

Shooting down of
I.A.F. Canberra
Aircraft in Pakistan

the question should be considered and suitable action should be taken in this regard.

श्री पद्मश्री (शिवाहू बाबोपुर)—रक्षित—अनुसूचित जातियाँ) उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, बिना विधेयक पर विचार करते समय मेरे जैसे मेम्बरो के लिये यह समझना जरूरी हो जाता है कि देश के अन्दर जिस तरह की कर व्यवस्था लागू है उस में क्या क्या हेर फेर हुए और आगे के विकास के लिये हम किस तरह की व्यवस्था करे। हमारे देश के अन्दर जैसे कि दूसरे देशों में भी होता है, जो दो प्रकार की कर प्रणालियाँ हैं, यानी प्रत्यक्ष कर और अप्रत्यक्ष कर, उन में प्रत्यक्ष कर बहुत आवश्यक और सुलभ मालूम होते हैं, ऐसा अर्थशास्त्रियों का विचार है। इसी लिये हमने अपने देश के अन्दर ऐसी व्यवस्था को पूरा करने की कोशिश की है। जहाँ तक सम्भव हो सके देश के अन्दर अधिक से अधिक प्रत्यक्ष कर लगाये जायें क्योंकि अप्रत्यक्ष करों का प्रभाव जनता पर ज्यादा पड़ता है। हालांकि जनता पर सीधे तौर से यह लागू नहीं होते लेकिन फिर भी वही नोंग है जिन पर असली असर पड़ता है और वे लोग इन करों में दब जाते हैं। इन लोगों को इस में राहत मिलनी चाहिये।

17.58 hrs.

[Mr. SPEAKER in the Chair]

चूँकि उन पर करों का भार अधिक पड़ जाता है इस लिये मैं निवेदन करता चाहता हूँ कि हमने देश के अन्दर जो अप्रत्यक्ष कर लगाये हैं उनकी अच्छी तरह से देख भाल हो और देखना चाहिये कि उन से जितनी आमदनी हमारी होनी चाहिये उतनी आमदनी करने का इन्फ्रेक्ट डग क्या है। आमदनी का हिसाब किताब ठीक से होना चाहिये। देश के अन्दर हमने जो कर लगाये हैं उनको बसूल करने के लिये हम क्या पालिसी बनायें उसके विषय में न जा कर, किस तरह से हमारी

हालत खराब हो रही है, कहा कहा पर फजूलखर्ची हो रही है, इस तरफ मैं आपका ध्यान दिवाना चाहूँगा।

हम जानते हैं कि हमारी आमदनी क बहुत सा भाग हमारे देश की अपनी विकास व्यवस्था पर, हमारी योजना को पूरी करने पर खर्च होना जरूरी है। इस वास्ते देश का विकास तो होना ही चाहिये। इस के ऊपर अधिक से अधिक खर्च होना चाहिये। लेकिन आज कल सरकारी कर्मचारियों को बतन देने, भत्ता देने, उनके निवास की व्यवस्था करने और दूसरी चीजों पर वह खर्च हो रहा है। इस के अलावा जब हम देश की उन्नति करना चाहते हैं तो हर तरफ करना चाहते हैं, अपनी रेलों की उन्नति करना चाहते हैं, सड़कों को भी बढ़ाना चाहते हैं।

18 hrs

STATEMENT RE: SHOOTING DOWN
OF I A F CANBERRA AIRCRAFT
IN PAKISTAN

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member may continue tomorrow The hon. Defence Minister.

The Minister of Defence (Shri Krishna Menon): Mr Speaker, Sir, it may be recalled that on the 11th of April last, Government reported to this House, with regret, the loss of one Indian Air Force Canberra Aircraft and also the circumstances in which that event occurred so far as the latter were then known to Government. The House was also promised a fuller report on the occurrence when more became known about the circumstances that led to it and are otherwise relevant. In pursuance of that undertaking, and because of the concern in the public mind about this incident and in view of the large number of mis-statements of facts, official and otherwise, that continue to emanate from Pakistan, Gov-

[Shri Krishna Menon]

ernment is now placing before the House further relevant and known facts

The Pilot and the Navigator, the sole crew of the shot-down Aircraft, who had become casualties as a result of the incident have now been returned to us. They have been hospitalised. While there is no reason to think that they will not fully recover, their progress is slow and the injuries and shock sustained by them are considerable.

