

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Sir, the point I made on the floor of the House on that day was... (Interruptions)

SHRI R. MOHANARANGAM: It is a theft. (Interruptions) It is a theft.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Nothing will go on record now.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Sir, ***

SHRI BHOLA PRASAD.

Sir, 李李李

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: I am not going to make any aspersion. I want a CBI probe into the incident because the subject comes under the Concurrent List. (*Interruptions*). They are misleading the House. (*Interruptions*).

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Jaswant Singh, please. Do not record anything. Yes, Mr. Jaswant Singh.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: *

SHRIMATI NOORJEHAN RAZA-
CK (Tamil Nadu):*

SHRI R. MOHANARANGAM:*

SHRI U. R. KRISHNAN:*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Don't record anything. Yes, Mr. Jaswant Singh, you read the notice (*Interruptions*). I will not permit anybody. I tell both of you that in future I am not going to allow you anything. You have already taken 20 minutes. (*Interruptions*). This is not proper. I have been quite liberal, but I am sorry to say that both of you have wasted 20 minutes for nothing. (*Interruptions*). I will not allow any of you. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI PILOO MODY (Gujarat): Even if two wrongs are being committed for which we may have sympathy with you, there is no reason why you should commit a third wrong. (*Inter-ruptions*):

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: *

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Nothing will go on record, Mr. Gopal-samy. You have taken 20 minutes, You should be ashamed of this. Yes, Mr. Jaswant Singh, read the notice. Let me go ahead with the Business of the House. (*Interruptions*). Do not record anything.

SHRI U. R. KRISHNAN: *

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: *

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: *

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no, nothing will go on record. May I request you and other Members that I have always allowed and accommodated both the parties and other Members and I will be doing so in future also, but my only request is, you kindly go through the record? When I have allowed one person from one party the other person stands. I am prepared to allow you one by one, but have some tolerance. Show some tolerance to the House. Hear your adversaries also. You do not have the patience to hear the other side. Yes, Mr. Jaswant Singh

**CALLING ATTENTION TO A MAT-
TER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPOR-
TANCE**

The reported supply of arms including F-16 Bombers, to Pakistan by USA Endangering Security Environment of our country

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): Do I have your permission to speak from here?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes,
yes.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I call the attention of the Minister of Defence to the reported supply of arms, including F-16 bombers—I did not

[Shri Jaswant Singh]

say 'bombers', this has been added here by mistake—to Pakistan by U.S.A. endangering security environment of our country.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:
Mr. Minister, you also come to the front row.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: (Gujarat): Sir, it is an important issue. We wish the Prime Minister had come. This House wishes really the Prime Minister had come to enlighten it on this important issue.

श्री शिवचन्द्र झा (बिहार) : श्रीमन्,
इसका जवाब तो प्रधान मंत्री क. रेंना
चाहिए था ।

SHRI PILOO MODY (Gujarat):
Otherwise divest herself from this portfolio.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE (SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATEL): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I share the concern of this House on the decision of the Government of the United States of America to provide large scale military assistance to Pakistan. We have reason to believe that the military supplies from the U.S. would include sophisticated weapons system such as F-16 aircraft, tanks, armoured personnel carriers, guns, air-defence systems, air and naval missiles, radars, destroyers and other offensive equipment. The items that are to be supplied in their quantum and sophistication appear far in excess of Pakistan's legitimate defence requirements. It is well known that arms transfers under the Foreign Military Sales Programme are at rates that are sub-stancially subsidised. Thus the money figures cited in this context publicly so far are likely to be found much smaller than the total real value of arms, armaments and other equipment Pakistan will be receiving.

2. The F-16 aircraft, the sophisticated air-defence systems, anti-tank missiles armed helicopters, night-vision equipment, the very advanced

communication systems and tanks, all of these represent induction into this region of a class of armament at least a generation ahead of anything operating with the other armed forces on the sub-continent. While this massive transfer of arms is being justified on grounds of meeting a supposed threat from and through Afghanistan, a lot of the equipment proposed to be given to Pakistan is such as would be unsuitable for deployment on the Pak-Afghan border. It is also not worthy that Afghanistan is a land-locked country and that the present arms deal includes naval equipment. It has been our experience that whenever Pakistan has been armed for whatever purpose by the United States, the weapons have been used against us. The induction of such a large volume of advanced technology weapons systems in the very compressed time-frame that, according to reports, has been agreed to, will tilt the delicately poised balance in the region in favour of Pakistan. It is bound to result in an undesirable and avoidable arms race.

3. India's views on this question have been unambiguously conveyed to the Governments of the U.S.A. and Pakistan. It has been made clear by us to Pakistan that while we accept the sovereign right of every country to acquire arms for self-defence, India cannot but feel deeply disturbed about the threat to the peace and stability of the sub-continent, posed by Pakistan's acquisition of such offensive weapons systems. We have conveyed our apprehensions that such acquisitions by Pakistan of advanced weaponry in quantities in excess of all her legitimate defence requirements, could undermine the process of normalisation of relations between the two countries.

4. Hon'ble Members are anxious to know what steps we are taking to safeguard our security and territorial integrity in the light of these developments. Without going into details of the specific steps that may be con-

"There is no *quid pro quo*. Pakistan will not give any bases or similar facilities. Pakistan will not enter any regional consensus or regional alliance because there is no political basis for such an alliance. No Arab country will become a part of a strategic consensus promoted by the U.S. which includes Israel and Egypt. They consider that the Israeli menace is a greater threat to them than any other kind of threat. There should be no constraint on the pursuit of an independent foreign policy as we have been pursuing in the past, whether in regard to support for the Iranian revolution or wanting to bring about a transformation of the whole Persian Gulf region into a non-aligned area free of the military presence of the superpowers, free of the presence of the American Rapid Deployment Force and the with-

[Shri Jaswant Singh]

drawal of Soviet forces from Afghanistan.

Now, by itself this is an unambiguous statement, but the theory is that Mr. Agha Shahi does not speak for the foreign policy of Pakistan. That is why our concern.

Now what are the consequences? I would hope that the Hon. Minister will rise above purely military levels and convey to us what in the strategic sense are the consequences of this development that is taking place. I said there are four major consequences, and I would, through the debate, make an appeal both to our Government as also to the people of United States—I do not know whether the Government of the United States at all hears under the current Administration. There are four questions. There is going to be an arms race on the sub-continent, suicidal to both of us, to Pakistan and equally to us. There will be a defeating of the very purpose for which these arms are now intended to be inducted into Pakistan namely an increased dependence on the Soviet Union and weakening of all moderate and liberal elements in the entire sub-continent. Thirdly, inevitably—and sadly I have to voice this concern—a situation may well arise when there will be a war in the sub-continent once again because the history of the past of arms assistance to Pakistan demonstrate that. And that war is not in our interest; that war is not in Pakistan's interest. It may well lead to a dismemberment of that country, which is not in our interest. It will inevitably lead to a weakening of the process of development in this country, which may well lead to a weakening of the democratic forces in this country, which is not in our interest. (*Time-bell rings*) You ring this bell for me. Please hear me before the bell tolls for you and me, jointly for both of us.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It may be so, but nine minutes are already over. That time has not come.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I would wish to submit..

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please put your questions.

SHRI PILOO MODY: He is speaking well. He is making a very good contribution. This should be the last time that you ring the bell.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He can put his questions. Please conclude now. I request you to conclude now. Put your questions and do not make long observations.

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI (Maharashtra): When you, Sir, sit in the Chair...

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I cannot put questions like this.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Do whatever you like, but please conclude.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Fourthly, a very important consequence, is the question of both nations going nuclear. I will rush through my points, though it is criminal to rush through. These are...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Jaswant Singh, this remark is not proper. The time for the initiator is seven minutes and you have already taken nine minutes and you are calling it criminal, the attempt to control it. The debate cannot be allowed to go on like this.

SHRI PILOO MODY: You have taken three minutes and I will now take two minutes. By that time, he would have finished.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I now conclude. These are the four things that arise: (1) Arms race; (2) increased dependence on the Soviet Union; (3) a war leading to dismemberment of Pakistan and weakening of democratic forces in this country; and (4) the nuclear dimension of this problem. I had hoped that the Minister would come out with something like that in his statement. Now I have

not got the time to talk on these concerns in an elaborate way because there is a limitation on my time. Therefore, I would go to the question of the options available to us, strategic options, diplomatically and militarily strategic options. It is my belief, Sir, that, no matter what the short-term interests may be, the long-term interests of the free world, the long-term interests of the United States and the long-term interests of India congruate there is a confluence. I appeal and beseech the Government to go beyond the immediate problems (*Interruptions*). Yes, there is a word like congruate I would submit that there is need for us to take initiative in the military sense. I had submitted to the hon. defence Minister in a different forum and in a different context that as a country, I feel, we have lost both kinds of initiative, diplomatically and militarily. Of course, this would be rebutted and I would be happy if I am convinced that it is not so. There is need for military initiative in a lot of matters. There is here with me a piece of paper with a large list which is, the shopping list of Pakistan, the wish list and the minimum acceptable list. I think there is need here to talk about four serious shortcomings in the military structure. We are extremely deficient in our artillery. There is a qualitative difference. I think there is a serious situation developing as far as the AFV fleet is concerned. As far as the tank fleet and the Indian Army is concerned, there is a serious situation developing, and I draw the Government's attention to it. I think there is a great gap on the question of the missiles. There is the congruence that is taking place between the U.S.A. and Pakistan. Already there is the Indian Ocean satellite. I think we need to take note of it. There is the fourth aspect, and that is the aspect of the Helicopter Wing of the Army. I am not talking about the Air Force and the Navy because time does not permit me to do so.

