

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Yes, Sir. It is very difficult for us to pick and choose. We have to it in good faith.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Even though office is taking sufficient precaution, still it happens sometimes. Of course, the unemployment problem is a grave one. But I do not think any hon. Member would say that focussing the attention of the House in this manner should be tolerated. Then, about section 144 etc. this is not the time to consider them. About the punishment, the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs has already agreed to the plea made by almost everyone here. But I may remind the House that formerly the punishment was for four days. We are showing some leniency now. While exercising our judgment in showing leniency we must also bear in mind that if leniency is shown even if such instances are repeated then an impression may go round that we are taking a lenient view on every occasion. The House should bear that in mind.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Keeping them in jail would be taking a lenient view because they will get two hot meals a day.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : While appreciating the plea for leniency, at the same time, we must unanimously condemn such methods of demonstration, however important the issues might be. That is the only point I wanted to mention. Now I shall put the motion, as amended, to the vote of the House.

श्री मोलहू प्रसाद (बांसगांव) : दफा 144 के मामले में कोई व्यवस्था नहीं हुई ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I am not concerned with that point. Government will take note of it ; but not now.

SHRI RAGHU RAMAIAH : May I say that the motion, as amended, will read as follows :

"This House resolves that the two persons calling themselves (1) Shri

Rambir Singh and (2) Shri Dharendra Kumar Sharma, who threw pamphlets from the Visitors' Gallery on the Floor of the House at 2.23 P. M. today and whom the Watch and Ward Officer took into custody immediately have committed a grave offence and are guilty of the contempt of this House.

This House further resolves that they be sentenced to simple imprisonment till 7 P. M. on Thursday, the 10th April, 1969 and sent to Tihar Jail, Delhi.."

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The question is :

"This House resolves that the two persons calling themselves (1) Shri Rambir Singh and (2) Shri Dharendra Kumar Sharma, who threw pamphlets from the Visitors' Gallery on the Floor of the House at 2.23 P. M. today and whom the Watch and Ward Officer took into custody immediately, have committed a grave offence and are guilty of the contempt of this House.

This House further resolves that they be sentenced to simple imprisonment till 7 P. M. on Thursday, the 10th April, 1969 and sent to Tihar Jail, Delhi."

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : We will now take up the Half-an-hour discussion.

18.44 hrs.

HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION

RUSSIAN ARMS TO PAKISTAN

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त (दिल्ली सदर) : मंत्री महोदय, ने जो कुछ सवाल के उत्तर दिये कि रूस ने पाकिस्तान को कितने हथियार दिए, उसको देखते हुए यह निश्चित रूप से कहा जा

[श्री कंवरलाल गुप्त]

सकता है कि रूस की पालिसी भारत के लिए अब दिन व दिन तेजी से बदल रही है। दो साल से इसकी शुरुआत हुई है। पहले भारत के साथ जो रूस की नीति थी वह इस प्रकार की थी कि वह भारत का इन्ट्रेस्ट देखता था, आहिस्ता आहिस्ता वह न्यूट्रलाइज हुआ और अब उसकी प्रो-पाकिस्तान पालिसी बनती जा रही है। इतना ही नहीं है, जो हथियार दिये जा रहे हैं उनकी सप्लाय की गति बढ़ गई है और साफिस्टिकेटेड हथियार दिये जा रहे हैं। इसके अलावा सोवियट डिफेन्स मिनिस्टर ने जो स्पीच दी है वह एक खतरे की घंटी है। सोवियट डिफेन्स मिनिस्टर ने पाकिस्तान में जो कहा है, जिसको कि रेडियो पाकिस्तान ने भी कोट किया है, उसको मैं आप के सामने पढ़ रहा हूँ :

"Marshal Grechko was quoted by the Pakistani press and radio saying that the Soviet Union was interested in Pakistan strengthening its defence against its enemy and in the maintenance of military balance in the region."

सभापति जी, आपको मालूम है कि पाकिस्तान कई बार यह कह चुका है कि दुनिया में हमारा कोई दुश्मन नहीं है भारत के अलावा और जो यह बैलेंस की बात कही है वास्तव में स्थिति यह है कि मिलिटरी बैलेंस जो है अगर पाकिस्तान को हथियार दिए जाते हैं तो और बिगड़ जाता है और खतरा और भी बढ़ेगा, जैसा पुराना अनुभव बताता है। तो यह जो बात कही गई है इस का मतलब यह है कि स्वयं रूस भी यह स्वीकार करता है रूस का डिफेंस मिनिस्टर कहता है कि भारत पाकिस्तान का दुश्मन है और उसको मजबूत करना चाहिए मिलिटरी बैलेंस इस रीजन में रखने के लिए।

इतना ही नहीं वहां सोवियट रूस की नेवी के डिप्टी चीफ ने जो कहा है वह 20 मार्च के

पाकिस्तान टाइम्स में जो छपा है वह मैं पढ़ कर सुनाता हूँ।

18.46 hrs.

[SHRI GADILINGANA GOWD in the Chair.]

"Powerful Pakistan fleet is a pre-condition for peace in the Indian Ocean."

