

with conviction. In his death we deeply mourn the loss of an esteemed colleague.

I shall now request Members to stand up and observe a minute's silence as a mark of respect to the memory of Shri G.P. Somasundaram.

(Hon. Members then stood in silence for one minute).

Secretary will convey to the members of the bereaved family our deep sense of sorrow and sympathy.

SHRI G. A. APPAN (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Chairman, Sir, as he was a sitting Member and a revered Member of this House I request the House and the Chair to please adjourn the House for the remaining portion of the day.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is not the practice, Mr. Appan.

Now, Calling Attention.

CALLING ATTENTION TO A MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

CONTINUED U.S. ARMS SUPPLY TO PAKISTAN AND IMPLICATIONS THEREOF

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, before I take up this thing, I should like to have your direction. This question was discussed in the other House during the period when we were not in session as a regular debate. Now, Sir, just a discussion on Calling Attention is not adequate. May I suggest therefore that this Calling Attention be transformed into a motion for discussion rather than a mere calling attention? As you know, Sardar Swaran Singh made a statement in this House but we could not discuss it because the same day we adjourned. The other House discussed it and a lot of time was given to it and I do not see why we should not also get an opportunity for a thorough discussion on his statement and subsequent developments. Therefore my request to you is that this Calling Attention should, as we have done in the past, be transformed into a motion for discussion.

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I also support the contention of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. Several things have taken place in the last few days; major events have taken place as far as the world is concerned and we should have a full-dress debate on all these issues. As far as the United States and Pakistan are concerned there have

been new developments with regard to China also and therefore it would be in the fitness of things that we have a full discussion and not just this Calling Attention.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I follow.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT (Haryana): We should have the Calling Attention plus a debate also. This Calling Attention should be gone through and we should also have a debate.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND IN THE MINISTRY OF SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT/
(SHRI

संसदीय कार्य

विभाग तथा नौवहन और परिवहन मंत्रालय में
राज्य मंत्री

OM MEHTA): Let this be gone through and then we will try to find some time for a short duration discussion.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal) : What is 'some time'? We must have it today.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is not a question of finding some time; it should be done as soon as possible, today or tomorrow.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You see it can be easily done today. The subject of the Calling Attention is the same; it can be converted into a motion for discussion as had been done in the past. Why again go through all this?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I want to make one suggestion. I suggest that after the Bills are disposed of, this may be taken up as a Short Duration Discussion today.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS/विदेश मंत्री (SARDAR SWARAN SINGH): I would crave the indulgence of this House because the Demand relating to the Ministry of External Affairs is coming up for discussion in the other House today. These dates are already fixed and both today as well as tomorrow I will be busy in the other House. I do not want to come in the way of your decision for arranging a Short Duration Discussion. But I will not be available today and tomorrow.

SHRI BHUPESI GUPTA: If he is not here, there is no point. I understand the hon. Minister will not be replying to the debate in the other House today. He will be only listening to the debate. It is important for him to listen to the speeches, I agree....

SHRT NIREN GHOSH: The Bills that are there are regarding Gujarat and Punjab.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I suggest 'hat this be discussed today as the hon. Minister will not be replying in the other House today.

SHRI OM MEHTA: It is entirely for the House to decide.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The calling attention should come. I beg to call the attention of the Minister of External Affairs to the continued arms supply by the Government of U.S.A. to Pakistan and the implications thereof.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Gurupadaswamy wants to say something.

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY): I just want to say that today may not be utilized for a general debate on this issue. I would like that a separate day may be fixed for this. This motion, as he has started it, may be gone through, but the general question may not be taken up today.

MR. CHAIRMAN : That will be considered. In the meantime this will go on.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I have already called his attention.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Sir, I regret to inform the House that since the issue of shipment of American arms to Pakistan was discussed last in this House, there has been no change in U.S. policy. On the contrary, it has come to our notice that U.S. Military equipment still in the pipeline for delivery to Pakistan may be even more than has been publicly admitted by the U.S. Government. While the U.S. State Department spokesman mentioned on July 8, 1971 that the average approximate annual figure for the last five years of supply of arms to Pakistan has been in the order of \$ 10 to 15 million, Senator Church quoted an estimated figure of \$35 million, in respect of military equipment still in the pipeline. We have reason to believe that his figure is nearer to the correct one. In any case amounts in Dollars alone do not give a correct picture. As we know, Pakistan has been in the past obtaining equipment from certain governmental sources at throw-away prices. Spare parts which may cost very little can reactivate deadly weapons.

I would like to assure the House that our views on the supply of arms to Pakistan have

been conveyed in unequivocal terms to the United States Government. We have explained to them the adverse impact it could have on the peace and stability of the subcontinent. It could have an impact on Indo-US bilateral relations as well. It is surprising that the US Government which has been counselling restraint it to us should have itself taken a measure which will aggravate the situation.

The supply of arms by any country to Pakistan in the present context amounts to condonation of genocide in Bangla Desh and encouragement to the continuation of atrocities by the military rulers of Pakistan. It also amounts to intervention on the side of the military rulers of West Pakistan against the people of Bangla Desh.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We have been very carefully following the statement made by the hon. Minister apart from what has appeared in the newspaper from the side of the United States of America. I must say that we remain disappointed by the manner in which the hon. Minister has reacted to these things. Sir, first of all, even now he has said that the supply of arms to Pakistan in the present situation is a condonation. He would never use the word 'abets'. Yet, Sir, arms are being supplied for the act of committing the crime of genocide there and the USA is acting as the principal in this second degree in aiding that genocide and still, he says, it is 'condonation'. I am surprised that the Government does not have the courage to say that it is a direct help and abetment to the criminal act of genocide. It is a violation of the International Convention on Genocide, the UN Charter and the Human Rights Charter, thereby making the US guilty of violation of these International laws. Sir, now what is the assessment of the Government, political, military and otherwise, of the present step by the United States of America of the supply of arms in the present situation to Pakistan? That assessment has not been made. Sir, is it not a fact that since the US-Pak military pact was signed in 1954, just with a view to facilitating the ouster of the Fazlul Haq Government after the East Bengal Elections—a Government of which Sheikh Mujibur Rahman was also a Minister—US military hardware worth about 2500 million dollars nearly Rs. 2000 thousand crores—have been sent to Pakistan?

