

B.A.K. Railway track diversion at R.D. 117;

(b) whether the extent of submersion in the back catchment area above the Farakka Barrage in Bihar has been ascertained by a proper survey and the concurrence of Bihar State for this submersion obtained and

(c) when is the Feeder canal likely to be completed and flow of 40 cusecs of water from the Ganga into the Hooghly-Bhagirathi channel made possible?

THE MINISTER OF IRRIGATION AND POWER (SHRI K. C. PANIG): (a) The present position regarding different items of work mentioned is as under:

Work	Present Stage of Execution
(i) Bridge at R.D. 28 near Ballalpur.	A road bridge at R.D. 28 5 to serve Ballalpur Shankarpur region has been recently approved. The foundation stone for this bridge was laid on 28-2-1974
(ii) Bridge at R.D. 34 near Shankarpur	
(iii) Bridge at R.D. 62 Dhulan-Pakur road	Substructure, except for load testing on one abutment well and raising of pier, completed. Casting of deck slab in progress
(iv) Digging of canal from R.D. 87 to R.D. 98.	The work is in an advanced stage of progress.
(v) Diversion for N.H. 34 at R.D. 107	Both the Railway line and the National Highway 34 will be diverted over the rail-cum-road bridge at R.D. 112. The rail traffic has already been diverted over the new bridge. The road portion is nearing completion.
(vi) Diversion for B.A.K. Railway track at R.D. 117	

(b) According to the back water survey conducted by the Project, an area of 5,029 ha. will come under submersion. Of this, 390 ha. will be in West Bengal, 2,620 ha. in Bihar and 2,019 ha. in either Bihar or West Bengal depending upon the finalisation of the mid-stream survey being conducted by the two States. Both the State Governments are agreeable to the submersion and have initiated land acquisition proceedings.

(c) Work on the Feeder Canal is expected to be completed by the monsoon of 1974.

Proposal to Link Kezhoor (Kerala) and Madurai (Tamil Nadu) with Microwave net work of Indian Railways

2804. SHRI A. K. GOPALAN: Will the Minister of RAILWAYS be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government propose to have a new station building at Kezhoor in Kerala:

(b) whether there is any proposal for Kezhoor in Kerala State and Madurai in Tamil Nadu to be linked with microwave net work of the Indian Railways and

(c) if so, when that is likely to be completed?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS (SHRI MOHD. SHAFI QURESHI): (a) No. There is no Railway Station named Kezhoor in Kerala State.

(b) and (c). Do not arise.

12 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE U.S. NUCLEAR-POWER AIRCRAFT CARRIER 'KITTY HAWK' SAILING INTO THE INDIAN OCEAN.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour): Sir, I call the attention of the hon. Minister of External Affairs to the

following matter of urgent public importance, and I request that he may make a statement thereon: "The reported order given by the U.S. Government to its nuclear-powered aircraft carrier 'KITTY HAWK' to sail into the Indian Ocean."

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI SWARAN SINGH): The House will recall the statement that I made last November when a US Task Force with the aircraft carrier "Hancock" entered the Indian Ocean. US sources had then offered various explanations. I had expressed Government's misgivings at this development based on the eventuality that it would lead to a more permanent military presence and thus start a chain reaction leading to big power rivalry and military competition in the area. It is with concern therefore that we have received the information which has been confirmed by our Embassy in Washington about the arrival of the aircraft carrier "Kitty Hawk". Whether it is a replacement or an addition, it supports the belief that U.S. Naval forces are intending to stay in the Indian Ocean for a considerable period of time. We cannot also escape the conclusion that the expansion of base facilities in Diego Garcia by the US is connected with such a more long term presence of US Naval forces in this area.

Our policy regarding the Indian Ocean has been repeatedly expressed. Any large scale presence of the navy of one big Power is bound to attract the navies of other big Powers. Such rivalry would create problems for littoral countries the overwhelming majority of whom desire to maintain the Indian Ocean as an area of peace. Government of India have strongly supported the UN General Assembly Resolution of December 16, 1971 declaring the Indian Ocean a zone of peace for all time and calling upon the Great Powers to halt the further escalation and expansion of their military presence in the Indian Ocean. Government have also associated themselves actively with efforts in the United Nations and elsewhere for the realisation of this objective. We are therefore deeply concerned at the continuing presence of the US naval task force in the Indian Ocean

which is confirmed by the arrival of the aircraft carrier "Kitty Hawk".

