

کیا ہے - ان عبادت گاہوں سے ناجائز قبضہ ہٹانے میں وقف بورڈ کی فڈلٹ کوتاہی اور نا اہلی اور وقف قوانین کی کمزوری اور پولیس اور حکومت کے عملے کی لاپرواہی اور ملی بہمت کی وجہ سے کوئی عملی قدم نہیں اٹھا پا رہا ہے -

مثال کے طور پر جامع مسجد دلی کے شمال میں واقع دربیہ کی مسجد شرف الدولہ جو نواب صاحب کی مسجد کے نام سے مشہور ہے اس مسجد سے متصل ایک مدرسہ بھی ہے اس مسجد کے صحن میں ایک کورڈ پتی [صرف اور دوسرے درگاہوں نے دفاتر اور ملازمین کے لئے رکھا ہے اس گاہوں میں تبدیل کر رکھا ہے - اس طرح مسجد کھجور چارڑی ہازار اور مسجد قاضی والی نئی دلی ریواؤ اسٹیشن کو بھی دوکانوں اور ہوٹل میں تبدیل کیا جا چکا ہے - مسلمانوں کے مسلسل مطالبے کے باوجود حکومت کی جانب سے نئی دلی کی مسجد کورٹلہ مبارک پور میں نماز پڑھنے کی اجازت نہیں دی جا رہی ہے - شانتی ون میں نہرو سادھی کے قریب واقع مسجد کو قی - قی - اے - نے مصلوئی تھلے پر گہلی چھڑیاں اور درخت لگا کر قہک دیا ہے -

سکولز ہندوستان کی راجدھانی میں جہاں اس وقت مرکزی حکومت

کی سیدھی عمل داری ہے مسجدوں پر مظالم اور ان کی تباہی اور ہربادی روکی جانی چاہئے تھی - حکومت ہند کو چاہئے کہ وہ اس طرف خصوصی توجہ دے اور چھ ماہ کی مقدرہ مدت نے اندر ان مسجد کی بحالی کے لئے عملی قدم اٹھائیں - وقت کے قوانین میں جو خامیاں ہیں انہیں اوتھلڈس کے ذریعہ دور کریں - وقف کی جائیدادوں پر سے قبضہ ہٹانے کے لئے وہی قانون استعمال کیا جائے جس کے تحت سرکاری املاک پر سے ناجائز قبضہ ہٹائے جاتے ہیں - اوقاف کو بہمت کلتروں کے قانون سے مستثنیٰ قرار دیا جائے اور ہرنی کمیٹی کی سنارشات پر عمل کیا جائے -

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS, 1981-82—
Contd.

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House will now take up discussion and voting on the Demand for Grant under the control of the Ministry of External Affairs, for which six hours have been allotted.

Hon. Members, whose cut motions to the Demand for Grants have been circulated, may, if they desire to move their cut motions, send slips to the table within fifteen minutes, indicating the serial number of the cut motions they would like to move.

A list showing the serial numbers of cut motions treated as moved will be put up on the notice board shortly. In case any member finds any discrepancy in the lists, he may kindly bring it to the notice of the officer at the Table without delay.

Demands for Grants, 1981-82 in respect of the Ministry of External Affairs submitted to the Vote of Lok Sabha.

No. of Demand	Name of Demand	Amount of Demand for Grant on account voted by the House on 13-3-1981		Amount of Demand for Grant submitted to the vote of the House	
		Revenue	Capital	Revenue	Capital
1	2	3	4	5	6
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

31	Ministry of External Affairs	25,73,27,000	4,78,51,000	128,66,34,000	23,92,56,000
----	------------------------------	--------------	-------------	---------------	--------------

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY (Calcutta South): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Report that emanates from the Ministry of External Affairs, at the very outset, cautions us that this Report of the Ministry covers a particularly difficult period of international relations, in which there was a sharp intensification in Great Power rivalries and competition. I agree that the international situation has aggravated. I agree that dark clouds are gathering. But the analysis that is present here is confusing and misleading. According to the Government, the aggravation of international situation is due to great power rivalry, as if the real cause of this danger, the real cause of tension is due to the rivalry of the two Super Power. Now, this stems from the understanding that the international situation is dominated by power model. It is the quest for power that is at the root of all international tensions and rivalry. Mr. Chairman, I do not find any reason to accept this type of analysis. This type of analysis does not reveal the true character of international situation. There is a dangerous trend in this analysis to equate the two great powers and there is also a deliberate attempt not to show the political and economic forces that are behind international tensions. Frankly speaking, if we analyse the international situation since the Second World War, it will

be evident that the policy of the United States of America enunciated in the Truman Doctrine was nothing but a cold war preparation in the name of containing communism but actually to fight the liberation movements. It was an attempt to maintain the status quo and to stem the tide of national liberation movements and revolutionary movements, and the United States of America was frank—rather devastatingly frank—to say that the danger really lies in the fact that American interest and for that matter, the interest of the whole capitalist world was in danger because of the nationalist movements in Asia, Africa and Latin America, and Latin America, and also it is due to the Second World War and precarious economic conditions in Western Europe and the desire of the people to change the status quo, to change the socio-economic system. It is clear that after the Second World War the bogie of Soviet threat was held out to the people of the world. Let us analyse that after the Second World War the Soviet Union was facing tremendous difficulties and it was also a non-nuclear power. So, it was not possible for the Soviet Union without caring for its internal economic development to concentrate on this type of thing which the USA was telling and this Soviet bogie, this Soviet threat was used as a matter of fact to fight the revolutionary forces,

(Shri Satyasadhan Chakraborty)

to fight the nationalist forces. It was the United States of America which openly declared that its responsibility was to maintain the status quo. It will be clear from this, that in the Marshall Plan they gave economic and military assistance to France and other western countries. More than 50 per cent was utilised not for the protection of metropolitan France, not to fight the mythical Soviet threat, but to fight the people of Vietnam, to fight the people of Algeria. Similarly in Belgium, NATO assistance was utilised to maintain their colonial empire. Great Britain also utilised the American assistance not against the Soviet Union because they knew that there was no immediate threat from the Soviet Union but they utilised the assistance against the people who were striving for independence who were fighting against colonialism and imperialism. The military assistance provided by the United States of America was utilised to fight the freedom fighters, nationalist forces, liberation force. It is dangerous on part of our Government to equate the super powers and to say that the present rivalry is due to the rivalry of the two super power viz., USA and USSR. Even at the present moment, let us analyse the statements of Mr. Reagan and Mr. Brezhnev, Mr. Regan openly says that he does not mind limited nuclear war and there is an open threat from the United States of America. And what is this threat? Either the Soviet Union will have to give up its political system or accept the danger of war. What is this? It is that until and unless you openly review your economic system, we are ready to fight. In this Report we find that the Indian Government is trying to equate these super powers. The Government of India refuses to see that it is the crisis of capitalism, in the USA today it is the crisis of monopoly; capitalism which is desperately leading them to intensification of cold war and if possible leading to hot

war. To-day in Britain 10.3 per cent of the working forces are unemployed. United States of America is facing economic disaster. What is the way out? Their way out is spending more for Defence. The United States of America have even cut social welfare programme. But it has increased its defence expenditure it is running to 170 billion dollars. (Interruptions).

