

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: Government have absolutely nothing to do with this. The tension or the strike was between the contractor and the workers. We were not in the picture at all.

श्री मधु लिमये : फिर प्रश्न का जवाब प्रधान मंत्री नहीं दे रही हैं। या तो यह अणु शक्ति विभाग ये किमी दूसरे को देदे, या शीघ्र जवाब दे।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप कहते हैं कि चूँकि यूनिजन.....

Shri Priya Gupta: If the Prime Minister is unable to understand the work of this Department she should hand it over to Dr. K. L. Rao or some technical person who would be able to understand the problem.

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आपने कहा कि चूँकि मिनिस्ट्री ने एक ऐसी यूनिजन को रिकगनाइज कर लिया, जिसको किलेबर का समर्थन प्राप्त नहीं था, इस वजह से वह स्ट्राइक हुई थी, जिसकी वजह से काम पिछड़ गया और देर हुई। वह कहती हैं कि हमारा किसी रिकगनीशन से सम्बन्ध नहीं है। यह जो स्ट्राइक हुई थी, वह कांटेक्टर और उनके कर्मचारियों के दरमियान थी।

श्री मधु लिमये : इसमें मेरी दिक्कत यह है कि मजदूर क्षेत्र तथा औद्योगिक रिश्ते राज्य के मातहत हैं और अणु शक्ति विभाग केन्द्र के मातहत है।

U.S.A. Submarines for Pakistan

- +
- *397. **Dr. M. M. Das:**
Dr. P. N. Khan:
Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad:
Shri M. L. Dwivedi:
Shri P. C. Borooah:
Shri S. C. Samanta:
Shri Subodh Hansda:

Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether the submarine, loaned to Pakistan for training purposes, has

gone back to U.S.A. for carrying out certain repairs;

(b) whether it is a fact that another submarine has been given on loan to Pakistan by U.S.A. for training purposes; and

(c) whether Government have taken up the matter with the Government of U.S.A.?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri M. C. Chagla): (a) and (b). No, Sir, so far as the Government of India are aware.

(c) Does not arise.

Dr. M. M. Das: May I know whether this submarine which was given by the USA to Pakistan for training purposes played an active role during the hostilities last year until it was rendered inactive by a depth charge from an Indian naval ship?

Shri M. C. Chagla: All that we understand as far as this particular submarine is concerned is that it was given by the USA in 1964 on loan for five years on the usual terms that it was not to be used for any purpose except against communist aggression.

Mr. Speaker: He wants to know whether it played an active role during the hostilities between Pakistan and India last year.

Shri M. C. Chagla: We are not aware that it was actually used during the hostilities. (Interruptions). May I clarify this? It was on loan from the USA to Pakistan, and the principal purpose was the training purpose....

Shrimati Savitri Nigam: It was used. It was accepted in the House.

Shri M. L. Dwivedi: It was said here openly in the House.

Shri Tyagi: Are we arranging for submarine training in India??

Dr. M. M. Das: May I know how far the attempt on the part of the Indian Government to acquire submarines at least one for training purposes, has been successful? May I also know

within what range of time in the future we shall have the pleasure of having one submarine?

Shri M. C. Chagla: That does not arise out of the main question.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: It has been admitted in this House that this submarine loaned to Pakistan for training had been used actively during the time of the hostilities and aggression against India. May I know what action has been taken by Government to ask USA to take back this submarine if it has not already been taken back?

Shri M. C. Chagla: As the House knows, Pakistan used Patton tanks against us which had also been given by the USA for a specific purpose. The Government of India have protested against it and have drawn the attention of the USA to the fact that arming Pakistan means really aggravating the situation between the two countries, and there is every risk of whatever is supplied to Pakistan being used against India as was proved and confirmed by the recent Indo-Pakistan conflict. So, the submarine also, if it was used against India, falls in the same category as the Patton tanks and other American arms which were used against us contrary to the arrangement between Pakistan and the USA.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: Patton tanks and the Sabre-jets had been given for other purposes. It is clearly in the agreement that the submarine has been given for training. Therefore the two things fall in different categories. The submarine was sent for training purposes but had been used during the hostilities. Therefore, we want to know why the attention of the USA had not been drawn to this. Neither the Patton tanks nor the Sabre-jets had been given for training purposes. So, submarine falls in a different category.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: They were to stay but this was to be returned.

Shri M. C. Chagla: In theory, although this is loaned for five years, the USA has the right to recall this submarine; and if this submarine has been used....

Mr. Speaker: He wants to know whether the Government of India have brought specifically this fact of the submarine having been used during the hostilities, to the notice of the US Government.

Shri M. C. Chagla: As far as I know, we have drawn the attention of the United States to every instance of American arms given or loaned to Pakistan having been used against India. I am sorry I am not in a position just now to say whether we had specifically drawn the attention of the USA to this.

