

[Secretary General]

Sabha with the request that the concurrence of Rajya Sabha in the said amendments be communicated to Lok Sabha."

(II)

"I am directed to inform Rajya Sabha that the Navy (Amendment) Bill, 1973, which was passed by Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 22nd November, 1973, has been passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 12th November, 1974, with the following amendments:—

*Enacting Formula*

1. Page 1, line 1, for "Twenty-fourth" substitute "Twenty-fifth".

*Clause 1*

2. Page 1, line 3, for "1973" substitute "1974".

2. I am, therefore, to return herewith the said Bill in accordance with the provisions of rule 121 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha with the request that the concurrence of Rajya Sabha in the said amendments be communicated to Lok Sabha."

Sir, I lay a copy of each of the Bills on the Table.

**CALLING ATTENTION TO A MATTER  
OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE—  
CONTD.**

**Reported Entry of U.S. Naval Task Force  
in the Indian Ocean**

SHRI SHYAMLAL GUPTA (Binar): Sir, I call the attention of the Minister of External Affairs to the reported entry of the U.S. Naval Task Force into the Indian Ocean and Government's reaction thereto.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN) : Sir, On November 10, 1974 a task force of U.S. 7th Fleet consisting, according to our information, of an aircraft carrier the "USS Constellation", three destroyers, and one fast combat supply ship, entered the Indian Ocean. The exact duration of the task force's stay is not known though from some remarks of an official U.S. Government's spokesman it appears that it will be an extensive visit.

The House will recall that the U.S. 7th Fleet last appeared in the Indian Ocean on June 29, 1974 and remained there till the 30th of August; and also that the U.S. aircraft carrier, the "Kitty Hawk", was deployed there from March 11 to April 21, 1974. Government reiterates their deep concern and misgivings at these developments which are inconsistent with U.N. resolutions declaring the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace.

Recently the U.N. 15-Member *Ad hoc* Committee on the Indian Ocean, of which India is a Member, has recommended to the General Assembly to call on the Great Powers to refrain from increasing and strengthening their military presence in the Indian Ocean region as an essential first step towards the relaxation of tension and the promotion of peace and security in the area. A further proposal was made unanimously by the *Ad hoc* Committee to convene a U.N. sponsored Conference on the Indian Ocean.

At this stage I should like to assure the House that Government will continue their efforts to mobilise international opinion and with other States of the region, take all possible measures to achieve our objective of creating the Indian Ocean as an area of peace and tranquility.

SHRI SHYAMLAL GUPTA : Sir, the United States has acquired Diego Garcia from Britain and is expanding its military base there. Russia and China are also on the run to have access to the Ocean and have supremacy there. India should guard itself against the designs of all these Super

Powers. Russia, under the pretext of Asian Security, is against whom? India should not be a party to the so-called Asian Security trap. Yesterday the External Affairs Minister has said that the time for passing resolutions had passed. What does this mean? What does the Indian Government intend to do? In view of the statement of our Minister, what action will the Indian Government take?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I think in my statement itself I made it very clear as to how we look at the problem. We do not look at the problem as the problem of one Power or the other. Now it is a problem of creating an international opinion over this matter, particularly giving importance to the forum of U.N. It is only by this method and this approach . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal) : It is a problem of compelling the Western Powers to comply with the U.N. resolution.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : That is right; that is what I mean. This is the only way we can do it. It is not a question of India *versus* one Power or another Power; it is not a question of taking sides with one Power or the other. We have to look at it from the different approaches and I think you will appreciate Government's particular approach in this matter.

SHRI HARSH DEO MALAVIYA (Uttar Pradesh) : Sir, as our hon. Minister has pointed out, this aircraft carrier "Constellation" which passed through the Malacca Straits on November 8th, commanded by Rear Admiral D.C. Dav's, is of 84,000-ton displacement and it was accompanied by three destroyers—"Camden", "Ochrane" and "Berkeley"—and the escort ship "Stein". The strike aircraft carrier "Kitty Hawk" has a 76,700-ton displacement. These are some of the biggest aircraft carriers with 90 aircraft and 5,000 men. It passed through the Indian Ocean and it was supported by three torpedo boat destroyers and a tanker. When this unit quit the Indian Ocean, the missile-carrying cruiser "Chicago", two torpedo

boat destroyers and some escorting ships again passed through the Indian Ocean.

The U.S. task force is to join the warships of two other Western navies in the Indian Ocean—the British and the French and naval movements are under way on the east coast of Africa. Forty-seven American warships have visited Indian Ocean between November, 1973 and August, 1974 and this represents almost an eight-fold increase over the six warships during the same period in the previous year.

This, I would like to submit, has to be viewed in the following background. The Indian Ocean has already a whole chain of bases belonging to U.S., Britain and other NATO Powers. This chain of bases begins with U.S. military installations on the western coast of Australia and ends with the Simonstown British base in South Africa. Its inter-median links are situated in the Cocos Islands, the Chagos Archipelago, Maldive and Seychelles Islands and Bahrain, then in Ethiopia, in Madagascar, etc.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU) : Please ask clarifications.

SHRI HARSH DEO MALAVIYA : We already know of Diego Garcia and in this background I would like to point out that the U.S. top navy Admiral Elmo Zumwalt referring to the building of the U.S. base in Diego Garcia and the U.S. presence in the Indian Ocean told the U.S. Congressional Committee on March 21, 1974—I quote—that "these are to provide the ability to influence events in that area. The capability to deploy our military power in the region is an essential element of such influence." The objective is made clear. Apart from the notorious Guam doctrine of the unlamented ex-President Nixon, President Ford has also blatantly declared referring to the CIA activities and other U.S. developments that all this is done in the interest of the U.S. naval security and to intervene in situations in other countries when it may be

[Shri Harsh Deo Malaviya]

going against the U.S. interests. So, it is a blatant declaration by a Head of the State.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU) : I don't want to interrupt you but you are not asking questions, you are just giving an explanation.

SHRI HARSH DEO MALAVIYA : Just allow me two minutes because this is an important question threatening us all.

This U.S. presence in the Indian Ocean is sometimes sought to be explained by hon. Members on this side and on the other side. It was alleged by a high U.S. official that the U.S.S.R. has bases in Iraq, Iran, Yemen and Somalia but this was denied. Presence of the U.S.S.R. ships in the Indian Ocean on our side cannot be made an argument because they have no bases here, they only pass through this route, this is the route from Vladivostok to Leningrad.

So, it is quite obvious that the situation is fairly serious and the despatch of the U.S. warships is a deliberate move. In spite of protests from various quarters, in spite of the opinions frequently expressed by our Government and our Prime Minister, it is a deliberate move. In this background, I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether this question of U.S. naval presence in the Indian Ocean was raised with Mr. Henry Kissinger when he visited India recently and if so, what was his reply? We would like to know this because we want to improve our relations with the U.S.A. And personally, Sir, with due apologies, I must say I won't believe Mr. Kissinger; I won't believe him because he was the Chairman of the 40-man Committee which killed Allende, which he denied. So, we would like to know what was his reply?

Then, Sir, Mr. Seymour Weiss, Director of the U.S. Bureau of Politico-Military Affairs said recently that even if the USSR presence was not there, the U.S. would go ahead with its bases in the

Indian Ocean because of important political and military needs of the U.S. national interest. He reminded that the U.S. oil industry has investments totalling about 3,500 million dollars. The USA meets 85 per cent of its natural rubber requirements, 80 per cent of its tin requirements from this area. According to one estimate, the direct U.S. investments in these countries amounted to 10,000 million dollars. Concentrated in the Indian Ocean bases are 60 per cent of capitalist world's known resources of uranium, 40 per cent of gold, cent per cent jute.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU) : Now, please wind up.