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Sir, this Government to my mind, is running with a hare and hunting with the hound.

SHRI VASANT SATHE (Akola): Who is the hare and who is the hound?
SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I will explain to you.

Sir, this Diego Garcia is not one base. But it is an apex and it is a completion of US naval strategic triangle in the Indian Ocean. The two corners are, one in South Africa and the other one is in Australia. With the acquiring of Diego Garcia from our commanding masters, the United Kingdom, Luatazeno/Marques and Nocala from Portuguese, a long chain of naval bases from Simonstown in South Africa to the North West Cape in Australia, which were built by NATO

MR SPFAKFR: You seldom read the speech.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I wanted to mention the names correctly . . . along with the large US Military communication bases at Nagnew, Maldives and the use of UK base of Vacaos, they have commissioned the most powerful, very low and extra low frequency stations for helping the nuclear missile submarines in regard to communications.

Sir, this 'KITTY HAWK' has 75,000 tonnage carrying 80 aircraft and 5,000 crew with three destroyers and an oiler. The U.S. has built a network of bases in the Indian Ocean and in the adjoining areas. There are six strategic bases around Thailand, at Utapao, Udorn, Korat, Nakhon, Phamon and Dbolo. The upgrading of Diego Garcia facilities means increased fuel storage capacity, deepening of lagoons for bigger vessels, lengthening of the runway by about 8,000 ft. more parking area in the air field, and improved communication facilities at a cost of \$32.3 million. That will give them

[Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu]

the ability to stage forces in the areas as much as they want. It is a lame excuse that they are doing it because of the presence of the USSR.

There is an admission on record by no less a person than the Director of Politico-Military Affairs:

"USA will go ahead even if no USSR forces in Indian Ocean 'without any qualification'".

In 1973 the ship days of the US ships in the Indian Ocean was 2,109. Moreover, they have a large fleet in the Mediterranean. They have become the self-appointed world policemen. They United States says, to be polite, "we are strengthening our diplomatic efforts to further our national interest". It is nothing but capitalism exploiting and blood-sucking the backward and developing countries. The US oil industry has invested in the Gulf countries \$3,500 million. Probably, the opening of the Suez will add to their designs for control over that area.

In Bangladesh, in Chittagong and Cox Bazar there are 10 US-inspired fishing trawlers doing intelligence work with antenna and aerial equipped with electronic gadgets and monitoring messages from other ships.

In India the then Home Minister Shri Chavan admitted that there are four centres of CIA in Patna, Bangalore and two other centres. The Chief Minister of Assam has said that Assam is the hunting ground for CIA.

The Tories of UK, while fully agreeing with you, have been condemning you from behind and adopting this double standard, yet you want to be with them because you are their stooges in the Commonwealth.

We have in this country the danger of Union Carbide. I have first hand information, because I had been there myself. In Vizag they have fishing vessels. Under the garb of fishing vessels they are operating the most well-equipped trawlers with

all modern gadgets. They are spying on us. Yet, their carry on business had increased by 100 per cent. We are permitting this even though we caught them under-invoicing their exports.

I would like this Government to take a lesson from what the North Koreans have done with Pueblo. They made the Americans come down on bended knees when it was a matter affecting the integrity of their country. The authorities here get cold feet because the Americans are their god-fathers. Can you do really anything like what the North Koreans have done? If you ask me, my answer is a definite "No" because, as I said at the beginning, they are running with the hare and hunting with the hounds. They have sold their honour and they have sold their country.

The Prime Minister said that Mr. Johnson is a man of peace, when he is the butcher of Vietnam. Westmoreland, who was responsible for the happenings in Vietnam, was treated by us as a State guest.

MR. SPEAKER: He should conclude Now.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Am I too blistering?

MR. SPEAKER: We have a fixed time for this.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: There are only three members present today and we have 45 minutes. I have taken only 8 minutes. If you want, I will sit down. Johnson in his Memoirs says:

"Certain responsible persons in the Government of India had been working to further the cause of US—the then Food and Agriculture Minister and the then Food Secretary".

