

Gazette of India dated the 3rd March, 1979, issued under Article 309 of the Constitution.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-4110/79].

MR. SPEAKER: I am prepared to meet you and discuss it.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: We have never created trouble in this House. We feel so strongly about it and you would not allow us... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I am prepared to meet all of you to evolve a new procedure. (Interruptions). The House stands adjourned for 15 minutes.

12.28 hrs.

The Lok Sabha adjourned till forty-five minutes past Twelve of the Clock.

The Lok Sabha re-assembled at Forty-nine Minutes past Twelve of the Clock.
(MR. SPEAKER in the Chair)

MR. SPEAKER: I am glad to announce to the House that a certain understanding has been arrived at. Suppose some important talks take place between the Prime Minister, or the External Affairs Minister or some other Minister, with some outside leaders and if any agreement is entered into between them, if either the leaders of any of the Groups or any section of the members, or a fairly large number of members require a statement to be made by the Government and they write to the Speaker, the Speaker in turn would request the Government to make a statement or place a report on the Table.

AN HON. MEMBER: The joint communicate also.

MR. SPEAKER: The joint communicate as well as the agreements entered into and the understanding arrived at.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE): Why have the poor Foreign Minister? Let it be confined to the Prime Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: No, no; both the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA (Delhi Sadar): Whenever there is an accident in the railways, the Railway Minister comes and automatically makes a statement.

MR. SPEAKER: We are not on accidents now.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Jadavpur): You have referred to an understanding. We do not know anything about it. Understanding between whom?

MR. SPEAKER: In the discussion with the members.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: In that case, you should call a meeting of the different groups. I do not know how when some hon. Members raise some point, you immediately call a meeting.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Chatterjee, if necessary, I will call a meeting of the leaders.

12.50 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE REPORTED PRO/OSAL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO STATION A NEW Naval Fleet IN THE INDIAN OCEAN

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: (Badagara): I call the attention of the Minister of External Affairs to the following matter of urgent public importance and I request that he may make a statement thereon:

(Shri K. P. Unnikrishnan)

"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 Saudi Arabia and Pakistan."

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE): Mr. Speaker, Sir. On 12th March, I had expressed our concern in this House over reports of the US Government despatching a carrier-led naval task force to the Indian Ocean and the Gulf area. Hon. Members are understandably concerned at this move especially in view of some indications that after the recent events in Iran and Afghanistan, the US Government is considering the option of increasing US Military presence in the Region.

We are maintaining a close watch over the developing situation in the Indian Ocean and the Gulf area. We have, however, so far not received any confirmation of the reports that a new military alliance involving Saudi Arabia and Pakistan is being forged. Recent trends, like the disintegration of the 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 happened recently in some countries of this region.

In this connection it can be reiterated that stability can only be achieved through regional, functional and economic cooperation between countries acting in consonance with their national interests. Problems which exist, 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 area and enhanced super power presence 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 multi-lateral militarism.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRIISHNAN: It is often said that the style is the essence of the man. Now, we have had a remarkable statement from the Minister of External Affairs. Like the statement to which he has referred; this reflects the essence of the policies and personality of Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee, i.e. the Minister of External Affairs. That is the new style of diplomacy, the new style of foreign policy that he has set and that he is trying to

project. It consists of prevarications; it consists of a very good sugar-coated pill to be passed on to Parliament and to public, but it conceals his total abandonment of considerations of national security, questions that ought to cause concern to anyone, not only to this House but to the whole country and I thought it would have caused concern to the Minister himself.

What am I to make of this statement? What is the world to make of this statement? I would want you, Sir, also to say this. I had called attention to the specific proposals of a new Naval Fleet the report of which had appeared widely in the international press and also in the national press. What he is talking and telling us in about the reported movement of a Naval Carrier Force, which was also reported, from Philippines to the Indian Ocean as well as the movement of some other destroyers, that is, aircraft carrier "constellation", guided missiles carrying destroyers and the Cruiser from Philippines to Indian Ocean which contains 5000 service personnel and 80 aircraft including F-14 Fighters with a range of 1000 miles or around, moving to Diego Garcia.

My question was, and it still remains to be answered, about the reported movements of a new Naval Fleet called the Fifth Fleet. I know, he knows about it; he wants to conceal it from the House. I know, when Mr. Warren Christopher visited, this question was raised. Can he tell the Parliament that he didn't or his officials did not raise this question? Not only of the movements in the Indian Ocean but also about the new build-up, what assurance did he get, about which the House cannot be kept in the dark? This is not a matter to be laughed at. This is a far more serious matter.

