attention notice tabled by me and Shri Indrajit Gupta on the supply of arms by USA to Pakistan is pending, because we never gave a calling attention notice on the supply of arms by USA and USSR. The supply of arms by USSR was in 1968-69. That is no more news, that is by now a story, but this is of recent occurrence.

MR. SPEAKER : All these were ballotted.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : In the last session there was a calling attention notice on the supply of arms by USA to Pakistan. That was at our instance. But here both have been clubbed. We want our calling attention to be admitted separately, so that we are able to say something about this nasty deal with Pakistan.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE (Calcutta-North East) : In regard to this matter, the concerned rule, rule 197, is very clear that not more than one matter could be there in a motion.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore) : One of the matters took place one year ago.

MR. SPEAKER : This is one matter, *viz.*, supply of arms by other nations.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE : I do not mind at all a discussion of the matter, but my first submission is that two matters have been juxtaposed, and my second submission is that the matter of the supply of USSR arms to Pakistan had been already on the anvil of the House in the last session, and again to bring it up when it is no longer a matter of recent occurrence is not proper. Therefore, let there be a discussion. If the House wants a discussion on the USSR supply of arms to Pakistan, nobody is against it. I cannot stand in the way, and I do not, but I do try to stand in the way when I believe that formally some rules which should be respected are not being properly respected.

MR. SPEAKER : There were two kinds of motions. One was on USSR, the other was on USA.

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा (मधुबनी) : पिछली बार आपने कहा था कि किसी के कालिंग एटेंशन मोशन में अगर वर्डिंग में थोड़ा इधर उधर हेरफेर होता है तो आप क्लब नहीं करते हैं। अभी आपने कहा है कि सब नाम आपने क्लब कर दिये हैं । रूस और अमरीका वाले मोशन जिन्होंने दिये हैं, उनके नाम आपने क्लब कर दिये हैं। पहले परम्परा अलग रखने की थी । मेरी प्रार्थना है कि आप एक ही तरीका अपनाएं। बहुत से हमारे नोटिस पिछले सेशन में इस लिये रिजैक्ट हो गए थे कि वर्डिंग हमारी दूसरी तरह के थे ।

MR. SPEAKER : The motion by Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta covered both these countries. Besides that there were many other motions, and I am told by the office these are all identical on the same subject. So, they have been covered by this motion.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : One is a story, and the other is news.

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : अमरीका जो हथियार दे रहा है वह ज्यादा वर्निंग प्राब्लैम है । प्रधान मंत्री ने इस बात को अमरीका के साथ उठाया भी है । उसको आप अलग से लें ।

12.10 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

SUPPLY OF ARMS TO PAKISTAN BY U. S. A. AND U. S. S. R.

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त (दिल्ली सदर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं अविलम्बनीय लोक महत्व के निम्नलिखित विषय की ओर वैदेशिक-कार्य मंत्री का ध्यान दिलाता हूं और प्रार्थना करता हूं कि वह इस बारे में एक वक्तव्य दें :

> "संयुक्त राज्य अमरीका और सोवियत समाजवादी गणतंत्र संघ द्वारा पाकिस्तान को शस्त्रास्त्रों की सप्लाई किया जाना तथा पाकिस्तान को उन शस्त्रास्त्रों को भारत के विरुद्ध प्रयोग करने की घोषणा ।"

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI SWARAN SINGH) : Govern-

[Shri Swaran Singh]

ment appreciate and share the concern of all parties in Parliament about the latest announcement by the US Government regarding American supply of arms to Pakistan. The result of this decision may well be that Pakistan, which is already over-armed, will use this accretion of armed strength to threaten India instead of trying to settle differences peacefully through bilateral discussions.

2. The House will recall that in 1965 the US Government had imposed a ban on the supply of lethal weapons to Pakistan and India. On September 30, 1970, we were officially informed that the United States Government had decided to make an exception to this ban and to supply to Pakistan some aircraft and armoured vehicles in replacement of losses and natural attrition. We lodged protests with the US Government through their Ambassador here as well as through our Ambassador in the United States. The US Government had given us an assurance, and later made a public statement, that this sale would be a one-time exception to the ban.

3. The American Government has told us that they have offered to sell to Pakiston six F-104 type star fighter-interceptors, 300 armoured personnel carriers, seven B-57 bombers and four maritime patrol aircraft. These are sophisticated offensive military hardware.

4. In reply to our protest, the American Government has tried to justify its decision by saying that no great significance should be attached to this replacement of items of equipment and that this sale was to meet Pakistan's defence requirements. We have pointed out that we are unable to accept these arguments. Pakistan has repeatedly asserted that India is her only enemy. As the House is aware, India has, apart from signing the Tashkent Declaration, made repeated offers of a No-War Pact to Pakistan and has taken several initiatives for normalising relations with her. Pakistan has, therefore, no ground to apprehend any threat from India ; on the other hand, it is Pakistan that has committed aggression against India since independence. Certain Pakistani leaders who held high office in 1965 have been proudly asserting during their recent election campaign that it was under their leadership that Pakistan had started these conflicts with India.