Shri C. Subramaniam and Shri Dias, now Governor of West Bengal.

The Times of India/Washington Post say:

"High level CIA agent (direct US contact) in Union Government".

There was no reply to a question of mine on this point. They are allowing it deliberately. They have two policies, one for domestic consumption and another for consumption in the international world.

They have allowed US Photographic flights over China from Indian bases. There is the project "Peace Indigo" by Bharat dynamics in collaboration with International Dynamics of USA, multi-million dollar Company, the C.I.A. and they supplied poisonous gas in Viet Nam and covered northern frontier with radar network. Farlier, there was a nuclear umbrella arrangement, a joint Air Exercise of USA, U.K. and India. They have also had joint electronic surveillance of China border.

The Ford Foundation Chief, Mr. Bundy, was driven out from Burma by glorious students—I congratulate them. He said, "PL 480 funds to feed the Indian masses; we have the Peace Corps." Our intellectuals in educational institutions have fought to keep U.S. money out of India. Now, again, it is coming through back-door....

MR. SPEAKER: He is going entirely out of the scope of the Call Attention.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I am finishing.

They are hand in glove with the Americans. As I told you, they have one set of policies for consumption within the country and another set of policy for consumption outside. The inflow of American capital, remittances and collaboration is increasing.

All that I want to say is: Hands off everybody from the Indian Ocean.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Gwalior): Including China.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Include China in the Asian Security Pact, if you are going to have that.

Take over all American business in the country, like President Nassar has done in Suez Canal, Mr. Mossadique has done in oil companies and Mr. Allende has done in Chile.

Thank you very much for giving me time and bearing with me with patience.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: Sir, it appears that the hon. Member opposite had some pages of his prepared speech for the President's Address debate and, probably, he could not deliver it at that time and he has taken now the opportunity of reeling off some pages of his unfinished speech.

It is very interesting that he has not asked me to elaborate on anything. So, the best way to answer him is that he has made very sweeping allegations against my colleagues and against Government officials for which there is absolutely no justification. They are unwarranted. For instance, to bring in the name of Mr. C. Subramaniam or Mr. Dia ..
(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu, nobody interrupted you when you were speaking.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I would like to say that the voice of Indian Parliament against the acceleration of naval presence of United States would be more effective if it had not been diluted by the type of statements. I am sorry to say, which Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu made. Let us all concentrate on mounting a united pressure on the United States and also on Britain to give up Diego Garcia base and not to step up their naval presence. But Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu is not doing any service when he says that we are not opposed to it. I am sure his lone opposition will not be heard by anybody. It is the opposition of the Parliament, of the Government and of the country as a whole which will help in mounting requisite pressure. No amount

[Shri Swaran Singh]

of his criticism of internal policy is going to help... (Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER: If you go on like that, I will ask the Minister not to reply.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I would like to say that the better approach, if I may suggest, for Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu's party would be to join us in raising our strong voice against the establishment of base in Diego Garcia, against the accelerated military presence of the United States and of other naval powers. He is certainly not helping the cause by saying or hinting even obliquely that the Government of India's attitude in this respect is not firm, is not clear. If I may say in all humility, he is playing into the hands of those elements in the United States who are trying to show that the opposition in India is not strong, is not real. It is not the correct position. There are signs of opposition even in the United States; the members of the United States Senate are also voicing their protest against the expenditure of over 30 million U.S. dollars on the Diego Garcia base; it is suggested by those critics of this policy in the United States that this increased tension might come in the way of establishment of detente and may also open up the United States Government to a justifiable criticism that the United States are adopting the role of world police-men. So, I would like to suggest to my friend opposite that, in this respect, he should join us in voicing our opposition to the establishment of the base and also our strong opposition to the induction of big naval units of the U.S. Navy, because this is an action which is opposed not only by India but by all the littoral countries surrounding the Indian Ocean, by all the African countries and by all the Asian countries—may be, there are one or two exceptions. Even countries like Australia and New Zealand are in favour of keeping the Indian Ocean as an area of peace.