It is not just a broad international question as is made out. With the various platitudes, like, increase in the presence of any major foreign power would bring forth the rival build-up

and all that, everybody knows it. Who does not know it? All his platitudes about the concern of 'normal peace-time, maritime commerce', are the words that come very often from the spokesmen of Western Agencies; the neo-colonialist spokesmen who in the name of ensuring peaceful maritime commerce are threatening the security of this country. The question is one of threat to the security of this country; not one of ensuring normal peace-time, maritime commerce, which everybody knows and contributes to and which everybody wants.

In this statement, I am sorry to say, there is a distinct change from the position that the Government of India had taken right from the days of previous regime regarding Diego Garcia and the questions of Indian Ocean. As I said, it is a matter of vital concern to our national security because we have a certain place in this region from Suez to Singapore or Aden to Singapore, as the strategists would call it. It is not only a broad international question concerning littoral countries—that is a broad question about which we should be concerned—but it is primarily a question of national security and a real threat to the national security. To react in this way to that major question, when a super power i.e. the United States is going to have a newly-assembled fleet in Diego Garcia or in the Indian Ocean, it is a matter of great concern for us. On this, I am afraid, he has had nothing to say, except repeating the platitudes. Even the old teeth which we had whenever we spoke in the United Nations or outside have been pulled out. By whom? Is it Mr. Vajpayee's contribution to our concern regarding the threat that is developing in the Indian Ocean?

13.00 hrs.

This only proves that genuine non-alignment is moving from non-alignment to genuine alignment. There is

(Shri K. P. Unnikrishnan)

some genuine alignment that has taken place, the results of which we have seen in parts of West Asia, the results of which we are seeing in Vietnam. That is the neo-American-Chinese new equilibrium that is being built up and which, I do not know whether Mr. Vajpayee would like to support. But this pronouncement is another example of soft-peddalling of this new threat to our security and the contours of the new forces that are emerging. I am not surprised because this is based on Schlesinger's counter-force theory which has been accepted by the United States. To their surprise, they have found that not only Iran has slipped out of the orbit but certain developments have taken place in Afghanistan, causing consequence in a region which, apart from being an international question of concern to us, as a question of war and peace, of ensuring commerce, and so on, is right on our borders: it is right on our western flank. The entire British concept, when they were overloading in this sub-continent was protection of the Indian Ocean to protect the Indian Sub-continent, and it was secured from Aden to Singapore by the control of this Ocean. Now that is being threatened, and he cannot easily throw it away by talking of platitudes.

As I said, the *Wall Street Journal*-- it is not an ordinary journal--has said that the United States must immediately supply arms to Pakistan, and President Zia-ul-Haq says that they should not only be armed but should also be supported in building up their defensive capacity which really means offensive capacity. There was the visit of the Defence Secretary, Mr. Harold Brown to Saudi Arabia and the report that a new alliance is in the offing. Now, he has had nothing to say on any of these problems. He repeats his old platitudes.

I would like to know whether he is aware of this because he only talks

about, as I said, of the movement of a carrier Naval Task Force, whereas my question was regarding formation of a new Fleet--and if so, whether he has lodged any formal protest and whether diplomatic initiative will be taken or has been taken to mobilise littoral countries and other States of the Indian Ocean area to oppose this move.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, in the Call Attention Motion two points were mentioned: (i) reports about stationing of new Naval Fleet in the Indian Ocean; and (ii) the proposal to forge a new military alliance with Saudi Arabia and Pakistan. My friend, Mr. Unnikrishnan, says that I have not referred, in my statement, to the first point. That is not correct. In the first para of my statement, I have clearly stated:

"...Hon. Members are understandably concerned at this move, especially in view of some indications that after the recent events in Iran and Afghanistan, the U.S. Government is considering the option of increasing U.S. military presence in the region..."

Whether it is the Fifth Fleet or the Sixth Fleet or the Seventh Fleet, all these fleets form part of the American Navy and if they decide to depute a new task force, that will increase the presence of American Navy in the region. I do not understand this. Sir, my friend, Mr. Unnikrishnan is very intelligent and very alert, but, I know he is the Opposition. So he has to say something...

