

(द) बम्बल परियोजना द्वारा 14 लाख एकड़ की सिंचाई शक्यता उत्पन्न करने का विचार है। 1970-71 तक, 10-80 लाख एकड़ की सिंचाई शक्यता उत्पन्न की गई थी। शेष शक्यता के परियोजना के पूर्ण होने पर उत्पन्न होने की संभावना है।

भारी वर्षा के कारण जमीन में घंस रहे खमोली के गांव

4103. श्री कूलचन्द्र वर्मा :

श्री एन० एन० पाण्डे :

क्या सिंचाई और बिद्युत मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या भारी वर्षा के कारण खमोली जिले के 15 गांव जमीन में घंस रहे हैं ,

(ख) क्या इन गांवों के जमीन में घंसने के कारण कुछ व्यक्ति मारे गए हैं ; और

(ग) यदि हां, तो इन गांवों के व्यक्तियों की रक्षा के लिए सरकार ने तुरन्त क्या कार्यवाही की है ?

सिंचाई और बिद्युत मंत्रालय में उपमंत्री (श्री बंजाराब कुरील) : (क) से (ग). उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार ने बताया है कि भारी वर्षा के कारण कोई भी गांव नहीं घंस रहा है। बहरहाल, भूस्खलन और कटाव का प्रभाव 23 गांवों पर बुरी तरह पड़ा है। भूस्खलनों से और मकानों के गिरने से 7 व्यक्तियों के प्राण चले गए। नन्द प्रयाग और मासों गांवों में बचाव के अस्थायी उपाय का काम शुरू है और बाकी इक्कीस गांवों के लिए उपयुक्त उपाय तैयार किए जा रहे हैं। क्षतिग्रस्त मकानों के निवासियों को अधिक सुरक्षित स्थानों पर ले जाया गया है।

12.00 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

REPORTED SUPPLY OF ARMS TO PAKISTAN BY USSR AND FRANCE

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur) :

Sir, I call the attention of the Minister of External Affairs to the following matter of

urgent public importance and I request that he may make a statement thereon :—

"The reported supply of arms to Pakistan by the USSR and France and the reaction of the Government thereto."

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI SWARAN SINGH) : Government have seen Press reports to this effect. Government have been in touch with the Governments of the USSR and France both in New Delhi and their respective capitals.

The Soviet Ambassador has told us that the Press reports about USSR Government having supplied arms to Pakistan after the military action in Bangla Desh are incorrect.

The French Government had informed us that they have not entered into any new contracts for the supply of arms to Pakistan after the military action in Bangla Desh. They had also informed us towards the end of June that they would not make any deliveries of arms even on old contracts. We have, however, expressed our grave concern to the French Ambassador about the reported supply of arms to Pakistan. We have asked our Ambassador in Paris and the French Ambassador in New Delhi to take this matter up with the French Government.

In view of the prevailing practice of clandestine sale of arms through private parties in Western Europe, the possibility of Pakistan acquiring arms through such sources cannot be ruled out.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Sir, the motivation of this calling attention notice is not to provoke any nation to send further arms to Pakistan in case they do not desire to do so, but we do want to have certain clarifications from the Minister, so that the position will be clarified before the people.

As far as the news item that has appeared in the press this morning is concerned it is reported that the Soviet Ambassador met our Foreign Secretary to confirm that Moscow has made no supplies of arms or spares to Pakistan since the Bangla Desh crisis erupted on March 25. Sir, sometimes diplomats always make diplomatic statements but it is very clear from the statement that has been made by the Soviet Ambassador that as far as the position after 25th is concerned no arms had been despatched but on the background that in 1969 arms