Is it not a fact that even though there was a so-called embargo at the time of Indo-Pakistan War in 1965 the US were still supply-

ing arms through Iran, Turkey, West Germany and other countries of the CENTO and the NATO in order to replenish the armaments of the Pakistani forces? Sir, in the present situation we find that it has been continuing ever since 1966; now it has been stepped up.

In today's newspaper we read that the Padma is carrying cannons also, not merely spares and other things. In this connection, I should like to know the policy of the Government. He has said, 35 million dollars in the pipeline, as one of the Senators has stated. It is much more. But the significant part of it he has not mentioned. Now, it is known that these things are not part of "slippage" an American expression, or 'bureaucratic bungling', another American expression. The supplies are being made on orders from President Nixon himself. This is what has been disclosed in the American Senate by the Senator from Idaho, and it has not been since denied. In fact, the State Department has more or less admitted that President Nixon's orders are responsible for the supply of these arms. Arms are being given to Pakistan at throw-away prices. It is no price at all. It is a nominal price. It is like a director getting a salary of Re. 1 per month. It is like that. Arms have been gifted to Pakistan by the Americans. In such a situation, I should like to know what is the policy of the Government. Is it not a fact that it is an abutment of the genocide there and, apart from that, provocation of war against India? And with the supplies of arms arriving at the Bangla Desh borders, we find bellicosity on the part of the West Pakistan troops rising every day. I come from Calcutta, everybody is saying that as Pakistan is getting arms from the US, the troops on the other side are being more and more bellicose and developing provocative action including shell-fire into our territory. This is happening, Sir. I am a little surprised. Here, the hon. Minister made a statement in which he has made an assessment of the United States thing. What he has said here is rather interesting—

"As a result of my talks with the Governments of countries visited by me, the following areas of agreement emerged:

- (1) That there could be no Military solution and all Military action in East Bengal must stop immediately."

On your arrival here you told Parliament, we were told, that America is giving more

arms for the continuance of the military action.

The second item of area of agreement is—

- "(2) That the flow of refugees into India from East Bengal must stop immediately."

The next day the Americans made it known that arms will go and that they were justified in supplying the arms.

That does not stop the flow of refugees. It increases the flow of refugees. Yesterday I found out in Calcutta that the refugees in West Bengal are coming at the rate of 30,000 per day even now.

The third item, according to his statement, is that conditions must be created for the return of refugees. Are the Americans creating conditions for the return of the refugees by giving arms to butcher Yahya Khan's Military junta?

The fourth item in his statement is political solution. The other day a statement was made here in this House and on the 28th June Mr. Yahya Khan made his broadcast and he told the world the kind of solution he wants. I do not wish to go into this thing. Even after that, the Americans made a special point to make it known to the world what kind of things they were supplying to Pakistan. Is that the way a political solution would be found?

The fifth item is that the situation is fraught with grave danger to the peace and security. Now American arms are coming to maintain peace and security here. Now what is the remedy for us? Here is the statement of the Minister made in this House. We will have our full say when a full-dress debate takes place. But the hon'ble Minister was misleading the House. He has no business to tell us that America has come to this kind of agreement. If he has the courage he should declare that he has been bluffed and swindled by the Americans.

Sir, what is more shocking is that along with the statement he made on the 25th of June, the spokesman of the State Department, immediately following their meeting, issued a statement which did not warrant what the Minister said in Parliament here. Therefore I charge the Government with some kind of connivance, with having no courage to speak to the Americans that they are endangering the peace and security of this region. I should

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta] like to know why even now he is not saying that this is an act not only for the suppression of the struggle of the people of Bangla Desh, but the arms supplies are meant against India also. It causes war provocation. It is provoking the West Pakistani troops to start military actions. Provocations are coming from the other side of our borders. Therefore, whereas his assessment is neither a political assessment nor an economic assessment, the Americans are giving so much aid. *(Time bell rings.)* I am finishing.

The Government should rectify its position. I would urge upon the Government to develop a little courage and not just be led by the brief given by Mr. L.K. Jha who is a thorough unfit as our Ambassador in the United States of America. His performance makes it clear that he has totally failed to serve the national interest there. On the contrary, I believe, Sir, he has been instrumental in misleading the hon'ble Minister. The hon'ble Minister is making a statement which he made on his return from the United States of America. What is our Ambassador talking there? I should like to know why you are spending so much money in the United States of America. Is it to get arms for Pakistan by the Americans and then to be told in this manner that they are helping the cause of peace? Therefore I take a serious view of this matter. This thing should be discussed. Mr. L.K. Jha, should be recalled straightaway for having failed to carry out the limited responsibility expected of him. This is number one.

