

बन्ध सन्त्रास्त्र राज्य सरकार को सौंप दिये जाते हैं ।

12 hrs.

**REPORTED RAIDS ON CERTAIN VILLAGES IN WEST BENGAL**

**SHRIMATI ILA PALCHOU DHURI** (Krishnagar) : Sir, there has been very disconcerting news from West Bengal in today's papers that 2,000 men raided a village and hacked two people to pieces. These are said to be CPI (M) people. Not only had they gheraoed the thana but it was only after those who were arrested were let off that the gherao was lifted.....

(Interruption)

**MR. SPEAKER** : We are having a debate at 4 O'clock on this.

**SHRIMATI ILA PALCHOU DHURI** : The Government should make a statement on this, if necessary, after verifying it from the West Bengal Government.

12.01 hrs.

**CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE:**

**Reported violation of air corridor between West and East Pakistan by Pakistani aircraft**

**SHRI D. N. PATODIA** (Jalore) : Sir, I call the attention of the Minister of Defence to the following matter of urgent public importance and I request that he may make a statement thereon:--

Reported continuous and wilful violation of the air corridor between West and East Pakistan by Pakistani aircraft over the territory of India.

**THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE AND STEEL AND HEAVY ENGINEERING** (SHRI SWARAN SINGH) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have to inform the House that on 30th October 1969, a Pakistan Air Force C 130 aircraft over flying Indian territory between Dacca and Karachi flew up to 5 nautical miles outside the Pre Determined Route for a distance of 160 nautical miles.

This was, by any standard, a serious violation of Indian air-space and continued in spite of the fact that the Flight Control at Calcutta repeatedly asked the aircraft to return to the Pre-Determined Route. The Pakistan Air Force C-130 returned to the Pre-Determined Route only after our aircraft were sent to intercept it.

We have lodged a strong protest against the continued and frequent violation of Pre-Determined Route by Pakistan Aircraft over flying Indian territory. We have urged to Government of Pakistan to give firm instructions to the crew of all aircraft over flying Indian territory to remain strictly within the Pre-Determined Routes.

**SHRI RANJEET SINGH** (Khalilabad) : Our Defence Minister has one weapon, the weapon of protest.

**SHRI D. N. PATODIA** : It is a very serious matter and the Hon. Minister by making a statement has concealed much more than what he has revealed.

**SHRI RANJEET SINGH** : We seriously protest to him.

**SHRI D. N. PATODIA** : This corridor facility given to Pakistan came out of an agreement signed between India and Pakistan more than two years ago by which Pakistan allowed only one Indian military courier plane to fly over their territory. Indian plane was to be fully searched at Karachi; no photographic material was permitted to be taken and the crew was not permitted to move out of the airport. In return, India allowed Pakistan to fly all sorts of military and combat planes, to transport all sorts of military equipment, to halt at Lucknow and to permit the crew to move out of the airport, mix with the civilians and make all sorts of investigations.

This agreement about which violation has been reported now has done no good to India. In fact, it has done a lot of damage to India. In course of these more than two years, all our missile sites of India have been thoroughly photographed by them and they have been able to locate the gap points of our radar system by which, in future, these Pakistani aircraft

[Shri D. N. Patodia]

with be able to overfly our territory with out being detected by our radar system. In respect of this violation, the manner in which the protest note has been made by the hon. Minister is extraordinary. The violation took place on 30 October and the protest note was sent after 23 days on 23rd November only after some other protest note a similar incident was earlier received from Pakistan.

In view of these developments, I wish to ask certain pertinent questions from the hon. Minister. Where was the necessity for India to enter into such an agreement which is so much adverse to India's interests? Was the agreement signed against the advice of the Air Chief at that time? How many violations by Pakistan were detected from the beginning of the agreement? Why was this protest note sent after 23 days after the date of the violation? Why is it in this particular case India did not shoot down Pakistani aircraft because it dived in to our territory up to five miles, particularly, when sometime back an Indian plane was shot down by Pakistan on similar grounds? Has the incidence of violations increased after resumption of arms supply to Pakistan by U. S. S. R. and U. S. A.?