[Shri Madhu Dandavate] agreement was arrived at with Pakistan—if I remember aright on 4th March 1969—when the External Affairs Minister was Minister in-charge of Defence he made a categorical statement that Soviet Union had supplied T-54 and T-55 tanks to Pakistan and that the supply of arms was to continue. I would like to have the clarification—though the clarification given by the Soviet Ambassador states that after 25th, that is, after eruption of movement in Bangla Desh, no arms have reached Pakistan—is it a fact that arms have been despatched before that date and they have reached subsequent to 25th March. About that there is no clarification at all. In, this case I would like the hon Minister to remember that this, clarification is required because there is a certain background of the world powers which have been pursuing certain 'Asian strategy'. They want to pursue the policy of balance of power in Asia and if India challenges this concept of balance of power they would like to reframe their policy regarding India too. It is not merely U. S. A. which shamelessly entered into an arms deal with Pakistan but USSR too did the same. After sending these arms the former President, Mr. Eisenhower, clarified that these arms would not be used for aggressive purposes. There seems to be a strange coincidence between the statement made by Mr. Eisenhower and the Soviet Prime Minister Mr. Kosygin's rejoinder to our Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi stating that Russia had entered into a deal with Pakistan but these arms would not be used for aggressive designs. Probably, the language used by the Soviet Prime Minister and President Eisenhower was identical because their Asian strategy was also identical. In this connection I would like to state, that Russia had gradually changed her attitude. There was a time when on Kashmir they had a pronounced view in favour of India but gradually they became non-aligned. In 1965 all the big powers including America and Russia refused to name Pakistan as aggressor. Then Russia pressurised India to sign the Tashkent Agreement.

I would also like to point out that after every news of arms despatch the explanation always given is that we were not in the know of the despatch of these arms and shipment of the cargo. I would like to know from the Minister concerned whether it is not a failure of our embassies. According to the

accepted practice all the prominent newspapers always announce the dates of loading and unloading of cargo sufficiently in advance. So, whereas everyone else knows about these details our embassies do not know about the despatch of ships. Is it not a failure on the part of our embassies? If we had come to know about these news items regarding shipment of arms at the right time we could have exerted certain diplomatic pressures.

As regards France, Sir, it has been the consistent policy of the western powers again to pursue the same Asian strategy and see that they do not disturb the balance in Asia. They do not like a virulent State like Bangla Desh to come up and join hands with India and thus disturb this balance. As regards supply of arms to Pakistan, Germany has done it. Italy has done it. In addition to that I would like to point out that consistent campaign is going on through Pakistan Radio day in and day out—that during the talks of Kosygin with the Pakistan authorities, Mr. Kosygin, had assured the Pakistan authorities that Bangla Desh was an internal problem; it is not a problem in which USSR would like to interfere. That being the position probably the arms have been despatched earlier and received after 25th. I would like to know when a number of countries have been despatching arms—U.S.A., Soviet Russia, Germany, Italy, France, etc.—whether our Government categorise these arms into progressive arms, reactionary or retrograde arms. Is it to be taken that if men face reactionary arms they are liquidated, if they face progressive arms, they are liberated. And probably if they die at the hands of Chinese arms they are resurrected. I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether it is not a fact that all these powers including Russia, America, France, Italy and others are adopting a particular posture as far as arms supplies are concerned and they are not prepared to take a firm attitude *vis-a-vis* India and Bangla Desh because many of them have a guilty conscience.

If America's hands are soaked in the blood of the Vietnamese those of Soviet Russia are soaked in the blood of the freedom-fighters of Hungary and Czechoslovakia. With this guilt on their conscience how could they lend support to the case of Bangla Desh?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: It has been a long speech and I have no intention to make

a counter speech. However, there are one or two points to which he asked me to reply and I will try to touch upon those points briefly, without entering into an argument, because in his presentation there are several draw-backs and several snags which are fully known to the House and Government's appreciation of the situation has been given from time to time. He has pointedly asked by way of information one specific point: earlier on there have been supplies of U.S.S.R. arms to Pakistan. It is a fact and I have myself made statements both as Defence Minister and also as Minister for External Affairs, about supply of arms from U.S.S.R. to Pakistan. So, if there were any supplies earlier to March 25 or even despatch of arms earlier to March, 25 and if these arms have reached Pakistan after 25th March, this possibility cannot be excluded. The other point he talked about was balance of power. We have always steadfastly adhered to the view that this doctrine is unacceptable and unreal because the facts of the situation are; India is five times the size of Pakistan and then Pakistan's own contention has always been that India is Pakistan's only enemy whereas in India we face bigger problems on account of our population and size. We have our differences with our neighbours both in the North and the West. Any talk of balance of power is unreal in any part of the world. It is completely misplaced and out of place so far as the Indian sub-continent is concerned. If anybody continues to adhere to the policy, it is his fault, not ours. We do not accept any such approach. We do not permit this argument to go unchallenged.

