

tations may be possible. If you see what actions we have been taking, whether it is West Bengal where the communist Government was not prepared to face the Assembly or whether it is Gujarat or Haryana, in all these places, have we acted in conformity with the spirit of the Constitution?

18.15 hrs.

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker in the Chair]

Then, if we want to sustain our democracy at all, the most worrying factor in my opinion is the growth of the multiplicity of the parties. For sometime to come, what our country needs is a stable Government. Short of a stable Government, whether it is in the States or at the Centre, we cannot achieve any kind of sustained growth in our economic and social life of the country. Therefore, we have to put all our efforts to see how to bring about a stable Government. Unfortunately, today, in our country, we have given an opportunity for various parties to grow. Look at the spectacle of West Bengal, 14 parties going to the people and asking the illiterate people to make a choice of the niceties of their ideologies. Can it be a representative Government? Can the illiterate people make a correct choice? The multiplicity of parties give an occasion for a sort of colition Government.

Look at the nature of the party system. It is some sort of a criss-cross. Some are purely local parties; some have ideological overtones; some have ideologies within ideologies; some have marginal differences; some are purely personal-oriented and things like that. We are just confusing the entire electorate. With the present practice of giving an opportunity for the growth of mushroom parties, hereafter, each small party with 3 MP's or 3 MLA's can think some day in the future they can be somebody in the formation of the Government. Therefore, this is a matter that merits serious consideration.

Another aspect that I want to raise is that there should be a Ministry for Tribal Development. Here, I must say, we have not done anything for the tribal population in this country. What little progress has been registered in some areas of Assam and in some other places. In the rest of the areas, we have not doing anything, whether it is

Andhra Pradesh or Orissa or Madhya Pradesh. In these places, there has not been any progress made. I ask: What have we done for these tribal people in the last 20 years? I have yet to see in my district Srikakulam one single person who has graduated from the tribal people living in the mountains. When we come to statistics, they are largely confined to certain areas where the Christian missionaries have done a commendable job. In rest of the areas, we have not doing anything for the tribal people. We have to recognise the fact that special measures have to be taken in regard to that and there should be a special Ministry, not only in Andhra but in other States also, and at the Centre under the charge of a Cabinet Minister to see that the interests of the tribal people are taken care of.

With these words, I welcome the intention underlying this particular Bill.

SHRI J. MOHAMED IMAM: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I fully support the Bill moved by my hon. friend, Shri P. K. Deo.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The hon. Member may continue next day. Now we shall take up the Half-an-hour discussion.

18.30 hrs.

HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION

USA's National Arms Policy towards Pakistan

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE (Betul): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the arms supplies by the United States of America to Pakistan has always been a very sore point in the Indo-US relationship all these years. Before the hostilities with Pakistan in 1965 when rather ruthlessly and carelessly weapons were being supplied, all sorts of lethal weapons were being supplied, to Pakistan in return to whatever Pakistan might have done to the United States of America, India was assured in terms that for whatever purpose these weapons may be used, they will never be used to shoot the Indian people for Americans, according to the American Government, carry some responsibility towards the Indian people also. However, it was later on left during the hostilities to President Ayub Khan

[Shri N. K. P. Salve]

to teach what the reality of things was and be snubbed the President of the United States of America and told him, 'If we are not going to use these arms against India, did you think that they should be kept in cotton wool?' That is how the United States of America got the rebuff.

Thereafter, after the hostilities of 1965, whether it was the conscience of the American President which shook him or whether it was the humiliating and extremely insulting treatment which the Patton Tanks received at the hands of our brave men in the areas of Khem Karan, Chamb and Jaurian it was decided that it would be a part of the national arms policy of the United States of America not to supply further arms to Pakistan or to India. This went on for quite sometime. Pakistan had suffered terribly. Its weapons, its tanks and its aircraft had been very badly and irreparably damaged in the 1965 hostilities and, therefore, Pakistan started lobbying again in the United States of America and pressure was brought on the Pentagon and the fact was driven home to the Pentagon by the Pakistan people very craftily—their diplomacy is certainly superior to ours—and they made it clear to them. These 1500 million dollars worth of weapons which you have given us will not be worth their value in steel and iron unless you again agree to supply us arms and unless you repair them and unless you reactivate them." They went of course a step further so that they can again start shooting the Indian people.

