

[Shri Bhanu Pratap Singh]

Table a copy each of the following Notifications (Hindi and English versions) under sub-section (3) of section 44 of the Food Corporation Act, 1964:—

(1) G.S.R. 768(3) published in Gazette of India dated the 22nd December, 1977 containing Corrigenda to Notification No. G.S.R. 1528 published in Gazette of India dated the 16th October, 1965.

(2) G.S.R. 769(E) published in Gazette of India dated the 22nd December, 1977 containing Corrigenda to Notification No. G.S.R. 1415 published in Gazette of India dated the 14th September, 1967.

(3) G.S.R. 770(E) published in Gazette of India dated the 22nd December, 1977 containing Corrigenda to Notification No. G.S.R. 1597 published in Gazette of India dated the 29th August, 1968. ([Placed in Library. See No. LT-1609/78].

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I have given a notice on this.

If you see item 5(1), it is a corrigenda to Notification No. GSR 1528 published in the Gazette of India dated the 16th October, 1965. Then you come to the second one. It is a corrigenda to a Notification published on 14th September 1967 and the third one is a Corrigenda to a Notification published on 29th August 1968. I will not blame the present Minister so much although they are now there for the past ten months. But how are these things brought in the Ministry? What are the officials doing? The Minister should assure the House that the officers responsible for these serious lapses will be pulled up. The House cannot be taken for a ride like this. We are not rubber-stamps. We do not grant *ex-post facto* sanction.

SHRI BHANU PRATAP SINGH: The hon. Member should have appreciated the vigilance of the Ministry in having unearthed this after such a long time. Anyhow, I will look into the matter why this was not unearthed earlier.

NOTIFICATIONS UNDER CENTRAL SALES TAX ACT, 1956

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI ZULFIQUARULLAH): I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following Notifications (Hindi and English versions) under sub-section (2) of section 13 of the Central Sales Tax Act, 1956:—

(1) The Central Sales Tax (Registration and Turnover) (Amendment) Rules, 1977, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 762(E) in Gazette of India dated the 17th December, 1977.

(2) The Central Sales Tax (Registration and Turnover, (Second Amendment) Rules, 1977, published in Notification No. GSR 778(E) in Gazette of India dated the 28th December, 1977. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1610/78].

12.08 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

REPORTED PRESENCE OF U.S. NAVAL FORCE IN THE INDIAN OCEAN AS A CONSEQUENCE OF THE EXPLOSIVE SITUATION IN THE HORN OF AFRICA

DR. BALDEV PRAKASH (Amritsar): I call the attention of the Minister of External Affairs to the following matter of urgent public importance and request that he may make a statement thereon:

Reported presence of Naval Force of the United States of America in the Indian Ocean as a consequence of the explosive situation in the Horn of Africa and the suspension of US-Soviet negotiations over arms limitation in the Indian Ocean.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE): Mr. Speaker Sir, the House is fully aware of the Government's

view that the military presence of Great Powers in Indian Ocean is a cause of tension and insecurity in the area. The concept of a Zone of peace in the Indian Ocean implies elimination of foreign military presence from the area. India, a member of the U.N. Ad Hoc Committee, is also actively participating in the implementation of the U.N. Resolution on Zone of Peace in the Indian Ocean. Preparations for a meeting of the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean to be convened in New York for implementing the U.N. Resolution, are at hand, India has given expression to its belief that for achieving concrete results, the participation of Great Powers and major maritime users of Indian Ocean in the proposed international conference is essential.

It is in this context that India has welcomed USA-USSR talks on mutual arms limitation in the Indian Ocean as a step towards the establishment of Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace although our objective remains that of elimination of all foreign military presence from the Indian Ocean. India hopes that any bilateral understanding/agreement reached by the Great Powers shall incline them to extend increased cooperation to the U.N. in this matter and thus facilitate the establishment of the Zone of Peace.

The current explosive situation in the Horn of Africa is a source of deep concern to us. Ethiopia and Somalia, apart from being neighbours linked to us by the Indian Ocean, with whom we have friendly relations, are also developing countries and our fellow partners in the non-aligned fraternity of nations. The continuance of this conflict is vitiating the generally improving climate of international relations and causing a serious set-back to detente. This makes it all the more imperative for us to contribute to the search of an early peaceful and negotiated solution to the problem. This House will recall that as early as August last, I had appealed to the leaders of Ethiopia and Somalia

through their Charged' Affaires in New Delhi, for exercise of restraint and statemanship, and had also expressed the hope that a peaceful settlement of the dispute would be arrived at and that the OAU Good Offices Committee on this subject would succeed. I had also expressed our apprehension that the conflict in the Horn of Africa would divert attention away from the burning issues in Southern Africa and that the continuation of the dispute would weaken the Non-aligned movement and invite increased Great Power rivalry in the region. To our great disappointment, the OAU efforts have not yet succeeded and some of our fears are proving correct.