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPA (Telli-cherry): Mr. Speaker, Sir, by sending this aircraft carrier, 'Kitty Hawk', to the Indian

Ocean at a time when the entire peace-loving countries, all the littoral countries and all those who want peace in the world, are opposed to this kind of U.S. efforts of escalation of war or tension in this area, is yet another example of the total disregard of the U.S. Imperialist administration to world public opinion. Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu has explained what this Kitty Hawk is, how dangerous it is and all that.

I would like to draw attention to another fact that this is not the only one ship which is being sent here. I was just going through a report where it is said that there are already two task-forces with two aircraft carriers—with 140 to 160 aircraft over them—and five destroyers and some oil carriers already in the Indian Ocean; there are two destroyers and an amphibian ship in Bahrain, in the Persian Gulf; there is another set of two destroyers and a command ship in the island of Diego Garcia. And to this big naval build-up is being added this Kitty Hawk, another aircraft carrier with highly sophisticated electronic devices, missile launches, 80 to 90 aircraft and nearly 5,000 armed men.

This should be viewed in the context of global strategy which is now being worked out by the United States in collusion with Peking and South Africa. It is one of the dirty political games that we are witnessing in this period. The gentleman whom Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu just now quoted, Mr. Seymour Weiss, Director of the US State Department's Bureau of Politico-Military Affairs, in his testimony, has stated that Pakistan, Iran, Singapore and even the People's Republic of China had publicly 'applauded' the US decision to build a base in Diego Garcia. This is the position.

When this happens, when such a serious thing happens, we agree that the Government of India have protested against it and they have taken a position which can be appreciated. But I do not understand another thing which is happening in the name of the Government of India.

We have an Ambassador in the United States, Mr Kaul who is eulogizing all the time how friendly is the United States and how helpful they are in various spheres. Whereas the United States has got an ambassador, a hawk, in India, Mr Moynihan, who is going round the country and propagating the dirty politics of the US imperialist aggressors in this country and selling their aggressive policies everywhere. But our Ambassador is singing and chanting the glory of the United States. I do not understand why this is happening. I would like to know from the hon Minister whether the Government will do something about these Ambassadors who are going to the United States who sometimes become more loyal than the king.

Then, there is another propaganda which is going on. This propaganda is being conducted by the Western Press, the United States and the imperialist forces and they are planting this propaganda as far as possible in the Indian press also. I would like the Minister to deny this propaganda here on the floor of this House. They say that USA is sending all these naval aircraft carriers and other things and building up a naval strength in the Indian Ocean because they think that the Soviet Union is doing that. In the Indian Press in the recent period there were news about it. One news said that India had offered port facilities to the Soviet Union in Visakhapatnam and other places. I know the Government had denied it. Then there was another news that when Soviet Union had mounted its build-up of naval forces in the Indian Ocean, the Government of India kept quiet and the same Government of India is very angry over the United States. These are propaganda by the western press. This is also denied by the Government.

Lastly, they said that there is an attempt by Soviet Union to use the Indian Ocean for nuclear tests which was also denied by the Government of India. But I would like to know whether this propaganda has not got a motive to suggest that the

Americans are coming to the Indian Ocean with the innocent purpose of balancing the military forces in this region because they fear that the Soviet Union is present here in a big way. Even the NATO powers say that Soviet presence in the Indian Ocean is not a very big thing. They say that after the 1971 Bangla Desh war the Soviets have not increased their naval forces in the Indian Ocean and they also say that they do not have any big naval battle ships in this region.

Now, I would like the Minister to tell the House what exactly the Government will do apart from protesting over it. It is of course part of the methods that we protest, the entire country, the peace-loving forces, unitedly protest against this aggressive act of the United States. But apart from that, what I want to know is, whether the Government would take a position to denounce this thing, whether you would make it clear that you don't expect US to do justice to the peace loving people, which they have not done in any part of the world in their history. We should understand that this is really the character of imperialism. It is inherent and so long as imperialism is there they will try to commit aggression they tried to impose war on the peace loving people we have seen it in Vietnam, we have seen it at the time of the Bangladesh liberation and we have seen this everywhere. Many interesting things are happening around our country. All these years we thought that we have the sea front of our country quite safe. Now we are getting alarmed at the news which comes relating to the Bay of Bengal where trawlers are sent in the name of fishing set up with electronic gadgets and devices to spy over the Soviet ships who are clearing the harbour of mines and certain destructions caused by Pakistan during the days of the Bangladesh liberation war. The net result is, the Indian Ocean as I have told you has been made a spring-board of war, today by the imperialist powers. What is our relation going to be with the Commonwealth. The United States in 1966 when Labour party

