being the formal head of this institution? Why?...*(Interruptions)* Expel Britain from Commonwealth...*(Interruptions)* A good feature, no doubt, that a new kind of leadership as has been claimed by many, has emerged with India, Canada and Australia. They have the duty to see that we are able to take effective steps to isolate Britain and USA. How they are dependent on the Third world countries we have to see that. We see that in the USA 4 out of 5 new jobs in the late seventies were directly linked with foreign trade. 1 in 10 of the US workers in manufacturing jobs to-day are involved in the export trade and 40% of the overall growth in US exports in recent years can be traced to the trade with less developed countries of the south. This I am quoting from an ILO feature that appeared in the *Business Standard* of 9.4.85. It is not that they are powerful. The so-called poor nations—it is they who are powerful. It is these countries who are exploit us. Their survival is dependent on us. Now, how can we take a step? In that mini-Commonwealth Summit or whatever that is called—in the Declaration it is said that within the confines of the Commonwealth alone we just cannot do much, but we have to go beyond, to the international community. How are we going to ensure that? Today we have seen that six countries

have declared sanction and they have appealed to the other Commonwealth countries to do it. But what is the South African Government doing? They are imposing counter-sanction on the frontline African States. They are trying to subvert their economy. Now it becomes our duty to see how we stand by those countries in the hour of crisis, how we are able to help them in dispelling or warding off the conspiracies of the South African regime.

Another point is this. We have the power with us. We cannot suffer this kind of inhuman policy that is being pursued by the apartheid regime in South Africa. We sometimes feel helpless that so many nations are opposed to it, so many sanctions are adopted by different international fora, including the United Nations and still nothing happens. Are we really so helpless that we cannot do anything; that apartheid cannot be dismantled? Now we have to seriously think how we can put pressure on not only South Africa but on America and Great Britain, what can be done. Here one voice has been raised in Latin American countries. "Do not pay the debt that is there with America, Great Britain and other rich nations". Mr. Fidel Castro has given this slogan: "Do not hand over one trillion dollars in the next ten years". We have to think how we are going to put pressure on them.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : We can take the same attitude towards IMF also.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : Accepting the Queen as Head of the Commonwealth will not solve the problem. The role of Britain not only in the context of South Africa but also in the context of our own country is clear to us. We have to take a lead. The point is, how we can take a lead. We have to inspire the other countries as we did in 1946 and also afterwards as we took a role when South African was expelled from the Commonwealth during the regime of a Tory Government. Now, what has another Tory Government done? Anyway, we have to think how to put pressure on them.

We are purchasing arms from Britain. They are desperately trying to sell arms. Apart from this, they have many other things to all. There are different companies like Westmoreland Helicopter. Why did you take it? You could say: "If you do not impose sanctions, we will cancel the Westmoreland helicopter purchase for the ONGC; we will cancel the deals about Sea Harriers and Sea Eagles". Why should we have links with them? I am not demanding that we sever our relations with them, diplomatic or any such thing. But we can certainly think in league with other countries...

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please conclude.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : Everyday has said that economic sanction in itself is not the end but a means to achieve a particular end. The people there are fighting, they are shedding their blood. Mandela is in prison; so many others are also behind the bars; and they have been behind the bars for the major part of their youth...

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please conclude.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : One point more. I have seen, the Prime Minister has said that any military help to the people is ruled out. Why? We are non-violent; I have no objection...

AN HON. MEMBER : Who said ?

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : It has come in the papers. We have seen that Mugabe has said and repeated that we should form an Asian African Defence. We are non-violent...

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please conclude.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : I must tell you how they are using this...

17.00 hrs.

MR. CHAIRMAN : There is some time restriction. We will have to finish it today and so many leaders from the opposition have to speak.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : How is the Botha Government trying to

exploit this particular sentiment, this particular sentiment of non-violence? Our country which is the land of Mahatma Gandhi preaches non-violence and we helped in the making of the film "Gandhi." Botha took that up tried to show it to the people and told them to be non-violent. There are protests from...

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please resume your seat. Nothing more will go on record. Nothing more will be recorded. I have given you enough time.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA (Bankura) : He is now concluding.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Instead of suppresing South Africa you are suppressing the Member !

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : I must say that we should not rule out any possibility. We must take lead to inspire other countries and effectively take steps to dismantle apartheid. With these words I conclude Sir.

17.03 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

SHRI BIPIN PAL DAS (Tezpur) : I fail to understand what was the purport of Chowdhary's speech, whether he wanted to condemn apartheid and South Africa or he wanted to bring in something else. He condemned Commonwealth. I think, in my opinion, the recent decision of the Mini Commonwealth is a very big step forward. He has talked of Margaret Thatcher or Britain leading the Commonwealth. He must read properly that in this Mini Commonwealth it is Mrs. Margaret Thatcher and UK who have been completely isolated. You want expulsion. (Interruptions)...

Mr. Barrister Saheb, you are interrupting me. But I do not interrupt anybody.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Therefore, you address the Chair, nobody will interrupt you.