5. According to reliable estimates, American military aid to Pakistan from 1954 to 1965 was of the order of 1.5 to 2 billion dollars. What is particularly disquieting for us in this deal is that the United States tries to justify it on the ground that they are replacing the equipment supplied by them which has become unserviceable with use and time. The mere acceptance, in principle, of any responsibility for replacement becomes a cause for grave concern. But for American arms aid to Pakistan, the sub-continent might have been spared more than one destructive war.

6. Past assurances that US arms to Pakistan would not be used against India proved worthless, and this time even such an assurance has been omitted. This shows that US Government itself believes that these arms will be used against us. Such a step will not only increase tension on the sub-continent and lead to an arms race, but will also make Pakistan more intransigent towards India and render normalisation of our relations with Pakistan more difficult. The US decision, therefore, is all the more regrettable particularly at this juncture when we were beginning to see some hope of normalising relations with Pakistan in some fields.

7. When the USSR supplied arms to Pakistan in 1968-69, we protested to them. We pointed out to them that their military equipment, in addition to what Pakistan had already received from America and China, was obviously for use against India. At that time the USSR Government assured us that their arms supply to Pakistan was not intended to hurt India but might help in persuading Pakistan to normalise relations with India. We did not agree with this assessment. We, therefore, continued our objections with the Soviet Government. We are glad that the Soviet Government have given consideration to our representations and informed us that they have not supplied—and do not intend to supply—any military hardware to Pakistan in addition to that already supplied in the past.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI (New Delhi) : Sir, a point of clarification. What is an armoured personnel carrier ? (*Interruption*) Please allow me to understand the vocabulary. He

mentioned armoured personnel carriers." Are these tanks or are they something different? What are armoured personnel carriers? (*Interruption*) What is the harm in knowing it? If he mentions some word which does not exist in the English dictionary, why do you prevent me from seeking a clarification? I do not understand it, and nor any of the Members here. I cannot understand his vocabulary and language. It is a point of clarification. What is the meaning of this term? I have been reading the English language for some time. Sardar Sahab also studied in Jullundur. (*Interruption*).

MR. SPEAKER: Members should not speak without my permission. I am sorry I have to follow the rule that the words of Members who speak without the Speaker's permission will not be recorded. I have said that previously on many occasions.

Now, Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI: What is the harm in trying to know the meaning of that term, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta.

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त : अध्यक्ष महोदय, अमरीका ने पाकिस्तान को हथियार देने का जो कारण बताया है, उससे किसी भी देशवासी की तसल्ली नहीं है । अमरीका ने पाकिस्तान को ये आर्म्ज सप्लाई करके उसी तरह से दुनिया की सबसे बड़ी डेमोक्रेसी को एक बड़ी भारी चोट पहुंचाई है, जिस तरह से रूस ने पाकिस्तान को हथियार सप्लाई करके एक दोस्त की पीठ में छुरा घोंपा था। मैं बगैर लम्बी चौड़ी भूमिका के तीन चार सवाल पूछना चाहता हूं ।

अमरीका कहता है कि यह वन-टाइम एक्सेप्शन है । उधर रूस ने भी पाकिस्तान को बहुत हथियार सप्लाई किये हैं। पचास करोड़ लोगों के प्रोटेस्ट के बावजूद, दुनिया के दो बड़े देश यह जानते हुए भी कि चाइना भी पाकिस्तान को हथियार सप्लाई कर रहा है और थर्ड पार्टीज के जरिये भी पाकिस्तान में हथियार आ रहे हैं, पाकिस्तान का कोई दुश्मन नहीं है और ये हथियार हिन्दुस्तान के ही खिलाफ इस्तेमाल होंगे, पाकिस्तान को हथियार सप्लाई कर रहे हैं। यू० एस० ए० में पाकिस्तानी एम्बैसी ने न्यूयार्क टाइम्ज को लिखी गई एक चिट्ठी में कहा है ।

"Pakistan will use American arms to force India to support the Kashmir issue."

मई, 1970 में लेफ्टिनेंट-जेनेरेल राबर्टस एच० वारेन ने, जो पेंटागन के हैं, अमरीका कांग्रेस की एक कमेटी के सामने कहा :

"....that Pakistan has used the USA arms against India in 1965 war, and it will happen again."