The House may also recall that I had mentioned in my earlier statement that at the very time I was making it these officers were on their way home. Pakistan Authorities had earlier that day promised to return them and they were scheduled to reach India that afternoon. They did not however arrive. Pakistan authorities informed Air Headquarters later that evening that the Airmen would not be returned as Pakistan Medical Specialists had advised that the men were not fit to travel. Pakistan authorities, therefore, were not prepared to take the responsibility for moving them. They also informed our Air Headquarters that if we wished to move the Airmen and bring them back we should send our own Doctor, who would have to accept full responsibility for whatever might happen in consequence of their being so moved.

The House will no doubt feel concerned as the Government do that these injured men who were according to Pakistan Medical Specialists themselves in such a bad way were being subjected at that very time to interrogation, harassment and threats.

Air Headquarters immediately sent an Air Force Doctor to Lahore. He was taken by the Pakistan Air Force to Rawalpindi where he reached at 1.00 A.M. on the 12th of April. The Doctor decided to bring back the Airmen forthwith and under his own care. Pakistan authorities, however, demanded and obtained from our

Doctor an assurance in writing that he was taking the casualties' away on his own responsibility and at our risk and also in the face of the contrary advice given by the Pakistan Medical Specialists. Our Doctor and the injured men left Rawalpindi for Lahore in a Pakistan Air Force Plane at about 3.30 A.M. From there they were transhipped into the Indian Air Force Plane which brought them to Delhi at 7.00 A.M. They were immediately hospitalised.

Forty-eight hours had passed since they had been shot down. The two officers were still suffering from severe shock, the Pilot more than the Navigator, and they had to be kept in total quiet and rest. The Hospital authorities reported that the Airmen were found to be suffering from the following injuries and effects of ejection from extreme altitude.

(a) Sqn Ldr J C Sengupta (3657)
G D (P)

- (i) Compound fracture with laceration of the right lower leg (operated on in C.M.H. Rawalpindi)
- (ii) Fracture left angle (Discovered in M.H. Delhi)
- (iii) Severe sprain left knee.
- (iv) Fracture right lower arm.
- (v) Fracture spine (Discovered in M.H. Delhi)
- (vi) Injuries to pelvis and shoulder
- (vii) Shock and disorientation
- (viii) Contusions and Lacerations

(b) Flt Lt S N Rampal (4218)
G D (N)

- (i) Fracture right lower leg.
- (ii) Multiple contusions and lacerations
- (iii) Shock and disorientation."

The Hospital authorities prohibited visitors and ordered that the patients should not be disturbed. Interrogation of them by Air Headquarters

was, therefore, not possible until the 19th of April. Our Air Headquarters, in accordance with usual procedures, have interrogated them for brief periods at a time, as permitted by Doctors, from the 19th April till this morning.

Both the Pilot and the Navigator have been closely examined. They have stated categorically and repeatedly that their flying over Pakistan territory was the result of navigational error.

Owing to the extreme importance of this factor, not only with regard to this particular incident but to the Air Force generally in respect of discipline, morale and efficiency, the Air Force authorities have done the interrogation on this matter with particular thoroughness and care. I shall read some of the questions and answers.

“Question: What was the reason for your going off track?”

Answer: My Compass must have given wrong readings.

Question: How is it that your ground position indicator confirms your position as over Pathankot?”

Answer: As it was hazy weather, I could not pin-point myself visually, and I had no reason to doubt the accuracy of my instruments.

Question: How then do you explain this error in navigation?”

Answer: I overrelied on my navigational aid and could not verify the accuracy of my compass by visual pin-pointing and because of the haze.”

The pilot has stated that he took off from Agra on the 10th April at 06.45 hours and set his course to Pathankot expecting to arrive there at 07.40 hrs. When he crossed the Sutlej, the weather became hazy and he could not see the ground. He continued flying, and a little later, he read his instrument as indicating that he was over

Pathankot. The House should be informed, however, that when he believed himself to be over Pathankot, it is now known, that he was in fact over Pakistan territory. Believing as he did that he was over Pathankot, he turned his aircraft slightly to the left towards his task area which was 25 miles north of Jammu. Thereafter, he flew for ten minutes in that direction. He saw ahead of him two airfields close to each other and a town. Seeing this, he began to feel uncertain of his position. He felt he must have drifted off his track and that he was probably over Pakistan territory, as he knew there were not two airfields close to each other in his task area.

