

of all powers; he explained just now that Indian Ocean should be a zone of peace and it is a simple corollary that all powers should withdraw their naval presence. That is a very simplistic approach because it is well known that in all oceans of the world navies of big powers, small powers, do keep on moving. So, that is not the question. The straight question you have to clinch. Because you always seem to equate big naval powers present, meaning thereby USA is present, so the Soviet Union is present; Soviet Union is present, so the presence of U.S.A. is justified. That would not solve the problem. I would like to know categorically since you have come to know that United States of America has categorically refused to get out of the Indian Ocean, they have a permanent base which is used for nuclear presence at Diego Garcia, that is the real danger, do you have similar base? If it is not so by other powers, merely because they are on the defence, you try to keep your fleet. Are you going to equate this? Are you in the United Nations going to pointedly unite all other nations of the world as against the positive action of the United States of America and say that they must remove this base in Diego Garcia, particularly, the nuclear base? Ships may come and go, we can take care of it later.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAJEE : There is no question of objection to movement of ships. If the movement is regular it is not extraordinary. If the movement is to safeguard legitimate interests, there are sea routes which are open to all countries and big powers are using those routes. Littoral countries are in a position to guarantee the freedom of navigation in the Indian Ocean. That does not require setting up of military bases or presence of big power navy almost on a permanent basis. They keep on moving. But the countries do remain in the Indian ocean. The hon. member has suggested something for action and I propose to examine the suggestion made by the hon. member.

MR. SPEAKER : Question No. 63 is postponed.

गुट निरपेक्ष देशों का सम्मेलन

* 64. श्री यादवेंद्र दत्त :

श्री अमर राय प्रधान :

क्या विदेश मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) हाल में हुई गुट निरपेक्ष समन्वय ब्यूरो की बैठक का क्या परिणाम निकला; और

(ख) सम्मेलन में कम्युनिश्चिया और मित्र के बारे में क्या निर्णय किये गये ?

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAJEE): (a) The meeting of the Non-Aligned Coordinating Bureau at Co'ombo once again revealed the inherent strength and resilience of the Non-aligned Movement, the capacity to overcome internal differences of opinion in accordance with well-accepted principles, to maintain unity and continue its independent and dynamic role in international affairs. The text of the final communique adopted has already been placed in the Parliament Library.

(b) With regard to the participation of Kampuchea in the meeting, no consensus could be arrived at and the Chairman declared that without setting a precedent or prejudging the definite decision on this matter, neither this question nor any other issue related to Kampuchea would be raised in the Plenary or at any of the Committees. On the question of temporary suspension of Egypt, the Bureau Members felt that it was beyond their competence to deal with this matter and accordingly the Bureau decided that the proposal be left for decision by the Sixth Summit Conference of the Non-aligned Movement.

SHRI YADAVENDRA DUTT : Is it a fact that certain powers made a move at the Non-aligned Conference to ascribe certain Resolution which might have had the effect of aligning the non-aligned movement virtually to certain blocks of powers whom they profess that those blocks were their natural friends? Is so, what was the stand of the Government of India in the matter?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : No such proposal was made. On the contrary the Colombo meeting has emphasised the non-block character of the non-aligned movement had also as an independent factor in international politics to maintain peace and develop-cooperation on the basis of five principles of peaceful Co-existence.

SHRI YADAVENDRA DUTT : The question is of shifting the question of Egyptian expulsion on the non-aligned movement to the Havana Session. Will it be proper to penalise the State for actions which that State might have done in its own national interest and those interest may not have been agreeable to certain powers. Is the non-aligned movement going to accept this principle of expulsion, because of certain nation's taking action in their own national interest.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : The question of suspension of Egypt is complex and complicated question. There is no precedent for expelling any member, least of all a founder-member. But on the West Asian and Middle Eastern problem, the non-aligned movement has been taking a very consistent stand. Unfortunately, the treaty between Egypt and Israel is a partial treaty and not a comprehensive settlement. The entire Arab territory has not been vacated and the legitimate rights of the Palestinians have not been restored, including the right to have an independent State. India has criticised the treaty because we feel that the treaty falls short of a comprehensive settlement. But there was no consensus so far as the question of suspension of Egypt was concerned.

SHRI AMAR ROY PRADHAN : May I know whether the Government of Cuba gave a draft declaration to be presented in the next summit in Havana and what are the items included in the draft? May I know whether the Kampuchea issue has been included in the draft? May I also know whether the Cuban Government said in the draft, "Socialist world is a natural ally to the non-aligned movement"? May I know whether the hon. Minister agrees with this Cuban proposition or not? |

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : The hon. Vice-President of Cuba was in New Delhi for consultations, which are being held in the capitals of non-aligned countries in preparation for the forthcoming Havana summit. The question of Kampuchea has to be decided by the

summit and the question will be who should represent Kampuchea. That will not be a part of the document. It is not correct to say that the draft document circulated by Cuba includes the demand that non-aligned nations should declare the socialist block as their natural ally. Our Cuban friends made it quite clear that their national position on this question, is different. They do regard the socialist countries as their natural ally and as the ally of non-aligned nations. But as Chairman of the non-aligned summit they said they will not impose their views on the movement as a whole and we are satisfied with the position that they have stated.

SHRI SAUGATA ROY : I just heard the Foreign Minister saying that Egypt-Israel treaty do's not take into account the problem of Palestinian refugees as also many other outstanding problems in that area. May I ask him in this context as to why was it they immediately before the non-aligned bureau meeting, the Prime Minister of India came forward with a Statement and letter to the Cuban President, Fidel Castro, that India will not attend the non-aligned summit in case Egypt is not admitted there? On the one hand, the Foreign Minister says, the treaty is not satisfactory. On the other hand, the Prime Minister is going on record saying that unless Egypt attends, he will not attend the non-aligned summit. What is the logic behind this?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : There is no question of keeping out Egypt from the summit meeting. If any decision has to be taken on the demand made by Arab countries for temporary suspension of Egypt it has to be decided by the summit. The Prime Minister made India's position clear. But in an earlier interview he had also said that if there was no consensus on this question, India will abide by the general opinion.

SHRI SYED KAZIM ALI MEERZA : As far as the policy of India is concerned, is it not out stand that the Palestinians are on the right path, their their motherland has been denied to them and that they should get their right? If that be the case, as far as this Treaty between Egypt and Israel is concerned, it is not in the interest of the Arab and the Middle-East as a whole. It is a partial monoeuvring which will weaken the policy of justice. Is it or is it not correct?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : The Palestinian question is the core of the Middle-East problem. Unless legitimate rights, national rights of the Palestinians are restored, unless they are allowed to come to their hearths and homes, unless they are allowed to exercise the right to an independent state if they want to have such a State, the possibility of a lasting and just peace in the Middle-East will not materialise.