यह जानते हुए भी आखिर ये दो बड़े देश पाकिस्तान के साथ इतना प्यार क्यों कर रहे हैं ? क्या यह हमारी फारेन पालिसी के दिवालियापन की निशानी नहीं है ? इससे यह पता लगता है कि पाकिस्तान की पालिसी सक्सेसफुल हुई है ।

दूसरा मेरा सवाल यह है कि जो वन टाइम एक्सेप्शन है यह वन टाइम का क्या मतलब है ? क्या इसमें भी कोई राज है ? क्या टू टाइम होने वाला है ? हालांकि मैं इस चीज में भी विश्वास नहीं करता, वह टाइम एक्सेप्शन भी क्यों होना चाहिए, इसका लाजिक क्या है, यह मैं समझ नहीं पाया ।

दूसरी चीज मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूं कि क्या यह तो सही नहीं है कि यह जो दो बड़े देश हमारे देश को प्रेशराइज करना चाहते हैं कि कश्मीर के बारे में हम कोई पाकिस्तान के साथ समझौता कर लें जैसा कि वह चाहते हैं या नान-प्रालिफरेशन ट्रीटी पर हम जब तक हस्ताक्षर करने का एश्योरेंस न दें तब तक वह आर्म्स सप्लाई करते रहेंगे, क्या यह बात तो ठीक नहीं है और यदि ठीक है क्या सरकार

[श्री कंवरलाल गुप्त]

इस बात का एश्योरेंस देगी कि काश्मीर के बारे में घोषणा करे कि वह निगोशिएबल नहीं है ?

अगली चीज मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि क्या सरकार ने कोई यह एसेसमेंट किया है कि कितने हथियार रूस ने पाकिस्तान को सप्लाई किये हैं ? अभी आप ने कहा कि आगे रूस सप्लाई नहीं करेगा । लेकिन अभी तक रूस ने कितना हथियार दिया और क्या जो एश्योरेंस आई है यह लिख कर आई है या मौखिक आई है ? और अमेरिका कितना देने जा रहा है, इन दोनों पार्टियों से पाकिस्तान के पास कितना हथियार आया ? क्या यह सही है कि पाकिस्तान ने 1965 में जो उसका नुकसान हुआ था उसको उसने पूरा कर लिया और इसके अलावा आज उसकी मिलिटरी स्ट्रेंथ दुगुनी शायद हो गई । अगर यह सही है तो क्या आपने इस प्रकार का कोई असेसमेंट किया और किया तो असेसमेंट के बाद आपने अपने लिये उस पर क्या कार्यवाही की ? यह भी एक चीज देश जानना चाहता है ।

दूसरी चीज—हमीदा साहब ने कहा था कि इजरायल टाइप की शार्ट वार की सम्भावना है, तो मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि उसका क्या बेसिस है ? क्या यह सही है कि पाकिस्तान की इंटेलिजेंस पिछले कुछ दिनों से हिन्दुस्तान में ज्यादा ऐक्टिव हो गई है और यहां पर इन्फिल्ट्रेशन भी पाकिस्तान का ज्यादा हो गया है ?

आखीरी चीज मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि सरकार सेल्फ रिलाएंस की बात करती है क्योंकि मेरे दोस्त चाहे कितना भी रूस का साथ दें लेकिन रूस और अमेरिका अपने स्वार्थ में हमारे देश की आहुति चढ़ाने को तैयार हो सकते हैं । वह हमें बड़ा बनते नहीं देखना चाहते । तो सेल्फ रिलाएंस हो ।

इसके लिए क्या हम लोग जो हमारे टार्गेट्स हैं, रिक्वायरमेंट्स हैं, उसके हिसाब से प्रोडक्शन कर रहे हैं ? जहां तक हमारी जानकारी है हमारे देश में प्रोडक्शन उतना नहीं हो रहा है । कई चीजों में और मिग के बारे में खास तौर से हम रूस के ऊपर बहुत डिपेंड करते हैं । आपने कहा कि जो मिग बनाये जा रहे हैं वह सारे इंडिजिनस हैं । यह बात गलत है । मिग के काफी पार्ट्स बाहर से आते हैं ।

इसके अलावा क्या सरकार ने जो यह कहा कि हम चीन से बातचीत करने को तैयार हैं तो क्या सरकार इस दबाव में आने के बाद ऐसा कह रही है क्योंकि आपको मालूम है कि चीन भी हमारा दुश्मन है और पाकिस्तान भी हमारा दुश्मन है दोनों का मिल कर मुकाबिला आप नहीं कर सकते, इस लिए क्या उसका रास्ता यही रह गया है कि बगैर उसके ऐग्रेशन हटाए आप उससे बातचीत करने को तैयार हो जाएंगे ? बगैर उससे अपने देश की भूमि वापस लिए हुए उससे बातचीत करने को तैयार हो जाएंगे ? यह देश इस बात को जानना चाहता है कि जब तक चीन ऐग्रेसर है तब तक सरकार उसके साथ बात नहीं करेगी, क्या सरकार ऐसी घोषणा करने को तैयार है ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I will first reply to Mr. Sondhi's question. Armoured Personnel Carrier is not a tank, because tank weaponry is entirely different. Even the traction is different. Armoured Personnel Carrier is principally a protecting equipment which enables the military to carry people from one place to another.

