

क्षेत्र के लिए जापानी नागरिकों से प्राप्त  
प्रार्थनापत्रों की संख्या इस प्रकार है :—

महाराष्ट्र—60

पश्चिम बंगाल—25

तमिलनाडु—9

संघ शासित क्षेत्र दिल्ली—80

[THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI DHANIK LAL MANDAL): (a) Requests for visas from foreigners are considered on individual merits having regard to the purpose of the visit, the work to be performed and reasons for visiting India. Visas for engaging in any work are granted for specified periods in the recommendations of the technical Ministries concerned.

(b) The number of applications received from Japanese nationals during the period from January 1977 to December, 1978 for the State of Maharashtra, West Bengal, Tamil Nadu and the Union Territory of Delhi is as follows:—

Maharashtra	60
West Bengal	25
Tamil Nadu	9
Union Territory of Delhi	80

#### REFERENCE TO THE SPECIAL COURTS BILL, 1979

SHRI SHRIKANT VERMA (Madhya Pradesh): Sir, yesterday I gave notice of a breach of privilege by Mr. Ram Jethmalani. You see, yesterday the voting took place on the Special Courts Bill. Mr. Jethmalani had circulated a letter and in that letter he not only appealed to Members to support the Bill but he also cast aspersions on a particular political party and the Members belonging to that political party. Sir, I am not concerned about the future of any

†[ ] English translation.

individual or what judgment is given by the Special Court or by any other ordinary court. But I am certainly concerned about my performance in this House. In this connection, Sir, I will quote from the May's Parliamentary Practice, page 151. Here it is clearly written... (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

SHRI ANANT PRASAD SHARMA (Bihar): Sir, he is making a point of Order I - m m.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I can understand. A privilege matter is not to be discussed on the floor of the House. Yesterday it was raised and I told him that I was going to examine it.

SHRI ANANT PRASAD SHARMA: But you have permitted him to raise the point of order, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For the information of Mr. A. P. Sharma and the Members of this House, he had come, I can tell you, to my chamber and I have explained to him the whole position. What more do you want?

SHRI SHRIKANT VERMA: I am raising a point of order, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have explained to you the position.

SHRI ANANT PRASAD SHARMA: Sir, you kindly hear him.

SHRI SHRIKANT VERMA: I am quoting the procedure.

SHRI ANANT PRASAD SHARMA: Then you can give your decision.

SHRI JAGDISH JOSHI (Madhya Pradesh): Sir, this cannot be allowed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please wait, I will reply. He got up on a point of order. The position was explained to

him. Then how can I allow it, you tell me.

SHRI ANANT PRASAD SHARMA: Sir, he is making a point of order connected with that subject.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sir, he should not have been permitted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How can I know before hand what the point of order is? I will have to allow him. Now he has referred to a matter about which I had a discussion in detail with him . . . (Interruptions)

SHRI SHRIKANT VERMA: Sir, I still hold.

SHRI ANANT PRASAD SHARMA: Sir, he is making a point of order. Kindly listen to him.

SHRI SHRIKANT VERMA: Then you can give your judgment on that. (Interruptions).

SHRI JAGDISH JOSHI: Sir, it is not the practice of the House to discuss privilege motions in the House. He may enlighten you or the Privileges Committee but how can he raise it in the House? (Interruptions).

SHRI SHRIKANT VERMA: Sir, he % trying to influence. He sent this letter only a couple of days back. He tried his best to influence our future performance. Now, is it not breach of privilege? It is a clear case of breach of privilege. I do not want to go into that. Although he has said that he is writing this letter in the name of democratic decencies but this is the most indecent letter which he has written to the Members of this House. And, I say that this is a contempt of this august House and not only of a particular party, and this is a fit case (Interruptions) I am not at all bothered. It is the privilege of the House and this House can decide whether Mr. Jethmalani or anybody can write... (Interruptions). In 1966, Mr, Madhu Limaye

referred to certain cases m e ok Sabha... (Interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN: A privilege cannot be raised as point of order in the first place. Since you have raised it, I will tell you. Shri Jeth-malani's letter merely appeals to the Members to help enact the Special Courts Bill. Although it may cast aspersions on a political party, it does not deter or obstruct or biter-fere with a Member's conduct in the House. The tone of the letter will indicate that it is persuasive rather than coercive. Even speeches or writings containing vague charges against Members or criticising their Parliamentary conduct in a strong language without imputing any tnala-fides have not been treated as a contempt or breach of privilege. One or two rulings have been given in the Lok Sabha when Mr. Ayyangar was the Speaker. Similarly, there are a number of instances. Several rulings both in the Lok Sabha and the House of Commons support this. I have said the whole thing and have explained to him in detail in my Chamber. It wa^ not necessary, and still he has raised it:

Let us go to the next item.

SHRI SHRIKANT VERMA: Please allow me to read it;

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, you cannot do it.