[Shri C. K. Chandrappan]

was in power, first approached Britain about the Diego Garcia base. Now that the Labour Prime Minister Mr. Wilson has again come to power the United States spokesman has said that they have no expectation that Labour will make any change in their attitude. I want to know whether our Government has taken up this question of Diego Garcia with the new Government of Britain, requesting them to change or to reverse this policy of imposing war and tension on this region. If they say they will not, then the Government should be bold enough to tell this House that we will say: To Hell with your Commonwealth. What is the meaning of remaining in such a Commonwealth?

Lastly my three points are the following. What is the understanding of the Government in relation to the collusion of US and China regarding military naval build-up in the Indian Ocean? What is the attitude of the Government towards the Commonwealth? What is the Government going to do? Will they take it up with Wilson Government immediately? Lastly, will the Government come out now denouncing the United States for this kind of aggressive action, because this should be considered as a matter of aggression?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: The broad approach of the hon. Member, if some of his strong expressions could be eliminated, tallies broadly with the Government of India's approach. He has voiced quite understandably strong reactions against the establishment of the Diego Garcia base and also of the continued USA's naval presence in the Indian ocean. We broadly agree with that. He was, I think, unnecessarily hard on our Ambassador; ambassadors in any country are expected to strengthen relations between the country to which they are accredited and the country which they represent. That is the normal function of all ambassadors in whatever part of the world they may be functioning. And if Mr. Kaul, in accordance with the Government of India's policy tried to project India's attitude on several matters, which might bring about some greater

understanding between India and the USA, we should not decry that.

We should not decry at all an Ambassador acting under instructions from his Government. Mr. Moynihan's name was mentioned again. I did make a statement with regard to the statements which were attributed in press to Mr. Moynihan, I think, in Madras.

I would like to say this much that the statements attributed to him may be the presentation of the U.S. Government's viewpoint. But, we totally reject the validity of the arguments contained in those statements. Our opposition to the establishment of the Diego Garcia base is strong and we continue to adhere to that policy.

I now come to the four specific points about which the hon Member had asked me to give Government of India's reaction. Apart from our continuing to express our opposition to the establishment of the base and the induction of the U.S. Naval Forces into the Indian Ocean, we also intend to activate the *Ad Hoc* Committee and the working Group in the U.N. which is already functioning. In order to ensure that the Indian Ocean remains an area of peace, as per the General Assembly Resolution, the working Group becomes more active and mobilises international opinion and opposes the establishment of this base and the continued presence of the US Naval Force in the Indian Ocean, we also propose...

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: By that time, everything will be completed in Diego Garcia.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: The work on the base is already more or less complete. They are now only enlarging it. Diego Garcia is not the solitary black spot. There are others also and our opposition is directed against all bases, old or new because we are totally opposed to the establishment of bases in the Indian Ocean. We will also continue to mobilise opinion

amongst littoral countries and also in the group of non-aligned countries I think that the continued agitation of this matter in the international forum is not likely to be ignored. Already there are voices in the U.S. which are opposed to the establishment of this base by the U.S.

The second point about which the hon. Member mentioned is with regard to our association with the commonwealth. I would like to say that the overwhelming majority in the Commonwealth family of nations is also opposed to the establishment of the Diego Garcia base. In fact, the Commonwealth is a forum at which the African leaders, the Asian leaders and the Caribbeans can get together and mount the requisite pressure which they can exercise in any international forum against the British Government whether it relates to the British attitude with regard to the supplies of military equipments to South Africa or to the establishment of a base like Diego Garcia. We should not lightly ignore the importance of this forum. There, the African, the Asian and the Caribbeans leaders can raise their joint voice and oppose such activities by the U.K. It was in the Commonwealth forum that Australia and New Zealand also altered the policies of the earlier Governments and lent their support to the general attitude in the Commonwealth Conference of condemning the South African policies of Apartheid and also the general desire of the Asian, African and Carribean Members of the Commonwealth to ensure that the Indian ocean remains an area of peace and tranquillity.