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: As you did.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: I have nothing to conceal from this House. And let me assure the House that I will never commit that crime, I will never commit that folly. I regard it a sin. If something escapes my attention, that is a different matter. But there will be no deliberate attempt to keep the House in the dark...

SHRI VASANT SATHE (Akola): Is this your remark against the Prime Minister?

MR. SPEAKER: Against you, Mr. Sathe.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Against you, Mr. Sathe and against the former Prime Minister.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: I have not concealed anything, neither has the previous Prime Minister. Yesterday your Prime Minister concealed.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: There has been no change in the Government's policy vis-a-vis the Indian Ocean. We are active in the United Nations. We are active in the Non-aligned Group. We have been emphasizing that all military bases, including Diego Garcia, must be abolished. But this is a specific question. A conference of littoral and hinterland countries is being called. India is a Member of the Ad-hoc Committee. So, please don't see change where there is no change. (Interruptions) Now, he has brought in China.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: Please answer my question.

13.08 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair].

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: I am not going to answer that. Kindly reserve it for the debate on the External Affairs.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Are you going to allow China to come to that meeting on the Indian Ocean?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Let him answer Mr. Unnikrishnan.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: We are having consultations with all countries, particularly, with the countries in the Gulf Region. This region, this area has suddenly become very sensitive and very important and we

have received indications from some of the countries that they do not want the presence of the American fleet in that area.

I might inform the House that the President of the Yemen Arab Republic—he gave an interview to a paper and this is what he said:

“We shall not be under the control of the USA or USSR. We are under the control of Yemen and the Arabs. We shall not allow any big power to interfere between us.”

Similarly, the President of United Arab Emirates, Shaikh Daoud has come out with a statement:

“No country can pretend to play the role of gendarme. The security of the Gulf countries lies in co-operation with the littoral States without foreign involvement.”

Sir, the Gulf countries are alive to the danger of foreign involvement. We are keeping contacts with them and we hope that wiser counsels will prevail. This matter was taken up with Mr. Christopher and we expressed our concern. Now Mr. Unnikrishnan says that even concern has not been expressed. I came to the House *suo moto* on the 12th. Concern is being expressed and even in this statement the expression of concern is there...

SHRI VASANT SATHE: But not protest.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: I cannot reply to all sorts of questions.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shrimati Mohsina Kidwai.

श्रीमती मोहसिना किशवई (भाजमगड) :
 उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आप के माध्यम से मैं यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि हमारे एक्सटर्नल अफेयर्स मिनिस्टर साहब ने जैसा स्टेटमेंट इस हाउस में दिया है, अभी जैसा ऊनीकृष्णन जी ने कहा उस से कहों ऐसा नहीं लगता कि उन्होंने सीरियसली इस चीज को लिया तो कि यह इतना बड़ा अहम मसला है, यह मसला आज का नहीं है, यह कई म

(श्रीमती सोहसिना किदवाई)

से क्या था रहा है, खास तौर से बंगला देश की लड़ाई शुरू हुई उस वक़्त से एयर अमेरिकी बेड़े का ज्यादा प्रभाव पड़ने की बात है। मैं दो ब्रीच सवाल धापके जरिए से करना चाहती हूँ। 1977 में जब जिमी कार्टर साहब अमरीका के सदर हुए तो उन्होंने धाते ही कहा कि कम्पलीट डिमिलिटरीजेशन आफ इंडियन ओशन की बात हम करते हैं तो मैं जानना चाहती हूँ कि उसको दो साल हो गए, इस बीच हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी का दौरा अमरीका का हुआ, हमारे विदेश मंत्री का भी दौरा अमरीका का हुआ, क्यों नहीं उन्होंने इतने प्रहम सवाल, जोकि हमारे मुल्क की सिक्वोरिटी से बाबस्ता है, हमारे मुल्क की तिजारत से बाबस्ता है और इस पूरे कांटेनेन्ट की सिक्वोरिटी से बाबस्ता है, को हाई प्रायटी पर उनके साथ हल करने की कोशिश की ?