I would like to contradict very emphatically the suggestion that he has made that in 1965 at Tashkent there was any pressurisation by the Soviet Union. This is factually incorrect and totally misplaced. I would like to contradict this with all the emphasis at my command.

Then, about France, he said, that they also adopt the same strategy of balance of power. I do not subscribe to this at all. I do not think that France, unlike several other European powers, has always put across either in their Parliament or even private talks or elsewhere, this doctrine of balance of power which, in any case, we reject and we do not accept at all. I cannot recall any instance in which France may have subscribed to such a theory of balance of power.

As to what Pakistan radio puts out everyday is a controlled medium of dissemination of information and they would, certainly like to present to their own people something which is favourable to them. This should not surprise you if they are putting across to their people their own version of what other countries tell their representatives because it is one of their functions, when they find there is a growing criticism of the military atrocities, of the military regime, that they would like to reassure their own people that all is well amongst the international community. We should not take under notice of what they say.

Further, he has asked as to whether there is any distinction between, what he dramatically called, reactionary arms or retrograde arms or other type of arms. All arms are arms. No arms have yet been invented which operate or fire only in one direction. All arms are deadly arms, whether they originate from a socialist country or a capitalist country or a neutral country or whatever it may be.

AN HON. MEMBER : Or a non-aligned country like India.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Even a non-aligned country like India. Our weapons are more deadly than many other weapons.

I do not think this way of describing such a serious matter in these terms will serve any purpose. We have always taken the view that arms in the hands of Pakistan from whatever source they get them are a source of danger to us. It does not give us any satisfaction if their origin is a capitalist country or a socialist country or any country whatsoever. We have, therefore, been stressing upon all countries that they should desist from giving arms supply to Pakistan because this only makes them more intransigent rather than lessening the tension in this area.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Since you have already accepted the contention that before 25th March, arms might have been despatched to Pakistan by U.S.S.R., did our Government make any effort to find out whether arms have been despatched?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : There has not been any confirmation of this.

SHRI P. K. DEO (Kalahandi) : Sir, our sad experience is that the statement of the Foreign Minister is always sketchy and not factual. The statement made now is that there is no actual supply of Russian arms to Pakistan. In this regard, I would like to know categorically if the Foreign Minister has ascertained from the defence Ministry because our knowledge is that the story that was published yesterday has come from the Government circles.

So, as the Defence Minister is also here now, he should corroborate the statement of the Foreign Minister. I say so because of the so-called good conduct certificate procured by the Foreign Minister and his statement after the conclusion of his visit to the various world capitals has proved that it is not even worth the paper on which it is written. It has completely exposed the diplomacy of our country, the bankruptcy of Indian diplomacy and day in and day out foreign arms supply is continuing to Pakistan. And so far as USSR is concerned, the Minister cannot abdicate his responsibility by saying that arms supplies may be available from private sources. Sir, as everybody knows, so far as USSR is concerned, the entire economic activity there—production, distribution and foreign trade—is state-controlled so, he should ascertain and find out from USSR sources and as well as from military intelligence of our Defence Ministry as to the actual facts of this story.

Secondly, the Pakistan Radio news bulletin which has been monitored has not been contradicted as yet. It has categorically stated that after the Ambassador, Mr. Jamshad Marker, has met Mr. Kosygin, he has assured that the entire affairs in Bangla Deah is the internal affairs of Pakistan and Soviet Russia has nothing to do with that. This has not been contradicted as yet by the Russian quarters.

Secondly, I would like to know...

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Secondly, thirdly or fourthly. Everytime you are saying 'secondly'.

SHRI P. K. DEO : Finally, I would like to know....

AN HON. MEMBER : Semi-finally.

SHRI P. K. DEO : ... the reasons for the silence of USSR regarding the atrocities in

Bangla Deah. (*Interruptions*). I think Mr. Banerjee is not the Russian Ambassador. The Russians have been silent about it, I would like to have categorical answers to all the questions.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : First of all, I would like to assure this hon. House through you, Mr. Speaker, that this fashionable expression of the Foreign Minister being in need of good certificates from abroad or from any one is totally unfounded and I strongly resent that. (*Interruptions*) I am not born in that tradition like our former feudal princes that I am in need of any certificate. I can stand on my own and I do not require any certificate good or bad from my hon. friend or from any source. I know what my responsibilities are and it is unfortunate that this sort of expression should be used by my hon. friend which is totally unfounded. I don't care about these expressions. I would beg of the hon. Members not to indulge in this type of pastime.

