

[Shri Siddayya]

small weightage given to the scheduled castes' and tribes' representation in the Lok Sabha and Assemblies. I took some trouble to make some calculations. I find that if this Bill is passed only a few more seats will go to the scheduled castes and tribes. It is 9 seats for scheduled castes and 10 seats for scheduled tribes in the Lok Sabha. In the Assemblies it is 6 seats for scheduled castes and 7 seats for the scheduled tribes. Only in the case of Union Territories, there will be some difficulty because there are only two or three seats in some Union Territories and if this Bill is accepted, the scheduled castes and tribes will get the entire reservation.

Reservation was provided for these communities on the ground that they will not be elected to these important bodies unless the seats are reserved for them. It is a question of participation in the administration of the country and unless this weaker community gets some opportunity to influence the policies and programmes of the government by actually participating in the administration, this community cannot come up.

Secondly, the suggestion of Shri Suraj Bhan for the amendment of articles 330 and 332 is not a new thing. Article 330(2) reads :

"The number of seats reserved in any State or Union territory for the Scheduled Castes or the Scheduled Tribes under clause (1) shall bear, as nearly as may be, the same proportion to the total number of seats allotted to that State or Union territory in the House of the People as the population of the Scheduled Castes in the State or Union territory or of the Scheduled Tribes in the State or Union territory or part of the State or Union territory, as the case may be, in respect of which seats are so reserved, bears to the total population of the State or Union territory."

If you come to article 332(3), it reads :

"The number of seats reserved for the Scheduled Castes or the Scheduled Tribes in the Legislative Assembly of any State under Clause (1) shall bear, as nearly as may be, the same proportion to the total number of seats in the Assembly as the population of the Scheduled Castes in the State or of the Scheduled Tribes in the State or part of

the State, as the case may be, in respect of which seats are so reserved, bears to the total population of the State."

This is a very simple proposition. If this amendment is accepted, only a few extra seats will go to the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. It is true that an anomaly may arise in some cases. Government may feel some difficulty in making both the seats in a particular Union territory reserved for Scheduled Castes and Tribes. But there is another kind of anomaly at present. In Pondicherry the population of Scheduled Castes is 56,846. But there is no seat reserved for them, whereas in the case of Laccadive and Amindive island there is a seat reserved for them even though their population is only 24,108.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The hon. Member may continue his speech the next time when this subject is taken up. We will now take up the Half an Hour discussion.

17.29 hrs.

[Shri Vasudevan Nair *In the Chair*]

HALF AN HOUR DISCUSSION

Supply of Soviet Arms to Pakistan

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai) : The Government of India's over-obliging commitment to the foreign policy of Russia and too faithful dependence on arms supplies by Russia to India have created an impression inside India, and mostly outside India, that India has almost turned to be an infra-satellite of Soviet Russia.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI SWARAN SINGH) : It has become a very stale expression now. It is extremely stale.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : Infrsatellite means the invisible satellite.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Please yourself.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I think, the interruption should not start at this stage. It

is only a half-an-hour discussion. The hon. Member may take ten minutes.

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA :** This is the political portrait of India inside and outside this country very largely.

We saw in the morning the performance of our External Affairs Minister in regard to the Russo German Treaty. Undoubtedly that treaty was contributed to peace in the world but, unfortunately, the external Affairs Minister completely forgot that the cessation of active hostilities between the Arab countries and Israel contributed more to the peace of the world. The Government forgot to mention about that until the external Affairs Minister was reminded about that. That shows that the attitude of India has also justified that India has already become an infrasatellite of Soviet Russia.

When the present Foreign Minister was Defence Minister, he said in this House that the policy of supply of Russian arms to Pakistan was an index of a major shift of Russian policy towards India vis-a-vis Pakistan. The mutation of Russian policy towards India vis-a-vis Pakistan can be described as follows. First it was Russia stands for India ; then it changed to Russia stands with India and at the present moment it can be said to be Russia is not against India. Those days are not far off when the Russian stand in regard to India and Pakistan will be at par. Our Government should take note of the shift of Russian policy towards Pakistan vis a-vis India ; otherwise, India will have to face a second time that national humiliation that this country very tragically faced at the time of 1962.

In reply to a question about the quantum of the arms supply to Pakistan by Russia, the Defence Minister said :

"Though sufficiently reliable figures of the quantities are known, it would not be desirable to reveal them. Government are also aware of the agreement between Pakistan and the Soviet Union for an oceanographic survey and fishery research. Three Soviet vessels visited Karanchi in February 196 ."

If these figures are sufficiently reliable figures that are known to the Government, what stands in the way of making them known to the public of India ?

It is not unknown to the world that Russia has already supplied to Pakistan Ilyushin-28 light bombers, Mig-19 interceptors, Mig-21 for air defence. T-54/T-55 tanks, and 200 130 millimetre guns and other field artillery pieces and military stores. The exact quantum of the supplies have not been mentioned by the Government but a very well known paper, *Neue Zurcher Zeitung* of Switzerland said on 15.12.1968 that this quantum amounts to 100 Mig-19s, 60 to 70 Mig-21s, 30 to 40 Ilyushin-28 light bombers, spare parts for 60 Mig-19 and 14 Ilyushin-28 light bombers and also about 250 tanks to Pakistan.