It is the United States of America which is now openly propagating limited nuclear war and in the name of what? It is in the name of military superiority over the Soviet Union.

Let us examine the two statement of Mr. Reagan and Mr. Brezhnev. Mr. Reagan says, we must have superiority over the military might of the Soviet Union. Mr. Brezhnev says we do not want any military superiority. We want peace. But then Mr. Brezhnev says that at present the military equilibrium that exists between NATO and WARSAW powers that creates a non-war-condition. But if this equilibrium is altered, there is a danger of war and this danger is coming from the United States of America and its allies.

MR. CHAIRMAN: May I know who are the allies?

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY: There are Western European countries, international allies, and also some allies like Mr. Subramaniam Swamy and others.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You cannot name him.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY (Bombay North East): I cannot be a single-man country.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY: Individuals are also allies.

In this Report, we find that India Government is trying like an ostrich to bury its head and not to see the realities of the present-day world. That is dangerous because from this

analysis, our Government will reach wrong conclusions, wrong strategies and wrong tactics.

Again, in this Report, we find that our Government talks of non-alignment as a part of our foreign policy and we support non-alignment. After our Independence, we found a bi-polarised thermo-nuclear world. True. The relevant response to the situation is decidedly non-alignment. Non-alignment is also rooted in our freedom struggle.

What are the basic principles of non-alignment? Firstly, it is anti-colonialism; it is anti-imperialism. All the countries which subscribe to this non-alignment had to fight against imperialist domination and exploitation, economic, political and social... So, the basic principle of non-alignment is anti-colonialism, anti-imperialism. And that was emphasized in the Belgrade Conference.

Another principle of non-alignment is peace; it is non-aggression of any kind. Also, another principle of non-alignment is, mutual discussions and negotiations. But, unfortunately, we find that in the recent non-aligned nationals' Conference—the number has increased; it may be 100 or more—this anti-imperialist content of non-alignment has been corroded. We find, there are countries among the non-aligned nations who take their lead from the imperialist bloc. That is why, if you go through the press reports of these countries you will find that they say that Soviet Union was cornered, as if the main thing is rivalry between the Soviet Union and others, as if the main thing is not to fight imperialism, colonialism, the basic principle is not to see that the under-developed and developing countries become economically self-reliant, that they become economically strong and all the colonialist and imperialist forces are defeated.

Unfortunately, in the Conference of Non-Aligned Nations, there are many countries which were only some

years back in the American camp, either a member of SEATO or some other military bloc of USA and there are some American-backed Trojan horses. And they are trying to torpedo the very spirit of non-alignment, anti-colonialism and anti-imperialism.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Won't you allow the freedom of consent?

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY: I would like to ask our Foreign Minister to enunciate clearly the principles of non-alignment and the basic principles which the Government of India adheres to.

There are some Members who would say: Where is this colonialism or imperialism? Well, it is true that most of the countries which were oppressed, plundered and looted by the imperialists, have become free. But, there is something like dollar imperialism and I would like to refer to one book, not written by Lenin, but written by Shri Jawaharlal Nehru "Glimpses of World History". There a whole Chapter is devoted to dollar imperialism. The doctrines of United States of America, right from its Munroe doctrine which was nothing but a doctrine to entrench themselves economically in the Latin American countries, are all doctrines of dollar imperialism. So today, neo-colonialism, economic imperialism, dollar imperialism, all these are the real threats to the world. But unfortunately in the report itself there is no mention of it. Only what is mentioned is that there is a struggle between the poor South and the rich North, as if the struggle is not between the exploiting neocolonialists, exploiting imperialists and exploited and oppressed nations but a struggle between the poor South and the rich North. I refuse to accept this type of analysis.

Then this report mentions about Afghanistan. Now, what is the matter in Afganistan? Well, some people say that in Afganistan, the Soviet army has occupied the Afgan territory.

MR. CHAIRMAN: They have a liberated.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY : Well, you have a different view about liberation. I beg to differ. What is the condition? And there are some friends who are ready to fight for the freedom of the Afghan people. What type of freedom did not the Afghan people enjoy? What type of freedom do you want to fight for? But the Soviet Union has said openly that they want to withdraw provided there is no interference from outside.

I would again like to draw the pointed attention of the Foreign Minister to the fact that the Regan administration has openly said that they are going to arm the insurgents and send them to Afghanistan. But, what is the United States of America doing? It wants to force Afghanistan to the *status quo*, the rule of the 40,000 people who own two-thirds of the land. In Afghanistan, a country of 1,50,00,000 people, there are only 200 factories and there was feudalism. There was no liberty. The people were oppressed and the United States of America talks of freedom and is trying to bring back the old situation.

(Interruptions)

Regarding Afghanistan, even today the Soviet Union is openly saying that it is ready to withdraw provided there is a guarantee that there will be no outside interference. May I ask some of our friends whether they are ready to say that the United States of America would agree to readily withdraw from South Korea? Is the USA saying that it is ready to withdraw from Japan? They are not saying.

The Soviet Union is demanding only one simple thing. It says that it is ready to withdraw even tomorrow provided there is a guarantee to the sovereignty and independence of Afghanistan. Where is that guaranteed? Why is it that these fighters for freedom are not guaranteed this

simple thing that is enshrined in the Bandung Conference principles—that there should be no outside interference? I think that our Government should seriously think about this and should not submit to the pressure of some of the so-called non-aligned nations who are acting at the behest of the United States of America.