Number two, the American action should be declared as a hostile act towards India. Our diplomacy and policy have failed. For its warlike actions against India, its hostile action against India, America should be charged in the United Nations and outside of helping the genocide, of violating the Conventions, of violating the U.N. Charter, of violating the Human Rights Charter and creating tension in the Indo-Pak sub-continent. These things should be done—not this kind of wishy-washy, hanky-panky, ridiculous statement that the hon. Minister has made. These are the demands I am making. Besides, I do not know why the American Ambassador was sent to Calcutta to meet the refugees. Sir, I was ashamed when I saw a picture of Mr. Keating meeting the refugees. Who allowed the American Ambassador to go there?

They are allowing Americans to take photographs of the Tripura airport, the Agartala airport and so on. Do I understand that when that country is responsible for helping genocide, the envoy of that country should be sent to the Indian border to meet the refugees? I am surprised. The Ambassador should be kicked out of West Bengal. I would ask the people to kick him out. I would ask the people of West Bengal to kick him out^o kick him in the street, when they have been behaving in this manner.

It is an insult to our people. By supplying arms to Pakistan, they are sending refugees to West Bengal, and they are sending, with the permission of the Central Government, the American envoy here, Mr. Keating, to go and put on airs as if he is sympathetic to them. This is absolutely double-facedness unworthy of a responsible Government. Ask Mr. Keating not to go out of Delhi. You can ask him to go back home, but certainly you should not send him to West Bengal to talk to the refugees as if they are being of service to us. Never have I seen such a weak-kneed policy. America is preparing West Pakistani troops for war against India. We are being told that anything may develop. And the people who are supplying arms to West Pakistan are being sent there to our border in order to pretend as if they are our friends. I say, Sir, this policy has got to change. I lodge my strong protest against the manner in which the Government is handling matters with regard to the United States of America. I demand that a Cabinet meeting should be held on this subject. The national sentiment should be taken into account and proper preparation should be made politically and diplomatically to meet the challenge the United States has flung against us. We are being driven to the position of 1965. Pakistan is being egged on to start war against our country. We do not want war. We do not want armed actions by India or military action of this type. But certainly we want all help to be given to the Bangla Desh freedom fighters. And recognition must be given to Bangla Desh. These two things should be done.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : That will be enough.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I am finishing. I shall say more later. There is no suggestion of any concrete action. What prevents them from recognising Bangla Desh and giving massive assistance to the freedom fighters.

I should like to know. These points should be clarified by the hon. Minister.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : Sir, the Government takes their services, but never listens to their advice.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : We also know the contribution of the party to which the hon. Member belongs, the Marxist Communist Party.

Sir, in his characteristic and eloquent manner, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has unburdened himself of everything that was on his chest during this period when the Rajya Sabha was in recess. In one speech, he has compressed all his ideas, whether they relate to the present Calling Attention Notice or otherwise. And perhaps he has drawn very heavily upon the brief which he has prepared for participating in the general discussion and has made a full-fledged speech.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : On a point of personal explanation, Sir. I left Calcutta last midnight and this morning I saw the Calling Attention Notice. This is an extempore speech.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : You do not require a written speech. It is in your mind all the time.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: I can testify to what he said just now because I came in the same plane.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : But you did not come from the same place in Calcutta. Sir, one way of dealing with his speech would be to make a counter-speech. I have to resist that temptation. I will, therefore, try to answer specifically some of the suggestions that he has made because he has not asked anything from me. He has made several suggestions and in a very forceful manner.

SHRI A.G. KULKARNI (Maharashtra): Why don't you send him to America in the place of Mr. L.K. Jha?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa): He has asked for a Cabinet meeting.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : I would like to answer his suggestions. First, he says that our Ambassador Jha should be recalled. I am sorry I cannot oblige Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. I must say, and I repeat what I had

said on an earlier occasion, that Mr. Jha has done good work there. . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I protest against it. What good work has he done—producing a statement of this kind ?

The only quality of Mr. Jha is that he has accredited himself to the United States.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : Whatever may be the country to which an Ambassador is accredited, we cannot always judge his work from the attitude of the host country. If we go into this, then perhaps it will not be the proper way of approach to a matter of this nature. Secondly, he said that we should use a more strong language while describing the action of the U.S. in supplying arms to Pakistan. I think that the language used is pretty strong although it is not as strong as Mr. Bhupesh Gupta's language.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : The question is : Does he consider it a violation of the UN Charter ? Use any language. It is helping genocide and creation of tension in this part of the world in violation of the UN Charter.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: In the last paragraph of the statement that I read I have said quite clearly that arms supply to Pakistan in the present context amounts to condonation of genocide in Bangla Desh and encouragement to the continuation of atrocities by the military rulers of Pakistan. If Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has patience and he looks up the dictionary, he will find that abetment means the same thing as encouragement to the continuation of these atrocities in that part of the world. So he cannot compel me to use a word which he used. He should give me the latitude to select my word.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, it is very important, it is; not the same thing. Abetment does mean more than encouragement. I may encourage many things, yet I may not come under the law, the law of mischief. Here the moment you say abetment, he is liable for action under the provisions of the UN Charter,

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : Then the third question that he asked was why Mr. Keating went to Calcutta or to West Bengal..