My last point is about the Tashkent Agreement. Regarding the Tashkent Agreement which is, in any case, a dead document about which neither U. S. S. R. nor Pakistan are any more concerned, is India now prepared, in view of these developments, to repudiate the Tashkent Agreement rather than permit herself to be humiliated on every occasion?

SHRI RANJEET SINGH : Scrap it. *(interruption)*

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : The hon. Member has put too many questions. I will try to answer as many of them as possible briefly instead of trying to reply to his general arguments.

In the first place, I would like to say very categorically that is wrong to say that the agreement of over flights between India and Pakistan is weighted against us. It will be absolutely wrong for us to take that view. It is a reciprocal arrangement

where over flights of the aircraft of the country are permitted over the air space of the other. C-130 is a transport plane with which we are concerned now..... *(Interruption)*

SHRI RANJEET SINGH : What about their fighters and combat aircraft? He is trying to mislead the House.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : It is a very wild charge. If you make a charge in such a manner, it is very surprising. We have also got the right to overfly the fighter and combat aircraft of the Indian Air Force over the Pakistani territory and we have actually utilised this facility ..

AN HON. MEMBER : How many times?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : A very large number of times. That should set at rest any apprehension.

The other point made was that all our missile sites and radar gaps have been detected. That is also incorrect. There was no justification from this question to make any such allegation ..

SHRI D. N. PATODIA : Why not?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : The first question was about the necessity of the agreement. That is a reciprocal arrangement where facilities are made available to either country and it is something which is in our mutual interest.

SHRI D. N. PATODIA : Not at all.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Then, this agreement was entered into after taking the advice of the Air Chief. It is wrong to suggest that this was entered into against the advice of the Air Chief. This is a suggestion which is totally unfounded. I would request the hon. Member not to make such an allegation unless he has verified it.

SHRI D. N. PATODIA : Are you sure about it?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I am absolutely sure.

**SHRI D. N. PATODIA :** No.

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH :** It is amazing that you should go on persisting some thing without having any knowledge of facts. About this particular violation, as the House is no doubt aware, PDR is a Pre-Determined Route which is a line across which the aircraft of one country overfly another country's territory. If there is any deviation, according to well established international practices, the Air Control warns them that they are out of the PDR. and ask them to come back to the PDR. If they do not come back, we scramble our aircraft.

In this particular case, our fighter aircraft went up and drove it back to the PDR. It is no good...

**SHRI RANJEET SINGH :** It should have been forced to land.

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH :** ...to shoot down transport aircraft of other countries. It will be bad and it is against international practice. However much you may have these feelings of suspicion against Pakistan, we should not depart in a light hearted manner and in a spirit of bravado, from international practices that obtain in such cases. Shooting is not undertaken in the case of transport aircraft about which they already notify that a particular plane is going. And I would request the hon. Member not to cite examples without carefully checking them up. In the case of shooting down of our Canberra, we protested at that time that it strayed into their territory.

**SHRI RANJEET SINGH :** We did not protest.

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH :** If a transport plane...*(Interruptions)*.

I do not give way. That is not the way to deal with it. I refuse to take note of such interruptions.

The point is if in a particular case a transport plane is going and is permitted to go and it deviates from PDR, there are well recognised conventions and international practices about giving a warning to it and

asking it to come back to the PDR. If it does not obey, we scramble our aircraft and compel it to come back to the PDR. But shooting down is an extreme step which we should not undertake and I am not also sorry that we did not undertake shooting.

**SHRI D. N. PATODIA :** What about the delay in protest ?

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH :** Sir, there is no connection between these deviations and the resumption of supplies of arms to Pakistan by some nations. Of course, hon. Members may not like many things, but lumping them all together and trying to build up a case without trying to understand the real implications is unfair.

**SHRI D. N. PATODIA :** Why was there so much delay ?

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH :** In such cases, Mr. Speaker, the protests are lodged by the Ministry of External Affairs and in this particular case I think they lodged the protest on 15th November, 1969.