In this Report we find that there is a mention about Diego Garcia. Why is it that the U.S.A. is intensifying its activities there? Why is it that the Diego Garcia base is going to be nuclearised? It is because of the global strategy of the U.S.A. to maintain this *status quo*, to maintain the economic interests of the imperialist powers headed by the U.S.A. The Government of India should openly say—not only just air its voice meekly but say it definitely—that these foreign bases must be liquidated. The Government of India should take a firm stand on this and it must give a lead. I know that our Foreign Minister, whenever he talks, is very subtle which is necessary, but in foreign policy it is sometimes necessary to be very bold and to call a spade a spade. We should demand that there should be withdrawal of all military bases in Diego Garcia lock, stock and barrel. This is a danger to the people not only of the littoral or hinterland States but of the whole region here.

In this Report, I find, the Government mentions about the new economic order. Well, I support it. Our foreign policy should be based on our interest. Now, what is our interest? Our interest is that we want to have a strong economy, we want to be independent, self-reliant. But, unfortunately, what is happening? Because of the policy we are pursuing, we are becoming dependent on the imperialist powers and their aid, because of this economic weakness, because of our failure on the economic front, our non-alignment policy is getting diluted. We cannot boldly enunciate our foreign policy because we know that we must have help from the European Common

Market, we must have help from the U.S.A. It is generally agreed that a nation which is economically weak cannot pursue an independent foreign policy. So, it is necessary—so that we pursue a hold foreign policy which is anti imperialist, anti-colonialist,—that we must have a self reliant economy..

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please try to conclude.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY: I am capable of speaking without being directed from here or from there. I am concluding, Mr. Chairman.

I agree that there are dangers because the U.S.A. has decided to arm Pakistan to the teeth. We must tell it frankly that this arming is a danger to the whole region. We want friendly relations with Pakistan. I agree with the Report when it says that we must have friendly relations with Pakistan on the basis of the Simla Agreement. A developing country like ours must have friendly relations with all the neighbours. That is why I urge upon the Foreign Minister to open a dialogue with China which is a great neighbour of ours so that we can defuse tension.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: And a friend also China may be a great neighbour but it is also a friend.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY: We want friendly relations with all because it is in our interests...

MR. CHAIRMAN: And malice towards none.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY:....so that we manage and retain a peaceful atmosphere with all our neighbours, so that we are not compelled to increase our defence expenditure and can devote our scarce resources for our economic development. There are some friends who understand that the defence capability depends upon military hardware. In

the world of to-day it is not only the military hardware in any war, but it is also the economic strength of a country which is the true defence of the country. You have to cloth the people, you have to feed the people and you have to educate the people. You must have a production base which is capable enough to sustain an independent foreign policy and the independence of the nation. Until and unless we do that, until and unless we have real economic strength, simply increasing defence expenditure is not going to protect us.

There are friends who are very friendly with USA and who say 'See Soviet Union in Afghanistan' I ask them. Pakistan was with the USA. It was one of the "freedomwalas." What has happened to Pakistan? As a matter of fact, in the list of the aid-recipients, Iran and Pakistan topped the list. What is the condition of Iran? What is the condition of Pakistan? I will ask them to pause and ponder. That is why a request through you our Foreign Minister to consider that the Reagan administration has initiated a policy of naked interference and aggression intensifying war preparations and openly declaring that the United States of America will maintain the *status quo* meaning thereby their imperialist plunder, even if necessary, through war. It is an open declaration. I want the Government of India to take note of it. Instead of balancing and instead of saying that the two super powers are in competition, they should realise that it is the imperialist powers which are endangering our freedom and it is the imperialist powers which are now trying to tilt the balance in their favour to start a war and it is the imperialist powers which are now trying to export counter-revolution and it is the imperialist powers which openly say that they will not allow any change in the socio-economic system.

[Shri Satyasadhan Chakraborty]

Mr. Chairman, I request the Government of India to at least revise its policy and also to openly proclaim to the world that India stands by the struggling people of the world. What is happening in South Africa? The United States of America is openly supporting the racist regime there. The USA is trying to create another Vietnam in El Salvador. Who is doing all these things? What is the role of the Soviet Union? What is the role of the Soviet Union when there was the problem of Kashmir? Was the Kashmir problem the result of super powers rivalry? Was the Soviet veto due to the power conflict? Is it not a fact that since the 1917 November revolution, the Soviet Union has openly declared that it is in favour of freedom and liquidation of foreign bases and that it will stand by the people who fight for freedom and fight against colonialism.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please conclude now.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am really sorry to say this. I do not find any reason what compels you to intervene and disturb me. (*Interruptions*) It may be, you may not like what I say. You allow me some time more.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the Chair can disturb, then the Chair has the right and the duty also to tell the Member to conclude. You are not the only speaker, there are a large number of speakers.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY: Have I consumed more time?

AN HON. MEMBER: More than what is allowed.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY: I have not consumed more time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am not arguing. Mr. Scindia,

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY: ~~He~~, Sir. I protest. You are intervening unnecessarily.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You must conclude now.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY: Why are you disturbing me? I have a right to say what I like to say. I have the responsibility to conclude. But, from the very beginning you were disturbing me. This is not the way. You had been disturbing me all the time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Excuse me. There are several hon. Members who want to speak.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY: You could have asked me to conclude. All the time you had been disturbing me. Why, Sir? You are wasting my time. (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Have I wasted your time?

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY: Since you are in the Chair, if you do not like what I say, even then you have to hear me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Excuse me. There is no question of likes or dislikes.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY: Have I consumed more time?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then it is your judgement. (*Interruptions*) Excuse me. Then I am helpless. You must conclude now. Whosoever sits in the Chair would have done the same thing.

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA HAIDER (Durgapur): Kindly allow him three or four minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is what I have been telling him. I have allowed him time. Your party had been allowed 22 minutes. But, I have allowed him to speak for half-an hour. If two or three minutes are required to conclude, then say so—not in this manner. I am always reasonable.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: He can deliver the rest of the speeches..

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is correct. He can get other opportunities also.

