

Working of Co-operative Rice Mills 12.04 hrs. in Andhra Pradesh

201. SHRI K. SURYANARAYANA:

Will the Minister of AGRICULTURE be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government are aware that several co-operative rice mills in Andhra Pradesh are not working and kept idle since the last three years; and

(b) if so, the reasons therefor and the losses to the societies on account of keeping them idle?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI ANNASAHAB P. SHINDE):

(a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The main reasons for several cooperative rice mills remaining idle/under-utilised have been as follows:—

- (i) Natural calamities like cyclone and drought conditions due to which the price of paddy ruled high, and it was uneconomical for the mills to procure paddy;
- (ii) Adverse effects on the economy of the mills due to millers' levy levied by the State Government and restrictions on the sale of levy-free rice imposed by the District Authorities;
- (iii) Inability to compete with private rice mills, some of which indulge in malpractices.

Information regarding losses, if any, to such societies on account of their remaining idle/under-utilised capacity is not readily available.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

REPORTED PRESENCE OF U.S. NAVAL FLEET IN THE INDIAN OCEAN

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA (Tumkur):
Mr. Speaker, Sir, 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:

"The reported presence of U.S. Naval fleet in the Indian Ocean."

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI SWARAN SINGH):
On October 29, 1973, the U.S. Government announced that it was despatching an aircraft carrier task force into the Indian Ocean as a part of the alert of U.S. forces around the world. This task force was not however, called back when the alert was lifted. According to the State Department, it was a precautionary move related to moves by other States in the Middle East crisis. Subsequently some other justifications were put forward such as the assertion of the right of navigation through the Straits of Malacca, balancing the increased Soviet naval presence in the Mediterranean, safeguarding the oil routes from the Middle East etc.

It is not easy for us to understand what particular task the Americans have before them for which they have thought it necessary to constitute the so-called task force.

I reiterated on November 1 the objective of our policy regarding the Indian Ocean i.e. to ensure that it remains an area of peace free from Big Power rivalry. Any large scale and loud presence of the navy of one Big Power is bound to attract the navies of other Big Powers. Such rivalry could create problems or littoral countries the overwhelming majority of whom desire to maintain

the Indian Ocean as an area of tranquility. Government of India have strongly supported the U.N. 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. In this context, we are naturally concerned at any escalation of a major naval power's presence in the Indian ocean.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: It is strange that the Government of India have strongly supported the UN General Assembly Resolution of December 16, 1971 declaring the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace for all time and an area of tranquility for all the littoral countries which are concerned, and yet there has been a deliberate and mischievous infiltration by great powers like America which has been making a sneaky attempt on the Indian Ocean by sending their task-force, which we do not know for what purpose they have sent. The External Affairs Minister has been astonished at this fact and he has made a statement to this effect, but it has proved beyond all reasonable doubt that America is operating on our Indian Ocean in order to create a big rivalry among the global powers, and this kind of thing happened at the time of the liberation of Bangla Desh also, when America sent the Seventh Fleet to the Indian Ocean in order to give a threat to the countries in this region which were peace-loving and supporting the cause of liberation of Bangla Desh.

Therefore, I would like to say that there is a big conspiracy behind this. Even in this Middle East crisis and this West Asian conflict, we are finding this. Deliberately, America is creating a situation, about which sensational revelations have been

made in many papers of this country, which have stated that war looms over the Indian Ocean, and there are certain acts of big powers like America in the Indian Ocean which are very disturbing, as, for instance, their developing Diego Garcia as a base for attacking ships, and it has been stated, for instance:

"In a trial of strength with the Socialist giant, but far from its own shores, the United States has chosen the Indian Ocean as the testing ground. With Diego Garcia as its strongest base in this region, the US Navy plans to control the movement of ships, particularly oil tankers."

This is a deliberate act by America, because India has supported the Arab countries. We are surely within our rights to support the Arab countries and work for the establishment of a durable peace in the Middle East, and thereby establish global peace in this world. It is gratifying to note that our astute leader of this country has been doing it, but unfortunately this kind of establishment of a base in the Indian Ocean has been a step which has been a source of great concern for a great and democratic country like India and the littoral States which are concerned with the Indian Ocean.