White House meanwhile continued to be very vociferous. They said, 'Whatever it may be, having been convinced what happened, we are not going to supply any further arms to Pakistan.' Then, Sir, it is too well-known that Pentagon is capable of gagging and muzzling the white House and subsequently it started with the unfreezing of the non-lethal weapons and it was a supply of a trickle of spares to repair the tanks. And the trickle soon became a torrent and now it is an unabashed fact that the United States of America is going to supply on a massive scale spares for the aircraft. What we are told in this is—the Soviet Union is no exception. They are great friends of course, so also USA and there is no doubt about it—they are supplying arms to Pakistan and they are telling us that 'We are doing this because we want to wean Pakistan away from China.'

In their endeavour they are now so much anxious to espouse the cause of India where the Indian people were shot by their arms. Now, they are saying, 'We want to wean Pakistan away from China. Therefore, kindly let us supply arms to Pakistan.' Apart from the fact that I cannot understand the logic of this matter, do they, Sir, think that they will give us lollipops and we will accept them? What happened in 1965? Why did they supply arms in 1965? Why did they supply the Patton Tanks? Could not the USA know, could not the Pentagon know that these Patton tanks were not meant to cross over the Himalayan frontiers or the North West frontiers nor the Arabian sea? The only direction in which they can come is the direction of Delhi and the only people they can shoot are the Indian people, a people who are trying to be friendly, a people who do not want war, a people who told *Pakistan Times* without number, 'Our way of life is not war. Let us sit across the table and try to settle our matters.' However, unfortunately, Pakistan is not trying to see the hard realities of Kashmir and other issues to come to a settlement. But this is not the only problem.

We have been told that collusion between China and Pakistan is firmly established and a road has been built in Morkhun to Khanjerab area. That is in Pakistan—occupied Kashmir area. This road has been built substantially with the aid and assistance of the Chinese. This of course is going to constitute a very vital link of communication for the Pakistan units in Kashmir and also afford substantial logistic support to the military units of China in the Western Tibet. Undoubtedly it is true and is well known that China has been give in substantial arms to Pakistan. They have given the fullest equipment for two divisions, 250 tanks, 120 Migs, 2 squadrons of IL 27 in addition to innumerable weaponry that they have given them in vehicles in armoured cars and what not and financial assistance. Now, this being true, it is necessary for us to see the impending danger. China has a tremendously vast nuclear potential. They have a vast inventory of atom bombs. I am sure China is not a friend of Pakistan. It will devour Pakistan at the first possible opportunity. If the arms supply and the financial assistance is not an indication of China's friendship

with Pakistan, it certainly, is an indication of the animus which the Chinese leadership exhibits towards India and just to spite India this has been given. Where is the guarantee that they will not give atom bomb and nuclear weapons to Pakistan, and if Pakistan attacks India, if even an atom bomb were to be dropped on any of our cities, what are we going to do ?

श्री रणजीत सिंह (खलीलाबाद) : रघु-
पति राघव राजाराम ।

एक माननीय सदस्य : आखिर में तो सभी को यही करना है ।

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE : I am not yielding. The hon Member will only weaken my case by supporting me. My submissions, having made this assessment, what are we going to do ? Is not the danger real ? I am pointing this out because I consider this danger to be very real and we are only trying to avoid facing the situation. In one of his replies on the 10th January, 1970, Shri Morarjibhai, who was then the Deputy Prime Minister, said as follows :

"Question : China has exploded its fifth a omic bomb. Should we now go ahead irrespective of world opinion and manufacture our own atom bomb ?

Shri Morarji Desai : I do not think we should ever dream of manufacturing atom bombs. That will not help us for winning the war against China. What will help us in winning the battle against Chinese aggression is strengthening of our conventional forces and by exhibiting an indomitable courage, we will be able to vacate the Chinese aggression, I am quite sure."