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA HALDER: Kindly allow him to conclude.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY: Mr. Chairman, Sir, while specifically agreeing with (Interruptions)

SHRI JAGDISH TYTLER (Delhi Saagar): You have spent all the time talking about Russia and America. Within the remaining time you should talk about your own country.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY: Are you going to conduct the debate like this—I want to hear from you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You must conclude now. You cannot find fault with the Chair. Excuse me. No comments. You just conclude now.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY: Mr. Chairman, Sir, while broadly supporting the foreign policy of our Government and while supporting the non-alignment policy, I would caution our Government that there are serious attempts from inside and outside to corrode the anti-imperialist content of our Foreign Policy. Mr. Chairman, Sir, I warn our Government that the moment we actually are influenced by these forces, the standing, our country has in the minds of the millions of the people who are fighting colonialism and imperialism, will gradually go down. That is why I would urge upon the Government to initiate a bolder and dynamic foreign policy consonant with the real interests of our great country and of our great people and also to give a lead to the Afro-Asian countries against imperialism, colonialism and economic exploitation.

SHRI G. M. BANATWALLA (Pon-nani): I beg to move:

“That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1”.

[Failure to invoke total and effective economic and political sanctions against the Zionist State of Israel acknowledged by the U.N.O. as a racist entity like South Africa]. (1)

“That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1”.

[Policy of furthering relations with the Zoaist State of Israel, a racist entity like South Africa, as evident from Government recognition granted to M.Sc. (Civil Engineering) degree of Israel Institute of Technology]. (2)

“That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1”.

[Failure to order closure of Israeli Consulate in Bombay]. (3)

“That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1”.

[Weak and unsatisfactory policy regarding Soviet military intervention in Afghanistan]. (4)

“That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1”.

[Need to give more effective support to the Palestine Movement]. (5)

“That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1”.

[Need to strengthen friendly relations with neighbouring countries]. (6)

“That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100”.

[Need to set up a permanent Expert Advisory Committee for continuous critical evaluation of foreign policies and formulation of policy alternatives]. (9)

[Shri G. M. Banatwalla]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Need to form a cadre of the foreign languages Interpreters, immediately]. (10)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Need to give full diplomatic status to the Mission of the League of Arab States in Delhi]. (11)

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA
(Madhubani): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1".

[Failure to take effective steps for making Indian Ocean a zone of peace and work for elimination of military bases like those at Diego Garcia]. (7)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Failure to support the demand of Mauritius for return of Diego Garcia to it at the Delhi Conference of Non-aligned Foreign Ministers]. (15)

SHRI R. K. MHALGI (Thane):
I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1".

[Failure to bring back forty Indian Military Officers who are in the jails of Pakistan since last ten years]. (8)

SHRI T. R. SHAMANNA (Bangalore South): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Failure to take suitable action to counteract the proposed atom bomb blast by Pakistan]. (16)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Failure to take effective check and vigilance over foreign espionage agents]. (17)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Failure to put India in a better and brighter honoured place in the world map]. (18)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Failure to repute proper persons (both diplomatic and consular) to serve in our foreign embassies in different countries who can project India's image in a better way]. (19)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Failure to check the attack on Indians in United Kingdom on the basis of colour, economic and other grounds]. (20)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Failure to declare our stand on Afghanistan issue with particular reference to the involvement of U.S.S.R.]. (21)

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI
(Patna): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1".

[Need to land open support to the policies of Afghanistan]. (23)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1".

[Failure to take initiative in finding a political solution to the Afghan problem]. (25)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1".

[Failure to block the setting up of American nuclear base in Diego Garcia]. (26)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Need to make Indian Embassies more functional]. (27)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Need to give all possible help to Hang Samarin Government of Kampuchea]. (28)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Failure to avoid delay in issuing passports]. (29)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Need to strengthen the publicity work abroad]. (30)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Need to make our relations with socialist countries more purposeful and strong]. (31)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Failure to implement the Official Language Act, 1963 in different Embassies of the country]. (32)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1".

[Need to persuade USA to open negotiations on the basis of peace proposals put forward by the Soviet Union]. (34)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1".

[Need to openly condemn the American intervention in other countries]. (35)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1".

[Failure to demand the abolition of military base of America at Diego Garcia in the recent conference of non-aligned nations in New Delhi]. (36)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1".

[Failure to take up diplomatic initiative for getting the Arab's land under Israeli possession evacuated]. (37)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1".

[Failure to snap diplomatic relations with the Government of Israel]. (38)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1".

[Failure to take steps to meet the imminent danger to the entire Asian region arising out of the collusion of American-Pakistan-Chinese forces]. (39)

[Shri Ramavatar Shastri]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to the Re. 1".

[Need to extend more help to African countries in their freedom struggle]. (40)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1".

[Lack of alertness from the danger posed from supply of arms on large scale to Pakistan by USA]. (41)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1".

[Need to counteract the danger posed from the American military base in the Indian Ocean]. (42).

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1".

[Failure to condemn the intervention of USA, Pakistan and China in the internal affairs of Afghanistan]. (43)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1".

[Failure to oppose the axis of USA-Pak-China]. (44)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Need to remain vigilant in view of the threat posed to Indian security by USA. Pak-China axis]. (45)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Policy of vacillation in strongly opposing American imperialist policies]. (46)

SHRI P. K. KODIYAN (Adoor): I beg to move:—

"That the demand under the Head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1".

[Failure to take strong diplomatic action against the continued harassment and illtreatment of Indian visitors to Britain] (47).

"That the demand under the Head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1".

[Failure to impress upon the British Government to provide citizenship to all British passport holders irrespective of their colour and origin] (48).

"That the demand under the Head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re.1"

[Failure to settle the problems of the remaining Stateless persons of Indian origin in Sri Lanka] (49).

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1".

[Failure to lodge a strong protest with the British Government for pursuing a racist immigration policy]. (50).

"That the demand under the Head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1".

[Failure to protest against China's action in constructing military air bases in Pakistan] (51).

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1".

[Failure to protest against construction of roads linking Karakoram Highway to occupied Kashmir territory with Chinese help] (52).

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to meet the situation arising out of continuous military build up by U.S.A. in the Indian Ocean]. (53)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to meet the threat posed to the security and peace in the Indian subcontinent by United States policy of massively arming Pakistan]. (54)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to take positive action in cooperation with other littoral States to convert Indian ocean into a zone of peace and to ensure elimination of foreign military bases like Diego Garcia]. (55)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to express India's strong disapproval and opposition to the move by U.S.A. and Britain to raise a Rapid Deployment Force for intervention in the Gulf region]. (56)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to take concerted action through the U.N. and in cooperation with African states to ensure independence and freedom of Namibia from the domination of racist South Africa]. (57)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to provide more effective material help to the people of Namibia in their struggle for

national liberation against the illegal racist regime of South Africa]. (58)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Need to express India's disapproval of the direct and indirect help being given to the apartheid regime of South Africa by Western Powers]. (59)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to take diplomatic initiative to meet the situation arising out of frequent military incursions into the territories of Angola and Mozambique by South Africa]. (60)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to take adequate steps to protect the Indian immigrant workers in Gulf Countries]. (61)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to set up a special cell in the External Affairs Ministry to deal with the special problems of Indian immigrant workers in Gulf Countries]. (62)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Need to set up schools in Gulf Countries for the proper education of children of Indian employees]. (63)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Need to send a delegation of M.P.s. and officials to Gulf Countries to study the problems of

[Shri P. K. Kodiyan]

Indian Immigrant workers employed there]. (64)

“That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100.”