SHRI HARSH DEO MALAVIYA : History shows that soldiers have always welcomed investments in any part of the world and 3 billion dollars have been sent to the Shah of Iran and the Shah of Iran has declared that he wants to make Iran a super power. Now the Shah of Iran visited our country and we were very happy to hear when he said that he would cooperate with India in making the Indian Ocean a zone of peace. I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether any positive move has been made in this direction or any positive decisions have been arrived at to seek the Shah's cooperation in making the Indian Ocean a zone of peace.

Now a few points about China. The Newsweek has reported that the Diego Garcia and the U.S. Naval presence in Indian Ocean has China's tacit approval. It is reported by the Newsweek, an important journal of the U.S.A., and we know that China is desperately hunting for uranium. China and India are the members of the U.N. *Ad-hoc* Committee to which the hon. Minister, made a reference yesterday and said that this Committee has made a certain move.

If China is really serious about making the Indian Ocean a zone of peace, may I please ask the hon. Minister whether he would think it advisable, in spite of our present strained relations with our neighbour, to take up this question with them so

as to arrive at some common understanding to make it a zone of peace?

Then, Sir, in a seminar in Delhi in February this year, the former Chief of Naval Staff, Admiral Nanda and Admiral A. K. Chatterjee, saw the danger of a war in the Indian Ocean. This danger of war has also been voiced by the well-known and famous Far Eastern Economic Review of Hong Kong which says that the Indian Ocean will be the next battle field. The Admirals said that India should build up its maritime strength. Admiral Kohli also has told us that India needs a three-dimensional expansion of the Indian Navy. We must have our destroyers and we must have our anti-submarine frigates, etc. So, I would like to know what steps are being taken to strengthen our maritime force.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU) : That will do.

SHRI HARSH DEO MALAVIYA : I am finishing. Please have patience.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU) : There are many others to put questions.

SHRI HARSH DEO MALAVIYA : One last point I would like to raise. It would be very difficult for us to trust the words of the U.S.A. An international conference on the Indian Ocean began in New Delhi yesterday and it was addressed by our esteemed Minister of External Affairs. I was in that conference and I know how warmly his speech was welcomed by all the delegates of about thirty countries. Now, I would like to know whether you would consider entering into some kind of naval defence agreement, I do not know exactly what—with your neighbouring countries, especially with Ceylon because Ceylon is vitally concerned. Ceylon took the initiative. And will you consider entering into some kind of arrangement with Ceylon for naval defence? These are some of my questions.

SHRI N. G. GORAY : Has Ceylon a navy?

SHRI HARSH DEO MALAVIYA : Sri Lanka. I stand corrected.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU) : You have put five questions. Thank you.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : As far as information is concerned, I must say the hon. Member has more information about the history of it than I can give. He has raised some five specific questions to which I will give very brief answers. In the course of my talks with Dr. Kissinger, we did discuss and raise the question of the base at Diego Garcia. We pointed out to him that on this question the Government of India's point of view is very clear, categorical and against having such a base in the Indian Ocean. It is not only the Government of India, but the entire people of India are united on this particular question. He naturally heard it. He made it clear later they have different views on this matter.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : But did he tell you this? When you were discussing this matter, we were told through the press, that you did not see eye to eye. How can you? But did he tell you that America was contemplating sending a bigger task force to the Indian Ocean almost immediately on the heels of Dr. Kissinger's visit?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : No. He did not tell me and I did not ask him.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Why should you ask?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I did not ask him and he did not tell me.

*(Interruptions)*

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : It was double talk. Dr. Kissinger indulged in double talk.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : As far as our position is concerned, we explained our stand to the United States Government

[Shri Y. B. Chavan.]

and they know our point of view very categorically. I think not only the United States of America but practically the whole world knows India's position in this matter. Now, he asked me about what happened about Iran and he himself said that the Shah of Iran in his discussions with the Prime Minister welcomed this idea and concept of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. I should say this is a very positive improvement. In this whole process the way to approach this problem is we have to build up public opinion and create an international consensus for it because it is only under pressure of this opinion that this can be achieved.

SHRI HARSH DEO MALAVIYA : But, Sir, how to reconcile between these views?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : You are getting into difficulties by merely ideologically arguing yourself. Whatever his other ambitions are, the fact is, he has this ambition; his is a sovereign country; he has rich resources with him. Even then, if he agrees with this concept, let us welcome it. Let us be realistic in this matter. It is not to be merely considered by certain ideologies in this matter. We have to be very hard-headed realists and try to deal with the problems and situations as they come. So, whatever his other views and other things are, it is certainly a positive thing in our relationship with Iran in the last year that we have widened our area of cooperation in the economic field. Also he has welcomed this concept. It is something, a positive thing. *(Interruptions)* He said what is the Chinese position in this matter. Well, China has welcomed this idea. They certainly want the Indian Ocean to be a zone of peace. But I hope they mean what they say. I think I will have to say the same thing for all the countries in this matter because ultimately we will have to judge nations and big powers by what they do rather than by what they say. Naturally, one has to begin with saying, by giving expression to views: that is the beginning, and the next step

is to watch what happens actually. *(Interruptions)* Well, I think he gave the views of CIA, etc. I do not think how this comes within the peace concept in the Indian Ocean. It is only a question of building up our own national security in a proper way, and that thing is taken care of in the Defence Ministry.

As far as Sri Lanka is concerned, he is trying again to think about some sort of military alliance. I do not think we stand for that.

SHRI S. G. SARDESAI (Maharashtra) : These things have to be judged not just by the declarations but by their actual concrete and practical policies. That is a very correct position to take. Now, with regard to this entire question of making the Indian Ocean a zone of peace, apart from the various declarations which have been made by the big powers and the super powers—they have a long experience and practice also to which the Minister just now referred, specifically with regard to this whole question of naval base and these things in the Indian Ocean, as the preceding speaker, Shri Harsh Deo Malaviya pointed out, even before the Congressional Committee of the United States, an important representative of the US Armed Forces says that USSR or no USSR, we are going to have a base. It is a clear declaration. He did not mince words at all.

So far as the attitude of the USSR is concerned, I should like to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister the fact that in a joint statement signed by the Government of India and the Soviet Union, by our Prime Minister and Mr. Brezhnev, it is categorically stated that both India and the USSR will cooperate among themselves and with other countries concerned for the purpose of making the Indian Ocean a zone of peace; it is an official statement. Now, here is a Government which openly states that it will go ahead with the base, no matter whether the USSR is or is not there. And here is another Government which gives you a common commitment that it will try to make it a

zone of peace. It is not a question of words it is also a question of practice and experience.

I go a step further. When Mr. Kissinger was here recently, I should like to know whether the Minister of External Affairs or the Government of India asked him a specific question—here is an assurance given to us by the USSR that they are prepared to sit with us and even with the USA because the interested States include the USA also, not only the littoral States.

They have given an assurance that they are prepared to sit with all others to see that this sea is turned into a zone of peace. Are you prepared to co-operate with us and the Soviet Union to turn it into a zone of peace? Did you ask him? You should have asked if the Soviet Union is prepared to come to some sort of agreement what are their terms of agreement? You should have asked about the conditions on which they are prepared to give up their base. They should give us some positive reply so that the problem could be solved. Were any such questions put before the United States representative, or did we only repeat our past positions and he repeated their past positions. They have to be categorically asked whether they are prepared to sit and discuss. What are their terms because the other countries have also given their terms?

One point in this connection because that is really very shocking. Mr. Kissinger said in his statement also that the United States will not do anything which will encourage an arms race in this sub-continent. If you bring in new dimensions it will mean direct intervention and that raises the question of arms. If that comes our defence is involved, our security is involved. We may have to increase our arms. And Pakistan will then take objection. All sorts of things will happen. So the categorical assurance given to you has been broken within weeks after he comes and goes away.

