

Mr. Speaker: He will finish now. We have to take up the Half-an-Hour Discussion.

Shri N. Shivappa: I am concluding now. I hope the Railway Minister will take these valuable suggestions into consideration. I think, the whole matter will be reconsidered and a higher allotment will be considered. I hope the matter will be expedited and speedy work will be done. We should give that project the highest importance, so that we get the maximum benefit out of it.

17.35 hrs.

SUPPLY OF U.S. ARMS TO PAKISTAN*

Mr. Speaker: Only question and doubts might be raised instead of a speech, so that within half-an-hour we will be able to finish this.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): In reply to Starred Question No. 12 dated the 22nd May, 1967, regarding supply of U.S. arms to Pakistan, the hon. Minister stated in conclusion that:

"the U.S. authorities have informed us that the supply of spare parts is subject to a case-by-case examination of all requests and that each case will be considered bearing in mind the various considerations."

"They have also assured us that this policy is directed solely to preserve the interests of peace and to reduce tension, and that they do not intend to act to the detriment of our security interests".

I do not know how of all persons our very wise External Affairs Minister thought that the supply of spare parts by the US to Pakistan, even after this conflict with India, can serve the interests of peace and can reduce tension.

The other day, when his colleague, Shri Swaran Singh, was replying to a

call attention notice on the Akhnur firing, a pertinent question was put, I think, by Shri Hem Barua, whether the supply of spare parts by the US to Pakistan had aggravated the situation more and whether this had given them further impetus to start shooting on our borders. The Defence Minister did not rule it out. He said that he also thought in the same manner. So it is clear that the supply of US arms to Pakistan has aggravated tension on our borders.

Against the suspension of arms supply, Pakistan was threatening retaliatory action. I quote from *The Hindu* of 28th April 1966:

"FRESH THINKING LIKELY ON US ARMS TO PAK—Pindi closes down American military installations."

The item reads:

"The disclosure that Pakistan has retaliated against US suspension of arms to it by closing down some US military installations in North-Western Pakistan seems likely to reopen the debate within the US Government over whether or not Washington should continue to withhold arms aid to Pakistan".

"Both in public pronouncements and in their talks with Indian leaders from Mrs. Gandhi downwards, US leaders had given the impression that there is no likelihood of US resuming arms aid to Pakistan in the foreseeable future—at least not until Pakistan fulfilled one primary condition, its willingness to live at peace with India".

Despite all this, Pakistan threatened to close down certain American military installations necessary for their expansionist tendencies and designs. So ultimately they decided to give in to Pakistan and resume the supply of arms.

Previously also, I would draw your kind attention to the fact that certain

[Shri S. M. Banerjee]

questions were raised in connection with arms supply to Pakistan. In 1966, regarding West German supply of jets to Pakistan, I quote this from the *Hindustan Times* of 14 August 1966:

"BONN SALE OF JETS MAY START INTERNATIONAL ROW."

It was known that jets were being supplied to Pakistan by other countries which might result in an international row on our border.

"Large numbers of fully-operational Luftwaffe Sabre jets sold by West Germany to Iran at knockdown prices, are making their way to the Pakistan Air Force."

This was objected to by our Government. I doubt whether we have received any reply to our protest. I am told that these countries, who are allies or satellites of American imperialism are still supplying arms to Pakistan. When it was brought to Pakistan's notice that they also reduce their defence expenditure, what was the reply? Let me quote from the *Hindustan Times* of 12 June, 1966.

"PAK TO SPEND 12 PER CENT MORE ON DEFENCE"

Then Pakistan took a decision to have compulsory military training in the various schools and colleges . . .

Mr. Speaker: He is explaining the whole thing all right. But it looks as if the whole half an hour will be taken by him. There are two or three others also who have to speak and then the Minister has to reply.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I am at least entitled to ten minutes.

Mr. Speaker: I have no objection. But at 6 P.M. I will have to adjourn the House.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Under the rules, the Member who initiates it gets ten minutes. The others can put questions.

