

from the Secretary-General of Rajya Sabha :—

“In accordance with the provisions of rule III of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to enclose a copy of the Mines and Minerals (Regulation and Development) Amendment Bill, 1986, which has been passed by the Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 24th July, 1986.”

MINES AND MINERALS (REGULATION AND DEVELOPMENT)
AMENDMENT BILL

[English]

SECRETARY GENERAL : Sir, I lay on the Table the Mines and Minerals (Regulation and Development) Amendment Bill, 1986, as passed by Rajya Sabha.

12.05½ hrs.

FINANCIAL COMMITTEES (1985-86)
—A REVIEW

[English]

SECRETARY-GENERAL : Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the Hindi and English versions of the “Financial Committees (1985-86)—A review”.

12 06 hrs,

12.06 hrs.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE

[English]

Thirty-fourth Report

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI (Bhubaneswar) : Sir, I beg to present the Thirty-fourth Report (Hindi and English versions) of Estimates Committee on Action Taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the Eighth Report of the Committee (8th Lok Sabha) on the Ministry of Commerce—Tobacco Board.

12.06½ hrs.

SUPPLEMENTARY DEMANDS FOR
GRANTS (GENERAL), 1986-87

[English]

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF EXPENDITURE (SHRI B.K. GADHVI) : Sir, on behalf of Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh, I beg to present a statement (Hindi and English versions) showing Supplementary Demands for Grants in respect of the Budget (General) for 1986-87.

12.07 hrs.

STATEMENT RE : RACISM AND
APARTHEID IN SOUTH AFRICA

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : Shri Shiv Shanker.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI SHEILA DIKSHIT) : Shall I make the statement, Sir ?

MR. SPEAKER : Yes.

SHRIMATI SHEILA DIKSHIT : India has consistently opposed the policy of racialism and apartheid practised by the Government of South Africa (Interruptions).

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA (Bankura) : Sir, he has come.

SHRIMATI SHEILA DIKSHIT) : Sir, do I continue or.....(Interruptions).

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER : Let him read the statement. Why should you bother ?

[English]

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur) : You cannot change the horses in the midstream.

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER : Let him read. It is for you that we take all the trouble.

[English]

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF COMMERCE (SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER) : India has consistently opposed the policy of racialism and apartheid practised by the Government of South Africa. Over 80 years ago Mahatma Gandhi raised his voice against the immorality, inhumanity and injustice of apartheid. Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru spearheaded the international struggle for racial equality and majority rule in South Africa. This tradition has remained the sheet anchor of India's policy against apartheid.

From the very moment the people of India gained control over their destiny, the opposition to apartheid began to be manifested in specific decisions of Government of India. The Interim Government of India in July 1946 banned all trade with South Africa even though it meant a loss of 5% of India's export trade at that time. We withdrew our High Commissioner in the same year and finally closed down our trade office in South Africa. This was followed by other decisions such as banning of overflights of its territory by South African registered aircraft, severance of shipping links cutting of economic, cultural, and consular links. In 1977 India acceded to the Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid and in 1981 enacted the Anti-Apartheid Act.

Our national actions against apartheid have been matched by our efforts to mobilise the international community against Pretoria's policies. India was the first country to take the issue of racial discrimination in South Africa to the United Nations as early as 1946. We sponsored, alongwith other countries, the first Resolution in the UN General Assembly in 1962 calling for sanctions against South Africa. Similarly India has consistently campaigned in other fora, notably the Non-Aligned Movement and the Commonwealth. The Non-Aligned Movement today stands solidly behind the call for universal, comprehensive mandatory sanctions. Within the Commonwealth, largely due to efforts of India and other like-minded countries, some progress has been

made towards the acceptance of the principle of sanctions, even though the movement is slower than we would have wished.

At their meeting in the Bahamas in October 1985, the Commonwealth Heads of Government adopted the Nassau Accord which calls upon the Pretoria Government to declare that it would dismantle the system of apartheid, terminate the existing state of emergency, release immediately and unconditionally Nelson Mandela and others, establish political freedom and to initiate a process of dialogue across lines of colour, politics and religion. Besides, the Accord prescribed a certain number of economic and other measures against South Africa to be adopted and applied by all the members of the Commonwealth. In pursuance of the Accord, the President of Zambia and the Prime Ministers of Australia, the Bahamas, Canada, India, U.K. and Zimbabwe appointed a 7-member group known as 'Eminent Persons Group'. It included distinguished individuals from India, Australia, U.K., Canada, Nigeria, Tanzania and Barbados. Its specific task was to contact all the parties in South Africa and initiate a process of dialogue which might eventually lead to the dismantlement of apartheid. This group visited South Africa and a number of Frontline States and submitted its report in June this year. The report was unanimous. It admitted failure to initiate the process of dialogue and concluded that the Government of South Africa was not genuinely interested in dismantling the system of apartheid. The report clearly brings out the intransigence of the Pretoria regime and its rejections of the reasonable suggestions made by the EPG to initiate the process of negotiations.

After the publication of the Eminent Persons' Group report, public opinion all over the world has become convinced that stronger measures against Pretoria are the only peaceful alternative to violence in South Africa. In May the EEC Summit discussed this question and decided, inspite of the desire of several members to apply sanctions, to send its Council President Sir Geoffrey Howe to South Africa and some neighbouring countries. This step has led to serious disappointment and

apprehensions among the leaders of the Frontline States and the liberation movements in South Africa. President Reagan in his latest statement, as the British Prime Minister earlier, has taken a clear position against sanctions characterising them as ineffective.

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

India's opposition to apartheid, her belief in the imperative of mandatory comprehensive sanctions against South Africa in order to pressurise it to dismantle the system and her support for the struggle of the people of South Africa is constant, steadfast and unwavering. "Apartheid" as our Prime Minister has said "cannot be reformed. It must be eliminated". The peaceful means to do it is to apply comprehensive universal mandatory sanctions against the South African Government. The alternative is violence, bloodbath and destruction in the region. These are articles of faith with us and we shall continue to articulate these beliefs on every occasion. We hope that we shall succeed in persuading all the nations of the world that sanctions against the racial regime of South Africa is imperative and urgent.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Bolpur): Sir, there is not a word of condemnation about American attitude and against what President Reagan has said.

(Interruptions)

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI (Guwahati): In view of the fact that Mini Summit is taking place, in view of the recent developments in South Africa and in view of our boycott of the Commonwealth Games, we should discuss it.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: No problem. You can give it in writing. We can discuss it in the Business Advisory Committee. No problem.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: I have a submission. Hon. Members would no doubt like to discuss this subject. They could perhaps do so more effectively after the Mini Summit in London so that we could report back the conclusions and give more details and seek the guidance of the House at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: Now, Submissions under Rule 377.

12.12 hrs.

MATTERS UNDER RULE 377

[English]

(i) Demand for more funds for repair of roads on borders of Jammu, Poonch and Rajauri districts and construction of bridge over Aik Nallah in Jammu district.

SHRI JANAK RAJ GUPTA (Jammu): A number of roads on the borders of districts Jammu, Poonch and Rajouri which are maintained by Border Roads Organisation are in a dilapidated condition. There is a need to construct a bridge on Aik Nallah near village Arnia, Teh. R.S. Pura Distt. Jammu to connect the roads as it is creating great inconvenience to the inhabitants of that area.

I would like to urge the Government of India to provide more funds for the repair of those roads and construction of Bridge on Aik Nallah.

[Translation]

SHRI ZAINUL BASHER (Ghazipur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want to make a submission before reading the matter under rule 377.....

MR. SPEAKER: No, it is not possible. You can only read it,