There is another factor to which I draw the attention of the Government a strategic factor, as far as the security of this country is concerned. There is disaffection, civil strife and disorder in our border States. It is a factor which leads and contributes directly to our total war effort. There is also the question of the morale of the troops.

These are the factors. I will make three appeals and I will sit down. I think there is need to pursue the no-war pact and enlarge it. The no-war pact is a negative concept. Consider the aspect of giving a positive proposal to Pakistan, of peace and friendship, of which the no-war pact constitutes just a small part. (*Interruptions*).

There is also the need for us to diversify our sources of supply as far as armaments are concerned. There is the qualitative and quantitative factor of the armaments supplied from a single source. And whatever the source, there is the factor of influencing the policy both internally and externally, and I would draw the Government's attention to that.

I think, finally, there is need for all of us to reach across the Governments and reach the people of the United States and reach the people of Pakistan and explain the point that here in this particular position a very serious situation is developing in the sub-continent and that peace between these two countries is the primary concern.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Sir, I am at a loss to understand what the questions were.

SHRI PILOO MODY: You cannot understand the questions.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: These are certain suggestions given, and I would not quarrel with those suggestions. Some of them are certainly acceptable and we would certainly accept them.

[Shri Shivraj V. Patil]

Sir, as far as the suggestion given not to rely upon one country is concerned, it is the same kind of policy which the Government of India is following.

As far as the no-war pact is concerned, since 1949 we have been proposing to Pakistan that the two countries should enter into a no-war pact. It was suggested by Pt. Jawaharlal Nehruji, it was suggested by Lal Bahadur Shastriji, it was suggested by our Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhiji also. We have read in the newspaper the President of Pakistan saying that it would not be worth the paper on which it would be written. And now we have a proposal made to us exactly at the time when they are receiving the offers from the other countries about the arms, saying, "Let us enter into a no-war pact." To say the least, it is very cynical. We are for peace. We are for maintaining tranquility in this area. We are ready to accept any genuine offer for peace. But we cannot be deceived. We will not allow ourselves to land in a situation in which we would be duped.

As far as the diversification of the resources is concerned, the policy which we are following with regard to this, has been made very clear by our Prime Minister. Now, as far as reaching the people in Pakistan and the United States of America is concerned, we are all for that. We go with the impression that the people in the United States of America as well as the people in Pakistan do not want any escalation of any kind which will lead to war or conflict. But we are not sure as to what is the position the Governments in the two countries is taking. But we would plead that the Governments should also see eye to eye with the people in those countries and should accept the desire of the people in the world for peace and security and tranquility.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Satyanarayan Reddy.

श्री बी० सत्यनारायण रेड्डी (आंध्र प्रदेश) :
सभापति जी, यह ज्ञात आज इस
सदन के सामने कालिग अटेंशन है, यह
बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण है।

सबसे पहले हमको यह सोचना
चाहिये कि पाकिस्तान और हिन्दुस्तान के
दरम्यान कौन से ऐसे मसले हैं जिसकी
वजह से जंग का खतरा हिन्दुस्तान पर
आया है। इस बुनियादी सवाल के बारे में
हमको सोचना है। सभी जानते हैं कि
हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के बीच कोई
ऐसा मसला नहीं है जो जंग की तरफ ले
जाए या जंग का डर हिन्दुस्तान और
पाकिस्तान में पैदा करें। सिर्फ एक मसला
है और वह काश्मीर का मसला है। जब तक
इस काश्मीर के मामले को ठीक ढंग से हल
नहीं किया जाएगा, यह खतरा हमेशा
बना रहेगा।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr.
Reddy, please confine yourself to arms
supply. यह जो मसला है, उस पर बोलिए।
Not on other matters.

श्री बी० सत्यनारायण रेड्डी : मैं इसी
सिलसिले में बोल रहा हूँ। हिन्दुस्तान ने
बहुत बड़ी गलती, जबरदस्त गलती यह की कि
जब पाकिस्तानी कबालियों ने काश्मीर पर
हमला किया हमारी फौज फाटह के रास्ते
पर थी, उस वक़्त हमने सीज-फायर का
छुआव दिया। यह हमने बहुत बड़ी गलती
की।

हमने दूसरी बहुत बड़ी गलती, तिब्बत
के मामले में की। वगैर चीन से अपने
संरक्ष के मामले को छुआये चीन की
सुअरेनटी को, इच्छेदार को हमने तिब्बत
पर मान लिया। यह दो जबरदस्त

गतिधर्मों की वजह से हिन्दुस्तान को आज तक भुगाना पड़ रहा है। एक तरफ 1962 ने चीन ने हमला किया हिन्दुस्तान पर, पाकिस्तान ने दो बार हिन्दुस्तान पर हमला किया, पहला 1965 में और दूसरा 1970 में। यह दो हमले हुये और तीसरा हमला होने का अंदेश है।

तो इसके बारे में सरकार को सोचना चाहिए कि जर्मन के बुनियादी सवाल क्या है। यह हथियार अमरीका अपनी गरज से दे रहा है, अमरीका अपनी गरज से अपनी ताकत को बनाये रखने के लिए, अपनी पावर बैलेंस को बनाये रखने के लिए एक तरफ पाकिस्तान को आर्म्स दे रहा है, दूसरी तरफ अरब कन्टीज को आर्म्स दे रहा है, एक तरफ इजराइल को आर्म्स दे रहा है, सब तरफ अमरीका ने अपने हथियार को फैला रखा है। तो क्या पाकिस्तान इन हथियारों को चीन के खिलाफ इस्तेमाल करेगा? नहीं, चीन के खिलाफ कभी इस्तेमाल नहीं करेगा। उसकी चीन के साथ दोस्ती है। क्या रूस के खिलाफ इस्तेमाल किया जाएगा? नहीं उसके खिलाफ भी इस्तेमाल नहीं किया जाएगा क्योंकि जिया उल हक ने कई बार कहा है कि हम रूस के साथ लड़ने के लिए नहीं है। वह रूस के साथ लड़ना नहीं चाहते है। तो फिर किसके साथ लड़ेंगे। दूसरा पड़ोसी, ईरान के साथ भी नहीं लड़ेंगे।

फिर दूसरी तरफ अफगानिस्तान का मसला है, अफगानिस्तान से लड़ने का मतलब यही होगा कि रूस से लड़ना। तो फिर उससे भी लड़ाई नहीं होगी। फिर किससे होगी? फिर हिन्दुस्तान से होगी। जितने भी हथियार जो अमरीका पाकिस्तान को सप्लाई कर रहा है, वह जैसा कि पहले इस्तेमाल किया गया है, इस बार भी यह खतरा है कि उन हथियारों को, एफ-16 या और जो दूसरे फाइटर्स

बाम्बर्ज है, यह सब हिन्दुस्तान के खिलाफ ही इस्तेमाल हो सकते हैं।

इसके बारे में आपने क्या कोई ऐसे इंतजाम किये हैं कि जिससे इस खतरे को बखूबी तौर से निपटाया जा सके?

दूसरा सवाल यह है कि जैसे मैंने आपसे कहा, बुनियादी सवाल आपसे यह है कि पाकिस्तान ने गैर-कानूनी तौर पर कश्मीर के कुछ हिस्से को अपने कब्जे में रखा है, कई बार पाकिस्तान के मौजूदा मिलिटरी के जो रूज हैं, उन्होंने इलान किया है . . . (व्यवधान)

श्री उपसभापति : इसको मत दोहराइए।

श्री बी. सत्यनारायण रेड्डी : यह इसी सिलसिले में ही है। यह तो हथियारों के बारे में ही है। उन्होंने कहा है कि जो इस वक्त, मौजूदा सीज-फायर लाइन है, उसको कभी भी पाकिस्तान मानने के लिए तैयार नहीं है। क्या हिन्दुस्तान की हुकूमत ने पाकिस्तान की हुकूमत की तबज्जह इस तरफ दिलायी है कि गैर कानूनी तौर पर, फौजी हमले से जो इलाके उन्होंने अपने कब्जे में ले लिए हैं वह वापस किए जाएं। क्या इसके लिए हिन्दुस्तान ने कोशिश किया है या नहीं किया है? अभी तक क्यों नहीं। इस सिलसिले में इकदाम ले रहे हैं?

श्री उपसभापति : अब समाप्त करिए।

श्री बी. सत्यनारायण रेड्डी : मेरा समय है, बोलने दोजिए। भंत्री महोदय से मैं यह भी कहूंगा कि आपने कुछ उसूल तय किया है कि जो इलाके जयदस्ती या हमले से . . .

श्री उपसभापति : वह दूरे सवाल हैं।

श्री बी० सत्यनारायण रेड्डी : ... वह इलाके उस मुल्क के हवाले कर देने चाहिए जिसके लिए गए हैं जैसा कि इजराइल ने अरब के इलाकों को...

श्री उपसभापति : ठीक है, माननीय मंत्री जी ।

श्री बी० सत्यनारायण रेड्डी : हिन्दुस्तान के इलाके पाकिस्तान के कब्जे में चले गए हैं वे हिन्दुस्तान को वापस मिलने चाहिए :

श्री उपसभापति : वह समझ गए मंत्री जी जवाब देंगे ।

श्री बी० सत्यनारायण रेड्डी : एकतरफा बात नहीं करनी चाहिए । एक और अहम बात है कि क्या हिन्दुस्तान की हकूमत ने इस बात की तरफ तबज्जह दी है, जैसा कि भी अखबारों में आया है कि करोड़ों रुपए हम को भी हथियारों पर लगाने पड़ेंगे, जो बाम्बर्स फ्रांस से, जर्मनी से हम खरीदने की...