Mr. Speaker: There are a number of questions also.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: The Minister made a statement in this House believing seriously the intention of the US Government that their supplying spare parts to Pakistan will ease tension and is meant for peace. This is wrong. What they are doing in Vietnam, what they are doing in other places is known to us. The recent acceleration of tension in West Asia is a clear indication that American imperialists and monopolists are very serious about their intentions, and their help to Pakistan is a danger to our security. Even when it was brought to their notice that Pakistan was taking arms from China, they kept mum. No comments from the Senators. It was referred to the US Congress. They kept mum—nothing to do with it. We know that Pakistan is getting arms from China. Two ordnance factories have been set up or are being set up in East Pakistan with Chinese help. The US is also supplying them arms.

I wish to make it clear that it is high time that we also defined our foreign policy and stated what it should be. Do we still protest against these unfriendly acts by the US Government and keep quiet. Have our eyes not been opened even after what happened during the India-Pakistan conflict? Who were our friends then and who were enemies? Was this not clear before the eyes of the Indian people, before the eyes of the hon. Minister? Is it not a fact that the USSR stood like a rock by us as our friends.

Shri Banga (Srikakulam): Oh!

Shri S. M. Bhanuwar: Prof. Banga says 'Oh'. I understand his fear. But he need not have any grouse.

If we can have good relations with the Soviet Union, let us have a full-fledged arms pact with the Soviet Union to counteract the offensive launched by the American bloc on our soil. They are using Pakistan as a base against India in the name of fighting China. I am sure they did not object to the Chinese giving arms to Pakistan.

I suggest this is a shameful act and our External Affairs Minister should not issue statements like that of a widow in Hindu society having no son. I feel that the time has come for us to act. I feel there should be a definite understanding between India and the Soviet Union in the military sphere to counteract this move on the part of the American imperialists.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta. As I said, I am closing it at 6 o'clock.

Shri D. N. Tiwary (Gopalganj): On a point of order. Subsequent speakers could only ask a question and not make a speech.

Shri Randhir Singh (Rohtak): We should also be allowed to put questions.

Mr. Speaker: Only those who have sent chits will be allowed to ask questions.

Shri Thirumala Rao (Kakinada): May I make a submission?

Mr. Speaker: Those who have given notice will be allowed. You have not given notice. You are 'stealing' the question. You cannot be allowed. It is not proper. If you had given notice, I would certainly have allowed it.

श्री कंचर साहू (दिल्ली सदर) :
कांटेस वाले

श्री डी. एन. तिवारी : क्या ली थी कोई बात हो जाए ली कांटेस की बात करना शुरू कर दिया जाता है।

Mr. Speaker: I will ask Shri Tiwary to sit down. He is a senior member.

Shri D. N. Tiwary: He was accusing me and therefore, I have to retort.

Shri Thirumala Rao: My submission is that we have to regulate the debate according to the rules. The member who opens the discussion will have ten minutes. Then it is for you to decide how many questions are allowed, leaving sufficient time for Government to reply to the points raised.

Mr. Speaker: That is what I am saying. I have decided that. Only those who have sent chits will be allowed to put questions. If they all take half an hour, it is all right. I will close the discussion at 6 P.M. the Minister will be happy then because he will not have to reply. As far as I am concerned, I will close this at 6 P.M. If it is extended beyond that,

श्री कंचर साहू यन्त्र : पाकिस्तान की यू० एस० ए० ने प्रार्थना दिये हैं और यही कारण है कि टैंगन हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के बीच बढ़ा है। यह एक घनहीनो एकदमो यू० एस० ए० के पाट पर। हमारे बनर्जी साहब ने कहा कि प्राप एलायंस में शामिल हो जाएं, यू० एस० ए० द्वारा के साथ एलायंस कर लें। मैं न इस हक में हूँ कि यू० एस० ए० द्वारा के साथ एलायंस किया जाए और न ही इस हक में हूँ कि बमरौका के साथ किया जाए। इस को मैं गलत समझता हूँ। सैल्फ इटिरेस्ट में जो काम हो कंट्री के इटिरेस्ट में जो काम हो उसको प्राप करें। उसी को ध्यान में रखते हुए हमारी फारेन पालिसी बननी चाहिये। न हम बमरौका की तरफ जाये और न उस की तरफ न डिस्टेंडरशिप की तरफ और न डेमोन्स्ट्री की तरफ। फारेन पालिसी का जहाँ तक

[श्री कंधर लाल गुप्त]