I would like to state that Bangladesh is a reality. Our External Affairs Ministry should know that this is a conspiracy to create a global rivalry in the Indian Ocean. It is a deliberate act of confrontation committed by the United States. High-ranking American diplomats have made it known that President Nixon's aim in ordering the aircraft carrier *Hancock* and five destroyers of the US Seventh Fleet from the Pacific to the Indian Ocean is to 'punish and warn the Indian and Bangladesh Governments' for supporting the Arabs in the war with Israel. This is in violation of the Resolution of the UN.

of December 16, 1971. By this Resolution the General Assembly had stated that the Indian Ocean should be kept as an area of peace and tranquility for the littoral States.

There is another aspect of the activity of the United States. They have set up and fortified a powerful base on Diego Garcia island in the British-owned Chagos Archipelago, 1000 miles south of Ceylon. Already nuclear missiles have been planted on the island according to intelligence reports. The nuclear armoury is now reinforced with sophisticated war planes, long-range delivery-vehicles for its nuclear warheads and an undisclosed number of servicemen.

It is also reported that more ships from the Seventh Fleet will soon be diverted to this region to patrol the waters from the mouth of the Persian Gulf, Aden and the Red Sea down to the Bay of Bengal and even further east. While helping along with the Seventh Fleet in the Mediterranean, to give flank support to Israel in case of another war with the Arabs, the Seventh Fleet contingent in the Indian Ocean is bent on deliberately provoking a conflict with the Arab States and its allies in Asia, like India and Bangladesh. This is prejudicial to the interests of India and Bangladesh. Such is the deliberate attempt on the part of the United States to produce a confrontation.

I would like to know whether the hon. Minister is aware of the fact that certain companies are operating in this area on a spying mission. It is reported that US spy trawlers operated by the Union Carbide, ostensibly on shrimp fishing, are in this area. They are equipped with sophisticated equipments and instruments for sounding and probing and other purposes.

This is how the United States has acted. It is a deliberate violation of the U.N. Resolution I have referred to

Therefore, I would like to ask the hon. Minister what steps he has taken to see that a protest is lodged against this action by America, which is an act of aggression, in order to create a global conflict in this region which is a matter of serious concern to the peace-loving countries of this region. Has a united effort been made by all the littoral States against this act of confrontation by the American Government? Has this matter also been brought to the notice of the United Nations? I would like categorical answers to these categorical questions.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: Sir, the hon. Member has given a lot of information, and I am sure that it is useful information. But I would like to add one thing. He made mention of Diego Garcia base of the United States of America. It is a fact that the United States Government announced that Diego Garcia became operational as of 23rd March, 1973. According to our information, it has a satellite tracking base in Seychelles, and a powerful communication station also they have got at Kagnew. They have got these facilities in that region.

About the object that the United States had in sending this fleet, I have myself mentioned in my opening statement the various conflicting reasons that the United States administration—the military authorities—have from time to time been giving, and I have no doubt in my mind that the very fact that they altered one reason after another does create a reasonable doubt about the credibility of these various reasons that they have given.

The hon. Member has quite naturally drawn the attention to the Arab-Israeli conflict, the situation in West Asia,—or the Middle East as other countries call it. It is true that the appearance of the task force in the Indian Ocean took place at a time

when this conflict was still going on. But the House is no doubt aware that very concrete steps over the last three or four days have been taken between the parties concerned, between Egypt and Israel, which had opened up the possibility of restoration of peace and for the stabilisation of the cease fire. Even if there was any justification at that time, which we reject out-of-hand for this fleet being present in this region, now that the peace situation prevails, and I must say that in this the United States and the Soviet Union have both co-ordinated their effort in bringing about a cease fire and are now making serious efforts to stabilise peace, there is no justification at present for bringing and keeping this task force in this region.

