

श्री लाल आडवाणी : मदरलैंड और आर्गनाजर का केस उनके सामने है।

SHRIMATI SUMITRA G. KULKARNI : We continue our advertisements. And that is the reason why it is being published also. We are happy that it is published . . .

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI : This is the way in which you try to squeeze the press muzzle the press. You may not jail the Editor, but you do it in other ways.

SHRIMATI SUMITRA G. KULKARNI : This continuous allegation that there is no freedom of the press is not true. If such papers are coming out, it means that there is freedom. Why should you deny something which is so obviously visible to everyone of us. And we are participating also in that.

Then I was surprised that Mr. Advani should have brought up again the licence issue. The licence issue was there last time. Can't we rise above this kind of thing, this obsession?

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI : No, I brought it up because it was said that any MP can be there and I can also be there. (Interruptions)

SHRIMATI SUMITRA G. KULKARNI : It is not in good taste. So, my submission is that this fear that our press is being muzzled or is being undermined surreptitiously should be totally banished from our mind, and we should have no hesitation in passing this Press Council Bill that has been brought by the Government. I would also like to submit to the hon. Minister that the report of the informal Committee of MPs should be expedited. Particularly when gentlemen like Mr. Bhupesh Gupta are there to preserve the freedom of the press, why should there be any delay about what the formation of the nomination committee or the machinery should be? If anything we should be going about it more quickly. I am surprised that in spite of his being there, they are not exerting themselves. So, my request is that it should be expedited.

Before the session is over, we should have the regular Act so that we do not require these stop-gap arrangements. And nobody should have this fear that the press is being muzzled in this country. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The House stands adjourned till 2-15 p.m.

The House then adjourned for lunch at fifteen minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at sixteen minutes past two of the clock, Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair.

CALLING ATTENTION TO A MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

Reported Decision of U. S. Government to Resume Arms Supply to Pakistan

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (उत्तर प्रदेश) : सभा प्रति जी, संयुक्त राज्य अमरीका की सरकार द्वारा पाकिस्तान को हथियारों की सप्लाई पुनः आरम्भ करने के कथित निर्णय तथा उस पर भारत सरकार की प्रतिक्रिया की ओर मैं विदेश मंत्री का ध्यान आकर्षित करता हूँ।

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir. Government of India has received reports that the United States is considering the possibility of resuming arms supplies to Pakistan. Press despatches from Washington and Islamabad have also hinted that the 10-year old American arms embargo may be lifted and that the United States may supply sophisticated weapons to Pakistan. According to our information, this question was also discussed during Prime Minister Bhutto's official visit to Washington on 5th and 6th February although no decision has been announced.

The Government of India views the supply of American weapons to Pakistan with grave concern as it will have serious

[Shri Y. B. Chavan]

repercussions on the peace and stability of sub-continent. We have taken up this matter with the U.S. Government at the highest level and have brought to its attention the consequences of the reversal of their present policy on the process of normalisation on the sub-continent. On 28th January, I addressed a letter to the Secretary of State on this subject and conveyed to him our deep concern about the harmful effects of arms supplies to Pakistan on the peace of this region as well as on Indo-American relations. I particularly emphasised that Pakistan's fears about a military threat from India are wholly fanciful and unwarranted as both India and Pakistan are committed in the Simla Agreement to work for friendly and harmonious relationship and the establishment of durable peace in the sub-continent and to settle all their differences through peaceful means.

It has always been India's policy to promote peace, stability, cooperation and good-neighbourly relations among the countries of this area on the basis of equality, sovereignty and respect for independence and territorial integrity of all States. Despite the unfortunate past, we have made special efforts to bring about normalisation and reconciliation with Pakistan. Thanks to these efforts, we have succeeded to some extent in improving relations between the two countries in spite of the slow progress in the implementation of the Simla Agreement. These hopeful trends will be jeopardised—and the promise of cooperation replaced by the spectre of confrontation—by an American decision to induct sophisticated weapons into the sub-continent. It will not only create new tension between India and Pakistan but also revive old misgivings about the United States' role in the region.

In recent months, both India and the United States have made sincere efforts to improve their relations. The Secretary of State himself stated while in India last year that the United States does not wish to encourage an arms race in the sub-continent. In view of the past history of the Indo-American relations, it is our earnest

hope that the United States will carefully consider all implications its decision to supply weapons to Pakistan will have on the relations between our two countries. We also trust that the United States Government will not reverse its present policy of non-induction of weapons into the sub-continent as this could not be in the interests of the United States, India, Pakistan, or peace of this region.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : उपसभापति जी, इस प्रस्ताव के तीन पक्ष विशेष हैं—अमरीका, पाकिस्तान और भारत। जहां तक अमरीका का सम्बन्ध है, वह इससे पहले भी 1965 में पाकिस्तान को हथियार देकर और 1971 में बंगला देश के मुक्ति आन्दोलन में अपना 7वां बड़ा भेजकर बहुत बड़ी गलती कर चुका है। अब तीसरी बार यह आग में घी डालने का काम उसने किया है जब पाकिस्तान को अमरीका ने फिर हथियार देने का निर्णय लिया है। अमरीका की इस अमैत्रीपूर्ण कार्रवाई का मैं स्वयं तथा अपने दल की ओर से सबसे पहले तीव्र शब्दों में निन्दा करना चाहता हूँ। लेकिन जब मैं अपने दल शब्द का प्रयोग करता हूँ तो मैं अपने को संकुचित सीमा में बांधता हूँ। मेरा अनुमान यह है कि इस प्रश्न के ऊपर इस सदन में जितने भी दल हैं वे सब एकमत हैं। सदन शब्द को कहकर मैं पूरे देश का प्रतिनिधित्व कर रहा हूँ कि सारा देश इस प्रश्न पर एक राय के स्वर में आवाज देगा और सभी मिलकर तीव्र शब्दों में इस निर्णय की निन्दा करना चाहते हैं। मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि भारत सरकार अपनी ओर से अब या जब उचित समझे एक इस प्रकार का प्रस्ताव इस सदन में और उस सदन में भी लाये और सर्वसम्मति से हमारा यह राय या हमारे निन्दा के शब्द दोनों सदनों की ओर से स्वीकृत होकर उस राष्ट्र को जायें ताकि वह समझ सके कि अमरीका के इस निर्णय के प्रति पूरे देश में कितना रोष और कितना असन्तोष व्याप्त है।

जहां तक 1971 में उसको हथियार मिले हैं—मेरे आंकड़े अगर सही हैं तो—1971 तक, उपसभापति जी, 2,700 मिलियन डालर

के हथियार पाकिस्तान को अमरीका से मिल चुके थे। लेकिन अब जो हथियारों का ऐंथी-मैंट हुआ है, इसमें किसी प्रकार की कोई सीमा नहीं रखी गई जो ये हथियार मिलेंगे वह कितने के होंगे या किस प्रकार के हथियार होंगे। यह शब्द उन्होंने जरूर कहा है कि वह डिफेंसिव आर्म्स होंगे। लेकिन जहां तक मेरी अपनी जानकारी है, डिफेंसिव आर्म्स के ऊपर और ऑफेंसिव आर्म्स के ऊपर कोई विशेष प्रकार का स्विच लगा हुआ नहीं होता डिफेंसिव आर्म्स आक्रमण के लिए प्रयोग नहीं किये जा सकते। इससे पहले भी अमरीका ने जब पाकिस्तान को शस्त्र दिये थे पीड़ित जी उस समय प्रधान मंत्री थे। यहां से विरोध प्रकट किया गया था तो अमरीका ने यह कहा था कि ये जो हथियार पाकिस्तान को हमने दिए हैं वह भारत के विरुद्ध प्रयोग में नहीं आवेंगे। लेकिन हुआ बिल्कुल उल्टा। जब आक्रमण हुआ तो वही हथियार और टैंक भारत के विरुद्ध प्रयोग में लाए गए। तो अमरीका का यह कहना कि डिफेंसिव आर्म्स हैं, रक्षात्मक हथियार हैं, प्रहारात्मक हथियार नहीं हैं यह उपहासास्पद है। अब स्थिति यह है कि अमरीका ने कोई सीमा नहीं रखी है पाकिस्तान को हथियार देने की। लगता है कि पाकिस्तानी आर्मी को अमरीकन शस्त्रों से लैस करने की तैयारी की जा रही है और जैसा स्वयं आपने अपने वक्तव्य में कहा है कि अमरीकी विदेश मंत्री डा. किरीसिंगर जब यहां पर आये थे तो उन्होंने अपनी प्रेस कॉन्फ्रेंस में भी इस बात को कहा था कि पाकिस्तान को हथियार न देने का जो निर्णय 1971 से पहले का हमारा है उस प्रतिबन्ध को हटाने नहीं जा रहे हैं। लेकिन फिर उन्होंने इस प्रकार का निर्णय लिया तो समझ में नहीं आता कि अमरीका ने अपनी बुनियादी नीति में इस प्रकार का महत्वपूर्ण परिवर्तन क्यों किया। हालांकि मैं यह जानता हूँ कि अमरीका ने जब हथियारों पर प्रतिबन्ध लगाया हुआ था उस बीच में भी अमरीका से हथियार पाकिस्तान को आ रहे थे। ईरान से आ रहे थे या सऊदी अरब के माध्यम से आ रहे थे या तुर्की के माध्यम से