सामग्य है दुनिया में न कोई किसी का दोस्त होता है और न दुश्मन, देश के हित में जो बात हो बहू होनी चाहिये। अमरीका की आज पालिसी बहू प्रतीत होती है कि हिन्दुस्तान उसके सामने हमेशा हाथ पसार खड़ा रहे। टेक्नीशियनों के मामले में, फूड के मामले में, धार्वस के मामले में, एक्सपर्ट्स के मामले में, सभी मामलों में इतना इनफ्लुट्रेशन यू० एल० ए० का हमारी लाइफ में, हमारे देश की साइड में हो गया है कि आज कहने को तो हम इन्विजेंट हैं सेमिन सोचने वाली बात यह है कि क्या हम सही मार्गों में इन्विजेंट हैं? अमरीका एक तरफ हट जाए तो हमारे देश का क्या अनेका? इस तरह की हालत घाज हो गई है। इस बास्ते आपकों सोचना चाहिये कि किस तरह से देश अपने पैरों पर खड़ा हो सकता है। वही पर अमरीका के पॉस कोर के बालेटीयर आ रहे हैं, वही पर टेक्नीकल एक्सपर्ट्स आ रहे हैं और वही पर कुछ और आ रहा है। यह बांज अन्द होनी चाहिये। फारेन ऐज जो हम से रहे हैं इसको हमें बन्द करना चाहिये, फिर बाहे बहू रूप हो या अमरीका हो या कोई दूसरा मुल्क हो। हम किसी के ऊपर निर्भर न रहे। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि इसके बारे में आप क्या कर रहे हैं।

अमरीका वही पालिसी अक्षयार कर रहा है जो जब अक्षय किया करते थे। वे हिन्दू मुसलमानों को लड़ाया करते थे। आज अमरीका ने पाकिस्तान को पकड़ लिया है और उसको पकड़ कर हमेशा के लिए टैशन को सा खड़ा कर दिया है। मैं समझता हूँ कि अमरीका को बता दिया जाना चाहिये कि यह उसका एक अन्तर्देशी एक्ट है और इस को हिन्दुस्तान कभी टालनेट करने को तैयार नहीं है। अक्षय अमरीका इसको नहीं मानता है तो इस अपने इन्विजेंट और एक्शन से जितना ज्यादा से ज्यादा प्रोटेस्ट कर सकते हैं उन्हें करना चाहिये। एन साइड कण्ड में

अमरीकी इन्विजेंट पाकिस्तान में भारत के खिलाफ इस्तेमाल किये थे और तब भी अमरीका ने कहा था कि वे हमारे खिलाफ इस्तेमाल नहीं होंगे। मैं सवाल पूछना चाहता हूँ। मंत्री महोदय बतयें कि धार्वस एंड क्वैररह पाकिस्तान को कितनी बिनी है और यह एड जो रिज्यूम की गई है क्या यह सही नहीं है कि पिछले कनफिडेंट में कितना पाकिस्तान का मुकसान हुआ था वह सारा मेक अप हो गया है और उससे कुछ ज्यादा ही धार्वस उसकी मिल गए है?

जीजी हमले के समय जितने धार्वस यू० एल० ए० ने हमें देने का वादा किया था उन में से कितने धार्वस अभी तक मिले हैं, यह भी मैं जानना चाहता हूँ। मेरी इनक्वायरी यह है कि मुश्किल से बाधा माल ही हमें मिला है और पाकिस्तान के मुकामले में हमें कुछ भी नहीं मिला है।

Shri V. Krishnamoorthi (Cuddalore): After the Tashkent Declaration, the entire country knows what was the attitude of the United States Government; and in spite of our objections not to give any military assistance to Pakistan which will create another conflict between India and Pakistan, the United States Government have revived their policy of aiding them by way of spares and other things. This is a serious situation which has put the security of India into jeopardy, and this gives room for a lot of confusion among the other countries also. The hon. Minister has already pointed out that the revival of the policy of the United States Government is more slanted towards Pakistan, but he cannot keep quiet simply saying so. What action has the Government taken? Has he taken it up in the Security Council or the United Nations Organisation to condemn the acts of the United States Government in this regard? Pre-

viously when they were giving aid through the Dulles Mission we had raised a lot of objections, but in spite of the objections they had given arms aid to Pakistan, and that created the last conflict. What action has the Government taken to condemn the United States Government through the United Nations Organisation. Do the Government propose to acquire more arms from some other countries, without allying itself with the Soviet bloc or some other bloc? Will the Government clarify the position?