अब इस से स्पष्ट है कि रूस के बड़े बड़े नेता आज पाकिस्तान के नेताओं को खुश करने में लगे हुए हैं और ऐसा लगता है कि हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार को दे हैव टेकिन इट फार ग्रान्टड कि वह तो हमारे साथ हैं ही, बदल नहीं सकती है। इस प्रकार का उन का ऐटीट्यूड है। इसलिए मेरा पहला सवाल यह है कि आया सरकार की राय में जो नीति रूस की भारत के लिए ताशकन्द ऐग्रीमेंट के समय थी आया उस में कोई बदल आया है या नहीं? अगर आया है तो क्या आया है?

दूसरा सवाल यह है कि सोवियट डिफेन्स मिनिस्टर और नेवी के डिप्टी चीफ ने जो पाकिस्तान में कहा उस के बारे में भारत सरकार का क्या रीएक्शन है और उस के ऊपर सरकार ने क्या कार्यवाही की?

तीसरा सवाल यह है कि अगर सरकार यह समझती है कि रूस का ऐटीट्यूड हमारे लिये बदला नहीं है तो क्या सरकार विश्वास के साथ कह सकती है कि कल को अगर पाकिस्तान ने सेक्योरिटी काउन्सिल में कश्मीर का सवाल उठाया तो जिस तरह से रूस पहले वीटो करता था क्या आप को यह विश्वास है कि रूस फिर भी इस की वीटो कर देगा?

कितने हथियार अभी तक पाकिस्तान को दिये गए हैं नेवी का सामान भी मैंने सुना है दिया है, सब-मैरीन्स दी हैं। मैंने सुना है कि फिशिंग वैसेल्स के नाम से कुछ ऐसे पानी के

जहाज भी पाकिस्तान को मिले हैं जो स्पाई का काम करते हैं और ऐसे चार पानी के जहाज मिले हैं जो रूसी लोग चलाते हैं और ट्रेनिंग देते हैं और वह बहुत ही खतरनाक किस्म की सब-मैरीन्स हैं ।

नया रिजीम जो पाकिस्तान में आया है रूस और अमरीका दोनों उस को खुश करना चाहते हैं, और ऐसा भी हो सकता है कि हम लोग कमप्लेसेन्सी में रहें, आज पाकिस्तान में भगड़ा हो रहा है और हम कमप्लेसेन्ट हो जाय । लेकिन मैं बताना चाहता हूँ कि पाकिस्तान के लोग जब अपनी आवाज उठाते हैं तो पाकिस्तान की सरकार का हमेशा रवैया रहा है कि हिन्दुस्तान का होवा दिखा देती है । वह हम पर हमला भी कर सकते हैं । और नये डिक्टेटर ने कहा है कि बंगाल में हम इसलिए फोर्सिज भेज रहे हैं चूँकि हिन्दुस्तान की फोर्सिज का वहां पर कन्सेन्ट्रेशन है । तो क्या यह सही है कि हम ने कोई अपनी फोर्सिज भेजी हैं और उसकी वजह से पाकिस्तान ने फोर्सिज भेजी हुई है ? क्या हमारा कोई कम्प्लेक्सन है ? दूसरे हम ने क्या प्रोकाशंस लिए हैं जिससे कि न्यू रिजीम को इस तरीके का मंड ऐक्शन न लेना पड़े ? क्या यह सही है कि इस तरह की बात आई है कि पाकिस्तान को हम ने कुछ फोर्सिलिटिज दी हैं, जैसे कि उन की सेनाएं ईस्ट बंगाल में जाने के लिये या उन के हवाई जहाज जाने के लिए इस प्रकार की भी क्या कोई बात की है ?

आखिरी मेरा सवाल यह है कि यू एस एस आर के ऊपर हमारा जो मिलिटरी इक्विपमेंट के के लिये डिपेंडेंस है इसके लिए बहुत हद तक जो हम रूस पर डिपेंड करते हैं वह ठीक बात नहीं है । केवल एक ही जगह पर कतई डिपेंडेंट होना ठीक नहीं है इसलिये मैं मंत्री महोदय से चाहूंगा कि दूसरे देशों के साथ भी वह अपने डिफेंस पैकट करें । सब से अच्छी बात तो यह होगी कि सुरक्षा के लिये हम स्वयं अधिक से अधिक अपने पैरों पर खड़े हों और ज्यादा से

ज्यादा हथियार और अन्य आवश्यक लड़ाई का सामान हम स्वयं अपने देश में बनायें, मैं मंत्री महोदय से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इस सम्बन्ध में उन्होंने क्या कार्यवाही की है जिससे कि हम ज्यादा लड़ाई का सामान अपने देश में तैयार कर सकें ? क्या मिजाइल्स भी हमारे देश में बन रही है यह मेरा प्वाएंटंड सवाल है ?

एक सब से आखिरी बात निवेदन करके मैं समाप्त कर दूंगा । जैसे चीन, पाकिस्तान की वह जो पिंडी चीन ऐक्सिस है, चीन की ताकत बहुत बड़ी है, हम से कई गुनी ज्यादा है और अगर कहीं यह दोनों मिलकर हम पर आक्रमण कर दें तो हम उनकी मिली हुई ताकत का मुकाबला नहीं कर सकते हैं । यह बात साफ है और इस तथ्य को छिपाना नहीं चाहिए और मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि इस खतरे का सामने करने के लिये सरकार ने क्या प्रबन्ध किया है ?