[Need to provide more air travel facilities for the Gulf Malayalese to enable them to travel direct between the Gulf Countries and Kerala]. (65)

“That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100”.

[Need to take adequate steps to ensure the safety and protection of Indian employees in Gulf Countries]. (66)

SHRI MADHAVRAO SCINDIA (Gona): Mr. Chairman, Sir, in recent years the international system has moved into a position of very delicate balance. The situation is pregnant with possibilities more indicative of negative movements than of positive. Dangerous new doctrines are being formulated projecting nuclear war as limitable, winnable and, therefore, acceptable. It is against this threatening canvas that the future course of our country has to be charted. It is through these tempestuous waters that our External Affairs Minister has to steer the ship of Indian foreign policy. The concept of non-alignment can help to contain if not entirely prevent global confrontation. After all after non-alignment came into existence in 1956 it ensured that no new military pacts came into existence in the Great Power context. And we cannot overlook the fact that after that date none of the third-world Countries that were liberated failed to adopt non-alignment as the guiding principle of their foreign policy. With super power and great power manipulations kept to a minimum, countries feel more comfortable in this forum—though I will agree to a certain extent with Prof. Chakraborty that there is a tendency

displayed amongst some non-aligned countries to deviate from the fundamental criterion of non-alignment, that is, not to add fuel to great power tensions nor contribute in any way to their strategic confrontation.

Sir, non-alignment has a potential force for peace is as relevant today as it was at the height of the first Cold War—but its future depends on how the conflicting pulls are managed and how optional consensus is reached and this dilemma was much in evidence in the recent non-aligned Foreign Ministers meeting in New Delhi. I must congratulate the External Affairs Minister and his team for the sagacity that they displayed in adopting the consensus approach as opposed to a distinctly individualistic one. I cannot agree with people like Abu who say that not unlike virginity non-alignment is a state of mind. Non-alignment has a positive role to play in this world even today not because of the number it commands but because of its moral force. For those who say that not much was achieved in this Conference I can only say that for so many Foreign Ministers of so many countries to get together under one roof is an achievement in itself. The very nature of the formulations which are achieved and evolved in international gatherings depend a great deal or compromise and in an area as vast and diverse as non-alignment many compromises will have to be effected.

14.54 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

But, undoubtedly India has played a pivotal role in saving non-alignment from foundering on the treacherous rocks of conflict from within.

Sir, as far as the question of Iran and Iraq is concerned it was handled as dexterously as circumstances permitted. The dispute between these two nations is of a most com-

plex nature but we must begin by trying to convince the two countries that continuance of this war will spell disaster for both. There may be a personality clash in some respects but ironically both the Ayatollah and Saddam Hussein must be convinced of the fact that they have a stake in each other's survival. Because, the Super powers and the great powers are awaiting an opportunity to get direct access into the oil pipe of the Middle east and the Gulf. And in the final count both the countries will be the losers never mind who wins. Because, the weakness of the defeated will be exploited by the super-powers against the interests of the victor. This is a stupendous task. But nonalignment and the movement has once again demonstrated that in spite of most other forums having been rejected, this particular forum was accepted by both the countries.

Briefly the two poles on which the edifice of non-alignment rests today are independence and development. It is obvious that both are inter-dependent; and I think the time is ripe for a nonaligned break through on the economic front. Their recommendation for the establishment of an appropriate development institution to help, promote and encourage developing countries for their mutual and beneficial economic cooperation is something which should be vigorously pursued. There is also a realisation of where their interest lies and there is a perceptible thawing in the North countries' attitude. The Brandt Commission report has not really met any serious intellectual challenge. And it is the new accepted doctrine and even hard-line Northern countries.

Like Mrs. Thatcher's for instance, are jostling for a place in the major and minor summits that are taking place. I am not suggesting that we are going to witness immediately a glorious sub-burst explosion of goodwill and agreement. But things are moving and the time is ripe for India which has already re-established her international prestige to do this. The

time is ripe for us to call for an International Conference for the establishment of a new International Monetary Arrangement and a more constructive role for the IMF, so as to establish a more just and equitable economic order in the future.

Sir, gifts from the developed nations to the under-developed ones or developing ones are never accepted with gratitude. At the most they will be accepted with indifference. It is 'trade, not aid'; 'technology, not charity' which is a healthy demand; is based on the instinctive need for self-respect. This is what we must stress.

As far as our region is concerned we are seeing ominous portents. I must remark here that the Moscow Olympics have had a wide effect. Prof Chakraborty and his party truly deserve a gold medal. In a complicated contortion of this physique, in a supreme gymnastic movement, we find Prof. Chakraborty now firmly ensconced in supporting Soviet Russia, instead of supporting China. For this I feel they should be given a gold medal.

AN HON. MEMBER: Soviet Aerobatics.

SRI MADHAVRAO SCINDIA: Sir, I have always been an advocate of a balanced relationship between the super-powers with perhaps a slight bias towards Soviet Russia because of our geo-strategic position. But in the face of gnawing doubts about the Americans turning into reality, can we be blamed now for looking northwards for an even closer support? Because, after all, it has been the Soviets who have always come to our aid in times of need. I am sure that as long as the Soviets refrain from interfering in our domestic matters, political or otherwise, this friendship will continue to strengthen. The Americans are displaying a chilling naivete in categorising countries of this region into 'dependable sheep' and 'unreliable goats'. The proposal to aid Pakistan by a Military-cum-economic package