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): As a result of the new orientation of their policy, the United States Government is going to resume aid to Pakistan by way of supply of spare parts etc. Pakistan has been getting from USA military aid as a member of SEATO and CENTO which consists of...

Mr. Speaker: You do not go into the details now; everybody knows them.

Shri D. C. Sharma: In view of all this, I want to know, what is the total amount of aid which Pakistan is getting as a member of the treaty organisation and what are the terms on which Pakistan is going to get that aid?

Shri F. Venkatasubbalah (Nandal): By the resumption of military aid to Pakistan by the US Government, it is clear that they want to maintain the balance of power and to foment eternal conflict between India and Pakistan. May I know whether Pakistan is the beneficiary as it is getting aid from both the US and China and also from other countries like Iran? Has any diplomatic action been taken by the E. A. Minister to impress upon these countries that are supposed to be friendly towards us and whose causes we have been espousing so that they may not be instruments in sending arms to Pakistan?

Shri D. C. Sharma: It is not balance of power but balance of terror.

Shri Indrajit Gupta (Allipore): Apart from making plaintive appeals and protests to the US and hoping against hope that Pakistan will behave itself, may I know what positive initiatives in the field of foreign policy, if any, had been taken by the Government in order to meet the new threat by widening our circle of friends and our potential allies so that in case the worst happens we are not left all alone?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri M. C. Chagla): Mr. Speaker, I do not think Mr. Banerjee was quite fair to me when he read out the last part of my answer out of which this discussion arose. All that we have put in there was the American case. Our case is stated in the earlier part of the answer and may I read it out again lest the House forget it:

"Having been unfortunately the victims of Pakistani military aggression, we have been consistently pointing out to the U.S. Government the dangers to our security which would result from any accretion to Pakistan's military strength which will inevitably result from the reactivation of Pakistan's military machine built up of arms and armaments received as aid from the U.S.A. We have pointed out to them that Pakistan is the only beneficiary of the latest U.S. decision since we had not acquired any appreciable quantity of U.S. arms, while Pakistan would be able to restore and increase her offensive strength against us."

Then comes their case, that is the U.S. case.

"The U.S. authorities have informed us that the supply of spare parts is subject to a case-by-case examination of all requests and that each case will be decided bearing in mind various considerations. They have also assured us that this policy is directed solely to serve the interests of peace and to reduce

[Shri M. C. Chagla]

tension, and that they do not intend to act to the detriment of our security interests."

We have entirely disagreed with this and we have pointed out the implications. We strongly protested both here and in Washington that the new policy which the United States had initiated will be most prejudicial to India and far from working for peace will increase tension between Pakistan and India. Unfortunately the USA always equates India with Pakistan; that has always been the trouble. They say: we will give you the same as we give to Pakistan. We will study your requests case by case and we will give you spares as we give to Pakistan. The US forgets that the whole military establishment in Pakistan was built by American arms. We have hardly any American arms so that by giving spares to Pakistan, they are reactivating the whole military machine of Pakistan. What spares can we ask from the United States? We have hardly bought any arms; we have either bought them from the United Kingdom or from the USSR. Therefore, the whole fallacy lies in this. While saying, "Oh, we are impartial, we are objective, we are treating both the countries alike," we have pointed out to them that in saying this, "you are in fact acting in a manner prejudicial to India". I quite agree with Shri Banerjee that the result of the promise has been to increase the tension. Pakistan is in this favourable position. She has got arms from China who is the enemy of the United States; she has got arms on a large scale from there. She will now get spare parts from the United States which will make it possible to restore the military machine as it was before the Indo-Pakistan conflict. We have also pointed out as to Pakistan's behaviour in the Kutch conflict and the Indo-Pakistan conflict. As the House will remember, President Eisenhower had given us a solemn assurance that the arms supplied to Pakistan will not be used against

India; they were intended to be used against communists and the communist threat. What happened? We know it to our cost. It was the American tanks, the American aircraft, which took part in the conflict in Kutch and more so in the conflict of September, 1965. It was with American arms that Pakistan fought us; it was due to the bravery of our Jawans, it was due to the machines which we had, which were perhaps not as good as the American machines, and because of the will and determination of our people that we won that war. We pointed this out to them. We said, how can we trust a country which has violated an assurance given by it to you; and we have told them, "What is the guarantee that any assurance that you might get from Pakistan now will be kept"? Therefore, it is wrong to believe....