क्या आप ने जब रूस और चीन के बाऊंडरी क्लेश के बारे में रूस का समर्थन किया तो रूस से आप ने क्या यह विश्वास प्राप्त कर लिया है कि अगर कल को चीन हमारे ऊपर हमला कर दे तो रूस हमारी मदद करेगा या रूस पहले ही की तरह से कह देगा कि चीन तो हमारा भाई है और यह हिन्दुस्तान वाले हमारे दोस्त हैं ? मैं समझता हूँ कि यह नीति गलत होगी और मैं मंत्री महोदय से चाहूंगा कि यह बात स्पष्ट करें कि चीन और पाकिस्तान का मिल कर अगर हमला हो तो उस का सामना करने के लिये उन्होंने क्या प्रबन्ध किया है ? क्या किसी दूसरे देश ने ऐसी हालत में हमें मदद करने का विश्वास दिलाया है विशेष कर क्या रूस ने ऐसा विश्वास दिलाया है ?

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE
(SHRI SWARAN SINGH) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, the points that have been raised by the hon. Member are important and we have ourselves expressed our concern about the supply of lethal equipment by U.S.S.R. to Pakistan. It may be recalled that the Prime Minister made a detailed statement about our attitude on the supply of arms by

[Shri Swaran Singh]

U.S.S.R. to Pakistan and, on several subsequent occasions, I myself had to say a great deal about this matter.

The basic point in this connection is our constant desire to normalise relations with Pakistan. We have said on innumerable occasions that we want to live in peace and in good neighbourly relations with Pakistan. But notwithstanding all our efforts, we have not succeeded in persuading Pakistan also to reciprocate to our desire. Therefore, any accrual to the armed strength of Pakistan makes Pakistan all the more intransigent and also makes the restoration of normalcy more difficult. It is in this context that we have to view the accrual to the armed strength of Pakistan. So, from whatever source Pakistan gets the arms, whether it is from United States of America or from China or from several other NATO countries or from Soviet Union, this definitely creates a situation in which Pakistan's intransigence increases and restoration of normal conditions becomes all the more difficult. Apart from that, it imposes a heavy burden on India to take measures to increase our defence potential in order to meet any possible threat. This is not a theoretical matter or a matter of assessment. We have seen that we had to face aggression from Pakistan on three occasions after Independence. It is for this reason that we know that any accrual to the armed strength of Pakistan throws a heavy burden on us to take adequate steps to ensure that our capacity to repel any aggression is not in any way impaired. We have no aggressive design against any country, but at the same time we are determined to defend our own sovereignty and our own integrity, whatever may be the price. This is the whole basic question. We have explained our position more than once to the USSR Government and to its various dignitaries. I explained this when I went to the Soviet Union towards the end of last year. And when the Defence Minister of USSR visited our country, we reiterated our concern in this respect. We have, however, to admit that we have not been able to convince USSR about the great danger is implicit in their supplying arms to Pakistan. Their policy in this respect continues to be one of supplying arms to Pakistan, although they go on saying that they will supply comparatively a small

quantity of arms. But we know that, whatever may be the quantity of arms supplied, it will definitely impose a greater burden on us. That is our whole approach. How do we meet the situation? We have to continue our efforts to reiterate our view point and to make it clear to all countries, including USSR, that any supply of arms to Pakistan will create a very difficult and explosive situation and that they should desist from pursuing that policy. This has been our constant approach. We have succeeded in certain cases in dissuading countries from supplying arms to Pakistan and we have not succeeded in certain other cases. But we have to continue our effort because it is worthwhile to make that effort and it may yield results on some occasions. At the same time, as was mentioned by the hon. Member towards the end of his speech, we have to take adequate steps on our side to be ever ready to meet any aggressive design or line which Pakistan may be tempted on any occasion to adopt. It is for this reason that we have taken action in various directions.

19 hrs.

The hon. Member has mentioned that we should try to manufacture all the equipment that we require for our defence needs. That is precisely the policy that we are pursuing and I am happy to report that every successive year has added to the production from our ordinance factories, from State undertakings which are engaged in the task of manufacturing vital equipment for the armed forces and also from mobilising the effort from the private sector. That is an effort which has continued and which will continue. At the same time we cannot take risks, and in regard to certain categories where we have not yet been able to establish capacity to manufacture equipment of sophisticated type, we have to depend on acquisition from abroad. And we have acquired equipment from whatever sources it may be available, to meet our requirements. There is bound to be a gap between the time when our own manufactured equipment of various types may be available but the danger to us being a sort of constant one and which cannot wait, in the meantime we have to augment our defence potential by acquiring equipment of various types from abroad. In this respect we have no inhibitions. I want to make it clear that from whatever source it may be avail-

able, we will acquire because we pay for it and I do not see any objection in getting equipment from whatever source it may be available. Without going into details it is a fact that we have acquired various types of equipment from several European countries including UK and France. We have also got equipment from the Soviet Union and from other East European countries. That is the policy we have pursued.