**SHRI BIPIN PAL DAS :** South Africa is the last resort of imperialism. The minority rule over majority is continuing there. It is nothing but dictatorship. They are committing atrocities, indiscriminate killings and putting into prison a large number of people including leaders like Nelson Mandela.

They have even defied United Nations and the entire international community. But one by one, step by step, white rule has come to an end in Africa. The white rule in Rhodesia which is now known as Zimbabwe, Angola or Mozambique has come to an end step by step. This must be taken note of by people who want to support Mr. Botha indirectly.

They are continuing illegally. White minority has absolutely no right to rule over the majority. South Africa has no legal right to continue its authority on Namibia. Their mandatory authority has long been over. They have defied United Nations in this regard. South Africa is trying to become a Nuclear Power. God alone knows whether they have already become nuclear power.

They have become a source of breach of international peace in the whole world. They have even become aggressive against their neighbours. South Africa and apartheid have become a very dangerous type of disease—more than cancer—in international politics of today.

It was Mahatma Gandhi who was the first to raise the banner of revolt against apartheid on the soil of apartheid, on the soil of South Africa. Let that be remembered. It was not Lenin or Stalin. (Interruptions).

It was Mahatma Gandhi who was the first man to raise this banner of revolt against apartheid long before you woke up. India was the first nation to raise this issue in the forum of United Nations even before Independence. If I am wrong please correct me. Even before Independence India was the first nation to raise this issue in the United Nations. We are deeply committed on this. We want an end to this apartheid system.

We have given support to the African

moral support but also material support to them. Please take note of that, (Interruptions).

Sir, a question was raised that we are committed to non-violence. The African National Congress and SWAPO are engaged in a violent struggle. How could we support this ? Let me educate Mr. Chowdhary on this. (Interruptions) Please listen to me first. What did Gandhiji say ? Gandhiji said that a rat has every right to use violence against a cat. He supported rat's violence against cat. When a woman asked if I am molested by a 'goonda' how could I defend my honour in a non-violent manner. Gandhiji said use your teeth and nails. That is non-violence. So don't mis-interpret it.

Therefore, in the situation of South Africa and Namibia there is absolutely no other way except for the people to go in for a violent struggle and we have to support them.

I welcome the statement made by Mr. Faleiro about the outcome of the recent mini-Commonwealth. In this meeting U.K. has been completely isolated. The Prime Minister has said that Britain is no longer the leader of Commonwealth. More facts are coming and will come. Please have patience. We were the first to impose sanctions. There was a time when India imposed sanctions but China had trade relations with South Africa.

It is regrettable and condemnable that countries like U.K. and USA are whole-hearted supporters of this racial regime in South Africa. We congratulate those countries who have joined hands with us in the Commonwealth to agree to apply sanctions against South Africa.

Let USA and UK and Mr. Botha know that the days of imperialism and colonialism are over, and they would not stay there for too long. The freedom struggle of the black majority against the white minority has streamrolled the conspiracies and imperialist designs in South Africa, as I have already mentioned. It must and shall succeed in South Africa and Namibia. It cannot be stopped. Let Mr. Botha and his patrons read the writings on the wa



and behave accordingly. Either they should voluntarily surrender or these mighty forces of freedom fighters and the entire world will compel them to go out of South Africa. History cannot be stopped by anybody. History has its own course and it will follow its course; it has followed its course all these years. In the last forty or fifty years, particularly after India became independent, one by one, many countries became independent. It had its effect the world over. That is the process of the history and that cannot be stopped. It could not be stopped in Indonesia, it could not be stopped in Angola, and it could not be stopped in Mozambique and it cannot be stopped in South Africa. They are bound to succeed and we have to give moral and material support, and as my friend, Shri Dinesh Goswami said, end this problem through negotiations, as far as possible. We have to use all the weapons.

I would like to emphasise on one aspect. More important than the outside pressure, it is the pressure to be built up inside by the people of South Africa themselves and we have to lend our support to them in their struggle both moral and material.

7.12 hrs.

[MR SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY (Mahbubnagar) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, Apartheid is the greatest moral issue facing the mankind today next only perhaps to the nuclear armament. I do not want to indulge in inanities, but the most tragic ironical aspect of the situation is not merely the inconceivable inhumanity of the system, but the strange and inexplicable kind of helplessness of the humanity to prevent it. How do we go about meeting the situation? That is the question, I think, to which all of us must have to address ourselves. The helplessness has been arising mainly from a kind of complicity of the two leading members of the western alliance, namely the United States and the Great Britain.

As has been pointed out earlier, the United Nations passed a resolution way back in 1962 calling for universal mandatory economic sanctions. Twenty-five years have

since elapsed. The system became more oppressive and helplessness also appears to be increasing. The arguments advanced by President Reagan against economic sanctions are rather strange. Reagan appears to think that sanctions from his point of view would be quite affective against Libya, against Nicaragua and against Vietnam. But he somehow thinks that sanctions could be counter-productive only in South Africa. Sir, recently, I was shocked when Reagan described the African National Congress outlawed in South Africa as communist and terrorist. I am amazed at this kind of tendency on the part of Reagan and friends of his ilk who see a communist behind every bush.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Jadavpur) : What is wrong with communists ?