Then the third question asked is about our assessment of U.S.—China collusion in the establishment of Diego Garcia. He has said that in a statement which has been made by the U.S. spokesman it is mentioned that China was specifically consulted. I would suggest that we should wait for Chinese reaction to this because China had said that they are in favour of keeping the Indian Ocean as an area of peace and tranquillity. So, it is for the Chinese first to react to this. It is for China to clarify their position as to whether

the statement made by the U.S. spokesman in this respect is correct or not.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: If the Chinese keep quiet then what should we conclude?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: Silence sometimes means acceptance of the position.

Lastly, we have already expressed our very strong opposition to this policy of the U.S. government and I do not see whether using a strong adjective will necessarily help.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: I want to know whether it is a fact that China supported the U.S. Resolution.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH. I have already said on the Floor of the House that China had lent its support in favour of the Indian Ocean being kept an area of peace and tranquillity. Therefore, the U.S. allegation that Diego Garcia has been established after consulting China is a matter which I cannot comment upon. China has to comment or if anyone else has the information he has to comment.

SHRI BIRENDER SINGH RAO (Mahendigarh) Sir, we are all deeply concerned and share the deep anxiety of the Government to keep the Indian ocean as an ocean of peace. He has rightly said that if there is presence of one big Power in the Indian ocean it is bound to attract the Navies of other big Powers. I take the Minister on his word that he has been making all the efforts to keep the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace but the fact remains that in spite of the Government effort the main threat today to the security of the country comes from the Indian ocean side which has during the ages in the past been absolutely free from any danger. The question arises as to what extent the efforts of the Government have been successful and to what extent the impression that the Government of India is partial and biased towards certain powers is correct. Diego Garcia has been made much of. I want to know whether it is not a fact that U.S. and U.K. entered

[Shri Birender Singh Rao]

into a pact about using Diego Garcia as a base sometime in the sixties.

The first time it was in 1966. India has been a very important member of the Commonwealth. It is stated that most of the other littoral countries in the Commonwealth are also deeply concerned about the increasing naval presence of the US in the Indian Ocean.

I would like to know what specific effort as a member of the Commonwealth was made by the Government of India to persuade the UK not to enter into a fresh pact with the US, not to extend facilities for its navy and air force on that island, and also to what extent other countries, supported India's stand. Was the matter ever discussed in any conference of the Commonwealth countries during the past so many years? The British Government through its Foreign Secretary charged India with keeping silence and with connivance on the presence of one big power in the Indian Ocean. I would like to know whether the Government of India has taken the pains to convince UK and also other non-aligned countries about the baselessness and falsity of this charge. I have not seen any statement from the Government of India giving us particulars in detail about the hollowness of this charge. I would also like to know what is the Government of India's reaction to the USSR's attitude to the increasing naval presence in the Indian Ocean of one big power or the other big power. Has it come to the notice of the External Affairs Minister that *Pravda*, which is supposed to be the official organ of the USSR Government, wrote that the Indian Ocean is free for any nation to use

If the USSR holds this view, what has been the Government of India's effort in trying to convince her that this sort of attitude is likely to endanger the security of this continent and of the other countries around it. The Indian Ocean is a very large area extending from Australia to Iran.

12.42 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair.]

I would like to know whether it is not a fact that almost all the littoral countries in the Indian Ocean have given facilities for port or for mooring or for bunkering to one big power or the other. Is it not a fact that even in places where the US or UK has her bases, the USSR also has established her bases nearly? I would give the name of Seychelles and Mauritius where there are UK bases, but the USSR also has deep water mooringbuoys there. Similarly, near Diego Garcia and Madagascar, the USSR has also mooring facilities in the ocean. When one big power has a base in one place, the other big power also establishes its presence. The USSR has a base near Madagascar; it has a base in Bihara in Somalia where SAM missiles are also reported to have been installed. It has also bases in Socatra, Hodeida, Aden, Mukala and several other places in the Red Sea and Persian Gulf areas. Even Iraq has provided facilities to the USSR. Similarly Iran has provided facilities to the US. Certain other countries have given facilities to the UK.

