लाभ की जो रकमें विदेश भेजी थीं उनका ब्यौरा इस प्रकार है :—

वर्ष	चालू लाभ	संचित लाभ
	(करोड़ रुपयों में)	
1965-66 (संशोधित)	9.86	3.64
1966-67 (प्रारम्भिक)	8.60	5.87
1967-68 (प्रारम्भिक)	7.64	8.31

(ङ) और (च). सूचना इकट्ठी की जा रही है और वह जिस रूप में तथा जहां तक उपलब्ध होगी, सभा की मेज पर रख दी जायगी।

---

12 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

Supply of U. S. arms to Pakistan

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं अविलम्बनीय लोक-महत्व के निम्न विषय की ओर वैदेशिक कार्य मंत्री का ध्यान दिलाता हूं और प्रार्थना करता हूं कि वे इस के बारे में एक वक्तव्य दें—

"अमरीका की प्रतिनिधि सभा के सदस्य लेरी कफलीन द्वारा अमरीकी कांग्रेस में दिये गये इस कथित वक्तव्य की ओर कि 22 सितम्बर, 1965 को शस्त्रास्त्रों सम्बन्धी रोक लगाए जाने के 30 दिन पश्चात् से अमरीका पाकिस्तान को गुप्त रूप से शस्त्रास्त्र सप्लाई कर रहा है।"

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI DINESH SINGH) : The Government have seen newspaper reports of a statement made by U. S. Congressman Larry Coughlin that the U. S. Government have been involved in arms shipments to Pakistan despite assertions that a weapons embargo had been imposed as a result of the 1965 Pakistan-India conflict. He has said that 90 surplus F. 86 Sabre jets were sent to Pakistan from West Germany through Iran in early 1966 and that refurbished Sherman tanks were supplied to Pakistan from West Germany through Italy about seventeen months ago.

The House is aware that the U. S. arms embargo was relaxed in early 1966 to permit supply of non-lethal items. This policy was further changed in 1967 when sales of spare parts of lethal weapons directly from the U. S. and sales of lethal weapons through third country were permitted on a case-by-case basis.

The Government have clearly conveyed to the U. S. Government India's strong opposition to the supply of arms to Pakistan and are in touch with them on this matter. We are not aware of direct sales of lethal weapons from the U. S. to Pakistan since the 1965 conflict. We have also been successful in preventing, by and large, supplies of U. S. arms to Pakistan through third countries.

So far as the question of supply of 90 F-86 Sabre jets is concerned, I may refer the Hon. Members to the statement made by my predecessor in the Lok Sabha on the 2nd of September, 1966. To the best of our knowledge no Sherman tanks have been supplied to Pakistan since the 1965 sconflict. If the reference is to the reported supply of 100 Patton tanks through Italy, the House has been informed on a number of occasions that this deal has not gone through.

श्री मधु लिमये: अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस में जो एक गलती है, पहले उसका खुलासा किया जाय तो अच्छा होगा। अखबारों में जो रिपोर्ट आई है, उसमें पैटन टैंकों की चर्चा नहीं है, शर्मन टैंकों की चर्चा है। क्या मंत्री महोदय सुन रहे हैं ?

श्री दिनेश सिंह : बड़े जोर से सुन रहा हूं और समझने की कोशिश कर रहा हूं कि आप क्या कह रहे हैं।

श्री मधु लिमये : आपने कहा है कि —

If the reference is to the reported supply of 100 patton tanks through Italy.....

लेकिन जो रिपोर्ट आई है, मैं उस को पढ़ कर सुनाता हूं । अगर कोई गलतफहमी है तो मैं अपनी सप्लीमेंट्री खराब नहीं करना चाहता हूं—आपने कहा है—

He added that the USA completely abandoned the arms embargo about 17 months ago when the refurbished sherman tanks were supplied to Pakistan from West Germany through several Italian firms. (*Interruption*).

If the reference is to the reported supply of 100 patton tanks.....

यह रिपोर्ट शर्मन टैंक्स की है, इसलिये पहले आप इस का खुलासा कीजिये तब सप्लीमेंट्री पूछूंगा ?