SHRI VIRENDRAKUMAR SHAH (Junagadh): What arms does it carry ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: It is of a comparatively minor character.

I will try to be brief in my reply. To the first question of Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta my reply is an emphatic 'No'. Secondly, he asked what is meant by 'one-time exception'. By this

term we understand that this will be the only supply. As to whether they stick to that, that is a separate matter. Our understanding of the expression is that this is a one-time exception.

SHRI UMANATH (Pudukkottai): Exception itself indicates that it is only once. So, why say "one-time exception"?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I cannot improve upon the language used by an American. This is what he said. From the expression "one-time exception" we have understood that this would be the only supply that would be made in relaxation of the ban that has been imposed in 1965. Whether they stick to that is another matter.

The third question was whether this is an attempt to pressurize us either to change our attitude on Kashmir or to compel us to sign the non-proliferation treaty. Neither the United States, nor the Soviet Union, has ever given the slightest indication to us that their supply of arms to Pakistan has anything to do with these two issues. On these matters we have taken a view, which is a national view, and we intend to stick to it, whatever may be in the minds of others.

Fourthly, he asked abuut the quantum of supply of arms to Pakistan by United States, Soviet Union and through third parties. On this whatever information is with the Government has been shared with the House from time to time. The United States themselves have announced that this is what they intend to supply. Many other countries do not disclose the quantum of supply and one has to depend on other sources. It will not be proper for me to divulge information unless it is authority given by the supplier or we have got authentic information about the quantum thereof.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: What about the total supplies from Russia?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: The fifth question was about Pakistan making up the total loss. It is true that they have made up the losses that they suffered at the time of the Indo-Pakistan conflict and they have also increased their military potential, if we compare it with their capacity in 1965. The only reply that I can give, which could more appropriately be given by the Defence Minister, would be that during this period we were also compelled to take matching action and we have tried to check all the accrual to Pakistan military strength in making and formulating our defence and equipment plan.

Then a question was asked about the statement of my hon. friend, Shri Mahida. The best thing would be to ask him the question because he may be able to answer what precisely he said and how does he explain it.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: Sir, on a point of order. You must compel the Minister to reply because the Government is one and this question is related to what he has said.

SHRI S. K. TAPURIAH (Pali): Who said it is one?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: If he wants a reply from me then my answer is that it does not arise out of the present question, which relates to the supply of arms to Pakistan by the United States.

In answer to his sixth question I would like to say that we have always laid the greatest stress on self-reliance and, in the mean time, whatever we cannot produce ourselves we should not lightly ignore the sources that have helped us to increase our defence potential by supply of various types of equipment. We will continue to stress the role of self-reliance and, at the same time, will not hesitate to get supplies from whatever sources they are available so that the time lag between our own production and the requirements of the situation may be as narrow as possible.

The last question was about our Chinese policy. That is a separate matter not at all connected with the present question-

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त: अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप मेरी मदद कीजिए । मैंने यह पूछा था कि रूस ने कितने हथियार दिए, यह उन्होंने नहीं बताया । मैंने बहुत प्वाइंटेड क्वेश्चन पूछा था कि रूस ने कितने हथियार दिये, यह उसे जानबूझ कर एवायड कर रहे हैं ।...

(व्यवधान)

MR. SPEAKER : He said that they did not supply.

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त : जी नहीं । स्टेटमेंट में लिखा है :

> "We are glad that the Soviet Government have given consideration to our representations and informed us that they have not supplied—and do not intend to supply—any military hardware to Pakistan in addition to that already supplied in the past."

मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि पास्ट में कितना सप्लाई हुआ, उसका क्वान्टम बतलाइये । अमरीका के बारे में तो आपने बतला दिया कि 1965 तक कितना सप्लाई हुआ, लेकिन रूस के बारे में क्या कोई सोफ्ट कार्नर है, जिसकी वजह से नहीं बतलाना चाहते हैं, आप दोनों को बराबर क्यों नहीं रखना चाहते हैं ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय, चीन के बारे में भी मेरा रेलेवेन्ट सवाल है । मैंने पूछा था—चीन और पाकिस्तान हमारे दो दुश्मन हैं, इस समस्या को सुलझाने के लिए क्या यही रास्ता है कि आप चीन के साथ अन-कन्डीशनल बात कर रहे हैं—इसके बारे में जवाब दीजिये । महोदा साहब के बारे में भी आपको जवाब देना चाहिये ।

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : With regard to the first question, my reply is simple. The United States of America have themselves officially disclosed the military hardware that they are supplying to Pakistan. Therefore it was my duty to inform the House about it. The USSR have not disclosed as to what supplies they have made to Pakistan. They did not disclose to anyone else even the supplies that they made to us. Therefore we attach importance to not disclosing the figures relating to the supply to us and did not insist that they should tell us what they are supplying to Pakistan.... (*Interruption*)

