

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI (Delhi): I think he is not a Member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He is a Member. Whether he is a Member or not, when any reference is made by any paper against any Member, the first thing that he is expected to do is to refer the matter to the Chairman of the Joint Committee. They will consider the matter. If they refer the matter to the House, we will definitely take it up.

REFERENCE TO BREACH OF PRIVILEGE MOTION AGAINST THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE

श्री भैरों सिंह शेखावत (मध्य प्रदेश) : सभापति महोदय, हमने एक विशेषाधिकार के प्रस्ताव की सूचना कल दी थी रक्षा मंत्री श्री स्वर्ण सिंह के विरुद्ध। इस सदन को जानकारी है कि दिनांक 17 को एक ध्यानाकर्षण प्रस्ताव इस सदन की चर्चा के लिए रखा गया था कि दो स्क्वेड्रन वाइलिंग्स फाइंड इन्फरमेशन विदेशों को देते हुए पकड़े गए। उनमें से एक व्यक्ति को सजा मिली और दूसरे व्यक्ति को छोड़ दिया गया। इस प्रश्न के संबंध में सभापति महोदय, इसी सदन में श्री लोक नाथ मिश्र ने स्पष्ट रूप से यह पूछा था, मैं कोर्ट करके बताना चाहता हूँ :

"Shri Lokanath Misra: This has to be taken into consideration. But the hon. Member has tried to play down the incident very efficiently. Sir, I would like to know certain things very specifically. He has tried to avoid the basic question whether the two gentlemen who indulged in these activities and who are from Soviet Union, belonged to the KGB, or they belonged to the Soviet Embassy in India, or they were only private citizens of Soviet Union, because there are no free citizens there. Has the Gov-

ernment of India lodged any kind of complaint with the Government of Soviet Union?"

इसका जवाब सरदारजी ने यह दिया है

"Sardar Swaran Singh: Perhaps the basis on which he framed his rather elaborate question is not there and, therefore, I need not pursue this matter at all. Then, he put what he called basic questions or key questions. He asked as to whether all these persons belonged to any particular service or any particular branch. I would like to say quite clearly that they were not private citizens. Which particular class they belong to, I do not know."

सभापति महोदय, इसके बाद जिस आई० ए० एस० आफिसर ने दिल्ली हाई कोर्ट में याचिका दी है उस याचिका के शब्दों को मैं आपको पढ़कर सुनाना चाहता हूँ। याचिका में लिखा है कि—

"On the afternoon of October 31 last, Wing Commander Agharkar, Air Force Intelligence Director, sent for the petitioner to his office at Vayu Bhavan and confronted him with an accusation that he had been instrumental in causing security leakage on vital defence information to one Major I. V. Kanavsky, Assistant Military Naval and Air Attache of the Embassy of the U.S.S.R. at New Delhi."

इस संबंध में मेरा कहना यह है कि सरदार जी को उस वक्त जानकारी थी और उन्होंने इन प्रोसीडिंग्स को भी देखा होगा, लेकिन बावजूद मेंबरों के बार-बार इंसिस्ट करने के कि क्या ये लोग के० जी० वी० या सोवियत एम्बेसी से संबंधित थे, इस बारे में कोई इन्फार्मेशन नहीं दी गई और इस प्रकार कोई इन्फार्मेशन न देकर उन्होंने हाउस का ब्रंच आफ प्रिविलेज किया है और इसलिए मैंने यह मोशन आपके सामने रखा है।

MR. CHAIRMAN: In fact, I have not allowed the breach of privilege to be moved. But since the hon'ble Minister is here it is better that he clarifies so that the Member is satisfied and the House should be clear about his views.

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SARDAR SWARAN SINGH): I am grateful to you for giving me this opportunity to clarify the point. The first thing is that it is quite interesting that while the questioner was hon'ble Shri Lokanath Misra who is apparently satisfied with my reply, Mr. Shekhawat somehow or the other feels that I gave a wrong reply to Mr. Misra....

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY (Uttar Pradesh): We are more thorough.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I know. I would like to say that Mr. Lokanath Misra apparently did not take it up but Mr. Shekhawat has raised this matter. This is one aspect which I would like to place before this honourable House.

Then, Sir, he has read out a statement but he is not able to point out as to which part in my statement, according to him, is incorrect. To recaptulate, the question that was framed was in three parts. He said, "Coming back to the question, it will be found, Sir, whether these two gentlemen who indulged in these activities and who are from the Soviet Union" I never contradicted it because everybody knows that they are from the Soviet Union.