The differences between Ethiopia and Somalia over the Ogaden province of Ethiopia erupted in the form of a full scale armed conflict last June. Ethiopia ascribed this to the invasion of its territory by Somalian troops while Somalia claimed it as liberation of Ogaden by the Western Somalia Liberation Front. Though the matter came before the OAU Summit Conference in Libreville last August, its subsequent mediatory efforts did not succeed. The situation continued to deteriorate. Now, there are reports of large scale external military involvement in the area. Even allegations have been made that Ethiopia with its augmented military capabilities may decide to carry the war across the frontiers Ethiopia, as the House is aware, has denied these allegations and has gone on record to say that its objective is to get the aggression vacated.

Our Prime Minister has had an exchange of correspondence with President Carter of USA and President Brezhnev of USSR in which the developing situation in the Horn of Africa has been referred to. He has stated that the conflict in the Horn of Africa required restraint on the part of external powers as it could become more complicated by increasing rivalry and foreign military involvement. He has suggested that ways and means of restraint should be found to bring about

[Shri Atal Behari Vajpayee]

a settlement respecting the principle of inviolability of the established frontiers as enshrined in the OAU Charter and that an acceptable political solution under the OAU, UN or any other mutually acceptable auspices, be urged.

Secretary of State Vance had stated in his Press Conference on 10th February 1978 that the Soviet and Cuban involvement cannot help but have an effect upon the relationship between USA on the one hand and USSR and Cuba on the other, and that it is a matter which USA will obviously keep in mind as they proceed with the talks on the Indian Ocean because what seems to be happening there was in his view inconsistent with the limitation of forces in so far as the Indian Ocean talks were concerned. Even then, he had observed that USA would continue with those talks, but pointed out that obviously it affected the political atmosphere in which those talks are carried forward.

There have been some consultations recently about the desirability of convening the Security Council of the United Nations to consider the situation in the Horn of Africa. Both the USA and UK feel that the aim of a debate in the UN Security Council would be to have deliberations and seek negotiations which would contribute to a political solution by reinforcing, through UN involvement, the OAU efforts at mediation. They stress that the purpose of the Council meeting is to seek a settlement and not to engage in a propaganda exercise. They also feel that the respect of territorial integrity of all States in the area should be one of the guiding principles in bringing about a peaceful resolution. In fact, as stated by Dr. Brzezinski, the U.S. position is that Somalia ought to withdraw to its territorial frontiers, that the invasion of Ethiopia ought to be terminated that there ought to be peace-keeping arrangements, preferably by the OAU, and, in that context, the reported foreign involvement by the

Soviet Union and Cuba ought to be also terminated by the departure of their forces.

The Soviet Union holds the view that the first step is the Somali withdrawal from Ogaden. They are at pains to point out that while Western Powers had shown no concern at the time of Somali aggression of Ethiopia, they are now voicing their concern about the situation in the Horn of Africa when the Ethiopian side has begun to repel this aggression. They feel that their assistance to Ethiopia in repelling the aggression should not be construed in any way as their being interested in the expansion of the conflict. They are categorical in stating that cease-fire without Somali withdrawal is not possible. They think that once Somali forces have withdrawn, the problem could be tackled by the OAU. They have informed the USA that they are opposed to a Security Council meeting as it would only aggravate the situation.

We also understand that the African group is not in favour of discussions in the Security Council. At the same time, Nigeria who is chairman of the OAU Mediation Committee, has been trying very hard to mediate between Ethiopia and Somalia in order to bring the conflict to an end. Nigerian efforts seem at last to be succeeding with their having arranged a meeting, which would take place in Lagos shortly between the special emissaries of Ethiopia and Somalia.

We have all along felt that the solution to the problem—as indeed for all intra-African problems—should be sought in consonance with the letter and spirit of the OAU Charter. We, therefore believe that the parties to the dispute should respect and observe the letter and the spirit of this Charter. We are in favour of any concrete and agreed initiative that can bring about such a solution. We, therefore, welcome the proposed meeting to be held shortly at Lagos between Ethiopia and Somalian special emissaries and hope

that it will have a successful outcome. We would support any move which would reinforce the OAU efforts leading to cessation of hostilities and a mutually acceptable solution, and we hope that the requisite cooperation for the success of such efforts would be forthcoming from all parties concerned.

I would now refer to what certain Hon'ble Members seem to regard as a connected move, namely, the reported U.S. Naval presence in the Indian Ocean. There have also been reports of Naval presence of other Great Powers in the area. While it is not possible for us to accurately assess the connection between this development and the situation in the Horn of Africa, we are of the view that such foreign naval presence in the region cannot but act as an impediment to the lessening of the tension in the area, and also to the effort of the international community for establishment of a Zone of Peace in the Indian Ocean.

There is no truth in the reports that due to developments in the Horn of Africa, US-USSR talks on questions concerning arms limitation measures in the Indian Ocean have been suspended.