आ रहे थे, लेकिन अमरीकी हथियार बराबर उसका प्राप्त होता रहे। अब वह द्वार अमरीका ने सीधा पाकिस्तान के लिए खोला है। मैं यह भी जानता हूँ कि जार्जिन के अन्दर पाकिस्तान का वायुसेना के अधिकारी, उनके पाइलट जार्जिन की एयरफोर्स के साथ मिलकर सैनिक अभ्यास कर रहे हैं। इसकी पृष्ठभूमि में मैं एक बात यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि यह जो महत्वपूर्ण परिवर्तन अमरीकन नीति में है रहे हैं क्या आपने उनकी तह में, उनके मूल में जाने का प्रयास किया है। एक तो यह है कि अमरीकन जो युद्धपोत हैं, अणु शस्त्रों से लैस उसके जहाज हैं और जो डियर्गो गार्शिया से हिन्द महासागर में चक्कर लग रहे हैं, मेरी अपनी जानकारी यह है कि पाकिस्तानी नौसेना के युद्धपोत भी उनके साथ अभ्यास में लगे हुए हैं। मेरी अपनी जानकारी में और समाचार-पत्रों में भी निकला कि अमरीका ने स्वयं अरब देशों में तेल के प्रश्न पर लड़ाई तक की धाकी दी है। दूसरी ओर अमरीका ने पाकिस्तान को सीधे तौर पर हथियार देने का निर्णय किया है। वियतनाम में भी युद्ध विराम की जगह फिर युद्ध की काली घटाए मंडराने लगी हैं। अमरीका पाकिस्तान को हथियार दे कर विश्व युद्ध के कगार की ओर ले जा रहा है, ऐसा लगता है।

दूसरे में आपसे पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इस समाचार में कहां तक सत्यांश है कि पाकिस्तान के साथ जो यह शस्त्रों का समझौता हुआ है, अरब खाड़ी का कोई एक छोटा सा सैनिक अड्डा है मकरान, ऐसा सन्त है इसे अमरीका को प्रयोग करने की अनुमति दी है। शस्त्रों के प्रयोग पर पण्टागन में खासतौर से चर्चा हुई थी। यह तो मैंने अमरीका पक्ष से संबंधित बात कही है अब मैं पाकिस्तान पक्ष से संबंधित बात कहता हूँ।

पाकिस्तान को अमरीका ने कितनी मात्रा में हथियार दिए हैं यह प्रश्न इतना महत्वपूर्ण नहीं है जितना महत्वपूर्ण प्रश्न यह है कि पाकिस्तान को जब-जब अमरीका या बाहर से मदद मिली उस में पाकिस्तान की

[श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री]

क्या स्थिति हुई ? उपसभापति जी, सबसे पहले पाकिस्तान को अमरीका द्वारा सहायता मिली 1954 में, जब आइज़न हावर प्रेज़ीडेंट थे और उस समय शायद गुलाम मुहम्मद फ़ाइम मिनिस्टर थे। अमरीका से सहायता मिलने का सबसे पहला परिणाम यह हुआ पाकिस्तान में ज़्वार भाटा आया और वहाँ की संविधान सभा भंग हुई। एक दूसरा पेंक्ट अमरीका से पाकिस्तान का और हुआ जिसमें पेशावर का हवाई अड्डा प्रयोग के लिये उन्हें देने का निर्णय हुआ। इसका परिणाम यह हुआ कि पाकिस्तान के अन्दर वह शासन समाप्त हुआ और मिलिटरी शासन आया अयूब साहब के हाथ में सत्ता आई। 1963 में जब उन्होंने पाकिस्तान को टैंक देने शुरू किए तब सीक्रेट आर्म्स डिविज़न जो पाकिस्तान का था वह अमरीकन टैंकों के आधार पर बना। इसका परिणाम यह हुआ कि उसने भारत पर आक्रमण किया। चौथी बार 1968 में पाकिस्तान ने रूस से कुछ अपने सम्बन्ध बढ़ाने की कोशिश की। जिस पर रूस ने कहा कि हम कुछ हॉलिकोप्टर दे रहे हैं कोई बड़े हथियार नहीं दे रहे हैं। लेकिन कुछ सहायता उसने रूस से जरूर ली। इसका परिणाम यह हुआ कि अयूब के हाथ से सत्ता हट कर याह्या ख़ां के हाथ में आई। 1970 में थोड़ी सी आंख मिचौली फिर चली वन टाइम एक्सप्लेन के नाम से हथियारों के सिलसिले में। इसका परिणाम यह हुआ कि 71 की लड़ाई हुई। इसके बाद अमरीका का सातवां बड़ा बंगाल की खाड़ी में आया। परिणाम यह हुआ कि बंगला देश मुक्त हुआ लेकिन पाकिस्तान में याह्या ख़ां की छूट्टी हुई और भुट्टो साहब के हाथ में सत्ता आई। जब अमरीकन हथियारों की चर्चा चली उसके बाद पाकिस्तान में एक नया ज़्वार-भाटा आया और बलोचिस्तान में माशिल-ला लागू हुआ, आवासी पार्टी पर प्रतिबंध लगा। खान अब्दुलगफ़्फ़ार ख़ां जो सारे देश के प्रमुख स्वतंत्रता सेनानी हैं उनके भीषण की अटकलें लगाई जा रही हैं। इस तरह से पाकिस्तान में फिर जनतंत्र की समाप्ति की तैयारी हो रही है। मेरा कहना है कि जब जब पाकिस्तान को बाहर से हथियार मिलते

हैं या कोई सहायता मिलती है तो निश्चित रूप से पाकिस्तान में कोई न कोई ज़्वार भाटा आता है।

अब ध्यानाकर्षण प्रस्ताव का दूसरा पक्ष है भारत। इससे संबंधित दो-तीन बातें पूछना चाहता हूँ। पहली बात तो यह कि जो शिमला समझौता हुआ था उस समझौते का ढोल हमारी सरकार ने जोर-जोर से पीटा। उसमें पाकिस्तान ही लाभ में रहा। पाकिस्तान ने अपनी जमीन भी वापस ले ली और 90 हजार से अधिक जो युद्ध बंदी थे वे भी उन्होंने वापस ले लिए और इन दोनों के बाद पाकिस्तान ने जो अपनी आंख बदलनी शुरू की तो भारत सरकार जो जोर-जोर से ढोल पीट रही थी उसके अंदर कुछ कमी आई मेरा कहना यह है कि हमारी विदेश नीति जो आकाशी विदेश नीति है कभी व्यावहारिक विदेश नीति है भी बन पाएगी या नहीं ? इसका दोष स्वर्ण सिंह जो विदेश मंत्री थे उन्हीं के ऊपर है या प्रधान मंत्री पर भी है इन बातों की चर्चा मैं नहीं करना चाहता हूँ। मैं इस बात की चर्चा अवश्य करना चाहता हूँ कि अभी जो पाकिस्तान के साथ हमारा बातचीत का सिलसिला शुरू हुआ इसमें भारत सरकार बराबर यह कह रही है कि पाकिस्तान के साथ हमारे संबंध सामान्य हो रहे हैं और अमरीका से जो कटुता बढ़ गई थी वह दूर हो रही है। लगता है हमारे विदेश मंत्रालय का जो असैसमेंट है वह बहुत गलत है। क्योंकि अमरीकी हथियार पाकिस्तान को मिलने से हमारी विदेश नीति की असफलता निश्चित रूप से सिद्ध होती है।

दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि अमरीका में जो हमारे राजदूत कॉल साहब बैठे हुए हैं जिनके वक्तव्य प्रतीतिदन हमें यहां देखने को मिल जाते हैं, आखिर उनकी उपलब्धियां क्या हैं ? क्या उनका कार्य सिर्फ यही है कि उन्होंने भारत को तीन लाख टन या चार लाख टन गेहूँ दिला दिया ? जब पाकिस्तान को अमरीका द्वारा हथियारों की सप्लाई कर दी कॉल साहब ने उसके एक दिन पहले कहा कि यह संभव नहीं हो सकता है अमरीका की नीति में परिवर्तन आए। इसलिए

में पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आखिर हमारे राजदूत जो अमेरिका में बैठे हुए हैं उनकी उपलब्धियाँ क्या हैं, जब कि इस प्रकार की बातें हो रही हैं ? तीसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे विदेश मंत्री ने कहा कि उन्होंने इस बारे में एक पत्र लिखा है। मैं यह नहीं जानना चाहता कि उस पत्र की भाषा किस प्रकार की है और न ही मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि उस पत्र की भाषा यहाँ पर पढ़कर सुनायी जाए, लेकिन मैं इतना अवश्य कहना चाहता हूँ कि वह एक प्रेम-पत्र तो है नहीं निश्चित रूप से स्नेह-पत्र भी नहीं हो सकता फिर क्या वह असंतोष-पत्र है ? क्या हम यह समझ लें कि वह तिराध-पत्र है ? जब इतना भयंकर कार्य होने जा रहा है और इतने बड़े पैमाने पर हथियारों की सप्लाई हो रही है। इस उप-महाद्वीप में फिर से युद्ध के बादल मंडराने की तैयारी हो रही है तो आप कम से कम हमें इतना आश्वासन तो दें कि जो पत्र उनका गया है उस पत्र के अन्दर इस देश के अन्दर जो असंतोष और रोष है निश्चित रूप से उसकी अभिव्यक्ति उसमें की गई है और इस देश की जनता उसकी निन्दा करती है। यदि ऐसा नहीं तो हम चाहते हैं कि कोई दूसरा पत्र उनका लिखा जाय जो इन दोनों हाउसों की और पूरे देश की भावनाओं का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाला हो।