SHRI CHITTA BASU (West Bengal) : And why he should not be kicked.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : We should be a little more decent than just kicking people. The question that he asked was why he went there to have a look at the refugee camps. It has been our policy that the representatives of other countries, the Ambassadors of other countries, Members of Parliament from other countries and pressmen should freely go and see the refugees. And I can tell you that any person who has gone, any foreigner who has gone, and has had a look at the refugee camps and seen the misery writ large on the faces of people, has returned a different person altogether, and there is nothing for us to hide there and I do not see why there should be any objection to any Ambassador of any country going to the refugee camps and seeing for himself the plight of refugees and also the tale of woe which they recite and which can also be read from their condition. I Strongly reject the suggestion that while dealing with the United States we are adopting another attitude than the one warranted by the circumstances. We have told the United States Government, their representatives at all levels, of the strength of our feeling and we have also pointed out in unmistakable terms that the continued US supply of arms to Pakistan in the present conditions is not only encouraging and helping the military rulers to carry on their atrocities against the unarmed people of Bangla Desh, but it also makes Pakistan more intransigent, more bellicose, and as such it affects our security also. We have all along taken this stand that any supply of arms to Pakistan by any country amounts to encouraging Pakistan to carry on Pakistan's policy of confrontation against India and thus this is a matter which affects our security. This is perhaps what the honourable Member was suggesting. We have already done that. Then he has made a suggestion that there should be a special Cabinet meeting. I would like to assure Mr. Bhupesh Gupta that Cabinet meetings do take place from time to time and it is hardly a matter in which Parliament as such should make any suggestion. We can always meet at the shortest notice. We have met on several occasions. We have discussed in the Cabinet and in the various sub-committees of the Cabinet this issue almost on a continuous basis. I would like to assure Mr. Bhupesh Gupta and the House that this is a matter of the highest importance which is constantly under discussion and under review of the Government at all levels.

I would like to assure him that we attach the highest importance to this question.

Lastly he raised the question of recognition. This has got nothing to do with the present Calling Attention.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : I am surprised at the suggestion of Shri Bhupesh Gupta. He suggested the recall of our Ambassador in USA. If anybody has failed in his task, it is not the Ambassador, but it is his friend Sardar Swaran Singh.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : I am your friend also.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Now this shows where the shoe pinches. I thought that from the public posture shows by Shri Bhupesh Gupta they were not in collusion yet. But by his suggestion to recall the Ambassador, I got the impression that Shri Bhupesh Gupta is still hand in glove with the Congress because he does not want any of the Ministers to resign for their failures. He does not want the Prime Minister to resign on this issue. He only wants to recall the Ambassador from Washington.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : That is your privilege. You can very irresponsibly ask others to resign. That is the privilege your Party.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : My Party may or may not be able to do anything.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: My friend is an intelligent man. If I refuse to be stupid, is it a crime ?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : My party may or may not come to power, but when it comes to power, it will shoulder its responsibility. But the fact is that today Sardar Swaran Singh has to shoulder his responsibility. He cannot shirk it. Therefore, if I accuse anybody of failure, it will not be Shri L.K. Jha whom Shri Bhupesh Gupta wants to recall. I accuse Sardar Swaran Singh, Is it not a fact that Sardar Swaran Singh on his return from his highly talked of tour of eight or nine capitals of the world made a statement in the aerodrome of Delhi that he was assured that the USA would do nothing against the interests of India ? He said that he had been assured by the President of the United States that nothing would be done against the interests of India. Now, who has failed in his duty ? If he had been briefed by Shri L.K. Jha, then

I would have taken him to task and asked for his recall from Washington. But the Foreign Minister himself went to the capital and he had personal knowledge of everything. He talked to the President of the USA and carried the impression that nothing would be done by the USA against the interests of India. My first question is whether Sirdar Swaran Singh did not mislead the entire country by his wrong statement which he made when he came back from the USA saying that nothing should be done by the USA against the interests of India. Let him answer that question. If he could say that he was cheated, let him frankly say so. I would be happy... (*Interruptions*). Shri Bhupesh Gupta took his own time. Now by his interruptions, he is taking part of my time also. Again he will take his own time, when we have a debate. Sir, let me put my second question. In the context of the changed circumstances in the international field, we have absolutely no friend, either near about or even far away.

We have none. Is it not a fact that the new association between the United States of America and China, the People's Republic of China, where Pakistan acted as the priest, as reported in some newspapers.

SHRI A.P. CHATTERJEE (West Bengal): Pakistan acted as what?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Pakistan acted as the priest in the marriage of convenience or in this grand alliance.

AN HON. MEMBER: In this unholy marriage?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Yes, that is a better phrase. In this unholy marriage in which Pakistan acted as the priest, is it the price that the United States of America is going to pay through supplies of arms and ammunitions?

Then, Sir, has the External Affairs Minister tried to know something about it? Even during his visit to the USA he did not have any sent of it. His ambassadors in the different countries could not post him with information, up-to-date information, so that he could tell us that this is going to happen and that there may be a changed situation in the international field and therefore, India may have to face a new situation. He did not tell us about it any time. Therefore, Sir, he was always back-dated so far as the international information was concerned and the information supplied to him by our ambassadors

was concerned. Now that it has happened, now that it is a matter of fact, I want to ask whether he would try to know whether Pakistan would be getting additional arms and ammunitions as a price for the task that it undertook in bringing both these countries together.

Then, No. 3, Sir, has our Foreign Minister ever attempted to find out what the total quantum of supply of that blessed agreement through which the United States of America was supposed to supply arms and ammunitions to Pakistan? What is the total quantum? Nobody seems to know anything about it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I think it is about 2 billion dollars or something like that.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : I cannot believe that.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Misra, you continue.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : I can believe what Mr. Swaran Singh says. I do not believe either what the "Pravada" says or the "New York Times" says.