**STATEMENT BY MINISTER SUPPLEMENTING ANSWER TO UN-STARRED QUESTION NO. 203: DATED 22ND FEBRUARY, 1979 REGARDING RE-APPOINTMENT OF OFFICERS IN BHEL**

उद्योग मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री जग-  
दम्बी प्रसाद यादव) : श्रीमन्, मैं आपकी अनु-  
मति से भारत हैवी इलेक्ट्रिकल्स लिमिटेड  
में अधिकारियों की पुनर्नियुक्ति के सम्बन्ध में

22 फरवरी, 1979 को राज्य सभा में अंतरा-  
कृत प्रश्न 203 के लिए गए उत्तर की अनु-  
पूरक सूचना देने वाला एक विवरण (अंग्रेजी  
तथा हिन्दी में) सभा पटल पर रखता हूँ।  
[See Appendix CVIII Annexure No.  
126]

#### PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

##### I. Report (1977-78) of the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research, New Delhi.

##### II. Accounts (1976-77) of the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research, New Delhi and related .. papers.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI  
MORARJI DESAI): Sir, I beg to lay on the  
Table a copy each (in English and Hindi) of  
the following papers:—

(i) Annual Report of the Council of  
Scientific and Industrial Research New Delhi,  
for the year 1977-78.

(ii) Annual Accounts of the Council of  
Scientific and Industrial Research, New  
Delhi, for the year 1976-77, and the Audit  
Report thereon.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-4117/79  
for I and II].

Report and Accounts (1977-78) of the  
Richardson and Cruddas (1972) Limited,  
Bombay, and related papers

उद्योग मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री  
जगदम्बर प्रसाद दादव) : श्रीमान्, मैं आपकी  
अनुमति से कम्पनी अधिनियम, 1956 की  
धारा 619क की उपधारा (1) के अधीन  
निम्नलिखित पत्रों को एक-एक प्रति (अंग्रेजी  
तथा हिन्दी में) सभा पटल पर रखता हूँ :

(i) 1977-78 के वर्ष के लिये  
रिचर्डसन एण्ड क्रुडॉस  
972) लिमिटेड, बम्बई

का पांचवां वार्षिक प्रतिवेदन  
तथा लेखे, लेखों पर लेखा  
परीक्षकों के प्रतिवेदन तथा उस  
पर भारत में नियंत्रक महालेखा-  
परीक्षक की टिप्पणियों सहित।

(ii) कम्पनी के कार्यकरण की  
सरकार द्वारा समीक्षा।

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-4119/79  
for I and II]

##### Notifications under the All India Services Act, 1951

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE  
MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI S.  
D. PATIL): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table  
under sub-section (2) of section 3 " of the All  
India Services Act, 1951, a copy each (in  
English and Hindi) of the following  
Notifications of the Ministry of Home Affairs  
(Department of Personnel and Administrative  
Reforms)".

(i) G.S.R. No. 329, dated the 3rd March,  
1979, publishing the Indian Police Service  
(Pay) First Amendment Rules, 1979.

(ii) G.S.R. No. 366, dated the 10th  
March, 1979, publishing the All India  
Services (Leave) Second Amendment  
Rules, 1979.

(iii) G.S.R. NO. 369, dated the 10th  
March, 1979, publishing the Indian Police  
Service (Fixation of Cadre Strength) First  
Amendment Regulations, 1979.

(iv) G.S.R. No. 370, dated the 10th  
March, 1979, publishing the Indian Police  
Service (Pay) Second Amendment Rules,  
1979.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-4122/79  
for (i) to (iv)]

##### Corrigendum to SRO No. 57, dated the 9th February 1979.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE  
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE (PROF. SHER  
SINGH): Sir, I beg to lay o'n the Table, under  
section 185 of the Navy Act, 1957, a copy (in  
English and Hindi) of the Ministry of  
Defence Notification S.R.O. No. ' 75,

dated the. 1st March, 1979. publishing the Corrigendum to S.R.O. No. 57, dated the 9th February, 1979. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-4141/79].

**I. Report and Accounts (1977-78) of the National Industrial Development Corporation Limited, New Delhi and related papers.**

**II. The Jute (Licensing and control) (Amendment) Order, J.1979**

**III. Notification of the Ministry of Industry (Department of Industrial Development).**

श्री जगदम्बो प्रसाद यादव : श्रीमन्, मैं आपको अनुमति से निम्नलिखित पत्र सभा पटल पर रखता हूँ :

**I. कम्पनी अधिनियम, 1956 की धारा 619क की उपधारा (1) के अधीन निम्नलिखित पत्रों की एक-एक प्रति (अंग्रेजी तथा हिन्दी में) :**

(i) 1977-78 के वर्ष के लिये नेशनल इण्डस्ट्रियल डेवेलपमेंट कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड, नयी दिल्ली का तेईसवां वार्षिक प्रतिवेदन तथा लेख लेखों पर लेखापरोक्षकों के प्रतिवेदन तथा उस पर भारत के नियंत्रक महालेखापरोक्षक की टिप्पणियों सहित ।

(ii) कारपोरेशन का कार्यक्रम की सरकार द्वारा समीक्षा ।

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-4123 79 for (i) and (ii)].