तीसरी बात मैं अपने वक्तव्य का समाप्ति की ओर ले जाते हुए उपाध्यक्ष जी, यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी सरकार के अन्दर एक ऐसी लाबी भी है जो सरकार पर विशेष रूप से इस प्रकार का दबाव समय-समय पर डालती रहती है कि रक्षा साधनों का काफी विकास हो चुका है। लेकिन मैं चाहता हूँ कि दुनिया की बदलती हुई परिस्थितियों के अन्दर जो तैयारियाँ हो रही हैं उनको भी ध्यान से ध्यान न करें। चीन की निगाह हमारे ऊपर सीधी नहीं है। अमेरिका के अन्दर रूस के विदेश मंत्री बैठकर अपनी बातचीत कर रहे हैं और उधर पाकिस्तान को हथियारों की धड़ाधड़ सप्लाई दे रहे हैं। ऐसी स्थिति में अब समय आ गया है जब आपको थोड़ा सा इस प्रकार के मित्रों की राय से सावधान होने की आवश्यकता है जो हमें

1RSS/74-7

रक्षा साधनों में कमी करने का समय-समय पर परामर्श देते हैं। दूसरी सबसे बड़ी बात है जो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ वह यह कि जहाँ हमें पाकिस्तान को अमेरिका द्वारा दिए जाने वाले हथियारों के संबंध में या चीन द्वारा दिये जा रहे हथियारों के संबंध में असंतोष प्रकट करना चाहिए, निन्दा करनी चाहिए और रोष प्रकट करना चाहिए, साथ ही साथ एक वैकल्पिक मार्ग भी हमें निकालना चाहिए। वह वैकल्पिक मार्ग यह है कि अरब और रूस, इन दोनों कीष्टियों से हमें किसी दूसरे देश पर निर्भर न करना पड़े। जहाँ तक हमारी रक्षा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है, हमें यह नारा बन्द कर देना चाहिए कि हम आणविक शक्ति का शान्तिपूर्ण कार्यों के लिए प्रयोग करेंगे। जब हमारे वैज्ञानिकों के पास वह प्रतिभा है, हमारे देश की इच्छा है और हमारी रक्षा व्यवस्था की यह मांग है और चारों तरफ से इस प्रकार की स्थिति बनती जा रही है तो मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस संबंध में हमें एक स्पष्ट दिशा बताई जाए। जब हमारे वैज्ञानिकों ने आपको आणविक विकास की दृष्टि से एक पूरी शक्ति दे दी है तो अब वह समय आ गया है जब इस देश के अन्दर आणविक शक्ति का विकास रक्षा व्यवस्था की दृष्टि से करना बहुत आवश्यक है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि आप इस संबंध में गम्भीरतापूर्वक विचार कर इस सदन के माध्यम से देशवासियों को कोई उत्तर दें।

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Mr. Deputy Chariman, Sir, Prakash Vir Ji has raised practically all the aspects of this problem and I will briefly deal with all of them one by one. It is not only one party or one Member or this House or the other House, but the entire nation is of one voice in saying that the American arms supply to Pakistan is going to have an adverse effect on the normalisation process that has started in the sub-continent and on the relations between the U.S.A. and India. I have no doubt that America will take note of this one particular aspect of the problem. It is not an ordinary thing and I can assure the hon. Member that the letter that I wrote to him was a letter which gave him a very

[Shri Y. B. Chavan]

clear idea of the strong reaction that this country will have as a whole.

So, there was no question of writing any love letters to anybody in the matter.

The other point that he raised was the American policy in the Indian Ocean and, as a matter of fact, in the entire Asian region, what are its affects going to be and what is our assessment about it. I think it is much better if we see what the factors were which were responsible for these ups and downs in Indo-American relations. And this was basically the fact that they always tried to play a sort of balance of power politics in the sub-continent. They had this idea of parity of military strength between India and Pakistan. When the Secretary of State was here because we know that this is an attitude responsible for this sort of things, we specially raised this particular aspect before him. And he was very categorical in this matter when he spoke about it that it is not the U.S. Government's policy. I am only repeating what he said. He said that they do not any longer believe in this policy of having a balance of power and that there is no question of any parity between the two countries. Then he also said that it is not their intention to start any arms race. And this is the occasion when we will have to test them on this particular matter whether they mean it or not.

Prakash Virji mentioned about the base that is likely to be established at Makran on the Pakistan coast. Well, we have also read about it, heard about it. But at the present moment, I cannot affirm it or reject it as not a fact. But one will have to be careful about it because we see the tendency of having these naval bases all over the Indian Ocean. It is certainly not in the interest of America. It is definitely against the interests of all the littoral countries of the Indian Ocean and, I think, we are to pursue our policy of creating an opinion for treating the Indian Ocean as a peace zone. That is the only effective answer to this particular problem.

Now, coming to the other aspects of the problem, as far as Pakistan is concerned,

Prakash Virji raised certain aspects about the effect of this arms supply to Pakistan. I think he is right that whenever the arms were supplied to Pakistan, they were only used against India. That is our experience in 1965. That is our experience in 1971, and this is going to be the effect of the supply of more sophisticated arms in future. Well, I agree with him that the distinction between defensive arms and offensive arms has not much of a meaning in this particular matter. It is also true that such a supply of arms is not in the interest of Pakistan itself. This is also a thing which Pakistan should realise, and if the Americans want to be friendly in the real interest of Pakistan, they should not tempt them with arms. This is one basic thing which I hope both the U.S. Government and the Pakistan Government also realise. So, far, I see a common approach between me and Prakash Virji. When we come to the other aspects, I must say, we have got different approaches. Because, Simla Agreement was the only right thing to do under the circumstances then. And what does the Simla Agreement say? It is not merely an agreement; it lays down certain new approach as to how to develop relations between these neighbouring countries. If at all we want to avoid the intervention of any third big power, our emphasis will have to be on the bilateral relations and a willingness to sit together and negotiate the problems that may be existing between the two countries. Therefore, this was a right thing. If we say that we do not want to have any bilateral agreement and understanding, then that is an invitation for the third powers to come in with their arms and other temptations. So, the policy of the Government in this matter is not what he said;

आकाशवादी हैं। यह आकाशवादी नहीं, यह पूरी व्यवहारवादी नीति है।

Therefore, I would request the hon. Members that this demand for atom bomb, atomic weapons and nuclear weapons would not be the right policy to follow. It is neither in the interests of India's security nor in the interests of peace in this part of the country. Naturally, we have declared

our intention that we will certainly develop nuclear technology in this country and we will use it for peaceful purposes. That stand is a firm stand and we stand by it.

Shri Prakash Virji made some mention of Shri T. N. Kaul's activities there. Shri Kaul is trying to help relations improve between Indian and the U.S.A. He is doing that as the Ambassador of India. I think that should be the line on which he should work. He has not lost ultimately the interests of India in this particular matter. He has been very careful to warn all the responsible authorities there of the consequences that will follow not only on the Indo-U.S. relations but also on the good neighbourly and good friendly relations of the various countries in this sub-continent in which everybody should be interested.

I think I have practically touched all the questions that he has raised.

SHRI S. G. SARDESAI (Maharashtra) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I have followed the Statement of the hon. Minister for External Affairs very carefully and I will come to that later. First of all, I would like to join my voice and the voice of my party to the previous speaker who has said that this particular decision of the United States Government to lift the embargo on arms supplies to Pakistan deserved the emphatic condemnation of this entire House, of all the sections of this House and the entire people of India and we have no doubt that such condemnation will be there and the condemnation should be clearly there on all the four counts. First of all, if we see some of the recent developments in the Indian Ocean to which I will make some reference later on, it will be seen that this decision of the United States Government is a direct threat to India itself. It is a continuation of the direct threat to India. Secondly, it surely endangers the peace of this entire sub-continent to which the hon. Minister referred. Thirdly, coming at a time when Indo-Pak relations were steadily improving and various kinds of agreements were taking place, it is clearly intended to

queer the pitch for these improved relations and once again to exacerbate the relations between India and Pakistan. And, the fourth count on which also I think we have to speak very bluntly is that it is a downright breach of faith and trust. When Dr. Kissinger was here, he said that the American Government will not encourage any arms race in India. There is not the remotest doubt that it was a fraudulent statement made before us because by no stretch of imagination can anybody say that this kind of supply of arms to Pakistan can go hand in hand with the statement that they do not want in any way to encourage arms race in India. Now, sir, when I speak of the gravity of the situation, I have something else in view also. That this particular decision has undoubtedly been taken, though the hon. Minister's statement did not clearly state so, is obvious for the extremely simple reason that there is no smoke without fire and secondly that in view of this statement what prevented the American Government from making a public statement that no such decision has been taken. Our Ambassador approached the Secretary of State in the United States even before Mr. Bhutto went there and asked him clearly whether the U.S. Government was going to take any such decision and the Secretary of State gave evasive replies which have appeared in the press. So, the very fact that they do not deny these reports clearly establishes that this kind of a decision is already there. Why do I say that the gravity has increased tremendously? I do not think that this particular decision taken by the United States Government can be separated from a series of developments which have taken place in very recent years. It comes as a part of this whole development and inseparably connected. The first and foremost is the question of turning the Indian Ocean into a naval base at Diego Garcia. Despite protests from all the littoral States the American Government has categorically come out with a statement that they are going full steam ahead to turn Diego Garcia into a full naval and army base. There may be no secret about it.

[Shri S. G. Sardesai]

Simultaneously, there is another thing. Mr. Kissinger came here. Immediately when they came here an assurance was given that they will not create any tension. Within weeks after that naval military manoeuvres were made not only in the Indian Ocean but in the Arabian Sea.