One should add to this arms supply by Russia to Pakistan the already acquired arms by Pakistan prior to the 1965 war from USA free of cost. According to the figure given by the former Foreign Minister, Shri Dinesh Singh, it will amount to 700 million dollars worth of American arms acquired by Pakistan. To it should be added, as is known to all, what quantum of Chinese arms have also acquired by Pakistan. It is also not unknown that Pakistan is having defence shopping from France and other countries. Even from Czechoslovakia, Pakistan has acquired many arms. As a result of the arms supplied by Russia to Pakistan, already talks are going on in USA that the American Government will also lift its embargo on arms supply to Pakistan. Mr. Chester Bowles has already protested and also Senator Fulbright has said that this will be wrong. But already negotiations are going on between Pakistan and USA and it is probable that NATO arms have already been supplied to Turkey as well as to Pakistan.

When this question of arms supply was raised, when Mr. Kosygin visited Pakistan, last year, after visiting Pakistan and making a commitment to the Government of Pakistan in regard to the arms supply to Pakistan, Mr. Kosygin dashed to Delhi to assure Mrs. Indira Gandhi that Russia is not trying to have friendship with Pakistan at the cost of India. After the visit of President Yahya Khan, Mr. Arshad Hussain, the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, categorically mentioned in the Pakistan National Assembly as follows :

"Whatever China has done during the last 5 years, no power on earth can save the friendship between China and Pakistan."

[Shri Samar Guha]

Not only so. Mr. Arshad Hussain asked Peking to ensure that the deal between Russia and Pakistan will be not at the cost of friendship with China.

Sir, you will remember, last year, even Mr. Kosygin made a dramatic dash to Peking, perhaps to ensure China that Russian friendship with India or with Pakistan or Russian arms supplied to Pakistan and India is not at the cost of China. In this equation of costing of arms supplies, in the equation of costing of friendship between Russia, China, Pakistan as also India, what is the puzzle? The puzzle as also the result of the equation is that Russia is having friendship with China; Russia is having friendship with Pakistan and Pakistan is having friendship with China and all assuring the other that it is not at the cost of the other. What it amounts to? It means that it is at the cost of India. Russia-Pakistan-China triangle of friendship is being built up. The Government of India should take note of it.

What is the real motive behind the supply of Russian arms to Pakistan? Some of the Soviet infiltrators inside the ruling Congress party, some of whom have already got the ministerial cushion, try to explain by writing some articles in *Mainstream* and others that it is only to wean away Pakistan from China. This is nothing but a puerile political explanation of a complex matter. I want to know from the Government whether it is a tactical hibernation on the part of Pakistan which is creating an impression that Pakistan is loosening its tie with SEATO and CENTO powers. Is there any positive indication whatsoever that Pakistan has served its relationship with either SEATO or CENTO? Not only so. Is there any indication that as a result of the arms deal between Russia and Pakistan, Pakistan has stopped the building of the military and a trade road between China and Pakistan *via* Gilgit? Is there any indication that the relationship of China and Pakistan, in any way, is either freed or loosened?

There is no indication whatsoever. Therefore, I will again report that it will be an infantile expression to say that the Russian arms supply to Pakistan is meant for weaning away Pakistan from China.

What is the effect of the Russian arms supply to Pakistan? No. 1 It will increase tension between India and Pakistan. It will disturb peace in this sub-continent. It will make the posture of Pakistan more intransigent in relation to India. I am afraid it will now open American complicity with Pakistan again and I am afraid the possibility of the Indian sub-continent turning into a field of cold war between Russia, China and USA will again become, I say, alive. It will also disturb the military balance of India and Pakistan. If you take together the Pindi-Peking axis the military balance of India will be extremely disturbed.

Again, the Government of Russia, I have been told, have assured Mrs. Indira Gandhi that the Russian arms will not be allowed to be used against India. Similar promises were made by USA. We know what was the result and what was the outcome of these assurances at the time of Indo-Pak conflict. It is very strange that in reply to some of the questions in this House, the Deputy Minister, Mr. Surendra Pal Singh, said that the anxiety of the Indian Government has been communicated to Soviet Russia. Mrs. Gandhi in Calcutta in a statement said in September last that the Indian Government will resent the supply of arms to Pakistan by Russia. What is this delicate expression? Should they not lodge a strong protest with Russia? This shows—it justifies my observation—that India has become an infra-satellite of Soviet Russia?

Now I want to ask a question: I want to know from the Government. What is the political explanation of the Government of India as regards the move of arms supply by Russia to Pakistan? Secondly, I want to know from the Government whether Russian arms supply to Pakistan will increase tension in the sub-continent and also, as I have already said, will extend the field of cold war between the big powers in the sub-continent. Thirdly, I want to know whether it will seriously disturb the defence balance between India and Pakistan, and when we consider the military balance between India and Pakistan, we can never forget that Pakistan has entered into a military alliance with China. Therefore, when you consider the military balance with Pakistan, you should also keep the military

power of China in view. Fourthly, I want to know from [the Government that in the event of any actual Indo-Pak conflict how the Indian Government will prevent Pakistan or exercise pressure on Russia to prevent Pakistan from using its arms against India ?