Lastly, I would like to know one thing because today and yesterday also in his speech the Minister of External Affairs mentioned the question of rivalry. I want to ask a simple question because Mr. Ford also said the other day that the Soviet Union has got bases in the Littoral States. Three countries have been mentioned—Somalia, Yemen and Iraq. The representatives of these three countries have categorically stated that there is no base. The Soviet Union has also denied it. I should like to remind the Minister of External Affairs that at one time the Americans also said that the Soviet Union has got a base in India. They mentioned India and our former Minister of External Affairs protested against it. So here is a denial. Where is the question of equating it? Where is the rivalry? The other side openly says that the base is there. I want to know facts and not a repetition of words. I want to know where the rivalry is. So broadly these are the three points. Did you ask Kissinger about his terms for turning the sea into a zone of peace? Then we could discuss the matter. On the question of rivalry what has the Soviet Union got to say? All these are questions of facts.

So I will end where I began. If the External Affairs Minister wants an evidence of practice of concrete behaviour, then this evidence of practice of concrete behaviour has been there for years and years. I will not go back to Bangla Desh or Vietnam. When they threatened Bangla Desh we had a treaty with the Soviet Union which helped up undoubtedly to take stronger positions in the context of a threatened conflict. I, therefore, do not understand the position that you are taking. I would surely like this Government to take clear decisions for having discussions with the United States. We must have discussions with them. To put it concretely, we want to turn this area into a zone of peace. Tell them these are our efforts and ask them to tell us what their counter-efforts are.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Sir, I would like to make it clear that whenever the word "great power rivalry" was used in my speech yesterday, my idea was not to

[Shri S. G. Sardesai]

compare the U.S.S.R. with the U.S.A. at all. If you go by the experience of the support that the U.S.S.R. gave to us in our very difficult times it is a good evidence of their attitude on this question. So my idea is not to compare these things. I am not merely trying to look at this question academically. If it is a programme or if it is a line of action I concede the hon'ble Member can convert it into reality. But the question is how we should proceed in this matter. It is not a question of debating this matter with Mr. Kissinger because I am not seeing it as rivalry between the two countries in this matter. And, therefore, when there was a basic disagreement, naturally, the discussion never proceeded any further. There was no occasion for putting before them the U.S.S.R. position; they know their position.

SHRI S. G. SARDESAI: My point is what are their conditions for seeing to it that the area turns into a zone of peace?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: This question was not discussed.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am very glad a conference is being held on Indian Ocean which you were good enough to inaugurate. It is a good thing. But you mentioned "rivalry". I think you better explain it because the American base or the American naval presence aggressively is not due to any rivalry. On the contrary on the imperialists have ganged up, with America leading, in order to threaten us and other littoral countries. They have defied the U. N. General Assembly Resolution and have also brushed aside the Soviet proposal for turning it into a zone of peace.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I was trying to reply to Mr. Sardesai, I do not want to convert it into some sort of a conversation between me and some Members. The point is, it is not a question of what you and I have to say. The question is how we

can take along with us the whole body of littoral nations. And there certainly this argument of rivalry is used.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Wrongly

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: This argument is used there. It is not a question of whether I believe in that idea or not. Certainly we may have some different experience in this matter. Therefore, when we are trying to deal with this cause, namely, the conversion of Indian Ocean into a peace zone, I think we will have to go in a rather methodical manner, and the only methodical manner is the way I have indicated.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: On a point of order. Excuse me. Mr. Chavan, I am very glad, at least made one point. He said he did not equate the Soviet Union and the United States of America. I am very glad. But he used the word "rivalry". I agree that some people are using that argument. But you should not belong to that category, especially when your Prime Minister and Mr. Brezhnev have signed a joint statement.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: I do not belong to that category. Certainly it is a step forward that Brezhnev himself has agreed with us and it is recorded in our joint communique. It is also a very hopeful factor that we like to go ahead.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, first may I with your permission congratulate to Mr. Chavan on becoming the Minister of External Affairs. Now, Sir, is it not significant that the Indian Ocean's importance seems to have changed since December 1971? And here I want to draw your attention to two facts. In 1971, the entry of the U.S. 7th Fleet into the Bay of Bengal, I think, introduced the first element of tension in the Indian Ocean. Do you consider it so? Secondly, a U.N. resolution demanding that Indian Ocean be made a peace zone was first passed in December 1971. It was proposed by Sri Lanka and passed in December 1971. Subsequently many a time

this question has come up in different forms. I hope the Minister would correct me if I am wrong. Is it not a fact that both the Soviet Union and the United States abstained from voting on all the resolutions on Indian Ocean? There was a resolution in 1971; then there was another resolution in 1972; there was one more resolution in December 1973. Now, Sir, I want to draw the attention of the Minister to what the USSR said in not voting for the resolution recently. This is a letter dated 18th June 1974 written by the Permanent Representative of the USSR to the United Nations. I mention this because a reference to Mr. Brezhnev was made here. I would like the Minister to clarify what the actual position is. Here the Soviet Union says:

"The Soviet Union is prepared to participate with all interested States, on a basis of equality, in a search for a favourable solution to this problem."

Nowhere in that line does the Soviet Union say that they regard Indian Ocean as a zone of peace.

This letter was written by the Permanent Representative of the USSR to the United Nations Secretary-General...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : What about the joint statement with Brezhnev ?

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY : This statement by Brezhnev was in 1973. This letter is in 1974. I thought my friends here knew that the latest statement is more valid . . . (*Interruptions.*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU) : Why don't you address the Chair ?

THE SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY : I am a new Member still. Whenever the word USSR is raised, these two people get up as if they have taken up some contract for that country.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : On a personal explanation. I have not taken any contract from anybody. He may have

taken somebody's contract. Today's paper quoted a report from Moscow in which it was said that the Soviet Government is in favour of the International conference being held.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY : I am now addressing the Minister.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU) : You have invited the trouble.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY : If you are not giving me protection, what can I do ?

SHRI N. G. GORAY : Sir, will you keep this House as a zone of peace ?

श्री रवी राय : भूपेश गुप्त कितनी बार उठे हैं ?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU) : The Chair cannot go on quarrelling with every Member.

श्री राजनारायण : भूपेश गुप्त और जेड० ए० अहमद से आपका क्वरेल नहीं करना चाहिये, क्वरेल तो हम लोगों से करिए।

SHRI RABI RAY : Either he should rise on a point of order or he should ask for some clarification.

श्री राजनारायण : कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी का जो मेम्बर खड़ा हो उससे क्वरेल मत करिए, करिए तो हम लोगों से करिये।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU) : Please go ahead.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY : I am a little confused. Here just now Brezhnev's statement was mentioned. But we know that USSR along with USA have consistently abstained from voting in the United Nations in favour of a resolution calling for the Indian Ocean to be a zone of peace. I want to read out the letter written by their Permanent Representative in the United Nations.



THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU) : Come to the next point.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY : it says that Soviet ships and vessels have never posed any threat to any one in that region. In accordance with the existing rules of international law and with universally recognised international practice, they are engaged in training cruises and in the search for and recovery of Soviet spacecraft flying over Indian Ocean. They were admitting their presence. (*Time bell rings*). Let me say what I want to say. The first fact is that after the Bangla Desh war, there was a change in the balance in this region and this trouble has started since then. Does not the Minister regard it as a serious matter ? Secondly, what steps are you planning to take in view of the fact that both the USA and the USSR do not plan to leave the Indian Ocean free ? Dr. Kissinger's statement in the press said that USA wants to intervene in the Indian Ocean. But I was shocked to read Mr. Popov's statement yesterday, equating USA and USSR without understanding the very good speech of Shri Chavan. He said that Indian Ocean was the shortest route and nicest route and therefore would go into it (*Time bell rings*). I won't take a minute more than the time taken by Shri Malaviya.

DR. VIDYA PRAKASH DUTT : Will the hon. Member define "going into" ?

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY : Both Mr. Popov's statement and the earlier statement of Tass of 25th May, 1974 stated this, I am reading out.

"Indian Ocean is the natural and the shortest possible way from the Soviet western ports to the Soviet Pacific harbours in winter."