When all these countries have provided facilities to all the big powers, one big power or the other big power, where is the question of the littoral countries being together in the fight for maintaining the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace? I would like to know whether Chittagong still has the base of the USSR Navy.

If it is true, may I know whether the Government of India, being in alliance with the Bangladesh Government, has ever tried to persuade the Bangladesh Government or the USSR Government to remove its naval presence from Bangladesh so that, as said by the Minister himself, other big powers are also not attracted?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I think we are going beyond the scope.

SHRI BIRENDER SINGH RAO : All these are very important points, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I know. I am only pointing out that we are going far out of the scope. We are now discussing the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace rather than the despatch of the nuclear-powered aircraft carrier 'Kitty Hawk' of the United States to the Indian Ocean.

SHRI BIRENDER SINGH RAO : Diego Garcia is mentioned by the Minister; other countries have been mentioned. He has stated that the presence of one big power is also bound to attract other big powers.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : If it is a nuclear fleet of Russia coming in because the nuclear fleet of America is there, I can understand, but we are now discussing the entire question of the Indian Ocean.

SHRI BIRENDER SINGH RAO : All these are connected.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Please conclude.

SHRI BIRENDER SINGH RAO : There are reports that there are a large number of trawlers belonging to the United States under the garb of oceanography, with all facilities of communication for collecting information. Similarly, it has been reported that the USSR also has maintained a fleet of 18 to 20 ships in the Indian Ocean for the last nine years. What did the Government of India do to see that this activity by one big power did not attract activities from other big powers also ?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : All right. You have put the question.

SHRI BIRENDER SINGH RAO : It is a fact that the Government of India so far has failed in its efforts to maintain the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. We would like to have a clarification from the Minister as to what extent his efforts have been successful or whether they have not been successful at all and the Government has failed entirely in this matter.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I would like to say that this rather wide-ranging involvement of all manner of countries does not appear to be based on facts, and we should always make a distinction between the provision of facilities to naval units or naval craft of any country by various ports and the provision of bases. For instance, India provides the normal bunkering facilities even purchase of food, provisions, etc., to all the friendly countries' naval vessels whether it is the United States or Britain or France or the USSR. So, the provision of these normal facilities in peacetime is not regarded as something objectionable. But from what the hon. Member has stated in a rather exaggerated manner, it appears he has infected by certain propaganda which has been persistently carried on in the western press . . .

SHRI BIRENDER SINGH RAO : I do not belong to any party and you cannot say that I am speaking for China or the USSR or the United Kingdom, or that I have been influenced by somebody's propaganda. Have I not got my own brain?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : The brain does not carry always all the information.

SHRI BIRENDER SINGH RAO : This Minister is making fun of everything. (Interruptions).

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Information is what is supplied by others.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU : Was he not in the Congress in Haryana ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : He is a friend of mine. He is more close to me than he is to you.

I would like to say that the provision of a base is a serious matter which cannot remain undetected. The hon. Member has mentioned a number of countries in this respect; for example, he said that the USSR has a base in Madagascar, Mauritius, Socotra, Somalia and in Iraq; that is not borne out by facts at all.

[Shri Swaran Singh]

None of these countries has ever accepted this allegation; all of them have denied these allegations... (*Interruptions*) I would like you to correct the record; you have said that there were bases in all those countries.

SHRI BIRENDER SINGH RAO: I said: deep water moorings close to those countries, in the Ocean, wherever other countries had got bases.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I do not want to enter into that controversy. It is my duty because the names of several friendly countries have been mentioned and I am anxious that the names of those friendly countries should not be brought in unless there is clear evidence. I should like to say categorically that the statement that the USSR has bases in the countries which the hon Member has mentioned namely, Madagascar, Mauritius...

