

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (नई दिल्ली):

50 एकड़ का किसान कहाँ है ?

श्री बालासाहिब विश्वे पाटिल : नाम-इरींगटोड एरियाज में लैण्ड सीलिंग के बाद भी 54 एव.इ. का किसान है ।

इसलिए इनपुट्स की कीमतें, बिजली, पानी के दाम, कीमतें जो लोन देते हैं, इन सब चीजों के बारे में जब तक छोटे किसानों को अलग से सुविधाएँ नहीं दी जाएंगी, तब तक उसकी उन्नति नहीं हो सकती ।

इसलिए छोटे किसान के बारे में अलग से सोचने की आवश्यकता है । उसको संरक्षण देने की आवश्यकता है । अगर सब किसानों के बारे में एक तरह से सोचा जाएगा तो छोटा किसान ऊपर नहीं आ सकता । आज छोटे किसानों की संख्या कम हो रही है । वे अपनी खेत बेच रहे हैं और बड़े किसान खरीद रहे हैं । इसलिए छोटे किसान की ओर ध्यान देने की बहुत आवश्यकता है ।

18 hrs

आशा है मंत्री महोदय इन सब चीजों की ओर ध्यान देंगे । इन शब्दों के साथ मैं अपने साथी लक्ष्मण का धन्यवाद देता हूँ ।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Sunder Singh: You take only one or two minutes. Then next time you can continue.

श्री सुन्दर सिंह (फिल्लौर) : माननीय लक्ष्मण जी यह जो बिल लाए हैं पता नहीं किस के खिलाफ लाये, गवर्नमेन्ट के खिलाफ लाए हैं या एग्रीकल्चरल प्राइस कमीशन के खिलाफ लाए हैं या किस के खिलाफ लाए हैं । ऐसा मालूम होता है कि उन्होंने सिर्फ फार्मर्स का ही इस में ख्याल रखा है । क्या बाकी लोग भूखे मर जाएँ ? उन्होंने दो सौ रुपया करने की बात कही है । क्या बात करते हैं ? लैंड रिफार्म अभी तक हुआ नहीं है । हमारे यहां एक एकड़ में किसान आठ आठ हजार कमाता है । वह मेहनत करता है और कमाल दिखाता है । किस किसान की बह बात करते ? क्या मार्जिनल किसान की बात करते हैं ? उत्तर प्रदेश के जो किसान हैं वे काम ही नहीं करते हैं ।

18.01

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

स्पीकर साहब को ही आप लें । ये एक लैंडलार्ड है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : गन्ने के बीज को जो बाकी है वह अगली बार के लिये रख लेते हैं । आप अगली बार अपना भाषण जारी रखें । बाकी जो कुछ आपको कहना है, अगली बार कहें ।

18.02 hrs.

RESIGNATION BY MEMBER

MR. SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that I have received a letter dated the 22nd July, 1982 from Shri Zail Singh, an elected Member from Hoshiarpur constituency of Punjab, resigning his seat in Lok Sabha. Although it is not the practice to inform the House of the reasons for resignation, in this particular case I am happy to inform the House that he has resigned his seat in Lok Sabha in view of his election as President of the Republic. I have accepted his resignation with effect from today, the 22nd July, 1982, afternoon

18.03 hrs.

DISCUSSION ON PRIME MINISTER'S STATEMENT RE. SITUATION IN LEBANON—Contd.

MR. SPEAKER: We shall now resume the discussion under rule 193. Shri Ram Singh Yadav.

श्री राम सिंह यादव (अलवर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, लेबनान के सम्बन्ध में दोनों पक्षों की ओर से जो विचार व्यक्त किए गए हैं वे अपने आप में एक बहुत गम्भीरता लिए हुए हैं । लेबनान की पृष्ठभूमि को जब हम देखते हैं तो ऐसा प्रतीत होता है कि वास्तव में यह समस्या उपनिवेशवाद और साम्राज्यवाद की देने है । 1920 में सब से पहले 16500 ज्यूज यहां पर आकर आबाद हुए थे । चर्चिल साहब सैक्रेटरी की हॉसियत से—लेबनान गए थे और उस समय यह मसला सब से पहले सामने आया था । अरब लोगों ने उसका बड़ा विरोध

[श्री राम सिंह यादव]