In fact, the last round of such talks was held in Berne, Switzerland according to schedule, from February 7 to February 17. Thus, this did not end abruptly nor were they called off prematurely on account of the situation in the Horn of Africa for any other reason. However, we are given to understand that the US Government has informed the Soviet delegation at these talks that it regretted the current Soviet activities in the Horn of Africa and that the increase in Soviet naval forces was inconsistent with the spirit and substance of the negotiations. The Soviet side view this as another instance of the American practice of making use of unrelated situations for political purposes. As regards the substance of the negotiations that ended ten days ago, we understand that

concrete progress has been registered. Both USA and USSR have characterised the discussions as "frank and useful" contributing to an understanding of each other's position. Moreover, there is agreement for these talks to be resumed, though unlike the hitherto practice of agreeing upon approximate date and venue of the next round of talks, the date of subsequent meeting has been left to be fixed by mutual agreement later on.

Sir, we have always held that the benefits of detente should flow to the international community as a whole. We have always been in favour of peaceful solution of disputes bilaterally, or through regional organisations such as the OAU in case of inter-African problems, and if need be through mutually acceptable auspices. Indian Ocean should be a Zone of Peace guaranteeing peaceful maritime activity through which international commerce flows. Meaningful programmes of economic cooperation among its littoral and hinterland States for the benefit and welfare of the people inhabiting Indian Ocean region ought to be developed. Any development which impedes evolution of the course of events in these directions is a matter of serious concern to us. What is more, India can ill afford to have tension-creating presence in the vicinity of its maritime zones. This is how we view the situation to which the Hon'ble Members have drawn attention. This House will agree that a just, peaceful and negotiated settlement of the problem in the Horn of Africa is bound to exercise a healthy influence in bringing about an early establishment of Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace and will be conducive to development of mutually beneficial *inter-se* economic cooperation in the region. All efforts in this direction will have our full support.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai): May I rise on a point order? We are grateful to the hon. Minister for giving a massive information in answer to a culling attention

[Shri Shyamnandan Misra]

motion. But, I address this question to the Chair specifically that in a calling attention you always insist, very rightly so, that it should not occupy more than 20 or 25 minutes or so. This is also the opinion expressed in the Business Advisory Committee. Now, if the hon. Minister takes so much time in making a statement in response to the calling attention motion, then, the time necessarily taken would be much longer.

Would you kindly not ask the ministers to so frame their answers that they can keep all these things in a smaller compass? He has already read out ten to fifteen pages statement.

SHRI ATAL BEHARI VAJPAYEE:
Five pages only.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:
Whatever it may be. You pull up any hon. Member if he takes more time.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not pull up anybody. I only request. This might have been much smaller. Dr. Baldev Prakash.

डा० बलदेव प्रकाश : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मंत्री महोदय ने जो वक्तव्य हाउस के अन्दर दिया है, उसमें दो-तीन चीजें बिल्कुल स्पष्ट होती हैं। एक तो यह कि हमारी सरकार इंडियन ओशन में निगरानीकरण के लिए पूरा बल लगा रही है। दूसरे यह भी कहा गया कि यू० एस० ए० और यू० एस० एस० आर० की सरकारें भी इसी लक्ष्य को ले कर के काफी देर से बातचीत कर रही हैं लेकिन अभी बातचीत स्थगित हो गई है। मैंने जिस बात के ऊपर बल दिया था, अपने कालिग प्रॉपोजन मोशन में, वह यह है कि अमेरिका के जंगी जहाज इस समय इंडियन ओशन के अन्दर आये हुए हैं। इससे इस क्षेत्र के अन्दर तनाव बढ़ रहा है। मंत्री महोदय ने भी यह बात मानी है कि इंडियन ओशन में यू० एस० नेवल

फोर्सिज की किसी भी प्रकार की प्रेजेंस इंडियन ओशन में तनाव घटाने के किसी भी प्रयास में एक हकाबट पैदा कर रही है। हम सारी डिवलेपमेंट को बड़ी गम्भीरता के साथ लेते हैं। इते इज ए मेटर आफ सीरियस कंसर्न टू अरस, यह उन्होंने कहा है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जब ऐसी बात है तो क्या सरकार ने कोई कार्रवाई भी की है या केवल आप गम्भीरता में उसको देख ही रहे हैं।

अमरीका की नीति हमेशा यह रही है। 1972 में भारत और पाकिस्तान के बीच लड़ाई हुई थी। तब अमरीका ने अपने नेवल जंगी जहाज बंगाल की खाड़ी में भेज दिए थे। अमरीका की सरकार ने तब भी कहा था कि यह चीज लड़ाई में अनरिजिस्टर्ड है। ऐसा करके उसने तनाव जारी रखने की कोशिश की थी। ऊपर से हमेशा यही कहा जाता रहा है कि तनाव को घटाने का हर प्रयास किया जा रहा है। यह पुरानी नीति है। यही नीति भारत और पाकिस्तान के बीच में तनाव का सब से बड़ा कारण थी। अमरीका के राष्ट्रपति कहते हैं कम्प्लीट डिमिनिटराइजेशन आफ इंडियन ओशन। लेकिन दूसरी तरफ वहाँ पर यू० एस० नेवल फोर्स के जहाज आ रहे हैं। इन दोनों में कमे तालमेल बिठाया जा सकता है।

20 फरवरी को अमरीका के डिफेंस सेक्रेटरी ने लास एंजल्स में वर्ल्ड एफेयर्स के अन्दर भाषण देते हुए कहा है :

USA plans to strengthen its strategic forces in Asia and upgrade it in the Pacific.