If ever an atom bomb is dropped people are either killed immediately or those who are not killed immediately will be as good as dead ; and after our cities are reduced to rubble, whom are you going to fight with indomitable courage and conventional weapons ? I am unable to understand this unrealistic approach.

Sir, I wish the External Affairs Minister was here ; because I wanted him to make

certain commitments in this matter. He is not here, the junior Minister is here ; I hope he will be in a position to say about this. Because, the External Affairs Minister has been considered in the United States of America—I found this during my visit—a Pro-Russian person, still, because of his personal charm, he has been extremely respected. My submission is this. In view of this impending nuclear threat on us at least will our Government take any steps to ensure that in case Pakistan comes out with a nuclear attack, there will be a firm commitment and binding from the U. S. A and Soviet Union that Peshawar, Rawalpindi and Karachi will be destroyed mercilessly and there will be retaliatory measures ? Because, Sir, I feel, we are not preparing ourselves. I do not see any reason why we should not invest about Rs. 300 crores a year in the course of the next : years for a really powerful arsenal ; I think this point may be taken up later ; Mr. Ranjit Singh ji may take it up when we are debating the Demands on the Defence Ministry. May I therefore know from the Minister, will he make a statement as to what concrete steps are being taken, excepting the indomitable courage and the conventional weapons—and in case Pakistan is to ruthlessly and unscrupulously attack us with the Chinese atom bombs, how are we going to protect ourselves ? If you are going to sleep over it, may be the country will not live long enough ; maybe it might happen like this : when someone suggested to the head of the Red Indians that they should use guns—this was in 1620—he said : What are you talking of these noisy things ? Sharpen your knives and increase the length of the arrows and bows ; these noisy things will never help you. Indomitable courage will alone help you'. The result is that it is only of interest to anthropologists. I only hope that our great tribe would not come to such a pass that we become of interest to the anthropologists.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore) : Sir, this Half-an-Hour Discussion has arisen out of the question which dealt with what was described as the U. S. National Arms Policy towards Pakistan. Some announcement like that was made from Washington from the Pentagon. The reply given by the Ministry to this question did not throw any light on that at all. What exactly go the

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

Americans mean by this National Arms Policy towards Pakistan ?

So, I am talking the opportunity just now to ask the Minister if he can throw some light on this question because it is obvious now that since Pakistan is no longer directly a Member of the Military Bloc and since it has disentangled itself from its direct commitments, as for example, by dismantling of U 2 base at Peshawar and so on, any assistance she might get from the United States will be indirectly through third parties and not directly. And the reports we get from time to time of supplies of U. S. planes or tanks to Pakistan are invariably linked up with some third country like Turkey or Iran or Italy or somebody through whom these military hardwares pass through to Pakistan. I would like to know one thing. Whenever these reports appear and they are raised in the House by vigilant Members, the reply given always is that the Government of India has made it clear more than once to the Government of the United States that the supplies of arms to Pakistan will be regarded by this country in a very serious light, and we have tried to represent to the authorities in Washington that this kind of supplies will only encourage Pakistan to be more bellicose towards India. That is all that the Government of India does.

My point is that since these arms supplies are no longer going to be made directly from Washington to Pakistan but invariably through third countries, is this what is meant by the National Arms Policy towards Pakistan ? If so, has the Government of India thought out any other strategy or tactics as to how they are going to counter this because, making representations to Washington is no use any more ? They continue to say that they are not supplying arms directly to Pakistan.

So I would like to know what is the position ; whether we are able to keep any kind of check or track on the supplies which may be coming through third countries to Pakistan ? And what does the Government propose to do about that ?