किया था। यही चीज 1936 में नियमित रूप से अरब गुरिल्लाज के रूप में हमारे सामने आई जब अपने अधिकारों के लिए वहाँ लोग संघर्ष पर उतारूँ हुए। 1936 से लेकर आज तक यह संघर्ष वहाँ जारी है। यह संघर्ष अपने अधिकारों के लिए, न्याय के लिए किया जा रहा है। बड़े दुःख की बात है कि 6 मई 1982 को बर्बरतापूर्ण हमला लेबनान के ऊपर इजराइल ने किया जो आज भी जारी है। इसके फलस्वरूप करीब 15000 लोग मौत के घाट उतारे जा चुके हैं, हजार लोग घायल हुए हैं और छः लाख सिविलियन पापुलेरुस बेधरबार हो गई हैं। मान्यवर, इसमें सबसे बड़ी भावना इजराइल की यह है कि वह एक विस्तारवादी सिद्धान्त को लेकर के प्रारम्भ से चल रहा है और इस सिद्धान्त के लिए उसने जो कुछ भी अत्याचार अरब लोगों के साथ किये, वहाँ पर पापुलेरुस पहले जिस तरह से हारमोनियस तरीके से रहती थी उसमें असंतुलन पैदा करने का कार्य मैनडेट शवर्स ने किया और उसके बाद जो प्रोटेज्क्शन मिलता रहा सामाजवादी शक्तियों का वह आज भी उनको किसी न किसी रूप में मिल रहा है। इसलिये सारे विश्व को ऐसी साम्राज्यवादी शक्तियों के विरुद्ध, जो इस तरह से अन्याय कर रहे हैं उनके विरुद्ध सारे विश्व का जनमत तैयार करने का दायित्व हमारे ऊपर है, और हमारे देश ने उसमें पहले की है। मैं प्रधान मंत्री और विदेश मंत्री को धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि उन्होंने इस सम्बन्ध में सबसे पहले ठोस कदम उठाया है और इजराइल के काउन्सिल जनरल को परसोयानान-ग्राटा डिक्लेयर कर के इजराइल वापस भेज दिया है। इसलिये जो वक्तव्य यहाँ पर प्रधान मंत्री जी ने दिया मैं उसका स्वागत करता हूँ। माननीय बाजपेयी जी ने कहा कि इसका कोई हल नहीं है। लेकिन वास्तव में इसका हल है और प्रधान मंत्री के वक्तव्य में ही इस बात का इशारा किया गया है :

“...the nations who are in a position to influence Israel to take immediate

steps to lift the siege of West Beirut and withdraw its troops to its own territory. After this immediate objective is achieved, negotiations must begin for a just, comprehensive and durable solution acceptable to all concerned.”

इजराइल के क्या इरादे हैं ? यह लड़ाई जो इजराइल ने की है वह इस तरह की नहीं है कि किसी कारण से हो, बल्कि दुराग्रह है। और उसकी किस तरह की विस्तारवादी नीति है 13 जुलाई के “पैट्रियट” में साफ तौर से लिखा गया है :

Israel currently occupies a third of Lebanon containing an estimated one million people, and “intends to stay there”, reports the Palestinian News Agency, Wafa.

The Agency quoted Gen. Ley, Israeli Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, as telling the New York Times: “We are planning on the assumption we will remain during the winter, and perhaps longer”. In the occupied areas, virtually all males between the ages of 15 to 50 are sent to the new Ansar concentration camp near Abetiya, Wafa added. Palestinian refugee camps have been bulldozed and Palestinians receive especially harsh “genocidal treatment”.

इन हालात को देखते हुए यह मानवता और विश्व शांति को एक चुनौती है और इस अन्याय और अत्याचार का मुकाबला हम सारे लोग मिल कर करें, यही इस सदन का मत है। मैं तो चाहूँगा कि मंत्री जी एक संकल्प प्रस्तुत करें सारे सदन को कि जो अरब लोग हैं उनको जो होमलैंड का अधिकार है वह मानवता का अधिकार है और उतारका हम सारे देश के लोग समर्थन करते हैं।

