

SHRI BHERAVADAN K. GADHAVI : The poor people who are engaged in making bricks are coming to grief for want of coal ash. The cooperative societies and other people take it on a monopoly basis. There is a lot of misconduct on their part also. In view of this, I would like to know whether the Government contemplates to sell coal ash to the poor potters, particularly those who hail from the villages.

Secondly, it has also come to light that because of scarcity of coal, at certain places a racket is going on. Instead of dropping down the ash, sometimes in connivance with these people, the drivers and others drop down the live burning coal at a particular spot, which benefits these people. Will the Government take action in this regard also ?

SHRI MALLIKARJUN : The unburnt coal, cinder as we call it, is dropped out of the fire boxes and it is not being given to the cooperative societies. The hon. Member says that in connivance with the drivers and others, coal is dropped and the private contractors and others make use of it. We have issued strict instructions to exercise proper vigilance in this regard and if any particular case comes to our notice, action will be taken immediately.

SHRI Y. S. MAHAJAN : Sir, the potters are in backward community in our society. They have formed cooperative societies, for instance, in my district. But they are not being given coal ash. In the Bhusawal Division of the Central Railway coal ash is given to contractors. I would like to know whether the Hon. Minister will give instructions to the Bhusawal Division to see that Government policy is followed ?

THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS (SHRI KEDAR PANDAY): I shall look into it and see that justice is done.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: You will look into it that Government policy is followed.

SHRI KEDAR PANDAY : We sell coal ash to cooperative societies. That is the confirmed policy of the Railway Ministry. If there are real specific cases of departure that shall be looked into and that should be referred to us.

श्री मोती भाई शार० चौधरी : पश्चिम रेलवे में भी ऐसा कदाचार चल रहा है। छोटे मोटे रेलवे स्टेशनों पर जो कोयले की राख होती है उसके घोटाले में रेलवे कमचारी भी शामिल रहते हैं और इसीलिए प्राइवेट लोगों को वह कोयले की राख दे देते हैं और छोटे छोटे वर्तन बनाने वालों की कोआपरेटिव सोसाइटीज को वहां कोयले की राख नहीं मिलती है। तो क्या मंत्री जी पश्चिम रेलवे को कहेंगे कि कड़ाई से सरकार की पौलिसी पर अमल हो ?

श्री केदार पांडे : छोटे छोटे लोग भी कोआपरेटिव सोसायटी बना सकते हैं, उनको बनाना चाहिए, यही हमारी पौलिसी है। अब इंडिविजुअल को देने में गड़बड़ हो सकती है।

**ब्रिटेन की प्रधान मंत्री के साथ हुई
बातचीत**

+

* 1094. श्री मूल चन्द्र डागा :

श्री इन्द्र जीत गुप्त :

क्या विदेश मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) 15 अप्रैल, 1981 को भारत की यात्रा पर आया ब्रिटेन की प्रधान मंत्री के साथ किन-किन विषयों पर बातचीत हुई थी और भारत तथा ब्रिटेन के बीच किन-

किन मामलों के बारे में समझौते किये गये थे ; और

(द) क्या ब्रिटेन की प्रधान मंत्री के साथ अमेरिका द्वारा पाकिस्तान को हथियारों की सप्लाई के सम्बन्ध में भी बातचीत हुई थी और इस सम्बन्ध में ब्रिटेन की प्रधान मंत्री की क्या प्रतिक्रिया रही ?

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO): (a) The British Prime Minister and our Prime Minister discussed major international issues, the new Nationality Bill and Indo-British Economic relations. The following five Memoranda of Understanding were signed:

- (i) Cooperation in certain industries and in trade;
- (ii) Collaboration on Space Activities;
- (iii) Cooperation in Science and Technology;
- (iv) The development of the Indian Power Generation sector; and
- (v) Cooperation in the development of the Indian Coal Industry.

Letters were also exchanged on two Economic Cooperation Agreements on the Thal Fertilizer Project and on Local Costs Grants for 1981. A convention on Avoidance of Double Taxation was also signed, which will facilitate further commercial and economic activities between the two countries.