हमरी बात यह है कि 1964 में श्रीलंका में नानएलाइन्सड कान्फेस हुई थी और उसमें प्रपोजन रखा गया था कि इंडियन ओशन को जोन भाफ पीस बनाया जाये। श्रीलंका की सरकार बदलने के बाद अब यूनाइटेड नेशन्स में सिर्फ दो कंट्रीज ऐसे मैम्बर्स हैं, हिन्दुस्तान और श्रीलंका, जोकि इस सवाल को बहुत मजबूती और जोरदार तरीके से उठा सकते हैं। मैं मंत्री जी से जानना चाहती हूँ क्या उन्होंने अपने पड़ोसी मुल्क, श्रीलंका की सरकार बदलने के बाद वहाँ की मिनिस्ट्री के साथ बातचीत की कि अब उनकी इस मामले में राय क्या है ? मैं उनको बताना चाहती हूँ, उस वक़्त श्रीलंका के जो ट्रेड मिनिस्टर धाये थे उन्होंने कहा था :

"This country favoured a balanced presence of big power Navies since the peace zone is an unrealistic aim."

मैं जानना चाहती हूँ कि क्या आपने श्रीलंका की सरकार के साथ इस मामले पर बातचीत की ?

एक बात मैं और भी बताना चाहती हूँ। मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि अमरीका जानबूझ कर इंडियन ओशन के मसले को लेकर डिले कर रहा है। मैं जानना चाहती हूँ कि भारत सरकार ने इस विषय में क्या कदम उठाए हैं जिससे इसको एकपेन्डेंट करके इस मामले का जल्दी से जल्दी हल निकल सके।

एक बात और भी है। मैं तीन चीजों को इक्कठा एक चीज देखना चाहती हूँ। इस प्रकार का अमरीका का रवैया जो हमारे मुल्क के साथ रहा है और सवाल धाज हमारे सामने उठा है, यह बात बहुत पहले एक्सटर्नल अफेयर्स मिनिस्ट्री को मालूम होनी चाहिए थी और उनसे बातचीत करनी चाहिए थी। पहली चीज है —

Common naval base—military base—in the Indian Ocean

मूसरी बात है— Supply of arms to Pakistan.

तीसरी चीज जिसका इससे कन्सन नहीं है लेकिन मैं चाहती हूँ यह तीनों चीजें एक साथ देखी जायें और वह है—

Costlier U.S. Uranium to Tarapur Atomic Power Station

मुझे डर है कि हमारे मुल्क की तरफ, इंडियन ओशन की तरफ एपीटी बढ़ने की बात हीरो रही है वह कहीं ईस्ट इंडिया कम्पनी न साबित हो। यह बड़ा प्रहम सवाल है, हमारी सरकार को हाई प्रायटी पर इस मसले को हल करना चाहिए ताकि पूरे सब कांटेनेन्ट को इन खनरात से बचाया जा सके। अमरीका ने 1948 में पजियन गल्फ के एक छोटे से मुल्क बहरीन में अपनी बेस बनाई, आस्ट्रेलिया में उन्होंने अपनी कम्प्यूतिकेशन बेस बनाई और जो सबसे स्ट्रेटिजिक प्वाइन्ट है इंडियन ओशन में डिप्लो गार्मिजा वहाँ पर ने अपनी इंटेलिजेंस की पूरी बेस बनाना चाहते हैं। तो यह सारे खतरात हैं इस मुल्क की सिक्वोरिटी के लिए, इस मुल्क की तिजारत के लिए, इस मुल्क की आजादी के लिए। इसलिए मैं पूरजोर तरीके से कहना चाहती कि हाई प्रायटी देकर धाप इस मसले को हल करें और बताये कि उस विषय में धाप क्या करने जा रहे हैं। हर बात में एक्स प्राइम मिनिस्टर को खीच कर धापका कोई काम अब बनने शाला नहीं है। अब इस अजीम मुल्क की जिम्मेदारी धापके ऊपर है, इसलिए धपको बताना पड़ेगा कि इस मुल्क की सिक्वोरिटी और आजादी के लिए और अभाव की फला बहबूद के लिए, साईसी दुनिया में तरक्की के लिए धाप क्या करने जा रहे हैं।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं प्रधान मंत्री को खीचना नहीं चाहना, प्रधान मंत्री को तो उसी पक्ष में बैठे हुए एक सदस्य ने खींचने की कोशिश की थी, जिसे मैंने नाकामयाब कर दिया...

श्री बलराम साठे : पिछले प्रधान मंत्री को खींच कर।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : मैं अपने पैरों पर खड़े होने में समर्थ हूँ, अपने दामियल के प्रति जागृक हूँ और कर्तव्य की भावना से काम करने की कोशिश कर रहा हूँ। धाप को पसन्द है तो ठीक है.....