SHRI CHITTA BASU (Barasat): At the outset I associate myself with those colleagues who have unequivocally condemned the massive Israeli aggression on Lebanon. Sir, we have also gone through the statement on this issue by the Prime Minister of our country. The Prime Minister's statement, as far as it goes, I

admit, reflects some of the very fundamental aspects of the Palestinian problem. It deals with all aspects which are positive and by and large very good. But there are certain negative features also. The main negative feature in the statement is that she has preferred to keep silent over the United States' role in this massive aggression by Israel on Lebanon, although she has, I admit, characterised the Israeli aggression as unprovoked. She is right. She has further stated that Israel's action is a flagrant violation of all canons of international law and behaviour. Finally she sums up by saying that it is indicative of an arrogance which has shown calous disregard for the rights of other nations and peoples. The negative feature is that she has not mentioned anything about the forces, which have persistently contributed to the increasing arrogance of Israel. She has kept silent over that.

As a matter of fact, some of the points have already been made by Shri Indrajit Gupta about the linkage between the United States of America and the massive Israeli aggression on Lebanon. I will only point out that the visit of the Defence Minister of Israel, Mr. Sharon, to Washington is an event, which led to invasion by Israel upon Lebanon. As I have no time, I refrain myself from quoting profusely. I would only draw the attention of the House to the statement alleged or reported to have been made by Mr. Sharon when he was about to leave for Washington. He said:

"Israel will express willingness to strengthen politico-security coordination and cooperation with the United States."

On May, 16, he said this just on the eve of his departure for the United States. On May 26, General Haig says:

"Time has come to take concerted action in support of both Lebanon's territorial integrity with in its internationally recognised borders and a strong

Central Government capable of promoting a free, open, democratic and traditionally pluralistic society."

Therefore, for Mr. Sharon or his Israeli aggressor the clearance was there. They really understood what the concerted action from the side of the United States meant. And concerted action followed. Immediately after that, during the presence of Mr. Sharon, massive generous military and financial aid have been allowed to flow into Israel, details of which have already been mentioned by Shri Indrajit Gupta. Although I have some other information in this regard, I refrain from quoting them in order to save time. Therefore, there has been generous aid, both in terms of military as well as financial assistance, from the United States to instigate Israel to launch aggression upon Lebanon.

Another point which I want to emphasise and stress is that the Prime Minister's statement has been a view which isolates the Lebanon situation from other developments in the international scene, as if it is merely an event between Israel and Lebanon or PLO. She has not only missed the link between the United states of America and the Israeli aggression but she has also sought to describe the event as an isolated event. As a matter of fact, I strongly feel that this Israeli aggression on Lebanon is a part, indivisible and integral part of the global strategy of the United States of America. Unless we have this kind of broader view, we shall not be able to reach the right conclusion.

The United States' strategy has many disastrous facets. The Reagan Administration is now forcing the West European countries to deploy Pershing Missiles on their territories threatening the security of the socialist countries as also its own NATO Allies. This is one aspect.

The United States of America is now trying to turn outer space into an arena of nuclear conflict. The United States of America is also making preparations for a first nuclear strike to destroy the Soviet Union and other socialist Coun-

[Shri Chitta Basu]

tries. USA is also talking about winnable limited nuclear war. It also urges its allies to extend the NATO operations to the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf. It has organised a rapid deployment of forces to intervene in West Asia. It has converted Diego Garcia into a naval air base and has modernised it and has acquired new bases in Pakistan and Sri Lanka. It is carrying out a massive arming of Pakistan to help her develop into a nuclear power. It is trying to bring the oil rich West Asian region under its control, with the Israeli Zionist regime as its dependable ally. It also wants to destroy the PLO. These constitute the framework of the US global strategy. As a matter of fact, the Israeli aggression of the Lebanon is a part of this global strategy of the United States.

The question which I would ask of the hon. Minister of External Affairs is this. Would you kindly take this view or would you isolate this from the broader aspect of the US global strategy? If you take an isolated view, then I say that Government cannot take a right decision and shall be faltering and vacillating.

Lastly, I would urge upon the Government that some steps have to be taken, the steps which we have mentioned earlier, even in the Consultative Committee meetings. Government should take immediate steps to close the Consulate at Bombay. That will indicate our wrath and indignation and boost the morale of the Arab countries, which may feel that the time has come when they should get united and resist the Israeli aggression.