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK (South Delhi) : This was already disclosed in this House. You did tell this House as to how many tanks and other things were supplied.... (*Interruption*)

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA : You had said earlier that Russia supplied tanks, 130 mm guns and other ammunition to Pakistan.... (*Interruption*)

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : If I have already supplied this, I do not know why he is asking me about it again. But I do not remember it. I distinctly remember that I have not supplied the figures relating to the various items. I might have supplied.... (*Interruption*)

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : You have given this in answer to my question.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : If I have already disclosed it you can use it. But I do not have it in my memory. However, today I do not have those figures.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK : He has already done so.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I think, I did not give the actual number.... (*Interruption*)

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY (Kendrapara) : Sir, if you read this statement, you will find that althoug it begins with the sentence that Government shares the concern of the country and of all political parties, actually speaking they have not shown any concern for overarming of Pakistan that is being done not only by the USA but also by the USSR and China, and that the country is faced with a great danger.

I am very glad that so far as the USA is concerned, they have devoted two pages and have given us great details of the military supplies made by America. They have come to the conclusion that so far as the USA is concerned they supply arms to Pakistan in order that those arms are used against India. We are glad that at least one assessment regarding one country is correct and our country accepts this. But, at the same time, I should have expected that, having admitted this, they disclosed what steps actually the Government has taken or proposes to take to meet this challenge.

About USSR he has mentioned it in a small paragraph and has expressed happiness that they have given due consideration to our repeated representations. The USSR is known to be the auther of the Tashkent Declaration. Even in their explanation that they have supplied they say that they have a policy and they are arming them so that the relationship between the two countries can be normalised. They say that by supplying arms to Pakistan they are helping in normalising the relations between Pakistan and India. They say that this is a part of the Tashkent Declaration that they are really implementing. This is what the Russians have said. This is the reason given by the Russians for supplying arms.

You will remember, Sir, when we pressed this point in the House for a discussion at that time, there was a resolution and the Government did not agree about it. This is a double standard that we are always playing and we are becoming a laughing stock in the world. The people laugh at us because of our attitude. However much you may hide the facts, it is all clear. In this statement, in a very cleverly drafted sentence, it is being made out as if no military hardware were ever supplied by Russia to Pakistan.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Where is it ?

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY : May I read it out ? It says :

> "We are glad that the Soviet Government have given consideration to our representation and informed us that they have not supplied and do not intend to supply any military hardware. . . . .

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Read it further.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY :

> "....to Pakistan in addition to that already supplied in the past."

What does it mean ? It is a very cleverly drafted sentence. Let us be very clear. What is the first sentence ? It says, they have never supplied arms. Probably, what is meant here is the supply of tractors, helicopters, etc. I want to put it whether it is not a fact that Soviet Union has supplied to Pakistan 130 MM/ artillary guns, whether these are military hardware or not. I want to know whether it is not a fact, whether it is known to the Government of India or not, that during the course of these years from 1968 onwards, 85 million dollars worth of military hardware were supplied by Soviet Russia to Pakistan. Is that not known to them ? If it is known to them, why is it that they have now said that they are not going to supply. When so much details about the American supply of arms are given why we have not taken this trouble to bring facts about Soviet Union supply of arms to the notice of the country and the House ?

Again, I would like to know one thing more. Now, they say they have informed us. When did they actually inform us ? Is it when our Prime Minister met Mr. Kosygin while going to America, seeing the agitation in the country about it, that they assured us about it or is it in reply to the protests that they have been getting earlier ?

We will be satisfied if in view of the over-arming of Pakistan a regular discussion takes place in the House about the military position of our country and about the defence policy that we are adopting. I would like to know whether as a result of the arms supply to Pakistan, let alone all other things, even in the infantry divisions because of the semi-military conscription that Pakistan is having, after the supply of these arms we will be in a great disadvantageous position because a number of divisions have to be employed in Nagaland, for our commitments with China and for our internal services and practically speaking, very few divisions will be left to confront with Pakistan. If this is the position, I would really like to know whether countries like Russia believe that the balance has been disturbed and in case of a conflict with Pakistan, they would come forward to help us because they have armed them already. Are they going to supply you on payment, supply you, the same materials, the same armaments or the same things which they have supplied to Pakistan so that we can meet them and actually what they talk about normalisation can come into being ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : With regard to the first question, I would request my esteemed colleague, a very senior Member of this House and leader of a Party, not to judge our point of view to the supply of arms by the United

[Shri Swaran Singh]

States as compared to USSR by the length that is devoted in this reply.

SHRI NATH PAI (Rajapur) : We welcome it.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I would like him to refresh his memory that there was a long debate about the USSR's supply of arms and I had at that time the responsibility as Defence Minister to handle it.