श्री दिनेश सिंह : मैंने अपने वक्तव्य में बहुत साफ कहने की कोशिश की है कि जो खबर हम को मालूम हुई है.....

श्री मधु लिमये : मेरे प्रश्न का उत्तर नहीं दिया—

If the reference is to the reported supply of 100 patton tanks through Italy .....

मैंने रिपोर्ट पढ़कर सुनाया है । अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह सरकार विभाजित हो गई है । इस की कोई नीति नहीं है । ये लोग चुप्पी साधे हुए हैं । पहले आप इस का खुलासा कीजिये ।

श्री दिनेश सिंह : अध्यक्ष महोदय, माननीय सदस्य खुद विभाजित हो रहे हैं, सरकार विभाजित नहीं है.... (**व्यवधान**).....

जहां तक माननीय सदस्य के प्रश्न का सम्बन्ध है, मेरी कठिनाई यह है कि जब मैं प्रश्न का उत्तर दे रहा था, माननीय सदस्य तरह तरह के खयालात में डूबे हुये थे उन्होंने समझने की कोशिश नहीं की कि मैंने क्या कहा । अब मैं आपकी आज्ञा से फिर से उस को पढ़कर सुना देना चाहता हूं—

"To the best of our knowledge no sherman tanks have been supplied to Pakistan since the 1965 conflict. If the reference is to the reported supply of 100 patton tanks through Italy the House has been informed on a number of occasions that this deal has not gone through....."

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा प्रश्न यह है कि अमरीका के जो संसद सदस्य हैं, साधारण तौर पर उन को फौजी मामलों के बारे में अधिक जानकारी मिलती है, बनिस्बत इस सदन के सदस्यों के और वहां पर इन चीजों के बारे में इतनी गुप्तता भी नहीं रखी जाती । इसलिये जब लैरी कफलीन साहब अमरीका की सरकार पर आरोप करते हैं–

In remarks prepared for publication in the Congressional Report the Liberal Republican said that recent suggestions that the USA might lift the embargo were misleading because there has been no effective ban.

इसलिये मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि जब एक संसद सदस्य वहां पर रिकार्ड के लिये यह कहता है कि यह शुरू से गुमराह करने की बात चल रही थी, हथियारों पर कभी रोक नहीं थी, तो क्या मंत्री महोदय इस बात की जांच करायेंगे, अमरीका में हमारे दूतावास के द्वारा इस चीज के बारे में ज्यादा अच्छी जानकारी हासिल करेंगे ?

दूसरा सवाल—इन हथियारों के चलते, जोकि मरम्मत किये हुये हथियार हैं, पुराने हथियार हैं, इन के चलते भारत और पाकिस्तान दोनों विदेशों के चंगुल में फंसते चले जा रहे हैं । क्या मंत्री महोदय इस बात का प्रयास करेंगे कि क्या रूस, क्या अमरीका या दूसरे देश कोई भी हिन्दुस्तान को या पाकिस्तान को हथियार न दें, किसी को भी न दें और हम लोग हथियारों के मामले में तथा

अन्य चीजों के बारे में स्वयं आत्म-निर्भर बनने की कोशिश करें ?

श्री दिनेश सिंह : जहां तक माननीय सदस्य का पहला सवाल है—हम को जो सूचना हमारे दूतावास से तथा अन्य जरियों से मिली है, उस को सदन के सामने रखा है। माननीय सदस्य ने कहा है कि इस के बारे में और कोशिश करें पता लगाने के लिये, तो हम जरूर और ज्यादा कोशिश करेंगे।

जहां तक उन का दूसरा सवाल है—किसी देश से हथियार न लें तथा कोई और देश पाकिस्तान को हथियार न दे—जहां तक अमरीका का सम्बन्ध है, हम ने उन से कहा है कि वे पाकिस्तान को हथियार न दें। जाहिर है कि जिस तरह उन्होंने हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान को इसमें एक साथ रखा है, अगर वे पाकिस्तान को हथियार न दें तो मुमकिन है, हम को भी हथियार न दें। लेकिन इसके लिये हम को तैयार रहना पड़ेगा, हम बाहर के किसी भी देश से हथियार न खरीदें—यह हमारी सुरक्षा के लिये सम्भव नहीं होगा। माननीय सदस्य को यह बात समझनी चाहिये कि हमें अपनी सुरक्षा केवल पाकिस्तान से ही नहीं करनी है, चीन से भी करनी है और चीन के पास काफी हथियार हैं। इसलिये हमें काफी हथियार बाहर से लेने पड़ते हैं।