Finally, the Government should continue to strive for a negotiated political settlement of the Palestinian problem. That problem can be solved only on the basis of the recognition of the very fact that the Palestinian people have got the inalienable right of a nation-State. Our Government was in favour of it. It should continue to follow this policy and see that the other non-aligned countries are made to accept this line so that a peaceful solution can be found to this problem.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI P. V. NARSIMHA RAO): Mr. Speaker, Sir. I am grateful to the hon. Members, who have participated in this debate and have made very valuable contribution. I have very little to say by way of reply. Because, when one finds oneself completely in agreement on all substantive points raised in the discussion, there is hardly anything to reply. I would, therefore, be very brief and attempt to supply a few missing links, certain points that have been raised and need certain clarifications. I shall confine my reply only to these.

As I said, when there is such a unanimity on the substantive issue, there is no need for me to repeat all the arguments. It goes without saying that the whole of the country is behind the PLO, behind the Palestinian cause, and this has been amply reflected in the debate in this House.

I would only request hon. Members to note, as has been explained by some members, that the stand which we are taking today on this question is nothing new. As the Prime Minister explained, in the other House if I remember right, we had very serious misgivings even at the time of carving out this new State of Israel. We voted against the majority plan. "Our representative in the U.N., the Commission, stated before the General Assembly that Great Britain wanted the creation of the Jewish State for political and strategic reasons in total disregard of the principle of self-determination. The Indian Delegate referred to the desire of the Arabs to be free. He further emphasised the repercussions that partition would have on the future of peace in Palestine. It would merely be a temporary solution to the problem and would increase instability in the Middle East for years and years to come."

This was in 1948. So, these words have proved prophetic, they have come true, and we are having instability all over, there is no end in sight to the problem, it recurs from time to time. If you only count the number of times there have been Israeli attacks on the Arab territories, I think it is a long list and this is only a culmination of that list. In 1967 we had Resolution 242 immediately after a war; then 1973, then 1978 and now 1982. So, this is a continuous process that is going on, as was feared by our representative at the time Israel was born. So, Sir, we find that India's misgivings, India's opinion, has been vindicated and has come true and today it has to be admitted that we have never taken this as an isolated instance. When we have been opposing it right from 1948, how could any one say that the Statement of the Prime Minister on the present situation takes this as an isolated incident? I just cannot reconcile the two. It is true that the Prime Minister did not start with a historical background and a long thesis on the matter. She was concentrating on what is obtaining in that area today; she was concentrating on the anguish, on the anger, on the tragedy that is taking place and therefore, she is trying to tell the people, tell Parliament, tell the whole world, that immediate attention is needed to what is happening there. She said, first the withdrawal has to take place. While the forces are, there, you cannot think of anything else except withdrawal. That has to be affected. And then she went on to say that withdrawal by itself will not be enough because the problem has been simmering and simmering for so many years and it is time that after the withdrawal takes place, we don't just forget about it and wait for the next aggression to take place, but start working methodically and assiduously on a permanent solution. It is true that solutions have been thought of, solutions have been adumbrated in resolutions, but practical steps need to be taken more vigorously now and this no one can deny. But before that, withdrawal has to take place and under the shadow of these armies all around Beirut, no one can think of a solution

except getting them to withdraw. So, this was a very logical, pointed statement in regard to the given situation.

Sir, a point was raised as to what initiatives we have taken ever since the aggression began on the 6th of June. I would like to inform the House that on the 4th of June, when air raids preceding this particular aggression first took place, we were in Havana. The non-aligned Bureau was in session. There is time differential of eight or ten hours. While the aggression was taking place, we came to know about it and we were still in session. We immediately authorised the Chairman to move the Security Council on behalf of the non-aligned. Within hours this was done. So, the first initiative on this question came from non-aligned Bureau which was in session.