Recently in the Consultative Committee for Defence Ministry certain serious questions were raised that Russia was withholding certain spare parts and arms and ammunition and also gun barrels.

I also want to know from the Government whether Government of India is going to make diversification of defence shopping in different countries.

Lastly, Sir, I want to know whether the Government of India is going to prevent Russia from having any interest in the Indian ocean, maybe in the name of survey or maybe, in the name of fishing, and that political fishing will not be started in the Indian ocean and I want to know whether the Government of India will prevent this, and if so, how will they prevent it. What are the protest notes which have been sent to Russia ? I want that Government should place those protest notes, the text of those protest notes completely, on the Table of the House so that Members may know about it.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Shiva Chandra Jha.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : And lastly, Sir, the Government of India should not forget this : Be it Russia, be it America or be it China or any other big power in the world,—no big power wants that India should be a big power. Government should keep this always in mind before entering more into the vortex of Soviet Russia and before becoming,—as I have said already and I repeat it—an 'infra-satellite' of Soviet Russia.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Let Members ponder over this—if the Member who leads the Half-an-Hour Discussion takes 18 to 20 minutes, what will be the time left for others ? Shri Shiva Chandra Jha.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : I have not taken 20 minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN : You can look at the clock.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : If you were not disturbing me, I would not have taken...

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Shiva Chandra Jha.

श्री शिवचन्द्र भा (मधुबनी) : कम्प्ल इस के कि मैं सवाल पूछूं, मैं कुछ शब्द कहना चाहता हूं। हम सब जानते हैं, और यह बात निर्विवाद है, कि जब से पाकिस्तान बना है, उसकी हुकूमत की बागडोर दूसरे लोगों के ही हाथ में रही। हम जिस को बुर्जुआ जनतन्त्र कहते हैं, उस डिमाक्रेसी का खारमा भी पाकिस्तान में हुआ। बहुत हैरानी की बात है कि जहां पर डिमाक्रेसी भी नहीं है वहां की प्रोप्रेसिब रूस किस तरह से मदद कर रहा है। मैं एक हफ्ते कराची में था। वहां के लोगों से मेरी बातें हुईं। उन लोगों ने मुझ से कहा कि एक भारी गलती हम से हो गई। हम लोग पाकिस्तान बनाने की हवा में बह गये। हम लोगों ने सोचा था कि पाकिस्तान बन गया तो वह हमारे लिए विहित होगा। लेकिन हमारी आर्थिक हालत तो जो हिन्दुस्तान में थी उस से भी बदतर है। यह देख कर बड़ी हैरानी होती है कि रूस पाकिस्तान को फौजी मदद दे रहा है, हालांकि पाकिस्तान एक डेमोक्रेटिक देश नहीं है—वह बूर्जवा डेमोक्रेसी भी नहीं है। तो फिर रूस किस दृष्टिकोण से ऐसा कर रहा है ? ऐसा मान्य होता है कि उस के दृष्टिकोण में इन्टरनेशनलिज्म कम है और नैशनल जियो-पॉलिटिक्स ज्यादा है।

मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि 1965 में हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान में जो लड़ाई हुई, उस से पहले रूस ने पाकिस्तान को कितने हथियार दिये और उसके बाद कितने हथियार दिये।

1965 की लड़ाई में हमारे द्वारा

[श्री शिवचन्द्र भा]

पाकिस्तान के जो हथियार पकड़े गये, उन में कितने रूसी हथियार थे ?

भारत को अब तक रूस से कितने हथियार आम्बर्ज और एम्पुनिशन, मिले हैं ?

इस बात की क्या वजह है कि चीन, रूस, अमरीका आदि सब पाकिस्तान को ही चाहते हैं, भारत को कोई नहीं चाहता है और भारत सरकार यूँ ही "बम भोलानाथ" बनी हुई है? क्या इसका कारण यह नहीं है कि भारत सरकार की विदेश नीति 'ए रिड्डल रैण्ड इन ए मिस्ट्री इनसाइड एन एनिग्मा' है और इनकाम्पिटेंट, इनकाम्प्रिहेंसिव और इनइफेक्टिव है ?