(b) Yes, Sir. Our Prime Minister conveyed India's concern on the proposed US delivery of arms to Pakistan to the British P.M. The British Prime Minister said that every nation has the right to protect itself.

श्री मूल चन्द्र डागा : ब्रिटेन की प्रधान मंत्री 15 अप्रैल से 19 अप्रैल तक यहां रहीं और मैं आर्थिक मुद्दों को छोड़ कर यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि ऐसे कौन से राजनीतिक मुद्दे थे जो उभरे हुए थे और जिन राजनीतिक मुद्दों को भारत के प्रधान मंत्री और हमारे यहां के मंत्रियों ने उठाया हो और उनका निराकरण नहीं हुआ हो ? और भारत के हित में और भारतीय मूल के जो लोग ब्रिटेन में रहते हैं उनकी समस्याओं का निराकरण नहीं हुआ हो ? उनका निराकरण न होने का क्या कारण था ? और क्या यह सही है कि राजनीतिक मामलों में भारत और ब्रिटेन की वैचारिक दूरी अमेरिका और ब्रिटेन में अनुदार दलों की सरकारें बनने के बाद और बढ़ गई है ?

श्री पी० बी० नरसिंह राव : मैं कह चुका हूँ कि चर्चा हुई है अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय मामलों पर, नेशनैलिटी बिल पर और ब्रिटेन और भारत की आर्थिक समस्याओं पर। अब जो अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय मामले हैं उन पर चर्चा हुई, नतीजा यह हुआ कि उन्होंने अपनी बात कही, हमने अपनी बात कही।

श्री मूल चन्द्र डागा : कौन से ऐसे मुद्दे आपने उठाये जिनका निराकरण नहीं हो सका, खासकर भारतीय मूल के लोग जो ब्रिटेन में रहते हैं उनके बारे में मैंने जानना चाहा था ?

श्री पी० बी० नरसिंह राव : वह तो उठाया गया। निराकरण नहीं होने का कारण यही था कि उनकी अपनी बात पर अड़े रहना था और हमकी अपनी बात उनकी सुनानी थी। दोनों तरफ से यह काम पूरा हुआ।

श्री मूल चन्व डागा : ब्रिटेन की प्रधान मंत्री, श्रीमती थैचर, ने पार्लियामेंट के सदस्यों के सामने भाषण देते हुए अपनी इम्मीग्रेशन पालिसीज के बारे में कहा था कि नैशनलिटी बिल से भारतीयों को कोई फ़र्क नहीं पड़ेगा। हमने कहा था कि इस सम्बन्ध में श्वेत और अश्वेत में भेद न किया जाए। क्या मैं मान सकता हूँ कि क्या ब्रिटिश सरकार की इम्मीग्रेशन पालिसीज कई वर्षों से ब्रिटेन में रहने वाले भारतीयों के हित में होगी या उनके प्रति डिस्क्रिमिनेशन किया जायेगा ?

श्री पी० बी० नरसिंह राव : जब ब्रिटेन की प्रधान मंत्री यहाँ बोल रही थीं तो हम सब सुन रहे थे। उन्होंने साफ़ कहा कि नैशनलिटी बिल के कारण कोई पक्षपात नहीं होगा रंग या किसी और बुनियादी पर। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने खास तौर से उस बात की तरफ़ इशारा करते हुए कहा कि हम यह आशा करते हैं कि आपके इस कानून में ऐसा कोई बुरा अंतर नहीं पड़ेगा। उनके कहने का मतलब यह था कि कोई बुरा अंतर नहीं पड़ना चाहिए।