श्री उपसभापति : ठीक है, समाप्त करिए ।

श्री बी० सत्यनारायण रेड्डी : जो हम कोशिश कर रहे हैं उस के बारे में क्या खर्चा पड़ेगा, वह किस स्टेज पर है...

श्री उपसभापति : बँठ जाइए ।

श्री बी० सत्यनारायण रेड्डी : इस के साथ मैं पूछना चाहूंगा कि पाकिस्तान ने जो 'नो वार पैक्ट' का मोआहदा करने के लिए पेशकश किया है,

श्री उपसभापति : नहीं, नहीं । बहुत से प्रश्नों का जवाब वह दे चुके हैं ।

श्री बी० सत्यनारायण रेड्डी : ... इसके बारे में भी वह जवाब दें ।

श्री शिवराज बी० पाटिल : मान्यवर, यह जो निवेदन सदन के सामने रखा गया है उसमें बड़े संक्षिप्त में मैंने कहा है कि

आज संसार के इस हिस्से में जो परिस्थिति निर्माण हो रही है उसका सामना करने के लिए, उसका मुकाबला करने के लिए, जो भी जरूरी है हम कर रहे हैं । ऐसा मैंने इस निवेदन के अन्तिम परिच्छेद में बताया है । अब वह क्या कर रहे हैं इसके बारे में सविस्तार बतलाना जरूरी नहीं है, योग्य नहीं है । कुछ दिनों के लिए करना है वह भी करेंगे, दूरदृष्टि रख कर जो करना है वह भी हम करेंगे । इस सम्बन्ध में हम सजग हैं । इस सम्बन्ध में जो हमारी जिम्मेदारी होती है सरकार की, वह जिम्मेदारी निभाने के लिए हम तैयार रहेंगे । इस प्रकार का आश्वासन उसमें दिया है और वह फिर से मैं देना चाहता हूँ ।

जहां तक काश्मीर का जो हिस्सा पाकिस्तान के कब्जे में आज है उसके सम्बन्ध में जो हमारी नीति है वह हमने स्पष्ट की हुई है, हमने उस पर अपना हक छोड़ा नहीं है । हम वह हक छोड़ने के लिए तैयार नहीं हैं मगर हम समझते हैं कि वह मसला जैसा हमारा शिमला पैक्ट करार है या जो हमारी मूल नीति है उसके आधार पर तय किया जाएगा, लड़ाई झगड़ा करने की जरूरत नहीं है । जिसका जो हक होता है वह उसको दिया जा सकता है और इस सम्बन्ध में जो छोटी-मोटी बातें हैं उनकी चर्चा हो सकती है ।

उन्होंने पूछा कि पाकिस्तान जो तैयारियां कर रहा है उस सम्बन्ध में हम क्या कर रहे हैं । मैंने संक्षेप में बताया है कि जो भी करने के लिए जरूरी है, ट्रेनिंग देने की दृष्टि से, हथियार की दृष्टि से या नीति निर्धारण करने की दृष्टि से, वह हम जरूर करेंगे । वह करना जरूरी है । आप भी करने के लिए कहते हैं, लोग भी करने के लिए कहते हैं और

आपके कहने के मुताबिक, लोगों के कहने के मुताबिक इसमें से जो जिम्मेदारी का निर्माण होता है उसको हम पूरा करेंगे। "नो-वार पैक्ट" के बारे में मैंने पहले बताया है। हम शान्ति चाहते हैं, नो-वार पैक्ट चाहते हैं। लेकिन इसका क्या मतलब है, अब जिस प्रकार आ रहे हैं, क्यों आ रहे हैं, पहले क्या नीति थी—इन सारी चीजों को दृष्टि में रखते हुये उसके बारे में हमको सोचना होगा। हम ने कहा है कि हम शान्ति के पक्ष में हैं। नो-वार पैक्ट हमारे सामने आता है तो उसके अन्दर कोई गुगली हो, उसके अन्दर कोई ऐसी चीज हो कि धोखा हो सकता है तो हमको सजग रहना पड़ेगा।

SHRI V. B. RAJU (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, it is an undisputed fact that the present supply of sophisticated weapons to Pakistan has disturbed the military balance in this region. There is no difference of opinion on that point. But what this side of the House is unable to appreciate is the ambivalent attitude of the Government.

Before I come straight to the point and explain that, let me say in one sentence that in 1962, which was also a watershed year in our external relations, our relations with China, our neighbour, deteriorated. But that was retrieved or corrected in a decade, in 1972, with the Simla Pact which the present Prime Minister actually was responsible in bringing about. Then we had the satisfaction that we need not worry about the security of our borders.

Now, in another decade after 1972, in the year-end of 1982 the question before us is, whether what has been achieved in 1972 will be undone or whether it will be improved upon. And even now the same Prime Minister presides over the destinies of our country. Sir, this is a challenge to the wisdom and genius of this nation and the Government.

Mere F-16, even though it is mentioned in the Calling Attention Notice, is not the main issue. I think we have been the best salesmen for F-16s in the world. I think so much propaganda has been done about F-16s that even our school children today talk about F-16s. We have tried to educate the nation about the dangers inherent in the supply of sophisticated weapons by America through a simple item like F-16.

Sir, peace can be achieved in two ways—through war and through diplomatic resources. Do we consider, does the Parliament consider that in this region we should enter a weapons race and that war is inevitable for establishment of peace? What does the Government want to convey to the Parliament and to the people? Do I take that diplomatic resources have failed? Defence capability actually by itself cannot be sustained without actual diplomatic support. As I said earlier, I am only pointing out the ambivalence.

Some suggestion came for a No-war Pact from Pakistan. It might be some newspaper publicity or whatever it is. But we react in streets with panic, with attributing motives. We offered it in 1949. It is a matter of history and it is a point of fact. Nobody needs to argue about it. Pakistan has made a similar suggestion now. What was the necessity for the head of the Government to react to it in public and say that no formal suggestion has been sent to us? We could have waited. Or, Parliament should have been taken into confidence.

Defence is a sacred cow. We cannot touch it. That is why in an earlier debate I said that defence matters should be discussed in Parliament in camera. No opportunity is given to us. Pakistan knows much more about our defence capability than the Indian Parliament knows. Therefore, this is an ambivalent attitude.

[Shri V. B. Raju]

In this statement it is said that it has been made clear by us to Pakistan that while we accept the sovereign right of every country to acquire arms for self-defence, India cannot but feel deeply disturbed about the threat to the peace. Should the Foreign Minister of India go all the way to Islamabad and Karachi to tell Pakistan: "You have the right to acquire arms and you are sovereign to that extent"? Is it actually necessary to make that pronouncement? Why should the Foreign Minister of India go there to say that and come back in three days time to condemn Pakistan saying that they are acquiring F-16s? Is it not ambivalence? Did we not say earlier that Pakistan was acquiring weapons from America and the superpower rivalry has come into our region? Then, Sir, the third thing is about the security of the region.

Sir, the latest that I have got before me is a despatch from Kathmandu saying that the Foreign Minister is reported to have said, when Nepal claimed that that country should be a peace zone, that peace is a regional matter. Sir, I want a clarification on this that peace cannot be considered only as a national issue, but should be considered also as a regional issue at the regional level. What does it mean? Did we ever meet at regional level to bring about security into this region? We were all always opposing regional pacts and regional level meetings on security matters. Sir, this is the ambivalence which I am trying to point out. My sincere opinion is that this is not a party matter, but this is a national matter and this is a human matter. Let us not react, let us only act. But acting needs planning. As in 1962, should we go on in a panicky way for acquiring weapons? From Mig to Mirage—that has been the progress so far. Meanwhile Jaguar was there

during the Janata Government period, and submarines from West Germany; a lot of publicity. And, Sir, the IMF is linked with all these things! Why should we become panicky about it? I do not know whether the Defence Minister knows about the impression about us outside our country. We talk too much without meaning much. Sir, why this panicky situation, I cannot understand. And, Sir, in this country, we have created a sense of insecurity and that is a very dangerous thing, Mr. Deputy Chairman. There is a feeling in this country that war with Pakistan is inevitable. Is it that thing that we should create? No. I would request the Prime Minister to use all her wit and wisdom to see that Pakistan is not actually misled by her present rulers. We have a duty cast upon to go in assistance of the people of Pakistan. There are two opinions in Pakistan. There is a strong opinion in Pakistan against the acquisition of weapons of this nature and we are not making use of those resources. War alone is not the instrument and, as a major country, we have got a greater responsibility and I would actually like the Defence Minister to read the speech of the Pakistani Ambassador on 13th September, 1981, which he gave in the Rotary Club here. He spoke in India's language.