He decided to check his position, and, therefore, tried to establish radio contact with Srinagar. He failed to receive any response. Fearing that he was over Pakistan territory, he at once turned right towards India. It was at this point when he turned Indiaward that he felt a ‘thud’ in his plane. He saw the red warning lights in the plane indicating to him that the under-carriage had been hit. His hydraulic pressure gauge had also dropped to zero. Within moments of this, the Canberra received a second and longer burst of fire shaking her up as a result of which she went completely out of control. The aircraft nursed down a steep spiral dive and the Pilot had to order his Navigator to eject and did so himself. Since, however, the plane was hurtling down in a steep dive at the time of ejection, the Pilot received severe injuries in his legs and right arm. The injuries to his arm incapacitated him from manipulating his parachute while descending, and the injuries to his legs prevented him from landing on the ground in the normal posture. He fell in a gorge and in the fall received further injuries.

The Navigator, however, was more fortunate. His injuries were fewer and less severe, bad as they were. Fortunately, he could manipulate his parachute, and he landed near a

[Shri Krishna Menon]

village. The villagers who had seen also the Pilot descending through the air and falling farther away, later brought him also to the village. These villagers were kind and hospitable. After some time, they put the Navigator on a pony and the Pilot on a charpoy and moved them towards Rawalpindi. This kind of journey did not, however, improve their condition. When they had travelled about two miles, an ambulance met them and both the Airmen were taken to the Military Hospital, Rawalpindi.

When they reached the Hospital, the Pilot had already lost consciousness. The Navigator was in extreme pain and was given pills and injections by Pakistan Hospital authorities. Despite this, he had a restless night. The next day, starting from mid-day he was interrogated by Pakistan officers continuously until late in the evening of the 11th April. The Pilot regained some consciousness by the afternoon of the 11th April. But even then he was only semi-conscious. In fact, at no time till two or three days ago was he in any reasonable possession of his faculties.

During the interrogation of both the air men, the Pakistan officers concerned appear to have subjected them to much pressure and harassment. They appear to have told their victims that they were in Pakistan and not in India, that it was better for their health if they confessed that they had deliberately violated Pakistan territory for aerial reconnaissance and photography. The Pilot, however, has only hazy recollections of the whole of this period. He, however, remembers people continuously shouting at him, and a feeling of being threatened and harassed. He has no recollection whatsoever of speaking himself or signing any statement at all as alleged. He vaguely remembers being moved a number of times and of being in an aircraft.

The Navigator has stated that he was separated from the Pilot from the moment they reached the hospital, and that the Pakistan officers interrogated

him separately and not with the Pilot. He was told that it was no use his saying he was off track and was over Pakistan territory owing to faulty navigation since the Prime Minister and the Government of India had already admitted that they had been sent out on a mission to fly over Pakistan and to take photographs. The Navigator was further told that his Pilot had confessed to deliberate violation of Pakistan territory and that he would do no good to his health if he persisted in his story of faulty navigation and the Canberra going off track. His interrogation came to an end near about the midnight of the 11th, only when he was totally exhausted. A short time later, however, Pakistan officers saw the Navigator again and asked him to sign a paper which, those officers asserted, contained no more than what he had said to them. The statement was not read by him, indeed, he was in such a condition of physical and mental exhaustion that he could neither read nor appreciate the contents of anything read out to him. The Pakistan officers repeatedly assured him that the statement was only to the effect that they had come over Pakistan territory as a result of navigational error. He was also told that he had to sign the statement which was a mere formality which he had to comply with before he could return to India. In his completely exhausted physical condition he signed a paper which he was told said that they had come over Pakistan because of faulty navigation. It is significant that neither the Pakistan authorities nor the Pakistan press have so far said anything about a statement of the Navigator.

Pakistan has referred to a confession made by the Pilot. Government, in their answer to a question on the 14th April in this House, expressed doubts about the veracity of the alleged confession because even at that time Government were aware that the Pilot had been badly injured. He was unconscious most of the time and not in possession of his faculties. He could not, therefore, have signed

facilities. He could not, therefore, have signed anything knowing what he was doing.

The Pilot under interrogation by us has repeatedly affirmed that he has no recollection whatsoever of saying anything or signing anything. If therefore, his signature, or what purports to be his signature, appears on any paper it cannot be regarded as of any value.