**SHRI RANJEET SINGH :** Why was it lodged after 3 weeks ?

**श्री रवि राय (पुरी) :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं रक्षा मंत्री जी से स्पष्ट जवाब चाहता हूँ कि एयर कोरीडोर एग््रीमेंट पाकिस्तान से होने के बाद कभी इस अवधि में कोई बॉम्बर या मिलिटरी एयर क्राफ्ट ने हमारे आकाश का उल्लंघन किया था ? यदि हाँ तो क्या सरकार सदन को बतायेगी कि अगर भविष्य में ऐसा किया गया तो हम उसको मार गिराने की कोशिश करेंगे ? क्या इस प्रकार बॉम्बर या मिलिटरी हवाई जहाजों द्वारा हमारे आकाश का उल्लंघन किये जाने पर उनको मार गिराने के लिये सरकार के पास हिम्मत की कमी है, या तेज हवाई जहाज हमारे पास नहीं है, या इन्विपमेंट की कमी है ? क्या कारण है न मार गिराने के ? इस के बारे में मैं मंत्री जी से स्पष्ट उत्तर चाहता हूँ ।

पहला यह कि क्या कोरीडोर एग््रीमेंट होने के बाद पाकिस्तान के साथ, उन के मिलिटरी

[श्री रबिराय]

या बॉम्बर हवाई जहाजों ने हमारे आकाश का उल्लंघन किया है? यदि किया है तो क्या दिक्कत थी जिस से उन को मार कर नहीं गिराया? मार कर गिराने के लिये क्या सरकार के पास हिम्मत की कमी है, या तेज हवाई जहाजों की या इन्विजेंट की कमी है?

मैं मंत्री महोदय को बताना चाहता हूँ कि जैसे रूस सरकार ने अमरीका के 'यू 2' जहाज को गिराया था उस का अनुकरण आपको करना चाहिए। इस तरह का कोई कदम उठाने का विचार सरकार का भविष्य में है; रूस ने दिखा दिया कि किस ढंग से अपने आकाश और मुल्क की रक्षा की जा सकती है। उनका अनुकरण हम को करना चाहिये। मैं चाहूँगा कि मेरे इन सवालों का उत्तर मंत्री जी स्पष्ट रूप से दें।

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : With regard to the first question, I would like to say that the House may kindly keep a distinction between the permitted flights even by military aircraft over the Indian territory and intruders.

श्री रवि राय : मैं वायलेशन के बारे में पूछ रहा हूँ।

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : So far as the mutual agreement is concerned, we can transport our military aircraft over Pakistani territory. That is permissible. On that, the precaution is that there has to be a landing. If it is our aircraft, then it has to land in Pakistani territory at one point which is mutually agreed. If it is Pakistani aircraft it has to land at an Indian airport before it is permitted to go ahead. If there is an intruding aircraft of Pakistan or of any other country, it is our job to shoot it down and it is wrong to suggest that we have not got the equipment. We have equipment and so far as courage is concerned, the hon Member may lack courage, but it will be a bad day if the Air Force lacks courage.

श्री रवि राय : एक लाख वर्ग मील का इलाका पाकिस्तान और चान को दे कर आप

करेज के बारे में उपदेश दे रहे हैं। इस तरह की बात मत कहा कीजिये। कोलम्बो प्लान की अभी भी धर्यो आप उतार रहे हैं।

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : It is a well recognised international practice that intruding military aircraft can be shot down. We are in a position to undertake that. This is quite in accordance with international practice and we are well-equipped to do that.

SHRI HEM BARUA (Mangaldai) : Sir, we are told by his predecessor Shri Krishna Menon that shooting down would not be a civilised manner.

MR. SPEAKER : Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta.