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore) : With regard to the supply of F-86 sabre jets Mr. Coughlin is reported in a statement as saying : 'I charge our Government knew from the beginning that those 90 planes were destined for Pakistan." In his statement the Minister has referred to some statement made by this predecessor in this House. In that statement we were told that after repairs in Pakistan these planes are going to be sent back or have been sent back. I would like to know that when Mr. Coughlin is saying that the United States Government knew from the beginning that these planes were destined for Pakistan, what is the position now, as far as Government is concerned ? Does not their previous information need some fresh verification and fresh consideration ? As Shri Madhu Limaye has pointed out, it is of no consequence whether they are Patton or Sherman tanks. The point is, the deal has not gone through according to the Minister. May I know from him what is then to prevent it going through at any time in the future and does not this whole thing only throw a lurid light on the duplicity of the United States' Government in this matter? I would say, the Chinese Government at least gave planes to Pakistan openly not by the backdoor and indirect methods. Mr. Dinesh Singh had been to the United States. The President of the United States has been here. We are told always that they discuss all these questions and we have been assured that no arms would be given. But, I want to know, whether, if these back-door methods continue our Government would consider cutting off diplomatic relations with the United States.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : I should like to leave Members to draw their own conclusions and not make any comment. We have to go by the accepted declarations of the countries concerned. So far as the question of supply of arms is concerned, whether it is concealed or open, I would consider it just as bad. I would not consider supply of arms by China any better because it is declared whether as some thing is given by some other country which is not declared. Pakistan's acquisition of arms is certainly a threat to us and it would be a threat whether the weapon is given openly or indirectly. So far as the deal is concerned, about the future, as to what is thereto prevent these countries from giving in the future, how can I say what is to prevent that, except to say that we should continue our efforts to see that Pakistan does not get these arms which would be a kind of arms threat which could be used against us? Regarding the clarification that the hon. Member has mentioned, I think, it is a clarification to be given by the United States Government to one of their Members of Parliament. It is very difficult for me here to give any clarification on behalf of United States Government.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : For the first part he has not replied. His predecessor

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

has said in the statement mentioned here that these planes, after being repaired in Pakistan were going to be sent back to Iran. I want to know from him as to what is the Government's information. Have those planes been sent back or they are in Pakistan?

SHRI DINESH SINGH : My colleague has informed the House that the Canadian Government where these planes were manufactured had informed us that these planes, after they were serviced in Pakistan would go back. This is an assurance that Iran had given. Both the Canada Government so far as I recollect and the West German Government from where these planes were sold have been informed. Both of them had been assured that these planes after they had gone through certain verification would be returned to Iran.

AN HON. MEMBER : What is your information?

AN HON. MEMBER : Have they gone back ?

SHRI DINESH SINGH : It is very difficult for me to say how these planes.....

श्री मधु लिमये : ईरान दूतावास में आपका एम्बैसेडर है ।

SHRI DINESH SINGH : I am only trying to give the information correctly to the House. It would be very easy to give some information, but I am not the Pakistan Government or the Iran Government, and I have no method....

श्री बलराज मधोक (दक्षिण दिल्ली) : आप अपनी जानकारी बता दीजिए ।

श्री मधु लिमये: उसे ये बताना नहीं चाहते हैं ।

SHRI DINESH SINGH: I would beg of the hon. Members to try to appreciate how our missions abroad function. They do not have radars there to see whether these planes have crossed or not crossed. These are planes which could keep on moving from one country to another. We do not have any radars; what we tried to find out are the things that we have given to the House.