Thirdly, the development which has recently drawn the anxiety of the Government of India is the menace posed by the mass supply of arms by the United States to Iran and to all the reactionary Arab regimes. All these things are definitely connected.

Then, again there is a statement of the American President and the Pantagon and these are the same words, that it is the right of the American Government to destabilise any government in the world wherever they feel that the American interests are involved. These kind of statements are made by responsible American leaders.

Then in this connection I should also refer to the statements made by leaders of Bangladesh. All kinds of subversive activities are being indulged in Bangla Desh by American agencies. Nothing is hidden about this. It is in this context that Pakistan is being given more and more arms and I will go still farther and draw your attention to one more fact. I think it is necessary for this Government also to make it clear to the American Government that every act of aggression committed against India by Pakistan after Independence is an aggression by proxy. The fundamental responsibility of all the aggressive acts of Pakistan against India during this regime lies with America because if the Pakistan were not armed so tremendously by them, they would not have been able to commit all this aggression. This aspect also has to be very boldly and bluntly conveyed to the American Government.

There is another thing to which the previous speaker also made a reference and that is also true that whenever America have supplied more and more

arms to Pakistan, it is not just a question that our integrity is involved. They go on resorting to all sorts of activities like the recent developments in Baluchistan and North Frontier. That is also a thing which should cause grave danger. It may sometimes spill over and create problems for us as we had to face problems during the Bangladesh trouble. So the thing which I wanted to say is that this is something which needs a very strong protest and it is exactly from that point of view that I should also like to state that the statement made by the External Minister or the reference made in the Presidential Address of yesterday, is very disappointing. I can very well understand it and I know the position of this Government. We have also supported it but just to say that we are concerned is not enough. In the President's Address it is said:

"We hope that the United States will continue to support the trend towards normalisation on the sub-continent and will not take any steps which may adversely affect it."

On the one hand, according to you, you say that steps have already been taken. This is what you say that such a particular position would amount to such a step and yet we go on saying in the President's Address that "we hope that such steps will not be taken." I think this is not correct. It is not properly brought out. It should have been in a firm, clearer and emphatic language. I think the Government of India has to convey to the United States Government that the assurances given to us by Mr. Kissinger when he was here have been openly violated.

This is what has got to be conveyed to them. If this kind of things continue, then surely India will have to think of what action it should take of defend its own integrity. (*Time bell rings*). In the statement that was made yesterday, you have drawn the attention of the Government of the United States, you have expressed your grave concern and you have expressed your earnest hope. You know

whom you are talking to. These words are not going to have any effect. Let the Government of India convey to them, undoubtedly in a very dignified but clear, stern and unambiguous language, that this is an hostile attitude and inimical act towards India. That is what has got to be conveyed. If not, then I think you are in for the same kind of experience which you have had twice or thrice during the last 25 years.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : The hon. Member has practically expressed his agreement with what Parkash Virji said and I think I have replied to those points. His only complaint seems to be that the words that we have used are not to his satisfaction. If these words are not going to give a clear idea of what we think about it, then I think no words are likely to convey it. We are very categorical about our attitude regarding the supply of arms to Pakistan. It will have an adverse effect on the normalisation process and peace in the entire region. Naturally we have to put it in a language which Governments understand.

SHRI HARSH DEO MALAVIYA (Uttar Pradesh) : At the outset, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to something which appeared in the latest issue of Newsweek with the heading "The Man Who Came to Dinner". It is reported, "Bhutto raised his glass in a champagne toast to host Gerald Ford. This is a beautiful world and we must preserve its beauty." This man is going to preserve the beauty by asking for arms. Further it says, "Indeed, there have already been rumors of a Pakistani agreement to provide the U.S. with an air and naval base on the shore of the Arabian Sea in return for weapons, a proposal that is reportedly supported by the anti-communist Shah." It is a very clear statement. Furthermore, a Persian Gulf diplomat has been quoted as saying, "A neutral Indian Ocean is a joke." Our demand for Indian Ocean as a zone of peace is being considered by them as a joke. As pointed out by the friends opposite, in 1950 the U.S.A. supplied arms to Pakistan which

have been used against India. As far as Mr. Kissinger is concerned, I would like to say with all due respect to him, that I regard him as a double-faced man. There are many stories about him. He has been quoted in the Newsweek as saying when he virtually foreshadowed a new policy in a speech last week, "Pakistan is our only ally in the curious position of being subject to American embargo." On the other hands, he comes to India and says, "We have a different assessment now." When the Chile happenings were going on and Allende was overthrown, Mr. Kissinger stated that they had nothing to do with Chile. Later on, he admitted that President Nixon had granted 11 million or billion dollars to overthrow Allende.

Now, Sir, what I would like to point out is, there are certain facts. Here is the Newsweek. I am only quoting the American sources. In the latest Budget submitted by the President to the U.S. Parliament, the expenditure towards defence purposes is 94 billion dollars. According to the write-up of the Newsweek, what amounts would be given towards supply of arms to their allies and friends, is not indicated. But obviously this Budget of 94 billion dollars is higher than ever; it is the highest ever Budget for defence purposes.

Then, Sir, there are other very disturbing things which I would like to bring to the notice of the hon. Minister. There was a report in the papers that there was reported building-up of F-9 fighter bombers aircrafts by China and clandestinely transferring to Pakistan TU 16 Soviet design long range bombers. The whole thing seems to be concentrated upon India—Diego Garcia, the U.S. naval ships in the Indian Ocean and all kinds of internal troubles. In this context, Sir, I would like to bring to the notice of the hon. Minister the following: A statement by our Prime Minister to *LINK* published in *PATRIOT* of 24th January 1975 in which Mrs. Gandhi very clearly said:

"A formidable combination of anti-Democratic, Anarchist and Destructive

[Shri Harsh Deo Malaviya]

forces...is making a last-ditch stand in the country today."

And furthermore, she said:

"These forces have backing from outside forces who do not like India to be strong and who generally disapprove of many of our policies. They are largely the same classes that supported Hitler in Germany—who seek to sow distrust in democratic and parliamentary institutions, by loudly preaching narrow national chauvinism by recklessly promising all kinds of things."

There have been reports in the Indian papers—we are not in a position to know but there have been reports—this of course the hon. Minister can clarify, that Richard Helms the former Director of the C.I.A. he is presently the U.S. Ambassador to Tehran; he is the master spy of U.S.—made a secret visit to India. He was here. Then there was another report in the papers that William Colby, the present Director of C.I.A. also visited India secretly recently. Also there was report when Kissinger came here that one of his purposes was to coordinate the C.I.A. activities of Nepal, Bangladesh and India. So these are the reports.

Then, Sir, there are certain questions which I would like to put here. There is a book by Victor Manchetti (?) *C.I.A.—cult of intelligence*. This writer served for 14 years in the C.I.A. In that book he has said that in the NEFA area there was a regular American base, in our territory, to train the Tibetan guerilla. I do not know but this is what he has written and this man served the C.I.A. for 14 years. So I would like to point out that there is a very serious situation. But the good point is that there are sensible people in the U.S.A. and I would mention some of them, like Democrats Mansfield, then liberals Frank Church, Philip Hart of Michigan, Walter Mondale of Minnesota, etc., and conservative freshman Robert Morgan, and moderate Walter Huddleston of Kentucky. These are the people who are in the U.S. Senate taking strong objection to supply of arms. They do not want any supply of arms to

Viet-Nam; they do not want U.S.A. to interfere in these parts. This is another information wanted to bring to the notice of the hon. Minister.

Now I would like to ask certain questions. Will the hon. Minister say if he can—I do not know if he can; if he does not know, he need not answer—whether Richard Helms, the former Director of the C.I.A. and now U.S. Ambassador in Tehran, did come to India secretly? Did Mr. Colby come here, the present Director of CIA, the man who said that it is the right of the USA to de-establish governments? He has accepted it.

DR. K. MATHEW KURIAN (Kerala) : It is always done in collusion with the Government.

SHRI HARSH DEO MALAVIYA: Then I would like to know about the letter the Minister has written to U.S. Secretary of state. Have you received any response from that side? If no response has been received, will you write another letter? If any response has been received, I would like to know what it is. Have we also in the same spirit taken up this question with Pakistan? Have we taken the initiative to tell Pakistan that this kind of thing will not be in the best interests of India and Pakistan? Are we taking certain steps in that direction? What is the truth behind the reported supply of Chinese arms to Pakistan? That also I would like to know. My last question is this. Have you considered any proposal to contact these various Senators, who are fighting a very strong battle? They are very important people, democrats Mansfield and Frank Church, etc. Probably he is a Presidential candidate. They are fighting a strong battle against the supply of arms to Pakistan, to the countries of Asia, Vietnam, etc. They are very sensible people. Shall we not approach them also in some way to put forward India's case before these important Senators? Thank you.

Shri Y. B. CHAVAN : Will Sir, the hon. Member has given further his assessment of the effect of US arms supplies to Pakistan

and I think his fears are very justified. I certainly see the contradiction in Dr. Kissinger's statement here and the statement to which he made a reference. Actually what the Prime Minister said in her general statement is the well-considered view of the Government. I do not think I am expected to comment on that. The only piece of information that he asked me is whether the ex-Chief of CIA visited India. My information is that he did visit India in 1973 at the invitation of the then Ambassador of USA, Mr. Moynihan. This visit was known to us. He as the Ambassador at Tehran in Iran met our Foreign Secretary as well. So, it was a known visit. It was not a secret visit.