श्री शिव चन्द्र का (मधुवती) : उपाध्यक्ष जी, मेरा पहला सवाल यह है कि क्या यह बात सही नहीं है कि अमरीका की नीति जो बदली

है, जो पहले एमबार्गो था 1965 की लड़ाई के बाद पाकिस्तान को आर्म देने में, उसमें कुछ परिवर्तन हुआ है इसलिए कि अमरीकी राष्ट्र-पति ने अपने यूनियन ब्राफ कांग्रेस मैसेज में जो उन्होंने जनवरी में दिया, उसमें इसका कुछ संकेत किया है, परिवर्तन के लिए डायरेक्शन दिया है कि जो पुराना एमबार्गो था उस पर नहीं चलना है। और इसलिए नेशनल सेक्योरिटी काउंसिल ब्राफ अमरीकन ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेशन खुद स्टडी करने लग गया है कि किस तरह से इस आदेश को बढ़ाया जाय, राष्ट्रपति के डायरेक्शन को बढ़ाया जाय।

अगर यह बात सही है तो आपने कौन सा कदम उठाया है, क्या प्रोटेस्ट अमरीका के सामने आपने किया है ?

दूसरा सवाल है कि 1965 की हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान की लड़ाई के बाद छिपे रूप में, या खुले रूप में, जिस का आप को पता लगा या नहीं लगा, कितने टंक और दूसरे हथियार अमरीका ने पाकिस्तान की दिये हैं ? उन का सम टोटल कितना है ?

तीसरा सवाल यह है कि पाकिस्तान को अमरीका से ही नहीं मदद मिलती है, बल्कि रूस से भी मिलती है, चीन से भी मिलती है, तो क्या वजह है पाकिस्तान को रूस भी देता है, चीन भी देता है और अमरीका भी देता है और आप को कोई नहीं देता है ? क्या आप ने कभी जानने की कोशिश की कि इस की क्या वजह है कि पाकिस्तान को सब कोई टंक और हथियार देते हैं और आप को कोई नहीं देता ? आप बम भोला नाथ ही बने रहते हैं।

आखरी सवाल यह है कि क्या इस की यह वजह है कि आप की जो विदेश नीति है वह इन तीनों के लिये इन्कारिप्रहेन्सिवल है यानी दूसरे शब्दों में ए रिडल रेंज इन ए मिस्ट्री इनसाइड एन एनिग्मा है ? उस में कोई कंसिस्टेंसी नहीं

है, जिस की वजह से आप की यह परिस्थिति है ?

SHRI BISWANARAYAN SHASTRI (Lakhimpur) : Both the USA and USSR are friendly to India. In spite of that, they are vying with each other in supplying arms to Pakistan. Is it due to our foreign policy being not properly projected, or understood by those countries or our not having been able to persuade them not to supply arms to Pakistan and to supply arms to India ? Is there any change in government policy after the 1965 Pak aggression which was encouraged by this arms supply policy and the assistance of China also ? Secondly, with this going on, the eastern region which is more vulnerable to Pakistani and Chinese attacks has to be taken proper care of. Government have also admitted that there is a collusion between China and Pakistan. What concrete steps are going to be taken to prevent such arms supplies by these countries to Pakistan.

SHRI S. KUNDU (Balasore) : This is really an interesting question ; at the same time, I should imagine it is very difficult for the Minister to answer regarding the arms supply policy of foreign countries in the present condition of the world. The cold war strategy has become so much developed that countries friendly to us like the USA and Russia are supplying arms to Pakistan, though Russia had said that Pakistan was the aggressor and America knew very well that Pakistan had aggressed on India. We are living in such a dangerous world that we do not know how non-aligned countries like us can thrive against the big powers. At the same time, there is need to project a dynamic independent policy.

The Minister can tell us whether America or for that matter even Soviet Russia are supplying to Pakistan, though both are friendly to us, because of the consideration that since Soviet Russia is giving arms to Pakistan, America says it has to counteract it, and since America supplies arms to Pakistan, Russia considers that it has to counteract American influence as also Chinese influence. In this competition of containment, countries like ours become a casualty. Therefore, there is definite need to approach this problem and project it as one between countries which are committed to