SHRI A.P. CHATTERJEE: You said that he is misleading the entire people.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Till he continues as the External Affairs Minister he is responsible to this House. He has misled the country. Let him mislead the House. Then he can face the consequences, SHRI A.P. CHATTERJEE : Does misleading lead to real leading?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA. : Sir, Mr. Chatterjee has come to his rescue. Now, Sir, you can find a change in their attitude. SHRI A.P. CHATTERJEE : I have not come to the help of Mr. Swaran Singh. He is too big a man.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Mr. Chatterjee, you have your opportunity and then you might put whatever you want to put. Let me have my say. Now, Sir, my third question is.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : You have asked four or five questions and still you say, "My third question".

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Sir, I wanted to know the quantum. It should be told to us that this would be the final shipment and nothing beyond, the amount, the quantum that the "Padma" or any other ship carrying arms and ammunitions which would be a par

[Shri Lokanath Misra] of the agreement which was signed before the 24th April or whatever it is. Therefore, Sir, I think that our External Affairs Minister has that much of intelligence to find out either from the American Ambassador or our Ambassador there what the total quantum was under the agreement. Let us know that and let us also know how much has been supplied and how much is left out. Therefore, once it is known, we shall be sure that once that is fulfilled, once the commitment is fulfilled, the USA cannot fall back on this particular plea of supplying a part of the agreement which is still left out. Now, Sir, ..

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I think that is enough.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Sir, this is the last question, if you allow me. It is all right if you do not allow me. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is a privileged person, but I am not.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : He fought for the special privileges of the princes and calls me a privileged person.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : I did it on the basis of conscience and you have done it against the consensus and the conscience of the House.

The last question I wanted to ask was whether the USSR was not generous enough to supply spares to Pakistan... *(Interruptions)*.

Mr. Chitta Basu, I don't think, recently visited Moscow or was brinked by the USSR Ambassador here. Kindly do not say anything about which you do not know anything.

The point is that this particular news-item which appeared in many newspapers in the country is still there.

AN HON. MEMBER : Undented.

(Interruptions).

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : I would like Mr. Swaran Singh to deny it. I do not believe in what Moscow says or what Pravda says, or, least of all, what Mr. Bhupesh Gupta says....

(Interruptions).

SHRI A.P. CHATTERJEE : The U.S. President, Mr. Nixon, is going to Peking

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Nixon is running after Chou-En-Lai. There is no doubt about it. . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Now, ir after the election debacle. ■. *(Interruptions)*.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please ask your question. There should be no interruptions.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : My last question is that the U.S.S.R. is also guilty of supplying spares to Pakistan, and thus perpetrating the genocide. The U.S.A. is also perpetrating it. Now, in this context may I ask Mr. Swatan Singh what he is going to do about recognition of Bangla Desh. He says that it is neither here nor there. It is not contained in the Calling Attention Motion. So many things are not contained in the Calling Attention Motion. Mr. Swaran Singh's name is not in the Calling Attention Motion. All the same, he is replying to it. I would therefore ask him: What is the latest attitude of the Government of India so far as the recognition of Bangla Desh is concerned "? Unless they recognize it, unless they take a categorical decision in the matter, these things are surely to continue.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : Sir, about the first question, I would like the hon. Member to have a second look at my statement about it. He has referred to the statement that I made to the Press on my arrival at Palam airport after visiting several capitals. He has based his first question on a wrong quotation from my statement. And I am not expected to reply if the statement is read out of context, and also the statement upon which he bases his question is not correct. I never made any statement to mislead any body, and this charge is absolutely ill-founded and ill-conceived.

In the second question he says that there is a new change in the situation on account of the process of detente that has been started between the People's Republic of China and the U.S.A. It is a very significant development, and I have already made a public statement about this new development. But I do not see as to what connection this has with the US supply of arms. Both the U.S.A. and China have been supplying arms to Pakistan even before this process of detente, and I do not see what is the qualitative change, at any rate, in this process of detente. This is a separate, significant development. But at this moment we are discussing the question of arms supply to Pakistan by the U.S.A. The third question he asked was, whether as a result of Pakistan's efforts to serve the United States and China to come closer to each other, is Pakistan likely to get more arms? I cannot reply to this question either in the affirmative or negative. AU that I know of is, even with-

out (his Pakistan was getting arms and is likely to continue to get arms both from the People's Republic of China and also from the U.S. Then lastly he asked whether I am able to say what is the total quantity involved in these transactions. I have already said that the figure given by Senator Church of 35 million dollars worth of equipment being in the pipeline does appear to be correct. Whether any more arms come or not I cannot say because I cannot foresee or foretell what the future supply is likely to be.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Under the agreement orders must have been placed. There must be some figure in the agreement. I want to know whether he knows anything about the figure.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: There is not one agreement, Mr. Misra. You should try to understand that they have placed several orders, under that relation of the original ban which the US Government had placed after the 1965 conflict. There are two separate things. One is exception to supply of non-lethal equipment. I have said that the quantity in the pipeline is likely to be of the value of about 35 million dollars. Whether more will come I cannot speak on behalf of the US Government but perhaps he can, Mr. Misra, notwithstanding his protest to the contrary. Then he asked about the press statement about USSR's supply of spares for military equipment to Pakistan. The USSR Government has very clearly made a statement that after April, 1970 they have not supplied any arms or any spares to Pakistan and I have no information to the contrary. We should accept the word of the Government of the USSR when they categorically say that they have not supplied any arms or any equipment or any spares to Pakistan after April, 1970.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI (Rajasthan): Have they included spares?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Yes.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: The US also said specifically.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I do not think they have said so specifically. If they have said that they have not supplied, I will accept that statement.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : They said that they supplied because they have an agreement.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Mr. Misra, why should you talk on behalf of the US Government?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The US is saying that it is supplying —

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Wher, did they say ?