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : I am not finding any fault with the communists. I am only saying that all those who fight for their liberation or independence are not necessarily communists.

Today, Margaret Thatcher has been isolated not only in the Commonwealth. I find her being isolated in her own country. But, of course, she is unrepentant. The argument is that the sanctions would hurt the Blacks! It is a very strange argument, more particularly when the Blacks are prepared to suffer the loss that may accrue to them from the enforcement of the sanctions. The British Government was setting a lot of store in the Mission of George Howe, which was destined to be a failure from the beginning. It was boycotted by all the African leaders, even by such a moderate leader as Bishop Desmond Tutu.

India for its part Sir, did well in boycotting the Commonwealth Games. But I would like the Minister of External Affairs to tell us as to why India was not the first nation, but the twenty-fourth nation to have done that.

Sir, it is heartening to note that the Blacks themselves within South Africa have intensified their struggle and the effects of their intense struggle are being felt by the Whites themselves. Therefore, for the first

[Shri S. Jaipal Reddy]

time, you find a minority of Whites developing a liberal outlook.

As is known to all of us, the Frontline States which are often exposed to raids by South Africa are in need of wide-ranging assistance. Are we prepared to extend all kinds of assistance to those Frontline States? I would like to know from the Government as to what assistance they have been able to render and as to what assistance we propose to render in the years and months to come.

Sir, I welcome the mandatory economic sanctions that have been approved by the six of the seven nations that met recently in London. But they are good as far as they go and they do not go far enough. I am not saying that Britain should be expelled from the Commonwealth. I am not saying that we should sever our relations either with Britain or with the USA. No country in the world can sever relations on the basis of an issue. But Sir, I have one suggestion to make. It is not the Government of Britain or Government of the USA which is dealing with the Botha regime. The multi-nationals based in Britain and USA are dealing with South Africa. The question today is whether India, along with other Commonwealth countries is prepared to sever its links with all such multi-national companies that are doing trade with South Africa. This, in my view, will be a very effective and devastating weapon. I would like to know from the Government whether the Government is prepared to adopt this weapon.

**MR. SPEAKER :** Now Mr. Swell—five minutes. It has to be over by 6 O'clock.

**SHRI G.G. SWELL (Shillong) :** Give me a little more time, Sir.

**MR. SPEAKER :** You just summarize what they have said, and put them in a compact form.

**SHRI G.G. SWELL :** Kindly reconsider, Sir. I have a lot of things to say.

The first thing I would like to say is my appreciation, to my friend Eduardo, the

Minister of State for External Affairs, for having lost no time in bringing this Motion before the House. He came back from London only yesterday; and today, the Motion is before us.

The relevance of this discussion is this: our team led by our Prime Minister had played a magnificent role in the Mini Summit in London. We had not deviated from our declared stand. We have stood firm, we have been able to get two White countries along with us in everything. But it is necessary that this message should go, that not only the Government, not only the Prime Minister, but the whole country expresses its stand and support through this House. And this is what we are going to do today.

I believe that at the end of this discussion you Sir, as the custodian of the feelings, of the wisdom of this House, will come forward and summarize the discussions and try to put words in any form, in the form of a Motion, in the form of a Resolution—it does not matter—which would send a message from here to the whole world, as to where we stand.

It is easy to be somewhat pessimistic about the outcome of the London Mini Summit meeting, in the sense that there has been no unanimity, in the sense that Mrs. Thatcher had dissociated herself from the decision of the majority of the participants in the Summit. She had gone a step further and has been somewhat supercilious, somewhat contemptuous of the decision arrived at by the Six, when she said that what Britain can do to bring about a change in South Africa—even with a very limited decision—would have much more effect than all the decisions taken by the six countries. And the President of South Africa had been quite cock-a-hoop with the decision of the Mini Summit. He thought that he would not be affected in any way. As a matter of fact, he has become more militant, and immediately after the decision in London, he had gone on some kind of a retaliatory action against the frontier States: against Zambia, against Zimbabwe, by levying some kind of taxation on goods that pass through South African Ports to Zambia and Zimbabwe. This is the situation. Now it is necessary that we are clear headed about

what they are doing. It is good to be more clear headed; it is good to realise that we are up against a problem and we have to work against it. I say on my part that the outcome of the mini Summit in London has been a success. If you look at the declaration, there has been a progression from what they decided in Nassau and what they decided in London in the mini Summit. In Nassau, they spoke only about ban on loan to South Africa, about ban on the purchase of Krugeranda, about ban on government funding and trade missions, about ban on the sale and export of computer equipments to South Africa that can be used by security forces, ban on contracts and sale of nuclear goods, ban on sale of oil, embargo on export of arms etc. This was decided by Nassau, but in London, they have gone many steps further : ban on air link with South Africa, ban on investment and re-investment, ban on import of agricultural products, termination of double taxation, termination of government investment in trade in South Africa, ban on government procurements, ban on government contracts with majority owned companies by South Africa, ban on promotion of tourism and ban on all bank loan to South Africa, ban on the import of uranium, coal, iron and steel in South Africa, ban on all Consular establishments. Now, this has been a distinct progress agreed to by these countries; and even Mrs. Thatcher, despite her obstinacy has seen reasons not to be obdurate; in that, she has agreed to some kind of voluntary ban on investment in South Africa, voluntary ban on promotion of tourism and to go along with EEC in the case of import of coal, iron and steel and uranium.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : What is voluntary ban we have not been able to understand ?