श्री गौरी लंकर राव (गाजीपुर) : पसन्द है।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : माननीय सदस्य का कहना ठीक है कि यह मसला बहुत प्रहम है, अगर मसला पुराना है—यह कह कर उन्होंने इस की प्रहमियत कम कर दी। हमारे पड़ोस में जो नवे परिवर्तन हुए हैं, उन के प्रकाश में "गल्फ" में नव-शक्ति को बढ़ाने की बात है—यह एक नई बात है जिसे हम बढ़ी

गम्भीरता से देख रहे हैं और जिसे बड़ी गम्भीरता से देखा जाना चाहिये और जिसे रोका जाना चाहिये ।

माननीय सदस्य ने पूछा कि अमरीका गये, बात हुई या नहीं ? अरु बात हुई । हिन्द महासागर का सवाल, हम जब कभी भी अमरीका से बात करते हैं या सोवियत संघ से बात करते हैं—अरु उठाते हैं । दोनों देशों के बीच में बातचात हो रही थी । 1977-78 में बातचीत के चार दौर चले, थोड़ी सी प्रगति भी हुई, लेकिन बाद में मामला ठप्य हो गया । अखिरी बैठक फरवरी, 1978 में स्विट्जरलैण्ड में हुई थी, लेकिन उस में अगली बैठक की तारीख तय नहीं हुई—स्पष्ट है कि मामला उलझ गया है ।

प्रेजिडेण्ट कार्टर ने, जब वह प्रेजिडेण्ट नहीं थे, मि० कार्टर थे, तो चुनाव के दौरान में डी-मिलिट्रिजेशन की बात कही थी, लेकिन अब जो बातचीत हो रही है, वह तो स्टीललाइजेशन करने की बात हो रही है । दोनों देशों के बीच जो शक्ति है, वह बराबर की शक्ति हो—इस के बारे में बातचीत हो रही है । हम तो चाहते हैं कि शक्ति घटे और हिन्द महासागर बड़ी शक्तियों का अखाड़ा न बने और इसी लिये हम चाहते हैं कि बातचीत फिर से शुरू होनी चाहिये । इस पर हमने जोर दिया है । मैंने जैसा पहले श्री उज्ज्वलान्न के प्रश्न के उत्तर में कहा था—हम यूनाइटेड नेशन्स में इस मामले में सक्रिय हैं और एक अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय सम्मेलन बुलाना का फैसला हुआ है

श्री बसन्त साठे : आप बार-बार दोनों को इन्वेट क्यों करते हैं—आप इस मामले में उन के वकील हैं—क्या ? आप की बातों से विश्व तो यह रहा है कि आप उन के वकील हैं । मैं इन सब में नहीं जाना चाहता हूँ—मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि हकीकत क्या है ?

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : हकीकत यह है कि जब तक सोवियत संघ और अमरीका दोनों समझौता नहीं करेंगे, सहयोग नहीं करेंगे, हिन्द महासागर को शान्ति-का-सागर बनाने का उद्देश्य पूरा नहीं होगा ।

श्री बसन्त साठे : इस का मतलब है कि हमारी कोई हस्ती नहीं रही ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : मेरे कहने का यह मतलब नहीं है । हम हिन्द महासागर के किनारे बसे हुए हैं और भी देखें जो हिन्द महासागर को शान्ति का क्षेत्र बनाने में हमारे साथ हैं, लेकिन इस तथ्य से आप इन्कार नहीं कर सकते कि सोवियत संघ और अमरीका में जो बातचीत हो रही थी, वह बन्द हो गई और जब मैं दोनों का नाम लेता हूँ तो आप कहते हैं कि मैं इन्वेट कर रहा हूँ । इस में इन्वेट करने का कोई उपाय नहीं है ।

श्री बसन्त साठे : हुकीकत बतलाइये । श्री कोमिनिंग ने इस के बारे में अभी क्या कहा, क्या उन का कोई बेस है या तिरफ अमरीका का ही है ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: No interruptions, please.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : माननीय सदस्य ने यह भी कहा कि पाकिस्तान को हथियार देने का मामला है, अमरीका के साथ हमारा यूरोनियम का सवाल है—इन सवालों पर अलग से चर्चा हो रही है और उन के बारे में सरकार का दृष्टिकोण समय-समय पर सब के सामने रखा जाता है ।

SHRI SAUGATA ROY (Barrack-pore): Sir, what I say now with reference to the Calling Attention Motion is not to run down our Foreign Minister. I know that he is a good man and a patriotic man. He has said in one of his interviews: 'I pay tribute to Nehru'. He is trying to follow Nehru's path. But, unfortunately, his Foreign Ministry is working in such a way...