The hon. Member has expressed concern recalling the experiences of the Bangladesh crisis, when an element of the Seventh Fleet moved into the Bay of Bengal and had stated that India and Bangladesh have been naturally concerned when a naval force is in strength in this vicinity. According to our information, the task force has gone in the direction of Diego Garcia; that is a place, about which mention has been made, near Mauritius. (*Interruptions*). The best reaction in such a situation is not to be frightened, whether it is India or Bangladesh, just as we were not frightened when the Seventh Fleet moved, and a war was going on. Even when we were engaged in an armed conflict, we kept up our nerve and refused to be afraid. Why should we be now afraid? At the same time, we should continue our efforts in the United Nations and in other organisations in order to ensure that the Indian Ocean remains as an area of peace and tranquillity and free from big power rivalry. I must, at the same time, sound a note of warning that in this respect the response from the main big naval countries had not yet been encouraging. The main naval powers concerned in

this case would be the United States, France, Britain and the Soviet Union. They have not made any positive response to the UN resolution but other points have been raised, that it is a complicated issue and that it involves the right to the freedom of the seas.

But I must also add that China, out of the five permanent members of the Security Council, is the only country which supported this concept. We shall continue with the help of the United Nations forum and in the non-aligned Conference to support the move in the United Nations on the initiative of Sri Lanka that the UN should continue to mount pressure and mobilise international opinion to ensure that the Indian ocean remains an area of peace.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur): In the statement the Minister of External Affairs has said that it was not easy for us to understand what particular task the Americans have before them for which they have thought it necessary to send that task force. If he used that language for diplomatic purpose, it is all right but the task of the American imperialists should be better known to the hon. Minister than to any of us. Their nefarious game is known to all countries which had suffered at their hands, namely, Viet-Nam and Korea, Laos, Cambodia. I remember that during our conflict with Pakistan when our soldiers were fighting with the MuktiBahani, we were also threatened by the paper tiger and they sent their Seventh Fleet, they sent their ship called Enterprise. If India takes a firm attitude along with its neighbour the 7th Fleet meet its Waterloo in the Indian Ocean itself. I should like to know from the hon. Minister whether any protest note has been sent by the Government of India, apart from the UN General Assembly Resolutions. If so, what is their reply?

[Shri S. M. Banerjee]

The explanation given by them, according to Press reports, was not satisfactory to the Government of India. Is it a fact that by its 7th Fleet the United States is paving the way for the Toakin bay type of incident in the Indian Ocean? I shall quote from a report which says that one of these old ships had been sent to Tonkin Bay in Viet-Nam and possibly such a ship is here with possibly a plan to continue the war against Arabs. You know the history of that ship which was damaged. They wanted to escalate the war in Viet Nam and they adopted this method. These are criminal and sinister designs of the American imperialists who want to escalate the war or restart the war and thus help, the Israelis. The hon. Minister said that no information was received; he said that there was no response from the naval powers; he mentioned four countries and he said that it was not encouraging. Apart from that what further steps have been taken by us to register our protest and expose the criminal designs before the entire world. The hon. Minister said he did not know the task of that task force. The task of that task force was to escalate the war and spread the war and create war psychosis. But they did not succeed in this. I would like to know whether this matter has been taken up with all other countries so as to mobilise world opinion against this constant appearance of this Seventh Fleet in the Indian Ocean. I do not depend much on the UN Resolution, though we respect it. I want to know whether India has made it firmly clear to the American imperialists that if they tinker with the Indian Ocean or the Bay of Bengal, the Seventh Fleet will meet its Waterloo on the Indian Ocean or Bay of Bengal.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I would like to clarify that the Seventh Fleet has not come to the Bay of Bengal.