democratic forms of government and those which are not. After all, America is committed to a democratic form of Government, and since we also believe in democracy, I would like to know two things from the Minister. First, we are struggling hard to build up a non-aligned policy, has the Minister ever checked up with the American Government whether it does not feel that its massive arms aid through different countries and also directly to Pakistan disturbs or retards our effort to build up a non-aligned policy ? Secondly, since we have not signed the non-proliferation treaty, what would be America's national arms policy, as Mr. Salve put it, in relation to the possibility of a nuclear war in this area ? Answers to these two vital questions would be very much helpful.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH) : It is very natural for the hon. Members to be so concerned and anxious about the arms build up in Pakistan with the aid of America, Russia, China and other countries. I share that anxiety and concern because from past experience we know fully well that this armed strength and arms build up is directed against us and at nobody else. Since our independence in 1947, we have been victims of aggression three times at the hands of Pakistan and we know fully well that, even according to Pakistan's own admission, she has no other enemy except India. So, whatever she is doing in regard to strengthening her military might is no doubt directed against us.

The hon. Members have very rightly asked how it is that Pakistan is able to get arms supplies from America, Russia and China and various other sources and that we are not able to get them. It is true that Pakistan is in a very happy and favourable position, and due to world circumstances, she is able to get arms from these countries, but it will not be correct to say that we are completely helpless in this regard and that we are not getting help from any source whatsoever. We are getting help from other countries. We have received help from America, Russia and various other sources, and we are making a great deal of effort on our own to make up our deficiencies and to improve our defence capabilities.

[Shri Surendrapal Singh]

It has been said that America and Russia are supplying arms to Pakistan knowing fully well that Pakistan has no danger to her security and independence from any quarter, and that, on the other hand, she has hostile designs against India. The fact of the matter is that whether it is America or Russia or any other country, they are sovereign, independent countries, they have their own national interests, they have their own principles to guide their own policies. It is very difficult for us to dictate to them and ask them to do this or that in a given situation. We have very good relations with them and we have put across our point of view to them and told them our difficulties which are always taken not of by those countries, but what they ultimately decide is their own business. They weigh the pros and cons of the arguments put before them and they ultimately take a balanced decision, keeping in view their friendship with us as well as their own global strategy and their own national interests.

Hon. Members have made the point that Pakistan is getting arms aid much in excess of her actual requirements and needs and these countries should be mindful of that. We have pointed this out to both America and Russia.

Whenever we have taken up this matter with them, we have told them that this accretion in Pakistan armed strength would cause tension and would put a great deal of strain on our own defence responsibilities and would create an atmosphere of cold war between the two countries and that it will come in the way of our efforts to normalise relations with Pakistan. They have also assured us that they are mindful of the arguments we have put forward, and that is probably the reason why there is hesitancy on their part to come to a quick decision in this regard. We hope that our arguments will be appreciated by them and ultimately they will take a decision which will be in the best interest of both India and Pakistan, in the interest of peace and stability in the world.

In regard to Russia also we have told them that their help to Pakistan will go against our interests. There again we have been told by the Russians that they will see to it that the balance, as they put it, will not be tilted in favour of Pakistan, that they will

keep in mind our requirements and will not do anything to harm our interests. The same argument is given by the United States. In the case of Russia also we have told them that they may feel that their policy is right from their own point of view but as far as we are concerned we are not convinced by those arguments and we do not accept them. In regard to American supply of arms, Mr. Indrajit Gupta asked whether it was their national policy. It is not a national policy; it is only a review which they are doing. According to the earlier policy they had placed a complete embargo on arms supply after the 1965 hostilities. In 1967 that embargo was lifted so that military assistance to Pakistan and India could be granted and the sale of non-lethal weapons was allowed both to Pakistan and India and the sale of spares for lethal weapons was also permitted both to India and Pakistan. I may also add here that under this declaration, the United States had also undertaken to prevent sale by third countries of NATO weapons of American origin either to Pakistan or India without their approval.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE : That does not mean that USSR and China can supply arms to Pakistan.

SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH : I shall come to that later.