SHRI BIRENDER SINGH RAO: I have explained it so many times; yet he does not understand.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The hon. Minister has made it clear that he has no information that those countries have given bases.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: He has also mentioned the name of a friendly country, close to us, Bangla Desh and said that the naval forces of the USSR were present there I think Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu said that there were some US trawlers in Cox Bazaar and some other areas... (*Interruptions*) As the House is no doubt aware Chittagong and Cox Bazaar ports had been mined by the Pakistani Navy at the time of the conflict.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: He has misunderstood me. There were ten vessels operating near Cox Bazar and Chittagong; they belong to the United States of America and they operate under the garb of fishing they have antenna and radars fitted to them and they were caught while spying and intercepting messages. But he

is mentioning Chittagong and Cox Bazar and this and that.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I am replying to Mr. Rao and not to Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu. What he said was that the USSR Navy was present there. Facts are that from certain portions of Chittagong and Cox Bazar the USSR had been asked to help Bangla Desh in removing the mines. There were some minesweepers which had been deployed there to remove the mines. You cannot call this action as USSR naval force presence in the sense we are discussing it. When we mention about friendly countries we should be extra-careful not to create such an impression even by the slightest implication.

SHRI S M BANFRJEE (Kanpur): It should be expunged.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: It is enough if it stands corrected.

About ourselves, I should like to say that our position is clear. We oppose the establishment of any base by any country other than the country concerned, whatever may be the country. This opposition is total because we believe that this introduces an element of tension.

Secondly, I would like to say that the allegation in this respect that India is trying to favour one country against another is totally unfounded. In fact, the hon Member must have noticed the Government's reaction to the statement, to which he made a reference—the statement made by Sir Alec Douglas Home. To say the least, that statement was completely unfounded. However, he is no longer the Secretary of State I would like to say that the statement that we were keeping quiet when other navies were establishing their presence in the Indian Ocean is incorrect. Our stand has been clear and consistent. We are opposed to the presence of any foreign naval force or the establishment of any bases in this region. Having said all that, we would strongly favour a discussion not only amongst the littoral

countries concerned, but, in this discussion we would like to involve the big naval powers also so that some agreement could be arrived at and there could be mutual restraint.

12.56 hrs.

RE: MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: We will now take up Matter under Rule 377.

It is true that according to the well-known principle of freedom of high seas, some naval vessels will be present on the high seas. But, the establishment of bases, the induction of naval units or the establishment of more or less permanent bases, are the things that create tension in the area. They generate competitive rivalry. They create problems for the littoral countries and this is opposed to the concept of Indian Ocean being maintained as an area of peace and tranquility. In this regard, I presume there is opposition in our Parliament to the establishment of bases or to the presence of Big Power navies in the Indian Ocean region. This rivalry will create more problems for the littoral States and they will be increasingly under various types of pressures from these foreign bases.

SHRI BIRENDER SINGH RAO: What about the efforts made in the Commonwealth? What is the Government's reaction to the comment of 'PRAVDA'?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: Sir, about the efforts in the Commonwealth, the question was to why we did not oppose the expansion of facilities. Of course, the expansion of facilities was never discussed. They announced that they have decided to expand. There was no opportunity in the Commonwealth, therefore, to discuss this matter. But, our opposition even to the establishment of the so-called communication base was clearly conveyed to Britain. Any expansion of facilities at the existing bases or the establishment of new bases would lead to the aggravation of tension, and hence our opposition to any expansion is clearly there. About the comment of 'PRAVDA', I have not studied it. But, I have stated our general policy very clearly.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour). Sir, I have given an adjournment motion regarding the release of the Gujarat students. (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order please.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Government is creating dis-order outside, There is no order here

श्री जयू लियये (बाबा): मेरा व्यक्त्या का प्रश्न है

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr Madhu Limaye is on a point of order. Let me hear him

श्री जयू लियये: प्राप नम्बर 2 और 3 का देखें। दो खरम हुआ और तीन मूक होने वाला है। हम लोगों के द्वारा जो नोटिस दिए गए हैं उनका क्या हावा? उनके बारे में कोई जानकारी प्राप्त दे सकते? कल दो सौ लड़का का गिरफ्तार किया गया है। उनके साथ प्रच्छा सम्क नहीं हो रहा है। उनका भी बन्ना म रखा गया है। इसके उपर बयान घाना चाहिये, हम का जानकारी मिलनी चाहिए।

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I have given an adjournment motion. Two hundred students have been jailed (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have heard your point.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I have given an adjournment motion on the release of these boys who have been jailed (Interruptions)