SHRI G.G. SWELL : The outcome has not been such a disaster. Despite her obstinacy, she has been shame faced enough to see logic. Now, I would say this : It has not been a disaster.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Are you satisfied ?

SHRI G.G. SWELL : I am not satisfied. The outcome of all this is a collapse of Britain under the leadership of Mrs. Thatcher, a moral and political collapse; it is not only the isolation, if you think about it. What has Britain been reduced to with Mrs. Thatcher and her attitude on this question is that she has not only lost leadership of the Commonwealth, but she has become some kind of a puppet tied to the apron strings of the EEC and the United States of America. She has reduced her country to this position that she is a puppet tied to apron strings of the EEC and the United States. In America, today, even Mr. Reagan is being barracked because the United States is thinking in terms of passing a resolution by two-thirds majority to compel him to impose sanction in South Africa. In all this India has been the leader, our Prime Minister has been the leader. Soon it may be possible for the whole of the international community to come round and, if it comes round, we hope that the present South African regime will come to an end.

[Translation]

\*SHRI A.C. SHANMUGAM (Vellore) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, on behalf of the A.I.A.D.M.K. I rise to support the Motion brought forward by the hon. Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs, Shri Eduardo Faleiro. Sir, we appreciate the action taken by our hon. Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi, in condemning the apartheid which has been practised in South Africa. Wherever apartheid is practised in any part of the world, our hon. Prime Minister will always rise to the occasion and come forward in support of the affected people. Sir, in the 7-Nation Commonwealth Summit held in London recently, our Prime Minister has been able to muster support to isolate the UK and its Prime Minister, Mrs. Thatcher. In the Summit, six Nations recommended imposition of economic sanction against the Pretoria regime. But that was rejected by the UK Government. Sir, I would like to ask the Government whether it is necessary for the UK to continue as a Member in the Commonwealth Nations.

\* The speech was originally delivered in Tamil.

[Shri A.C. Shanmugam]

Sir, our Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi, has been able to give a wide publicity to the world that India is always against the racist regime in South Africa. Our Prime Minister is a great leader in the world. It is not so easy for a leader to condemn a nation in public, against its uncivilised policies. In this context, I would like to point out that the British ruled India for 200 years and at that time we were treated as slaves. Now, because of the steps taken by the hon. Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi, Britain is being isolated and they now look like slaves in the eyes of the world. The father of our Nation, Mahatma Gandhi, started the freedom movement long back in South Africa. He had undergone so many difficulties and untold sufferings in South Africa for the cause of freedom movement there. We are surprised how Mrs. Thatcher has forgotten the history, particularly the freedom movement started by the Father of our Nation against the South African regime, long time back.

Another point I would like to place before this august House is that under the garb of supplying arms and ammunitions to other friendly nations, the arms and ammunitions supplied by the UK and the U.S.A. are actually finding their way to Pretoria Government in South Africa. We should take all possible measures to stop supply of arms to South Africa. The supply of arms in a surreptitious manner to the Pretoria regime by these two countries, namely, the UK and the U.S.A. clearly shows that they are against those countries which condemn apartheid policy followed in South Africa.

Sir, in the recent Press Conference held at London our Prime Minister made our policy clear and the way he answered the questions put to him by the Press shows his sagacity and maturity in world politics. He has also made it clear that it would be a great loss for the UK Government and Mrs. Thatcher if they do not join us in condemning the Pretoria regime in South Africa for their apartheid policy.

Sir, while appreciating the action taken

and the Indian Government with regard to South African regime, we would also appreciate if the same action is taken with regard to Sri Lanka. I therefore request all the hon. Members of this House, particularly all the party leaders in this House, to bring forward an unanimous Resolution like the present one, condemning the Sri Lanka Government for their continued policy of genocide of Tamils there. The Government headed by Jayawardene, in Sri Lanka should be exposed. We should all come out openly in condemning the countries like Israel, Pakistan and the U.S.A. who are supporting the Sri Lankan Government and also supplying them arms and ammunitions for massacre of the poor Tamils and the civilians there. I hope and I am sure the Indian Government will not hesitate to come forward and save the Tamils in Sri Lanka. I thank you Mr. Speaker, Sir, for giving me this opportunity to speak on this Motion.