यह बात किस तरफ हम को ले जा रही है। सरकार ने जो गम्भीरता से इस बात को लिया है वह गम्भीरता किस बात में है। क्या हम गम्भीरता मद्रा में सारी घटना को देख रहे हैं या सरकार ने कोई प्रीटेस्ट नोट, कोई रिजैटमेंट या कोई और गम्भीरता की बात अमरीका की सरकार तक पहुंचाई है ?

अगर तनाव घटाने की सरकार की कोशिश है तो ये जो जंगी बेड़े आ रहे हैं इनको वापिस जाने के लिए कहा जाए, इसके बारे में क्या सरकार की तरफ से कोई नोट भेजा गया है ?

मंत्री महादय ने कहा है कि मीटिंगें हो रही हैं और हमारी इच्छा है कि शान्ति के साथ समझौता हो जाए। इस तरह से सरकार जो तनाव घटाने की कोशिश कर रही है मैं उससे सहमत हूँ। अगली कार्रवाई सरकार क्या करने जा रही है ? और क्या कदम उठाने जा रही है इसका स्पष्टीकरण होना चाहिए।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : हिन्द महासागर को शान्ति क्षेत्र अगर बनाने की बात इसी आधार पर उठी है कि बड़ी बड़ी शक्तियाँ ने इस सागर को अखाड़ा बना रखा है। माननीय सदस्य ने स्वयं अमरीका के प्रवक्ता के कथन को उद्धृत किया है। इसके अनुसार अमरीका अपनी नोशक्ति बढ़ा रहा है। इस सम्बन्ध में अमरीका के साथ हमारा सम्पर्क है और हमने अपनी चिन्ता उन से प्रकट की है। माननीय सदस्य ऐसा न समझें कि सदन में खड़े हो कर चिन्ता व्यक्त करने से कोई असर नहीं होता है या इस तरह की चीज विश्व के जनमत को बनाने में कोई सहायक नहीं आती है। कहने को तो यह कहा जा रहा है कि हमारी नोशक्ति में कोई विशेष वृद्धि नहीं हुई है। इसका अर्थ यह है कि वर्तमान शक्ति तो हमेशा विद्यमान है मैं माननीय सदस्य का ध्यान अपने विस्तृत वक्तव्य की ओर खींचना चाहता हूँ। मैंने उसमें कहा है कि अगर हार्न आफ अफ्रीका में स्थिति बिगड़ी तो फिर रेड सी, इंडियन ओशन दोनों में शक्ति प्रतियोगिता बढ़ेगी। इसलिए हार्न आफ अफ्रीका का मामला तुरन्त हल होना चाहिए। माननीय सदस्य का यह कहना ठीक नहीं है कि

अमरीका और सोवियत संघ के बीच में हिन्द महासागर में हथियारों की सीमा बांधने के बारे में जो बातचीत चल रही है वह बातचीत टूट गई है या बातचीत खत्म कर दी गई है। ब्यान में मैंने उसका हवाला दिया है। बातचीत हो रही है और भविष्य में भी होगी।

SHRI SOUGATA ROY (Barrack-pore): The hon. Minister has made a long-winded, wishy-washy statement in which it tries to give the view of both sides. But there is a sort of silence on the role which the Government of India is going to take. This is not the first time that the U.S. presence has been noticed in the Indian Ocean. It has been noticed in the Indian Ocean whenever there was a conflict, for instance, the US Navy moved in the Indian Ocean during the Bangladesh conflict. I may also remind the Foreign Minister that it was in this Indian Ocean, in the Horn of Africa, the nuclear base has been set up at Diego Garcia against which the Government of India had protested at that time. This is a gun boat diplomacy. Now, they are moving their Naval Fleet from the Western Pacific Ocean into the Indian Ocean. That is why I said it is a wishy-washy statement. The Great Powers should withdraw. This is a statement of goodwill visit. It does not declare our policy. Sir, with your permission. I want to ask the Hon'ble Minister if the Government of India is going to give an outright condemnation of the United States presence in the Indian Ocean. Whether the Government of India instead of depending on the United Nations is going to take any initiative in calling a Conference of the littoral States to protest against the presence of the U.S. Navy in the Indian Ocean?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: I am sorry I do not agree with the hon. Member that it is a wishy-washy statement. I am making a statement on a situation which is very delicate

[Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee]

and India would like to play a constructive part. To be frank, in regard to Indian Ocean, the Janata Government has not departed from the policy which had been adopted by the former Government.

SHRI SOUGATA ROY: It was good.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: It was good then. Now it has become bad. Sir, we have repeated, times without number, that we are opposed to all military bases in Indian Ocean including Diego Garcia. All bases are to be eliminated. But that cannot be achieved simply by making a statement in Parliament or making a speech outside. After all those who have established bases, whose presence is causing tension in the Indian Ocean, we are having talks with them. The talks have made some progress though we would like the talk to succeed immediately. But it is always good to talk rather than indulge in gun boat diplomacy. India has no intention of calling a Conference of littoral and hinterland States because the United Nations Ad hoc Committee has already convened a Conference and we are an active Member in it. We are an active member of that ad hoc committee and no useful purpose will be served by calling a parallel conference.