Government regret to say that further examination in the hospital has revealed that the injuries and shock suffered by these men are more than originally believed. It now transpires that the Navigator has also fractured his spine. The effect of the shock from the fall from that great height has been grievous and to some extent still subsists. Both these airmen have confirmed that they flew at a height of 47,500 ft. The height of the plane given by Pakistan at first was 50,000 ft. It was later changed to 45,000 ft. This is no doubt intended to cover up the fact that at the height of 50,000 ft. the Canberra could not have been chased by a Sabre Jet, but could only have been shot at by the fighters lying in wait for her quite deliberately. Even at 45,000 ft. this is the only way it could have happened. It is absurd to suggest that the Sabre Jets could have chased the Canberra for over 100 miles and still kept her under their control.

No warning of any kind by radio or by firing tracer bullets as alleged by Pakistan was at all given. Both the Pilot and the Navigator who have been very closely questioned by our Air authorities on this matter are quite clear on this point. The Pilot was asked:

"Are you positive you did not receive any warning of any kind before being shot down?"

to which he has answered:

"Absolutely positive."

The shooting of the plane was calculated and wanton.

The first indication to the crew that anything unusual was happening was not any warning by radio or by tracer bullets as claimed by Pakistan, but the rude shock of a 'thud' in the plane. They became aware of the attacking planes only after they had been hit, when after having seen two air fields on the ground and realised that they were probably over Pakistan they had already turned towards India. Pakistan authorities have admitted that the Canberra was attacked by more than one Pakistan Fighter plane. It is, therefore, obvious to the House that the Fighters were armed and the guns loaded contrary to the practice of Air Force planes in peace time. The attack on the Canberra was deliberate, planned and prepared and was made not to prevent her from further penetration into Pakistan because she was already turning India-ward. It is to be noted that even the Pakistan version of the concocted confession of our pilot contains no reference to these alleged warnings.

The House would also be interested to know that it is the practice to give all such warnings on a wavelength accepted for this purpose by all nations. All stations, civil and military in every country are tuned to this wavelength. Such messages would, therefore, be received not only by the warned Aircraft but also by all air stations. They should certainly have been heard in Jammu and Amritsar. No air station anywhere heard any such message. It must be clear, therefore, that Pakistan's claim in regard to warnings is untrue.

It will be further noted that neither the Pakistan Air Command nor the Pakistan Government made any communication whatsoever to our Government or to our Air Headquarters about this incident. This would be the normal custom between friendly countries. What is more, they referred to an "unidentified" aircraft, even

[Shri Krishna Menon]

though they claim to have been trailing the Canberra for over a hundred miles. It was only after our Air Headquarters got in touch with Pakistan Air Headquarters the next morning to seek information, since the news had come to us through press and radio reports from Pakistan sources, that they even mentioned this incident, to us

In addition to various allegations and statements, official or otherwise, the Pakistan Press has printed a photostat which purports to be the photograph of a map giving the flight of our Canberra as tracked by their radar. This might give the impression to the layman that the photostat is a photograph of the track as it appeared on the radar screen. This is not and, what is more, cannot be the case. The photostat is a photograph of merely a map with lines on it which could be drawn at any time without any reference whatever to any radar tracking. According to the photostat which has appeared in the Pakistan Press, our plane entered Pakistan near Lahore and flew for about 160 miles in Pakistan territory. According to the facts which have come to light as a result of interrogation of the Pilot and the Navigator, the Canberra could have been over Pakistan territory only less than half this distance. It is inconceivable that a Canberra on a deliberate mission of reconnaissance and photography, as alleged, would knowingly expose itself even for 80 miles in Pakistan territory to no purpose. If taking photographs in that area was the intention, the Canberra could reach those areas by 3 or 4 minutes flight across the border. I may, however add for the information of the House that our Air Force have strict instructions not to engage themselves in any missions or exercises which involve violation of Pakistan or any foreign territory. I have no doubt in my mind that these instructions are strictly observed.

Several Short Notice Questions in regard to this incident have been

tabled since the 11th April. Mr. Speaker, Government submitted to you that the subject matter of these questions may be dealt with in the statement which they had undertaken to make. You were good enough to concur.

Most of the issues raised by such questions have already been covered by what Government have stated hitherto including what has been said so far today.

There is, however, one issue on which Members of the House have sought information. It is also a matter which has been challenged by Pakistan, and this is in regard to Government's view of the legality of the conduct of Pakistan in shooting down the Canberra. With your permission, therefore, I shall deal with this matter as fully as I can.