SHRI HARSH DEO MALAVIYA : What about Mr. Colby, the present Director?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: About the present Director, at the present moment I do not have any information. As far as the visit of Mr. Helms is concerned, as far as the latest period is concerned, this is the information that I have. I am glad that this House is quite aware of the dangers involved in the supply of arms to Pakistan and it is better that the US realises the unanimity of view in this country.

SHRI HARSH DEO MALAVIYA : I wanted to know from you whether you have received any response to the communication you sent to the US Secretary of State. Number two, have you taken up this question with the Pakistan authorities? What about the supply of Chinese arms? Are we going to take up this question with some of these Senators in the USA, whom we can approach? It is a democratic country? We can go and educate them.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : As far as the latter part of the question is concerned, about approaching members of the Senate and Congress, certainly that is being done. We are trying to educate public man in America and public opinion in America. Certainly very constructive and consistent efforts are being made.

SHRI T. V. ANANDAN : (Tamil Nadu) : Why not a deputation of Members of Parliament be sent to the USA?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Now, Sir, his question was about the letter that I wrote. No response as such formally has been received but the main purpose of this letter was this. We thought that, when Mr. Bhutto was visiting America and we found that he was going to raise the problem of arms supplies to Pakistan it was better before Mr. Bhutto reached there, they knew what India's reaction was.

That was the purpose of the letter and that purpose I hope is served.

SHRI HARSH DEO MALAVIYA : What about the Chinese supply?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : We shall consider that matter. About Chinese supply what can you and I do? Chinese views are known to us because they are also there.

SHRI DWIJENDRALAL SEN GUPTA (West Bengal) : I am drawing the attention of the Government to the second part of the Motion—the Government of India's reaction thereto. Shri Prakash Vir Shastri and Shri Sardesai have already expressed their opinion in favour of a decision by this House and that House and of sending the same to the US Government for being apprised of how we feel about this. That is one aspect. I want something more from the Government. It is not a stage where we can rest by sending a resolution, we should be more positive in our attitude and also in action. It will be absolutely our diplomatic defeat if we allow such a thing to happen. Pakistan and America, they are moving in their own interests. We have also our interests involved and we should see how best we protect them. Can't we take a decision of dissociating completely from America for all purposes? Can't we make others our good friends? Recently, a Chinese Minister who was present at the 33rd Table Tennis World Championship at Calcutta for the first time in many years publicly expressed

[Shri Dwijendralal Sen Gupta]

the desire to develop friendship with India. What has been our reaction to that? I think it appeared in the press and the Government has taken note of it. Now, in this balance of power politics, China is a big factor. We have not been able to make China our friend; we have not been able to make America our friend, not for our fault. Only we are depending upon Soviet Russia, and we have, for all purposes been identifying ourselves willy-nilly with Soviet Russia. Now, in this context, how best can we protect our independence from any power bloc? I want a positive direction from the Government.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : This is the positive direction. What more positive direction can I indicate? As far as we are concerned, what we think about it, what reaction will be there and what effect will be there, that we have communicated to them. It is now for the American Government to consider.

SHRI DWIJENDRALAL SEN GUPTA : Is it just protesting and doing nothing else about it? We could send one more letter and do nothing else?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : When we are dealing with Governments, I think this is one way of doing things.

श्री रवी राय (उड़ीसा) : डिप्टी चेंबरमैन साहब, मैं माननीय मंत्री महोदय से इस सिलसिले में यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि पाकिस्तान को आर्म्स सप्लाई करने का सवाल एक बहुत पुराना सवाल है। इसके साथ-साथ मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि यूनाइटेड स्टेट्स द्वारा पाकिस्तान को आर्म्स की सप्लाई की यह सदन निन्दा करता है। लेकिन मैं मंत्री महोदय से यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि अमेरिकी सरकार का जो वर्तमान रुख है, क्या यह कोई नई बात है? मैं यह स्पष्ट कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह सब पिछले एक महीने के अन्दर ही नहीं हुआ है। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या मंत्री महोदय को इस बात की जानकारी है कि सन 1972 के अन्दर दूर तरह का एक सवाल आया था और एक खोज हुई थी जिसमें यह कहा गया था कि—

"Another interesting study is that despite an official order to withhold further supplies, the Department of Defence agencies continued to make spare parts for lethal weapons available for Pakistan."

मेरा यह कहना है कि शुरू से ही यू.एस.ए. का पाकिस्तान के सिलसिले में दो तरह का रवैया रहा है, डबल स्टैंडर्ड जिसको कहते हैं, और हिन्दुस्तान के कंजम्शन के लिए कहा जाता है कि हम लोग उनको हथियार नहीं दे रहे हैं। जो खोज हुई उसमें, बावजूद इसके कि सरकार का यह रुख था कि उनको नहीं देना है लेकिन—

"Another interesting study is that despite an official order to withhold further supplies the Department of Defence continued to make spare parts for lethal weapons for Pakistan."

इसके साथ-साथ मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ, क्या सरकार को यह मालूम है कि एक मिस्टर आहलेंट, जो 1967 में पाकिस्तान में यूनाइटेड स्टेट्स के एम्बेसेडर थे, उनके कथनानुसार 1959 में इस तरह का पाकिस्तान और यूनाइटेड स्टेट्स के बीच में एक करार हुआ जिसके चलते पाकिस्तान को तरह-तरह के आर्म्स और साफिस्टिकेटेड व्हेप्स, लेथल व्हेप्स दिए जाने थे? क्या इस तरह का करार हुआ है, और करार हुआ है तो मैं मंत्री महोदय से वभी जानना चाहता हूँ कि उनकी क्या प्रतिक्रिया थी जब यहाँ मिस्टर किसिंजर पधारे थे और उनका कहना था कि हम हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के बीच में आर्म्स रैस को प्रोत्साहन नहीं देंगे लेकिन उसके साथ-साथ जब वे यहाँ से इस्लामाबाद गए तो वहाँ जाकर कहते थे कि :

"U.S. would give careful consideration to Pakistan's additional requirements about arms."

तो मेरा यह कहना है कि क्या चव्वाण साहब और भारत सरकार इतनी भोली हो गई है कि उन्होंने इंग बान का नोटिस नहीं लिया कि किसिंजर साहब का जो वहाँ इस तरह का

बयान हुआ, जिसमें उन्होंने इतना ही कहा था कि हम आर्म्स रैस को प्रोत्साहन नहीं देंगे लेकिन यहां से इस्लामाबाद चले गए तो दूसरी तरह का बयान दिए हैं। इसी तरह अगस्त 1974 में चव्हाण साहब के सीचिव केवल सिंह वाशिंगटन में कहते हैं कि अभी हम लोग यह मान कर चलते हैं कि आर्म्स देने के सिलसिले में अमरीका का कोई इरादा नहीं है पाकिस्तान की मदद करने का। वैसे तो यह सारा का सारा किस्सा बहुत पहले से है लेकिन बंगला देश के सिलसिले में युद्ध के बाद जो इस तरह का डबल स्टैंडर्ड का रुख अमरीका का हो गया है पाकिस्तान को आर्म्स देने के सिलसिले में, इसमें कोई नयी चीज नहीं है। कीसंजर साहब जो बयान दिए थे उसके खिलाफ चले गए। इसलिए मैं मंत्री महादय से ठांस सवाल पूछना चाहता हूँ, क्योंकि यह कोई नयी चीज नहीं है अमरीका के लिए और हमको लगता है सिर्फ केनेडी को छोड़ कर जितने भी अमरीका के राष्ट्रपति हुए हैं, वे शुरू से ही काश्मीर के प्रश्न को लेकर, दूसरे सवालों को लेकर, हिन्दुस्तान के खिलाफ रुख रखते आए हैं। और अमरीका के स्टेट डिपार्टमेंट का कहना है कि हिन्दुस्तान का जो ऐतराज है यह बहुत पुराना है, फिलहाल हिन्दुस्तान ने पाकिस्तान को यू.एस.ए. जो आर्म्स सप्लाई कर रहा है उसके लिए कोई ऐतराज नहीं किया है, और अभी चव्हाण साहब बता रहे हैं कि अभी जनवरी में हमने उनका चिट्ठी लिखी थी, तो क्या वह जो चिट्ठी लिखी थी क्या उसका अमरीका सरकार ऐतराज के तौर पर आब्जंक्शन की तरह नहीं मान रही है? किस विषय में उस चिट्ठी में लिखा था? मंत्री महादय से मैं चाहता हूँ इस बारे में सदन के सामने सफाई दें।

मेरा एक और सवाल है मंत्री महादय से। उनका कहना है कि हम लोग शिमला अग्री-मेंट को मानते हैं। हमारा यह कहना है कि जो हम लोग रंगीन देश के लोग हैं, हम लोग पिछड़े हुए देश के लोग हैं, और पाकिस्तान भी पिछड़ा हुआ देश है, पाकिस्तान भी रंगीन देश है, तथा पाकिस्तान और साउथ एशिया