**II. आवश्यक वस्तु अधिनियम, 1955 की धारा 3 की उपधारा (6) के अधीन पटसन (लाइसेंसिंग तथा नियंत्रण) (संशोधन) आदेश, 1979 को प्रकाशित करने वाली उद्योग मंत्रालय (औद्योगिक विकास विभाग) की अधिसूचना का० आ० सं० 102 (ई),**

दिनांक 20 फरवरी, 1979 की एक प्रति (अंग्रेजी तथा हिन्दी में) ।

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-4123/79 for (i) and (ii)].

**III. उद्योग (विकास तथा विनियमन) अधिनियम, 1951 की धारा 18क की उपधारा (2) के अधीन उद्योग मंत्रालय (औद्योगिक विकास विभाग) की अधिसूचना का० आ० सं० 111 (ई), दिनांक 26 फरवरी, 1979 की एक प्रति (अंग्रेजी तथा हिन्दी में) ।**

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-4126/79].

### CALLING ATTENTION TO A MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

**Reported Proposal of the United States of America to Station a New Naval Fleet in the Indian Ocean and to forge a New Military Alliance with China, Saudi Arabia, Pakistan and Bangladesh.**

SHRI G. C. BHATTACHARYA (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I call the attention of the Minister of External Affairs to the reported proposal of the United States of America to station a 'new Naval Fleet in the Indian Ocean and to forge a new military alliance with China, Saudi Arabia, Pakistan and Bangladesh.

SHRI NAGESHWAR PRASAD SHAHI (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, this should not be discussed under Calling Attention, but the whole day should be allotted for discussing this subject. This is a very important matter. Therefore, I appeal to you, Sir. No justice can be done to this subject if it is discussed under Calling Attention. Therefore, Sir, I want that this subject should be discussed for the whole day and a full day should be allotted for this purpose. Calling Attention is meant for some urgent matter. This is a matter which concerns vital interests of the

country and it has to be thoroughly discussed.

I have given my notice that in U.P., there is a great... (Inter, ruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Shahi, it will not be fair for you. You are always following the instructions from the Chair. It is not fair for you.

SHRI ANANT PRASAD SHARMA: (Bihar): He never follows the instructions, Sir.

SHRI SADASIV BAGAITKAR (Maharashtra): Sir, I support Mr. Shahi. Sir, I would request you to allot sufficient time for discussing all the aspects of our foreign policy. Of course, we can now discuss this Calling Attention. But I would request you to allot sufficient time so that we may be able to discuss the whole gamut of our foreign policy. Many important issues are involved in this.

SHRI G. C. BHATTACHARYA: Now, Sir, this is on the Agenda. Of course, I agree with what Mr. Bagaitkar has said. (Interruptions).

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE (Maharashtra): Sir, I have no doubt in my mind that the hon. Minister of External Affairs will admit that the issue is of vital importance not only to this country, but to the entire region as well. It has national, transnational and inter-national repercussions. Therefore, my submission is that we have not been able to get the Minister of External Affairs to make real commitments with respect to the foreign policy so far as the USA is concerned. This is one matter when we want to corner him and corner him so as not to allow him to get out of it, despite his ability in parliamentary finesse and skill. This particular Calling Attention is not a proper manner and method at all. My respectful submission for your consideration, Sir, is this. If you are

public importance

allowing this Calling Attention, you may allow it and keep it within time. But Sir, give a whole day for this subject so that we can get the Minister of External Affairs to tell us as to what the Government wants to do so far as the attitude of the United States of America is concerned in regard to proliferation of nuclear armaments and nuclear... (Interruptions).

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (DR. RAM KRIPAL SINHA): Sir, the hon. Minister should be allowed to make his statement.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: Sir, I am not the one who interrupts. But this is an important matter. Therefore my submission is that so far as the discussion on this subject is concerned, a whole day should be earmarked for this subject only. (Interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ramanand Yadav, why are you getting up again and again? Today's subject on the agenda is the Calling Attention. Let him make the statement. It is a separate issue whether this should be discussed for a full day or two days or three days. Now, the hon. Minister to make the statement.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE): Sir. On March 13th the Minister of State for External Affairs, Shri Samarendra Kundu, had already made this House aware of the concern felt by the Government over reports of the U.S. Government despatching a carrier-led naval task force to the Indian Ocean and the Gulf area. Hon'ble members are understandably concerned at this move specially in view of some indications that after the recent events in the region the U.S. Government is considering the option of increasing its military presence, particularly in the shape of naval forces in the region.

We are continuing to maintain a close watch over the situation in the

[Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee] Indian Ocean and the Gulf area. So far we have received no confirmation of the reports that a new military alliance involving China, Saudi Arabia, Pakistan and Bangladesh is being formed. Recent trends, such as disintegration of CENTO would suggest that military alliances involving developing countries, do not serve the declared purposes. On the contrary such arrangements invite counter-efforts, create instability and come in the way of cooperative relations. Moreover, they also tend to distort internal politics with resultant upheavals as has happened recently in some countries of this region.