I would like to say further that we are fully conscious of this additional burden that we have to carry in diverting our resources for meeting the Defence needs; even in this respect I would like to say that we are not over spending having regard to the size of our country and having regard to the fact that it is not only Pakistan but also China against whom we have to prepare ourselves to meet any aggression; it is in that context that we have to carry a heavy burden to meet the challenge. It is no doubt a heavy burden. But the valour of our forces, the co-operation from the people, the unity on issues like this that has been shown by our country on all crucial moments, and the acquisition of equipment by indigenous manufacture and from abroad, has enabled us to feel confident that we are in a position to meet any threat of the type that the hon. Member mentioned. I would like to say that we are not at all complacent because of the happenings in Pakistan. They are political issues, they are internal problems, but we cannot relax our effort in this sphere of preparedness and we have to continue our vigilance and our preparedness.

Having said this, now I will try to touch very briefly some of the specific points that have been raised by the hon Member. One of the points that he mentioned was as to whether there is any change in the policy of the Soviet Union as compared to the time when the Tashkent Declaration was signed. Well, I have no hesitation in saying that there is a change because when we signed the Tashkent Declaration they were not supplying lethal equipment to Pakistan which they are now doing. Obviously there is a change in their policy towards Pakistan. I would also like to say in fairness to the Soviet Union that they have been assuring us that they want to normalise the relations with Pakistan. They want to have friendly

relations with Pakistan, but this will never be done at the cost of friendship with India.

The second question that has been asked is as to what are our reactions to the press reports about the statements of the USSR Defence Minister and USSR Deputy Naval Chief. They are reported to have been made in Pakistan. We have made some inquiries about this. We still continue to make further inquiries but one point that has been mentioned is that the sentences that are quoted out of context. But we have not yet got any firm or authentic report about the actual words that have been used.

The third question that has been asked is a political question as to what is likely to be the attitude of USSR if Pakistan tries to raise the Kashmir issue in the United Nations. Well, I am not directly concerned with this issue. But having been associated with the Kashmir question and the happenings in the United Nations, I can say that we have given notice to the entire international community that there is a limit upto which they can pressurise us on this question of Kashmir. I have no doubt in my mind that not only USSR, but several other countries who unfortunately in the past did not always see eye to eye with us on this issue, are now changing their attitude and realising the strength of our case. Our case is simple. There are certain matters which are entirely within the jurisdiction of the Government of India because Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part of India, and any attempt to drag us before the international community on issues which are entirely internal will be resisted by us and we will not participate in any such discussion, and on that issue I would like to recall that I actually refused to participate in the discussion and contrary to my normal functioning, I even staged a walk-out which is not the exclusive privilege of the Opposition members over there. The important question that we have to bear in mind in this connection is that we should take a clear and unequivocal stand in this respect and having taken that stand we should not care at all as to who supports us or who opposes us, because I feel that India is big enough and large enough and our cause just enough to resist any pressure from whatever quarter it comes. I have no

[Shri Swaran Singh]

doubt in my mind that we are clear on this issue and no country can further pressurise us and I do not want our country to feel beholden to another country for the exercise of veto. If they exercise the veto, then they act according to the rights and wrongs of the situation. I do not want any partial treatment to be meted out to me even by a friend. In the international sphere, we have to stand on our own legs. It is wrong to expect some other country to pull our chestnut out of the fire. I am all for standing on our own legs. We have to take a correct stand and stick to it irrespective of what others do or do not do. When I say this, it is not in the spirit of defying any particular authority. It is the justness and the righteousness of our cause which is the correct rebuttal of any effort which might be attempted by any country to pressurise us on this issue.

Another question has been asked as to whether the USSR Government has supplied any naval equipment to Pakistan. To my information, they have not. Then, he talked about spying vessels and submarines. According to our information, they have not supplied any submarines. There is no question of supplying any spying vessels. This information is not correct.

Then it has been mentioned about countries trying to befriend the new regime in Pakistan. They have to deal with the country whatever may be the regime in that country. Other countries are entitled to have their own assessments and take action accordingly. We are also trying to befriend Pakistan because it is our neighbouring country. We have no illwill against them. The only thing that we want them to do is to abandon their hostility towards us. I have no doubt that the people of Pakistan do not want to live in an atmosphere of tension with India. They also want peace and we should encourage those tendencies and not talk of any other attitude.

We are vigilant about our defence and there is no let-up or slackening of effort in that direction.

Then it has been asked whether we have given any facility to Pakistan to enable them to transport their troops to East Pakistan. I have made some enquiries, because this

matter was raised sometime ago here and also perhaps in the other House. Perhaps it is true that Pakistan did move certain armed forces to East Pakistan. But that movement was organised essentially by sea. According to our information, they chartered several ships and transported a large number of soldiers to East Pakistan.

SHRI RANJIT SINGH (Khalilabad) : Essentially by sea, but partly by air over our territory.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : No, They have not asked for permission and we did not give them permission.

SHRI RANJIT SINGH : Have they flown without permission ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : They have not. The agreement is that their air force planes can overfly India just as our air force planes can overfly Pakistan territory, but they have to land here. So they never asked for any permission to fly any aircraft to carry any soldiers or armed forces.

I would like further to say that we are sufficiently equipped by our various detective devices including radar, and no flight will remain undetected. So this sort of vague talk that probably they have flown about which we do not know is not correct.