[Shri Madavrao Scindia]

totalling 2½ billion dollars over the next few years represents a return to the policy of John Foster Dulles which was initiated in the fifties and was abandoned in 1965 after great damage had been done. The American arguments that Pakistan is a piece of their West Asian jigsaw and not their South Asian one and must be viewed in that context does not carry conviction. Can we overlook the fact that out of the 6 military commands Pakistan has in its military structure only one is aimed at its western border and as many as 5 are towards its eastern? Can we overlook the fact that there is absolutely no way of ensuring that American arms to Pakistan will not be essentially used eastwards on us as they have been in the past? Can we overlook the fact that former CIA men are now in high advisory positions in the administration and this particular organisation does not have a very good track record as far as our country is concerned. Even the Rand Corporation report by Mr. Francis Fukuyama is clear on the issue. He has said that the 'Central Point' made to him by military and other leaders he met in Pakistan was that Pakistan's major preoccupation is and would remain India. The Americans

calling Pakistan a South-West Asian nation and therefore psychologically trying to create a pattern of conviction also does not hold water. I am not for once saying that the Soviet thrust into Afghanistan was in the least bit justified, but neither was the American build-up in Diego Garcia. These are all patterns which are affecting the attitudes towards India, towards Pakistan towards West Asia and these are all a part of the International game of dominoes which the Super powers play—all parts of one chain-action followed by reaction. It is difficult to say in the ultimate analysis which came first, the chicken or the egg. A very dangerous scenario is being enacted to save the oil jugular of their respective blocs. There is no point, however, for us to indulge

in the luxury of self-righteous anger over the games the great powers play. There is no room for any moralism here. The way Moscow intervened in Afghanistan and the way the United States master-minded the coups against Mossadegh in Iran and Allende in Chile in the past and the alacrity with which China, for all the radical rhetoric of its leaders, has embraced the Mobutus and Pinochets and Pol Pots of the world, has shown that considerations of ethics never enter their calculations. But the United States must realise that they cannot counter the Soviet threat in Afghanistan by injecting arms or by propping up Governments with no popular backing. They can only do so by promoting stability in the region and the intemperate American attitude is a cause of great concern because their policy, has a very far reaching effect on us where the focus well and truly is, and also on other parts of the world.

Talking of policy, they cannot afford to take the attitude of Mr. Winston Churchill, when 40 or 50 years ago, he joined the Liberal Party after leaving the Conservative Party, and a young lady who did not like this, accented him and said "Mr. Churchill, there are two things I do not like about you. One is your new policies and the other is your new moustache" upon which the great man replied "Dear Madam, it is unlikely that you will come into contact with either". Even now there is time for the United States of America to reconsider the resultant ramifications that this step is going to have and the tremendous instability that it is going to cause in the region. The acceptance by Pakistan of massive arms aid will not solve its problems on its western frontier; instead, it is going to heighten the tension on its eastern one and it will lead to a renewed military race in our region. By opting for the American alliance, Pakistan is only doing itself harm. The tragedy with our relations with Pakistan is that though they profess friendship, they are obsessed with a fear

psychosis as far as our country is concerned, or perhaps, this fear of India has become a traditional point of exploitation by the ruling cliques to keep themselves in power in that country. To clear all these suspicions, Pakistan would do well to accept a 'no-war' pact in the Simla spirit instead of converting the 1959 understanding with the United States of America into a military pact and acting as putty in the hands of Washington.

As far as Afghanistan is concerned, I would like to make a suggestion and what I am going to suggest, I am sure, is going to evoke response from Shri Biju Patnaik. I am going to repeat what I said while asking a supplementary question some time back. In respect of Afghanistan, one has to come to terms with realities. The Soviet presence in Afghanistan is a *fait accompli* and how ever much we may so desire, we cannot wish their presence away without offering a practical formula. Harrison, who is an authority on this region has envisaged a Finland type arrangement. According to this formula, first, the Soviet Union will withdraw its forces over a certain number of years, but with the right to go back into Afghanistan if it is found necessary in the interest of its security. It has a similar treaty with Finland. Secondly, Pakistan and Iran would refuse to give sanctuary to Afghan rebels in return for Soviet and Afghan assurances, not to aid Baluch and Pathan separatist movements, which Moscow might be tempted to encourage if too much pressure is mounted on Kabul. Thirdly, Pakistan and Iran are neutralised in the same manner in which Sweden was neutralised to make finalization possible.

This is formula, which deserves a closer study. It is a possible formula which can be put forward after some study in international gatherings. Otherwise, Afghanistan seems to have sounded the death knell of detente. As far as United States of America is concerned, linkage is back in vogue and the American answer to Afgha-

nistan and Poland may well be in El Salvador and Cuba. But what Washington fails to see is that detente is not a concession, whose withdrawal will upset the balance between the two super powers to the detriment of the Soviets. It is not a concession. It is a recognition of a harsh necessity in a nuclear age when both countries have acquired the capacity to destroy each other. So, whatever the United States does in the heat of the moment, I am convinced, that ultimately they will have to return to the policy of detente, sooner or later. Therefore, Moscow's categorical offer to revive the spirit of detente must be welcome and accepted.

In the Indian Ocean, the great powers are engaged not only for military purposes alone but also in order to exploit the natural resources of the sea. We must provide the lead to the littoral countries by improving our technical expertise in this field and our Government deserves our congratulations for the break-through that they have achieved in the recent past. In the meanwhile, disquieting reports about backdoor deal between eight western nations are coming in. They, according to reports, have apparently made a secret deal that they will pass legislation in their own countries, national laws in their own countries, and then recognise each other's legislation. They are interested in mining the rich polymetallic nodules, and manganese nodules on the Ocean bed. But this sort of secret deals could sabotage any United Nations Treaty and the third world can ask if the West can really be trusted, to negotiate in good faith. And if this is true we must expose such selfish and clandestine moves in international forums.

Sir, as far as China is concerned— I am returning to the region as a whole—the offshoot of events that are taking place, may leave us encircled by regimes which, if not hostile, may be cool towards us. China's response to Mrs. Gandhi's bold and statesman-like initiative in 1976 has been encouraging and our joint attempt should be try and see that this thaw

[Shri Madhav Rao Scindia]

turns into the spring of our relations and finally to the warmth of summer. But it may be difficult for China to grasp the intensity of feeling the 1962 war has evoked in our country which may lead to our advances towards friendship proceeding at a slower rate. But, Sir, our progress towards friendship with China must be maintained, but it must be done on a reciprocal basis in keeping with our mutual self-respect, because we must, of course, realise that the Moscow-Peking estrangement has left China as keen to remove its pressure from southern border as we are from our northern border. Furthermore, China is displaying an urge to bolster up its economy and concentrate on strengthening its world trade, which can only be done in peaceful conditions.