Lastly, Sir, I would like to say that generally the strategy is to talk about peace and be prepared for war. To put it this way: Hope for the best and be prepared for the worst. But we in India do the reverse. We talk about war and we never actually get prepared for peace. Now, Sir, this is not good. What I would, at this moment, like to have is the minority Report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by the four Democrat Members and it would be very much helpful if the Members of Parliament are supplied with the analysis they have made. Secondly, I would like to have a copy of the letter written by Shri G. Parthasarathi to an official of the Government of the United States

saying that our acquisition of the Mirage is a reaction to their supply of F-16's. That means that a large country like ours does not have, we do not have, a long-range defence plan, but we only react to what our supposed enemies do. That is not good. I would like to have a long-range defence plan for this country apart from the issue of the F-16's.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Sir, we do believe in the efficacy of the weapon of diplomacy. We do want to make use of that instrument for maintaining peace and good relations between countries. It would be wrong to accuse the Government saying that this Government has not taken any diplomatic steps to see that understanding between two countries develops. The very fact that our Foreign Minister went to Pakistan and spoke there about the relations that we should have would go to show that we are very keen about it. And the very fact that within a short time after the visit of our Foreign Minister to Pakistan there came certain guests from certain parts of the world to talk about the weapons goes to prove that we are here to make use of this instrument for having good relations, whereas the other side is not ready for that. Now we are trying diplomatically also to see that we could avoid war. We are not a country which believes in the efficacy of war. We are a country which believes in peace and non-violence. The struggle of our independence has proved that. The Panchsheel we put forth involved nothing but this kind of principle. The Simla Agreement goes to prove that we want to solve our disputes by discussions, and not by war. The letter given by our hon. Prime Minister to President Zia, saying that we want to have frontiers of peace with Pakistan, goes to show that we are taking diplomatic stands also to show that we are not for war but we are for peace. But, at the same time we cannot forget the lessons of history. You would not expect us to forget the lessons of history. We cannot afford that. With-

in a short span of thirty years we had to fight wars—not one, two or three but four or five wars. You would not expect us to forget that. You would not expect us to forget the ancient history also. We are trying to establish and create a situation in which peace would be possible. We would also take steps to see that our interests are also protected at the same time. We are not trying to create a sense of insecurity. But we are trying to educate the people. We are trying to make them mentally ready to face any eventuality that may arise. This is not a situation which has arisen out of what is happening in this region alone. This situation is the result of the international situation also. This is the result of what is happening in the entire world as such as well as in our neighbourhood and in our vicinity. So, to think that we are trying to create a sense of insecurity will be too off-the-mark.

Sir, we do not think that war is inevitable, we do not react. To say that we are trying to get the Mirage or any other aircraft because Pakistan is having F-16, would be a wrong thing. We are not reacting to that, because Pakistan is...

SHRI V. B. RAJU: Sorry for the interruption. You have not contradicted what is reported in the Press that Mr. Parthasarathy has written a letter. It is published. He has said that the acquisition of Mirage is because of Pakistan's having F-16.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: I am trying to explain that point also. I was on that question only. But we are not reacting. Our Defence plan is not a plan which is based on reactions. I may say that in 1974 there was a proposal for inducting weapons of this kind in the year 1980. Now, this is not something in reaction to what is happening in the neighbourhood. But if something is creating a dangerous situation, everybody would expect us to act quickly; everybody would expect us to act in a manner which would give us some sort of antidote to that kind of situation. So,

[Shri Shivraj V. Patil]

let me submit that we are not reacting but we are acting safely and in a planned manner.

श्री बुद्ध प्रिय मौर्य (आन्ध्र प्रदेश) :
पाकिस्तान के पास ता. आलरेडो है यह
मिराज 2000 ।

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: I am very sorry to say that knowing our philosophy, knowing our attitude, knowing our history also, we have some friends in our country who seek to be pleading for the countries which are not genuinely putting forth the 'No-War' pact. By saying that we have not acted properly, we are putting ourselves in the dock. We have not committed any aggression. We do not believe in that philosophy. Every now and then we have proposed for a no-war pact. Yet there has not been any no-war pact. Yet there have been aggressions committed on this country. And if today also standing here and outside the Government says that we are for the no-war pact but a genuine no-war pact, that we would not be deceived, I don't think we have committed any mistake. If any press reporter asks as to what your reaction is to the no-war pact, as a Government, as a responsible Government, we in the Government are expected to respond to it. And we have not committed any mistake in saying that we are for a no-war pact but a genuine no-war pact, a pact which would really protect peace.

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : उपसभापति जी, मंत्री महोदय ने बहुत परिश्रम करके अपना वक्तव्य पढ़ दिया ।

श्री जे० के० जैन (मध्य प्रदेश) :
पढ़ दिया नहीं, बं दिया ।

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : पहले मैं स्टेटमेंट पर आ रहा हूँ। इस परिश्रम की जरूरत नहीं थी। वह इसलिए कि प्रेजिडेंट जिवा-

उल-हक की सारी बातें जो वह कहता है अखबारों के जरिए हमें पता लग जाता है। इनको कहने की जरूरत नहीं है। वह कहते हैं कि हम एटम बम बना रहे हैं। वह भी अखबारों में आ जाता है। वह कहते हैं लाइन आफ कंट्रोल रिजेक्ट कर दिया। इन सब बातों को हम आसानी से जान जाते हैं अखबारों के जरिए। यह पता नहीं चलता कि उनकी तरफ से जो बातें अखबारों में आती हैं तो पिकचर कुछ होती है और यहां से जो कुछ कहा जाता है तो पिकचर कुछ होती है। इसमें पिकचर साफ नहीं होती बल्कि कंप्यूजन हो जाता है। उदाहरण के लिए मैं आपको बता दूँ कि पाकिस्तान आम भेजता है तो यहां से लीची भेजी जाती है। आम का जवाब आपको देना है तो बेल से दीजिए। (व्यवधान) दूसरी बात यह है कि मंत्री महोदय ने अपने ओरल जवाब में एफ-16 और दूसरी बातों की जानकारी दी। लेकिन उन्होंने एक दर्शन नहीं दिया। वह एक दर्शन को नहीं जानते। वह पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू के दर्शन को नहीं जानते। पंडित जी को वह भूल गये हैं।

श्री सत पाल मित्तल (पंजाब) : शुक्र है आपको याद आ गया ।

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : इस सम्बन्ध में मैं पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू की याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने चाहा था:

"War is too serious to be entrusted to a soldier, let alone peace."

मिलिटरीमैन जिवा-उल-हक जैसे आदमी से पीस की उम्मीद करना बेकार है। उनसे पीस की उम्मीद नहीं करनी चाहिये। सारा नक्शा कंप्यूज हो जाता है। (व. ११६)

श्री उपसभापति : आप प्रश्न पूछिए।

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : सवाल नम्बर एक यह है कि आपके विदेश मंत्री ने 10 जून को कराची इंस्टीट्यूट आफ इन्टर-नेशनल अफेयर्स में अपने भाषण में कहा कि हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान में कोई डिफ-सेज नहीं है। कोई समस्या नहीं है। यदि कुछ है तो कम्प्यूचिया को लेकर। (व्यवधान) क्या यह बात सही है ज्वायंट डिक्लेरेशन में आगाशाही के साथ उन्होंने यह दस्तखत किये हैं, मोडर्नाइजेशन आफ पाकिस्तानी आर्मी को कबूल किया है। पाकिस्तान माडर्नाइज हो इसका क्या मतलब है। यह पहला सवाल है। दूसरा सवाल है कि आपने स्टेटमेंट में यह एकाउण्ट दिया कि वह यह ले रहे हैं, वह ले रहे हैं, एफ-16 ले रहे हैं तो इनमें से आपके पास क्या नहीं है? मैं यह साफ तौर पर जानना चाहता हूँ कि पाकिस्तान को जो एयर क्राफ्ट मिल रहे हैं और दूसरी चीजें मिल रही हैं उनमें से आपके पास कौन सी चीजें नहीं हैं? आप कहते हैं कि पाकिस्तान के पास हथियार आ रहे हैं, लेकिन हम आल स्टैप्स ले रहे हैं? सभी मंत्री और मंत्रालय यह कहते हैं कि आल स्टैप्स आर विडिंग टेकन। लेकिन मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि पाकिस्तान के मुकाबले में आपके पास क्या नहीं है, यह हमें आप बतायें? तीसरा सवाल मेरा यह है कि क्या यह सही नहीं है कि एफ-16 के लिए पाकिस्तान और अमेरिका में जो एग्रीमेंट हुआ है, एक्जुअली वह एग्रीमेंट ही नहीं हुआ है बल्कि हथियारों की डिलिवरी भी शुरू हो गई है? आप जानते हैं कि रूजवेल्ट ने जो लैंड लीज का एग्रीमेंट किया था, उस एग्रीमेंट को करने से पहले ही यूरोप में हथियार उतरने शुरू हो गये थे। 7 सितम्बर, 1941 को अमेरिका युद्ध के लिये आगे आया था,

लेकिन अमेरिका ने हथियार भेजने पहले से ही शुरू कर दिये थे। एफ-16 विमानों के बारे में यह कहा जाता है कि वे 1985-86 या उसके बाद में आएंगे, लेकिन वास्तविक स्थिति यह है कि वे पाकिस्तान को डिलिवर होने शुरू हो गये हैं। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या ये बातें सही नहीं हैं? मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि एफ-16 और दूसरे जो एन्टी टैंक एयर क्राफ्ट्स हैं उनको काउन्टरैक्ट करने के लिये क्या आपके पास कोई दूसरे साधन हैं? आप जानते हैं कि उनकी रेंज बहुत भीतर तक जाती है, उसको काउन्टरैक्ट करने के लिये आप क्या कर रहे हैं? आखिरी सवाल मेरा यह है कि आपके इकोनोमिस्ट्स ने आपको केनकुनेट करके यह बनाया होगा कि एक एयरक्राफ्ट की कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन क्या बैठती है। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि एफ-16 विमान का कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन इन टर्म आफ रूपीज कितना बैठता है और विज-ए-विज जगुआर और मिराज-2000 का कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन कितना बैठता है?