AN HON. MEMBER : Just ignore him.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Then he says. . (*Interruptions*) About one or two points he has raised, I will try to answer.

He places great reliance on the sources of information being made available to him through some Government circle. I feel amazed at the irresponsible statement that he has made. Surely when this information is available to him through any Government source, I should have been the first person to be informed by him or any other person who says that it is from a Government source. I would also like to say that this practice of trying to make out that different Ministers are different wings of the Government and are not fully in touch with each other is, to say the least, most mischievous.

This statement that I am making is being made in consultation with Defence Ministry and all the information that Government has in various Ministries is pooled and therefore to suggest that this has come to him from this source or that source is something which is totally unfounded ; and I would not have used these expressions if I were not aware of a series of whispering campaigns that are being carried on by interested quarters as though there is difference of either approach or assessment between various wings of the Government. This is totally unfound and I would like to repudiate it strongly.

He has made a great revelation today that everything in USSR is under Government control ; therefore nothing could come from USSR through private sources. He is correct for once. And, when I talked of the prevalence of these underground markets of arms in Western Europe, it certainly does not relate to Soviet arms. This relates to arms other than Soviet arms. He is quite right for once. The supply of illicit arms and the prevalence of such markets do not relate to the Soviet arms, but, unfortunately, they relate to western European arms and arms other than those which are from socialist countries.

He also said I have not tried to contradict what was put out by Pakistan radio in a bulletin. I do not know whether that is the function which he expects from us. I would not like to contradict what Pakistan radio bulletin brings out every day. Because, if you pick out those points and highlight and pinpoint them, in what your adversary puts out, and contradict them, that would mean that it is something to which we attach importance. This is totally uncalled for and also it is unfair on the part of the hon. Member to make a statement that the USSR Government has been silent about happenings in Bangla Desh. Let me remind him that it was President Podgorny who, of the world leaders, came out first with an open statement condemning the happenings in Bangla Desh. The hon. Member may have his own political predilections but to forget realities is something which he should not have indulged in. His approach is misconceived. I would beg of him in the national interest not to see something suspicious where it does not really exist.

SHRI BIRENDER SINGH RAO (Mahendragarh) : The Minister said that they are in touch with USSR and France over the reported supply of these arms to Pakistan recently. He has said that French Government have informed them that they have not entered into any renewal contract for supply of arms to Pakistan after military action in Bangla Desh. They had also informed towards the end of June that French Government would not make any delivery of arms even on old contracts. But, Sir, we are still completely in the dark and groping and there are many points to be clarified. I would like to know whether the Government has sought confirmation from Soviet Government as to whether any supply has been delivered to Pakistan after the military advance against the people of Bangla Desh 3 months

ago. He has also not said anything pointedly about any confirmation coming from the French Government on the reported recent supplies to Pakistan. It is unfortunate if they did not put this question to the French Government pointedly. If they did ask them pointedly and the reply of the French Government is evasive, then it is most humiliating and it is adding insult to injury, and if this is so, I wish the hon. Minister had acted as sharply as he did to some remarks from the hon. Members to this behaviour from the French Government. I would like clarification on these things.

Then, it is a fact that Pakistan has been getting supplies of arms from the USA, Russia, France and Britain. India has also been getting arms and ammunition from these countries. It is reported that the USA gave Pakistan about 10 million dollars worth of arms recently after the Bangla Desh trouble. If my reports are correct, I have heard from certain important quarters, Pakistan has raised within the short period of three months five new military divisions. It is not a small job to raise five new divisions and equip them completely. If these countries have not supplied arms, would the hon. Minister give us information about who has supplied these massive arms and ammunition to Pakistan within this short period to enable them to build up its military strength against India ?