SHRI JYOTIRMROY BOSU (Diamond Harbour): In the mean time the details of the build up at Diego Garcia? They are equipping it every day with the most modern weapons, ICBMS, etc.

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR (Gandhi Nagar): We are grateful to Shri Vajpayeeji for giving us a factual and detailed statement. He himself called it a very delicate and important issue and I agree with him. But I did not confine myself to only one aspect in the call attention, namely, the explosive situation in the Horn of Africa and the dispute between Ethiopia and Somalia. We all agree with the government when he says that the Gov-

ernment hope that the two governments concerned would come to terms soon and settle the matter in accordance with the OAU charter. But I go to a different direction.

My call attention is also concerned with the proposal for a free and peaceful Indian Ocean, entirely and completely free of tensions. It includes the getting out of all the big powers either in a phased manner or in some other manner. It is a truism to say that the Indian Ocean requires peace and security and freedom of navigation, freedom of the seas, freedom of trade and transit. Most of the littoral countries, hinterland countries which incidentally, as Mr. Vajpayee himself says, are non-aligned countries and developing countries also cannot be bothered in terms of their economic and social progress by the super powers' military and defence manouevres and exercises in this area. That is why the question of Indian Ocean as a peaceful zone becomes important. It was Sri Lanka in 1971 which took the initiative in having the Indian Ocean declared as a peace zone, and it was later taken up by us also actively. I want to give the background because of Indian earlier stand that there must be freezing of big power naval presence in the Indian Ocean and there must be total demilitarisation of the whole area. I want to know what has happened to India's position in that matter. I want to know whether it is a fact that Prime Minister Mararji Desai told both the Russians and the Americans about this. The Prime Minister and Shri Vajpayee went to Russia, and the U.S. President, Mr. Jimmy Carter came to India. There were talks. What happened in those discussions? It seems to me that India is slightly or significantly, in a subtle way perhaps sifting from its earlier insistence, from two aspects, freezing the big power naval presence and total demilitarisation.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: How are the two things consistent? They are not consistent.

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR: That is the position which India took earlier. Anyway I hope the Minister will know what I am trying to point. He has given a long statement.

MR. SPEAKER: That does not mean that it should be equally long.

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR: I do not want to make a speech. I am sorry to say that Shri Vajpayee said that speaking in Parliament would not help or achieve anything. But, if may say so, speaking in Parliament, putting a question in Parliament certainly helps as well.

MR. SPEAKER: Please conclude.

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR: When a question is admitted....

MR. SPEAKER: No, no.

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR: I do not understand what you say, 'no, no', what?

MR. SPEAKER: You cannot go on. Rules permit that you can take three or four minutes.

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR: It is a very important matter and it also a delicate matter and if I do not give the full background I might be misunderstood. My point is whether India is going to move closer to the United States, President Carter before the election in the United States—perhaps as election rhetoric—had asked for a total demilitarisation of the Indian Ocean. Now he says that the naval presence of Both the USSR and the United States must be frozen at its current level.... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: You cannot go on like this, you have taken more than five minutes.

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR: It is very important.

MR. SPEAKER: The rules provide that no more than 3-4 minutes would be taken.

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR: If you insist, I will come to the question but this is a delicate subject.

MR. SPEAKER: Every Member says that his question is delicate and that his question is important.

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR: I bow down and skip off all the important matters in the hope that my questions will not create mis-understanding for, or on, my part! My questions are: a, b, c, d, and e. Was this question of the Indian Ocean discussed with the United States President when he came here because Mr. Vajpayee has assured us in November last year that this question will be discussed threadbare? I want to know whether it was discussed? Was it a discussion in general terms or in depth? Did Diego Garcia come in for specific mention, if not, why not? Is it a fact that the United States has been taking active steps for strengthening the Diego Garcia Island? In May, 1977 the United States Senate Armed Services Committee approved 7.3 million U.S. dollars for additional construction at Diego Garcia. Was this fact pointed out by our Prime Minister when the US President came here? Is India satisfied with a freeze at the current level of US and Soviet naval presence? What is India's initiative in the matter? Was there a subtle or a significant shift in the Indian position on the Indian Ocean? What is the response to the holding of a conference of all concerned, littoral, hinterland States and the Big five countries? Does the Indian coast continue to be under US active military surveillance?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: I made a long statement in the expectation that there will be fewer questions. I would now like to reply to his questions. The question of the Indian Ocean was certainly discussed when President Carter visited New Delhi. There has been no shift or tilt in

[Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee]

India's policy on the question of Indian Ocean being made a zone of peace. I am inclined to agree with the hon. Member. This question was raised by my friend, Mr. Shyamnandan Mishra that during the election, Mr. Carter—not President Carter, he became President afterwards—has stated that Indian Ocean should demilitarised, but now talks are going on between two big powers not about demilitarisation, but about limitation of armaments. Obviously there is a sliding back and this is not for the first time that this aspect has been brought to the notice of the House.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Will there be a control Commission?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Which control Commission?