श्री शिवराज बो० पाटिल : मान्यवर, जहां तक आम और लोचो का सवाल है, यह सिर्फ आम और लोचो का सवाल नहीं है, बल्कि यह सभ्यता का सवाल है। हम लोग सभ्यता में भी किसी से पीछे नहीं रहना चाहते हैं। सभ्यता के लिए हम से सभ्यता से ही जवाब देंगे।

श्री उपसभापति : शायद लीचियों बिहार से गई होंगी।

श्री शिवराज बो० पाटिल : दूसरा सवाल जो विदेश मंत्री जी के वक्तव्य के संबंध में पूछा गया है, उसका मैं कोई जवाब नहीं देना चाहूंगा। (व्यवधान)

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : उसका जवाब प्रधान मंत्री दे सकती हैं। मैंने उनके स्टेटमेंट को पढ़ा है? उन्होंने कहा है कि हिन्दु-

[श्री शिवचन्द्र झा]

स्तान और पाकिस्तान के बीच में कोई समस्या नहीं है, सब मसले हल हो गये हैं। मैंने मोडर्नाइजेशन का भी सवाल उठाया है।

श्री शिवराज बो० पाटिल : जी हां, मोडर्नाइजेशन का भी सवाल आपने उठाया है। आप जानते हैं कि हम किसी देश को यह नहीं कह सकते हैं कि हथियार लो या नहीं लो। हम किसी देश को यह भी नहीं कह सकते कि आप कंकड़, पत्थर या पुराने हथियार ही रख सकते हो। हमें ऐसे कहने का कोई अधिकार प्राप्त नहीं होता। हमारे कहने का मतलब यह है कि जितने भी हथियारों की किसी देश को अपनी खुद की सुरक्षा के लिये जरूरत हो, वह ले सकता है। मगर इतने हथियार लेना जिनकी मदद से दूसरों पर हमला करने की शक्ति प्राप्त हो जाये तो उसमें दूसरे नाराज हो जाएंगे। और दूसरों को उसके सम्बन्ध में आपत्ति उठाने का हक प्राप्त होता है। हमारे कहने का मतलब है कि हमारे पड़ोसियों को हथियार लेने का अधिकार है लेकिन यह अधिकार इतना नहीं जिससे हमारी सुरक्षा खतरे में आ जाये, जिसकी वजह से यहां पर एक भयानक परिस्थिति का निर्माण हो, यह कहने का हमारा मतलब था। उसका मोडर्नाइजेशन हथियार लेने के सारे सवाल उसमें आ गये। आपने पूछा कि आपके पास क्या नहीं है। मान्यवर, यह बड़ा भयानक प्रश्न है कि क्या नहीं है। यह होता कि क्या है तो ठीक है परन्तु क्या नहीं है तो फिर इसमें सारे संसार . (व्यवधान)

श्री शिवचन्द्र झा : स्टेटमेंट में जो है उनमें से क्या नहीं है। यह मेरा साफ सवाल है। है तो है और नहीं है तो कहिये नहीं है।

श्री उपसभापति : वह बताना ठीक नहीं होगा।

श्री शिवचन्द्र झा : जो स्टेटमेंट में है उनमें से क्या नहीं है?

श्री शिवराज बो० पाटिल : उपसभापति महोदय, यह कठिन बात है। मैं यह समझता हूं कि ऐसी बात करना बड़ा मुश्किल का काम है।

श्री शिवचन्द्र झा : है या नहीं है यह सवाल है।

श्री शिवराज बो० पाटिल : एफ-16 की डिमांड कब हो रही है, उसके संबंध में माननीय सदस्य ने यह पूछा कि शायद आज हो रही है या बल ही रहा है हमें ऐसा लगता है कि वह जल्दी होने वाली है और इससे ज्यादा मैं इस संबंध में कुछ कहना नहीं चाहूंगा और बाकी जो सवाल हैं उनके संबंध में मैं केवल...

(व्यवधान) उसकी कीमत कितनी है इसकी कीमत कितनी है, वह कितनी कीमत दे रहे हैं, उसकी कितनी कीमत ले रहे हैं, इस विषय में बोलना बड़ा कठिन है। (व्यवधान)

श्री शिवचन्द्र झा : कितना खर्चा हो रहा है. (व्यवधान) ... क्या यह मालूम नहीं हो सकता। इसके लिये आपके पास क्या जबाब है

श्री उपसभापति : यह प्रश्न नहीं उठता। श्री नरसिंह नारायण पाण्डेय।

श्री नरसिंह नारायण पाण्डेय (उत्तर प्रदेश) : उपसभापति महोदय, मैं कुछ प्रश्नों तक अपने को सीमित रखना चाहता हूं क्योंकि भाषण बड़े लम्बे हो गये हैं और मंत्री जी का वक्तव्य बड़ा साफ है। मैं श्रीमान्, ऐसा मानता हूं कि भारत अपने पड़ोसी देशों से शांति चाहता है लेकिन उस शांति को कुछ बड़े राष्ट्र

कमजोर करना चाहते हैं और उनका उसको कमजोर करने का अपना मकसद है। श्रीमन्, अभी अखबार में 'बिजनेस स्टैंडर्ड' कलकत्ता में निकला है 25 मार्च को कि यू० एस० ए० ने एक "सीक्रेट सीक्योरिटी पैक्ट" पाकिस्तान से किया है और उस "सीक्रेट सीक्योरिटी पैक्ट" के तहत में श्रीमन्, यह 2.5 बिलियन डालर का सीक्रेट पैक्ट है। और 1981-82 में 500 मिलियन डालर की मिलिट्री और इकानामिक एड देने की बात है। इसमें श्रीमन्, 400 मिलियन डालर मिलिट्री क्रेडिट के रूप में दे रहे हैं और आर्मेड फोर्स के रूप में दे रहे हैं और 100 मिलियन डालर एकानामिक आसस्टेंस के रूप में दे रहे हैं और 600 हजार डालर मिलिट्री ट्रेनिंग के लिये पाकिस्तान के जवानों को दिया जा रहा है। यह श्रीमन्, मैं आपके सामने ये फिगर्स रखना चाहता हूँ।

श्रीमन्, दूसरी बात यह है कि अफगानिस्तान के मामले में भारत सरकार की नीति बहुत स्पष्ट है और इस मामले को प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कई स्तरों से बहुत साफ किया है कि इसका राजनैतिक हल हंडा जाना चाहिए। इस लिये इसको दृष्टि में रख कर कोई मिलिट्री एड पाकिस्तान को बढ़ाने की आवश्यकता नहीं होनी चाहिये। लेकिन श्रीमन्, आज देश के लोग या दुनिया के लोग यह भी जानते हैं कि "पाकिस्तान को साउथ-वेस्ट एशियन कंट्रीज" का एक अड्डा बनाने की बात है। इंडियन पेनेनसुला से हटा कर उसकी परिभाषा करने की बात है और वह साउथ-वेस्ट रीजन का हेडक्वार्टर बनाया जा रहा है और इसके जरिये वेस्ट एशिया में तमाम गड़बड़ी शुरू की जायेगी। उसके जरिये यहाँ पर इंडियन पेनेनसुला में इस तरह की स्थिति पैदा की जा रही है ताकि उसके लिये एक स्टेटजी बनाई जाये और यह स्टेटजी यू०

एस० ए० की पालिसी का एक पार्ट है। मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से इन तमाम प्रश्नों का स्पष्टीकरण चाहता हूँ और यह भी चाहता हूँ कि हमारे चीन से मधुर सम्बन्ध होने की बात चल रही है और उस सम्बन्ध में हमारा आफिशियल डेली शेन भी पब्लिश ज्ञान वाला है और...

श्री उपसभापति : यह अंतर्राष्ट्रीय विषय में आप

श्री नरसिंह नारायण पाण्डेय : वहाँ पर इस बात को हम तय करेंगे। लेकिन आज चीन के बड़े-बड़े आफिसर पाकिस्तान आ रहे हैं और ऐसा लगता है कि एक ऐसा इनवायरन्मेंट बनाने की कोशिश की जा रही है कि इंडियन पेनेनसुला को "पिस जॉन" न बना कर एक अशान्ति का जॉन बनाया जाय। एक ऐसी साजिश चल रही है। इसलिए इस बारे में भी उन सरकार से जिनसे हम मधुर सम्बन्ध बनाना चाहते हैं हमारी बातचीत होनी चाहिए।

श्रीमन्, मैं मंत्री महोदय जी की इस बात से अपने को एग्री नहीं कर सकता हूँ... जिसमें उन्होंने कहा कि हम "जेन्युन नो वार पैक्ट" चाहते हैं। श्रीमन्, शिमला एग्रीमेंट क्या जेन्युन नो वार पैक्ट नहीं है, 1949 में पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने जो 'नो वार पैक्ट' की बात की थी क्या वह जेन्युन नो वार पैक्ट नहीं है? यह जेन्युन का क्या मतलब होता है? यह तो एक बार श्री इटल बिहारी वाजपेयी ने जनता पार्टी की सरकार के समय यह कहा था कि हमारी नीति जेन्युन नान-अलाइनमेंट की है। क्योंकि किसी अमर की राष्ट्रपति ने कह दिया इस लिए उसको लेकर घूमने लगे। मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे

[श्री नरसिंह नारायण पाण्डेय]

जो मकसद है वह साफ होना चाहिए और हमारा मकसद शान्ति के लिए (व्यवधान) हमारे ईरादे बहुत साफ है (व्यवधान) मैं मंत्री जी से माननीय जी से इन विषयों पर स्पष्टिकरण चाहता हूँ और यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि हम इसके बारे में क्या विचार रखते हैं ?