SHRI RANJIT SINGH : We take his assurance as it is.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Then it has been mentioned that we should not have too much dependence on any country. We do not have too much dependence on any country. Our essential approach in this respect is to have our equipment manufactured in our own factories in our country. But we should not also lightly brush aside the help we might receive from friendly countries including the Soviet Union when such equipment is supplied to us, and it will be wrong on our part to adopt an attitude of a highly critical nature, brushing aside what help we might be receiving from time to time, and to look always with suspicion. That is not a healthy attitude; that does not help us either in building our confidence or even in creating friendship.

There was even an internal contradiction in the thinking of the hon. member when towards the end, talking of the present strained relations between the USSR and China, he was trying to indicate a line which was opposed to his earlier thesis. So, while we are discussing such important and serious matters, we must have some clear objective before our mind. The objective is to get strength for us from whatever source available. We should value sources of help that enable us to strengthen ourselves; at the same time, we should not unnecessarily be critical even in spheres where criticism is not called for. It is a changing world, as the External Affairs Minister was at pains to point out yesterday. Many of the older alliances are changing and new ones are developing. In this we should also be sufficiently responsive to the changing situation and keeping in view our national interest, pursue policies which are correct policies also from the international peace point of view. This is precisely the line of policy we are following.

श्री कंबरलाल गुप्त : अगर चाइना और पाकिस्तान मिल कर हमला करें तो क्या रूस ने कोई एगोएँस दी है कि आपकी मदद करेगा क्योंकि बार्डर के केस में आप उन को सपोर्ट कर रहे हैं ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Our policy has always been clarified, that we have to depend on our own strength to meet any threat that we face from any country. To take to the easy way of looking either to the Soviet Union or sometimes to America or other countries—for help will not help our country. Unless we develop this feeling that we have to stand on our own legs, we cannot carry on. We have to undergo sacrifices if it comes to that; we have to carry a heavy burden. There will not be any easy escape. This is the line we should pursue.

SHRI RANJIT SINGH : I must say that after a very long time, the Defence Minister has spoke like the Defence Minister of a free and powerful country.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA : We would like to congratulate him on that.

SHRI RANJIT SINGH : I must congratulate him on that. That in itself shows

a major shift in the Government of India's policy. He has admitted that there has been a shift in the Soviet policy. Up till now the Ministers have denied it and they even went to the extent of saying that Soviet Union is free to sell arms to any country including Pakistan and it does not mean that there is a shift in their policy. Now Government agrees there is a shift and we are grateful for that statement.

This reputed speech of Marshal Grechko was made on 11th or 12th March. Having a diplomatic channel, even after a month has elapsed, we have no information as yet even about such an important speech. We know substantially well what Russia and China have supplied to Pakistan, and what Pakistan has purchased from France, like submarines etc., and also from USA. Is it not a fact that as of today Pakistan has achieved parity in amount strength with India division for division and they have got now more divisions and more fire-power than our entire army has ?

The hon. Minister also said that all this action of Pakistan in acquiring military were from Russia and other countries has lead to a certain amount of imbalance...

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I never used the word 'imbalance'.

SHRI RANJIT SINGH : All right. I will withdraw that word. He said that it has led to certain problems and now we have to increase our military preparedness. Recognising all this, knowing that it is our paramount duty to see that we are well prepared against any potential enemy, and also knowing the fact that Pakistan recognises us and us only as their enemy and therefore all their preparedness is only against us, what are we doing to maintain military balance in such way that Pakistan is never placed in a position to exploit and situation by attacking us or creating trouble in Kashmir as they did through infiltration in 1965 ? What is the new thinking in defence ? What is the new concept of defence ? We can maintain a good and powerful armed force and we can utilise it in such a way that burden is not felt on the country, just like so many other countries are doing, including China,

[Shri Ranjit Singh]

These are the pertinent questions that arise and I hope the hon. Minister will answer them.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (हापुड़) : सभा-पति जी, भारत जैसे देश के लिए जोकि शक्ति के क्षेत्र में अभी विकास की ओर अग्रसर है, सीमाओं से सटे हुए चीन और रूस जैसे दोनों देशों से एक साथ शत्रुता मोल नहीं लेनी चाहिए, यह बात तो किसी हद तक सही है। लेकिन उसका अभिप्राय यह भी नहीं है कि किसी देश के सामने हमें आत्मसमर्पण कर लेना चाहिए। रूस की मित्रता लेने के लिए हमको कितनी मंहगी कीमत देनी पड़ी है उसका एक ही उदाहरण मैं आपको देना चाहता हूँ—टूरिस्ट कारपोरेशन के चेयरमैन श्री रमेश थापर ने अभी पीछे कहा है कि बोकारो कारखाने के लिए रूस से जितनी भी सामग्री आई है उसकी जो कीमत दुनिया के और देशों में है उससे तीस और चालिस प्रतिशत अधिक रूस ने हमसे ली है दुनिया के सारे देशों के साथ हमारा व्यापार स्टेट ट्रेडिंग कारपोरेशन के द्वारा होता है जबकि रूस के साथ हमारा व्यापार सीधा है और वह भी रुपये के माध्यम में है। उस रुपये में से कितना वहां जाता है और कितना यहीं व्यय हो जाता है, उसकी कोई जानकारी नहीं है। लेकिन जो बात मैं विशेष रूप से कहना चाहता हूँ वह यह कि भूतपूर्व विदेश मंत्री श्री चागला ने, जब यह ही प्रश्न आया था, यहां कहा था कि रूस ने पाकिस्तान को हेलिकाप्टर दिए हैं। उसके बाद समाचार आया कि टैंक दिये। फिर उसके बाद समाचार आया कि मिग जहाज दिए हैं। और अब समाचार पत्रों में यह समाचार छपा है—मैं चाहूंगा कि रक्षा मंत्री इसके सम्बन्ध में भी हमको जानकारी दें—कि रूस पाकिस्तान में,—आणविक शक्ति के सम्बन्ध में अपने कुछ विशेषज्ञों को भेज करके उनके वैज्ञानिकों को ट्रेन्ड कर रहा है। प्रारम्भ में कहा यही जा