In this connection it can be reiterated that in the opinion of the Government of India stability can only be achieved through, regional, functional and economic cooperation between countries acting in consonance with their national interests. Problem which exists, can best be resolved with mutual respect through peaceful dialogues, as has happened recently with the Arab League mediation between the two Yemens. Increased presence by any major foreign power would inevitably bring forth rival build-up and is bound to result in further tension. We firmly believe that the best way to ensure normal peaceful maritime commerce, including the flow of oil through this region, is to help the countries of the region to develop their economies and resolve their mutual problems.

Recent events have made it more than clear that increased military and naval strength in the region and enhanced presence by one or both super powers could have adverse consequences, and add to the tensions in the region, which would be of concern to the entire world.

The United Nations is already seized of this problem of making the Indian Ocean a zone of peace. A conference of littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean and the Gulf is to be held in the coming months.

In keeping with the declared purpose of extending detente to all regions of the world and what we believe is the considered inclination of the countries around the Indian Ocean and the Gulf, we cannot but caution against any new military arrangement involving super powers or non-regional countries. We recognise this as a vital area for the world economy. Enlightened policies would point to defusing tensions rather than adding to them by new forms of multilateral militarism.

[Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair]

SHRI G. C. BHATTACHARYA: Sir, the statement of the hon. Minister does not reflect the grave situation which has arisen. It is merely a repetition of certain platitudes. Only this morning the newspaper 'Statesman' has given a report of certain discussion in the Lok Sabha and it is very important Sir; everything starts from cardiography. Here also, it is said that it has started from cardiography and from there a cardio-graphic aggression has been started. What is written there. I am reading:

"The Lok Sabha's attention was today drawn to an American publication's map of China with several features highly objectionable to India.

The publication—the New Book of Knowledge, T577 edition, published by Messrs Grolier Inc of New York—had on page 260 of its third volume a map of China "with that nation's name printed over a map of India". It showed a Chinese mother and child and a Chinese building on the Indian map. Arid by the side of that picture appeared the word "Peking".

"The place Peking has been shown somewhere in the region of Srikakulam in Andhra Pradesh where the Naxalites activities are still continuing."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please speak on the Motion.

SHRI G. C. BHATTACHARYA: I am coming to that. Sir, in this House I warned" the External Affairs Minister of the danger of the Sino-American alliance. That also had a connection with his visit to China. In spite of our repeated requests not to undertake this disastrous visit, he went there and as I have stated earlier, two years of his labour in building up the image has gone waste. He has received a set-back. We only sympathise with him. Then, Sir, what I want to say is that this alliance and the Indian Ocean military movements are connected with the same China-U.S. axis. The China-U.S. axis is propping this alliance. The alliance has been named as 'Islamic Alliance'. I will give the details. See the gravity of it and, Mr. Deputy Chairman, you do justice whether the statement of the Minister of External Affairs really reflects the danger which the country is facing. Sir, it is said;

"It is reliably learnt from diplomatic sources that the deck has been cleared for ushering in a dramatic political development of crucial importance for Asia and the World. According to these sources, preparations are all but complete for announcing the formation of a new military defence alliance comprising Pakistan, Bangladesh and Saudi Arabia. It is likely that Iran will join this alliance later, after conditions have stabilised in that country.

It is learnt that this was the most important decision to emerge from the top secret series of meetings of American policy planners and envoys held in New Delhi during the past few weeks.

Contrary to what the Americans gave the world at large and the Indian Government to understand, the New Delhi summit of US envoys stationed in the region was not merely for meeting Deputy Secretary of State Warren Chris-

topher who was visiting India, not was the get-together in Delhi primarily for consultations with the Indian Government on the question of nuclear safeguards.

The meeting with Indian leaders by Mr. Christopher was merely a convenient cover for the crucial secret meeting of American envoys and top policy-planners specialising in this region who met among themselves to assess certain vital security questions high on the American priority list.

The key man who coordinated discussions among the envoys was a senior official of the all-powerful National Security Council in America, and also President Carter's Special Adviser on South Asia. Significantly, the name of his powerful official did not figure in newspaper headlines. He was Tom Thornton, a top specialist on South Asia.

Among the policy planners aiding Mr. Thornton, and who accompanied him from America were Mr. Paul Kreisburg, who was stationed in India as the American Political Counsellor during the Emergency...

He piloted the emergency.

"and a senior woman official of the State Department, Jane Alleby, who heads the Washington desk for Bangladesh, Pakistan and Afghanistan."

Thereafter, the Statesman again warns about what happened during the discussions between our Prime Minister and the Prime Minister of the Soviet Union. It says:

"But both sides feared that the events in Iran might cast a shadow on Pakistan, particularly in the light of reports of moves to promote a new 'Islamic alliance' to replace CENTO. It could have a destabilising effect on the Indian subcontinent if it meant large-scale induction of arms into

[Shri G. C. Bhattacharya]

Pakistan from the Western Powers, as well as from China".

Now I will try to elaborate on the implications of this development.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please don't take much time. There are a lot of other people who want to speak. It is not a debate.