SHRI NATH PAI : It was an adjournment motion.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I don't remember whether it was an adjournment motion or not.

SHRI NATH PAI : You should.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : It was a discussion. It was either two hour discussion or some other discussion. I think Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta initiated that discussion.

SHRI NATH PAI : It was an adjournment motion by Mr. Piloo Mody.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I don't remember what it was. He will any time be impressed by the length of the statement if he compares my statement which I made in relation to arms supply at that time. He will be satisfied that it is longer than the one that I am giving about the US supply. That is not very material. I would appeal to the hon. Members of this House to concentrate on the dangers that we face rather than to have a tendency to sacrifice our own interest in trying to make out a case that we are trying to favour one or the other. (*Interruptions*) Whether they come from the USA or USSR, when they are in the hands of Pakistan, they are a danger to us. We should view it in that form.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY : What is your reply to it ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Now he says that I have given information about the supply of arms by USA but I have not given information about the quantity of arms supplied by USSR. I have already attempted to reply to that. In this particular case US Government have officially said that these were the items that they have decided to supply to Pakistan and, therefore, I am repeating what they have stated. The USSR Government have not made any such statement.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA : What is your assessment ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I will not give my assessment. We should avoid giving the information about our knowledge (*Interruptions*). It is a military matter.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY : I have put specific questions saying even the quantum supplied. What is your information ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I do not either confirm or contradict the figure which is nothing but a thing picked up from certain newspaper reports which I do not accept.

The second question is : what is being done to meet the challenge ? This is a matter about which we have replied very often.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY : This figure has been given by the Defence Ministry itself.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : May be. Then, it is all right. If it is given, what more do you want ? (*Interruptions*) I don't remember every time the reply that has been given earlier.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY : This particular reply has not been given in the House. In some of the Parliamentary Committees these details were given. The Minister says : "We don't know ; we don't have information." This is rather very strange.

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH (Buxar) : What is the good of the information if it cannot be disclosed in the House ?

MR. SPEAKER : Whatever may be the case in the consultative committee that should not be quoted here.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : We do give a little more information in the consultative committees than what we can publicly give. That is the practice which we have followed all along, because that is not meant for the public display. I think you cannot accuse us on this score.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY : You cannot say that you have no information.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : You should compliment us that we have given more information there in the Committees.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY : Therefore, is it fair to say : "We do not know anything." ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I would like very strongly to rebut this suggestion that in dealing with this matter we follow double standards. That is the type of expression which has been started by several opposition groups. This is something which is absolutely in their own imagination ; it is not our policy to treat it in that form at all.

About the phraseology that has been commented upon somewhat adversely by him, I would like to recall to his memory the statement made on the floor of the House about the nature of the equipments supplied by USSR to Pakistan. Surely, there are military hardware things like tanks, artillary, etc. and these are very much lethal armaments. There is nothing in the statement, which I have read again, which in any way condones or conceals the nature of the supplies made by USSR to Pakistan.

About the assurance as to when it was given, this assurance was given much earlier and you should not connect it with the last talk of the Prime Minister with Mr. Kosygin in Moscow when she discussed other matters with him on her way to UN.

Then, Sir, the hon. Member raised the general question that we should discuss in the House our preparedness to meet the Pakistani preparations, whether in the matter of training, or acquisition of supplies. Surely, this is a matter which is usually discussed when we discuss the Demands of the Defence Ministry. If there is any other motion which the House admits, which the Speaker admits, and my colleague the Defence Minister is prepared to discuss, I have no objection to that. I think I have answered all the points which he has raised.

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त : अध्यक्ष महोदय, कुछ जवाब दिया इन्होंने ? इससे तो अच्छा होगा कि इनसे कोई जवाब ही न मांगा जाये ।

श्री स्वर्ण सिंह : गुप्ताजी, आपकी समझ में नहीं आया ।

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त : आप कभी किसी बात का जवाब ही नहीं देते हैं ।

SHRI D. N. PATODIA (Jalore) : Supply of arms by USA to Pakistan needs to be Protested by us as strongly and in the same manner as supply of arms by USSR to Pakistan sometime back. The justification and the arguments given both by the USA and USSR with regard to supply of arms to Pakistan are neither impressive nor valid. When USA supplies arms, they say, they want to reduce the increasing influence of USSR in Pakistan. And, similarly, when USSR supplies arms, they also advance the same argument of trying to reduce the influence of USA in Pakistan. The fact of the matter is that on whatever pretext it may be, arms are supplied to Pakistan from all quarters.

Another argument given by them in justification of supply of these arms is that it would not be used against India. It is equally unimpressive. At this stage, I am reminded of what President Ayub said sometime back that "We are getting arms aid not to keep them in cotton pads." This saying of Ayub has been amply justified during all these years. In this context, I am also reminded of a statement issued by the Minister, Shri Mahida in which he said that there is the possibility of hit and run war by Pakistan. The Minister is expected to make a responsible statement and he should now either be able to come to the House and explain the circumstances under which the statement was made or he should be considered guilty of making an irresponsible statement.