रहा है कि अणु शक्ति का विकास शान्तिपूर्ण कार्यों के लिए है। लेकिन अन्ततोगत्वा उन का उद्देश्य क्या है यह हम रक्षा मंत्री से जानना चाहते हैं कि इस की जानकारी भी उनको मिली या नहीं।

दूसरी बात जो मैं विशेष रूप से जानना चाहता हूँ कि वह यह कि आप यह बताइये कि जो रूस पाकिस्तान को हथियार दे रहा है तो क्या केवल इसलिए की रूस अपने हथियारों का बाजार ढूँढ रहा है? या इसलिए कि रूस पाकिस्तान को चीन से दूर रखना चाहता है। इसलिए पाकिस्तान को वह हथियार दे रहा है? अगर इसीलिए पाकिस्तान को हथियार दे रहा है तो पीछे जब रूस के रक्षा मंत्री आये थे और जिस से आपकी मुलाकात हुई थी क्या उन से इस प्रकार की भी जानकारी ली कि जो हथियार रूस ने हम को दिये हैं उसी प्रकार के हथियार उन्होंने ने पाकिस्तान को तो नहीं दिये हैं? जिस से शक्ति के क्षेत्र में संतुलन बनाये रखने के अन्दर फिर किसी प्रकार की कठिनाई पैदा हो जाय? इस बात की जानकारी रक्षा मंत्री जी को है या नहीं? उन को जो हथियार मिले हैं उन में और हम को दिये हथियारों में किसी प्रकार की कोई भिन्नता है अथवा दोनों देशों में एक ही जैसे हथियार रूस ने दिये हैं? इस तरह वह दोनों देशों की पीठ थप थपाकर दोनों देशों को संघर्ष के पथ पर उतारू करना चाहता है?

दूसरी बात मैं विशेष रूप से यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि जब से पाकिस्तान को रूसी हथियार मिले हैं या अब जब पाकिस्तान के अन्दर नई सत्ता ने अपना कार्य भार सम्हाला है तो उसके बाद क्या हमारी सीमाओं पर पाकिस्तान की ओर से कुछ पहले की अपेक्षा हलचल तो नहीं बढ़ी है? क्योंकि प्रायः यह होता है कि जो नया शासक पाकिस्तान में आता है वह अपना अस्तित्व बनाये रखने के लिये कुछ हलचल बढ़ा देता है और भारत के प्रति भय के वातावरण का निर्माण करता है। ऐसी स्थिति

तो नहीं है ? अगर हैं तो उस की ओर से भारत सरकार या रक्षा मंत्रालय सतर्क हैं क्या ?

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai) : Sir, the statement attributed to Marshal Grechko the Defence Minister of Russia, when he visited Pakistan is extremely disturbing for reason that he has raised very serious issues when he said that Russia, if the report is correct, is going to help Pakistan with arms, for one specific reason, to strengthen its, *i. e.* Pakistan's force against its enemy. The second reason that has been stated, again, if the report is correct, is to restore or maintain the regional balance. India has a bitter experience of similar phrases used by USA when it supplied arms to Pakistan, when it was said that USA was supplying arms to Pakistan to maintain its stability mainly against the forces of Communism. It was also stated that USA had a prior commitment from Pakistan that the arms supplied by USA will not be used in any eventuality against this country. It was also said that if those arms were used against India USA will take suitable steps to see that Pakistan is not enabled to use those arms against India. It is a matter of history, not far off, how all these promises and all these commitments of USA proved futile. It is also our bitter experience how the arms supplied by USA were used against India during the Kutch conflict and also the major war against India in 1965. Therefore naturally, India should be very much worried by the reported statement of Marshal Grechko. In view of the past experience and also the successful defence and foreign policy used by Pakistan where in the name of bilateral relations with different conflicting countries they get arms from USA, China and now from Russia.

I want to know whether the Government has enquired from Soviet Russia that the statement attributed to Marshal Grechko is correct ? If so, have the Government tried to ascertain from the USSR Government what they mean by "its enemies" ? Who, according to USSR, is or are the enemy or enemies of Pakistan in the actual and potential sense ? Secondly, what is meant by regional imbalance ? Who are the forces that are creating defence imbalance in respect to Pakistan ? Have the Government tried to ascertain the view of the USSR Government

on what is meant by regional imbalance and which of the forces are likely to create imbalance with respect to the defence of Pakistan ? Then, have they requested the Government of USSR to supply the Government of India with information about the quantity, items and the nature of arms and also military equipments supplied to Pakistan ? Lastly, in view of the admission of the Defence Minister...