So, this is very clear. This is one side. Now, I come to the other issues. I am only dealing with the facts as they are. Now, Sir, I want to draw the Minister's attention

to the UN Report drawn up by experts which states something about the number of shipdays of the two Navies, the USSR and the USA. 'Shipdays' means the number of days of stay multiplied by the number of ships stationed. Upto 1971, the USSR Navy's shipdays in respect of the Indian Ocean was 1,400 whereas that of the USA was about 1,200 and upto 1973 end, the USSR Navy's stay was 2,800 shipdays which is more than double, two times more than what it was two years before, whereas the US Navy's presence was for 2,000 days. Here, Sir, I am not including the mine-sweeping activities of the USSR Navy during this period. Can you tell me whether there is anything in this which suggests that the USSR's presence and the USA's presence are as much in the Indian Ocean and they pose equal threats ?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU) : I think that is enough.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY : Please give me a few more minutes.

Sir, I agree that the Diego Garcia base provides a threat to the Indian security situation. I want to know from the honourable Minister whether it is not a fact that the UN Report mentions that the USSR also has bases in Barbora, in Somalia and in a few other places. In conclusion, I would like to ask the Minister two more questions.

Is the Government of India proposing to take an integrated view of the Indian Ocean or is it going to submit to the Pakistani, USSR and USA propaganda that the Indian Ocean should be divided into and looked at in parts like the Pakistani resolution which says that the sub-continent should be made a peace zone, a nuclear-free zone ? I would like to connect it with the US view that the Indian Ocean is only Indian in name and that it has got nothing to do with India and its view of West Asia zone, South Asia zone and South East Asia zone and so on. Does the Government of India share this view or does it take an integrated view of this situation and, if so what is its exact plan ? I would like the honourable Minis-

ter to be a little more indulgent and reply to my questions. I know he is the External Affairs Minister. But since he has been the Minister of Defence also, he must be knowing and he is also a member of the very important policy-making body, the Political Affairs Committee of the Cabinet . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU) : This prefacing is not necessary.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY : Does he propose to bring about a change in the core structure in the Navy and would recommend having, instead of cruisers and aircraft carriers which are only outdated, modern submarines and reconnaissance units and missile boats which will also help you in catching the smugglers? Does he propose doing this? Does the Government of India realise that Diego Garcia was under the control of the Government of India in 1941-42 and because of our carelessness we gave it up? Now, there are many islands from which the British are clearing off now. The Maldiv Islands are there and they have bases in some other places also. I want to know the Government of India's proposal with regard to Maldiv Islands. Do you have any proposal? I find that the Government does not have a representative in Maldiv. In fact, Sri Lanka is supposed to serve our interests. Therefore, will the Government of India have a fresh look at the whole issue relating to the Indian Ocean and see that it is able to exercise better control now?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Most of the questions which have been asked now have been answered in one way or the other in my previous replies. This is a question where presently there is very little scope for further questions to be answered. But I shall answer some of his questions which are directly concerned with the Indian Ocean concept.

Firstly, he asked whether the USSR or some other countries abstained. It is a fact that except China all other have abstained . . .

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY : May I interrupt? . . .

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : No. You will have to make a judgment, seeing the total behaviour of a country. Mr. Brezhnev has said that they are prepared to sit with the interested countries to sort out a solution to create the Indian Ocean peace zone. This is certainly a difference, qualitative difference, which we cannot forget . . .

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY : May I just interrupt? . . .

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I would request all the Members not to make a mistake in identifying it with one angle and then trying to take a view of the Indian Ocean as a peace zone. We have to look at the problem from India's point of view . . .

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY : Just one interruption. I quoted from the United Nation's Permanent Representative's letter to the Secretary-General, of 18th June, 1974. Nowhere does he say that we regard Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. He only said that we will have to work towards a possible solution.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Yes. As far as India is concerned, they support the idea of peace zone. You would like a country to commit in one word. But it is a very complex process. It is a process of colonisation for a couple of centuries. When colonization is dismantled, possibly it may come in a different form; this may be tried. That is the danger that we have to take care of. And when we, under these circumstances, are trying to evolve a new concept in the interest of all littoral countries of evolving it as a peace zone, I think we will have to be very careful in making an assessment and judgment about these countries.

Sir, his other main point was about the bases of USSR. USSR has categorically denied that they have got any bases in the Indian Ocean. Some of the countries which are mentioned—like the Republic

[Shri Y. B. Chavan]

of Amman—have also categorically declined that there is any base of the USSR in that country. Naturally, we will have to go by the statement of these Governments. If we want any co-operation from them, let us not start argument with them but try to achieve the objective . . .

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY : Factually, the position is really different. Have you got your own assessment ? . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : On 12th August, your Government—Mr. Surendrapal Singh or Mr. Swaran Singh—declared that there is no base in any of these countries . . .

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : This is what I am saying . . .

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : This is a lie . . .  
(Interruptions).

श्री राजनारायण : श्री भूपेश गुप्त जी कह रहे हैं लेकिन चाहे वह स्वर्ण सिंह जी ने कहा हो चाहे चव्हाण जी ने कहा हो या श्रीमती इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी ने कहा हो। They are telling lies. They are concealing the facts यह तो हमने डेट वाइज विश्व के तमाम ग्रन्थियों से निकाल कर इन्फार्मेशन दी है कि रशिया बेड़ा 1966 से है जिसमें 14 जहाज हैं, युद्ध पोत है। इसमें इजराइल है आप इसको देखिए।

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : The hon. Member has asked me to be a little more indulgent and say something about the nuclear peace zone, regional nuclear peace zone. That is being discussed in the U.N. I would say that India's Resolution is at the present moment under discussion. Sir, I would not like to make any statement which would unnecessarily create complications there.

As far as building up India's Navy is concerned, certainly it is a matter of national security, and I am sure the Defence Ministry is taking all possible steps . . .

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY : Do you reject it or accept it ?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : It is very difficult to give an opinion on that.

SHRI N. G. GORAY (Maharashtra) : Sir, I generally agree with the line that the Foreign Minister has taken in dealing with the situation created by the task force. I would like to point out one or two things. He was asked whether he discussed with Dr. Kissinger, when he met him, the American designs in the Indian Ocean and whether he pointed out to him that so far as the base in Diego Garcia is concerned, India and all the other littoral nations are very much disturbed. He said that we stated our position and no further discussion could take place. I would like to ask him whether he had any knowledge that whenever the talks are held between Russia and America in order to arrive at a detente and to make it stronger, the Russians have discussed this point with the Americans that one of the possible areas of conflict between the two nations was likely to be the Indian Ocean and since India was resenting this particular development, should they not sit together and eliminate that point of irritation ? Has he any knowledge whether such a discussion has taken place between the representatives of Russia and the representatives of America ?