But only accusing the USA or the USSR does not solve the problem. We have to see whether our own house is in order. I am prepared to agree with the previous speaker that the result in terms of supply of arms by the USA or the USSR is the result of the failure of our foreign policy. That is why after so many years we find today much difficulty with the

[Shri D. N. Patodia]

major powers in the world. Four major powers are really supplying arms to Pakistan ; France is supplying arms to Pakistan ; China is supplying arms to Pakistan ; the USA is supplying arms to Pakistan and the USSR is also supplying arms to Pakistan. Certain countries which are inimical to each other, like China and the USA are friendly to Pakistan, and all of them are supplying arms to Pakistan. I do not know when we might hear again that the UK is also supplying arms to Pakistan.

With regard to the policy of non-alignment I am prepared to say and I am inclined to say that the policy of non-alignment has been converted into the policy of appeasement of Russia today, and whenever the question of Russia comes, we are going out of the way to appease them and in respect of important matters like the supply of arms by Russia to Pakistan, we try to derive satisfaction by saying that our relations with Russia are many-sided and the problem of supply of arms should be examined in the context of the all-sided relationship with Russia, and we also try to derive satisfaction by saying that the Russians have given us an assurance that they will not supply it in future. And when it comes to the question of the USA, our Defence Minister comes out with the statement that it is an unfriendly act on the part of the USA.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : How will he define it ?

SHRI D. N. PATODIA : Just now, we heard the hon. Minister saying that he was not in a position to declare the particulars about the arms supplied by the USA. Why is he saying that ? He is saying that because thereby he wants to conceal the fact that the amount of arms and ammunitions supplied by the USSR is very much more compared to the ammunition and arms supplied by the USA. This very Ministry is on record in this House as having given the details with regard to the particulars of the arms supplied by the USSR, and this very Ministry is on record as having said that according to the information available with the Government of India, the USSR in 1968-69 supplied as many as about 150 tanks to Pakistan and 130 MMGs, ammunitions and radar sets and other miscellaneous stores. Is the hon. Minister in a position to deny what was said by this Government a few months ago in this very House ?

Apart from this, I have two more questions to raise. How do the Government explain today the discrimination practised by these four major powers of the world against India as compared to Pakistan, with regard to the supply of arms ? With the changing pattern of the world politics, are the Government now convinced of the desirability of changing their foreign policy and stopping appeasement of Russia and adopting in the real sense, as advocated by the Government, a policy of non-alignment towards all the countries equally ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Most of his comments were in the form of his own views. He has not asked me any particular question. He has given his own formulation, and his own enunciation of his views upon various foreign policy angles, with which I totally disagree.

Ultimately, what he says is that we should have a policy which is truely a policy of non-alignment. I am glad that the Swatantra Party to which he belongs now sees the wisdom of the policy of non-alignment, though all along they had been advising us to abandon the policy of non-alignment and have some defence pacts or other pacts with other countries, which has been the Swatantra policy so far.

About the other matters, I would like to say that his presentation or his comment upon various events, if I may use a very mild expression, is completely one-sided. He knows the arguments which have been placed before the House on several occasions when all these matters about which he has in a perfunctory manner touched upon today had been discussed at great length, and I am sure that he cannot be unaware of Government's viewpoint on all these various matters.

There is no question of appeasement of any country in our policy of non-alignment. We value help from whatever source we might get it, and it will be wrong for us to deny the efficacy or importance of the help in various fields, the

economic field, the military field, the industrial field etc., that we have received from the Soviet Union, and I would appeal to him not to belittle it merely because he belongs to the Swatantra Party which believes that everything that is Russian is something which they should not touch and they should always find some reason to criticise it.

That is not the way our national interests are served, and I would request him to be a little more non-aligned rather than always bring along this angle.

In all earnestness, I would submit that the matter which is really the provocation for the present question is the supply of arms by the US to Pakistan, but it is amazing that he has not put a single question on that. His main preoccupation has been to point out that we are trying to appease the USSR ; that is the entire thesis upon which he has proceeded.

SHRI D. N. PATODIA : What is he talking about ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : An attitude of this type weakens our hands in relation to supplies if they are made to Pakistan. This type of lobbying, in order to belittle the effect of American supplies of arms to Pakistan, is against our interest and I cannot permit it to go unchallenged.

SHRI D. N. PATODIA : On a point of order....

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I do not yield. Our position with regard to this matter is very clear. I am sorry if a particular impression has been created by his quoting some earlier reply by me. I must be frank with the House As Defence Minister, I do remember having replied to several questions about the quantum of supplies by the USSR to Pakistan, and at some point I do remember having given the categories. May be, I also gave the numbers of one or two items. But even at that time, I must have qualified it ; if I did not, I want to qualify it now and say that it was based on press information available to us. But in this particular case, concerning US supplies, there is an official statement by the USA which I can quote. But I cannot say the same thing with regard to the USSR's supplies.