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Admission ?

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : All right, I will say 'acknowledgement'. In view of the acknowledgement by the Defence Minister that there is a change of Policy by Russia towards India and also towards Pakistan, may I know whether the Government has explored an alternative potential source for supply, particularly the sophisticated arms that are being supplied by Russia ? Then, Russia is training nuclear scientists of Pakistan. May I know whether it is a fact that they are also given training for handling reactors in Pakistan and also for separation of plutonium ? May I also know whether this fissile element of plutonium can be used for making an atom bomb by any scientist within two months if they so desire ?

श्री शिवचन्द्र भ्वा (मधुवनी) : सभापति महोदय, मेरा पहला सवाल यह है कि जो आर्म्स रूस ने पाकिस्तान को दिये हैं, दे रहा है या आने वाले दिनों में देगा तो क्या यह बात सही नहीं है कि यह आर्म्स देने का समझौता रूस और पाकिस्तान के बीच ताशकंद में ही जब रूस हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के बीच में पंचैती कर रहा था उसी वक्त यह समझौता हुआ था कि पाकिस्तान को रूस द्वारा आर्म्स दिए जायेंगे ? क्या सरकार को इस बात का पता है ? मैं इस लिये पूछ रहा हूँ कि इधर हाल में भूट्टो ने कहा है कि वहाँ पर यह समझौता हुआ था। जब अय्यूब के खिलाफ वह बोल रहे थे तो अखबार में यह बात आई कि यहीं पर यह रूस द्वारा पाकिस्तान को आर्म्स देने का समझौता हुआ था और वहाँ से हमारा कश्मीर चला गया। इस तरीके की बात आई थी तो मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या ताशकंद में यह सम-

[श्री शिवचन्द्र भा]

भीता नहीं हुआ था ? इस से डबल स्टैंडर्ड का क्या पता नहीं चलता ?

दूसरा सवाल यह है कि आप ने कहा कि सबमरीस का पता नहीं है कि वह दी जा रही है ? ऐअर टु सरफेस मिजाइल्स के बारे में क्या आप को जानकारी है कि वह कितनी दी जा रही है ? न्युक्लिअर आर्म्स की जो बात उठी है, हमारे पहले वक्ताओं ने यह बात उठाई है, न्युक्लिअर आर्म्स की बातें चल रही हैं पाकिस्तान रूस से न्युक्लिअर आर्म्स लेने की तैयारी में है यदि वह बात है तो जैसा आप ने कहा है अपने जवाब में कि हम हर तरह से मुकाबला करेंगे तो मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या यह न्युक्लिअर आर्म्स का जवाब आप के पास है ?

तीसरा सवाल है कि जैसा आपको मालूम है कि रूस एक नया बहुत बड़ा रडार सिस्टम वेस्ट पाकिस्तान में बना रहा है और वह हमारे किसी जहाज को नार्थ इंडिया का जितना ऐयर का मूवमेंट है वह यहां के किसी जहाज के मूवमेंट को उस रडार से इंटरसेप्ट कर लेंगे डिटेक्ट कर लेंगे तो ऐसा जो रडार सिस्टम वहां बन रहा है उस के बारे में मंत्री महोदय को क्या कोई जानकारी है ? क्या आप को इस की जानकारी है ?

आखिरी सवाल मेरा यह है कि रशिया ने पाकिस्तान को आर्म्स दिये थे और आप को भी दिये थे, यह आप भी कबूल करते हैं। तो मनी टर्म्स में आप को उन्होंने कितने करोड़ रुपये का सामान दिया है और पाकिस्तान को कितने करोड़ रुपये का सामान दिया है ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Sir, it is very difficult to go into all the details. I can understand their desire but I have got a little bigger responsibility to observe silence with respect to all this inquisitiveness which I can understand.

One basic thing is that we do not give the details of the equipment that we manufacture. So, all the questions that are asked directly or indirectly to elicit from

me information in that respect cannot obviously be answered by me for reasons of security ; but I will try to answer as many of the points as possible.

I would like to make one position clear. More than one hon. Member has talked of military balance. It is an unfortunate fact of history that this talk of military balance between India and Pakistan was an expression that was coined by several countries. We have never accepted the validity of this expression. It is meaningless in the context of the situation that India faces today. Our size is bigger ; our problems are different and we face two hostile neighbours. In view of this any talk of military balance is absolutely besides the point and I would appeal to hon. Members that we should be careful in the use of this expression because it is really not relevant in the context of the situation that India faces today.

Now, Major Ranjit Singh asked me as to why we have not been able to check up the correctness of the statement that is attributed by the Pakistan Press to the Defence Minister of the Soviet Union. We have made enquiries and one of the things that have been mentioned was that it has been quoted out of context. Our information is that there was no written statement that was made and, therefore, we are trying to find out as best as we can the exact statement ; but we have not yet got it.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : Is it enough if a state like Russia simply says that it has been quoted out of context ? Will you also get the information ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I thought what he said before was fairly serious. Does he think that what he has said now is more serious ?

The report presents it in a serious form and when the Government spokesman says that it has been reported out of context, it means that the impact that is created by this report is not shared by them.

The second point was about parity in strength which I have already answered. The third point was what we were doing

to defend ourselves. We are strengthening ourselves in every manner that we can.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : We are discussing it in this Parliament !