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त (दिल्ली सदर) : मंत्री महोदय ने कहा कि यह जो एग््रीमेंट है यह म्यूचुअल इंटरैस्ट में है और रेंस प्रोकल है। मेरा कहना है कि यह एग््रीमेंट हमारे देश के हित में नहीं है और सरकार की अपीजमेंट पोलिसी का हिस्सा है शायद इस अंश में कि आहिस्ता आहिस्ता हमारे रिलेशन पाकिस्तान के साथ नामल हो जायेंगे। लेकिन रिलेशन नामल होने के बजाय हीस्टाइल हो रहे हैं जिस तरह से पाकिस्तान बिहेव कर रहा है। रबात में हमारी बेइज्जती कराई, खां अब्दुल गफ्फार खां को पाकिस्तान के ऊपर से नहीं आने दिया गया, उनको दूरसे रास्ते से आना पड़ा, तो इस तरह का हीस्टाइल एटीट्यूड जो पाकिस्तान का है उग के बाद भी हम ने यह एग््रीमेंट किया हुआ है, और मंत्री जी कहते हैं कि हमें भी फायदा हुआ है। तो मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि पिछले दो साल से जब यह एग््रीमेंट हुआ है हमारे कितने जहाज उसकी सीमा पर से उड़े और उनके कितने हमारी सीमा पर से उड़े। हमें थोड़ी दिक्कत होगी इस एग््रीमेंट को खत्म करने से जब कि पाकिस्तान का बहुत ज्यादा होगी क्योंकि दोनों विंग मिलाने में उसको बड़ी दिक्कत होती है। तो मेरा कहना है कि मंत्री महोदय क्या यह फिगर देंगे कि कितने

हमारे हवाई जहाज उधर गये और कितने उन के हमारे ऊपर से उड़े। जो स्पाइंग का काम कर रहे हैं, जैसे पटोदिया साहब ने कहा, उस का परिणाम कहीं यह न हो कि जैसे इजराइल ने अचानक यू० ए० आर० पर हमला कर दिया, ऐ ही कोई ताज्जुब की बात नहीं हमारे साथ भी ऐसा ही हो जाय तब आप कहें कि हम क्या करें, पाकिस्तान ने हमारी ओक में छुरा मार दिया। इसलिये देश के इंटरेस्ट को देखते हुए क्या मंत्री महोदय अपनी पोलिसी को रिवाइज करेंगे और इग ऐग्रीमेंट को खत्म करेंगे ताकि पाकिस्तान का जो हीस्टाडल ऐट्रीट्यूड है, चाहे ताश्कन्द डिक्लेरेशन के बारे में हो, चाहे खान अब्दुल गफार खां के बारे में हो, चाहे रबात के बारे में हो गुरीला वार-कंपर के बारे में हो, यह बन के ट्रैफिक बन्द हो। और क्या आप पाकिस्तान को बतायेंगे कि हम वही करेंगे जैसा आप हमारे साथ करेंगे। साथ ही क्या यह भी मही है कि आपने मिलिटरी प्रथोरिटिज को इम्प्टूकवन्म दे रखे है कि किमी कीमत पर हवाई जहाज को दूट नहीं करना चाहिये? क्या पोजीशन है यह जरा बता दें।

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH :** Mr. Speaker, Sir, may I say very categorically that it is absolutely wrong to suggest that we are adopting a policy of appeasement? There is no question of following a policy of appeasement. We have to follow a policy which is in the best national interest--and that is precisely our approach to this problem. As regards the specific question that has been asked, this has nothing to do with the general foreign policy overtones which are interwoven very cleverly by Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta into his question. This is a direct agreement in mutual interest ..

**SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA :** What is the mutual interest ?

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH :** ...and it will not be good to cast aside all agreement of mutual interest merely because we have got other problems which are irritating and

which are straining the relations between the two countries.

As regards the number of aircraft, I have not got the information at present, and, therefore, I cannot give straightway the exact number of Indian aircraft which overflew their territory and of the Pakistani aircraft which overflew our territory. But I constantly keep an eye on this comparison, and I would like to say that the comparison is not unfavourable to India. It is more or less favourable; we are also equally interested, and it will be wrong for us to imagine that it is an one-way traffic. That would be a wrong assessment of the situation.

As regards the third question, after I have stated categorically in reply to an earlier question that if there is an intruding military aircraft, we would be perfectly justified in shooting it down, there was no justification to ask me whether there were any instructions issued by us that the IAF will not shoot down in any case; that is not correct; no Air Force can be given such an order, and no Government can give such an order. Each situation has to be judged on merits.

**SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA :** Will he scrap this agreement? That was my pertinent question.

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH :** We are not going to scrap the agreement. I should like to say that categorically.

**SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA :** Why ?

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH :** Because it is not in our interest to do so.

**SHRI CHENGALRAYA NAIDU :** (Chittoor) : This is not the first time that Pakistani planes have intruded into our air space wilfully. There have been several such instances. In this case, it is not the case of any plane going on the basis of any agreement. Here, clearly they have violated our air space and have come about five miles into our territory. The hon Minister says that our fighter planes had gone and brought it back. May I know from the hon. Minister to which airport the plane was

[Shri Chengalraya Naidu]

brought ? It was not brought. He only says that our planes went and brought it. I would like to know whether we had asked them to come down and land in our airport. Then, we could have found out whether the plane was a military plane or a transport plane or even if it was a military plane, whether there were any military personnel in it or whether any photographic equipment had been fitted into it. We would have found out all those things. Wilfully, the hon. Minister is not instructing our Air Force to bring the plane down to our airport, so that our planes could go up and bring it down.

I know that the Air Force is fully equipped, and our Air Force personnel has got courage; of course, the hon. Minister has no courage to ask them to shoot it down. In the face of this, I think it is better for him in the interest of the country to resign from Government here and now and come out. What steps did he take to instruct the Air Force to see that if there is an air space violation, the plane must be brought down to our airport and not to their airport in Pakistan ?

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH :** I am glad that my cousin.....

**SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA :** He is a step brother now...

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH :** who has walked over to the other side has been good enough to give all the credit to our Air Force which it deserves, both in regard to their capacity as well as in regard to their courage. I attach greater importance to that but I am not bothered about the hoos of the hon. Member, because they are absolutely irrelevant. This is a matter in which my courage or cowardice does not matter at all... There are well recognised...

**SHRI CHENGALRAYA NAIDU :** I am not a coward. I have got courage; that is why I have come and sat down here. He is a coward, and that is why he is still sitting there

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH :** I would like to tell him again...

**SHRI RANDHIR SINGH (Rohtak) :** He is a brave because he is a kisan,

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH :** At least on facts, at any rate, let there be no disagreement. All military aircraft, whether they are fighters, bombers or transport aircraft, if they fly over Indian territory, have to land at an Indian airport of our choice, and no aircraft has been permitted to overfly our territory, that is, no Pakistani military aircraft has ever been permitted to overfly Indian territory without landing at an Indian airport, and this particular case is not an exception. Therefore, it is no use saying that if it had landed, we would have checked up and so on. Actually, every military aircraft lands, and this had also landed in our territory.

The present question is a simple one. It relates to deviation from PDR. Deviation from the PDR has to be corrected by warning by Air Control. If they do not heed the warning, then we scramble our Fighter aircraft, that is, our aircraft go into the air and tell the pilot 'If you do not deviate, we shall shoot the plane down'. If he accepts it and comes back PDR, that is the end of the matter.

**SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK (South Delhi) :** The hon. Defence Minister is very adept in the art of evading issues. Here too, he is taking refuge under a very technical thing that it deviated only by five miles, and we did all that. But can he deny the fact that Pakistan is following a policy of enmity towards India, and that Pakistan is doing everything possible to damage India's interest, to work up the people within the country to work against the Government and it is flouting the Tashkent Agreement in every possible way ? In view of all these things, just to take shelter behind only five miles is not proper. My question is very simple. According to the hon. Minister, what is Pakistan's intention towards this country ? The Foreign Minister is also sitting here and he has said on 8th October, that he had met his Pakistani counterpart and that he saw that there was a definite change in the Pakistani attitude. On the very next day, the Pakistan Foreign Office declared that there was no change in Pakistan's attitude. He is living in a world of phantasy, in a wishful world. He thinks that something will happen according to him, but that is not happening.

Now, I would like to ask two or three very specific questions. Is it a fact that he lodged his protest only after the Pakistan Foreign Office, inkeeping with its policy of taking the offensive, had called our Military Attache and lodged a protest, and it is only after they lodged a protest that we thought of lodging a protest ?