PROF. SAMAR GUHA (Contai): God save the country from Nehru's path!

SHRI SAUGATA ROY: Samar Babu wants to save this country from Nehru's path. We don't want that. Mr. Vajpayee has stated categorically that he is trying to follow Nehru's path with regard to foreign policy. We want him to follow that. But unfortunately Sir, the Foreign Ministry is being run in such a way that very often one wonders whether the statements are prepared here or in Washington, as it has been alleged by an hon. Member of the Janata party, Shri Madhu Limaye. Sir, he has alleged that the Foreign Secretary was directly involved with the American people; he has alleged that V. Shankar, Prime Minister's Secretary is also involved with the American people...

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAEYEE: I strongly object to it. He should not bring the names of those who are not here to defend themselves. He can write to me. He can criticise me here. But he can't bring in the name of persons who can't defend themselves.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: He is quoting somebody else. The Janata party has not taken any action against Mr. Madhu Limaye. Why are you blaming him? He is quoting only Mr. Madhu Limaye.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please come to the subject.

SHRI SAUGATA ROY: All I am saying is this. This statement is a lollypop statement, not to be taken seriously, not to be given to this august, honourable, House. I say this, because, this is a matter which is a very serious matter regarding the presence of US 5th Fleet in the Indian Ocean as also the reported formation of a military alliance and here he is given a lollypop, papering-over, soft-peddalling, statement. Nowhere in the statement does the word 5th Fleet come in. Nowhere in the statement does the word Diego Garcia come in. And the Minister later on says, "they also tend to distort internal politics with resultant upheavals as happened recently in some countries of this region"—meaning thereby Iran and Afghanistan! Sir, is it because of CENTO that this upheaval has taken place in Iran? Or is it because the people of Iran have risen in revolt against a dictatorial Shah? I believe that the statement shows a lack of understanding and perspective of our foreign policy. There are three very important things which have got to be considered because the scope of this Calling Attention is very wide. Number one is with regard to the middle-eastern situation where the 5th Fleet has gone now. What is happening in the Middle-east? After the fall of the Shah of Iran, the main stooge of American imperialism in middle-east, the sheikdoms in the Gulf Area have become shaky. Carter has been attacked in his own country of having followed a weak-kneed policy, for not being able to bale out the Shah of Iran. And President Carter is now going to Saudi Arabia, whom he is wanting to

keep as an ally. That is why he has brought in this Fifth Fleet, in the event of an immediate contest or struggle between the people and the rulers of North Yemen. But this is not the end of the matter. The US authorities have set up their base in Diego Garcia. Their presence in the Indian ocean is there. It is unfortunate that the Foreign Minister went on T.V. even without coming to the Parliament first, saying that 'We had differences with Kosygin on Kampuchea'. All right; if he does not want to recognise Kampuchea, it is his business. We demand recognition. But here he says: 'Enhanced super-power presence could have adverse consequences'. Why does he not say straightway that the presence of US military forces and US imperialist forces in the Indian Ocean would have very adverse consequences? I say this because it seems that Kosygin has made a statement in his presence that Soviet Union does not have any presence in the Indian ocean. In this so-called genuine non-alignment he is trying to equate imperialists with others. All I say is . . .

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: What is the question?

SHRI SAUGATA ROY: I am coming to my question. I now come to the main part of Mr. Vajpayee's statement in which he made some scanty reference to this important aspect. He says, there is no indication to say that the military alliance is in the offing.

When Warren Christopher, US Deputy Secretary of State, had been to Delhi, at that time a meeting of US envoys stationed in the region was called at Delhi and the envoys who came to attend the meeting were from Nepal, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Afghanistan and Iran. Who else accompanied Warren Christopher? The key man who coordinated discussion among the envoys a senior official of the all-power-

ful 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 Tornton, a top specialist on South Asia. Who else was there in Delhi? A very notorious man Mr. Paul Kreisburg, who was formerly in the US Embassy in Delhi was also present here.