श्री कंवरलाल गुप्त (दिल्ली सदर) : पाकिस्तान को तीन तरह से हथियार मिलते हैं : एक गिफ्ट के तौर पर ; दूसरे, सस्ते दामों, प्रो अथे प्राइस पर और तीसरे मार्केट प्राइस पर । पाकिस्तान के पास फारेन एक्सचेंज की कमी नहीं है, क्योंकि सऊदी ऐरेबिया और दूसरे देश उस को बहुत मदद देते हैं । अमरीका इनडायरेक्टली-ईरान और टर्की वगैरह के जरिये—पाकिस्तान को हथियार देता है । वेस्ट जर्मनी भी उसको हथियार देता है और यहां तक कि यूगोस्लाविया भी देता है । पाकिस्तान को कई देशों के हथियार मिलते हैं । अब रसा भी पाकिस्तान को आम्बर्ज देता है । आज पाकिस्तान का दुश्मन कौन है ?—केवल हिन्दुस्तान । इस बैंकप्राउन्ड में रसा को निश्चित रूप से यह मालूम है—और भारत सरकार ने भी कई बार उसको कहा है—कि इस से इस क्षेत्र का वॉलेंस बिगड़ जायेगा और पाकिस्तान के हौसले बहुत बढ़ जायेंगे । आप को याद होगा कि एक बार ख्रुश्चेव ने काश्मीर में इस देश के लोगों को कहा था कि जब आवश्यकता हो, तो आप आवाज देना, हम एक दम आप की मदद के लिए आ जायेंगे । मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या भारत सरकार हिन्दुस्तान

के प्रति रशन पालिसी में कोई शिफ्ट पाती है ; अगर हाँ, तो वह शिफ्ट किस तरह का है । पहले रूस पाकिस्तान के मुकाबले में हम को प्रिफरेंस देता था, फिर वह दोनों देशों को बराबरी का दर्जा देने लगा और अब उस का भुकाव थोड़ा पाकिस्तान की तरफ है । मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि इस समय रूस का दृष्टिकोण और नीति क्या है ।

क्या सरकार ने रूस की सरकार से पिछले एक या डेढ़ साल में बातचीत कर के यह मालूम किया है कि काश्मीर के बारे में रूस का रवैया वही है या उस में कोई परिवर्तन हुआ है ?

मैं यह भी जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या रूस ने कभी भारत सरकार के प्रोटेस्ट नोट्स का लिख कर जवाब दिया है ; अगर हाँ, तो आखिरी दो तीन चिट्ठियों का जवाब कब आया है और क्या मंत्री महोदय उन को सभा-पटल पर रखेंगे । हमें सन्देह है कि यह सरकार रूस से डरती है और वह जोरदार लेंटर नहीं लिखती है, जिस का परिणाम यह है कि रूस हमारे प्रोटेस्ट को इग्नोर कर रहा है । वह हिन्दुस्तान को टेकन फार ग्रान्टिड समझता है । रसा ने हमारा पचास हजार मील का क्षेत्र चाइना का भाग दिखा दिया, तब भी यह सरकार धुप है । रसा का रेडियो पीस एंड प्राइस और मास्को रेडियो हमारे खिलाफ प्रचार करते हैं, तो सरकार ने उसकी न्यूज को अखबारों को देना बन्द कर दिया । इस से रूस ससम्भता है कि भारत सरकार तो उस की जेब में ही है ।

दूसरी चीज मैं यह पूछना चाहता है कि जो रसा एम्पुनिशंस पाकिस्तान को दे रहा है वह गिफ्ट के तौर पर दे रहा है या सस्ते दामों में दे रहा है या बाजार भाव पर दे रहा है ?

इस के अलावा 1965 में जो पाकिस्तान

के पास हथियार थे क्या यह सही नहीं है कि उस से बहुत इम्प्रूव्ड पोजीशन आज पाकिस्तान की है ? टैंक्स, हवाई जहाज और एम्पूनिशंस भी पहले से बहुत ज्यादा उसके पास है ?

अगर यह सब कुछ है और रूस जानता है कि यह सब कुछ करने से हिन्दुस्तान पर उल्टा असर पड़ेगा तो क्या सरकार सिवाय प्रोटेस्ट नोट के कुछ और भी कहेंगे ? उन को साफ तौर पर यह सरकार क्यों नहीं बता देती कि यह जो कुछ आप कर रहे हैं यह अन-फ्रैंडली एक्ट है और हम दोस्ती चाहेंगे बेशक, लेकिन दोस्ती का यह मतलब नहीं है कि हम अपनी सेक्योरिटी को एनडेंजर करें। हम इन्सल्ट पाकेट नहीं करेंगे और यह अन-फ्रैंडली ऐक्ट होगा क्या इस प्रकार सरकार उन से कहेगी ?

अन्तिम प्रश्न—क्या यह सही है कि रूस ने पाकिस्तान को नैवल बेस पशियन गल्फ में बनाने का मौका दिया है ?

श्री श्रीम प्रकाश त्यागी (मुरादाबाद) : सभापति महोदय, मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या पाकिस्तान जो हथियार इकट्ठे कर रहा है और अपने बजट का 80 प्रतिशत पैसा इस पर खर्च कर रहा है तो क्या सरकार को यह संभावना है कि पाकिस्तान की ओर से यह सब भारतवर्ष पर शीघ्र ही हमला करने की तैयारी है ? ऐसी क्या आप की दृष्टि में संभावना है ? यदि है तो क्या इस से आप ने रूस को अवगत कराया है कि उन आधारों पर हमें भय लगता है, आप उन्हें हथियार क्यों दे रहे हैं आक्रमण के लिए ? क्या आप ने कभी इस प्रकार का विरोध मौखिक या लिखित रूप में रूस को किया है या नहीं किया है ? यदि किया है तो उनका क्या उत्तर आया है ?