Another point that I would like to make is that the entire picture of the Indian Ocean is changing since our war with Pakistan in 1971. Firstly, it was established beyond doubt that India constitutes a major power in this sub-continent. Secondly, one of our neighbours, Iran, has perhaps very high ambitions. I do not say that the Shah of Iran is overreaching himself. The Shah of Iran feels that his country should be powerful. Then, only two or three days back, Mr. Sadat said in

an interview given to an Arab magazine, *Al Ustu Al Arabi*, saying that the Arab nations used their oil power very wisely during the recent war and it had its effect. He hoped that it would be possible for them to use their economic power also. He expressed the hope that all the Arab nations put together will prove to be the third power in the world. Therefore, a confederation of the Arab States is also likely to come up. Therefore, so far as the Indian Ocean is concerned, there are two rival powers or two super powers, America on the one side and the U.S.S.R. on the other side. India has also emerged as a great power and that fact has now been conceded by Dr. Kissinger. Thirdly, Iran has its own ambitions. Then, the Arab States are thinking of becoming the third or the fourth power in the world. Therefore, the Indian Ocean is not that Indian Ocean about which we have been reading in our geography lessons. The whole picture is changing. Then you have to take China into account. The I.C.B.M. that China is trying to launch, has its trajectory right across the Indian Continent and into the Arabian sea. Therefore, China would also like to influence the politics in the Indian Ocean. China has sub-marine power also. In this context, I would like to ask him in the light of what he said yesterday that time for resolutions has passed and time for action has come, what sort of action Indian can really contemplate in these circumstances? For instance, Japan is importing 80 per cent of its oil from the Gulf States. The Arabs are also thinking of becoming the third power or the fourth power. If Iran becomes a big power, naturally its sympathy will be with the U.S.A. China's sympathy will be with the Americans. Russian sympathy will be with us for our sympathy may be with Russia. So, here, what I am saying is, if you interpret the big-power rivalry in the sense that there is a direct confrontation only between America and Russia, then, it is wrong. But, if you look at the configuration that is taking place round this particular problem of oil, then, perhaps, you will understand that there is a rivalry. Therefore, I would like to point out that

the only course left open for India is to plead that it should remain a zone of peace but simultaneously increase her strength. And so long as we have not got that sanction, the only sanction is that we must have our own Navy strong. This is my point of view. I would like to know how far he agrees with it.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: I would like to tell him that I have no official knowledge of any talks on this question between the USSR and the USA. This is about his first question. Secondly, he mentioned about some of the littoral countries or countries of the Indian Ocean and their future ambitions or their potential strengths and their plans, etc. I think this is a matter about which we should rather talk very carefully and speak rather very carefully. When we talk about the peace zone, we are not talking about the Navies of the countries in the Indian Ocean. We are talking about the great power operations and their bases in the Indian Ocean. We will have to see the point in that limited context. As far as we are concerned naturally, every country should have proper ambition to build its own strength and have a secure sovereign State. What is wrong about it? This is exactly the position that we have taken. That is why, we are trying for building up our bilateral, good, friendly relations with all possible countries and every country in the world. This is exactly what we mean by peaceful co-existence and non-alignment. With all these things, we certainly want to build our friendly relations with Iran, and our traditional relations with the Arab countries are also based on the same considerations. So, only because they become rich, what exactly is going to happen to us should not be the consideration.

SHRI N. G. GORAY: They are not only wanting to be rich but they want to be powerful.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: Nobody wants to be rich and remain without power. These are some of the elementary presumptions that we should take for granted. I

[Shri Y. B. Chavan.]

think, this is not a matter for debate and discussion. As far as we are concerned, looking to the security aspect of India, we shall certainly take necessary and proper steps. On that question, there cannot be two opinions.

श्री रवी राय (उड़ीसा) : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं सवाल करने के पहले एक टिप्पणी कर देना चाहता हूँ कि भारत सरकार की जो विदेश-नीति है यह गुट-निरपेक्षता के आधार पर नहीं है, यह भारत सरकार सगुण रूप से एलाइन्ड है। यह मैं इसलिये कहता हूँ कि भारत सरकार की जो कैबिनेट बनी है उसमें मान लीजिये चव्हाण साहब और बाबू जगजीवनराम—ये दोनों गये थे किमिजर साहब का स्वागत करने के लिये—और ये दोनों प्रो-सोवियत नहीं है और कैबिनेट में श्री के०डी० मालवीय और यादव जो हैं वे प्रो-सोवियत-यूनियन है, तो इस प्रकार ये भारत सरकार दोनों महाशक्तियों को खश करने के लिये है। यह है भारत सरकार की नीति और इसकी झलक आप चव्हाण साहब के जवाब में देखेंगे। अब मैं चव्हाण साहब से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि कि मान लीजिये ये गुट-निरपेक्षता की नीति पर विश्वास करते हैं और चाहते हैं कि सच्चे अर्थ में हिन्द महासागर एक पीस ज़ोन बने तो क्या यह जरूरत थी कि बरुआ साहब जो नये कांग्रेस अध्यक्ष बने हैं उनका ध्यान आया था कि ईस्टर्न यूरोपियन कन्ट्रीज़ और सोवियत यूनियन के साथ हमारे अच्छे संबंध है इसलिये भारत की कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के साथ हम दोस्ताना संबंध रखते हैं और इसलिये दोनों चले गये कल सम्मेलन में और वह जो सम्मेलन था इन्टरनेशनल कांफ़्रेस आन् इंडियन ओशन अगेन्स्ट फारेन बेसेज एंड जोनल बेसा क्या इसमें कोई गुट-निरपेक्ष आदमी आये थे, जैसे पापोव्ह साहब जो सोवियत यूनियन के नुमायंदे हैं, सोवियत यूनियन के प्रतिनिधि हैं? मैं सीधा सवाल पूछना चाहता हूँ विदेश मंत्री से कि आप मान लीजिये, निरपेक्षता पर विश्वास करते हैं तो फिर आप इस तरह के एलाइन्ड सम्मेलन में नहीं जाते।

आप एलाइन्ड सम्मेलन में जाकर सारी दुनिया की आंखों में पूरा प्रमाणित कर दिया कि आप एलाइन्ड हैं सोवियत यूनियन के साथ। हो सकता है चव्हाण साहब के मन में ऐसा न हो और प्रधान मंत्री उनको आदेश दिये होंगी आप जाइए, शरीक होइए। मैं मंत्री महोदय से जानना चाहता हूँ कि अगर इस हाऊस को, सदन को, जो उनके (चव्हाण साहब के) प्रेडीसेसर थे पिछले सत्र में सदन को गुमराह किये थे...

बावजूद इसके कि हम लोगों ने तथ्य दिया और कहा कि हम लोगों ने जो तथ्य दिये हैं उनके आधार पर बतलाइए कि क्या सोवियत यूनियन इसमें शरीक है या नहीं? क्या सोवियत यूनियन अपनी प्रिजेस को जस्टीफाई कर सकता है? मैं चव्हाण साहब से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या उनको यकीन है कि सोवियत यूनियन हिन्द महासागर में मौजूद नहीं है? क्या श्री चव्हाण साहब को मालूम है 1969 में इंडोनेशिया के विदेश मंत्री श्री आदम मलिक ने कहा था कि संयुक्त राष्ट्र अमेरिका और यू०एस० एस० आर० की जो दो शक्तियां हैं, वे आपस में संघर्ष रत हैं हिन्द महासागर में इसके साथ ही साथ मैं उन्हें यह भी जानकारी देता हूँ कि जनवरी 1969 में पीकिंग रेडियो ने कहा था कि रूस का एक जहाजी बेड़ा जिसमें 14 गाइडिड मिसाइल्स और 14 युद्धपोत हैं, वे हिन्द महासागर में मौजूद हैं। इस बात का समर्थन क्रिश्चियन साइंस मॉनिटर ने 2 मई 1969 को दिया था कि पीकिंग रेडियो ने जो बात कही है वह ठीक है। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि 1969 में लगातार इस तरह की खबरें अखबारों में आती रही हैं कि हिन्द महासागर में सोवियत जंगी जहाज मौजूद है। 1967 में दिल्ली के स्टेट्समैन ने भी इस बात की पुष्टी की है कि सोवियत कमान्डर पीटर नार्टन अपने जंगी जहाजों के साथ 1969 से और ढाई साल पहिले से भी हिन्द महासागर में अपने जहाजी बेड़े के साथ मौजूद है और उसकी परिक्रमा कर रहे हैं। इसी तरह की बात "टाइम्स" ने भी कही 27 अक्टूबर, 1969 को। जब श्री चव्हाण साहब जवाब दे रहे थे जो बीच में जब श्री भूपेश गुप्त ने सवाल किया तो वे मलायम पड़ गये। तो मैं