[English]

SHRI RAJ MANGAL PANDE (Deoria): How tragic it is that a country which has built up a history of glorious tradition now stands condemned. It is not only South Africa that is being condemned by the world community, but along with South Africa Britain is also being condemned. In this age when the whole world is witnessing the end of imperialism, colonialism and all kinds of racial discrimination, now one country in the name of South Africa is standing forth to have this menace of apartheid. The whole world community has been condemning it. Our Prime Minister has played a brilliant role in assessing the whole situation. It is only through him that Britain has not been eliminated; otherwise, the mini summit conference of the Commonwealth would have expelled Britain. To that extent her reputation would have been absolutely sullied. When the Commonwealth countries have imposed sanctions against South Africa, one question arises out of it. If they do not prove effective, what steps the Commonwealth countries will subsequently think to impose against South Africa whose tenacity is known so much so that for the last 50 years we have been witnessing that there has been no change in their stand taken on



father, Mahatma Gandhi, who initiated his whole campaign from South Africa and all the other countries subsequently got independence, that South Africa still remains the victim of apartheid? The world community has to find out some viable alternative to see what next could be done if sanctions fail. If these sanctions do not prove effective, naturally some kind of moral boosting for those people who are fighting against apartheid will have to be made so that they do not get demoralised and they may stand against this menace of apartheid. If we do not do so, then South Africa which has so much of potentiality and so much of resources that it could sustain itself for years to come and the frontline states may suffer against these sanctions. Today we have seen that South Africa has imposed many sanctions against frontline countries. If it is so, naturally, the world community has to think what further action has to be taken under that situation. If we do not do that, then there will be every danger that all our efforts all our energies and all these resources that we have spent all through these years at this menace will go waste. My appeal to the world community is that we have to think of some kind of a *via media* so that we may fight not only apartheid in South Africa and succeed but fight against the abettors of apartheid. If we do not give this moral and financial support to those countries, naturally our fight against apartheid will not be appreciated by the posterity.

I very much appreciate the speeches of my friends who have spoke.

**SHRI BALWANT SINGH RAMOO-WALIA** (Sangrur) : Sir, in brief I want to say on the subject that fundamental rights are not only being denied in South Africa but reign of terror has been let loose on the peace-loving people of that country. To our sad disappointment and anger, some western countries who, on the one hand, boast of being the champions of democracy in the world and claim to talk about civilisation as their monopoly, are supporting these inhuman action of the government of South Africa.

When we oppose and fight against domination and oppression, we are just marching with the caravan of the heroes of

history. It was due to total support of our people which could enable the Prime Minister to play a vital role in isolating the powerful patrons of South Africa, I mean to pressurise them. So, I congratulate the great people of India and the hon. Prime Minister both for isolating the British Government which was giving total support to the policies of apartheid of South Africa.

In my view, the imperialism, fascism and the forces of domination are fighting their last battle in South Africa. Black brethren are not fighting for majority rights, they are fighting for equal rights and complete democracy in that country. South Africa has got notoriety of being the symbol of fascism and sanctuary for killers of freedom fighters. South Africa has become a serious challenge to the civilised world. We should not only isolate South Africa but also her mentors USA and the British Government.

Once again we all extend our total solidarity with the fighting people of South Africa and I will also request for a resolution to be brought through you, Sir, to extend and praise the fight of the people in South Africa. Thank you.

[Translation]

**DR. G.S. RAJHANS** ((Jhunjharpur) : Hon. Speaker, Sir, as time is short I would confine myself to two or three points only. Eminent persons group had stated in the last paragraph of its report that if apartheid is not abolished in time in Africa then there will be more bloodshed than that witnessed in Second World War. The E.P.G. has rightly made this statement and Shri Rajiv Gandhi has reiterated it many a time. He has appealed to the intelligentsia of the world to think whether the end of the apartheid will be brought about in a peaceful way or in a violent manner. Apartheid has to go but the question is how and when it will go.

Apartheid is not something new but it is a century old problem. When gold was discovered in Johannesburg in 1886, the handful of Britishers subjected the local blacks to the worst type of exploitation

[Dr. G.S. Rajhans]

and forced them to live like animals. When the Britishers left in 1910 they did not transfer power to the blacks there, who were in majority but to a small number of white people. When the National Party came into power in 1948, then all limits were crossed and apartheid was imposed so ruthlessly that the whole world was shaken. Sir I mean to say that apartheid is not a day old problem. In the recent years, Shri Rajiv Gandhi said with all the emphasis at his command to resolve this problem of apartheid. No other leader of the world has advocated this cause in a more emphatic manner. So, I request my friends in the opposition to have patience because it is no mean achievement that Shri Rajiv Gandhi isolated Britain in the mini-summit. No one could ever think of it before. The most important thing I want to point out in this regard is that the day report of the Eminent Persons Group was presented, the Botha regime declared emergency in South Africa. No other country in the world has witnessed such type of emergency. The world is getting not a single news about the country. The newspapers there are leaving blank their editorial columns. The journalists from other countries are treated in an inhuman way. There are all sorts of rumour about the number of blacks killed there. Some guess it about 2000 and some say that about 4000 blacks have been killed. Atrocities being perpetuated there have crossed all limits. Alongwith apartheid, the emergency imposed there on the 12th June also deserves to be condemned.