श्री शिवराज बो० पाटिल : मान्यवर, जो आंकड़े यहां पर दिए गए हैं उनके बारे में कोई भाषण करने की जरूरत मैं नहीं समझता । साउथ ईस्ट एशिया में एक अशान्ति का वातावरण बनाने की कोशिश है ऐसा माननीय सदस्य का कहना है । मान्यवर, पाकिस्तान को बहुत बड़े पैमाने पर हथियार दिए जा रहे हैं और जो हथियार दे रहे हैं उनका कहना है पहले जमाने में जब हथियार दिए गए थे उस समय हमने कहा था कि इसकी वजह से इस हिस्से में अशान्ति का निर्माण होगा तो उस समय हमें बताया गया था कि यह हथियार भारत के खिलाफ उपयोग में नहीं लाये जायेंगे मगर आज ऐसा नहीं कहा जाता । आज तो वे कहते हैं कि यह भारत के खिलाफ हथियार उपयोग में लाये जा सकते हैं और पाकिस्तान का कहना ऐसा है कि यह हथियारों को लेने की जरूरत इसलिए हो रही है क्योंकि उनके पड़ोसी राष्ट्र में एक कोई परिस्थिति का निर्माण हुआ है । उनके साथ-साथ यह भी कहते हैं कि हम पश्चिमी पड़ोसी राष्ट्र से कोई खतरा नहीं है । यह भी कहते हैं कि जो हथियार वहां पर आ रहे हैं, उनकी वजह से दो प्रकार की परिस्थितियों का निर्माण होता है । या तो संसार के इस हिस्से में पाकिस्तान को हथियार देकर उसका उपयोग करने की इच्छा नजर आती है और उसके साथ-साथ उसका असर कुछ हम पर हो तो उसके बारे में भी

एक दृष्टिकोण नजर आता है जिसके बारे में हथियार देने वाले या लेने वाले को कोई चिन्ता करने की इसमें बात नहीं है । तीसरा सवाल यह कि यहां पर जेन्यून नो वार पेक्ट की बात आई । मैं माननीय सदस्य के कथन से सहमत हूँ जब वे कहते हैं कि हमारा शिमला एग्रीमेंट जो है उसको भी नो वार पेक्ट कहते हैं । हमारी पूरी नीति ही नो वार पेक्ट की नीति है । उसको ज्यादा और बढ़ाने की ओर कलम से कागज पर लिखने की जरूरत है, ऐसा नहीं है । पूरी नीति हमारी इसी प्रकार की है । मगर ऐसा नजर आता है कि एक तरफ से हथियार लिये जा रहे हैं और अब वे क्योंकि हथियार ले रहे हैं इसलिए हमको कहा जा रहा है कि हम और आप नो वार पेक्ट बनायें, एक डिप्लोमैटिक आफेंसिव लें, ऐसा कुछ इसमें नजर आता है, राजकीय वैचारिक आक्रमण की भूमिका उसमें नजर आती है । ऐसे डिप्लोमैटिक आफेंसिव के हम विकटम न बनें, हमको यह देखना है । यह बहुत जरूरी है । इसलिए हम कहते हैं कि यह आप नो वार पेक्ट नो वार पेक्ट क्या कहते हैं । आप कहते हैं कि जिस कागज पर लिखा जायेगा उसनी भी उसकी कीमत नहीं है । आप जब हथियार लेते हैं, जिस कागज को आप हथियार लेने के लिए उपयोग में लाते हैं उसी कागज के ऊपर हमको आप अलग स्टेटमेंट करते हैं नो वार पेक्ट का इस प्रकार की चीज करने का क्या मतलब होगा, यह समझा जा सकता है । हमारी पालिसी, हमारी पंचशील नीति, शिमला एग्रीमेंट, यह सब नो वार पेक्ट ही है । मैं अंत में यह कहूंगा कि सम्मानित सदस्य श्री जसवंत सिंह जी ने और अन्य माननीय सदस्यों ने, उनके साप्यों ने, जो यहां पर सवाल उठाए हैं उनके पीछे एक भावना नजर आती है । हमारा राष्ट्र हमेशा के लिए सतर्क रहे, किसी

भूल में न रहे, इस प्रकार की भावना शायद वे प्रकट करना चाहते हैं। इसके साथ-साथ यहां पर यह भी बताया गया युद्ध होना आवश्यक है, ऐसा मान कर न चला जाये, यदि राजकीय पद्धति से हम इसको टाल सकते हैं, इस प्रश्न को हल कर सकते हैं, तो करना चाहिए। हमारी सरकार जो है वह इससे सहमत है जहां तक हो सके डिप्लोमैटिकली सारे प्रश्न सात्व करना चाहते हैं। मैं सभी सम्मानित सदस्यों का अभार मानता हूं कि उन्होंने इस महत्व के प्रश्न के ऊपर सरकार का, सदन का और बाहर के लोगों का ध्यान आकर्षित किया है।

SHRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, from this House it is essential that there should be unequivocal condemnation of the action of the U.S. Government, especially after Mr. Reagan took over, in supplying such sophisticated arms to Pakistan. To suggest either directly or indirectly, or to point out some of the weaknesses in the policies of the Government will only give encouragement to those forces which constitute a serious threat to our country's security and integrity. I want to make it clear that it is not India's policy which is posing a threat to any of its neighbours. India's policies are time-tested. The policies of non-alignment, peaceful co-existence and friendship with other countries are tested by time and have given a moral force to this country, except for a short duration of two years when our foreign policy suffered a tilt in favour of imperialism.

The supply of arms to Pakistan is a part of the arms race throughout the world. What is Reagan administration doing in Europe? What is Reagan administration doing in the Middle East? They are doing the same here. It is a part of that global strategy of imperialists to strengthen their arms to dominate the world.

If we fail to see this threat, we will be helping them.

Coming to the question of supply of sophisticated arms, and that too almost free of cost, to Pakistan, where is the threat for Pakistan either from India or from the Soviet Union? Let us be clear about it. The Soviet Union has made it clear several times that the Soviet forces from Afghanistan will be withdrawn if there is no threat from Pakistan, if Pakistan's land is not used for training guerrillas, or for supplying arms to those who want to create trouble inside Afghanistan and upset its socio-economic system. Where is the question of the Soviet Union or India posing a threat to Pakistan? On the contrary, it is Pakistan which is posing a threat to our security in alliance and in combination with the U.S.A. and also—it is regrettable—with a country like China which has joined in this combination. One minute, Sir. Let me complete. I am one voice which is at least unequivocally condemning the action of the imperialists. Kindly let my voice heard. Whatever may be the differences with the policy pursued by the Government internally or externally, we should not be lacking in our condemnation of the action of both the U.S. imperialists and Pakistan—and also China—in posing this threat and creating instability in this region.

There are two forces in the world—one, the forces of war, arms race and threat to other countries' security; the other, the forces of peace and friendship with all peoples in the world. There is no other force. India should be firmly with the forces of peace to face this situation. The threat is rather serious, unprecedented after the Second World War both in Europe and in our region. Apart from making military preparations and diplomatic actions, how to alert the nation? The nation must be united. All sections of the people must stand together against this arms race and threat to our peace. Our Prime

[Shri M. Kalyanasundaram]
Minister had a very extensive tour recently in other countries where she explained frankly the stand of India with regard to the arms race and the threat to peace. We are also seeing how the anti-war movement is spreading and how the resistance to Reagan's policy of producing dangerous weapons including the neutron bomb is mounting in his own country. In America the people are condemning the Reagan Administration for the supply of arms to Pakistan. In America the people are condemning the Reagan Administration for the decision to supply AWACS to Saudi Arabia. But here indirectly they are saying that your policy is responsible—not that everything is right in the policy pursued by the Government of India in this respect. Is the Government of India responsible for the decision of U.S. imperialism to supply such dangerous weapons? Another thing. Not only are they not charging much for these weapons, but they would not supply enriched uranium for our Tarapur Atomic Plant. They would not help us. They would not even help us develop our atomic power indigenously.

Today the Defence Minister of Saudi Arabia, Mr. Sultan, is in Islamabad discussing with General Zia-ul-Haq—about what? He is bringing financial aid for the purchase of these weapons. What is the harm India did to Saudi Arabia? Saudi Arabia, Pakistan, Bangladesh and India all have common traditions and there is every justification for friendship and for the strengthening of friendship and economic co-operation amongst themselves. Neither Pakistan nor India is going to gain anything by war. It is an established fact. Both will lose. It is not that we want war. Our Government does not want war. From 1949 our record is clean that we are for peace and friendship with Pakistan. Facts will speak. Let us not bring in our subjective feelings into this national issue. This is not Mrs. Indira Gandhi's

personal affair or Congress' personal affair. It is a matter concerning the entire nation.