So far as our information went, these planes had gone back, but I was only trying to tell the House that this is not a matter on which we can give any categorical answer because we go on the basis of certain information that comes. We had been informed that they had gone back but today, as to whether they have come back or one hundred remain or ten remain, if I say something today about it, tomorrow, hon. Members will say that I have misled the House. Therefore, we would like to give full information as is available to us, namely that we were told that these had gone back to Iran.

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त (दिल्ली सदर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मन्त्री महोदय ने अपने स्टेटमेंट में कहा है :

"The House is aware that the US arms embargo was relaxed in early 1966 to permit supply of non-lethal items. This policy was further changed in 1967 when sales of spare parts of lethal weapons directly from the US and sales of lethal weapons through third country were permitted on a case-by-case basis."

मैं उनसे पूछना चाहता हूं कि अमरीका से कितने स्पेयर पार्ट्स पाकिस्तान गए ? सन् 1965 की लड़ाई के बाद पाकिस्तान की जो स्थिति थी, जो उसको क्षति हुई थी, क्या उस क्षति को पाकिस्तान ने पूरा कर लिया है ? क्या यह सही है कि आज पाकिस्तान के पास टैंक की संख्या हम से ज्यादा है ?

इसके अलावा पाकिस्तान कुछ डिफेंस पैक्ट्स का भी मेम्बर है जिस में यू० एस० ए० भी है तो वहां से पाकिस्तान को कोई सामान मिला है या नहीं ? अगर मिला है तो कितना मिला है ? आपने यह कहा है वाई ऐंड लार्ज हम रोक सके हैं थर्ड कन्ट्रीज के जरिये से— तो आपकी सोर्सेज के अनुसार कितना लड़ाई का सामान पाकिस्तान के पास गया है अमरीका के थ्रू थर्ड कन्ट्री से या डिफेंस पैक्ट कन्ट्रीज के जरिये से या सीधे ?

इसके अतिरिक्त जैसा मन्त्री महोदय ने कहा कि हमारा और पाकिस्तान का एक जैसा केस नहीं है क्योंकि हमारे सामने मेन डेंजर चीन का है और चीन की फौजी ताकत हमसे कई गुना है। अगर चीन ने हमला किया और भारत उसका मुकाबला नहीं कर पाता है तो उससे सारे एशिया की सीक्योरिटी खतरे में पड़ जायेगी । मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि अमरीका से इस आधार पर कि चीन से हमें खतरा है, हथियार क्यों नहीं मांगते हैं ? अन्त में मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि वाशिंगटन में जो हमारी इम्बैसी है उसकी क्या सूचना है— अमरीका की सरकार पाकिस्तान को हथियार देने के बारे में क्या सोच रही है, उसकी लेटेस्ट थिंकिंग क्या है ?

श्री दिनेश सिंह : इतने सारे सवालों का जवाब एक साथ दूं, मैं कोशिश करूंगा. . . .

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त : मैंने तो एक ही सवाल किया है ।

श्री दिनेश सिंह : चूंकि माननीय सदस्य ने एक ही सवाल किया है, मैं एक ही जबाब दे दूं— बाद में वे पढ़कर देख लेंगे कि एक सवाल के अन्दर उन्होंने कितने सवालात डालने की कोशिश की है ।

जहां तक हमारी सुरक्षा का सवाल है, हमारे साथी रक्षा मंत्री जी ने इसको कितनी ही मर्तबा इस सदन के सामने स्पष्ट किया है कि हम को मालूम है कि क्या खतरा हमारे सामने चीन से है, क्या खतरा पाकिस्तान से है और उसके लिए हमने क्या इन्तजाम किये हैं। उन्होंने इस सदन के सामने कई मर्तबा कहा है कि अपने साधनों के अनुसार हमने अपनी सुरक्षा का पूरा इन्तजाम किया है। मैं समझता हूं माननीय सदस्य को इस जबाब से सन्तुष्ट हो जाना चाहिये ।

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त : मैंने यह पूछा था कि पाकिस्तान को डायरेक्टली या इन्डायरेक्टली डिफेंस पैक्ट कन्ट्रीज के जरिये से कितने हथियार, स्पेयर पार्टस मिले ? दूसरे. . . .