On the 7th of June came the statement of the official spokesman of the Ministry of External Affairs in Delhi. I was still outside India. In this statement the Government of India condemned the unprovoked Israel aggression against the Palestinians in categorical terms. Then the Prime Minister sent a message on June 8 to Chairman Yasar Arafat. He was the first person whom she thought of because he was the person trapped there. He was the person who with his followers, with his comrades, with his colleagues, is bearing the brunt of the whole thing. So, it was quite natural for the Prime Minister to think of him first and send him a message of solidarity before she addressed any one else. Then P.M. received a message from King Khaled on June 8 and sent reply on June 10 in which she expressed India's continued full support to the Arab cause. Then P.M. sent messages to President Reagan, President Brezhnev, President Mettrand. In all these messages, it goes without saying, our stand was reiterated. They were requested, they were urged to do something about meeting the immediate situation in Lebanon. They were requested to make use of their influence on the parties concerned, on the party, the aggressor concerned, if it is possible to get immediate withdrawal undertaken. So, it was with that purpose that these letters were written.

There is no great secret about it. The letters were written on the situation, about the situation and urging upon the Presidents the urgency of the situation. She stressed that the immediate objective must be that Israel forces return to their country and efforts should be made simultaneously to initiate process to bring about a just and durable solution, as she stated here in Parliament.

Prime Minister was also in touch with President Castro and President Mubarak of Egypt and sent replies to their messages suitably, to the letters sent by them.

Then came P.M.'s statement on July 9th in both Houses of Parliament. Before that I had given certain details of the situation in answer to a question in the Rajya Sabha if I remember right. While answering the question I had given a description of what is happening there. So, the House has been kept informed at the earliest and initiatives have been taken right from the beginning. This is a series of initiatives taken by India, both as India and also part of the non-aligned movement. In international forums—June 4—statement issued by the Non-aligned Bureau Meeting in Havana, as I just said. June 11, because by that time all the permanent representatives had gone back to New York, active role played by India in the non-aligned group in New York. India was a member of the Working group set up by Non-aligned Bureau. India drafted and co-sponsored the General Assembly Resolution which was supported by 127 countries and opposed by only 2—Israel and U.S. with no abstentions.

PROF. N. G. RANGA (Guntur): U.S. was one.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO, U.S. of course .

Our permanent representative made a strong statement in the General Assembly on behalf of India.

July 15—17, India played an important role in the Nicosia meeting of the Non-aligned Bureau. We had something to do with the Communique which was brought out because the Drafting Committee was chaired by our representative. Action programme adopted by the meeting was more or less—I do not claim any authorship, I do not claim any copyright, but the action-programme was more or less—in line with what we suggested in the meeting along with, of course, the suggestion which came from other quarters. India was also elected as one of the group of nine countries to visit Lebanon to make on the spot investigation.

Now, Sir before I come to the committee about which some information was asked for, I would like to read just one or two paragraphs from the Communique.

“The Ministers condemned Israel for its aggression against the Lebanon and the Palestinian people and their representative, the P.L.O., as a continuation of the policy followed by Israel since its creation a policy aimed at expanding its territory at the expense of its Arab neighbours and at exterminating the Palestinian people.

“The implementation of such an expansionist policy has been made possible by the massive military, financial and political support given to Israel, particularly by the United States, in the context of their permanent alliance and which has been firmly condemned by the Non-Aligned Countries. Such a policy has led to the holocaust of the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples.

“The Ministers therefore called on the United States Government to reconsider its policy and exert all efforts to ensure the prompt and unconditional withdrawal of the Israeli forces from the Lebanon.”

Now, this is as categorical as one can make it. Than, Sir in Para 19:

"The Ministers Condemned the misuse of the veto by the United States which impeded the Security Council from adopting a unanimous resolution calling for the implementation of the cease-fire and from taking action in support of the Lebanon's sovereignty, for the protection of the Palestinian people and the realization of their inalienable rights."

And, as I just said, that part of the Communiqué which deals with the nine-Member Committee of which India happens to be a Member, the functions of this Committee are as follows:

"To follow closely the developments affecting the Palestinian people and their representative, the P.L.O., particularly in the Lebanon, including a visit to the Lebanon in order to hold consultation with the Government of the Lebanon and the leadership of the P.L.O. and to verify the crimes perpetrated by the Israelis and suggest measures of concrete support and assistance to the Palestinian and Lebanese people."