So, what is the attitude of the Government towards the decision of the U.S. to manufacture the neutron bomb? What is the attitude of our Government to the decision of the U.S. in supplying AWACS to Saudi Arabia? What is the attitude of our Government towards Saudi Arabia in its decision to financially assist Pakistan? Is it a friendship act? Is it not an unfriendly act? What are the steps you are going to take? I do not want to know all the details about defence arrangements. I am sure the Government of India will make the necessary efforts for defence. When I speak about defence and strengthening of defence, the co-operation of those workers and employees engaged in the production of our valuable weapons in our defence factories must be specially sought. Not only the entire nation must be alerted against this danger, not only the entire working class must be alerted against this danger but, particularly, the armed forces and the workers employed in the defence industries must be alerted and their willing co-operation on the basis of national interests and patriotism must be obtained. And patriotism must be roused. What action are they going to take? Sir, in other countries there is something like united anti-war movement, both separately and jointly. What are we going to do in our country for rousing consciousness among our people against the arms race for which the Reagan Administration alone is responsible by its policy?

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Sir, when we say that on our borders and on the horizon clouds of the danger of war are looming large. We are not trying to create any panic or a sense of insecurity or scare; we are trying to alert the people in this country and inform the people in the world that the clouds of war are

SHRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM: I do not intend to interrupt him at this stage. If necessary, I am prepared to meet the Minister and discuss with him. He must see that the officers do not provoke the workers and their interests are protected.

2

Finally, Sir, have we done enough to assuage Pakistan's fears of India? There have been rumours recently in the foreign Press that we are ourselves engaging or that we have a

[Shri Khuswant Singh]

project of some kind of joint naval manoeuvres with the fleet of the Soviet Union. I would like the Minister to express himself on that subject, and I hope he would contradict that statement that has appeared in the foreign Press that the Indian Navy and the Russian Navy are planning for some sort of a joint naval exercises.

You may be right in saying that the offer of the non-war pact is not genuine. But there are other steps that Pakistan has taken. It has taken the initiative in suggesting that we come to some kind of a settlement with them about the proportion of the arms that the two countries should have. Maybe we can have four times as much as they, but it is a matter we can discuss with the Pakistan Government. We can also discuss with them the proposals for withdrawing our forces from the border because it has been reported in many papers that there has been a vast increase in the number of the border incidents. And we have had experience that these border incidents often escalate into more serious fighting. Has the Government taken any note of the proposals that have come from Pakistan or floated in the newspapers on its behalf? I think it is time that we made it clear to Pakistan that we did not mean any ill-will against it. I think this should be stated more categorically than has been done in the past. If ever a confrontation takes place between the two countries, it will be total annihilation of both of us, not only for Pakistan.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Sir, things have become very clear to us and to the world. The suppliers of the arms have said that those arms could be used against anybody; they have not given any guarantee. The receivers of the arms say that they have no danger from the Soviet Union. What is the meaning of this? The meaning of this is that those arms can be used in one direction, that is India. If this is the position,

it would be, if not completely but at least partially, incorrect to say that because something has happened in Afghanistan the arms are being supplied to Pakistan. In the olden days, previously, when the arms were supplied to Pakistan, things like that had not happened but the arms were supplied and they were used against India. So, the theory that because something has happened in Afghanistan and because we have taken a particular stand the arms are being supplied to, or are being acquired by, Pakistan, does not hold good.

We have said that, as far as the situation in Afghanistan is concerned, we are not in favour of occupation of any territory by the forces of any other country. That is our stand. We have not accepted what has happened there, and we have said that the forces had to withdraw. But we have seen the situation in its totality, we have not seen it partially, from only one angle. If a situation is there in which interference can be caused by infiltrators, that also cannot be lost sight of. And we are looking at this problem from all angles. We are saying that in Afghanistan if there are any forces, they should withdraw. And we are saying that if there is any situation which creates a dangerous situation there, that should also disappear. That is our stand.

SHRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM: Has our Government taken up with the Pakistan Government that what they are doing in Afghanistan is wrong?

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Sir, we have all the time said that if infiltration is taking place through somebody else's territory, they have to bear that responsibility. And if the country says that this infiltration is taking place from that direction, there is a situation in which something more has to do be done.

Now, as far as creating a sort of public opinion in the United States is

concerned, I think that the opinion of the people in the United States is not the same as the opinion of the people who are governing there. I do agree that there are people in the United States of America also who understand the situation in this part of the world and who feel that the arms should not be supplied to Pakistan. The question is whether they are in control, whether they are in a position to control the situation. I really do not clearly understand as to what is to be done to create a situation in which the Government would act in a manner which will not create difficulties for this country. Now, as far as the people are concerned, there are people—we know that—there are Senators and there are Congressmen also ...

SHRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM:
Let us create opinion in our country.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: ...who are not for that. But I do not now what is to be done to impress upon those who are holding the reins of Government that this should not be done. In fact, if we say that in the past aggressions were committed and the arms were used against us by the country to which they are giving arms and help, well, that should be sufficient, and if we say that a situation conducive for peace has to be created here, they should understand that.

Now, as far as creating a sort of public opinion in Pakistan is concerned, when did we commit aggression? Aggression has been committed against us. We have not committed any aggression. Now there also the situation is the same. The feelings, the opinions of the people and the Government may not be the same in that country also. Also, I am sure there are people there who do not want this kind of a situation to develop. Now it is the responsibility of those who are in power, of those who are holding the reins of Government in Pakistan; they have to behave in a particular manner. We have been

saying that we do not want any conflict between the two countries. We have been saying that we are bound to respect the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Pakistan. We have said that we want friendship and peace with Pakistan. It should be more than sufficient to assuage the feelings of the people living in Pakistan also.

Now, as far as control of arms is concerned, a sort of fallacious theory is put forth. I am afraid these are the methods, tactics used to create a sort of screen to hide a situation that is developing in that country. If Pakistan is having less of territory and less of boundary, why should Pakistan have as much of defence forces, or why should it have army, navy and air force to the extent it has developed them today? Now the situation in India is, the boundary is very large, the areas are large and we have to protect our interests in different parts. To say that we should have the same kind of weapons and the same strength of army as they have, would be fallacious.

SHRI KHUSHWANT SINGH: I did not say that.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: You have not said that, but there are people who are saying that. You are not saying that. What you have said is, why not discuss this thing with them?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: What about joint naval exercises? That is the crucial point—the joint naval exercises.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Now, we have said, you have a right to acquire arms to the extent it is necessary for you to defend your territory; but you do not have a right to acquire arms which are really not necessary for your purpose. The same principle applies to us also and when assessing the situation we have to take into account the area, the boundaries, we have to protect, the countries

[Shri Shivraj V. Patil]

we have to face in different parts. And if we consider this thing, then the proposal which is coming from Pakistan, I don't think, holds good.

As far as other points are concerned, I don't think it is necessary to answer . . .

SHRI KHUSHWANT SINGH: I asked a specific question, whether there is any truth in the stories that have appeared in the press about the proposed joint naval exercise with the Soviet Union . . .

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Sometimes countries do exercise in conjunction with each other. But up to this time we have not taken any decision of this kind.

SHRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM: Can Pakistani and US Navies conduct joint exercises in our Ocean?

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: I said the same thing in a different fashion.

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA PANT (Uttar Pradesh): The statement of the honourable Minister reflects the concern of this House and I think, of the country as a whole, over the induction of arms into this region, specifically the sale of US arms to Pakistan. I do not want to repeat what other Members and the Minister have said about the definite impact this will have on worsening the security environment of the region. The Minister rightly stressed the policy of peace which India has pursued. But a weak India will invite war and, therefore, we must see that India is alert and strong. The Defence Minister said that he believes in non-violence. In the context of the discussion that was going on I thought that a Defence Minister believing in non-violence is a contradiction in terms . . .

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: The Government, I said.

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA PANT: . . . and, therefore, I thought it is necessary to emphasise this point.

In his statement he said that the arms supply is substantially subsidised. This is a very important and significant statement, and the deliberate use of the word "substantially" makes it far more serious. What does "substantially" mean? What is the Government's information? What is its assessment? What is it normally in the case of similar arms supplies to other countries? Because, the order of military supplies which is generally known is, I think, about 2 billion dollars; but the Government says it is substantially subsidised. Is it only 2 billion dollars out of the 3.2? And is it that this is the only the source of supply or are there other sources of supply also, under the cover of this supply arrangement? So, the country would like to know more definitely as to the quantum of arms which will be flowing into Pakistan under this arrangement. And this particular phrase "substantially subsidised" needs clarification.

The other thing that I would like to ask is a small point. When he talks of a sophisticated air defence system, is he talking of airborne early warning system like the AWAICS? Is that the implication of this phrase? I think the country would like to know that also.

The third point is F-16s will start arriving presumably next year. What is the time and spacing for the receipt of F-16s in Pakistan? Now, we are apparently negotiating with France for the supply of Mirage 2000, but the signing ceremony, which, according to the newspapers, was to take place when the Prime Minister visited Paris, did not take place. Is it 2 P.M. because of some hitch that has taken place? Or, is it because that there is some doubt about the supply of Mirage 2000? If there is no hitch, then when can we expect Mirage 2000 to reach this country? In this context, since there

is bound to be a gap between the receipt of F-16s by Pakistan and the Mirage in India, what will be the time span of this gap of vulnerability? How do we propose to meet this situation?

My fourth point is this. Any nuclear arms inequilibrium will further heighten the area of conflict that seems to have overcome this region. What is the Government's latest information on this point? When do they expect Pakistan to explode its first Bomb and whether that is likely to coincide with this gap of vulnerability with respect to the air defences of these two countries?