के जितने देश हैं आर्थिक दृष्टि से कमजोर हैं डेवलपिंग कंट्रीज की तुलना में और हम लोगों में कोई देश तो अमरीका के ऊपर निर्भर करता है, कोई रूस के ऊपर निर्भर करता है। मैं मंत्री महादय से पूछता हूँ : क्या यह सिर्फ शिमला करार की आरती उतार कर संतुष्ट हो जाएंगे या साउथ एशिया में जो रंगीन देश हैं, या जो हमारे पड़ोसी देश हैं, पाकिस्तान, सिलोन, वर्गा इत्यादि, इन सब देशों की आर्थिक ताकत और उसके साथ-साथ सैनिक ताकत को गठित करने के लिए क्या उनके पास कोई सुभाव है, कोई सोच है, ताकि आगे चलकर फिर हम सब देश रूस और अमरीका के ऊपर निर्भर न करें? इस तरह का कोई सोच क्या भारत सरकार के विदेश विभाग के पास है (समय की घंटी) या जो साउथ एशिया के देश हैं, वे आज इस तरह से मन में संकल्प लें और हम लोगों की आर्थिक ताकत इस तरह से बढ़ जाय ताकि आगे चलकर हम लोग आत्म-निर्भर बन सकें। लेकिन हमारे मंत्री महादय ने कहा है कि कई सालों तक भारतवर्ष और दूसरे साउथ एशिया के देशों को अमरीका और रूस पर निर्भर रहना पड़ेगा क्योंकि इसमें दो राय नहीं है कि खुद को आर्म्स के लिए दूसरों पर निर्भर रहना पड़ता है।

आखिरी सवाल यह है कि यूनाइटेड स्टेट की सरकार यह फैसला कर चुकी है कि पाकिस्तान को आर्म्स दिये जायेंगे, तो इस तरह का जो सोच या ख्याल है, उसके खिलाफ हमारी सरकार क्या कार्यवाही करने जा रही है?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: Sir, the hon. Member made a statement that it is an old attitude of America, which is a fact. Really speaking, because of this attitude of America, we have suffered. I think we had to fight more than two wars and hundreds of our young people have lost their lives in these wars. Therefore, this is something which is not very new to us. That is why the relationship between the USA and India was in a rather low level. It was the desire of the United States to improve relations. Naturally we would be interested to improve the relations if there is a proper response to it.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY (Uttar Pradesh): You overdid the welcome to Kissinger.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: Now you say this!

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: I said it then also. I was the only one to object in categorical terms.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: We welcome when we invite a guest here. We give them the normal welcome. But what we told him is something which is very important and what he told us is very important. We categorically told him what exactly are the causes of this ups-and-downs relationship between the USA and India.

SHRI RABI RAY: Do you think that he went back on his words, went back on the promise which he gave to you?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: If arms supply is made to Pakistan, there is no doubt that he has gone against his words. It will be very obvious. There is no question about it.

DR. K. MATHEW KURIAN: Why do you add the word "if"?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: Because I must go on the declared and stated facts. I am speaking responsibly here. My fears are that possibly it is true. But as long as it is not yet announced, I must go on that basis. They have not yet announced. Therefore, we are still making efforts to see that some wiser counsel will prevail there and they will desist from supplying arms to Pakistan. That is the approach that we have to take. Well, this was the basic point of the hon. Member. Now, if they supply arms, whatever the natural consequences, they will follow. If they do not keep their word, we will take our own positions and see what reasonable thing we can do. What the hon. Member said is right, that ultimately the countries must depend on their own capacity for

production of defence material. In our own country, this is the policy that our Government is following for the last nearly 20 years. And I think this policy has helped us a lot to create the necessary potential for the defence of our country.

DR. VIDYA PRAKASH DUTT (Nominated): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, there can be no two opinions about the grave development that has taken place with the reported U.S. decision to supply arms to Pakistan. I think that we ought to accept the fact that a decision has been taken in the United States and that possibly this decision was taken quite sometime ago to resume arms supplies to Pakistan. A formal statement has been withheld in order to soften and prepare Indian public opinion and public opinion in other countries of the world. The first question that arises is the timing of this decision. Why is it that the United States has chosen this particular time when there was a certain movement forward in the improvement of relations between the United States and India? How is it that that very moment has been chosen for making such a thing public? I would like to ask the hon. Minister: Is it because the United States expects a milder reaction from India in the expectation of this improvement of relations between India and the United States. Is it because they feel that India is going through lot of economic difficulties—many countries are going through such difficulties—and therefore we shall be muted in our response and in our reaction to this arms supply to Pakistan? This is my hunch, my guess and my assessment. I do not know whether Government agrees with this assessment. When Dr. Kissinger was here recently, he said very categorically to all the questions we asked, and some of us put it very bluntly to him about the question of parity between India and Pakistan, that was not the policy of the United States Government to promote an arms race in this sub-continent. But this decision precisely would be designed to promote an arms race between India and Pakistan and there is absolutely no doubt that so far as Pakistan is concerned, this

is the main consideration. On the eve of Mr. Bhutto's visit to the United States, the Karachi Home Service radio broadcast a commentary by Mr. Mohsin Ali in which he made two points. One was that the military imbalance in the sub-continent was a direct invitation to the invasion and dismemberment of Pakistan in 1971, and secondly, the military imbalance in this region neither promotes stability nor peace which are the professed aims of the American foreign policy. In other words, they want that the military balance between India and Pakistan should be of an order which they think is the proper balance. In other words, there will be an arms race. This arms supply will promote an arms race between the two countries. Obviously, the actions of the United States now will stoke the fires of the flame which they said they do not want to further inflame. At the same time, the American spokesman also said that they accepted the new realities in the Indian subcontinent. What are the new realities in the Indian sub-continent? The new reality is not that India is the dominant power in this region. I think it is a very wrong description of the reality. The reality is that there should be no foreign intervention so that Pakistan and India, through bilateral talks and negotiations, find a *modus vivendi* to live together with peace as neighbours. But this reality is not being recognised by the United States.

Another point that I would like to ask of the hon. Minister is about the U.S. motivation. Why is the United States doing it? My friend quoted Dr. Kissinger who talks about the curious case of an ally being unarmed and America. The question arises: Ally against whom? Certainly not against China because China itself is an ally of Pakistan and it is supplying arms to Pakistan. Also certainly not against the Soviet Union because Mr. Bhutto when he went to the Soviet Union recently and before that whenever Pakistan dignitaries visited Soviet Union, have been trying to reassure Moscow that whatever Pakistan has been doing was not directed

against the Soviet Union. So the question arises: Ally against whom? Obviously, it means ally against India or may be some other countries of this region because Pakistan has no intention of being an ally against China or against the Soviet Union.

Then, Sir, what worries me most is that this is not an isolated development. I should like to submit to the hon. Minister that a series of developments are going to take place in the Indian Ocean. In other words, this is a link in the chain of developments that are going to take place. It is not a question of a single base in Diego Garcia. A chain of bases are going to come up in the Indian Ocean. There is a base at the Cape of Good Hope in South Africa. There is a base coming up in Diego Garcia. There is also a base coming up in the Persian Gulf area and there are other bases coming up. Now, there is already a British base in Masrich. Now, negotiations are afoot and the US Government sometime back discussed the use of the airfield by the US military aircraft and the White House spokesman said the US Government was discussing with Oman and Britain about the possible and limited—that is their phraseology and I do not know what "limited" means—Air Force use of a base in Masrich and then there might be a naval base coming up in Pakistan. So, there is a chain of bases coming up to dominate in the Indian Ocean and that is what really worries me. (*Time Bell rings*). Sir, I do not want to take much time. But, in a situation like this, there are two aspects that should cause us concern. Firstly, a question was raised about the ceiling, the quantum, the size, etc. of the arms supply. At the moment, about a hundred or a hundred and fifty million dollars worth of arms is being mentioned. But, when these things are supplied, when these things are put into operation, we know from experience that there are really no limits. It is also said that if you keep the Indian forces that are employed on the northern borders apart, then there is already a certain military parity between India and Pakistan. In that case, it is a question of what effect this

[Dr. Vidya Prakash Dutt]

arms supply will have on the relative strength of the two countries. In other words, it is not only a question of a certain balance being created between Pakistan and India, but, in a way, it may be some imbalance that is being created in favour of Pakistan. I think we have to pursue a dual policy of firmness and flexibility. We have to pursue a policy which extends the hands of friendship to the people of Pakistan, but which, at the same time, also points to the dangers of what Pakistan is trying to do. Of course, we have to meet all eventualities. But if we say that we will meet all eventualities, then there are many question marks that are there because here is one development in which there is going to be a chain of bases dominating in the Indian Ocean and there is going to be another development by which there will be an artificial infusion of military blood and military muscle and we have to see how we are going to meet the situation . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please finish.

DR. VIDYA PRAKASH DUTT: Something was said about the presence of military intelligence agencies. I do not want to exaggerate anything . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please finish.

DR. VIDYA PRAKASH DUTT : But I would like to mention one thing. Two major foreign intelligence agencies were active in Tibet at a time when our relations with China were good and we had not fallen apart with the precise purpose of sowing discord between India and China. Now, Sir, it is not, of course to extenuate the Chinese behaviour subsequently . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I am afraid I have to call the Minister to reply.

DR. VIDYA PRAKASH DUTT: Sir, I would like to submit that this is a dangerous situation and we have to keep all these things in view. I am not against

building up good relations with the US. In fact, we have been trying to improve the relations with the US. But what I am saying is this: what is going to be the general policy of the Government of India in a situation like this and how are we going to meet the situation?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: Sir, basically, I am practically answering the same question in different ways. Ultimately, the basic position is whether America has given up its policy of playing country against country, trying to create balance-of-power tactics and so on. The question is whether they have given up this position or not. If they still have the policy of allies and non-allies, if they adopt the same policy, then we know how to act. I entirely agree with him that our policy is a policy of building up good neighbourly relations with other people and at the same time, we cannot be complacent enough to ignore the dangers involved in the situation and we will certainly have to be vigilant in this matter and take all the necessary measures for the security of the country. This is all that I can say. I do not want to go into the very comprehensive analysis of what happens in the entire Indian Ocean at the present moment. Naturally this can be considered and discussed in a broader debate at some later stage.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Dr. Kurian.