उनसे जानना चाहता हूँ कि मान लीजिये आप गुट निरपेक्ष में यकीन करते हैं, तो फिर दुनिया के सामने साफ तौर पर और निष्कता के साथ कहना चाहिये कि हम संयुक्त राष्ट्र आफ अमेरिका और सोवियत यूनियन के जो जगो जहाज हिन्द महासागर में घूम रहे हैं, उनको उचित नहीं समझते हैं। अभी मैंने आपके सामने उदाहरण दिया कि सोवियत यूनियन के 14 गाइडेड मिसाइल तथा युद्धपोत हिन्द महासागर की परिक्रमा कर रहे हैं। तो मैं इस सम्बन्ध में जानना चाहता हूँ कि उन्होंने क्या कार्यवाही की है? यू०एन० ओ० में 15 सदस्यों की जो कमेटी बनी हुई है, उसका भारत भी सदस्य है। यह कमेटी हिन्द महासागर को एक पीस जोन बनाना चाहती है, तो मैं श्री चव्हाण साहब से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि भारत सरकार इस कमेटी के द्वारा हिन्द महासागर को पीस जोन बनाने के लिए क्या कार्यवाही करने जा रही है जबकि वह जानती है कि हिन्द महासागर में सोवियत युद्ध पोत भी मौजूद है। इसलिए मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि इस कमेटी का जो प्रयत्न हिन्द महासागर को एक पीस जोन बनाने का है, उसके प्रति हम न्याय नहीं कर रहे हैं। संयुक्त राष्ट्र अमेरिका और सोवियत यूनियन, संसार की दो महाशक्तियाँ हैं और ये हिन्द महासागर को एक सेन्ट्रल जोन बनाना चाहती हैं। इसलिए मैं मंत्री जी से यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि जो मैंने सारे तथ्य दिये हैं, उन सब तथ्यों को मद्देनजर रखते हुए और इन दो महाशक्तियों से हिन्द महासागर को बचाने के लिये वह क्या कार्यवाही करने जा रहे हैं?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Sir, first of all I want to make one point clear and that is that I attended the non official conference on the Indian Ocean yesterday neither at the behest of anybody nor at the command of anybody. I think it is my duty as a Foreign Minister to attend a conference which is held here to support a cause in which we all are interested. So, I thought that it was my duty to attend this conference.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY : Are you attending similar other conferences on the Indian Ocean? (Interruption)

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Now, there is already one conference. What is the necessity of having another one. If anybody had any interest, they could have done so before also. There is no question about it. These are all hypothetical questions. I would like to make an appeal to the hon. Member of this August House. We should look at the problem from the national interest point of view. But some of us are trying to look at it from one angle and some from another angle. Let us not do that. When we say that the Indian Ocean should be a peace zone, it means that there should not be any military bases or naval forces or otherwise of any power, whether it be the U.S.A., the U.K., France or the U.S.S.R. I mean this is the objective for which we are working. There is no doubt about it. But, at the present moment. USSR claim that they have no bases here, but they certainly move in the ocean for their own purposes—they have admitted that; they have not tried to conceal that. They say they have to go from western part to eastern part and this is the way that they have to make use of.

(Interruption)

श्री रवी राय : अध्यक्ष महोदय, पोइन्ट आफ ऑर्डर। मैं विदेश मंत्री से जानना चाहता हूँ कि जब युद्ध जहाज महासागर में इस प्रकार दौरा करते हैं, परिक्रमा करते हैं तो क्या वे वह यह नहीं मानेंगे कि उनका बेस भी है क्योंकि वे आते जाते रहते हैं?

My question is clear.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Please try to understand. All that I am saying is what they have stated, what is happening today. I do not say that is our objective. Please make distinction between the two. Well, he said there are two groups one support-

[Shri Y. B. Chavan]

ing the Soviet Union and the other not supporting the Soviets. Sir, this Government has absolutely one policy. We are all supporting our Indian national interests.

श्री रवी राय : वरुवा साहब ने ब्यान दिया था कि हम ईस्ट यूरोपियन कन्ट्रीज और सोवियत यूनियन के साथ दोस्ती रखना चाहते हैं इसलिए बाध्य होकर हमको कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के साथ दोस्ती रखनी पड़ती है। यह उनका बयान है, वे आपके सदर हैं, आपकी क्या राय है इस बारे में ?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: You may have your own comments. I do not want to comment on that.

PROF. RASHEEDUDDIN KHAN (Nominated): Mr. Vice Chairman, Sir, At a time when the world is moving steadily towards a *detente* notwithstanding few setbacks in the pursuit of general international peace it is particularly disquieting to us in the Indian Ocean area to learn of the measures taken by the U.S. authorities not only in going ahead with the building of the Diego Garcia military base but also in regularly entering into the Indian Ocean with their task-force at brief intervals to show the flag of their naval might.

Sir, I would venture to suggest that the repeated entry on 8th November of the U.S. Naval task-force headed by the aircraft carrier 'Constellation' should be seen as a reminder of the global strategy of the U.S. The issue should not be clouded either by partisan consideration or by isolating the event from the larger framework within which it can be meaningfully analysed, as the Foreign Minister himself has said. From all accounts, the United States has the largest naval deployment and base facilities in the Indian Ocean, and therefore, it is the most dominant naval power in this region. Sir, it is not correct—I have got lots of facts to show—to say that the Soviet fleet in the Indian Ocean is either of the magnitude or of the capability in

terms of weaponry as the American fleet is.

(Interruption)

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: He must produce it. Sir, you cannot allow irresponsible statements like that. I am willing to produce the United Nations report which shows that Soviet Union and America have equal number of ships. You ask him to produce the figures.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): You must concede equal right to the other Member also to say what he feels. (Interruption). No, that is not good.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: Let him mention the figures. I have got a report of the United Nations which shows that the United States and the USSR have equal number of ships.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJ): Please don't interrupt.

PROF. RASHEEDUDDIN KHAN: My submission, Sir, is that because of a shift in defence weaponry, particularly after 1971—a fact which I would like the Ministry to examine—the defence of the Indian Ocean becomes very important for the littoral countries because with the obsolescence of the land-based and air-borne ballistic missiles, structure, which has become vulnerable—after the development of the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) system by the Soviet Union, the United States has shifted their strategy to Submarine Launched Ballistic Missile (SLBM). If we concede that considerable oil resources, mineral resources and sub-soil resources, of the third world are located in this region, it becomes a matter of concern to us all in the Indian Ocean, including India that here comes a power which has never shown its flag in defence of the right of the struggling people but on the contrary when for instance, Bangladesh was struggling for independence, we have known what they did and when this oil problem is also getting a little

controlled by the oil-producing people, it is important for us to examine its implications. I entirely agree that the Indian Ocean should not have no military base of any power and when I say any power, I mean literally any power. But we should not forget the other things, that it is a point of international law that high seas and oceans are open waters. It is not possible for any State to say that Soviet fleet shall not pass, Egyptian fleet shall not pass, the American fleet shall not pass. We are not saying this. American fleet is welcome to pass but we are questioning the military bases which are different from docking facilities, which are different from shipdays, which are different from all other categories of facilities which our learned Professor has mentioned. U.S. alone has not only the military base but what is more Diego Garcia is being built now as one of the major naval base in this area for reasons which should be obvious to any critical mind. Therefore, I should like to suggest to the Foreign Minister, let us have this item on the agenda of the next round of talks between India and the United States. I am happy that the nature and realistic talks—to borrow the phrase of the Foreign Minister himself—have gone well. Let us have it as a very important part of the agenda as to what they propose to do with Indian Ocean, what they propose to do with the military base at Diego Garcia. Also I would respectfully add that this is not a problem in which we say that we disagree. This is not a problem on which we must merely disagree. This is a problem on which we must not only refuse to disagree but we should sit down and talk squarely because in a world when the forces of detente are developing, when the problem of regional peace is also taking a shape, we just cannot sit quite. As a matter of fact, I think Dr. Henry Kissinger's visit from October to November being followed on the 8th of November by the show of this fleet is a reminder that they still talk in two languages one is the language of reasonableness on an area of comparative non-importance and one in the language of force. And I suggest let not the partisan approach, par-

tisan purposes of internal politics vitiate the patriotic urges of the people here. This is an important item. Let us have a straight talk with the U.S.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: I do not think he has asked me any question. He has expressed his views.