It has not come into our territorial waters or even near our territorial waters.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: I did not say that. I was referring to *Enterprise*.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: It is true that the *Enterprise* at the time of Bangladesh liberation did come to the Bay of Bengal. I have already made a reference to that when I was replying to Shri Lakkappa's question and I do not want to repeat it. As hon. members know, the Indian Ocean is a wide area starting from the Arabian Sea and Oman Coast down to the south-western tip of Australia and South Africa and all the littoral countries of Africa. Therefore, it has not been the practice and we do not want to create a new practice—that as soon as a naval ship belonging to any country enters the Indian Ocean, we should register a protest. Protest to whom? It is true in this particular case when these contradictory statements were made about the presence or bringing in an element of the Seventh Fleet into the Indian Ocean, we did ask the Americans both in Washington as well as here and they said, so far as India and this region is concerned, this, the naval force, is not directed against this region at all they are not likely to be in this vicinity. I myself made a public statement—that is even more than protest because protest generally remains on files—that it is our concern if there is any large scale presence of any naval power, because that will create a natural desire amongst the other navies to come in there. We do not want that the Indian Ocean should also become like the Mediterranean, which today is saturated with rival navies. We are also strongly urging in the UN and among the international community that every possible opinion should be mobilised in order to dismantle the foreign bases and ensure that the foreign navies do not come here in

any large number. Of course, some naval ships will always be here, just as our naval ships go to other friendly ports. Therefore, the mere presence of some naval ships is something about which we cannot object.

About taking it up with other countries, some particular countries, particularly African countries like Tanzania have already raised their voice against the presence of this navy. In these matters, where their immediate national interests are not affected, in the international community it takes time before they understand the implications and start reacting. I have no doubt that a vast majority of the littoral States surrounding the Indian Ocean will react in the manner in which we have reacted. We cannot ourselves start the type of activity which the hon. member mentioned because sometimes it can be counter-productive. Other countries are as much interested as we are. We have taken a public stand and now that it has been mentioned in Parliament, it will receive very wide publicity. I am pretty certain that all the non-aligned countries will react in the matter and that will have a great inhibiting effect upon the United States' ambitions, if they have any, to come here in any undesirable manner. I think this is the best way to deal with a situation of this type.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: A question was asked by Shri Lakkappa about Union Carbide, one of the American firms, which is helping them. He has not mentioned anything about it in the reply.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Gwalior): What has it to do with this?

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: In this report while dealing with the Pentagon it is stated:

"To make sure of its fighting ground and reap every vantage point in this vast waterway, the United States has utilized the services of a giant American commercial unit, Union Carbide."

It is an American firm in India I do not know whether any investigation has been made about it.

MR. SPEAKER: I have not been able to appreciate how the matter is relevant.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: At any rate, it is not relevant in the present context.

श्री मुल्लियार सिंह मलिक (रोहतक):

अध्यक्ष महोदय, पिछले चन्द सालों से अमेरिका और रशिया ये दोनों जो मार पावर हैं इन की नीति कई पॉलिटिक्स में इमिनेट करने के चली आती है और इसी तरह में वे अपने स्फेयर में आफ ऐक्टिविटीज को आपस में आहिस्ता आहिस्ता डीमाकंड भी कर रहे हैं। इसी तरह से हिन्द महासागर के अन्दर भी ये ऐक्टिविटीज को दिन प्रतिदिन इन्क्रीज कर रहे हैं। जो छोटे और कमजोर देश हैं उन को ये आपस में लड़ाने और भिड़ाने रहे हैं। मेरी तरफ से अध्यक्ष महोदय, भूत में और प्रेस में कोई परक नहीं है। अमेरिका और रशिया ये दोनों गुपर पावर जो हैं इन दोनों की नीति यह है और ये दोनों छोटे और कमजोर देशों के लिए पानक है। दोनों मिन कर वही काम करने हैं जैसे हमारे यहां मिसाल चली आती है कि जो बहुत जानाब और होशियार दुश्मन होगा उस को जब अपने दुश्मन को खत्म करना होगा तो वह चार को कहेगा कि तू लाय और गाह को या मकान मलिक को कहेगा कि तू जा। ये एक को लड़ाएंगे और दूसरे की मदद करेंगे इस एक मिसाल वेस्ट एशिया वार के अन्दर देखने का मिलती है। इस वार के अन्दर कोर्स और वार में और उस के बाद के निगोशिएशन आफ पीस में जो कुछ हुआ वह साफ तौर से जाहिर कर देता है कि रशिया और अमेरिका ने एक नया पैटर्न इस का अख्तियार किया है। क्योंकि लड़ाई के पहले आपस में इनका कम्पीटीशन रहा एक दूसरे कन्ट्री को आम करने का। यही नहीं जिस वक़्त वार ब्रेक आउट हो गया तो बजाय इस के कि उन को धाम्स को सप्लाय बन्द कर देते उस को और इन्क्रीज करते बले यों और किस तरह में उन के हाथ उन्होंने अपने हथियार