MR. SPEAKER: You answer Mr. Mavalankar's question.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: You prevent me from replying to Mr. Bosu's interruptions? He should be prevented from interrupting. In the interruption, I have forgotten....

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I am sorry.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: I know and the House is also aware that the United States Senate has sanctioned some extra amount so that the bases in Diego Garcia could be further strengthened. When this question was discussed with President Carter, our Prime Minister was very clear and categorical and he said that as a result of the talks between United States of America and Soviet Union, nothing will be left in Indian Ocean except peace. That means all foreign bases are to be eliminated, no new bases are to be established and there should be no further strengthening of the existing bases. I do not know why there should be any doubt about the policy of the Government in the minds of Members like Mr. Mavalankar.

श्री लखन लाल कपूर : (पूर्णिमा) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, विदेश मंत्री महोदय ने ध्यान आकर्षण सूचना के जवाब में 6 पृष्ठ का उत्तर दिया है। लेकिन मैं सम्मता हूँ कि वही कहावत चरितार्थ होती है कि खोदा पहाड़ और निकनी चुहिया। कोई भी ठोस जवाब वह अपनी तरफ से नहीं दे पा रहे हैं। हिन्द महासागर को शांति क्षेत्र घोषित करने की दिशा में 1972 से बातें चल रही हैं और भारत सरकार की तरफ से बार बार यह आश्वासन दिया जा रहा है कि हम इसको मान कर बनते हैं। लेकिन जो बड़े राष्ट्र हैं उन के खिलाफ हम प्रॉटेस्ट भर कर के रह जाते हैं। मंत्री महोदय ने जवाब दिया है कि प्रेसीडेंट कार्टर ने यह प्रस्ताव किया था कि इंडियन ओशन को न्यूनाइज्ड क्षेत्र मानेंगे, उस के बावजूद भी उन के बड़े इंडियन ओशन में है। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि अभी हाल में कामनवेल्थ कान्फरेंस जो सिडनी में हुई उस में हिन्द महासागर को शांति क्षेत्र बनाये रखने की दिशा में क्या बातें हुई हैं और उसका क्या परिणाम निकला है?

हमारा खण्ड यह है कि जब यू० एम० ए० के प्रेसीडेंट और यु० के० के प्रधान मंत्री भारत आए थे उस मौके पर जब बातचीत हुई तो आपने तो अपनी तरफ से बातें रखी लेकिन आप को क्या आश्वासन मिला? हिन्द महासागर को शांति क्षेत्र बनाए रखने के लिए ब्रिटेन के प्रधान मंत्री और यू० एम० ए० के प्रेसीडेंट की तरफ से आप को क्या आश्वासन मिला है? इस का ठोस जवाब मैं चाहता हूँ।

तीसरा खंड मेरे प्रश्न का यह है कि सोवियत रूस भारत के इस प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करता है कि हिन्द महासागर जोन आफ पीस रहना चाहिए। बार बार हमारे इस प्रस्ताव को सपोर्ट करते हुए भी क्या वजह

है कि रशिया के 20 जहाज हिन्द महासागर में मौजूद हैं ? मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि आप ने उन के जहाजों के हिन्द महासागर में रहने के खिलाफ कोई प्रोटेस्ट सोवियत रशिया के पास भेजा है ?

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, चर्चा सागर की हो रही है, पहाड़ की नहीं। सागर में से निकलेगी तो मछली निकलेगी, चुहिया नहीं निकलेगी।

माननीय सदस्य ने पूछा है कि 72 से चर्चा चल रही है और अभी तक कोई निर्णय नहीं निकला है, तो यह तो उन्होंने एक तथ्य का विवरण दिया है। हम चाहते हैं कि नतीजा निकले, मगर नतीजा केवल हमारे चाहने मात्र से नहीं निकल सकता है। हिन्द महासागर में सभी बड़ी शक्तियाँ अपनी जल-सेना के साथ उपस्थित हैं। वैसे हिन्द महासागर एक खुला हुआ सागर है। हम किसी को आने जाने से नहीं रोक सकते। लेकिन जब उन की उपस्थिति प्रतियोगिता में बदलती है और उन के वहाँ अड्डे बनते हैं तब उस से उम क्षेत्र के लिए एक संकट पैदा होता है और हम दोनों से इस बात के लिए कह रहे हैं कि आप अपनी बातचीत जल्दी खत्म कीजिए। इस बारे में सभी तटवर्ती देशों का समर्थन हमें प्राप्त है। जब प्रेसीडेंट कार्टर और मिस्टर कलहन आए तब भी हम ने इस बात की चर्चा की और वे भी मानते हैं कि सभी देशों की जो नौसेना की शक्ति है वह घटनी चाहिए। रूस भी मानता है कि उस की शक्ति भी घटनी चाहिए। मगर हो यह रहा है कि शक्ति बढ़ रही है।

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त : (दिल्ली सदर) : सब की ?