श्री राजनारायण श्रीमन्, मेरा पाइंट आफ आर्डर है।

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): Whenever you want to speak, you say point of order. No please.

श्री राजनारायण : भूपेश गुप्ता ने 9 बार पाइंट आफ आर्डर खड़ा किया।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU) : This is not good, when your leader has spoken.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, मेरा पाइंट आफ आर्डर है। कृपा करके मुनिए। सदन को इनलाइटन करने दीजिए। क्या इस सदन में माननीय मंत्री जी जो वक्तव्य अपना दे रहे हैं, इसके पूर्व के जो माननीय मंत्री जी इस विभाग के थे उन्होंने इस सदन में जो कुछ कहा है उसको भी कभी ध्यान में रखा है।

श्रीमन्, जुलाई, 1968 में, 29 जुलाई, 1968 को संसद् में ब्यान देते हुए श्री स्वर्णसिंह ने संसद् सदस्यों से विनती की कि वह हिन्द महासागर के बारे में बड़बड़ कर न बोलें। श्री स्वर्णसिंह ने संसद् सदस्यों को यह नम्रतापूर्वक बताया कि हिन्द महासागर का जल भारत के पूर्व और पश्चिम के देशों तक फैला हुआ है। इसलिए हिन्द महासागर की नीति की बात करना हमारी बड़मूल है। हमें यह गुमान नहीं रखना चाहिए कि हमारा हिन्द महासागर पर कोई खास दावा है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): There is no point of order.

श्री राजनारायण : यह पाइंट आफ आर्डर है। 29 जुलाई 1968 को श्री स्वर्णसिंह ने सदन में यह कहा कि हिन्द महासागर में हमारा कोई खास



[श्री राजनारायण]

दावा नहीं है। मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमने इसी संसद् में इस सरकार के लिए एक नीति मूलक बात कही क्या सरकार उस पर चलेगी ? वह मैं आपको पढ़ रहा हूँ :

पहला काम यह कि हम, भारत सरकार हिन्द महासागर पर अपना विशेष अधिकार जताए। बार-बार दावा करे। हिन्द महासागर के द्वीपों की पूरी पड़ताल कर इसमें बरती बसाए। जमीन तोड़े। फल-फूल और अन्य उद्योग धंधे कायम करें। विश्राम गृह बनाए और रियायती दर पर भारत के नागरिकों को आने-जाने वालों को बसने की सुविधा दे और तीसरी बात...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN : (SHRI V. B. RAJU) : There is no point of order. You are not raising a point of order.

श्री राजनारायण : मैंने इस संसद् में पॉइंट आफ आर्डर पर अपनी एक योजना बताई। कृपा करके सुन लीजिए। एक मिनट में खत्म कर रहा हूँ। आपके द्वारा संसद् सदस्यों से विनती कर रहा हूँ जरा सुनिए।

तीसरा, नई दिल्ली में या हिन्द महासागर में अंडमान द्वीप पोर्ट बलेपार नामक में सम्मेलन बुलाए। इस सम्मेलन में एशिया, अफ्रीका और हिन्द महासागर के हिस्सों को लौटाने के बारे में मलेशिया, इंडोनेशिया, आस्ट्रेलिया, मोजम्बीक (Interruption) युथोपिया आदि इस सम्मेलन में भाग लें और भारत इनसे द्वीपक्षीय या बहुपक्षीय संधि करे...

(Interruption)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU) : You are taking the time of the House.

श्री राजनारायण : भारत और सोवियत संघ मिलकर इसकी व्यवस्था करें। अमरीका, रूस (Interruption) अगर वह बाज न आए तो उनसे विग्रह करें।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU) : No, no. Please sit down.

श्री राजनारायण : मेरा पॉइंट आफ आर्डर यह है कि जब इस सदन के सम्मानित सदस्यों ने हिन्द महासागर की सुरक्षा के लिए एक नीति रखी, हिन्द को बचाने की नीति रखी तो सरकार जब यहाँ से सम्मेलन में गई तो इन नीतियों के बारे में सरकार ने चर्चा क्यों नहीं की। आखिर संसद् का मतलब क्या है ? जब संसद् में हम सुझाव देते हैं और सरकार कही जाती है तो सरकार को उस बारे में चर्चा करनी चाहिए।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU) : You are referring to policy and not to a point of order. Dr. Dutt.

श्री राजनारायण : यह सरकार रशिया की दलाली कर रही है। जब ईरान के शाह आए थे तो भारत सरकार की ओर से कहा गया था कि डिएगो गार्शिया में अड्डा बनाने से रोकते तो उन्होंने कहा कि आप रूस को नहीं रोकते तो मैं अमरीका को कैसे रोकूँ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU) : There is no point of order. Please sit down.

SHRI RAJNARAIN : Most important point of order.

इस सदन में सरकार को जो सुझाव दिया गया था उस सुझाव पर सरकार अमल क्यों नहीं करती है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU) : It is not a point of order. Please sit down.

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद साधु : मेरा एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। हर पार्टी से एक सदस्य बोलना है तो कांग्रेस पार्टी की ओर से तीसरा सदस्य क्यों बोल रहा है ?

DR. VIDYA PRAKASH DUTT (NOMINATED) : I do not have to take political tuition from him. I have a right to speak and I will speak on my own as a Member of this House.

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर : यह नियम तोड़ा जा रहा है। नियम के अनुसार दो इंडीपेंडेंट कैसे बोल सकते हैं।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU) : Independents are not a party.

श्री रवी राय : मेरा यह निवेदन है कि जो सदस्य नोमिनेटड हैं उनमें से दो सदस्यों को आपने बोलने दिया है और इसका कारण क्या यह नहीं है कि दो आदमियों को इसलिए बोलने दिया गया कि वे सरकार की नीति का समर्थन करेंगे ? इसलिए मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या इस तरह से दो आदमी बोल सकते हैं ? आप जानते हैं कि नोमिनेटड मेम्बरों का एक गुट है, एक ग्रुप है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU) : To make things very clear, the Independents do not belong to any party, firstly.

SHRI RAJNARAIN : They are nominated.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN : They themselves do not form into a group, secondly. And thirdly, it is a pleasure to hear the nominated Members. Let us hear them

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमान्, मेरा एक निवेदन है। आज वस्तु-स्थिति यह है कि नोमिनेटड मेम्बरों का एक गुट है, एक ग्रुप है। अगर आप इस तरह से बोलने देंगे तो मैं चाहता हूँ कि संविधान खोला जायें। नोमिनेशन का क्या आधार है ? मैं समझता हूँ कि नोमिनेशन का जो आधार है उसकी ये लोग पूर्ति नहीं करते हैं सिवाय श्री दपतरी के... (Interruption)

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर : मेरा यह निवेदन है कि... (Interruption)

DR. VIDYA PRAKASH DUTT : Sir, I do not know what is the purpose of that hon. Member trying to prevent us from speaking. I am not interrupting him. I listened to him with great respect. Whenever they speak, I do not say anything. I think they should respect other Members' right also, and I do not think that only one section of the House has certain rights and that the other section has no rights and privileges at all. In fact, I am very sorry. This is the first time that I felt really sad in this House that there are some Members who are all the time trying either to cast reflection on other Members or to interrupt them or to denigrate them or to show disrespect to the House. I am very sorry.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am sorry also that the discussion unfortunately degenerated into one section only trying to prove that Russia was the villain of the piece and the other section only trying to defend it. I do not think that was the purpose of the discussion at all.