[श्री मुख्तियार सिर मलिक]

को वहां पर टाई करने का काम किया ये सारी चीजें एक मिसाल हमारे सामने पेश करती है।

इन सारी चीजों को देखते हुये मैं फाजिल मंत्री जी से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इन दोनों कन्ट्रीज की नैवल स्ट्रेन्थ हिन्दू महासागर के अंदर क्या है?

What is the comparative strength of the super powers in the Indian ocean?

दूसरी चीजें मैं मंत्री महोदय से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जो अमेरिकन फ्लीट के बाबद कहा गया जैसे कि एस एम बैनर्जी ने कहा कि हमारी गवर्नमेन्ट तो अब तक के बारे में पता नहीं लगा सकी

It is not easy for them to curb the activities of these naval fleets.

उस के साथ मैं यह पुछना चाहता हूँ कि यह रशियन नैवल फ्लीट जो हिन्दू महासागर में है उस की ऐक्टिविटीज क्या हैं यह, आप ने आज तक जानने की कोशिश की या नहीं की?

जहां तक मुझे याद है मैं ने पैपर्स में पढ़ा है हमारे मंत्री महोदय ने जो यह मूवमेन्ट हुई अमेरिकन फ्लीट को उसकी बाबत कहा की

It may be against the Arabs.

क्योंकि इन की ओवर आ करने को पालिसी है। यह उन्होंने कही कहा है कि इट में बी अग्रेस्ट अब्स तो क्या उन्होंने कोई अरब देशों में इस बारे में बातचीत की है अगर बातचित हुई है तो उन्होंने इस के बारे में अपना क्या ख्याल जाहिर किया है।

इस के साथ साथ एक बात और पूछना चाहता हूँ कि अभी पीछे आस्ट्रेलिया के प्रधानमंत्री यहां आए थे और प्रधान मंत्री तथा विदेश मंत्री की उन के साथ बातचित हुई इसके अलावा दूसरे जो देश हिन्दू महासागर के हैं क्या हमारी सरकार ने उन दूसरे देशों के साथ भी बातचित करने की कोशिश की है ताकि सब लोग मिल कर यह जो बढ़ती हुई ऐक्टिविटीज सुपर पावर्स की इंडियन ओशन के अंदर है उस के बारे में कोई एक मुश्तक नीति अपना

सकें क्या; इस बात की कोशिश की है या नहीं की है यदि उन देशों से बातचित की है तो उस के नतायज क्या है यह मैं माननीय मंत्री महोदय से पूछना चाहता हूँ।

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: The first point which requires clarification by me is the mention of spheres of influence. Whatever may be the desire of any big power to create any sphere of influence we have from the very beginning rejected this concept and we will not accept any sphere of influence in this region or in any other region. We are totally opposed to it and we will continue to pursue an independent policy not only in this region but we will continue to oppose the creation of any spheres of influence of the type the hon. Member has mentioned.

Then, he asked about our information of naval strength of various countries, particularly, about the United States of America and the U.S.S.R. The naval strength in any particular ocean, particularly, in the Indian Ocean, is not something which is constant. Ships come; ships go. Any statement that I make today or, in fact, on any occasion, will be really out of date. There is no doubt that there are the U.S. naval ships; there are the Soviet Union naval ships; there are the French and the British naval ships. Of course, there are naval ships of some of the littoral countries in this region. The presence of naval ships in the Indian Ocean at any given time is some thing about which it will not be proper or safe to give any figures because they continuously go on changing.

There is one fact, however, that the United States along with their allies have got some basic facilities in the form of either bases or some other arrangements. They have facilities at Diego Garcia. Then, in Pakistan and Iran which are CENTO allies those facilities are also available. On the western coast of Australia, there are some facilities available to the American and British naval forces. According to our information, there is

no such country which might have signed any pact with Soviet Union for any base facility of the type. This is the real distinction I can give. But the actual presence of naval-craft at any given time is something which goes on changing from time to time. I cannot give any figures with regard to that.