श्री दिनेश सिंह: दूसरा सवाल फिर हो गया ।

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त : अध्यक्ष महोदय, सभी ने दो दो, तीन तीन सवाल पूछे हैं । अगर माननीय मन्त्री जी जबाब नहीं देना चाहते हैं तो दूसरी बात है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : श्री मधु लिमये जी ने लेरी कफलीन के स्टेटमेंट के बारे में सवाल उठाया था । काल अटेंशन के जबाब का आप सही इस्तेमाल करेंगे वह तो ठीक है लेकिन आप सिर्फ एक क्वैश्चन के ही एन्टाइटिल्ड हैं। मैं आपके सवालों को गिनता रहा हूं— मैंने सोचा मन्त्री जी जबाब दे दें तो ठीक है लेकिन मैं भी यह सोच रहा था कि आपने कितने सवाल किए हैं जबकि आप सिर्फ एक ही क्लैरिफिकेशन के इन्टाइटिल्ड हैं। अगर आप उसको रेगुलर डिबेट के तौर पर पूछते हैं तो मैं हैल्पलैस हूं। क्लैरिफिकेशन आप ले सकते हैं, क्वैश्चन कर सकते हैं। इन के अलावा अगर आप और कहेंगे तो मैं हैल्पलैस होऊंगा ।

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त : मैंने सवाल यह पूछा है कि कितना सामान 1965 से अभी तक पाकिस्तान के पास आ चुका है ?

MR. SPEAKER : That is not relevant.

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त : अगर यह जबाब नहीं आता कि कितना सामान आया तो क्या सवाल इस में से उठेगा ।

MR. SPEAKER : This relates to the Ministry of Defence.

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त : पाकिस्तान को अमरीका से कितना सामान आया है यह नहीं बतायेंगे तो कैसे काम चलेगा ।

MR. SPEAKER : Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA : I strongly protest against this.

SHRI TRIDIB KUMAR CHAUDHURI (Berhampore) : The principal charge that has been levelled by Mr. Coughlin against the American Government in the context of President Nixon's visit to this country and Pakistan is that although a formal arms embargo was there, there was really no arms embargo. He has also said that after the visit of President Nixon to our country and Pakistan, the pressure for arms supplies would increase. In that context and also in the context of further news from Pakistan after President Nixon's visit to that country, there has been a further development. An American Congressman has charged that there was never any arms embargo. We also know that the hon. Minister himself has said that the sale of lethal weapons on a case-by-case basis....

MR. SPEAKER : I am waiting for his question.

SHRI TRIDIB KUMAR CHAUDHURI: You had allowed every body else.....

MR. SPEAKER : I am not going to allow it in future. The question should be direct and should seek some clarification.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA : There is a difference between a question and a calling-attention-notice.

MR. SPAKER : That is not the scope of the item. Let the hon. Member kindly see that.

SHRI TRIDIB KUMAR CHAUDHURI : This is the direct question. Firstly, an American Congressman has made a charge against his Government. We are not concerned with that. But we are concerned to this extent that the American President, the head of the American Government, visits this country and the other country and after his visit, the news comes from that country that the American Government have agreed to supply arms to Pakistan on a cash basis and already the sales through third parties were authorised since 1966. In the light of that, may I ask whether Government have taken all precautions about collecting information whether the surplus arms, as for example, Patton tanks, Sherman tanks etc. which are lying in various NATO countries like Iran, Italy, Turkey, Belgium etc. are being sold through further third parties to Pakistan? Has the hon. Minister any information on that ? May I know whether any new arms supplies are being made and whether a new decision is going to be taken after the confabulations that President Nixon had with President Yahya Khan of Pakistan ? Has the hon. Minister any information on that ?

SHRI DINESH SINGH : I have shared fully with the House the information that we have had about the supply of arms to Pakistan either directly or through third countries. In the cases that came to our knowledge, in which we took up the matter wtih the governments concerned and also with the US Government, we had been able to prevent the sale of tanks from Italy and also later on from Turkey and West Germany. What information we are able to get we have been supplying to the House and we have been taking every action to prevent such sale of arms to Pakistan. I said 'by and large ' because it would not be possible for me to say categorically that there has been no other sale; to make such a statement would not be fair to this House because with the limited facilities we have, I cannot say that there has been no other sale; there may be other sales we might have missed, but by and large in cases of sales that came to our notice, we had been able to prevent such sales.