I travel extensively in the rural areas. The rural people even in our country do not know about apartheid, front-line countries and Namibia. Every one in our country should have come forward and raised his voice for the freedom of South Africa. I appeal to members of all parties to apprise the people of the problems of South Africa, Namibia and front-line countries. The people of South Africa best up the people of the front-line countries and we remain silent. It is correct that the government raises its voice but other people do not raise their voices. I want that resolutions from blocks and villages expressing solidarity with the oppressed people of South Africa be sent to the Government

so as to strengthen its hands. But it is unfortunate that the people of our country do not even know clearly about this problem. They do not understand this apartheid policy. I want that strong public opinion on this matter be generated. West Germany and Israel have their vested interests there. Israel is getting uranium from South Africa and making nuclear bombs. The problem is not so easy as it looks but is very complicated.

In the end, I request that the House should unanimously pass a resolution to support the action being taken by Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi in this regard and strengthen his hands. With these words, I conclude my speech.

[English]

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI (Guwahati) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, the House is in total unanimity today to condemn the inhuman policy of apartheid and expresses its solidarity with the great freedom-fighters of South Africa. It is no wonder, Sir, that we feel emotionally involved with the problems of South Africa for two reasons. Apart from the gross injustices being meted out to the black people there, the fact remains that even during our freedom struggle we considered that our freedom struggle is not only a struggle to liberate our country but it is a part of the global struggle against imperialism and colonialism.

Sir, Gandhiji started his experiment of Truth and Non-violence in South Africa. How as an Indian we can feel that that experiment has succeeded till the South African people are liberated from their bondage? So, Sir, this is not an occasion when we should discuss— or time does not permit us to discuss—various atrocities committed over the black majority population there in South Africa. In fact, Sir, I believe, in a not distance day when South Africa will become free, our first future generation will find it hard to believe that at a time when men crossed the frontiers of space, when men mastered different kinds of scientific knowledge, there was such a regime which could perpetrate such a crime merely because people had a different colour of skin than the others. I

also find it very difficult to comprehend as to how in a country like the United States of America which 100 years ago fought the battle for the abolition of slavery and even went to the extent of a civil war, but lost, one of its most illustrious Presidents, the Government is today supporting the worst kind of slavery, because apartheid is the worst kind of slavery based on the concept that a man because he has a white skin has the right to rule over a person with black skin. I find it difficult also to believe that a country like Britain which gave to the world the concept of one man one vote is supporting the denials the same to the South African population and how Britain has behaved in the mini summit is well-known to the world opinion today.

Sir, I am happy that the same experiment of Nassau was not conducted in London because in Nassau Summit compromises were made in order to get some unanimity or consensus. Today Britain stands isolated and the rest of the six nations have taken up or have expressed their own position in clear and unequivocal terms. This is not an occasion that everywhere we should debate in depth whether Britain should be expelled from the Commonwealth, but I believe that if a demand comes, and in fact one of my esteemed friends has made such a demand, this demand also requires some consideration. In fact I can point out—(Sir, under the rules I am not allowed to use the name of the President), but I think I am within power to use the name of the Speaker in a debate. Sir, you, while presiding over the Parliamentarians' Meet on apartheid, very clearly said that if Britain takes up a position which is against the world opinion, then we should think in terms of expelling Britain if necessity so arises. I would only say this much, Sir, that I do not know how much wealth there is in Commonwealth today, but it seems there is nothing common in Commonwealth. We cannot be a member of a club if that club continues to support the inhuman and archaic policies...

MR. SPEAKER : It is not the club which is supporting...

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI : That is why I am saying, Sir. Either that member

must go out of the club or we must have to think in terms of reviewing our position with that club. In fact, this point was also put to the leader of the SWAPO when he came here and he said, 'Why India should think in terms of quitting the Commonwealth ? If somebody should quit Commonwealth, it is Britain because Britain is the guilty party.'

Sir, I do not want to take much of the time. I believe that apart from passing a resolution—resolutions have been passed times without number in the United Nations and have been ignored with impunity by South Africa—I think we should have some positive thinking in terms of some positive measures.

I would like to conclude by giving some of my own suggestions. One, of course, is the building up of an international opinion. I believe there should be more communication amongst the parliamentarians of the world. Sir, I believe a large number of Senators and parliamentarians both of UK and USA do not go on this issue with their Government, either Reagan or Thatcher. We should have more communications with them so that there can be an unanimous opinion of the Parliaments. We should help the fighting people, the struggling South African people, with men and material, and we should have increased economic ties with the frontline States and, Sir, the pressure for release of Nelson Mandela should continue.

I will conclude by quoting Nelson Mandela from one of his own speeches, in which he took a quotation from Panditji from an article entitled *From Lucknow to Tripoli*. Nelson Mandela says :

"You can see that 'there is no easy walk to freedom anywhere and many of us shall have to pass through the valley of the shadow of death again and again before we reach the mountain tops of our desires'".