SHRI G. C. BHATTACHARYA: But you know, Sir, what the demand was. The demand was that a full day should be allotted for this.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is a different matter. The Chairman has said that he will consider it in due course. Here we are discussing a Calling Attention Motion. Every one has to be accommodated.

SHRI G. C. BHATTACHARYA: I will cut short. What has happened in the Indian Ocean in the last few years despite our efforts and the efforts of the United Nations. The more we are making efforts, the bigger are the efforts of America to strengthen Diego Garcia, to strengthen their naval fleet in the Indian Ocean. I do not know what purpose is going to be served by calling a conference of littoral countries in the coming months without taking concrete steps. This will only serve the purpose of certain elements who want to equate the two Super Powers, to equate a person who is having a base, a power who is strengthening the base and its naval forces and a power who has no base. I would like Mr. Vajpayee to make an announcement today—he is equating the two Super Powers—giving the name of the other Super Power and also the base that that Super Power is having in the Indian Ocean. Otherwise there is no sense in equating the two Super Powers in the context of military bases in the

Indian Ocean. Therefore, we should not do something which will not give the correct picture. We should not become the propaganda boy of any Super Power.

AN HON. MEMBER: How many bases are there?

SHRI G. C. BHATTACHARYA: I would like to know from the Foreign Minister. He should make an announcement because this is an important matter. He is always equating the other Super Power. Both in the Lok Sabha as well as in his speeches, he has done that. I want to know which are the bases the other Super Power is having? For one Super Power we know; Diego Garcia is there.

The concrete steps that I am suggesting are that you will have to apply economic sanctions. Short of that, you cannot prevent this disease from developing further. A solid decision should be taken in that Conference that no littoral country will allow any base to the American Government to further strengthen their naval base in the Indian Ocean, or to strengthen their bases outside their country. Secondly, which are the countries in these alliances? I am reminding this House and, through this House, this country that the American move is not directed against any other super-power. It is directed against the small countries of Asia one by one. Today it is Vietnam. They have been already attacked and they will be attacked again. Hence these alliances and this strengthening of naval base by America.

Sir, we have been thrice attacked at the instigation of America by Pakistan. We have been twice attacked by China and China is still occupying 4000 sq. miles of our own territory. And what is the position? As I said; I welcome normalisation. But in the name of normalisation you



are appeasing. Appeasement is dangerous. Therefore, China is still there. The Government of India in the name of genuine alignment are promoting nothing but alignment and neoutralism. This is going to be a very dangerous thing. By taking advantage of this they are trying to forge these alliances to insult this country. It is these pacts and alliances which are encouraging communalism in the border State. This, in turn, will provoke communalism inside India. So communal tension is being instigated both in this country and in the border countries which are going to join in the Islamic alliance. This is also a dangerous thing. And this danger is not at all being appreciated by the foreign Minister. At least this is not reflected in his statement.

Now, what I suggest is this. We have certain tested friends. We have a policy of non-alignment which has really done some good. Regarding our image there is no dispute. The policy of non-alignment has done some good. Today whatever image you have achieved in the third world countries is due to the policy of non-alignment. But here we have given the go-by to this policy. We are now taking to the policy of alignment. Sir, this is a dangerous policy and we have to refrain from this policy.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please be brief.

SHRI G. C. BHATTACHARYA: Only one suggestion. We should follow the policy of non-alignment very actively. Let us strengthen our alliance which we have been having so long with the Soviet Union, socialist countries, third world countries and the liberation movement. This is our strength. Do not go by the lollipops waived at us by these powers. They are insulting you as also giving certain promises which are not fulfilled. Even today there

is a statement that nuclear fuel is not coming by the end of this year; they will stop everything. You are going to get nothing. Do not give up friends. You are trying to cultivate people who are not friends. They have been posing as friends but they have done nothing for you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do.

SHRI G. C. BHATTACHARYA: We should do nothing by which we will become friendless in this world and when we will be attacked we will have no friends to help us.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: My hon'ble friend has covered a large area . . .

SHRI SITARAM KESRI (Bihari): Is it a satire by Mr. Bhattacharya?

SHRI G. C. BHATTACHARYA: You know, Sir, he is a courtier of somebody. So he should do it.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: . . . but the Calling Attention motion refers to reports regarding the presence of a new naval fleet in the Gulf area and also to the reports of a new military alliance comprising Bangladesh; Pakistan China and Saudi Arabia. Sir, I have said in my statement that these reports have not been confirmed. I am not supposed to react on the basis of press reports. (Interruption). We have our Ambassadors in these countries and these countries have their own Ambassadors in our country. We are maintaining close contacts and we are engaged in the task of collecting information.

DR. V. P. DUTT (Nominated): what is your information?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: The information is that there is no confirmation of the reports. That is the information. (Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Let the Minister speak.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA (Karnataka): They did not tell you about the Chinese attack on Vietnam. He takes no one into confidence.

DR. V. P. DUTT: Take the nation with you.