Then, the hon. Minister has said that this agreement is not working against our interest. He says that he does not have any figures. But in reply to a question by Shri Ranjit Singh on the 11th December, 1968, he has said that between 1st January, 1966 and 11th September, 1966, 57 Pakistani planes were allowed to fly over our territory while only 23 Indian planes flew over Pakistani territory. If that was the ratio in 1966, what is the ratio in 1967, 1968 and 1969 ? How does the hon. Minister say that this agreement is not working against our interest and that we are more benefited by it than Pakistan ?

My third question is this. In reply to Q. No. 221 today, which relates to the Tashkent agreement, we have been told by Government that Pakistan has agreed only to those steps in the implementation of article 6 of the Tashkent agreement as are to its benefit, and then the other details have been given.

When Pakistan is doing all those things which are in Pakistan's interest, and Pakistan is making only piece-meal agreements with us, which go against our interest, may I know why we always oblige Pakistan by entering into agreements which are in favour of Pakistan and not in favour of India ? In view of this record of Pakistani behaviour for the last five years regarding the Tashkent agreement, may I know whether the hon. Minister is prepared to reject and scrap the Tashkent agreement altogether and say that we are no longer bound by it as Pakistan is not bound by it and that we shall adopt a posture of relationship towards Pakistan which is based on pure reciprocity and mutuality of interest and firmness and other things and that the cobwebs that we may have in our minds regarding our relations with Pakistan would be removed ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I would suggest that so far as the foreign affairs

aspect is concerned, the hon. Member should keep his powder dry for a debate on foreign affairs, and I would not like...

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK : Is defence separate from foreign affairs ? The Foreign Affairs Minister is sitting just close to him...

SHRI M. L. SONDDHI (New Delhi) : Is the hon. Minister hinting that he is going to take over the External Affairs Portfolio because he is asking my hon. friend to reserve his comments for the debate on foreign affairs ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : My insinuations are not as crude as the hon. Member's.

SHRI M. L. SONDDHI : My insinuations may be crude, but are the hon. Minister's intelligent ones ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : This is a favourite pastime which the party to which the hon. member belongs always indulges in, raising this question and trying to show that they are very brave in the attitude India should adopt in relation to Pakistan.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK : There is no question of any reflection. I have put specific questions to which I want specific answers.

SHRI RANJEET SINGH : You are not pinning him down to answer the question straightway.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : He has not been pinned down either.

MR. SPEAKER : A number of times I have invited attention of hon. members to the rule. I feel myself completely helpless in spite of my repeated appeals. I will read it out. When the Minister replies, the member is entitled to ask with the permission of the Speaker...

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : What is the rule, Sir ? 195 ?

MR. SPEAKER : This is about calling attention. He need not worry about it.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA : Are you raising a point of order ?

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Tomorrow my name may be balloted.

MR. SPEAKER : Shri Madhok numbered his question 1, 2, 3, 4.

AN HON. MEMBER : No, (a), (b), (c).

MR. SPEAKER : He can ask only one question to save the time. Either we follow the rule or scrap it.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK : It is true that it is not in consonance with the letter of the rule. But we have developed a convention during the last 10-15 years.

MR. SPEAKER : No, No

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK : We should be governed not only by the constitution but by conventions. You must honour the convention that has been established here. Here is a very very important subject involving the security of the country and therefore you should allow us some indulgence.

MR. SPEAKER : There is no question of 15 years. Only a few years back, the procedure of call attention was introduced. I know how it came into being. Should I follow the convention or where there are specific rules, I should follow the rule ? I have to follow specific rules, not according to what he says.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I do not know how many questions I should answer, but I will very briefly try to answer the various points made.

First, I would like to say very clearly that the policy that we follow in relation to Pakistan who is our neighbour is a policy in which we take note of their continued hostility to us. All our defence plans, and all our postures in the international field are based on that. Unfortunately, the Government of Pakistan, as opposed to the people of Pakistan, is trying to adopt a policy of continued hostility to us in the diplomatic field, in the defence sphere and also in their collusion with China. All our thinking is based on that. I would like to assure the House that we do not take any light view of the situation but we fully take into account the postures of Pakistan.