In fact, this sentence, 'there is no easy walk to freedom...' was used by Panditji. And Nelson Mandela's determined voice thunders :

[Shri Dinesh Goswami]

"Dangers and difficulties have not deterred us in the past; they will not frighten us now".

And I am sure that the heroic spirit of Nelson Mandela who for 25 years now he has been in jail, and thousands of struggling South Africans will one day liberate the South African people from the bondage which they have so intensively suffered.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Basirhat) :** Sir, the people of the world are confronted with an international outlaw, and it would be idle of course, to think that they are going to change their policy or their stance easily. Let us, for the time being, not speculate, Sir, on what is going to be the impact of these sanctions on which the six Commonwealth nations at Marlborough House decided recently. Today, at 12 O'clock, I think, radio news has broadcast that after going back from London, the Canadian Prime Minister has said that, if necessary, they will sever their diplomatic relations with South Africa and recall their Ambassador. They still have their Ambassador there. But any-way, the point is that the international outlaw, whom we are fighting or trying to fight, is extremely powerful. We all know that. And the source of that power is the economic support that they are getting from their friends abroad. There are 1068 trans-national companies who have their affiliates in South Africa. These are the United Nations figure. 406 of these companies are based in the U.S.A.; 364 are based in the U.K.; and 142 are based in the Federal Republic of Germany. The total direct foreign investment in 1983 was between 15.5 and 17 billion dollars in South Africa, mainly in mining, in petroleum, in automobile industry, in chemicals, in electronics, in the banking and the financial services. Companies like Ford, General Motors, Doimler Benz are dominating the automobile industry with their plants in South Africa. In oil, Mobile, Caltex, British Petroleum, Royal Dutch Shell, the French company Total are controlling and owning 80% of the retail outlet of oil and three of the major refineries in South Africa. So, they are all tied up along with the Western Supporters, their entire economy.

Arms manufacture and arms import are going on despite the United Nations ban and despite the embargo. Here, I would just like to remind the House that we must be very careful as one of the leading nations in this struggle—we must be very careful. You will recall a few years ago, we had sold some of our old Centurion tanks. Whom we had sold them to, I do not know—some private party perhaps, some of those private arms dealers. But some of those Centurion tanks later on appeared in South Africa. So, we have to be very careful when we move in this matter because the end-use of these things must always be varified.

Similarly, I would like to tell the Minister that now our total opposition to apartheid should not be in any way diluted or diminished by any, even small thing like the reported link that we have got with the diamond trade in South Africa—India should not. And we should cut off unconditionally and comprehensively any kind of direct or indirect ties. This Hindustan Diamond Company of Bombay in which your Government holds 50% of the share, while the other 50% is held, indirectly controlled, by nominees of the De Beers company, which is the biggest diamond mining concern in South Africa and employs the Black workers and treats them like slaves. They are operating here through two of their nominees. One is their Bank of Bermuda which is the subsidiary of De Beers and the other is the Diamond Trading Company of the U.K. which is controlled by De Beers. There is no reason why South Africa should be allowed indirectly even to operate in the diamond trade on our soil through their nominees. This leaves a bad taste in the mouth and I would like to request the Government to take steps to see that this whole thing, this whole chapter is closed.

Last year, Sir, I had shown photographs in this House of some of the directors of this company in India who had gone to South Africa to meet their partners in the diamond trade there and how they were being feted and given reception and all that. It leaves a very unpleasant taste in the mouth and it should be completely closed now.

They have a nuclear programme also. As you know, they have uranium



enrichment plant at Valindaba which is supposed to produce plutonium, enough to make two or three bombs a year. Some people have said that they have already got stockpile of some 25 to 30 atom bombs, we do not know. They have the largest concentration of gold reserves in the world.

18.00 hrs.

It is another source of their strength. 51% of the world output on gold is in South Africa and, you know the power of gold in the world.

Because of these things, it is going to be a very long and difficult time and to the extent that we have been able, within the Commonwealth, to make some advance in London, we are, of course, happy and we congratulate the Government for the role that it has played there.

But I would say that we are, of course, for a peaceful solution. No doubt about it. But does it mean that we are against non-peaceful solution? It does not mean that. It cannot mean that. And I may say, I do not want to go into details, but a few years ago, when the victorious leader, Mr. Samora Machel of Mozambique was here as our honoured guest, speaking here at a banquet in Rashtrapathi Bhavan, where I happened to be present, he made a reference to the fact that when they were fighting for independence in Mozambique, that organisation was then known as Frelimo, he noted the fact that Frelimo fighters, the guerrilla fighters of Frelimo, were carrying in their hands some weapons which had come from India also. I do not want to say anything more than this but we have a duty. We have a responsibility. We need not shout about these things from the house-tops. We are for a peaceful solution. But we cannot be against a non-peaceful solution when the people of South Africa have been forced ultimately to take up arms in order to fight for their freedom. Let us remember that, because Mr. Nelson Mandela, as the American newspapers have reported, they have put out the whole story as to how he was betrayed by the CIA. He was arrested on information supplied to the South African Government by the CIA and there was a mutual tie-up between the CIA and the South African Secret Police. The

Americans were informing the South Africans about the movement of these African leaders who were compelled to go outside their country, and South African Secret Police was informing the Americans about the presence and the movements of Soviet and Cuban troops in Angola and other frontline States. So, they were working as a partnership. This was responsible for the information which was given to the South African Government to trace out and find Mr. Nelson Mandela and to arrest him, as a result of which the tallest leader of the South African Liberation struggle is now languishing in jail, for how many years, we do not know, and along with him so many others.