Therefore, there is no question of changing our policy ; the more we think of it, the more we are convinced that the policy we are pursuing is the correct one, and I would request them to support us.

SHRI D. N. PATODIA : My main question has not been answered. The Minister had said earlier that so far as supplies by the USSR are concerned, they are something confidential and Government were not prepared to disclose it. There is a new fact about the previous replies by the Minister himself in this House. He quoted certain quantum of supply. I quoted 150 tanks and so forth. Is he in a position to deny what I said ? How does he justify concealing these facts from the House on the plea that the USSR's supplies are not to be disclosed in public interest ? This is a contradiction. I would request him to come to the point and not use this argument to deny information to us.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I have already said, and repeat, that it has never been my intention, nor is it my intention now to withhold information. If I did not remember what I said on an earlier occasion, he should not use that argument against me. I stand by every word of what I said on the earlier occasion.

SHRI D. N. PATODIA : My second question has not been replied to. Is it a fact that the quantum of arms supplied by Russia was very much more than that supplied by the US ? Let him reply yes or no.

MR. SPEAKER : He has replied. I do not think there is any further clarification needed (*Interruptions*).

SHRI P. K. DEO : He has not replied.

SHRI D. N. PATODIA : You must protect me. The figures given by him have been quoted. He is aware of that. He is not disclosing the information we wanted but is attributing motives. What is this ?

MR. SPEAKER : He will please resume his seat. It has been replied in detail.

13.00 hrs.

MR. SPEAKER : His question has been replied to in detail. He asked a second ques-

[Mr. Speaker]
tion, and he replied again. I do not want to prolong it further.

SHRI D. N. PATODIA : It has not been replied to.

SHRIMATI ILA PALCHOUDHURI (Krishnagar) : In view of the fact that America is not listening to us, and that it is not only America which has been supplying arms to Pakistan, in view of the fact that Pakistan has been getting Mirage-III aircraft from France and Cobra anti-tank missiles and surface to air missiles from the Federal Republic of Germany and she has been getting arms from all over the world, what efforts are we making to get more arms for India ?

Secondly, I am very glad that the hon. Minister has said that we should concentrate our efforts on the dangers that we face and that the hon. Prime Minister has also remarked in her Meet-the-Press interview in New-York that the situation in India is quite different because we have on our borders foreign armies at a distance of 20 feet. In fact, in Kashmir and in the borders of Bengal in places like Nadia, we are facing them at even less than 20 feet. In view of this, may I know what measures are being taken to have greater security, so that our borders may be more secure, particularly in West Bengal ?

Thirdly, there is positive infiltration into the ordnance factories where there is stoppage of production of armaments. In view of the heavy supply of armaments received by Pakistan and the stoppage of production in our ordnance factories, we do stand in great danger. So what we are doing to control this kind of stopping of work in our ordnance factories and infiltration ?

Fourthly, is the Government aware that, on the strength of all these arms that Pakistan is receiving, centres of sabotage have been built by Pakistan where 10,000 people at a time are being trained in sabotage and guerilla warfare, and also that they have more than half a dozen underground jet airports in the Kashmir border ? In the spy ring that was smashed in the Uri sector, some of our own personnel were involved and have been arrested. In the light of all this, what are we doing to screen the personnel and stop this infiltration into the army and ordinance factories ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I have carefully listened to all the points. They are very relevant and important, but the hon. Member has addressed them to the wrong quarter. They relate either to the Defence Ministry or to the Home Ministry, and I am sure that if they are formulated in a proper form, she will get the replies from the Ministers concerned.

13.03 hrs.

RE: MOTIONS FOR ADJOURNMENT (*Query*)

MR. SPEAKER : Papers to be laid.

SHRI NATH PAI (Rajapur) : I seek your leave to raise the motion of privilege, of which I have given notice.

MR. SPEAKER : I am examining it. I will refer to it later on. I will let you know. I am examining all the privilege motions. There are quite a few of them.

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा (मधुबनी) : अविश्वास प्रस्ताव भी है।

SHRI P. K. DEO (Kalahandi) : I gave notice of an adjournment motion.

MR. SPEAKER : Parliament has nothing to do with what the MLAs do. I have not allowed it.

SHRI P. K. DEO : There has been a unanimous demand for a steel plant in Orissa, and the Chief Minister has written to the Government of India asking whether the Government of Orissa can go ahead with its own steel plant.

A grave situation has developed there. People are agitated. If you do not allow the adjournment motion, you cannot expect all of us to participate in the proceedings of the House. The MALs of Orissa have come here.

MR. SPEAKER : It has nothing to do with Parliament... (*Interruptions.*)