The hon. Member has said that the Australian Prime Minister visited India. It is true that we raised this matter with him and we were very happy to find that he also was of this view that the Indian Ocean should be kept as an area of peace and tranquillity, free from naval rivalry. That is a distinct improvement in the situation in this respect that the number of countries now supporting this concept of the Indian Ocean being kept as an area free from tension has increased; the powerful voice of Australia is also on this side, and that is a positive factor in the situation.

Then he asked whether on this issue we have talked to the Arab countries. He must realise that the main pre-occupation of Arab countries at the present moment is with the aftermath of the recent conflict. They know, as we know, that the Seventh Fleet elements have moved into the Indian Ocean as I have said, they have moved a little to the south-west portion towards Diego Garcia side—and we did not have any direct exchange of views with the Arab leaders on this problem. I do not know which statement the hon. Member is referring to in which I may have said that this might be directed against the Arabs. I am generally very cautious in these matters. May be, I may have mentioned that these are the various ideas that are floated, but I did not make any categorical statement to that effect.

SHRI P. M. MEHTA (Bhavnagar): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Indian Ocean has its own importance from the point of view of defence, American and Russian presence, trade routes and tapping of oil and other resources.

The statement that has been made appears to me to be only a statement of intentions, a reiteration of the objectives and policy of the Government of India; there is nothing concrete in the operative part of the statement.

This area of peace is being threatened by moves of big powers not for the first time—specially America and Russia have been continuously doing this; the move to build rival military bases has been under process for long. India has protested against these moves of big powers, but the Government has not succeeded in achieving its objective or policy so far. In the year 1969, Russia had planned to transform the Pakistani port of Gwadur, west of Karachi, into a submarine base, ostensibly for Pakistani use, and the United States had already begun transforming certain islands in the British Indian Ocean territory into air-sea transit communications and storage base. At that time India had taken up the Gwadur affair with the Soviet Union and the American affair with Britain. India had also protested against any action which, it neared would have the effect of importing big power rivalries and tensions into the hitherto untroubled Indian Ocean.

Now, we are protesting against the big power move to build up their military bases and to stop this rivalry, but it has not been achieved so far. It appears that we are not sincere or serious to achieve this objective. In July 1969, when our hon. Prime Minister returned to this country from abroad, a correspondent at the Calcutta airport put a question to her. This is what the *Hindustan Standard* of 7th July 1969 says:

"Asked about the Chinese allegation that India was allowing Russia to use some naval bases in the Indian Ocean, she is reported to have answered:—'We are not allowing any bases, but we cannot do anything about the movements of vessels of friendly countries.

[Shri P. M. MEHTA]

Our sea is open to any friendly country.”

Now, if this is the attitude, naturally, as stated in the statement of the Minister, ‘any large scale and loud presence of the navy of one Big Power is bound to attract the navies of other Big Powers.’ Now, this is the natural consequence which our country is facing.

The *Hindustan Times* of 11th August, 1973 reports:

“A Soviet Fleet is being steadily built up in the Indian Ocean as part of the preparation for a pre-emptive strike against China, according to a document smuggled from the Soviet Union to the West. Already 15 Russian ships—the document says—have been moved from the Mediterranean to the Indian Ocean waters....”

MR. SPEAKER: Please ask your question now.

SHRI P. M. MEHTA: This is very important. The correspondent says that 15 vessels have already sailed from the Mediterranean to the Indian waters. If we allow one country to move its ships in this part of the Indian Ocean, naturally, the other big powers are bound to come. There is no question about it.