दूसरा मेरा प्रश्न है कि क्या आपने रूस के सामने यह बात उपस्थित की है कि यह जो हमारी शस्त्रों की होड़ है इस से हमारे देश

के आर्थिक ढांचे पर प्रभाव पड़ता है आप यह शस्त्रास्त्र देते जाते हैं इस से हमारे देश के आर्थिक ढांचे पर प्रभाव पड़ता है तो आप पाकिस्तान को जो हथियार दे रहे हैं उस का लक्ष्य क्या है ? क्या आप हमारे आर्थिक ढांचे को और हमारी सुरक्षा को खतरे में डालने के लिए दे रहे हैं या कोई और लक्ष्य है ? अगर है तो वह क्या ?

18 hrs.

अन्तिम प्रश्न यह है कि पाकिस्तान के समाचार पत्रों से यह जानकारी होती है कि पाकिस्तान ने चीन, फ्रांस और दुनिया भर के देशों से हथियार लिए हैं। उन के पास शस्त्रास्त्र की अच्छी व्यवस्था है और हमारे हथियार अधिकांश में रूस के हैं, यह मुझे जो जानकारी समाचार पत्रों से मिली है वह बता रहा है, अगर इस के प्रतिरिक्त कोई और बात है तो आप बताईगा। और क्या यह भी सच है कि स्पेयर पाट्स और एम्पूनिशंस काफी मात्रा में रूस नहीं दे रहा है तो ऐसी दशा में यह हथियार 14 दिन से 15 बें दिन नहीं चलेंगे और आपकी इन्हें बनाने की स्थिति भी नहीं है। तो ऐसी स्थिति में जब पाकिस्तान के पास हथियार और देशों के भी प्राप्त हैं जिन के स्पेयर पाट्स और एम्पूनिशंस मिलने की आशा है और आप के पास होंगे रशिया के हथियार जो 14 दिन से 15 बें दिन नहीं चलेंगे और एम्पूनिशंस भी नहीं होंगे तो आप पाकिस्तान से मुकाबिला करने के लिए मावधानी के तौर पर क्या कर रहे हैं ?

SHRI S. KUNDU (Balasore) : We are living in such a difficult world that it is very difficult to know what sort of socialist realism is involved in Soviet Russia giving arms aid to a theocratic dictatorship like Pakistan.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : Capitalist State also.

SHRI S. KUNDU : A historian has said that today's politicians in certain countries are much more powerful than Mark Anthony and Hitler put together with

[Shri S. Kundu]

the vast army and nuclear weapons which they command today. It is unfortunate that in these days of world war politics, the super Powers are using Sardar Swaran Singh just like a pawn.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Not Shri Kundu ?

SHRI UMANATH (Pudukottai) : Kundu does not have power.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : He has power to create misunderstanding.

SHRI S. KUNDU : I would like to know two or three things specifically.

The Minister about a year ago had told us that between February and May, 1969, Pakistan had acquired 1:0 Russian tanks, T-55, helicopters, radar sets, ammunition artillery guns. This is so far as the Minister knew at that time. I would like to know the information with Sardar Swaran Singh about the supply of arms and items of arms from Soviet Russia to Pakistan, after that statement was made in May till today.

Secondly, it has been said that the arms have been given to Pakistan at a throw-away price and part of it as gift. What information has the Minister on this ?

Thirdly, when first this arms supply started from Soviet Russia to Pakistan and we raised this matter in this House, we were given to understand that Soviet Russia was saying that this aid had been given in order so wean Pakistan away from China. Is the Minister aware of any shift in the so called policy pronounced at that time by Soviet Russia now because Pakistan, instead of being weaned away from China, has become much more intimate with China ? Therefore, did he check up with Soviet Russia whether they are going to revise their policy ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : This debate has become somewhat difused and all manner of questions, political strategic, diplomatic have been raised.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : Naturally they are inter-related,

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : In the short time at my disposal I will try to answer these specific questions that have been raised.

First of all, I would like to say that Government has from time to time kept this hon. House informed about the supply of arms to Pakistan by the Soviet Union, by China, by the United States of America, by France and several other countries. I feel amazed that newspaper reports should be mentioned in this connection and that it should be conveniently forgotten that all this information has been very recently given to this hon. House by my colleague the Minister of Defence on 5th August, 1970 in reply to an Unstarred Question.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : Not the quantum, that is the most important thing.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : The quantum will not be given. I have explained on several occasions that even if we have the information about the quantum with us, it is not in our interest that Pakistan should know that we know fully what that quantum is. This matter has been explained on a number of occasions, and I do not understand why the same argument is repeated again and again.

What I am saying is that in this latest reply the types of weapons that Pakistan has acquired from China, from France, from the Soviet Union, from the Federal Republic of Germany, all this has been given. In reply to this question the arms that Pakistan obtained, prior to the 1965 conflict, from USA under the Mutual Defence Agreement has also been mentioned.

All that is mentioned in reply to that question. One need not go to newspaper reports.