SHRI MOHAMMAD YUNUS SALEEM (Andhra Pradesh): What- ever little information you have you can give.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: That is what I am trying to do. As I said in my statement, after the dissolution of CENTO, Pakistan has decided to withdraw and Turkey has followed suit. Only the United Kingdom remains. Now, after the dissolution of CENTO if any countries decide to forge a new military alliance, they will be acting against the current trends, they will be acting against their own interests and against the interests of this entire region. (Interruption). Sir, I will have to repeat that so far we have not received any confirmation.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: No information, no confirmation. Only confusion.

DR. V. P. DUTT: Confirmation can follow.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: There is no confusion in our minds. If confusion prevails there, I can't help it.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: There is confusion within your own Party {Interruptions}.

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI (Maharashtra): Sir, I am not going to repeat the voluminous information which my colleague has brought here or about the printing

of maps because map printing does not change locality and nationality. Sir, I want to know from the hon. Minister of External Affairs who is a very pleasant person....

DR. V. P. DUTT: But never gives any information.

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: Being a Minister of Foreign Affairs he has always to be evasive and never specific. Otherwise he cannot be a good diplomat. That I can understand. Very recently he has given a very exclusive interview to Mr. Kewal Varma of Sunday. (Interruptions) Sir, he wants me to be a courtier of Russia and I am not going to oblige him. I want to ask three specific questions of the hon. Minister of External Affairs. I do not want to take much time because much has already been said. (Interruptions). Now he himself has admitted that having lost Iran and because of the developments in the various countries, particularly in the Gulf area, it seems that because of their necessities and compulsions the Americans want to create a new alliance—because CENTO has also collapsed—and for that purpose it is up to them to enter into collaboration, cooperation, military alliances or whatever they want. But my concern is about what my nation stands to gain or lose there. To that I draw your attention. And in this connection I want to know whether you have stated what is written here to a query made by Mr. Kewal Varma. I only read these two, which you will have to reply to. The question raised was: "Why is the impression persisting that there is a pro-American tilt in your foreign policy?" That was the question very squarely put to you. Many Members of Parliament and others, since your visit to China, as Shrimati Alva has stated, have raised this point why this impression is persisting that there is a pro-American tilt. May be because previously you were a Jana Sangh Member and you were attacking from

"that side Pandit Nehru's non-alignment policy...

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:  
Never.

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI:  
...or the Congress policy. The impression was there. Your entire group was like that, pro-RSS. And Bihariji, your own...

AN HON. MEMBER: Say Atal Bihariji.

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: You do not accept Piloo Mody's becoming a joker and your party's snipers like Dr. Subramanian Swamy and Shri Madhu Limaye—I am not alleging anything like that. Your specific reply to the question put to you was that this has been given currency to by newspapers. It means, you had thrown the entire dustbin into the newspapers' offices, whereby you wanted to get away from it.

Then there was another specific question. When you became the Foreign Minister, you said that there was a tilt in the foreign policy of the previous Government. What was that tilt? Perhaps you wanted to go away from the main thrust of the question and you replied to it with what you call 'chhalaki' by saying "a tilt away from genuine non-alignment". So, Vajpayeeji, this impression has caused a great anxiety to me also, maybe to my party also, and many other people. The Russians, particularly Mr. Kosygin, visited us at a strategic time when China had attacked Vietnam. But Russia had a duty to protect Vietnam as per their agreement with them just as they have an agreement with us that if some power attacks us, we have to collaborate with each other. So this was a strategic time when Mr. Kosygin felt that he should visit India. In that connection, I would like to know whether the reason was the American's design to create a base in the Indian Ocean and rope in the

Gulf countries on this side and through China go up to the Philippines. Again, I would like to know whether Mr. Kosygin had, during his secret talks with the Prime Minister—it is reported very reliably—given a warning to the Government of India that the tilt towards the USA was a dangerous tilt. This is my information. I want a categorical answer to it. I am not beating about the bush. I do not want to 'do that. You are making a balancing act or whatever it is. Mr. Vajpayee, you, with your pleasant manners, are trying to convince people that this is not that. My friend has rightly pointed out that you remarked in the Lok Sabha that it is rivalry of great super powers to show off their presence. What is the other super power, apart from Russia? I am not the coterie of Russia, as my hon. friend said. I want to say: What is that super power?

SHRI G. C. BHATTACHARYA: You are a coterie of the USSR, not anybody else. You must understand the purpose for which I said it.

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: I did not follow it because you talked so loudly. So, what I want to say is that balancing act is being done. So, I want to know specifically whether the visit of Mr. Kosygin particularly at this moment has anything to suggest measures to counter-act the USA's Fifth Fleet presence and to show their dislike towards your visit to China, and the third point is whether the Russians have any real presence of military character in the Indian Ocean. Only on these three points, I want categorical answers. Do not be a diplomat with me. I am your friend, you are my friend and both of us have to guard the country's interests, that is why I am asking this.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Sir, during the visit of the Prime Minister. Mr. Kosygin, the question of the Indian Ocean was discussed. Both the Soviet Russia and India

[Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee]

agreed that genuine effort should be made to make the Indian Ocean a zone of peace. The Prime Minister, Mr. Kosygin, did not give any warning.