Therefore, I would ask whether the Government propose to convene a conference of the littoral countries and find out the ways and means to stop this military rivalry of big powers. I also want to know whether the Government would take into confidence all the concerned countries and will take up the issue in the Security Council to keep the Indian Ocean as an area of peace.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I will not comment on the earlier part which was more of a statement rather than any question. So, I will confine myself to the specific points

which he has raised at the end of his long speech. Two things were asked by him. He asked whether it was our intention to convene a conference of littoral countries and mobilise opinion. My reply is that all the littoral countries may not be of the same mind. We must not forget that. There are countries surrounding the Indian Ocean who are members of certain pacts. There are two countries, Pakistan and Iran. They are members of CENTO. There are other countries. South Africa is one. Australia is a member of the Pact. There are others also and I need not elaborate this more.

There are the non-aligned countries surrounding the Indian Ocean who attended the Lusaka Conference and the Algiers Conference and as hon. Member know, in both these conferences the desirability of keeping the Indian Ocean as an area of peace and tranquility was highlighted and this is part of the Resolution or the Declaration adopted both in Lusaka as well as in Algiers.

Secondly, I would like to submit that this matter is already before the United Nations. Already a Resolution has been adopted by the General Assembly declaring that the Indian Ocean should be maintained as an area of peace free from big power naval bases and naval rivalries. And, the follow up action on that also is continuing in the United Nations.

So, in view of all these points, it is not necessary to convene a separate conference specifically on this issue as this matter is already before the international community.

THE PRIME MINISTER, MINISTER OF ATOMIC ENERGY, MINISTER OF ELECTRONICS AND MINISTER OF SPACE (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI): I am sorry I have been misquoted. I have not stated ships of friendly countries. I said ‘any ships’. I said, any ships, when they come, we cannot prevent them sailing

n the Indian Ocean. That is what I have said.

AN HON. MEMBER: This is till worse.

12.52 hrs.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

RISE IN PRICES OF ESSENTIAL COMMODITIES

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Members, I have received a number of Motions—Adjournment Motions, Calling Attention Motions etc. As you know, we have to admit only one. I have given my consent to the moving of an Adjournment Motion regarding rise in the prices of essential commodities. Shri S. M Banerjee's Motion has got the first place in the ballot. The reasons given are, abnormal rise in the prices of essential commodities, petrol, kerosene oil, diesel and gas, milk and ghee (Delhi Milk Scheme) and failure of the Government to check the same.

Mr. Banerjee, would you like to get up and seek the leave of the House?

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur): Sir, with your permission, I seek the leave of the House for admitting my Adjournment Motion on Price Rise.

MR. SPEAKER: There is no objection to it from any side.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI K. RAGHURAMIAH): Sir, we object to it because it amounts to a vote of censure. We have absolutely no objection for a discussion of the subject. But as Adjournment Motion, we do object to it, as it amounts to a vote of censure.

श्री अध्यक्ष बिहारी बाजपेयी (ग्वालियर):

अध्यक्ष महोदय जो, सरकार के लिये आवश्यक नहीं है कि वह स्थान प्रस्ताव का विरोध करे। आप को याद होगा एक बार लोक सभा में जब दिल्ली में गोली चली थी और श्री

कन्हैया लाल बाल्मीकि स्थगन प्रस्ताव लाये थे, जो कांग्रेस पार्टी के सदस्य थे सरकार ने आपत्ति नहीं की।

अध्यक्ष महोदय: सरकार का कहना है कि और ऐसे ही बहस करनी हो तो उन्हें कोई एतराज नहीं। लेकिन अगर आप सेंसर करते हैं तो उन को तो फिर एतराज करना ही पड़ता है। यह उनका कहना है।

Those who are in favour of it may please rise in their seats.

More than 50 Members are standing. So, leave is granted.

What time does the hon. Member want this to be taken up?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Two o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: So, this will be taken up at two o'clock.

12.56 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

PROCLAMATION REVOKING PRESIDENTS' RULE IN UTTAR PRADESH

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI F. H. MOHSIN): On behalf of Shri Uma Shankar Dikshit,

I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Proclamation (Hindi and English versions) dated the 8th November, 1973 issued by the President under clause (2) of article 356 of the Constitution revoking the Proclamation issued by him on the 13th June, 1973 in relation to the State of Uttar Pradesh, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 492 (E) in Gazette of India dated the 8th November, 1973, under article 356 (3) of the Constitution. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-5638/73.]