श्री म० सा० द्विवेदी : जिस वक़्त पाकिस्तान को ट्रेनिंग के लिये सब-मेरीन दी गई थी, उस वक़्त पाकिस्तान को यह बतला दिया गया था कि पाकिस्तान से यह सबमेरीन यू० एस० गवर्नमेन्ट वापस ले लेगी। अब मंत्री महीदय कहते हैं कि वह वापस नहीं हुई है। क्या वह अब भी पाकिस्तान की सेवा में है और अमरीका सरकार ने उसे वापस नहीं लिया है? क्या मंत्री महीदय को पता है कि पाकिस्तान ने 6 सबमेरीन और हासिल करने का प्रयत्न किया है, उनकी स्थिति क्या है?

Shri M. C. Chagla: I have already said that this submarine is still with Pakistan. It was given in 1964 for five years as a loan, for training purposes. As the five years have not expired, the USA has not yet asked Pakistan to return the submarine.

As regards the second part of the question, I am not aware of whether Pakistan is trying to acquire other submarine from other countries.

Shri M. L. Dwivedi: That has come out in the papers.

Shri P. C. Boseah: Apart from the USA supplying submarine to Pakistan,

may I know whether Pakistan is getting submarine supplies from China and has also recently entered into contract with a French firm for getting three submarines, and if so, whether the Government of India have approached the French Government in order to restrain them from supplying those submarines to Pakistan in view of the inherent danger to peace on account of the arms build-up by Pakistan, and if so, their reaction thereto?

Shri M. C. Chagla: As I said the other day, if Pakistan goes about the world buying submarines and other arms on a commercial basis, it is very difficult for us to take action. But wherever we can, we point out to the countries concerned the result of arming Pakistan and its effect on Indo-Pakistan relations.

Mr. Speaker: The question hour is over.

Shri Hem Barua: On a point of order. May I know if you have admitted question No. 401 after the demonstration in front of Parliament House on November 7 or before that? If it was after that, I think you are not within your right to do so because there cannot be anything more obscene than what the naked *sadhus* demonstrated.

Mr. Speaker: He seems to be very particular about obscenity.

SHORT NOTICE QUESTION

1 डाउन अवध-तिरहुत डाकगाड़ी को उलटने का प्रयत्न

S.N.Q. 2. श्री विश्वनाथ पाण्डेय : क्या रेलवे मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि 10 नवम्बर 1966 को 1 डाउन अवध-तिरहुत डाकगाड़ी (पूर्वोत्तर रेलवे) में यात्रा कर रहे सैकड़ों यात्री बादशाहनगर और डालीगंज रेलवे स्टेशनों के बीच बाल बाल बचे जहाँ तोड़

फोड़ करने वालों ने पटरी पर बड़े बड़े पत्थर रख कर इस रेलगाड़ी को उलटने का प्रयत्न किया ;

(ख) यदि हां, तो इस पर सरकार की क्या प्रतिक्रिया है ; और

(ग) तोड़ फोड़ करने वालों के विरुद्ध सरकार ने क्या कार्यवाही की है ?

रेलवे मंत्रालय में राज्य-मंत्री (डा० राम सुभग सिंह) : (क) और (ख) जी नहीं। सही स्थिति यह है कि 9-11-66 को लगभग 18.40 बजे पूर्वोत्तर रेलवे के बादशाहनगर और डालीगंज स्टेशनों के बीच किलोमीटर नं० 773/3 पर 1 अप अवध-तिरहुत डाकगाड़ी का इंजन सीमा-स्तंभ के पत्थर के एक टुकड़े से टकरा गया जो रेल पथ पर रखा हुआ था। रेल-पथ को कोई नुकसान नहीं पहुंचा और न यात्रियों को कोई चोट आयी।

(ग) लखनऊ की सरकारी रेलवे पुलिस ने भारतीय रेल अधिनियम की धारा 126 के अधीन एक मामला दर्ज कर लिया है और वह इसकी जांच कर रही है। इस क्षेत्र में गण लगाने के लिए सिविल पुलिस तैनात कर दी गयी है।

श्री विश्वनाथ पाण्डेय : श्रीमन्, बादशाहनगर और डालीगंज स्टेशन लखनऊ शहर के अन्तर्गत हैं और लखनऊ उत्तर प्रदेश की राजधानी है। यह छोटी लाइन पूर्वोत्तर रेलवे लखनऊ में जाती है और अच्छी ट्रेनें भी जाती हैं तो मैं रेलवे मंत्रालय से जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या रेलवे मंत्रालय ने उत्तर प्रदेश की सरकार को भी इस घटना की सूचना दी है जिससे कि वह समुचित व्यवस्था इस रेल पर कर सकें और भविष्य में इस तरीके की विध्वंसक कार्यवाहियां न हो सकें ?

डा० राम सुभग सिंह : जी हां।

श्री विश्वनाथ पाण्डेय : पूर्वोत्तर रेलवे उत्तर प्रदेश, बिहार, बंगाल और आसाम में से होकर जाती है और उस का रेलपथ बहुत ही