What are the intentions of the United States? After being kicked out from Vietnam they have now set a running go of imperialism. Mr. Deng Xiaoping to attack the socialist Republic of Vietnam. Now he goes for forming a Pan-Islamic alliance. Mr Vajpayee has said in an interview given to Sunday that he is against fundamentalism. When he was asked:

"What about militarisation of these countries. Together, they annually spend 40 billion dollar and have a total strength of 35 lakh soldiers."

Shri Vajpayee says:

"No, just because all these countries believe in Islam, we should not think that on all international issues they will act as one. There are differences. What I am worried about is the resurgence of fundamentalism. All religions have come to terms with modernity, with science and technology."

Mr. Vajpayee also admits that revival of fundamentalism in the Asian continent of ours, Pan-Islamism, is a dangerous thing. The whole thing should be seen together; the presence of US Fifth Fleet in the Indian Ocean to back up Saudi Arabia, the meeting of US envoys from different Islamic countries here in Delhi, visit of Warren Christopher, Tom Tornton and Paul Kreisburg to Delhi and also the attack by the running dogs of im-

perialism, Chinese ruling clique on the Socialist Republic of Vietnam and also Indian Government's failure to recognise the new revolutionary Government of Kampuchea. It is in this context that the whole thing should be addressed.

I want to ask the Foreign Minister certain specific questions. He has said that he is a great admirer of Nehru and he pays tribute to him. First, I would like to ask him whether the report about the US envoys meeting in Delhi is correct or not, whether he has any report of such a meeting held here and whether he has protested. Secondly, during the presence of Warren Christopher here, had the Indian Foreign Minister conveyed our concern about the matter to him or not? Thirdly, instead of depending on the United Nations to take up the Indian Ocean issue and to hope that the super powers, or whatever he calls them, will some day come to an agreement on this issue to make it demilitarised, whether the Indian Government, which is the successor Government of Jawaharlal Nehru, who used to take a lot of such initiative in all Asian matters, will take any initiative in calling a meeting of the Asian States to face this new threat from American imperialism in the shape of 5th Fleet?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:
 Sir, I am not in a position to give information whether US ambassadors accredited to neighbouring countries met in New Delhi or not.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Why?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:
 I do not possess it; I will find out.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: What do you mean? Do your people do not know?

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: It is very strange.

SHRI A. C. GEORGE (Mukandapuram): What type of foreign office are you running?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Whenever I go out, I also hold meeting of the Indian ambassador in that region. Recently, I was in Nairobi and a meeting of the Indian ambassadors accredited to the neighbouring countries was called by me. There is nothing wrong in holding such meetings. We do the same thing ever we go out.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: I hope you do not do it secretly.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: If it was held secretly how did Shri Saugata Roy know about it?

SHRI VASANT SATHE: When you do not know, then he may ask: is it a secret from the Foreign Minister?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Not a secret. I will find out and let him know.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN:
rose

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Unnikrishnan, let him find out.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: Let him tell us not Mr. Roy. It is not a private matter between Mr. Saugata Roy and the Minister.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: He wanted to know. (Interruptions) He wanted to know whether we will depend on the United Nations or will do something on our own, to make the Indian Ocean a zone of peace. I will welcome suggestions. About initiative, it has already been decided to

hold a conference of littoral and hinterland countries. The ad hoc committee is working. If Indian Ocean is to become a zone of peace—we want to take a joint initiative—why should we not involve all countries which are party to that historic resolution? And that is what we are trying to do.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Now the information has come.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: Where is Jagat Mehta? (Interruptions).

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: I have been in the Opposition for 20 year. Do you mean to say that your own Ministers did not use to consult officials? (Interruptions) Let us believe in a responsible way (Interruptions)

A number of American Ambassadors were present in Delhi when Mr. Christopher came here; but we cannot say whether they held any formal conference or not. I have nothing to conceal.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: You are a good man your officers are not.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Let him answer. Let us not have a running commentary.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: I think I have replied to all the points raised by my hon. friends.

13.33 hrs.

MATTERS UNDER RULE 377

(i) STATE OF HEALTH OF LOKNAYAK
JAYAPRAKASH NARAYAN

PROF. SAMAR GUHA (Contd): Sir, I want to make a statement on Loknayak Jayaprakash Narayan. The whole country is extremely worried to hear the report about the sudden serious indisposition of Loknayak Jayaprakash Narayan. I am sure that the Members of this House are