Sir, I am touching two countries and I will conclude.

As far as Burma is concerned, where Ne Win controls merely one-third of the country, it can become a cause, a point of great insecurity for us in the future. It is not hidden from anyone's eye that China today controls *de facto* two-thirds of Burma and this is a matter of great concern, because we can have only feelings of friendship, feelings of concern for our friends in Burma. And therefore, Sir, with the natural resources that Burma has, it may have already become a potential prey in the eye of many a circling hawk whose final swoop may reduce us to a situation where we are surrounded by trouble spots aimed specifically at our vitals.

Sir, I would implore on the Government to pre-empt this and keeping the future in mind give a greater priority to our relations with Burma and through a massive and peaceful diplomatic push create a feeling of confidence in the Burmese mind for India.

Our problems with Bangladesh are not insurmountable. Their proposal of a South Asian formula is something

which deserves our special attention, but with a clear understanding that it will in no way impinge on, that it will not have any *locus standi* in bilateral issues.

Sir, it is time for a movement towards a South Asian consensus and this principle of regional cooperation may even be extended in the future to include ASEAN countries.

Sir, in conclusion, I can only say that more than ever before we are on the brink of a destruction the world has never known and this time the focus is well and truly on us. The world to-day is threatened not merely by the split atom, but even more by the split mind. Massive hypocritical rhetoric about principle is resorted to, to cloak sinister motives. As Napoleon says in Bernard Shaw's "The Man of Destiny": "There is nothing so bad or so good that you will not find Englishmen doing it; but you will never find an Englishman in the wrong. He does everything on principle. He fights you on patriotic principles; he robs you on business principles; he enslaves you on imperial principles; he bullies you on manly principles; he supports his king on loyal principles; and he cuts off his head on republican principles. His watchword is always 'Duty.'" Substitute the word 'Englishman' with the words "Great Powers" and you have the causes for the grave world scenario to-day in our small paragraph. But the great powers must realize that ultimately, there have always been limits to their machinations. This is because of the ultimate disjunction between military power and political influence. They can undoubtedly strongly influence global events, but the high points of history have always been determined ultimately by the will, by the determination and by the courage of a mass of faceless people. These are the lessons of Vietnam, these are the lessons of Iran, of Nicaragua and now, perhaps, of Poland and Afghanistan. It was not Marx, but Tolstoy who said that ultimately it is people, not rulers, who shape history.

The world must strive for a programme of survival with common and unified objectives. We must aim at a global community, based on contract rather than status, based on consensus rather than compulsion, based on vision rather than division. And with her centuries of tradition and philosophy of non-violence, who better to light the lamp of peace and douse the flame of war than India!

In the words of St. Francis of Assis:

Where there is discord, may we bring harmony;

Where there is doubt, may we bring faith;

Where there is despair, may we bring hope;

Where there is hatred, may we bring love.

This is the message we in India must champion in the world. Thank you.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY (Bombay North East): Sir, we have had two powerful speeches already, from different points of view; and so, I do not have to add another powerful speech. (*Interruption*).

The question really is that at a time like this, when we discuss the Demands for the External Affairs Ministry, a certain amount of evaluation has to be done as to what has happened in the past one year. I would like to know by what criteria the Minister judges himself. I don't want to pay him any compliment. I did pay him a compliment during the Calling Attention Motion. He rejected the compliment. He said: "I don't want any compliment from you." To-day, I am not in a mood to give him any compliment.

When I look back at this last one year, I find a large number of failures on the foreign policy front. A year of great deal of missed opportunities. Now, take the issue of recognition of

Kampuchea. I am surprised that Mr. Chakraborty did not express a word of appreciation for the decision that the Government took and earned the abuse of the non-aligned world.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY: I appreciated it last time.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: On the issue of Kampuchea, we know what happened at the non-aligned conference. In the non-aligned conference, India was isolated. India recognized Kampuchea on the plea that if we do it, others will follow. But, Sir, I have taken the latest reckoning. India recognized Kampuchea on the 5th of July 1980. But to-day, no country has followed suit.

Now, this is an indication of how isolated we are. On the question of Afghanistan, we know the draft that the Indian Government presented before the Non-aligned Conference and what draft was finally accepted. I would give this much credit to the Government that they did not make an issue of it; they went along with the consensus. But the general impression is that India was isolated on that issue also. In fact, India had to retreat on that issue.

Similarly, the relations with our neighbours like Pakistan, Nepal, China, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka and Bhutan have deteriorated. Therefore, I would like to know from the Minister in which area he thinks that he has succeeded. What are the concrete achievements of the last one year where India had said something and others had followed it. I would contrast this with the great success achieved by the Janata Government in two years and three months. (*Interruptions*). I would give most of the credit to Mr. Morarji Desai and not to Mr. Vajpayee. That is understandable. (*Interruptions*). But I will give some credit to him later on. In these two years and three months, India obtained from China a concession that they would not interfere in the north east. They said,

[Dr. Subramaniam Swamy]

"We did interfere in the past, but we are not going to do it in the future; it was a mistake on our part." They themselves said it publically. Today the Government itself, the Governmental officials tell me that China is not actually taking any interest in Assam area, north-east area. This is an achievement of the Janata Government. Has he got something to say like that?

The question of Salal Dam is there. For 20 years, there had been no solution. The Janata Party produced a solution to the satisfaction of both. (Interruptions). Well, if we had been there for full five years, you would have got whole of Aksai-Chin. Salal Dam had been lying there for 20 years. The Janata Government solved it. (Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The Minister will reply.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: In the case of India and Pakistan, people from Pakistan could not visit us and our people also could not go there. The Janata Party opened the door and said, let the people come and go. The tension disappeared. The world over people noted that. The Pakistanis themselves said, "The Janata Government period for us was the golden period." Never were the relations between India and Pakistan so good. (Interruptions). There was never any danger during the Janata rule that the United States would supply arms to Pakistan. Why? Pakistan itself did not feel the pressure, because they felt that they had good relations with India. So, that question never came up.

Similarly, on the issue of Bangladesh, a number of issues were lying pending. We solved them. There are concrete achievements to show. I am only saying these things for the Minister. I may be an ignorant person. Please tell us what have you done in this one year? Whatever you have done appears to be a failure.

(Interruptions). Therefore, let the Minister answer them. I know from where the voice is coming. (Interruptions). Therefore, I want this contrast to be placed before the Minister and let the Minister come and defend what he has produced.