So far as sales in the future are concerned, we cannot say what will be the policy of the US Government. We have conveyed to them our stand on this; we have discussed this with the Secretary of State and with President Nixon and we hope that the US Government will not sell arms to Pakistan, but it will not be possible for me to give any assurance because it is a matter which the US Government are examining.

SHRI B. K. DASCHOWDHURY (Cooch Behar) : The Minister's statement has no bearing on the subject matter of the call attention notice. It simply says

[Shri B. K. Daschowdhury]

that this Government has no frurther information than that mentioned here in the statement laid. I would like the hon. Minister to go through the papers very seriously and carefully. On the same day that this information was published, there was another news items published in the *Hindustan Standard* dated 14th August saying that the Senate Panel is suspicious of US-Thai secret part. It is said that it is the policy of the US Government to have certain secret pacts and those pacts were kept secret from the purview of Congress by the Pentagon.

The same thing is found here. There are three things to be considered. The US Congressional proceedings are exacting, high-powered proceedings. The fact of these secret sales of arms to Pakistan is certainly incontestable. Secondly, the Senate has been kept completely in the dark about the US-Thai secret pact by the Pentagon. This has been specifically stated by the Chairman of the Public Relations Committee, Senator William Fulbright. Thirdly, the mysterious fact of the supply of arms to Pakistan through third countries, such as West Germany, Iran etc., has been clearly stated by Senator Larry Coughlin.

In view of these things, this is a clear case of violation of commitments made to India by the US Government that there would be no arms supply to Pakistan after the Indo-Pak war. In this context, will Government consider lodging a sharp and strong protest with the US Government, to be sustained if necessary, by a new turn in our foreign policy towards that country, in view of their continued arms supply to Pakistan?

SHRI DINESH SINGH : I would beg of the hon. member to see it in the perspective in which it affects us. What the US Government has done on a secret basis with other countries they would naturally like to keep secret and would not disclose to us or to anybody else. The hon. Member has pointed out to a certain secret pact that they have entered into. How are we to know about it? These are matters which are kept secret between governments. Of course, every other country tries to find out, but it is not always possible to find out these secrets. We also keep some secrets despite our open society in this country.

Therefore, it has to be looked at in the perspective in which we are answerable to this House in regard to these matters. What the United States Government does, I do not say that it does right or it does wrong; it is on each matter that we have to see, and the fact that they have given such open support to Pakistan is a matter that has been discussed in this House and our opinion conveyed to the United States Government on many occasions. It is not something that we have seen for the first time; what we are now trying to do is to see that the United States adopts a certain attitude in the relations between India and Pakistan, and our talks with the United States Government have been on this basis. Whether they supply arms to Pakistan or not, it is our duty to defend ourselves, and let us look at it from that point of view. Whether Pakistan gets from China, from the Soviet Union or from the United States or buys from France or Germany or any other country, the point is that we have got to make greater efforts to defend ourselves. Let us not spend too much time in goging into what America is doing. Let us spend more time in seeing what we have to do to meet that challenge.

12·38 hrs.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE RE DELHI HIGH COURTS' SUMMONS TO MPS

MR. SPEAKER : There is a privilege motion already pending before the House.

SHRI HEM BARUA (Mangaldai): I wrote to you a letter.

MR. SPEAKER : I am on my legs now, on a different matter. I hope you will wait for some time. There are three privilege motions: by Shri Madhu Limaye a little earlier, by Shri Kundu and also one dated 4th August by Shri Salve. This is in connection with some discussion in this House about the Shankaracharya. Three of his disciples went to the high court and the judge later on, rather than deciding it himself, asked for the constitution of a Full Bench. So many points have been raised and very aptly raised by Shri Madhu Limaye, Shri Salve and also Shri Kundu. After reading the judgment and a number of