DR. K. MATHEW KURIAN (Kerala): Sir, since you, in your wisdom, have given me the last chance . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: No, it is not the last chance. Mr. Mariswamy is there.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are several more, for your information.

DR. K. MATHEW KURIAN: Please be liberal so far as time is concerned. Sir, . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am sorry I will be very strict.

DR. K. MATHEW KURIAN: Sir, I have listened very carefully to the hon. Minister's statement. But I must say with all frankness that the hon. External Affairs Minister's statement is more or less insipid and vegetarian . . .

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: I object.

DR. K. MATHEW KURIAN: It does not convey the spirit of protest and resentment which this Government ought to have if they are true to national interests. Sir, my suspicion is strengthened by the statement which appeared in 'The Hindu' dated 9th February, 1975. I quote:

"There has been some speculation here (that is, in Washington) that to sweeten the pill for India, Washington would couple its announcement lifting the embargo with an offer of a substantially larger quantity of PL-480 food aid . . ."

Sir, this is the statement. I am sure the hon. Minister will deny this. But the point I would like to make is this. Unless the economic independence of this country is strengthened, foreign policy which is a reflection of domestic policy cannot survive. With a weak economic base, no government will be capable of taking a strong stand *vis-a-vis* American imperialism. Unless the economic independence of this country is strengthened, unless the policy of the Government regarding increasing foreign aid from imperialist countries, increasing collaboration with Americans and increasing private foreign capital inflow—unless these things are reversed and unless the domestic policies are reversed—I am afraid, Government's ability to manoeuvre and Government's ability to influence international events will be reduced.

Sir, when Dr. Kissinger visited India in October last, the Government gave a red carpet reception.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: Right.

DR. K. MATHEW KURIAN: Dr. Kissinger spoke of India's dominant position and its special role in South Asia and the Government of India was taken for a ride. USA has now reversed the issue of arms parity between India and Pakistan. Sir, every one knows that Dr. Kissinger is a very slippery politician and diplomat. After 10 years of embargo, starting from 1965, now the embargo doesn't really exist if one is to take the hon. Minister's statement very seriously. Sir, the Government of India has demonstrated, in my opinion, the capacity to be wise only after the event. Every time the US Government went back on its own pronouncements they came out with a statement. Three months ago, only three months ago, the Government of India was under the Kissinger euphoria. Sir, Mr. T. N. Kaul is on record for stating that the pro-Pakistan tilt in US policy had already changed—this is on record. Mr. T. N. Kaul has been doling out the thoughts of Dr. Henry Kissinger and his *bona fides* and his so-called friendship with India. Despite the embargo, the US Government has supplied to Pakistan, according to my information, 300 armoured personnel carriers some time ago. Did the Government know about this? Sir, at that time the US Government said that it was one time exception to the embargo. But this one time exception to the embargo has now become the rule. There has been really a deception going on at some level which the Government should have understood. The Hindustan Times of 7th February 1975 reports (from Washington):

"The Pakistan Prime Minister, Mr. Z. A. Bhutto, has in his utterances confirmed that the US embargo on the supply of lethal arms to his country is being removed . . .". And that his Government's first priority would be to acquire missiles for the air defence system and anti-tank missiles."

As soon as the embargo is lifted, they are going to ask for missiles for the air defence system and anti-tank missiles. The U.S. intrusion of the Indian Ocean is now a well-known story. The movement of the

[Dr. K. Mathew Kurian]

Seventh Fleet even up to the Persian Gulf, the strengthening of Diego Garcia as a base for U.S. imperialism, the C.I.A.'s Chief's statement that the U.S. had a hand in removing or overthrowing Allende's Government in Chile and President Ford's recent statement that the U.S. has a right to intervene if there is an oil embargo show very clearly the objectives of U.S. imperialism. Apart from exchanging letters, you should take concrete steps in terms of domestic economic policy, foreign capital, foreign aid and foreign trade. Unless this domestic economic structure is freed from the increasing stranglehold of imperialism, our foreign policy against the U.S. will not succeed. I want to know whether the Government is thinking on these lines and whether they are prepared to reverse their policy.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : The hon. Member referred to Mr. Kissinger's visit. Mr. Kissinger was one of the visitors to India and he received the same welcome as any other dignitary would have received. Naturally, when we wanted to discuss with him, we treated him as a guest and we have to treat a guest as a guest. Even at that time I said either in this House or the other House that words were very good and they would be judged by the deeds that followed. There is no question about his taking us for a ride. Naturally, one has to be very circumspect in these matters when we deal with some of the very important issues.

As far as the elementary information that he gave about foreign policy being the natural extension of the domestic economic policy, it is an accepted thing. I would like to tell him that India's foreign policy has been successful. It has been accepted by the people. It is not one party's policy. It is the policy of our nation and, therefore, to that extent it depends on the domestic policy as well. If it is necessary to make any changes in the economic policy, we are doing that. He asked whether we are going to be misled by the economic aid that they are giving. There is

no relation between the economic aid and co-operation that they give us and our attitude towards the arms supply. The U.S. arms supply to Pakistan will be taken as a proof of the continuation of the old policy of U.S.

SHRI N. G. GORAY (Maharashtra): So far as the question of massive arms aid to Pakistan is concerned, I do not think there will be any difference of opinion in this House or even outside. There will be not only consensus but unanimity. We will all join in condemning this American policy. But I would like to raise a few points. It is not only America which is playing a double role. I think many of the major nations are doing the same thing. I think that it is one of the basic policies of America over the years that so far as India is concerned, they do not want it to be a major power in the Indian Ocean or in the Indian sub-continent. And that is why, their persistent effort is to create a balance of power. I think when Mr. Kissinger said that India had become a major power, his immediate concern was to cut India down to size by creating a countervailing force. But everybody is asking for condemnation of America for following this policy. I would like to know: Is the policy that is being followed by China anything else? China also has given massive arms aid to Pakistan. At the same time, we are trying to extend a hand of friendship towards China. They are not only giving aid to Pakistan but they are trying to take the Nagas and the Mizos from here to China, train them, send them back and equip them. This is not only against India. Even so far as Bangladesh is concerned, they are following the same policy. Here you have got double standards. So far as Iran is concerned, the Shah came here and if what as somebody said that we gave a red carpet treatment to Dr. Kissinger is true I suppose, we had given a crimson carpet treatment to the Shah of Iran. But that did not bar the Shah of Iran from joining the naval exercises in the Indian Ocean along with the American fleet.

And Pakistan also joined it. What about Saudi Arabia ? Their Minister, Mr. Yamani, was here. When the Press asked him about Pakistan, Mr. Yamani said, "We are very much concerned with the safety of Pakistan; not only with the safety of Pakistan but with the well-being of the Muslims in India also." So, Sir, I think, we shall have to take all these things into consideration. It is not only America which is doing it but it is China which is also doing it. Iran is following the same policy. So also Saudi Arabia. So, you cannot quarrel with everybody. Therefore, I am satisfied that you have registered your protests. But at the same time, if you say, down with America and that we must be almost abusive so far as America is concerned, then I don't think I agree with you. I think the most important point that was raised was by Mr. Mathew Kurian who said that after all, your foreign policy will be to a very great extent, an extension of your home policy. If you are strong economically in your own country, then you can take a certain posture. Sir, I do not agree with the Foreign Minister when he said that these two things can be completely de-linked, the American aid to Pakistan and their food aid to India. You may say that. But they know that you are not in a position to protest because you are expecting massive food aid from it.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Please do not misinterpret. I never said that you delink them. I said that their economic co-operation has nothing to do and it will not affect our attitude towards the arms supply.

SHRI N. G. GORAY : ... They feel that India may protest but India will have to come to us for wheat. And that is what we are exactly doing. Therefore, I say, strengthening our economic front is one of the proper answers to the American policy that is being followed. This is No. 1.

Secondly, Sir, Prakash Virji raised this question of nuclear armaments. I am not, Sir, a chauvinist. I do not want that we

should manufacture nuclear arms. But, at the same time, I would like to ask Mr. Chavan one thing. Suppose Pakistan goes nuclear tomorrow. So far as China is concerned, it has gone nuclear. We have stuck to our position that we shall not go nuclear. Suppose Pakistan develops it tomorrow. As somebody has described it Pakistan has no inhibitions so far as aid is concerned, so far as arms supply is concerned and so far as foreign relations are concerned. If it goes nuclear would you stick to this position that whether China goes nuclear or whether Pakistan goes nuclear, India will not go nuclear at all ? Therefore, I would say that the time has come when you should say that we are pledged to using atoms for purposes of peace so long as it is possible but we keep the option clear that if our neighbours go on increasing nuclear power, India will also have to reconsider this position.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : The hon. Member has raised some questions which I would certainly like to reply again because he has tried to misinterpret what I said. I said that I have not tried to delink this question but I would certainly like to say that these considerations will not come in the way of the Government of India taking right, strong and purposeful attitude. That is the basic position that I am trying to make out. He then raised the question as to what would be our position *vis-a-vis* other countries ? Well, as far as China is concerned, China not only gives arms to Pakistan but once China invaded our territory also. So, we know what position we have to take in this matter. But, at the same time, we have tried to be flexible and tried to develop good neighbourly relations in the gulf countries. When you yourself say that things are fast developing, you just cannot go on making enemy of everybody and treating everybody as enemy. Naturally our position was that if there is a change of attitude in the U.S.A., we certainly would like to improve our relations but we must see the proof of it. Not only do they not give any proof of it but stick to what they have done

[Shri Y. B. Chavan]

before and naturally we will have to reconsider this matter.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY (Tamil Nadu) : Sir, I stand before you like a true socialist because when I gave my name I had a few points but like a good smaritan I have shared them with my colleagues. Anyway, Sir, let us take a fresh look at the issue. I entirely agree with my hon. friend, Shri N. G. Goray. There was absolutely no friendly relationship between India and the U.S.A. from the very beginning. If at all there was any friendship between us, between India and the U.S.A., it was at the time when Chinese invaded our country and that too lasted for a short period. Either due to our policy or due to their policy we lost it and they looked with suspicion on us and we looked with suspicion on them.