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I think, the information of Major Ranjit Singh on the point of parity in strength is not quite correct. It is wrong, I suggest, to talk of parity because it is not Pakistan that we face but we have other commitments. I have no doubt in my mind that so far as Pakistan is concerned, there is no comparison today. We are definitely stronger in every respect. But the main point is that we have got other enemies also. So, I would request the hon. Member not to talk of parity with Pakistan.

SHRI RANJIT SINGH : I have talked only about Pakistan.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : That is not the whole story. Even if I am more superior to Pakistan, I do not want this impression to be created that I am over-arming myself. You should also appreciate the delicacy of the situation because we have to face other enemies. Our talk of parity which Pakistan is unreal and we should not talk in this vein at all. Therefore, there is no point in hammering that point.

Then, my hon. friend, Shri Prakash Vir Shastri, talked about trade terms with U. S. S. R., the Bokaro Steel Plant and the rest. I am not going to reply to them because those are matters which are dealt with by other Ministries. It is true there is some collaboration between Pakistan and U.S.S.R. in the matter of exchange of information about nuclear science. But it will be absolutely wrong for us to imagine that they can give any information about the technology relating to the atomic weapon. In fact, they are the main sponsors of the non-proliferation treaty and, under that, the Soviet Union has undertaken not to supply any information in this respect to any country whatsoever. Historically also, and on the basis of information that we have of the Soviet attitude and also, in fact,

of other nuclear powers, no one of them is in a hurry to pass information to any other country even though it may be very friendly to them.

Several questions have been asked as to why U.S.S.R. is supplying arms to Pakistan. I wish I could answer that. They have mentioned on various occasions as to why they are supplying arms. It is not for me to explain. I am not expected to explain as to why they are supplying arms. My position is clear. They are under a wrong assessment of the Pakistani intentions. We have tried to convince them. We have not succeeded in convincing them. We should accept that position. It is not for me to find out the particular reasons for the supply of arms to Pakistan.

Then, he asked the further question as to whether, after the new regime has taken over in Pakistan, there is any increased tension at the borders. There is no such increase of tension at the borders after the new regime in Pakistan has taken over...

S.M. BANERJEE : There is tension in their own country.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I was talking of not inside the country but at the borders.

Then, my hon. friend, Shri Samar Guha, in his characteristic manner, has asked several questions. The first part was his speech to which I do not want to make a counter speech. But I come to the questions direct. About the statement of the Defence Minister of U.S.S.R., I have already answered. About regional imbalance also, I have already answered. Then, about supply of quantity of arms to Pakistan, we have not asked them. We have no intention to ask them because, if we expect U. S. S. R. to give us information about the supply of their arms to Pakistan, probably, Pakistan can also expect U.S.S.R. to supply information of the U.S.S.R. supplies to us, and I do not want that we should place the U.S.S.R. in that position in which they give information to other countries of the U.S.S.R. arms supplies to us. That is something of greater value to me and I have no intention to pursue that line.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : So long as we depend so much on Russian assurance, Hindi-Russi bhai-bhai...(Interruption).

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : We should not lightly reject the idea of bhai-bhai. It has become a fashion to ridicule it. It will be a bad day if we were to live only in tension and forget altogether the concept of bhai-bhai. May be, we may have been mistaken. But that should be an objective which we should not lightly let go by notwithstanding all the disillusionment that we might have experienced. (Interruption) We are exploring alternative sources also.

Then he, asked me a very technical question about the splitting up of the atom and the like. He is a great scientist himself. I am forgetting science because I am older than him—I also did my Physics—and I will not like to go into the niceties of the splitting of the atom because this is not the forum for that. If he is interested, we can discuss it outside and he can give me his comments about it. We should regard this collaboration of technical know-how in the nuclear field, nuclear science, as a scientific phenomenon. Shri Samar Guha, I am sure, must be aware of the vast volume of information that is now available on nuclear science. And there are very few secrets now. It is a common pattern now: several countries are collaborating with one another in the matter of sharing of nuclear science and we should not treat the agreement between the Soviet Union and Pakistan in any light except the normal sort of exchange of information about nuclear science.

Then, my friend opposite put several questions as to whether, in Tashkent itself, it was agreed that arms would be supplied by the USSR, and he has quoted Mr. Bhutto. It is not a very safe thing to quote him, I would warn the hon. Member, because if really an agreement to supply arms had been entered into at Tashkent, that would certainly not be a point against Gen. Ayub; whenever Mr. Bhutto has talked of Tashkent, he has always said that there. Gen. Ayub did something very bad from the point of view of Pakistan which he was going to expose; this was the general tenor, although he has not been able to say anything on that issue. This is out of context. Probably the hon. Member has not followed carefully all the things that are going on in Pakistan. There is no question as to where the agreement was entered into...(Interruptions). It is immaterial from our point of view, from the substantive point of view, where the said agreement was entered into. So long as the agreement is there and it is being acted upon and they are getting arms, that is more important than the historical research whether it was entered into in Tashkent or elsewhere. That is absolutely immaterial and we should not waste our time in going into that aspect.

I have attempted to cover, briefly at any rate, all the points.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

19.43 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, April 10, 1969/Chaitra 20, 1891 (Saka).