(Interruptions)

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: The last question he repeated was about the Government's policy in relation to the recognition of Bangla Desh. I have already made a statement and I have said that this matter is under constant review. We are not opposed to the recognition of Bangla Desh. We will take a decision at the appropriate and suitable time and we will not hesitate to recognise Bangla Desh when we find that it is in our national interest and also in the interests of peace and in the interests of the freedom fighters.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Do I take it that in principle it is agreed that Bangla Desh should be recognised?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I have said and I would repeat that we are not opposed to the recognition of Bangla Desh.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: There are Directive Principles in the Constitution, it is agreed. Why do you talk of principles?

डा० भाई महावीर (दिल्ली) : श्रीमान् मंत्री महोदय ने अमरीका के अपने दूतावास को बड़ा अच्छा काम करने का सर्टिफिकेट दिया है। उन्होंने कहा है कि वे इस सलाह के या इस दिष्पणी के बहुत सख्त खिलाफ हैं कि वहाँ के राजदूत को वापस बुलाया जाए या उन्होंने काम ठीक नहीं किया ऐसी कोई बात यहाँ कही जाए। जब हम इस सदन में पूछ रहे हैं कि अमरीका कौन से शस्त्रास्त्र दे रहा है तो मंत्री महोदय उसके जवाब में यू० एस० के सिनेटर्स के स्टेटमेंट का उल्लेख कर रहे हैं। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या हमारे दूतावास का काम यह नहीं है कि वह इस देश को सरकार को, इस देश की जनता को, अमरीका की सरकार पाकिस्तान को हथियार दे रही है या नहीं और दे रही है तो कितने दे रही है और कैसे दे रही है, इसको जानकारी भी दें? क्या यह काम यू० एस० के सिनेटर्स का है कि वे हमारी सरकार के ऊपर कृपा करें और यह बतायें? और क्या हमारी सरकार इसमें अपने कर्तव्य की इतिश्री समझ लेती है कि सिनेटर्स का हवाला दे कर कह दिया जाए कि हमें लगता

[डा० भाई महावीर]

है कि: This is nearer the truth. यह सदन इस से ज्यादा जिम्मेदारी की बात सुनने का अधिकार रखता है। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि अगर यू० एन० के सिनेटर्स इस तरह के वक्तव्य नहीं देंगे तो क्या हमारी सरकार के पास कोई ऐसी जानकारी नहीं आवेगी? अगर नहीं आवेगी तो वहाँ पर करोड़ों रुपया खर्च कर के हम जो अपने दूतावास को रखते हैं उसका उपयोग क्या है, उसका अर्थ क्या है और उसको क्यों न समाप्त कर दिया जाए? महोदय, मंत्री जी ने पिछली बार यह कहा था कि यह 'स्पाइंग' हो जाएगा, जासूसी हो जाएगी अगर हम कह दें कि दूतावास इस तरह की जानकारी लें। अभी तीन दिन हुए मेरे एक मित्र अमरीका से आये हैं। उन्होंने हमें बताया कि वहाँ पर शस्त्रास्त्र भरे जहाजों के द्वारा पाकिस्तान जाना टेलीविजन पर दिखाया गया और लोगों ने उसे देखा, लेकिन हमारी सरकार को इस तरह की जानकारी प्राप्त करना जो "न्यूयार्क टाइम्स" वहाँ के डाक रजिस्टर से ले गया; क्या सम्भव जासूसी मालूम होता है? अगर यह जासूसी है तो मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि अगर यह काम हमारे दूतावास नहीं करेंगे तो फिर वे किस मर्ज की दवा हैं?

मैं एक दूसरा सवाल और पूछना चाहता हूँ। हमारे मंत्री जी अमरीका के सर्वोच्च नेताओं से मिल कर आये। मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इन हथियारों की सप्लाई के बारे में अमरीका की सरकार का कहना क्या है। वे क्यों दिये जा रहे हैं? क्या पाकिस्तान के ऊपर कोई खतरा है? क्या पाकिस्तान किसी तरह के संकट में है? क्या पाकिस्तान को किसी बाहर के आक्रमण का डर है? मैंने अमरीका के राष्ट्रपति का हाल का वक्तव्य छपा देखा है जिसमें उन्होंने वियतनाम की अपनी पालिसी के बारे में कहा है कि हम वहाँ इस लिये हैं: To see that the small country can exercise the right to choose its own way of life" दूसरे उन्होंने यह भी कहा है आगे चल कर: "The U.S. wants nothing but the right of everyone to live and let live." The right to live and let live? Arms to

Pakistan amount to giving Yahya Khan the right to commit genocide and the right to the poor, innocent, unarmed people of Bangla Desh only to be killed and to suffer that genocide.

जो सरकार यह दावा करती है क्या आपने उससे पूछा कि क्या आप का पाकिस्तान को आम्स देना "राइट टू लिव ऐंड लेट लिव" है? कौन से तर्क से इस आम्स सप्लाई को उचित सिद्ध किया जाता है, यह आपको वहाँ के नेताओं ने अगर बताया है तो मैं जानना चाहूँगा कि वह क्या है।

आपने ज्ञाने वक्तव्य के आखिर में यह कहा: It is a condonation of the genocide being perpetrated. अर्थात् आप ने यह कहा है कि यह जो कुछ वहाँ पर याहूया खां कर रहे हैं, जो आक्रमण किया गया है बंगला देश के निवासियों पर उसको यह एक तरह का समर्थन है अमरीका की तरफ से।

ठीक है, लेकिन क्या आप यह बात भी कहने को तैयार हैं या नहीं कि आज जो हो रहा है वह इससे कहीं अधिक है It is much worse. It amounts to an aggression on this country. Aggression has already taken place. It is continuously taking place, civil aggression and economic aggression.