So, all I have to say is that the Minister will tell us now because they are going now further to non-aligned Conference in Harare, of all places. It is a good thing. The non-aligned Conference is going to be held in Zimbabwe and this question will come up there in such a way that it will have to be taken due note of. All that we have to do is that we must move forward and take some further steps.

Poor Saifuddin Chowdhary has got into trouble because he asked for the same thing which you had suggested the other day. You were in a good company. The leader of Swapo Mr. Sam Njuma has also said the same thing that India has not committed any crime. Why should we leave the Commonwealth? It is Britain which should be pushed out.

MR. SPEAKER : The time is changing.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : I think the role of India has been very praiseworthy upto now but we should push forward further and see what strong steps can be taken. It is good to carry Australia and Canada with us so far and I hope that we will be able to keep them with us. They are countries which have got multi-racial and cosmopolitan populations now. The days of white Australia are over now. We should be able to keep them with us and we must move forward so that the isolation of Britain is absolutely total and more positive steps can be taken to see that South African struggle is helped.

**THE MINISTER OF TRANSPORT (SHRIMATI MOHSINA KIDWAI)** : In the *suo mottu* statement made yesterday, the House was apprised of the accident.

**AN HON. MEMBER** : What is this ? She is making a statement on accident everyday ?

**MR. SPEAKER** : She is to go to the Upper House. We will continue this discussion after the statement.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

**MR. SPEAKER** : This is with reference to her statement made yesterday.

18.07 hrs.

**STATEMENT RE : COLLISION OF  
162 DOWN TRAIN NEAR  
GARWA ROAD**

[English]

**THE MINISTER OF TRANSPORT (SHRIMATI MOHSINA KIDWAI)** : In the *Suo Moto* Statement made yesterday (6.8.86), the House was apprised of the unfortunate collision between the parted portion of a goods train and 162 Down Amritsar-Tatanagar Express between Garwa Road and Tolra station on the Garwa Road-Barka Kana Section of the Eastern Railway. I visited the site of accident as also the injured in the hospitals and it is with a heavy heart that I stand to place before the House further facts in regard to the accident. In the first place, I have to express my deep regret and sorrow over the accident, the loss of lives and injuries caused to innocent passengers.

One empty goods train with 43 Box wagons left Garwa Road at 2.06 hours and passed the next station at Tolra at 2.38 hrs. This train was going to patratu for loading of coal. 162 Down Amritsar-Tatanagar Express left Garwa Road at 2.55 hours in the same direction. The goods train had parted in Garwa Road-Tolra Section and 5 empty box wagons and the brakevan

Tolra, failed to observe that the complete train had not run through the station, and gave line clear to the next train, Amritsar-Tatanagar Express. The Railway staff at the next station Rajhara were more alert and reported to the control that the complete goods train had not arrived at their station. This was reported by the staff at Rajhara to the Control at 3.04 hrs. An order was immediately given to stop all trains in both the sections. However, unfortunately, Amritsar-Tatanagar Express had already left Garwa Road and it collided with the parted portion of the goods train at about 3.10 hours.

On receipt of the information about the collision, immediate action was taken to muster medical facilities. Railway doctors from Garwa Road reached the site at 4.30 hrs. on foot and rendered first-aid to passengers. A medical van with doctors came from Barwadih and reached the site at 5.00 hrs. Doctors, D.C. and S.P. Daltonganj, also rushed to the site at once by road. All the injured were removed to Garwa Down/Daltonganj Civil Hospitals by 7.30 hrs. by train. Local citizens also helped considerably in the relief work. Meanwhile, the medical vans from Gomoh and Chopan had also been rushed.

As a result of the collision, the brake van of the goods trains, two empty box wagons, the train engine of the Amritsar-Tatanagar Express and first coach next thereto, which was a luggage van-cum-Second class fell into a nallah. The second coach, which was a sleeper coach, stopped on the pier of the bridge of the next line, and passengers in that coach suffered only minor injuries.

The reason for parting of the goods train and the subsequent collision will be examined in detail by the Commissioner of Railway Safety, Eastern Circle, in the course of a Statutory Enquiry, which has been ordered. *Prima facie*, however, the accident appears to have occurred due to failure of railway staff to observe rules regarding check of complete arrival of a train before granting line clear to the following train. Administrative action has been taken against the officials found *prima facie*