Shri Indrajit Gupta: So you still believe in the innocence of the Americans.

Shri M. C. Chagla: We have protested. We have said this is wrong. Again, it is very illogical. . .

Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta: Are you quite convinced about the US intentions?

Shri M. C. Chagla: The United States tells us that "We are very much interested in the reduction of arms in India and Pakistan. We are very much interested in seeing that this arms race does not go on. Cut down your arms and we will try to persuade Pakistan to do so". While they say this on the one hand, they give spare-parts to Pakistan, which compels us in our defence for our own security to take measures for our security.

Shri S. S. Kothari (Mandsaur): What about the arms promised to you at the time when the Chinese invaded us?

Shri M. C. Chagla: We did get.

Shri S. S. Kothari: Have you got them?

Shri M. C. Chagla: At that time, we did get. There is no doubt.

Shri S. S. Kothari: Only a part.

Shri M. C. Chagla: We got them. But that was intended for the specific purpose of mountain warfare against China. It was not intended for any fight which we may unfortunately have in future with Pakistan. These arms were specifically intended for any aggression by China.

Shri Rang: Now, what is it you are going to do?

Shri M. C. Chagla: My hon. friend asks, "What is it you are going to do"? There is one thing that this country can do, and that is, what was suggested by the hon. Member there. We must learn to stand on our own feet and take every measure possible to see that our defence is strong, that we are vigilant, and we are not caught napping by the strength that Pakistan is building up. It was said, "Have we made diplomatic representations to countries which are supplying arms to Pakistan"? Let me make this clear. Pakistan is shopping all over Europe for arms. When we come to know of some country supplying arms, we take up this question, as we did in the case of Germany. Shri Banerjee referred to this. Germany sold aircraft to Iran which we found had gone to Pakistan; we took up that question.

श्री म. च. चगला : सब देशों का बाद में-आपट दि हूँ-पता चला । हमारे दुःखान पड़ने का करते रहे ?

श्री म. च. चगला : अब पता चला, तो इस शी में बड़ा कार्रवाई की गई ।
18 hrs.

Shri Phoo Mody (Godhra): The hon. Member is surprised that you did not know about it before.

Shri M. C. Chagla: West Germany gave us an assurance that these aircraft were with Pakistan only for servicing and they will go back to Iran. We are told both by West

Germany and Iran that; barring 10 or 12 of the Sabre jets, the rest have gone back to Iran.

Shri F. Venkatasubbalah: So, Iran is the villain of the piece.

Shri M. C. Chagla: Let me make one thing clear. Very often arms are purchased from private commercial firms dealing in arms, over which we have no control. In many countries, there is no control over sale of arms. I think it is a shameful thing. The fact that a private concern should make money out of endangering peace is a disgraceful thing, but there it is. In many European countries, there are private manufacturers manufacturing arms and they are entitled to sell it to any country. Therefore, if Pakistan goes shopping round Europe buying arms, there is nothing we can do, except to take the necessary steps to safeguard our interests.

श्री एच.वी.र. दिहू : वॉटन टैंक चीन से बंद
जट का मुकाबला किस चीज से करना है
परि उनसे कहां से लेने ?

श्री म. च. चगला : दुनिया में जो
हमारे मित्र देश हैं उन से लेने ।

Shrimati Sushila Rohatgi (Bilhaur): In spite of the various assurances given by the US Government and in spite of the various protests lodged by our Government, if Pakistan still takes action against India, is the US Government prepared to give a commitment that it will come to our assistance in that case?

Shri M. C. Chagla: As I said, the assurance was given to us last time by President Eisenhower. But I do not believe in any assurance. I believe in our own strength. If we are strong, we can defend ourselves. Assurances depend upon political considerations.

18.03 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, May 30, 1967/Jyaistha 9, 1989 (Saka).