श्री शिवचन्द्र झा : 1965 के पहले कितना प्राया ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Mr. Jha raised a pointed question whether USSR had supplied any arms or lethal equipment before the 1965 conflict. This matter was explained on earlier occasions ; if Members do not recall I may re-state that prior to 1965 USSR had not supplied any arms to Pakistan Therefore the second part of the

question whether we had captured at the time of the 1965 conflict any arms of Soviet origin does not arise. According to our information these supplies started after the 1965 conflict.

Several questions had been raised and if Mr. Samar Guha with his intellectual background goes over his speech today he will himself discover several contradictions. He tried at one stage to develop the theme : here are four countries, USSR, Pakistan, China and India. By some sort of a logic which I have not been able to comprehend fully, he wanted to give the impression that all the other three were together and were trying to conspire against India. This is the upshot of his arguments.

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA :** Not conspiring together. Pakistan said : not at the cost of Moscow ; Moscow says the same ; China says : not at the cost of Moscow. In that way it ultimately boils down to this : at the cost of India Russia, China and Pakistan are having their friendship.

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH :** Even after this clarification and pondering seriously over what he is saying, he should give an answer himself. He is conveniently forgetting the very important factor in the relationship between Soviet Union and China. Any amount of argument or sophistication and trying to clothe it in involvement does not alter the basic fact. It is amazing that he should readily accept this argument and say that this is the conclusion ; by some process he concludes that India alone finds itself in a position of disadvantage compared to the three countries he mentioned. He does so by some method which he is unable to explain. The hard realities of the situation are as follows. Today for countries who can find money, arms are available from all parts of the world. This is something basic which we should not forget. If we have money we can get arms from Soviet Union, France, United Kingdom, even from the United States. If Pakistan has money, they also can purchase arms almost from any country.

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA :** From the United States also ?

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH :** Yes. If people have money, arms are available, if

not directly from the United States, from other sources. It may interest the House to know that there are not many buyers for arms these days. For countries who can give money, arms are sold. Arms are being transferred in different theatres of the world, not always for consideration of money but for other considerations. These are factors which we must not ignore. Sovereign countries have a right to acquire arms from any source just as sovereign countries have a right to sell arms to whomsoever is prepared to pay for them. In our excitement, sometimes even in a moment of depression, sometimes even for political considerations, we try to highlight one aspect and depress the other and again try to highlight the third aspect, but we must not forget this picture which has to be carefully and clearly understood.

What is the world today ? The main manufacturers of equipments besides the USA are the highly developed and highly industrialised countries of western Europe and of eastern Europe. So far as the main location of arms is concerned, it is concentrated mostly among these countries who are members of these pacts. They have their own obsolescent arms ; as these become obsolete they put away the old ones and they go in for new ones. Today, it is a fact that both among the Warsaw Pact and the NATO pact countries, they have a replacement programme, and whatever is surplus they are prepared to sell. But there are not many buyers because there are not even many hot theatres where countries either have the capacity to acquire or have got the money to purchase, and quite a large number of arms are available only if countries are prepared to buy. What should be India's attitude in this rather uncomfortable world ? We steadfastly believe that in the short run in order to meet immediate requirements it may be necessary for us to acquire arms from other countries, and in this sphere without any inhibitions whatsoever we are prepared to meet our requirements, to purchase arms from whatever source they may be available provided they meet with our specification and we require them ; we will acquire them from all sources. I would like to say very clearly that we have not hesitated to get them from whatever sources they are available. On that we have absolutely no inhibitions and I am pained to find a consistent effort being

[Shri Swaran Singh]

made to show as if we are dependent only on one country for our arms. We have got arrangements for getting arms from countries other than Soviet Union. For some of our defence requirements we go to European countries,—

**SHRI S. KUNDU :** The point is about arms supply to Pakistan.

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH :** He says that it is an infra-satellite and that I am tied down to the Soviet Union. I cannot permit this statement to go unchallenged. He is the leader of your party and he has made this statement and these are being repeated from other quarters and it is time that this position was clarified.

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA :** Your attitude, your posture, your stand, your behaviour, and your attitude in foreign affairs—all lead to the same conclusion.

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH :** I am glad that Shri Samar Guha has discovered the various directions in which I move.

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA :** Not discovery ; your observations.

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH :** Discovery or observations. It is in this direction that India has to be strong. In this respect I was saying it is absolutely incorrect to say that we are dependent on Soviet Union alone for our defence requirements. We have got arrangements with other countries several European countries—Britain, France, Belgium, Sweden and several other countries of Europe. We do not hesitate to get our equipment from whatever source this equipment is available.

Secondly, the most important approach which we have persistently and consistently followed is to manufacture all our requirements in our own country, for obvious reasons, economic as well as strategic. This has been the policy that we have consistently pursued. I am conscious of the fact that there can be a time-lag between the arrival of a particular type of equipment from our own factories and our requirements which may be pressing, and to meet that interval it is necessary to acquire equipment. I think, we have gone to all countries. I would

like to repudiate any suggestion which, I have a suspicion, clothed with political overtones—always to suggest that we have tied ourselves too much with the Soviet Union. You may do it for political reasons. I do not grudge that, but I know, and with my association with the Defence Ministry and also with the External Affairs Ministry I can say without fear of the slightest contradiction, that this suggestion is totally devoid of any substance. But when it is repeated again and again, I suspect that it is not based on facts, but is a deliberate attempt to make political capital out of it and paint a picture which suits them politically.