I would think that the most important thing is that our foreign policy has to be based on a clear understanding for enlightened self-interest, national interest and India's mission in the world. I am not in favour of being pro-China, pro-America or pro-Russia. I have no hostility towards the Soviet Union. I am very critical of the Soviet action. But if the Soviet Union change their policy, I will be the first one to develop friendship with them. Like with China, I am not a communist, and in fact, the communists think that I am the first biggest anti-communist in the country; but, nevertheless, the Chinese policy was changed during the Janata rule; their attitude was changed. So, we took an advantage of it. If the Soviet Union change their attitude, our attitude towards them would also be changed. We are not denying that the Soviet Union helped us in the past. No one would deny that. But we know that they helped us because of national interest.

They supported Somalia against Ethiopia. Ten years ago they were doing that. But today what are they doing? They are supporting Ethiopia against Somalia. When the national interest changes they also change. In 1962 they told us, "How can we help you? You are only our friend. China is our brother. We cannot help you." In 1971, they came to assist them. Therefore, our national interest should be the guide and it should be based on that. I am sorry, our friend Shri Satyasadhan Chakraborty told us what the Soviet Union want. The question is, what we want. What is India's Foreign Policy that we should adopt.

In regard to Super Powers, the issues have to be spelt out.

So, Sir, it is a multipolar world. India's mission in the world today should be that we are a big power in this area. All the others are small countries, and therefore India's responsibility is to see that peace in this area is maintained. It should exert for that. If the small countries feel that they are threatened, India should go and assist them. That should be our mission. But, I am afraid, our mission is not that. Our mission seems to be making commentary, producing drafts which are not accepted and then working from here and producing a consensus. That is not foreign policy. Foreign policy should give direction. What is India's mission? I would like to know from him. Does he want India to progress in the line of getting more and more friends? But we are getting fewer and fewer friends. In the last one year we have got more enemies than friends. Pakistan has tension with India. It is not friend any more. During the Janata rule, it was a friend. I must tell you, it is the same thing with Nepal. The King of Nepal also feels that during the Janata rule they were more secure. Today they are anti-India. Mrs. Gandhi herself revealed when she said that during the Janata rule, she said in Hindi:

“भूटान ने हमें आँख दिखाई ।”

What does that mean? Is it some thing wrong? It is a credit to the Janata Government that we made Bhutan feel secure. Does Mrs. Gandhi want Bhutan to look at our feet and keep its eyes down? This is not a good approach to neighbours. There are more enemies today than in the Janata rule. Therefore, an explanation is due from him.

What is our relation with the super powers? Now in the Indian Ocean area the Americans are having more ships. Not that the Russians do not have bases. They have in Aden, they have in Cameroun Bay, Danang and Viet Nam. They are having there. They are getting new bases in Kampuchea. They are having more ships there.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Swamy, you have to conclude by 3-30.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: Yes. I know. I have to leave also. Therefore, can there be an equation of super powers without looking at what is the proportional strength? That is the important thing; and if the Government moves in that direction Mr. Chakraborty should not object.

I think there are two most important issues today. One is, Government will have to show statesmanship. Second is the issue of Pakistan. I am happy to say that when I went to Pakistan, I found a general recognition among the people of Pakistan that they cannot aspire for parity with India. They say so openly and their Foreign Minister also says so. They have no desire to compete with India, because they know that they have no choice. India is so much bigger than Pakistan. That is admitted in Pakistan. We should take advantage of it and we should try and see if they may be delinked from the super powers. That should be our attempt. But our attempt is, we are petitioning America. We should tell America not to give arms to Pakistan. That is the correct approach. We should make it clear to America, and We should try to woo Pakistan, try to convince them that they should not go to America, that it will land them into bigger trouble, and wherever insecurity is there, we should try to remove it. That should be our Mission.

I think a vital opportunity exists today for developing our relations with China. I am happy that the President in his Address stated the following, which I read:

“Our willingness to further normalise our relations with China and to discuss all outstanding problems has been made clear repeatedly. We hope that the Chinese will demonstrate their willingness to reciprocate.”

[Dr. Subramanian Swamy]

I think, what is more important is clarity in our mission as to what we consider Chinese reciprocity. What do we want the Chinese to do and what are the channels that we are opening for, to convince that we are at one with them? After all, they have taken a miss to our policy towards Kampuchea and we have been isolated on the issue of Kampuchea. (Interruptions).

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Get it set right.... (Interruptions).

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: Yes, certainly. There is a way of getting that back. There is a way of doing that in international diplomacy. There is no doubt about it. We must get back every inch of our territory. In the Janata Government, Shri Morarji Desai had made it clear that India's relations can never be normal with China unless they return the territory which belongs to us. But the question is how to get it. It is here that diplomacy is necessary and it is here that the Government has to show statesmanship.

The last one year has been a dismal record of failures and a record of missed opportunities. I hope the Minister will come and offer some hope for the next year.

With these words, I thank you very much.

15.30 hrs.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

NINETEENTH REPORT

SHRI T. R. SHAMANNA (Bangalore South): I beg to move:

"That this House do agree with the Nineteenth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 25th March, 1981"

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That this House do agree with the Nineteenth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 25th March, 1981."

The motion was adopted.

15.31 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE. FORMATION OF A NATIONAL YOUTH COMMISSION TO SOLVE UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEM OF EDUCATED YOUTH—
Contd.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now we take up further discussion on the following Resolution moved by Shri Phool Chand Verma on 13 March, 1981:—

"In view of the fact that the present educational system does not equip and prepare the youth for meeting the challenges of life, the whole planning process has failed to channelise our youth power into productive channels and there is lack of direction in providing employment to the educated youth during the Sixth Plan period; this House urges upon the Government to constitute a National Youth Commission immediately to examine and suggest, within a period of six months, appropriate measures for solving the problem of unemployment amongst the educated youth."

Time allotted was two hours. Time already taken is 1.42 hours. Shri Nawal Kishore Sharma was on his legs. After he completes his speech, the Minister will reply.

श्री नवल किशोर शर्मा (शौर): जपा-ध्यक्ष जी, मैं इस प्रस्ताव के संबंध में यह कह रहा था कि बेकारी और बेरोजगारी की समस्या का समाधान करने में कई मुश्किलें हैं। सबसे बड़ी मुश्किल यह है कि इस देश के अन्दर डिग्रीटी आफ लैबर नाम की कोई चीज नहीं है। इसलिए हमारे देश का