I would like to submit two points for the consideration of the House and of the Minister of External Affairs. The Indian Ocean, firstly, has been historically an ocean of trade and commerce and of peace and friendship. It is for the first time that tension, warships, naval facilities, etc. are being introduced into the Indian Ocean on this scale. And now, disturbing developments are taking place. The United States is building its base and facilities at Diego Garcia.

The second point that I would like to make for the consideration of this House is that the Indian Ocean is an Afro-Asian Ocean; it is not an ocean populated, or situated by the big powers; but it is an ocean on which are situated all the Afro-Asian States. Therefore, we have called it always an Afro-Asian Ocean.

Now, the situation is sought to be changed; a new base is coming up. The war-ships of various powers are running up and down the Indian Ocean. And therefore I say that the tragedy and the folly

[Dr. Vidya Prakash Dutt]

and the recklessness of the Atlantic and the Mediterranean Oceans will be now repeated in the Indian Ocean. Why we are objecting to all this is that after having built up a feverish pitch of tension in the Mediterranean, now they are trying to make arrangements here in order to prevent it from bursting into a world war. Why are you in the first instance creating this tension when afterwards you will have to come to agreement in order to prevent this tension from reaching the boiling point?

Secondly—and I think that to my mind is more important than anything else—I feel that this very passage of war-ships and these bases particularly, will become instruments to threaten and intimidate and brow-beat the Afro-Asian countries. We have seen this happening in other parts of the world, where, the big powers were attempting to throttle the movements which they did not like.

South Africa will be used to put pressure on African countries like Zambia and Tanzania. Pressure will be exercised on the Persian Gulf countries like Iraq and Asian countries like Afghanistan and India. It is, therefore, in this context that we are so concerned about the new enterprise of the Enterprise which is coming into the Indian Ocean. It is in this context that we are concerned about the building of the bases in Diego Garcia. Sir, in my first and only visit to Moscow in June 1973 I had long discussion with the Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister, Mr. Pegov, who is a Member of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party, a high level dignitary. I had told him that the Soviet Union should make its position public and clear on this issue. He said to me—and it was conveyed to me later that I can quote him—that whatever he was saying was for record. He said to me that the Soviet Union sympathises with India and other countries in their struggle for making the Indian Ocean a zone of peace. Secondly, what he said was that this was a matter about which the Soviet

Union was prepared to sit around the conference table with all the other countries concerned in order to resolve the issue. The third thing he said was that we cannot tell them that other countries can come in but they should not be allowed to come in. Sir, we do not want any warships, whether Russian or American. So this position must be understood. I do not want to speak more. Already enough has been said. But I would like to know from the Minister whether he does not think that the only solution obviously is a world conference, a conference not necessarily of all countries of the world but a conference of all littoral states in order to resolve this and in order to arrive at agreements, ground rules, understanding, arrangements etc. by which the Indian Ocean could be converted into a zone of peace. Now so far the Russian position has been told that they are prepared for it, I have also been asking many American officials about their position. But we have not yet received any satisfactory answer. Therefore, I would like to know from the Foreign Minister whether he has discussed with the American officials and with Mr. Kissinger the question of holding such a conference of all the littoral states, of concerned countries like the United States, the Soviet Union, Britain and so forth for arriving at a suitable agreement for converting this zone into a zone of peace and, if so, what is the United States response? If the United States response is negative, we would like to know why they are not prepared. After all, when one side say that they are prepared to come to a round table and the other side says that it is not prepared, then unless it can produce some weighty reasons for not coming together there seems something fishy. Then the suspicion arises whether the intention is to dominate or what else. Therefore, I would like to know whether they are prepared to come to such a conference, if not, why not? And whether these arguments have any weight or not, I would like to know from the Minister.

SRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: Will he assure the House that he will not attend any more conference on the Indian Ocean?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: The point is that this is not a question of any bilateral discussion and this will be a wrong way of approaching the problem. I say it will possibly be counter-productive. Therefore, our approach will have to be at the U.N. level where all the interested parties are present because even the Soviet Russia has said that in consultation with the interested parties they will try to search for a solution. So it is not a discussion with us alone that is important. That is why my emphasis still is on the international forum being more activated.

I would say one last word on this occasion, I would request hon'ble Members not to take any partisan approach as far as this question is concerned.

DR. VIDYA PRAKASH DUTT: I am on a point of order. My question was what is the response of the United States to enter into a discussion at the international forum; whether they are prepared for it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): He said it need not be taken at a bilateral level.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: It might be on a multilateral level.

#### RESOLUTION RE APPOINTMENT OF A PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE TO PROBE INTO THE PROBLEM OF COR- RUPTION IN VARIOUS SPHERES— *Contd.*

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, भ्रष्टाचार की समस्या को किस प्रकार से हल किया जाये, किस प्रकार से उसका समाधान किया जाये, उसके सम्बन्ध में मुझाव देने के लिए संसद सदस्यों की एक समिति के निर्माण हेतु मेरा जो प्रस्ताव है, उस प्रस्ताव के समर्थन में बोलने हुए मैंने निवेदन किया था कि जिस समय से हम स्वाधीन हुए उस समय से लेकर अब तक जो स्थिति इस सम्बन्ध में थी, उसमें किसी प्रकार का कोई अन्तर

नहीं आया है। इस सवाल पर सरकार का जो दृष्टिकोण पहिले था वही आज भी है। इसलिए मैंने 11 नवम्बर, 1974 को कांग्रेस अध्यक्ष श्री बरुआ जी ने जो बयान दिया था उसको कोट किया था कि वे भी आज उसी दिशा की ओर सोच रहे हैं और इस देश में वही व्यवस्था लागू करना चाहते हैं जिस समय देश आजाद हुआ था।

हम यह बात देखते आ रहे हैं निरन्तर और प्रतिवर्ष कि किसी न किसी प्रकार के भ्रष्टाचार के आरोप प्रान्तीय मंत्रियों और केन्द्रीय मंत्रियों के ऊपर लगाये ही जाते रहते हैं। हम यह भी देख रहे हैं कि इस देश के अन्दर किस तरह से ब्लैक-मनी का निर्माण हो रहा है, पूंजीपति बढ़ रहे हैं और पूंजीपतियों के साथ रहने वाले जो मंत्री हैं, सत्तारूढ़ दल वाले, वे आज किस तरह का कार्य कर रहे हैं। उनकी कार्यवाही की वजह से आज देश में अनैतिकता का वातावरण बढ़ता ही चला जा रहा है और ब्लैक मार्केट फैलता ही जा रहा है। इसलिए इस सारी परिस्थिति को बदलने के लिए मैंने चाहा कि एक समिति का गठन किया जाय जो इस सारी बात पर पुनर्विचार करे।

यह प्रश्न किसी विशेष दल का नहीं है बल्कि यह जो प्रश्न है यह सारे देश का प्रश्न है। सारे देश का प्रश्न होने के नाते भ्रष्टाचार की जो भी बात होगी, चाहे वह प्रधान मंत्री के विरुद्ध हो, रेल मंत्री के विरुद्ध हो, बिहार के मुख्यमंत्री के विरुद्ध हो, हरियाणा के मुख्य मंत्री के विरुद्ध हो, अगर किसी के विरुद्ध भी हो तो उसकी चर्चा सारे देश तथा दुनिया में फैल जाती है और इससे हमारे देश का बदनाम होता है। इस तरह की बातों से केवल कांग्रेस वाले ही बदनाम नहीं होते बल्कि सारे देशवासी इससे बदनाम होते हैं और इसका बुरा असर हमारी जनता में पड़ता है। इसलिए मैं यहां पर किसी विशेष मंत्री के ऊपर आरोप नहीं लगाना चाहता हूं क्योंकि इस प्रकार की अनेक घटनाएं मौजूद हैं और इस देश के अन्दर इस तरह की घटनाएं प्रकाशित होती ही रहती हैं। इस तरह की घटनाओं को बतलाने की आवश्यकता नहीं है। आवश्यकता तो इस बात की है कि