We know perfectly well that this sounds a very fair sort of a policy as it puts both India and Pakistan at par. But the facts are quite different and this policy is in fact very heavily weighted in favour of Pakistan for this simple reason that prior to 1965 Pakistan had received massive American aid in the form of lethal weapons and equipment etc. I can say that approximately 80 to 90 per cent of her armour and equipment is of American origin. As against that we had received very negligible amount from America in the shape of offensive weapons the total value of which is about one million dollars, whereas Pakistan got 1500—1700 million dollars worth equipment from America. The fact that Pakistan can get under this arrangement spare parts for her lethal weapons means that all her aircraft, tanks, etc. which had been damaged or rendered useless in the 1965 conflict can be repaired and refurbished and can be used once again. This has been a tremendous help to Pakistan whereas to us

it is meaningless in the sense that we cannot buy very much from America under this arrangement because we do not have much of their equipment.

19.00 hrs.

Now, as regards the supply of tanks and offensive weapons through third countries, as I have said already, under this declaration of policy also, America had undertaken to prevent such sales. But we know perfectly well that since 1967 Pakistan has been making frantic efforts to buy tanks and other lethal weapons from NATO countries by clandestine means and we have kept the House informed from time to time. We know how early in 1969, she made efforts to get some tanks from Italy. We intervened in that matter; we took it up with the Italian Government and through our diplomatic efforts, we were able to forestall that and the deal was called off. In the same way she tried with Belgium; again they failed. In 1967 she took up the matter with Turkey also. There was a proposal from that side to sell, I think, 100 to 200 tanks from Turkey to Pakistan and Turkey was in return to get some new tanks from America. That was the arrangement. In the earlier stages, we took up the matter with both the American and the Turkish Governments, and our efforts bore fruit in the sense that we were able to stop this deal altogether. And then again it was revived. As the hon. Members know, this proposal was again revived in March last. We again drew the attention of the US Government in this regard and took it up very strongly with them and we told them and gave them the arguments that this will not be helpful to us and, in fact, if this deal goes through, it will put our relations under a great strain and tension and it will have very grave repercussions.

Now, we have been informed by them that they have taken no decision in this regard and that the whole policy of 1967 is being reviewed by them, and they say that this supply of tanks through Turkey is also one of the factors in that review. But no decision has been taken yet. All that we can say is that after we have expressed our grave concern about this matter to them, we hope that they will give due consideration to it and will study all the implications and will ultimately take a decision which will

not go against our interests and the interests of this region.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE : About the nuclear attack.

SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH : The question of nuclear attack ; it is a very wide question which has been discussed here on a number of occasions before. Hon Members already known the Government's policy : that it is not our intention to go in for the manufacture of atom bombs.

SHRI RANJEET SINGH : What is your personal view ?

SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH : I represent the Government here. You can ask my personal views outside the House.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE : The manufacture, phased over five years, is the second aspect. The earlier aspect was, shall we get a firm and abiding commitment from the USSR and the USA that in case of a nuclear attack on our cities, we will have a retaliatory attack by both the countries—I mean an attack on Karachi, Peshawar and Dacca.

SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH : I do not think there is any country in the world which will give a guarantee like that. In the ultimate analysis, we will have to depend on our own ability to stand on our own feet and defend ourselves. We cannot rely on other people's benevolence. *(Interruption.)* We will have to build up our own defence capabilities and improve our defence strength, and I can assure the hon. Members this is being done by the Government of India in the Ministry of Defence. *(Interruption.)*

SHRI RANGA (Srikulam) : You are contradicting what you yourself have now stated : all the time you are negotiating with everybody : give us a little there and give us a little more here and so on.

SHRI RANJEET SINGH : His personal view on the nuclear attack is different from the Government's view. That is why he said he would express his personal views in private !

SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH : I cannot understand Prof. Ranga's argument. If we come to know that certain supplies are going to Pakistan which may be used against us, what harm is there if we negotiate with other countries to stop such supplies ? (Interruption.) If we have good relations with those countries who are supplying them and if we take up this matter with them and express our concern to them, what harm is there ? (Interruption.) But all this aside, as

I said, in the ultimate analysis, we have to depend on our own strength, and it is our policy to build up our arms strength to such a pitch that no country in the world will be able to cast an evil eye on us.

19.04 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Monday, April 27, 1970! Vaisakha 7, 1892 (Saka).