Then, I would like to know whether in the face of this danger, our Government have also tried and taken steps to step up their procurement of arms and ammunition to counterbalance the threat from Pakistan, and whether if this unofficial market exists in the world, our Government have also tried to purchase arms and ammunition from this unofficial market in those foreign countries and if so, to what extent,

I would also like to know what behaviour these countries have shown and what special consideration these countries have shown towards India in supplying arms and ammunition to this country as compared to Pakistan during the past few months and how far they have fulfilled their past contracts of supplying arms to India ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : About the first question, I have already attempted to answer it. The Soviet authorities have assured us that they have not delivered any arms supply to Pakistan after the military action in Bangla Desh.

[Shri Swaran Singh]

About the second question, I made it clear in my reply that the French position first was that they were not entering into any fresh contracts for supply of arms to Pakistan after the military action in Bangla Desh. Obviously, they did not at that time agree that they would cut supplies even on earlier contracts. But towards the end of June they have assured us that they have cut out all supplies of arms to Pakistan. There was no question of any evasive reply being given, and I have tried to give as precise replies as possible.

The third question that he asked was who had given this massive supply of arms to Pakistan to equip their five new divisions. For one thing, I am not quite sure whether all these five divisions of which he talks are already in position or whether they have been equipped. But if he is interested in these various sources of arms supply to Pakistan, this is something which has been placed before the House from time to time by my colleague the Defence Minister and by myself. If I may say, apart from the earlier supplies which came from American sources and French sources—because the French have always taken the attitude that they treat these transactions on a commercial basis, although they also say that when there is an area of tension then they stop the supplies to any country which is involved in that tension—they did get supplies, as I already mentioned earlier, from the USSR and from several other countries. But there has been considerable supply of arms to Pakistan from China. Also, they have got supplies from Iran and some even from Turkey. These are the various countries from which Pakistan has been getting arms.

Then he suggested that we should also go to the clandestine market in Europe for purchase of arms. I would like to reiterate what has often been mentioned to this hon. House that our principal source of defence equipment and arms supply is our own ordnance factories and our own units established in the country. It is true that for certain items of a sophisticated character or where we are still trying to catch up with our manufacturing programme, we do get supplies from whatever source that might be available. I have said on more than one occasion that in this respect the Government of India have no inhibitions whatsoever.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Aizpore) :
Even the black market ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Not necessary, because we can get it in the so-called open market.

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA (Serampore) : White market.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I am glad that the reds are thinking of the white market.

There is hardly any necessity to go to the so-called clandestine market. For one thing, the type of equipment available there is something which we manufacture in abundance ourselves. We are an advanced country in the matter of manufacture of various items, including defence equipment, and I would request the hon. members to shake off this feeling of helplessness ; he should not think of our going to these so-called unofficial markets for procuring arms. It is not necessary for a country like India.

About special consideration being shown to India, we do not expect any such consideration from any country. If we require any particular type of arms, we can get them ; there is no difficulty about it. Most of it we manufacture ourselves ; but if we require any, I have no doubt in my mind we can get it without difficulty.

श्री राम कंबर (टोंक) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, जब रूस से पाकिस्तान को हथियार ले जाने की खबर मिलती है तब हमारे विदेश मन्त्री कहते हैं कि वहाँ से कोई हथियार नहीं आये, लेकिन कुछ दिनों के बाद जब स्पष्टीकरण हो जाता है और यह बात सामने आ जाती है तब वह कहते हैं कि हाँ, आये हैं। ऐसी अवस्था में कुछ दूसरे देश बंगला देश के शरणाथियों के नाम पर छोड़ी मात्रा में सहायता दे देते हैं जबकि पाकिस्तान को भारी मात्रा में सैनिक सामग्री मिल जाती है। इसको देखते हुए क्या हमारी सरकार इसके बारे में कुछ विशेष चिन्तित है, और विशेष चिन्तित होने के कारण क्या वह छोड़े समय के भीतर बंगला देश को सान्त्वना देगी ?

श्री स्वर्ण सिंह : सान्त्वना का सवाल तो बिल्कुल अलाहवा है। उसके सुतर्गतिक कम्प्ली सन्वी चर्चा हो चुकी है। उस दिन शायद सान्त्वनीय संदेश को अपनी बात कहने का सीका नहीं मिला।

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : It is understandable that members of this House and the public at large should be considerably exercised in today's situation whenever a press report appears particularly so prominently and in such a well-known newspaper, as has happened on this occasion, to the effect that some arms supplies have been reaching Pakistan recently, particularly since the 25th of March. That is understandable, but I must say that these questions and answers have revealed that this is a rather strange and peculiar case.