My friend, Mr. Subramanian Swamy has said that we gave a red carpet treatment to Dr. Kissinger. I believe he has forgotten the fact that when Dr. Kissinger was here, there was an interview of the Prime Minister published in the *National Herald* which was not in tune with the red carpet treatment given. So, Sir, we had always a different or double attitude in many matters, as our counterparts had and we accept their attitude and they should accept our attitude.

After this oil embargo by the Arab countries, if we had closely followed the American foreign policy, we would have noticed a drastic shift in the American foreign policy especially after Ford had taken over the Presidency. He had clearly stated that if oil embargo is not lifted, they would resort to arms. There is a serious controversy going on in America and one Professor has come out with a theory that American army, the Seventh Fleet, can capture 400 square miles in the Gulf area, within a period of 12 hours and that they can capture nearly 3/4ths of the entire oil potential of the Arab countries. When the question was asked as to what would happen if the Arabs

destroyed their oil wells, pat came the reply that they would bring back the oil wells to work within a period of two months. It was also said that unlike Vietnam, this is a sandy place without any hillocks and without any dense forests and hence there was no possibility of any guerilla type warfare. That controversy is going on in America and the issue is being discussed. Kissinger had openly said that taking of arms is not ruled out and when Ford was questioned about it, Ford also said that he stood by the statement of the Secretary of State. So, Sir, it is a clear cut policy that America has lost its threat and they now propose to arm Pakistan. Whether it is coming true or not is a different matter but they are bound to give supplies to Pakistan, \$ 1200 million worth of arms. They are going to do it in a subtle way and there is no doubt that they would not do it. I entirely agree with Dr. Mathew Kurian that we should have our own policy. I see no reason why our great Finance Minister, Shri Subramaniam, should go to America with a begging bowl to get one million tonnes of wheat when we are told day in and day out that we are having good rabi crop and we can feed the entire nation. If it was so, why should Mr. Subramaniam go to the U.S.A. ? I do not find any reason in it. This shows that we are having a double standard. We do not want to deal with them firmly. If we had dealt with them firmly they would not have played this sort of game. They said something in September. When Dr. Kissinger came here they changed their attitude in December and they talked about supply of arms to Pakistan. In January we protested and then we may forget the whole affair and may be, Mr. Chavan would be visiting the USA shortly to talk to American Government for some help. I do not know that but we must put an end to, what you may call, running after the American Uncle for help. What will happen to our country even if we do not get one million tonnes of wheat ? Would you starve ? As if we are not starving already ? It will just add a little relief to the starving and that is all. Then, are

there no other countries to supply us wheat or rice ? I am told from a reliable source that nearly 2 million tonnes of rice—I am not talking of paddy—are available in Siam. They are prepared to give rice to us but we are having some phobia, some approach that we should not have anything from Siam.

We must be practical. If you find that the American trend is unfriendly, say it in unequivocal terms. The country would be with you, the whole Opposition would be with you. If we have to maintain our self-respect, our independence, our integrity, we must not hesitate to take action and we have one hundred per cent confidence in Mr. Chavan. He has remained our Defence Minister, he has been our Finance Minister and now he has become our Minister of External Affairs. We are sure he will prove his mettle. I know he is not responsible for this double policy individually. The responsibility should be on the Government entirely. Mr. Sardesai says that the Ministry of External Affairs is very firm and emphatic in its condemnation but he did not find anything in the Rashtrapati's Address. Perhaps he has forgotten the fact that between the South Block and the Rashtrapati Bhawan the distance is of about a mile. So, it will take some more time to have a reflection on it.

So, the point is that we have come to know that the designs of America are not good. They are not only arming Pakistan but having other sinister motives and what should be our attitude ? Should we not take a firm action ?

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY : Sir, with your permission and with the permission of the Minister I would like to draw his attention to a book which will help him and support what Mr. Mariswamy said. The book is "Jack Andersons, The Andersons Papers". I will just read a small paragraph.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : No, no, you have read it.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY : It is very interesting.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : No, no. He has already read it. Let the Minister reply. I have called Mr. Chavan. He has the floor now. (*Interruptions*). You need not read it.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY : It is not my question alone. . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : No, no. It is not a reading exercise here.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY : Then what is it ?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Mariswamy has asked for certain clarifications and let the Minister reply to them.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I would like to make one point clear and that is about the visit of Shri Subramaniam to the USA. He had not gone to the USA with a begging bowl. He had gone to attend the Advisory Council on the International Monetary Fund. Possibly if you think anybody going to the USA only goes with a begging bowl—a sign of inferiority.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY : Did they not negotiate with their counterpart for 1 million tonnes of wheat ?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : He may have incidentally had discussions about it. When you go to any country, naturally you meet the corresponding authority. That is a different matter. But he had not gone for negotiations. These matters are still under negotiation. And no economic aid is going to deter us from taking the right course or the course which is in the interest of the security of the country. He has himself said that he has practically repeated some of the points made by others. He wanted to know whether we are going to be firm. Even today we are very firm in these matters. If there is massive aid or any arms supply to Pakistan, that would mean the same old policy of the USA of

[Shri Y. B. Chavan]

playing the politics of balance of power in the sub-continent. This is the ultimate analysis; that will lead us to this conclusion.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Karnataka): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I would like to know from the hon'ble Minister for External Affairs, after the defeat of Pakistan in 1971 November, is it not a fact that Pakistan has replenished all the losses incurred during that war? And, is it also not a fact that some of the other countries have already supplied enough and more war materials to Pakistan? And added to that, the development of U.S. base in the Diego Garcia and similar bases in the Gulf area, and this reported decision of U.S. Government to supply arms to Pakistan, will not only endanger peace in the sub-continent but it may also endanger the peace in the world itself, and this may lead to Third World War. I would like to know what steps the Government would like to take to prevent the supply of arms to Pakistan by the USA, and when he goes to the USA next month for attending the Indo-American Joint Commission, whether he would impress upon the Secretary of State and the President of the USA that this reported decision of the USA to supply arms should be reversed in the interest of the sub-continent where efforts are being made to stabilise peace in the sub-continent. That will also help in improving the relations existing between the USA and India.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: As I have already said, the present exercise, this Calling Attention and discussion in this House, is really speaking one of the important steps to see that wise counsel prevails upon the US authorities in this matter. If at all I happen to go to the USA—I am not sure of it, though the dates are fixed in the middle of March—and if by that time the decision is not taken, certainly I will try to strongly express the view of this country and see that some wisdom prevails there.

THE PRESS COUNCIL (SECOND AMENDMENT) BILL, 1974—contd.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now we resume discussion on the Press Council (Amendment) Bill.

4 p.m.

श्री रबी राय (उड़ीसा): डिप्टी चैयरमैन सर, यह जो प्रेस काउंसिल एमंडमेंट बिल है, जिसका लाने के लिए गुजराल साहब को आर्डिनेन्स लाना पड़ा उसके सिलसिले में मैं यह सवाल करना चाहता हूँ कि क्या बिना आर्डिनेन्स ला करके डेमोक्रेटिक तरीके से एक बिल वे ला सकते थे या नहीं?

[The Vice-Chairman (Shri Jagdish Prasad Mathur) in the Chair]

यह जो प्रेस काउंसिल बिल आया है इसके सिलसिले में पहला सवाल यह है कि जो एक इनफार्मल कमिटी आफ पार्लियामेंट बनी थी प्रेस काउंसिल के चैयरमैन को नामजद करने के तरीके में परिवर्तन करके सही तरीका सुझाने के लिए क्या कारण है कि अभी तक वह कमिटी अपनी रिपोर्ट नहीं दे पाई है। इस सिलसिले में मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जिस तरीके से सरकार की ओर से प्रेस फ्रीडम पर हमला हो रहा है जो प्रजातंत्र में विश्वास करते हैं, लोकशाही में विश्वास करते हैं वे सब शकित हैं कि क्या इस प्रकार प्रेस की फ्रीडम रह पाएगी। इस विधेयक पर बोलने के पहले राज्याध्यक्ष की अध्यक्षता में '54 में जो प्रेस कमिशन बना था, जिसमें बहुत नामी सज्जन सदस्य थे और जिसकी रिपोर्ट के अनुसार ही यह प्रेस काउंसिल बनी है, उसकी रिपोर्ट से एक उद्धरण मैं आपकी और सदन की खिदमत में पढ़कर सुनाना चाहता हूँ और मैं इसीलिए सुनाना चाहता हूँ कि प्रेस की फ्रीडम की, जो प्रजातंत्र का चौथा पिलर कहा जाता है, जिसे फोर्थ स्टेट कहते हैं, उसकी मौजूदा स्थिति हिन्दुस्तान में क्या है। मैं रिपोर्ट के पेज 517 से पढ़ रहा हूँ—

“The tender plant of democracy can flourish only in an atmosphere where there is a free interchange of views and ideas which one not only has a moral