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI:  
In diplomatic terms?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Sir, when we friends meet, and as intimate friends as India and the Soviet Russia, we do not talk in terms of giving a warning. We exchange views, and there is a great common ground between the two countries.

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI:  
Except Kampuchea.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: I  
need not comment on that.

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KUL  
KARNI: Do not do googly bowling.  
We are batting here. Do straight  
bowling.

AN HON. MEMBER: You know the type  
of bowling also.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: When  
I say, there was a great measure of agreement  
between the Soviet Union and India, is that  
not a straight statement?

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI:  
What is broad?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Have  
I to define broad?

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI:  
You exclude Kampuchea.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Now  
Kampuchea cropped up. We are discussing  
the Indian Ocean.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: You  
are talking about broad similarity of views.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Both  
America and the Soviet Russia

have their naval presence in the Indian  
Ocean.

SHRI G. C. BHATTACHARYA: Bases?

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI:  
Mainly bases.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: I  
would like my words to be noted by the  
Members. Both the super powers are present  
in the Indian Ocean. India would like all the  
foreign bases including that of Diego Garcia  
to be dismantled. Our stand is clear,  
unequivocal. Whether the proposed  
conference, the international conference of the  
littoral and hinterland countries, will do some-  
thing good, only the future will tell. But as a  
member of the ad hoc committee set up by the  
United Nations, India is active with other  
countries who are interested in making the  
Indian Ocean a zone of peace.

Four rounds of talks have been held  
between America and the U.S.S.R. Now my  
friend asks why I should equate both. Both  
are super powers and both are holding talks.  
We are not there.

SHRI G- C. BHATTACHARYA: We will  
be affected, not they.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Of  
course, we will be affected. That is why we  
are interested.

DR. V. P. DUTT: The question was...

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: You  
do not... (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please. This  
is not the way. Order please. You have got  
your chances. No intervention. We cannot  
proceed like this at all.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: The  
last round of talks was held in July, 1977.  
Dates for future talks have not been fixed.  
We hope that

talks will be resumed. India and other littoral countries are vitally interested in this question, and we hope that something will come out of the international conference. Sir, I think I have replied to all the points.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: In the meantime, Diego Garcia is being expanded. (Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Shri Chakraborty,

SHRI AMARPROSAD CHAKRABORTY (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, ... (Interruptions).

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: I am asking a specific question. Please name the Russian base in the Indian Ocean. What is the name of the Russian base? (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: I want to know that,

SHRI LAKSHMANA MAHAPATRO (Orissa): The Government of India has said that there is no base of Russia,...

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: Who has said that?

SHRI LAKSHMANA MAHAPATRO: The Government of India. Many times in this House. (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, please. No cross-arguments. Please resume your seats. Shri Chakraborty has the floor.

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: He either avoids a reply ...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What ever conclusions you may draw, Shri Chakraborty has the floor.

SHRI AMARPROSAD CHAKRABORTY: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir,

I am not surcharged with emotion. I am neither a camp follower of the Soviet Union nor a camp follower of China nor a courtier of America. I am only for our national interests and I am speaking as an Indian and as an Indian alone. India must formulate its policy on its own basis on its own intellect, on its own principle of maintaining friendship with the socialist countries. That is the pure and simple approach. I find that emotions are aroused as to who are maintaining bases in the Indian Ocean. But can it be denied—it is mentioned in the statement given by the Government—that the USA and the USSR have had four rounds of talks in 1977-78 on arms limitation in the Indian Ocean? If arms limitation in the Indian Ocean is discussed between the USA and Russia, may I not presume that Russia has something in the Indian Ocean? I would like to know whether it is so. The Indian Ocean being a zone of peace, nobody should stay there. May I not say that nobody should be there? Whether we are friendly with somebody or we are friendly with the Soviet Union, I do not like that we should be dictated by anyone. If we want to have friendship with China, what wrong has the Minister done by going to China. If we want to start a dialogue with China, what wrong has he done? And in a joint session of Parliament, can a Minister come and say that China is a criminal? Shall we accept that? So there should be a limit to everything. There should be balance in foreign policy because we say we are following a non-alignment policy. But I find somebody on this side or somebody on that side saying that we are following a policy which is tilting towards either the Soviet Union or America or China. Sir, we for one want that as a country pursuing a policy of non-alignment we must be friendly with all the socialist countries. But we should not tolerate the presence of any foreign ship in the Indian Ocean—it may be Russia, it may be America, it may be China. So may I know from the

[Shri Amarprosad Chakraborty]

hon. Minister why this talk is going on between these two countries for limitation of arms in the Indian Ocean? Why have the other countries not been invited? Why was India not present at that talk? And the Government says that no date has yet been fixed for further talks. Secondly, Sir, a conference of Asian Foreign Ministers was held recently, on the 113/th and 13th of January, 1979. What happened there? When I asked a question as to when and whether a conference of littoral countries was going to be held, the Minister, in reply to my question, assured us saying, "Yes, we shall invite all the littoral countries and also China." When all the powers are sitting here, India should take steps, let everybody sit in India and India also must be present at the meeting. The meeting should be attended not only by USSR and USA—not these two countries alone—but let all littoral countries sit together. I ask the Foreign Minister whether any such steps are being taken for maintenance of peace in the Indian Ocean and to restrain the American power not to come and create disturbance, to restrain any super-power not to create this nuisance, so that India may live in peace, so that India may develop its own way and may come out as the most powerful nation in future. I want to know what policy is being pursued by our country,

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: India has welcomed talks between USSR and USA on the limitation of armaments so far as Indian Ocean is concerned. India would like demilitarization of the Ocean. But that might come later on. At the moment talks are being held in order to limit the armaments or the naval presence. And we hope that the limitation will lead to reduction and reduction will in turn lead to elimination ...