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA :** It is your subjective observation. We have proved on more than one occasion that it is not correct.

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH :** This is based on my knowledge of facts and not on what appears in newspapers or what one may get in a whispering manner from this or that chancery. I know the inspiration that some of our critics get. I am also conscious of its source but I do not want to go into that. This projection of India's defence does not do us credit.

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA :** On a point of order, Sir. The minister has made a very insinuating statement that some members are getting inspiration from certain sources.

**MR. CHAIRMAN :** I was closely listening to him. The records can be examined. He did not say 'members'. He said, 'some critics'. I hope the hon. member is not included in it.

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA :** I am one of the critics. I have made a lot of criticism. If anyone of us who have participated gets any inspiration from any chancery, it is up to his honesty to disclose that.

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH :** Prof. Guha is too good and innocent a person against whom I will make any such comment. There are other people who are much more complicated. Mr. Guha will discover by himself in course of time all the intricacies of this.

I have often carefully tried to revolve in my mind the object of raising the issue of USSR supplies of arms to Pakistan. This should be viewed in the proper perspective. It is wrong to pick out one country and try to make political capital. This is not the correct way of approaching this problem. The Prime Minister herself made a statement about the supply of arms. As Defence Minister, I made a clear statement bringing out all the aspects of the problem. My friends opposite in the Jan Sangh know it fully well. I still remember that they were saying that I made a statement in a very clear and forthright manner. I do not know what has happened thereafter that this question is raised again. According to our information, there are no fresh contracts or fresh arrangements for any fresh supply by USSR to Pakistan. Whatever are the supplies, they have already been stated by me in that statement covering also all the political aspects on the floor of the House.

Shri Kundu referred to an earlier statement made by me as Defence Minister in 1969. If he is interested in research, I will ask him to look at the debates again, because as late as 8th April 1970 I made another statement in response to a calling Attention Notice regarding the reported decision of USSR to supply 200 tanks to Pakistan. You were talking of 1969. This was only in April 1970 that I made a statement and I gave all the information that was available. I was mentioning all this only to say that, so far as factual information is concerned, we have kept this House and the country fully informed. And the last one is the statement made during the present session by my colleague, the Minister of Defence, giving a complete picture about the supply of arms to Pakistan from USSR and from all other countries.

Having said that, I would like to say that certain specific things have been mentioned and I will try very briefly to refer to them. One category of questions is that USSR has been saying that it is supplying arms to wean Pakistan from China and whether USSR has succeeded in that. I cannot answer for USSR. It is for the USSR to say whether it has succeeded in weaning Pakistan away from China. And if it has not, I cannot argue with it as to why is it that its assessment has gone wrong.

But we on our side have never accepted this assessment of the Soviet Union that by supplying arms the Soviet Union will succeed in weaning Pakistan away from China. It may be their assessment, which they have not mentioned to us pointedly; there have been comments and sometimes it has been mentioned. But I am not concerned as to whether their assessment is correct or incorrect. We have, from the very beginning, never accepted this assessment, and I have no hesitation in saying that we will never accept that assessment. This assessment is some thing which they may have for some complex reasons.

श्री श्रीम प्रकाश त्यागी : घापको क्या जवाब दिया रूस ने ?

श्री स्वर्ण सिंह : तक्षरीफ रखिए त्यागी जी और मुनिये ।

I say that I am not at all concerned with their assessment. What is the point in my telling them how they should wean away Pakistan from China. I am not concerned with that and I am not answering for the Soviet Union. But I, from the very beginning have taken the position that we do not accept their assessment. As a matter of fact, we held and still hold the view that this will definitely increase Pakistan's intransigence and several other things which Professor Samar Guha listed. In fact, I have studied his statement because this is precisely what I have said in my statement when I was giving my statement about the Soviet supply of arms to Pakistan. I feel flattered that he has done some home work and has unearthed the very expressions I have used in my statement when I informed this House about these supplies sometime back.

This loose expression of "defence balance" has been used I have touched upon this subject on an earlier occasion and I would like to do it again. This is an absolutely wrong approach on the part of everyone, including some innocent persons amongst us, to talk of balance between India and Pakistan. So far as India's defence requirements are concerned, they are not related only to Pakistan. Our main preoccupation these days is the threat that we unfortunately face from China and any accrual of strength to Pakistan militarily

[Shri Swaran Singh]

means that we have to take that into consideration as a possible threat from Pakistan and, to that extent, it is a greater burden cast on us, not only to make adequate arrangements to meet any threat from Pakistan but also from China. It will be over-simplification for us to talk of military balance. These are expressions which are used by western commentators to lull us into sleep that it is only a question of balance between India and Pakistan. We should never use that expression and we should not be taken in by this thesis. Our problems are different. Our responsibilities are greater and we have to organise ourselves in the matter of defence after taking into full consideration all those aspects.