सिविल एग्रेसन है, इकोनामिक एग्रेसन है। मैं तो कहूँगा कि Aggression has also the form of something like a geria warfare. इस से तो हमारे यहाँ कालरा के फँदने की स्थिति पैदा हो रही है। इस से ज्यादा एग्रेसन और क्या हो सकता है, लेकिन मंत्री महोदय ने यह नहीं कहा कि अमरीकी आम्स अगर पाकिस्तान को आज जाते हैं तो उसको भारत सरकार भारत के खिलाफ पाकिस्तान के मुले में उस की पीड अपथपाने के बराबर मानती है?

और चौथा प्रश्न यह है कि प्रेसीडेंट निक्सन जो आज चीन जा रहे हैं जिस का कुछ जिक्र किया गया, उस से हम क्या सबक लेते हैं? अभी तक पाकिस्तान को हथियार यह कह कर दिये जाते थे कि अगर उसे हथियार न दिये जायेंगे तो पाकिस्तान चीन पर निर्भर हो जाएगा। अब चीन और अमरीका के अन्दर कुछ मुहब्बत—एक फर्लेटिंग शुरू हुई है। हमें

उस में कोई आपत्ति नहीं है और विदेश मंत्री के इस कथन से मैं सहमत हूँ कि वह अगर ऐसा करते हैं तो 'रियलिटी आफ दी सिचुएशन' को स्वीकार करते हैं, अगर चीन के साथ कोई नार्मलाइजेशन होता है तो वह अच्छा है। लेकिन जब मंत्री महोदय यह कहते हैं कि इस ने हमारे स्टैंड को जस्टिफाई किया है या Our stand has been vindicated, तो मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या यहीं तक हम संतुष्ट हो जायेंगे या सरकार यह भी शर्त लगायेगी कि एक और बात विडिकेट हुई है इस से कि विश्व में ये बड़े देश किसी सिद्धांत की बात बेकार ही करते हैं। They follow nothing but their national interests and their national interests alone. और अगर अपने राष्ट्रीय हितों को ले कर चलते हैं तो आज जिस तरह की स्थिति उनके इस रवैये के कारण पैदा हो रही है उस में हम किसी और को दोष दें इसके बजाय यही सोचें कि हमारी गवर्नमेंट ने अपने देश को इतना समर्थ बनाने के लिए आज तक कोशिश क्यों नहीं की कि जिस से हमारी बात की दुनिया में कीमत हो। हम तर्क से, या दलीलों से या खाली 'आर्ग्यूमेंटेटिव' तरीकों से दूसरों को मनायेगे यही हम अब तक सोचते रहे हैं। हम एक हवाई दुनिया में रहे हैं। जरूरत है इस रियलाइजेशन की कि दुनिया का कोई भी देश अपने राष्ट्रीय हितों के लिए ही कार्य करता है। वही अमरीका कर रहा है। हमें सलाह दी जाती है—शांति रखो, झगड़ा न करो, जरा धीरज धरो, हमें आप से हमदर्दी है लेकिन फिर भी लड़ाई नहीं होने देना चाहिए। अमरीका की तरफ से यही सलाह और रूस की तरफ से भी यही सलाह, दोनों की तरफ से पेश रखने की सलाह। किसी तरह से 'प्रेसिपिटेट' नहीं करना चाहिए 'सिचुएशन' को, तो क्या सरकार यह सबक लेगी कि आज चीन की अमरीका के साथ जो दोस्ती की शुरुआत हुई है उस का कारण है चीन के पास न्यूक्लियर पावर, उस का कारण है इंटरनेशनल बेल्लास्टिक मेसाइल, जिसके विषय में यहां चर्चा भी हो चुकी है। तो मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या

भारत सरकार इस यथार्थवादी दृष्टिकोण को समझ कर यह मानेगी कि In politics there are no permanent friends, there are no permanent foes. There are only permanent interests. If America recognises its permanent interests, we also may learn a little lesson from America in this matter at least realising that we have to protect our interests, and for protection of our interests we need strength which our Government has been ignoring.

अखिर में, मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि यह सब बातें हो गयीं, निन्दा हो जाएगी अमरीका की, हमारा विरोध पत्र होगा। क्या सरकार अब अमरीका सरकार की इस कार्यवाही के खिलाफ कोई कदम उठाने का इरादा रखती है या नहीं? क्या यह करने के लिए तैयार हैं या नहीं कि कम से कम जब तक अमरीका की सरकार की नीति में परिवर्तन नहीं आता, आप किसी तरह के नये ऐड एग्जीमें की चर्चा या समझौते आदि की वार्ता करना उन के साथ बिल्कुल बंद कर दें? कम से कम स्वाभिमान का तकाजा यह है, 'सेल्फ रेस्पेक्ट' की चुनौती यह है। क्या आप इस के लिए तैयार हैं? इन्हीं दिनों में ने पढ़ा कि 50 लाख का एक एड एग्जीमेंट हुआ। एक तरफ इस तरह का हमारा अपमान हो रहा है और दूसरी तरफ हमारी भीख की झोली फैली है। क्या आप इस को बंद करने के लिए तैयार हैं?