Now hon. Members will see that this is not just a visit—it is not just one function. It is a series of functions, it is a continuing action-orientation which has been given to it, to follow closely the developments affecting the Palestinian people and their representative, the P.L.O. It does not end at that place. A point was raised, what happened to the Committee. Having formed the Committee, in the Committee we all said that we are prepared to go straight from Nicosia to Beirut. Since the airport of Beirut is unserviceable, we wanted to go to Damascus and from there, by whatever means available, to Beirut. We were all there, ready with our baggage. A special plane was kept at our disposal by the host Government, the Government of Cyprus. Then, immediately after the communiqué was adopted by the meeting, the chairman of the meeting, the Foreign Minister of Cyprus sent off messages to the Government of Syria, the Government of Lebanon and for information to Chairman Yasser Arafat,

Naturally, he could not make any arrangement for us which was to be made by the Government of Lebanon. We waited for one full day. No answer came. Naturally, the situation there perhaps did not permit the Government of Lebanon to take the responsibility of allowing us to go. So, we concluded thereby that the situation does not permit our going there and, after after waiting for one full day, we dispersed.

Now, the latest position in this connection is a telegram which I have received today, dated 20th July, that is, day before yesterday, in which the Foreign Minister of Lebanon is cited as saying:

"He expressed the gratitude of the Government for the interest and solidarity of the movement with Lebanon and the Lebanese people and he asked me to convey to all Ministers his appreciation and regard."

This is from the Foreign Minister of Cyprus who was Chairing the Conference,

"He said that we are very welcome to visit Beirut and he added that the situation there is very volatile and that it changes from day-to-day. He said that a trip to Beirut is not at the moment so easy although he would not say that it is impossible. His Government, however, in the circumstances cannot guarantee either the safety of the Ministers or the free passage to and from Beirut. He suggested that I call him again later on Thursday when he will be in a position to advise me whether a way may be found for the visit of the Committee."

So, it is not that the visit of the Committee is put off for ever. We are in touch with them and it is possible that they might say within a few days that they would be in a position to receive us in which case we are still prepared to go. With this decision we dispersed. It is not that we have given it up for ever. That is the latest position as regards the visit of this Committee.

When India was approached to be a member of this Committee, I unhesitat-

[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao]

ingly accepted it because it is in line with what we were thinking that something more than a resolution should be done, that something more than issuing of a communique should be done and that we should be able to go and show our solidarity with the PLO personally in this group.

Then, the second function entrusted to the groups is:

"Maintain continuous contact with the President of the UNGA, the President of the Security Council, the Secretary General of the United Nations, the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and the permanent and other members of the Security Council with a view to find an immediate, just and comprehensive solution to the current aggression and question of Palestine and to broadening the support and assistance of the world to the Palestinian people.

This again is a programme on a continuing basis.

The third one is:

"Prepare a Special Declaration on the Question of Palestine for the consideration of the Seventh Conference of the Heads of State or Government of the non-aligned countries, in Baghdad, September 1982, expressing the political support to and solidarity with the Palestinian people and their representatives, the P.L.O., and containing comprehensive recommendations for measures of assistance to them."

This we will have to undertake almost with immediate effect. There is not much time to lose. If the Summit is to take place in September 1982, it goes without saying that this work has to start forthwith. That is what we are going to do. So, this is just not a programme in the air. This is very much a concrete programme which we have undertaken. We have not indulged in just platitudes. This programme is a concrete programme and we are going to implement it. This is the

initiative taken by India both in the non-aligned movement and as India.

Now, I come to the initiatives by other bodies, forums other than the non-aligned movement. I am not saying this by way of any reflection. This only shows the helplessness of those concerned that the Arab League could not go much beyond deciding to send a delegation of Ministers to the capitals of the Permanent Members of the Security Council.

On all other matters, obviously the Non-aligned Movement has taken a very clear-cut initiative.

The same thing happened to the Islamic Conference. Perhaps the Conference never met.

And, therefore, the only forum which has taken an initiative, which has taken a clear-cut stand, which has adopted an Action Programme and which is poised to implement that Programme, is the Non-aligned Movement.

This happens to be the position at present.

I think I have answered the points which have been raised. I would just add one or two points.

There was some comment about our Ambassador in Beirut. I would like Hon. Members to appreciate one thing. There is a war situation there. Naturally, we at Headquarters would like to be in touch with our Ambassador from day to day and from hour to hour, if possible. We gave him certain flexibility, certain discretion to take any decision which he needed to take, in view of the circumstances prevailing. On one day we got a report that all the Indians are safe. Within 24 hours, we got the report that 4 or 5 Indians died. The situation in regard to Indians in Beirut continues to cause concern both at home and to the Ambassador there.