".... belong to the K.G.B."

to which I said I do not know, and I do not know even today. And from the statement of the petitioners before the High Court that he has read out, all that he has said is that one Major Kanavsky is involved. But wherefrom does he take that he is from the K.G.B. or from which other branch?

SHRI BHAIRON SINGH SHEKHAWAT: He is from the Soviet Embassy.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: He wanted to know whether he belongs to the K.G.B. and I said I do not know. I do not know even now because I think the hon'ble Member with his experience should know....

श्री राजनारायण (- त्त प्रदेश) : श्रीमन्, मेरा कहना यह है कि अगर मंत्री जी इनएफिसिएंट (अयोग्य) है तो इस्तीफा दे कर घर चले जाये ।

सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह : अगर आप का बस चलता तो यह बहुत अर्घ पहले हो गया होता ।

श्री राजनारायण : मैं यह पूछता हूँ कि क्या आपने इनके बारे में जानने की कोशिश की ?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Coming back to this specific question that was asked whether they belong to the K.G.B., even now I say I do not know. His question reads:—

"....whether the two gentlemen who indulged in these activities and who are from Soviet Union, belonged to the KGB, or they belonged to the Soviet Union, because there are no free citizens there."

Then it was asked to which particular branch they belonged. I never said that they do not belong to the Soviet Embassy. It is true that the name of the person was Major Kanavsky and he was an Assistant Military Adviser. Even now I cannot say, nobody can say, whether they belong to KGB or to which other branch they belong. So I do not see what objection the hon. Member has about what I stated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This clarification was needed from the Government. You have given that clarification. He wanted to know it.

श्री भैरों सिंह शेखावत : श्रीमन्, क्वेश्चन यह है कि क्या उस समय माननीय मंत्री को यह जानकारी थी कि नहीं थी, या यह कि उस जानकारी को उन्होंने सप्रेस किया ?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Whatever information he could gather, he has been able to place before the House.

श्री भैरों सिंह शेखावत : वह तो ठीक है लेकिन जिस समय वक्तव्य दिया गया क्या उस समय उनकी जानकारी में था या नहीं था ?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: What I said was, and I repeat again, that I did not know on that day to which particular branch of the Soviet Embassy he belonged. (Interruption) Mr. Bhairon Singh, you are an experienced man. You should first care to listen to me.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: We have much experience with you.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I know. Therefore, you should learn from that experience. Now, the question that was asked was as to which branch of the Soviet Embassy he belonged to, which I said 'I have no information'. I have now made enquiries and I find that his designation was 'Assistant Military Adviser'. At that time I had no information as to which branch of the Embassy he belonged. I do not see what is the point for me to suppress; if I did not know to which particular branch of the Soviet Embassy he belonged, I cannot be forced to say that I knew that he belonged to a particular branch of the Soviet Embassy.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: We cannot believe that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, next item. Prof. Nurul Hasan.

श्री भैरों सिंह शेखावत : श्रीमन्, सिर्फ एक मिनट में पूछ लेने दीजिए । श्री लोकनाथ मिश्र ने स्पष्ट शब्दों में दूसरा क्वेश्चन किया :

"Do these people belong to the diplomatic cadre?"

इसलिए यह पूछा था वह पूछा था, यह प्रश्न नहीं है । आपसे बिल्कुल स्पष्ट पूछा गया था कि वह डिप्लोमेटिक काडर के है या नहीं है और सोवियत एम्बेसी के थे । आप यह नहीं कह सकते कि मेरी जानकारी में नहीं था । अच्छा होता उसी समय सदन में इस जानकारी को दे देते तो कोई रूस वाले नाराज हो जाते, इस प्रकार की स्थिति नहीं होती ।

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Sir, I would like to assure him that I am more afraid of his being annoyed; I am not afraid of any foreign government being annoyed with me. But I would like to repeat that he was present in the House and he himself put long questions and I tried to answer them to the best of my ability. If he was not satisfied and he wanted me to amplify something, he could have easily got up and asked me and I could have clarified. Now, if he did not get up on that day—Mr. Misra even to-day does not object—I do not see what his objection is now. If he had wanted that I should clarify, he could have got up and I could have clarified. (Interruption) I thought I was clarifying. If there was any further point, I could have made a further statement.