For one thing, of course this news has not appeared in any other paper, I do not say that for that reason it should be dismissed, but it has appeared only in one paper, a paper which is well known for its pro-Swatantra and pro-American sympathies. The most that the hon. Minister has conceded in his reply is that the possibility that some arms may have been shipped before the 25th March and may have reached after 25th March cannot be ruled out. That way, nothing can be ruled out.

We have to proceed on the basis of what the facts are as far as they have been revealed in these questions and answers, and there we find that we have got on the one hand a report by this gentleman, I do not know who he is, the special representative of the *Statesman*, and the statement of the Soviet Ambassador, Mr. Pegov, on the other. That is how far we have reached so far in this matter. Now we have to choose at the moment—if further facts came to light later on, we have to see—between the word of the accredited Ambassador in this country of one of the major World Powers saying categorically that this report is incorrect and the word of the special representative of the *Statesman*. I do not think any sensible person will be in two minds as to what to believe.

An attempt is being made here in this report to put the United States and the USSR on the same footing, on a par, as regards this question of supplying arms to Pakistan, particularly after the 25th March. I can understand the *Statesman's* effort because some embarrassment has been caused to the USA in recent days by the revelations that have taken place and the admissions they had to make. Therefore, now this belated attempt is being made to put the USSR on a par with the USA.

Because my hon. friend Prof. Dandawate and some others indulged in some background talk about balance of power and all that, I think you will give me the same indulgence.

Mr. Chester Bowles, who is well known to practically everybody in this House and certainly to the Minister opposite, and who was one of the most prominent Ambassadors of his country to India for many years—I think he had two sessions as Ambassador in this country—has been writing a series of articles recently appearing in that same paper, the *Statesman*, the heading being "America and Russia in India". In the second of these articles, the following sentence occurs. I am only reading out one sentence :

"Today India's 28 divisions, its 700-plane air force and its small but competent Navy are largely supplied with Soviet equipment".

This is what he is writing. If he is wrong, because the minister just now said that we want to make it clear that most of our equipment is made at home, then he should correct Mr. Chester Bowles's wrong idea. I know a little, I study a little about defence matters because I am interested in them, and as far as the bulk of light arms is concerned, I do not doubt the Minister's statement.

But here is Mr. Chester Bowles. After all, he was here for two terms as Ambassador. He cannot be such an ill-informed person. He is pointing out that our Army, Navy and Air Force are largely supplied with Soviet equipment. Perhaps this has something to do also with Prof. Dandawate's theory about balance of power, I do not know, he can work it out for himself.

But this is a fact, this is the hard reality which my hon. friends of the Swatantra party better remember, that their security today is also dependent on Soviet arms and largely on Soviet equipment. Whether it is a good thing or a bad thing is a different matter.

SHRI SAMAR GUJHA (Contai) : I want to know whether my hon. friend is happy about it or whether our country should be self-sufficient in the production of arms.

SHRI P. K. DEO : Soviet stooge.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : In this matter I am proud to be a Soviet stooge because your American stoogery did not bring any arms, unfortunately it all went to Pakistan.

PROF. MADHU DANAVATE : We belong to the Indian lobby.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : He was a British stooge, British boot-licker, and then he shifted his loyalty to America.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : I am also not happy that our mountain divisions have been equipped by America.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : It is also my duty to point out another small matter. I do not know why Mr. Samar Guha is getting excited. I am not second to anybody in admiring what our ordnance factories have done; that is not the point. We can debate the Defence Ministry's demands in a day or two (*Interruption*) in today's Statement—I am restricting all my quotations to this only one bible—there is an extract of an article written by Mr. Chester Bowles in yesterday's *New York Times*; and this paper quotes from that article. I am saying this because you should see that attempts to put the two countries at par are completely wrong. What does Mr. Chester Bowles say... (*Interruption*) He is referring to the American arms shipment to Pakistan a few days ago. He says that it was first accepted as just another bureaucratic blunder which did not represent the United States policy. He says :

“However in the last few days there has been evidence that this was not an accident but a deliberate decision.”

This is what Mr. Chester Bowles has written.

I do not think that anything has come to light either by the efforts of the special representative of the *Statesman* or some of our friends here to prove anything which can show that the Soviets are doing something just like the Americans have been doing. However much you may try to make all sorts of gymnastic attempts. I am afraid it has proved a damp squib.