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : हाँ, सब की और उसका तत्काल कारण है हार्न

आफ्रिका का। इसलिए मैंने वक्तव्य में इस बात पर बल दिया कि अगर हार्न आफ्रिका की समस्या हल हो जाय तो प्रतियोगिता में कमी लायी जा सकती है। अन्ततोगत्वा बातचीत के द्वारा ही सारी बात नय होनी चाहिए। जहाँ तक विश्व का जनमत बनाने की बात है भारत अपनी ओर से यह कर रहा है और यूनाइटेड नेशंस की ऐडहाक कमेटी इस के बारे में सक्रिय है।

डा० मुरली मनोहर : (अल्मोडा) मेरा प्रश्न यह है कि अफ्रीका के शृंग में जो विस्फोटक स्थिति उत्पन्न हो रही है उसके परिणामस्वरूप हिन्द महासागर के क्षेत्र में यू० एम० ए० की नवल फोर्स मौजूद है। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि हार्न आफ्रिका की स्थिति बहुत ज्यादा गम्भीर है। इथीओपिया और सोमालिया के मध्य जो कल तक एक तनाव था वह आज एक अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय युद्ध की शकल ले रहा है। वहाँ क्यूबा की फौजें मौजूद हैं, वहाँ सोवियत पायलेट्स मौजूद हैं, वहाँ आर्म्ज्ड एण्ड एम्यूनी-शन्ज गिराये गये हैं। सोवियत रशिया के जहाज आर्म्ज्ड एण्ड एम्यूनीशन्ज ले जाते हुए कराची से गुजरे, वहाँ उन को रोका गया, उन की तलाशी लेने की कोशिश की गई, और डिप्लोमेटिक एक्टिविटीज के परिणाम स्वरूप उन को छोड़ा गया। दस हजार क्यूबन्ज आज भी वहाँ है। पहले सोमालिया सोवियत-रशिया के साथ था, तब तक वहाँ सब कुछ ठोक था, पोर्ट आफ बारबरा पर सोवियत-रशिया का कण्ट्रोल था। जो हार्न आफ्रिका पर कण्ट्रोल करेगा, वहीं पोर्ट आफ बारबरा पर कण्ट्रोल करेगा, वही अदन पर कण्ट्रोल करेगा, स्वेज कनाल पर कण्ट्रोल करेगा, और वही हिन्द महासागर में कण्ट्रोल करेगा। इसलिए हार्न आफ्रिका की समस्या सब से प्रमुख समस्या है। आज सोमालिया की मदद चीन भी कर रहा है, यूथोपिया की मदद इजराइल कर रहा है, कीनिया कर रहा है—

[डा० मुरली मनोहर]

ये सब सवाल आज वहां खड़े हो गये हैं। अभी जब कार्टर साहब उधर आये थे, तो फ्रेंच प्रेसिडेण्ट ने भी उन से चर्चा की थी, दूसरे लोगों ने भी उन से चर्चा की थी कि यह सवाल हल होना चाहिए और यह घमकियां भी दी गई थी कि इस से अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय परिस्थिति बिगड़ जायेगी। मैं इस बात को स्पष्ट रूप से कहना चाहता हूँ कि हार्न-आफ अफ्रीका में वे सारे तत्व मौजूद हैं—जिनसे स्थिति बिगड़ सकती है। यह एक ऐसा फ्यूज है, जो उड़ गया तो बड़ी भारी विस्फोटक स्थिति पैदा कर देगा। वियतनाम, कोरिया और भंगोला जैसी स्थिति पैदा हो सकती है और उस की सपटें भारतवर्ष और तटवर्ती देशों तक पहुंच जायेगी, एक भयंकर प्रतिद्वन्द्वता पैदा करने की कोशिश की जा रही है। कोरिया में शान्ति स्थापना हुई, वियतनाम में शान्ति स्थापना हुई, ईजराइल में शान्ति स्थापना हुई, भंगोला की समस्या भी चुप है, लेकिन अब हार्न-आफ अफ्रीका की समस्या को खड़ा किया जा रहा है। आज जो नेबल टक्सरमाइजिज हो रही है और जो शक्तियां इस में आगे बढ़ रही हैं, उन का मूल उद्देश्य आयल-पोलिटिक्स है, गन-बॉट पोलिटिक्स है और ये सब हार्न-आफ-अफ्रीका की परिस्थिति के कारण जन्म ले रही है। ये सब अर्थ-विकसित देश हैं—आप ने स्वयं स्वीकार किया है कि ये हमारे नान-एलाइण्ड कंट्रीज़ हैं, लेकिन आज इन को लड़ाने की कोशिश हो रही है। भारतवर्ष इन सब परिस्थितियों में तटस्थ या चुप हो कर नहीं बैठ सकता है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि भारत सरकार आप के नेतृत्व में इन पर क्या कदम उठाने जा रहा है, ताकि यह परिस्थिति निर्माण न हो। भारतवर्ष को चाहिए कि इस में आगे बढ़ कर कदम उठाये।