It is true there is no universally recognised and absolute rule of international law which regulates the conduct of a Territorial Sovereign if its air space is violated. This may be well said of most matters relating to international behaviour. They are however to be regulated, having due regard to the general principles of law recognised by civilised nations. Article 38(c) of the Statute of the International Court of Justice lays down that that body will apply among others "general principles of law recognised by civilised nations". The conduct of a Territorial Sovereign in all circumstances should also be regulated by his own municipal law, the multilateral conventions to which he is a party as well as Reason, Morality and Humanity. These are all well understood and accepted by civilised nations today. The practice of the United States, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia and other countries in recent years in respect of intruding Aircraft may be examined.

The view held in the United States is that all efforts should be made to have the plane land if it shows determination to cross over national territory. Fighter planes would be under

Aircraft in Pakistan

orders to withhold firing until it seems certain that the intruding plane was actually attacking. Such evidence might be the opening of bomb bay doors, or the plane's taking a flight attitude indicating a bombing run. The U.S. Government also expects the foreign Government to advise them in advance that in case a U.S. plane strayed into their territory because of mechanical trouble, it would be fired at.

The United States holds that the intruding Aircraft should be given warning, and further, requested or directed to land. Secondly, it should be led by the interceptor to an appropriate landing field or such a landing field should be pointed. The intruding Aircraft should be given warning of the intention to fire. To fire, even warning shots, at an unarmed Aircraft in time of peace, wherever such Aircraft may be, is regarded as entirely inadmissible and contrary to all standards of civilised behaviour. The flight of such a plane in no way constitutes a threat to sovereignty.

The United Kingdom regards firing as justified only to compel compliance in the case of an Aircraft which has declined to obey signals requiring it to land at the nearest aerodrome and this also only in cases where such Aircraft has been flying over a "Restricted" Area so declared and made known by the Territorial Sovereign beforehand. In all other cases the United Kingdom regards the usual method of protests and enquiry alone as applicable. This is the normal practice of nations in peace time.

The Soviet Union regards the resort to firing as appropriate in cases where foreign Aircraft after penetrating into the air space of the territorial sovereign refuses to land. Intrusions arising from faulty navigation, it is said, "give no cause whatsoever for confusion with international frontier violations", and such aircraft should not be fired upon.

No right of the territorial sovereign to initiate an attack is admitted in

cases of deviation by foreign aircraft of the prescribed corridors.

The Swedish regulations expressly provide that foreign aircraft should be sought to be turned away by warnings, that it should not be fired upon if it changes its course and seeks to fly away. They further provide that if the intruding aircraft commits an act of violence against targets within Swedish territory, it shall be met with force of arms.

Yugoslavia lays down that no unarmed aircraft should be fired upon, even if the intrusion is intentional. If there is non-compliance of instructions given by the territorial sovereign to the intruder to land, the proper procedure, according to Yugoslavia, is to inform the Foreign Government concerned and to take action through appropriate channels.

It is clear, therefore, that in cases of intrusions as a result of faulty navigation, intruding planes may not be fired upon at all. In other cases it should be communicated in advance to the foreign country concerned that any intrusion would be met by fire. The exemption of application of this rule, however, in regard to planes straying into territories due to faulty navigation is well accepted.

There are no known regulations of any Pakistan law—I am now referring to municipal law—either in regard to civil or military planes, which either justifies, much less prescribes, the conduct which Pakistan has, in fact, resorted to. There are some provisions in her law in regard to "prohibited" areas. This is also referred to in the United Kingdom Regulations. "Prohibited" areas in Pakistan are set out in paragraph 7 of "General Information in connection with flights to or within Pakistan by foreign aviators (No. 10 of 1949)." No part of the territory over which the Canberra either flew or is even alleged to have flown is either a prohibited area or anywhere near such area.

Over and above all these considerations, Mr. Speaker, Pakistan, as a

[Shri Krishna Menon]

Member of the United Nations has obligations to observe the provisions of the Charter. She has an obligation not to use force except in self-defence as provided in Article 51 against an armed attack. Her conduct, therefore, considered from any point of view, is in disregard of the canons, the principles and practices of international behaviour as well as the Charter of the United Nations. It also is in total disregard of the principle of reciprocity in relation to India.