AN HON. MEMBER : We would be happy if it is proved wrong.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : I shall be happy. I will be very much concerned if I find that the USSR is giving arms to Pakistan. But you should prove it first. You cannot go round after the story spread by some paper.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Gwalior) : The hon. Minister has not denied that the arms supplied to Pakistan by Soviet Russia before 25th March might be on their way to East Bengal.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : He will reply to you. He said that this could not be

ruled out. I do not know what it means. Let him clarify it again. Nothing can be ruled out. He has got no information; he said so himself. My friend Mr. Anthony is saying that he has got information and would not come out with it. Certainly, give it out if you have got information.

Just as some other Members had their views and background, I should say what my idea of view is. Why was this anti-Soviet diversion necessary at this particular moment? It was raised in the papers yesterday so that it can be brought in the House today. The other day I had asked the hon. Minister a question whether the sort of in my opinion—evasive, weak and hesitant attitude they are taking on the Bangla Desh recognition question had anything to do with the coming of Mr. Kissinger. He indignantly denied it. I think this diversion has been created like a conspiracy and, in my opinion, it meant to divert attention from the visit of Mr. Kissinger who is arriving here today as a personal envoy of adviser of President Nixon from a country which has openly declared now that as regards both economic assistance and military aid it is going to continue to help Pakistan. We are playing host, today in this capital of our country at the time of national emergency to the representative of the President of a country which has openly defied the wishes of the world democratic opinion on this issue. That is why this anti-Soviet provocation has been created to cast a smokescreen on Mr. Kissinger's visit.

I would finally say this. If this special representative of the *Statesman* is considered to be so well-informed that everybody was taken in by the story, the same special representative again in yesterday's paper, following the story about arms to Pakistan, has given another story, the heading being “Talks of Kissinger will be wide-ranging” and in the course of that, he says something which I want to ask the Minister. The Defence Minister is also present here. It says some of the people with whom he is going to have talks is Gen. Manekshaw. What business has he to talk to Gen. Manekshaw? Is it a fact, I want to know. What business has Mr. Kissinger—and I hope the General will not go along kissing Kissinger—coming here as the personal envoy of President Nixon to have talks with the chief of our army Staff and at a time when we are facing a serious situation on our borders? I would like

to know. I do not know if this special representative is equally authentic in his views on this item also. Please tell us. I am afraid that this kind of crude provocation should not be attempted again. I would like to say that, of course, the press has its own rights; the freedom of the press is there, just like the privilege of Members is here, but if people outside the House at least go on in this way, that is to say, without any shred of concrete evidence, and if these kinds of stories are put out at this particular time in our country's history, in this emergent situation, I would ask the Government to consider whether it would or would not attract those provisions in the Maintenance of Internal Security Act which you have passed the other day here, which says that anything done to prejudice the relations between India and the foreign powers will fall within the mischief of that Act. Please consider it.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : The hon. Member has given his own viewpoint with the latter part of which I will deal now. *(Interruption)* I am not objecting, I am only stating a fact. I would therefore, not like to be involved again in some argument except that I will try to answer one or two points about which he asked pointedly by way of information.

One thing which I could make out was whether Dr. Kissinger is having any talks with Gen. Manekshaw. I have made enquiries, and I have just been informed that there are no talks planned between Dr. Kissinger and Gen. Manekshaw *(Interruption)* But Gen. Manekshaw, I am told has accepted an invitation to a dinner function where Dr. Kissinger would also be present.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : No Indian should go there. *(Interruption)*

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I would strongly appeal to the House, to the hon. Members, that we should not be squeamish about this thing, and in such social functions, if we try to look at everything with suspicion—even about a social function—that is not fair. *(Interruption)* I would appeal to the hon. Members not to take this attitude. I would not be a party to encourage that type of attitude.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : May I know who is the host in that function ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : The Americans are the hosts. What is the harm? This should not be objected to. *(Interruption)*

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : I am showing you how reliable is the story.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : About reliability I think..

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : *Ross—(Interruption)*

MR. SPEAKER : Order, please. No interruptions. Is there a spring-board under you? You are getting up and sitting down. Kindly keep sitting down.