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA :** I have used the words Pindi-Peking axis; not Pakistan alone.

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH :** It is a very unbalanced axis. Axis is much too big an expression. When we talk of Pindi and Peking, any attempt to bring that as an axis really is to have one wheel with a diameter of 1 centimetre and perhaps another wheel with a diameter of, say, 10 metres. There cannot be an axis between a tiny, microscopic wheel and a big wheel with a big circumference. These axes do not work in that manner and one should be careful while using these expressions. These are some of the expressions which are used by commentators, intellectuals, men like Professor Samar Guha and other big intellectuals. But we should be very, very careful in reacting to these made up theories of a vacuum and of balances.

Coming to specific questions, let me start with a reply to the last question by Shri Om Prakash Tyagi. He asked if there was any information that Pakistan was going to attack us imminently. There is no such information and I do not think that there is any such risk that we face today. The other question he asked, therefore, does not arise.

**SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Balrampur) :** Is there no possibility of an attack from Pakistan ?

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH :** He said, imminent attack.

श्री ओम प्रकाश त्यागी : मैंने "सम्भावना" कहा है। सम्भावना है या नहीं।

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH :** We have to defend ourselves against any possible attack.

Then, apart from his speech, Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta, asked several questions. As to the shift in the U.S.S.R. policy, I have already answered that in my well-known statement which he studied carefully and heard here. On an earlier occasion when I replied as Defence Minister, I did say that the shift is there in that now they are supplying arms to Pakistan whereas formerly they were not doing that. So, obviously there is a shift.

Then, he asked if there is any shift in their policy on Kashmir. This also I had occasion to answer earlier and I will repeat that there is no shift in their policy but, at the same time, I would like to say that we have told clearly the international community that this is a matter which is our concern and any attempt to pressurise us anywhere will not be tolerated by us.

About protest notes and all that I do not know what you get by protest notes and replies. The hard reality is that not with standing all our efforts to persuade them not to supply arms, arms are being supplied. So, you can say that this is the reply to our suggestion. What is the use of my sending a letter tomorrow to His Excellency the Foreign Minister of U.S.S.R. ? I do not know what exactly it means. It has become a fashion always to say, "Did you send a written note; did you get a written answer?" as if it were such a simple affair. If I write a letter and the other side give you a no, does that satisfy the Opposition? Is that the standard by which international affairs should be run ?

**SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK (South Delhi) :** Our difficulty is that they take you for granted and do not bother.

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH :** This is absolutely incorrect. As a matter of fact, the Jana Sangh party has placed themselves in such a position that all political parties take them for granted. Sometimes they are even behind or in arrears with regard to

their principals. They have sometimes raised issues which even their principals have forgotten. This is a political slogan which they want to raise again and again, in season and out of season. There is absolutely no justification for it and there is no basis for this. According to our information, the gifts that Pakistan has received in relation to arms are from U.S.A. under the mutual defence aid agreement and, later on, they have also got some gifts without payment from China. But from other countries, Russia, France, Britain and several other European countries, according to our information, these are all purchases and not gifts.

**SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA :** At cheaper price or at market price ?

**श्री स्वर्ण सिंह :** मार्केट प्राइस का क्या सवाल है ? यह तो बनिया लोगों का काम है ।

These are not like *dal* price or sugar prices

**श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त :** सरदार जी का क्या काम है ?

**श्री स्वर्ण सिंह :** सरदार जी का यह काम है कि If there is a requirement, I must get that requirement. I cannot go in for tenders with regard to a fighter plane or a missile or a tank. These are not advertised ; they are not quoted in newspapers and their are no auctions for these things. Perhaps, it is a new line for *bantias* or Guptas or others. Their mind always goes to market operations. The arms are not subject to market operations even when Guptas are involved.

**SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA :** May I know whether Pakistan is more powerful today than she was in 1965 ?

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH :** It is true that

they have made up all their losses and may be, they may be more strong as compared to 1965. But from 1965 to 1970, 5 years have elapsed and India has not been sitting quiet.

**श्री शिवचन्द्र झा :** आपको कितना मिला है ।

**श्री स्वर्ण सिंह :** मैंने यह भी नहीं कहा कि उनको कितना मिला है । कितने में तो मैं जाता नहीं इस मामले में ।

We have also added substantially to our defence potential not only by manufacturing ourselves but by getting equipment from other sources.

Sir, before concluding, I would like to say that it will be wrong for us not to accept with gratitude the fact of the supply of arms that we have got from the Soviet Union at prices which are quite reasonable. I would also like to say that this type of criticism raised from time to time that we have not got the spares or we have not got the ammunition is totally unfounded. I can say from my personal experience as a result of my association with the Defence Ministry that we will not fail either for want of spares or of ammunition in case of difficulty. Any suggestions to that effect are completely unfounded. They are not based on any facts. It is unfair to our armed forces to create an impression by this type of questioning that we are either short of spares or ammunition.

**MR. CHAIRMAN :** The House now stands adjourned to meet again at 11 A. M. on Tuesday, the 18th August, 1970.

11.34 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, August 18, 1970/Sravana 27, 1892 (Saka).*