The Minister said that what is happening in our area is part of a global pattern. I would submit that it is not exactly so. In Geneva since yesterday discussions are taking place between the representatives of the USA and the USSR negotiating for minimising and, if possible, for removal of nuclear war-heads from Europe. These discussions have begun on a good note by statements by President Reagan and Mr. Brezhnev. On the one hand in Europe there is an active effort to see that the number of missiles is reduced and ultimately a nuclear-missile free Europe is ushered in. Here in Asia in our region, there is induction of arms by both the super-powers leading to the heightening of tension. These two trends do not really match. I would like to know whether the Government has given thought to this aspect of the matter.

The Prime Minister had talks with various world leaders and various joint communiques have been issued which condemn induction of arms into this region. Have these joint communiques been followed up by any country by influencing the opinion of the U.S. Government to desist from this course of action? Has this initiative resulted in any concrete action on their part?

Mr. Khushwant Singh suggested that public opinion in the U.S. could also be influenced. The hon. Minister did not, in my view, respond adequately to that suggestion. I think there is scope for initiative to be taken in this direction. There is divided opinion in the United States. There is no reason why we should hesitate in trying to influence that section of the public opinion in the United States which will be more appreciative of our point of view.

Lastly, there is this question of No-war Pact. The Minister said it is a googly. A googly can be played by competent batsman. The point is that we have proposed a No-war Pact in 1949 and I think recently we have renewed our offer for that No-war Pact. If that is so, has there been any response on the part of Pakistan to that? If we have renewed the No-war Pact . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You may leave that point for the international situation. The External Affairs Minister has already made a statement that it will be discussed later on.

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA PANT: Kindly bear with me. You have allowed everybody to raise this issue.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The External Affairs Minister is more competent to answer that question.

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA PANT: He is also a very competent Minister. I would not question his competence.

I would like to know whether there has been any response from Pakistan. If we have renewed the 1949 No-war Pact, in substance what is the difference between our 1949 No-war Pact offer and the offer that Pakistan has made?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, the honourable Minister. We are going to have a full debate on the international situation. Mr. Pant. That is why I said that.

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA PANT: Sir, ten speakers have referred to that issue and you have been pleased to listen to them also.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: And the Minister has also been pleased to reply.

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA PANT: That is different. I wish you listened more carefully to what I said.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Sir, let me first of all submit that very important and pertinent questions have been raised and I would certainly like to put forth the view of the Government on those points. I do agree that a weak India may not be in the interest of peace. So, to make this country very strong, so strong as to be able to defend herself, would be in the interest of peace in this region. As far as the Defence Minister talking about peace is concerned, I would say . . .

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA PANT: Non-violence.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: . . . that the Defence Ministry, the Defence Minister and all those who are working under her value peace. But they do understand that they have to do their duty also and they would certainly do their duties.

As far as the quantum of arms is concerned, Sir, I would not like to comment on the quantum of the arms. These are all statistics and this kind of information I would not like to put before this House and this information is already available in the newspapers. Now, to point out what exactly the quantum of arms is which Pakistan is going to get, it would be rather difficult to give all those details. But I will say this much that Pakistan is getting arms which will strengthen her Army, is getting arms which will strengthen her Navy, and is getting arms which will

strengthen her Air Force. Pakistan is getting arms which may not be used for defensive purposes only, but these arms may be used for offensive purposes also, and the arms that Pakistan is getting are less likely to be used in the western direction and more likely to be used in the eastern direction.

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA PANT: And inside the country also.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Now, as far as the sophisticated air defence system is concerned, it means so many things, the electronic system, radar, and all those things.

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA PANT: But I have asked a specific question.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Well, Pakistan may or may not get it. Even without getting it, Pakistan may, at the appropriate time, at the appropriate moment, get it from the country which is supplying her arms.

Now, as far as the time-frame is concerned, we feel that all these weapons are going to reach Pakistan very soon, in the very near future. Now, supply of Mirage and the visit of our Prime Minister to France: I must say, Sir, that our Prime Minister had gone to France to build a bridge of friendship, rather for strengthening the bridge of friendship that we have with France. She was more interested in talking about the world situation, the conditions existing in the world, the conditions in the different parts of the world, conditions in the different regions of the world. She talked about the development of the developing countries, the assistance that could be given to the developing countries, the exchange of technological and scientific knowledge and about all such things. She was not interested in talking about the Mirage deal or any one deal or another. So, there is no question of any deal having been concluded when the Prime Minister was in France.

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA PANT: That is incidental. But has it been clinched?

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Well, as far as my knowledge goes, that was not even discussed.

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA PANT: Has it now been clinched? That is the question.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Well, I must say that we are having a look at it and we are certainly considering the question of acquisition of Mirage. But nothing is concluded. We are in the process of negotiation. When will it reach? Well, it is difficult to say as to when it will reach, because that can be said only after the contract is concluded or after the finality is given to the discussions.

It is a very pertinent point as to how the gap of vulnerability will be bridged. The greatest asset with us is the will-power that we have. And then, we would like to use all that is available with us to tide over the difficulty that may arise is this interim period. Our effort would be to have all that is necessary for protecting our interests against the sophisticated weapons also that may be used against us. But if we do not have things with us, then we have to use, in a different manner, and using our skill and the technology, all we have with us, so as to tide over the difficulty.. That is all I can say about this thing.

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA PANT: Why don't call F-16 as "paper tiger"? (*Interruptions*).

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Somebody said that we have become the greatest salesmen of this thing, F-16. It is not like that. We have seen how F-16 can be used, how F-16 can be used against another country, for what purpose and with what consequence. It is known to us that Pakistan has been more responsible for painting a real picture of F-16 and the quality of F-16. But I am sure, with the skill that we have

which is the main instrument both of defence or offence... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: It is a crucial question—the gap of vulnerability. I do not find from your answer that we will fill that gap by will-power re-assuring. I do not think I am lacking in will-power.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: I have said something more than that. Probably the second thing which I said you did not hear.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Possibly.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: I have said that the instruments which are with us we will use in such a skilful manner as to tide over the difficulty. If we do not have anything, we do not lose heart; we use the instruments that are with us. We will use them in different configurations in different manner, in a skilful manner...

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Thank you very much.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: We just do not throw our hands up in the air, saying: Well, we cannot do anything.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: But it is not convincing.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: What more convincing answer can I give? We are confident of tiding over the difficulty. (*Interruptions*). I have said that we have instruments with us. We will use these instruments in a skilful manner in different configurations, to bridge the gap. (*Interruptions*).

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE (West Bengal): That may not... (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You reply to Mr. Pant. Do not be misled by his observations.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: As far as the nuclear capacity of Pakistan is concerned, the situation is really not

[Shri Shivraj V. Patil]

very soothing. Pakistan can have the nuclear capability at any time. All that we know goes to show that that country is trying to acquire that capability, and is likely to acquire that capability. Now, as far as the global situation is concerned, when I say that the global situation is not propitious, I say this with full responsibility. In the few months that have passed, things have happened in the world which are really not helpful for maintaining peace. We have seen F-16 being used. We have seen aeroplanes fired at. We have seen people talking in terms of neutron bomb, and so on. And I am really very apprehensive that probably the world may be successful in containing big wars but may not be successful in containing small wars. Nobody seems to be trying to stop the wars which are not really big. And that is very dangerous for the countries which are developing, for the countries which are trying to overcome their difficulties.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have covered all the points.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: So far as creating public opinion is concerned, we do believe that those who think in the right manner in different parts of the world will be successful in creating the right atmosphere; in the Government offices also, and the people who are holding the responsibility also. Now, as far as no-war pact is concerned, the Simla Agreement says that all the disputes will be decided by discussions; it includes everything. But if a country is saying that a particular kind of territory whether it belongs to this country or that country will not be decided by discussions alone and it may be decided by any other means also, that is a different matter. Now, we are for deciding the disputes by discussion. We are not for deciding any dispute by making use of weapons. Now this no-war pact is there in the soil, it is there in our thinking, it is

there in our policy, it is there in the pacts which we have entered into. It is not necessary to specify that this is a no-war pact and that is a no-war pact. It is a way of life with us.

REFERENCE TO THE REPORTED BOMB EXPLOSION IN GURDWARA GURDARSHAN PRAKASH AT MEHTA CHOWK, NEAR AMRITSAR KILLING THREE PERSONS

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Special mention by Dr. Siddhu.

DR. M. M. S. SIDDHU (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I thank you for giving me an opportunity to draw the attention of the Government to an explosion in Gurdarshan Prakash Gurdwara at Mehta Chowk. Sir, any explosion of any form in any religious place should be condemned whether it comes from outside or it is from inside, whether it was planted or it was there as part of the chain of explosions which have taken place in Punjab. I leave it for the Government, and only after investigation it will be known what the fact is. Sir, I offer my heartfelt sympathies to those who are killed. But there are a few points which this incident raises. One point is, has any person the right not to allow the police to get into that place or ban the entry of the police for two or three hours? The incident took place, according to the press, at 12-30 p.m. And the police in Plain clothes could reach only at 4 p.m. Then again it is reported that the Superintendent of Police, Mr. A. S. Atwal, was allowed in after 6 p.m. Now, I would like the Government to come forward and tell us, who reigns and who rules? Is it within the power of anybody to say that the police should not reach the site of the crime and during that time the evidence be destroyed? Sir, if has been stated that the area of the crime was not cordoned off, pending the arrival of the bomb and explosives experts. Even the bodies have not been taken over by the police. More-