On the specific questions asked, it is true that in this particular case the Pakistan Air Headquarters, not the Foreign Office, did call our Air Attache because they know that their aircraft had deviated and that we had used our fighters to bring it back to the PDR. Therefore, in order to forestall our action or protest, they did call our Air Attache to their Air Headquarters and asked why the extreme step of scrambling our fighters was resorted to in this particular case. But our Air Attache made the position quite clear to them that according to his information it was a clear deviation from the PDR and we were perfectly entitled to use our fighters to bring it back to the PDR. In this particular case, it was not a question of just protest; as soon as the deviation came to our notice, our fighters were actually up in the air and it was their presence that brought it back to PDR. There could not be a better protest than taking action then and there.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK : Then why did we lodge a protest ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : It is necessary, if there is a deviation from the PDR, that we should lodge a protest through diplomatic channels. About the second point about the agreement, he has quoted some figure that was given in 1968.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK : 1966.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : It is a three year old figure, and over the years when I say that the agreement is not unfavourable to us, I stand by that.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK : You say you have no figures, but here are figures to disprove your contention.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : This is not a very proper way of dealing with the situation. He is quoting same figure of 1966. Now we are in 1969.

SHRI S. K. TAPURIAH (Pali) : Then, give the figures.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : If he tables a separate question, I can give the numbers also. I have said and I repeat that I have kept myself in touch with the movement of

aircraft over either country and the overall impression on my mind is that it is not unfavourable to us. If they ask for the exact figures, we can give the figures also.

About the Tashkent Declaration, I do not want to say anything. It is very much a foreign affairs matter, and at the appropriate time I would request the hon. member to address the question to the External Affairs Minister.

12.36 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

Notification re : Management of Bengal Nagpur Cotton Mills etc.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FOREIGN TRADE (SHRI RAM SEWAK CHOWDHARY) : I beg to lay on the Table—

- (1) A copy of Notification No. S. O. 4433 (English version) and S.O. 4434 (Hindi version) published in Gazette of India dated the 30th October, 1969, regarding management of the Bengal Nagpur Cotton Mills Limited, Rajnandgaon, under sub-section (2) of section 18A of the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, 1951. [*Placed in Library. See No. LT-2098/69*].
- (2) A copy of the Export of Froglegs (Inspection) Second Amendment Rules, 1969 (Hindi and English versions) published in Notification No. S. O. 4537 in Gazette of India dated the 6th November, 1969, under sub-section (3) of section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963. [*Placed in Library. See No. LT-2099/69*].
- (3) A copy of the Textile Committee (Third Amendment) Rules, 1969, published in Notification No. G S R. 2172 in Gazette of India dated the 13th September, 1969, under sub-section (3) of section 22 of the Textiles Committee Act, 1963.

- (4) A copy of Corrigendum to the Annual Report on the working of the Cardamom Board for the year 1967-68, [*Placed in Library. See No. LT-2100/69*].

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Fifty-fifth Report

SHRI BHALJIBHAI PARMAR (Dohad) : I beg to present the Fifty-fifth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions.

12.37 hrs.

MATTER UNDER RULE 377

Shri Nehru's decision on India's Participation in religious Conference.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI (New Delhi) : I am grateful to you for permitting me to bring to the notice of this House a point, a very significant point, on what the External Affairs Minister, Mr. Dinesh Singh, stated on 17 November in the proceedings in this House on the motion for adjournment.

I have had a look at the communication which was received by you from the Minister. What the Minister says in this is contradicted by the common knowledge of most of the elder members of this House who know Mr. Nehru, and all those who have read his views in the various debates on external affairs which took place in this House are rather dismayed and amazed that the Minister should claim, and claim in the manner that he did in this House, that if religious conferences are held, then it would be in our interest if people from India participate in these religious conferences; and he said it in a manner that suggests that Pandit Nehru said this or thought this. It almost conveys, it does in fact convey, the impression that he is quoting from a document.

Further on he says that he is dealing with the subject in a manner which correctly reflects policy and does not mislead the House and he claims that the files concerned