So, it will be appreciated that we have to give some flexibility to the Ambassador. He writes that he is running a consulate from a building by the side of a cinema hall where Indian films used to be shown and more and more Indians congregate there for one reason or the other. It is a place where most Indians do generally

go. I would beg of you to imagine under what conditions he is functioning. He has not gone to any place for any luxury. I have visited Beirut before the aggression. Even in Beirut airport, you could see the atmosphere surcharged with danger, with peril. You can feel it in your bones. That being the situation, I think it would be rather uncharitable to level charges that the Ambassador is having a good time. The man goes to East Beirut, comes back to West Beirut and asks women and children to clear. The women say "No. We are not going to be separated from the men." Look at this. This is our culture! This is our cultural heritage! The women refuse to leave the men! What does he do? Will he not take them to a safer place? This is what he did? He is now keeping in touch continuously with us on the situation in regard to the Indians in Beirut. He cannot do that from a place where no one can contact or from where no one can be contacted. So, he has to do his duty. These are the situations which he is facing. We will certainly look into this matter afresh and if there is anything which he has not done, we will ask him why he has not done it.

But to level the sweeping charge that he deserted the Mission and that he has gone and taken refuge in a hotel and things like that, I would say is not only not proper, it is premature. And let us not really be unfair to our own representative who is working under extremely trying conditions.

If I may sum up, the consensus or the points of unanimity that have emerged in the debate—and that is how I would like to wind up my reply—are:

(1) The genocidal invasion by Israel of Lebanon gravely threatens world peace and could well explore into a Third World War.

(2) Israel must immediately comply with the unanimous Resolutions of the Security Council to ceasefire and withdrawal to its own territories. The permanent members of the Security Council, in particular must exercise their responsibilities which their status confers on them to ensure such compliance.

when they can use the veto, they should also use their influence in the positive direction.

(3) The sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity of Lebanon must be respected and preserved.

(4) A just, honourable and durable solution of the Arab-Israeli problem needs to be found without delay, through negotiations.

(5) Any such solution must be based upon a recognition of the inalienable rights of the Palestinians to self-determination and to an independent nation-state in their homeland.

(6) The acquisition and retention of territory by force is inadmissible and any such territory must be returned to its rightful owners.

(7) All States have a right to exist within internationally recognised frontiers without fear of aggression.

This, I would say, has been the consensus, has been the gist of what has been said during the debate. We entirely agree with this, and if Members would like to suggest any further initiatives, they may do so.

On the humanitarian level, the Communique also called upon all nations to give as much assistance, material and moral, as possible to the PLO; in pursuance of that, we have already started giving support of this kind to the extent possible, and needless to say that we would like to do more, and more and more people are coming forward to contribute. This will, again, be a continuous programme.

At the same time, if there are any other directions in which initiatives could be taken apart from what has been...

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: That was suggested, but you are not saying anything about it.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: That is something of a burden of a song which has been going on. That is under consideration. That is really not going to be such a big decision to take, but we will take it.

SHRI SUNIL MAITRA (Calcutta North East): On a point of clarification. In your

[Shri Sunil Maitra]

summing up, point No. 6 says that all the territories occupied and annexed by Israel should be vacated. Does it mean that all the territories occupied and annexed by Israel after the passing of the United Nations Resolution in November 1947 should be vacated?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: 1967.

SHRI SUNIL MAITRA: Because in November 1947, Israel was created through a Resolution of the United Nations.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Our stand is in conformity with 242, and the territories which are referred to in this are territories occupied after 1967. This is very clear. This has been said here.

If there are any further initiatives, any other directions in which initiatives could

be taken by the Government or by other agencies, parties, all of us are united on this; let us discuss them, let us exchange views on a continuing basis. I am prepared for that, and I would like to assure the House that we would be ready. We would be thinking ourselves in what new directions we should proceed because, when there is a Committee which is more or less a standing committee on the question, I am sure as we go along new vistas will open up, new suggestions would come and new initiatives could be taken and action could be initiated in new directions. This is what I would like to submit to the House. I once again thank the Members for their valuable contribution.

18.51 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Monday, July 26, 1982/Sravana 4, 1904 (Saka)