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: I cannot ask a question in such a diplomatic language, as his answers are. I would like to know (a) whether all this boils down to this, viz. that on almost all questions pertaining to international relations, international security and so on, the views expressed by Mrs. Thatcher were at complete variance with the perceptions and outlook of our Government. This is number one; (b) as far as the economic part of this agreement goes—which he has listed here—in the items which were covered, I don't find any mention—whether any discussion was held regarding the protectionist policies which the British Government is following, as a

result of which in the last few years, our adverse balance of trade with Britain is running to nearly Rs. 300 crores, affecting very badly Indian exports to Britain. There is no mention here about what happened regarding this question. (Interruptions)

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: While it is true that on several important matters, our perceptions are different, on one very important matter in the Middle East, we found considerable similarity in our approach; and that is the Palestinian problem. Mrs. Thatcher clearly said that Britain's approach to the Palestinian problem was different from the approach of the United States; and to that extent, we found that her views were more in line with ours, although they may not be identical. Except this one matter, on all other matters, all other important matters we only ended up by trying to understand each other's point of view.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Agreed to differ.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: The second part of Mr. Gupta's question did come up for discussion. We were able to persuade the British to agree that UK and the European Community give sympathetic consideration to appropriate commercial policy measures to improve India's exports. Both countries also agreed that vigorous efforts have to be made to resist protectionism, and to maintain and improve the open and multilateral world trading system. This is what happened on the trade side.

SHRI MADHAVRAO SCINDIA: The British Prime Minister has justified the American re-arming of Pakistan, when she has said that every country has a right to protect itself. A lot of

people have assumed that she has obviously the Afghanistan situation in mind; but in its very nature, this statement is specifically directed against us, because it is not true that a majority of the arms that are being supplied by America to Pakistan are of absolutely no use in the mountainous terrain of Pakistan's western frontier, but are only to be used on its eastern frontier? I would like to know from the hon. Minister of External Affairs whether this has been pointed out to the British Prime Minister, and if this has been pointed out, and in spite of that, she has made the statement, in the opinion of the Minister of External Affairs, does this not mean that she has tactfully accepted that India harbours aggressive intention against Pakistan in the face of which she is justifying the rearming of Pakistan?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: It has not come quite to that point. In fact, I enquired whether Mrs. Thatcher had discussed the massive scale military assistance to Pakistan by the U.S. when she visited Washington. I also said that this was something which caused us great concern. The British Prime Minister said that they did not really touch on this. They discussed bilateral relations and NATO. So, we need not go to the extent of reading too much in her statement because she has said that this particular point did not come up for discussion between her and the U.S.; it was clear that she was not committing herself to any position which we would like to allege.

MR. SPEAKER: Shri G. Y. Krishnan—next question
(Interruptions)

SHRI MADHAVRAO SCINDIA: Did you point out to her about the quantity of arms?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: It was pointed out to her

that the quantity and also the nature of arms that were sought to be supplied to Pakistan were of quite a different character and they would be only used against India; this has been our past experience. All these things were put to her and then I asked her whether she discussed this aspect of massive arms aid to Pakistan in Washington. She said, "No, this was not touched upon."

Restricting use of Conventional weapons

*1095. **SHRI G. Y. KRISHNAN:** Will the Minister of EXTERNAL AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that a number of countries have signed a U.N. convention forbidding or restricting the use of the most cruel and inhuman conventional weapons; and

(b) if so, the names of such countries which are not supporting such conventions?

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO): (a) Yes, Sir. According to information presently available to Government, the following 35 countries have signed the Convention on 'inhumane' weapons, which was opened for signature in New York on 10 April 1981:

1. Afghanistan, 2. Austria,
3. Belgium, 4. Bulgaria,
5. Byelo-russian Soviet Socialist Republic, 6. Canada, 7. Cuba,
8. Czechoslovakia, 9. Denmark,
10. Egypt, 11. Finland, 12. France,
13. German Democratic Republic, 14. Germany, Federal Republic of, 15. Greece, 16. Hungary, 17. Iceland, 18. Ireland, 19. Italy, 20. Luxembourg, 21. Mexico, 22. Mongolia, 23. Morocco, 24. Netherlands, 25. New Zealand, 26. Norway, 27. Poland, 28. Portugal,