There is another aspect in regard to the conduct of Pakistan which is totally against accepted principles of international behaviour. This is in regard to the treatment to which our men were subjected. They were not prisoners of war but citizens of a friendly and neighbouring country. Even assuming for argument, that they were prisoners of war or could be treated as such, how far does the conduct of Pakistan conform to the law and the practice on the subject? The Geneva Convention of 1949 which deals with the treatment of prisoners of war in Article 17 sets out that "every prisoner of war, when questioned on the subject, is bound to give only his surname, first names and rank, date of birth, and army, regimental, personal or serial number, or failing this, equivalent information." Thus the only additional information that can be obtained from intruding personnel is what they may volunteer themselves. In the present case not only did our men not volunteer information, but were subjected to pressures and intimidation to extort information which suited the interrogators. Even then, the Navigator who alone remembers what was said is quite clear on the fact that he informed them that the plane had strayed over the skies into Pakistan by faulty navigation. What happened thereafter by way of long interrogation under threat and pressure and the misleading statements and other technique used to extort statements

is against the Geneva Convention. Article 17 again lays down that "no physical or mental torture, nor any other form of coercion may be inflicted on prisoners of war to secure from them information of any kind whatever. Prisoners of war who refuse to answer may not be threatened, insulted, or exposed to any unpleasant or disadvantageous treatment of any kind."

"Prisoners of war who, owing to their physical or mental condition, are unable to state their identity, shall be handed over to the medical service. The identity of such prisoners shall be established by all possible means, subject to the provisions of the preceding paragraph". The preceding paragraph is about the humane treatment.

The House may be somewhat concerned if there were any elements of truth in the allegations made by Pakistan that the Canberra displayed a 'defiant and hostile' attitude. The allegation is not only fantastic but totally unrelated to fact. It tells a story which cannot be true of any unarmed aircraft. Wherein is the hostile attitude? She carried no arms or weapons. Is it suggested that a lone Canberra in broad daylight was on a bombing mission? What is more, the Pakistanis themselves admit that the Canberra was on a steep climb and was shot. No bomber with hostile intentions would be on a steep climb. Not even Pakistan can believe that the Indian Aircraft would fly over their skies with such an intention. It is too ridiculous even to contradict. The allegation is as fantastic as untrue.

In their statement of the 11th of April, the Government informed the House of the large number of violations across the cease-fire line in Kashmir. Counter allegations have been made by Pakistan that more numerous violations have been made by us. This is not correct. Apart from the incidents over the cease-fire line attributed to Pakistan or to India to which

special considerations apply, such as the presence of the UN Observer Corps, Government would like the House to be seized of the fact that the violations by Pakistan of our territory are both frequent and numerous. In the seven-month period between July 1958 and January 1959 the Government of India have protested in writing to Pakistan in regard to 27 instances of such violations giving them all the particulars. Each of these protests has been acknowledged but no further response has been made. In the two-month period between the 26th January, 1959 and the 26th March, 1959 there have been further 21 violations in respect of which the Government of India have made written protests to Pakistan. As against this, Pakistan has complained and protested to us in regard to three violations of their territory this year. We have investigated them. In two cases our aircraft are not concerned at all and the third refers to civil aircraft straying into their Air space.

The House should also be informed that in respect of the above-mentioned violations as many as 3, 4 and 6 Pakistan Fighters have been involved at a time. The intrusions have extended from such border areas as Suleimanki and Husseniwala to distances far into the interior near Meerut.

During the current month several violations of an even more sinister character have taken place. On the 9th of April a Pakistan aircraft penetrated 90 miles into Indian territory. On the 14th a Sabre Jet penetrated into a depth of 100 miles into our territory. On the same day another aircraft, also a Fighter penetrated 30 miles within our border. Yesterday, the 20th April, a Pakistan Aircraft penetrated some 85 miles into our territory in the neighbouring district of Hissar, not far away from Delhi (Interruption).

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): Why was not something done?

Shri Krishna Menon: Indian Aircraft have not resorted to any hostile action in spite of the provocation in respect of the Canberra.

As reported to the House the Government have already made an oral protest to Pakistan about the Canberra incident. With a due sense of responsibility and having regard to the seriousness of the incident Government have deliberately refrained from making any further communication to Pakistan or taking any other action in regard to this incident until the full facts have been investigated and our airmen interrogated and Parliament fully informed. Government will take all such steps as are legitimate and open to them according to the practice of civilized nations to secure the cessation of these violations of our territory and to obtain redress for the pre-meditated and wanton attack on our aircraft

Shri Khadilkar (Ahmednagar): Sir, may I put a question?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister has made an elaborate statement.

Shri Khadilkar: The statement was in reply to several questions put to the Minister.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I won't allow. Hon. Members will go through the statement, and if there is anything particular I will allow later on. The House will now stand adjourned.

Some Hon. Members: The statement may be circulated.

Mr. Speaker: Oh yes, it will be circulated.

18-32 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, April 22, 1959|Vaisakha 2, 1881 (Saka).