SHRI L. R. NAIK (Karnataka): A pious wish.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: It was asked: Why is India not there. Because India has not been invited. We have not been invited nor have we sought an invitation. These talks are being held between two great powers and we hope the talks will succeed. India is active so far as the ad hoc committee set up by the United States is concerned. We are in consultation with other littoral and hinterland countries. It is not a question of India alone. A similar question ...

SHRI AMARPROSAD CHAKRABORTY: I never said India alone. I asked whether India has taken any initiative to bring all the nations here.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: I have replied to this question umpteen times. We would like to take a joint initiative. All countries which are affected by the Indian Ocean being made an arena of naval rivalry must come together and must act in a concerted manner. That is what we are trying to do. My honourable friend has said many things about his idea of foreign policy. There is no tilt in our foreign policy. We are genuinely non-aligned. But those who want a tilt, they do not like our policy and they criticise us.

SHRI KALYAN ROY (West Bengal): Sir, the matter is very serious and in the background of that seriousness, I feel, the statement that he has read out is very disappointing. I am sure there is a new bias in what he describes as genuinely non-aligned. He has to emphasize that because people have found out that it is not so genuine as he claims. What is the background of building up military bases or strengthening the naval forces in the Indian Ocean? He has all the time described both as super-powers and having a naval fleet in the Indian Ocean, and has imputed motives as if they are in conflict, to grab some-; thing, to exploit something. What is the background of the presence of

the naval fleet in the Indian Ocean and the development of bases? The whole question of development of bases came in the background when the United States was losing Vietnam.

They were losing Thailand 1 P.M. where the people revolted.

The Pakistani and American arms were not able to suppress the ^nighly uprising in Bangladesh. It is from this area where the United States get about 60 to 70 per cent of their raw materials, leave aside oil which comes from Arab countries. They have made H very clear in their discussions in the Senate and the Congress Committees that without these raw materials such as rubber and oil the present economy of the United States, their Pentagon and their big industrial complexes cannot survive. Then they bought Diego Garcia from the United Kingdom. That was the background of Diego Garcia. Now, as against that, would you please mention one island, one single tiny island, where the USSR is having its base from where it can intervene in any of the States whether in Africa or South East Asia? You name one single port or one single base. If you cannot mention it, I hope you would not repeat—what I am forced to call—lies.

The background was that the United States' control was going away from area after area. They are now faced with a demand for radical socio, economic changes and that is why they wanted military intervention. When the Indian troops had to intervene to safeguard the interests of the people of Bangladesh and when there was a mighty uprising in Bangladesh, it was the Seventh Fleet which was coming to intervene directly. As a matter of fact the Nixon papers and the discussions which were brought out in the New York Times made it clear that Nixon had said that he was led down. He is reported to have said: "I did not think that Bangladesh would collapse so quickly". They wanted to intervene. They could not intervene

because the American Seventh Fleet was being followed by the Soviet Fleet. This is something that my friend Mr. Chakraborty should understand. The American fleet was pursued by the Soviet fleet and it was the presence of the Soviet fleet that neutralised the presence of; the American fleet. And what is more, the Bangladesh war did not prolong to the agony of Mr. Nixon. They could not intervene directly in the sub-continent. So Pentagon wanted a firm base. But in spite of the base they lost Bangladesh. In spite of the base they lost Vietnam. Now they waxft to strengthen Diego Garcia base with modern planes and most sophisticated equipment. Now they do not want to take any risk. They can directly intervene whether it is Yemen, whether it is Saudi Arabia or whether it is Teheran. Teheran is gone. This is the background and this is what the United States military clique wants. Mr. Chakraborty should try to understand this. Now President Carter and his war-mongers are getting panicky because they are losing all raw materials. My friend should understand the problem, which he fails. The American life line should be protected and their way of life should be protected. It is not the way of life in Asia or Africa. Pentagon's life line has to be saved for that purpose. If they want, Saudi Arabia can be attacked in order to protect their life line. If the Shah is to be brought back to Teheran, he has to be brought back. Full preparation for war is going on and you have got to see this in that context. Soviet Union is a country which is fighting against the bases, against acquiring ports, which is against supplying equipment and armaments to Pakistan or Iran or North Yemen and it is the Soviet Union which would supply you arms only to defend your independence and not to attack any other country. They stand on a totally different footing. Unfortunately, your genuine non-alignment is dictated by Mr. Palkhivala and not by Mr. A'tal Bihari Vajpayee. In this