मैं आप का ध्यान इस ओर भी आकृष्ट करना चाहता हूँ—क्या आप डीमोग्राफिक्स

को एक सीमित समस्या के रूप में देख रहे हैं या एक बृहद अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय तनाव के लक्षण के रूप में देख रहे हैं। यदि इस समस्या को उस लक्षण के रूप में देख रहे हैं : तो मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि उस के निदान के रूप में केवल यह कहना कि स्ट्रेटिजिक आम्ब्रं पर वार्ता हो रही है, उसकी प्रतीक्षा कीजिए, एक बहुत छोटी सी बात है। हमारा प्रयत्न तो यह होना चाहिए कि हम इस बिगड़ती हुई अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय परिस्थिति को रोक सकें।

श्री घटल बिहारो वाजपेयी : मैं माननीय सदस्य से सहमत हूँ कि हार्न-आफ-अफ्रीका की स्थिति को यदि सम्भाला नहीं गया, तो यह गम्भीर रूप ले सकता है। विदेशी हस्तक्षेप के कारण परिस्थिति और भी ज्यादा बिगड़ रही है। आज प्रातः काल ही मैंने यूथोपिया और सोमालिया के राजदूतों से अनग-अलग बातचीत की है। लेगास में जो बैठक हो रही है, हम आशा करते हैं कि वह सफल होगी, यद्यपि उस बैठकों के मार्ग में अनेक कठिनाइयां हैं। पहले युद्ध-विराम हो या पहले फौजें वापस हटें—इस को लेकर विवाद हो रहा है। सुरक्षा परिषद् की बैठक के लिए आम सहमति दिखाई नहीं देती है, इसलिए बड़ी शक्तियों से हम कह रहे हैं कि वे संयम से काम लें तथा हमने अपने दोनों मित्रों—सोमालिया और यूथोपिया से कहा है—यदि कोई विवाद है तो आपस में बातचीत के द्वारा हल करें। किसी भी हालत में शक्ति प्रयोग नहीं होना चाहिए, क्योंकि शक्ति प्रयोग विदेशी हस्तक्षेप को निमन्त्रण देगा और विदेशी हस्तक्षेप एक गम्भीर स्थिति के रूप में सामने आ सकता है।

यह कहना ठीक नहीं है कि भारत चुप है, बर्सक बना हुआ हुआ है। मैं इतना बोल रहा हूँ, आप यहां बोल रहे हैं—इससे

साफ़ जाहिर होता है कि भारत चुप नहीं है

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी : मैंने यह नहीं कहा कि आप चुप हैं ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : मैं इस बान से सहमत हूँ कि इस समय मुख्य प्रश्न डीगोर्गाशिया का नहीं है । डीगोर्गाशिया तो समाप्त होना ही चाहिए, लेकिन यदि हान-आफ़-अफरीका की स्थिति बिगड़ेगी तो वह बड़े भारी विस्फोटक रूप में सामने आ सकती है । इसी लिए मैंने बहुत व्योरे के साथ बयान दिया, जिस पर श्री श्यामनन्दन मिश्र जी को आपत्ति हो गई । लेकिन मैं आशा करता हूँ कि इस बयान का सभी माननीय सदस्य जरा गहराई से पढ़ेंगे और अगर इस में कुछ और करने लायक है तो अगर वे हाऊस में सुझाव नहीं देना चाहते, तो व्यक्तिगत रूप से मुझे सुझाव दे सकते हैं ।

12.56 hrs.

**RULING ON POINT OF ORDER RE:
THE PRESIDENTS ADDRESS LAID
ON THE TABLE**

MR. SPEAKER: On 24th February, 1978 when the motion of thanks on President's Address was taken up, Shri Stephen raised a point of order to the effect that copy of the Address placed on the Table of the House is incomplete as it did not contain the preliminary observations made in Hindi. I reserved my order.

Article 87 of the Constitution makes the following provision about Address by the President:

"(1) At the commencement of the first session after each general election to the House of the People and at the commencement of the first session of each year, the President shall

address both Houses of Parliament assembled together and inform Parliament of the causes of its summons;

(2) Provision shall be made by the rules regulating the procedure of either House for the allotment of time for discussion of the matters referred to in such address."

Since the Address is delivered by the President to Members of both Houses of Parliament assembled together, it is necessary that an authenticated copy thereof is laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha when it meets in its own Chamber for the purpose of discussion of matters referred to therein. To ensure that authenticated version is laid on the Table, copies of the Address both in English and Hindi are being authenticated by the President himself since 1958.

It has been verified that the Address by the President which was laid on the Table on 20th February, 1978 is the one duly authenticated by the President himself.

A copy of the President's Address placed on the Table of the House is in accordance with the past practice. The observations made by the President which are outside the Address as such have not been included in the past in the copy of the Address placed on the Table. The copy of the President's Address placed on the Table of the House is in accordance with Article 87(1) of the Constitution. It does not contravene any rule framed or any direction given by the Speaker. Hence the point of order raised by Shri C. M. Stephen is not tenable and the same is ruled out.

MR. SPEAKER: Now, there are two important statements to be made by two Ministers. Is the House willing to sit for a few more minutes, so that the statements can be made?

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I will raise my item tomorrow.