श्री अदल बिहारी बाजपेयी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारा यह कहना है कि जनरल माणिक शाह हमारे कमांडर इन चीफ हैं, इस हाउस में कोई ऐसी बात न कही जाय जो उनके ऊपर कोई रेफ्लेक्शन लाने वाली हो।

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I do not want to enter again into an argument about the authenticity of a press report. I would only appeal to the hon. Member and to other hon. Members of Opposition that if the press reporter's explanation or his analysis is correct, there should be the greatest caution not to rush to the House by giving Call Attention Notices merely based on press reports. So, it will be a good convention that we can establish. Merely because a press report is there, the tendency of making it a subject-matter of a Call Attention could perhaps be avoided. Otherwise, I do not want to be on the wrong side of the press. They might have their own views. Sometimes they criticise me. If they criticise another person or praise another person which is not liked by certain sections of the House, it is for them to straighten it out with the press, rather than involve me in this controversy.

Then he said, we should invoke the conditions of the Internal Security Act for taking action when the national security is involved. That may not perhaps be necessary. But what I think is very necessary is, if all of us could observe that discipline and not say things which might embitter or come in the way of our continued good relations with any country, that will be a very healthy practice, instead of getting ourselves involved in criticising one country and then criticising another country. In the process, you may criticise all countries and at the end, we may not be the gainers. Therefore

[Shri Swaran Singh]

I would appeal to hon. members that in a situation such as the one we are facing, we cannot expect every country to be cent per cent of our viewpoint. Our effort should always be to do our maximum to bring them round to our viewpoint and if they have any other feelings, to reduce them as much as possible and also to see that they do not supply any help to Pakistan which might strengthen them and enable them to continue their acts of atrocity. I am sure if we concentrate in that direction, it will yield results.

MR. SPEAKER : Papers to be laid.

SOME HON. MEMBERS—*rose*.

MR. SPEAKER : I will have to say that nothing will go on record if it is without my permission. Papers to be laid.

12.57 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

ANNUAL REPORT OF NATIONAL PRODUCTIVITY COUNCIL

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT (SHRI GHANSHYAM OZA) : On behalf of Shri Moinul Haque Choudhury, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Annual Report (Hindi and English versions) of the National Productivity Council, New Delhi, for the year 1969-70. [Placed in Library. See No. LT--604/71]

REVIEWS AND ANNUAL REPORTS OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION CORPORATION AND NATIONAL PROJECTS CONSTRUCTION CORPORATION

THE MINISTER OF IRRIGATION AND POWER (DR. K. L. RAO) : I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following papers (Hindi and English versions) under sub-section (1) of section 619A of the Companies Act, 1956 :

- (1) (i) Review by the Government on the working of the Rural Electrification Corporation Limited, New Delhi, for the period 25th July, 1969 to 31st March, 1970.

- (ii) Annual Report of the Rural Electrification Corporation Limited, New Delhi, for the period 25th July, 1969 to 31st March, 1970 along with the Audited Accounts and the comments of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-605/71]

- (2) (i) Review by the Government on the working of the National Projects Construction Corporation Limited New Delhi, for the year 1969-70.

- (ii) Annual Report of the National Projects Construction Corporation Limited, New Delhi, for the year 1969-70 along with the Audited Accounts and the comments of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-606/71]

12.58 hrs.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS, 1971-72—Contd.

MINISTRY OF FOREIGN TRADE—Contd.

MR. SPEAKER : The hon. minister was on his legs yesterday. He may continue.

THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN TRADE (SHRI L. N. MISHRA) : Sir, last evening I was referring to the important points made by some hon. members, especially DR. V. K. R. V. Rao, Shri R. S. Pandey, Dr. Malkote, Shri Venkatasubbiah, Shri Maddi Sudarshanam, Shri Damani, Shrimati Subhadra Joshi, Shri Janardhanan and Shri Shastri. I am very grateful to them for the consideration they have shown to the working of the ministry and for some of the valuable suggestions that came from Dr. Rao and some others. The discussion on the Demands for Grants provides Parliament an opportunity to review the working of a Ministry during the course of the preceding year and also to provide guidelines and suggestions about its working in the coming year. Therefore, it is a welcome opportunity for any ministry to come before the House and listen to the suggestions and criticisms made by hon. members.