इस के अतिरिक्त जो जहाज हमारे सारे विरोध के बावजूद पाकिस्तान को हथियार ला रहे हैं, उन को रोकने के लिए क्या हमारी सरकार बांगला देश का, पाकिस्तान का 'नेवल ब्लॉकेड' करेगी और क्या वह कोशिश करेगी कि इस तरह के हथियारों को वहां पहुंचने नहीं दिया जाएगा या यह कहा जाएगा कि वह हवाई सीज हैं, वह ओपेन सीज हैं, इंटरनेशनल वाटर्स हैं।

If we do it, we would be paying the Americans in a familiar coin. When President Kennedy decided to intercept the Russian warships going to Cuba, that was 1 P.M. something which was done on the open seas, on the high seas, and there was no international justification for it if you merely go by the constitutional aspect of it.

[डा० भाई माहावीर]

हमारा भी अधिकार है आज, जब यह हमारे ऊपर न केवल खतरा है बल्कि हमारे ऊपर आक्रमण हो चुका है, 80 लाख शरणार्थियों का हमारे देश में आना आक्रमण से कम नहीं है तो क्या आप इस तरह का कदम उठाने के बारे में सोचेंगे ?

(Time-Bell Rings)

और तीसरी बात यह है। मंत्री महोदय ने जवाब दे दिया है फिर भी मैं समझता हूँ कि इस मामले में अपनी भावनाओं को व्यक्त करूँ कि सरकार अपने कर्तव्य को पूरा नहीं कर सकेगी जब तक कि वह इंतजार करती रहेगी उस दिन का जब बंगला देश केवल एक कब्रिस्तान रह जाएगा, वहाँ शमशान की शान्ति होगी, क्या वह दिन होगा जबकि उसको आप मान्यता देंगे और उसकी सहायता के लिये कदम उठावेंगे ? क्यों आप आज समय पर कोई कदम उठाने का फैसला नहीं करते ?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH. Sir, so far as information about the supply of arms, their quantum and nature, by the United States to Pakistan is concerned, besides the information to which I have made a reference in my statement, we have information from other sources also. That is why I have said in the statement that the figure that is given by Senator Church appears to be nearer the correct figure. This is based on our own sources of information. Then the second question that he asked is 'Have the US leaders ever said as to why they are supplying arms to Pakistan? Yes, this question has been asked on several occasions since 1954 when they first started supplying arms to Pakistan.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: In the present context.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I am coming to the present times also. And at that time they were clinging to this argument that these arms are being supplied for —what they described as the containment of communism, although we knew that this is an excuse which is totally untenable. We knew that the type of equipment supplied by the United States to Pakistan was meant against India. And from the very beginning we have been making that position clear.

Then the hon. Member has asked as to whether they have been saying that they are supplying arms to Pakistan to wean them away from China. Yes, they have been using that argument also not in these terms, but somewhat indicating an attitude to that effect because the words that the hon. Member has used are not quite correct. But there is one over-riding argument that they always use that they are supplying arms in their own international interest, that is in the national interest of the United States of America. This again is an argument which is difficult to understand. But in international affairs even if any party wants to put forth an argument, they have the right to do so. You may accept it or you may not accept it.

Then the third question asked is: Have we told them that giving arms to Pakistan by the United States amounts to helping Pakistan in their aggressive actions and aggressive attitudes against India? Yes, we have done so, not only now, but even on earlier occasions.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: This is not there in your statement.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Now you are asking the question, I am saying that. I have also said that on several earlier occasions.

Then the fourth question that he asked is this. He agrees with my statement about the proposed or the forthcoming visit of President Nixon to Peking and he says that there is a lesson to be learnt that we should look after our own national interests. Well, I wish the hon. Member could learn that interest. We always know that we should act in a manner which is in our own national interest and we do not require a sermon from him, we know what our national interests are.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: Results belie your claims.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: And also he has said that this means that India should be strong. Yes, India should be strong I am not sure whether the Party to which the hon. Member belongs always helps India to be strong. The divisive element that they always introduce does make India weak and I would request the hon. Member to approach the problem in the correct spirit. That military strength, that capacity to manufacture all the arms that we require in the three wings of our Armed Forces lies in our economic strength, in our industrial growth and above all, in the unity of the people and any single formula or prescription that the hon. Member may put

forward does not answer that question. We have *to* be strong, we should be strong. This means strength on all these fronts rather than picking up one and trying to toe a particular line.

Then, Sir, he has made three suggestions. He asked: In view of the continued US supply of arms to Pakistan, am I prepared to accept the three suggestions that he has made? I will give reply in one sentence: I am sorry, I cannot accept them.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : Give some reason.

श्री चन्द्र शेखर (उत्तर प्रदेश) : उपसभापति महोदय, डा० भाई महावीर ने गीता पढ़ी है। क्या यह पद गीता का नहीं पड़ा है : कर्मण्येवाधिकारस्ते मा फलेषु कदाचन।

डा० भाई महावीर : चन्द्रशेखर जी, मैं उन्हें गीता का ही दूसरा अंश याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ तस्मादुत्तिष्ठ कौन्तेय युद्धाय कृतनिश्चयः।

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: From the whole history of nearly twenty years of American behaviour, is it not clear that America is interested in creating a certain balance of power in Asia and that is why all the various actions that America has taken have been anti-Indian? Even now through arms supply to Pakistan they are trying to create a certain balance of power in Asia which policy they are pursuing. Are they not aware that besides arms supply, American ships have been transporting soldiers to Bangla Desh for genocide? Even though America has said that they are not doing it, our information is that American ships have been utilised for transporting soldiers; not only ships but some of the aeroplanes have also been utilised. Is it not also a fact that between 1962 and 1965, after the India-China war the US gave arms to Pakistan, which arms would not be utilised either against China or against the Soviet Union, but would be used only against India? In 1963 a submarine was given to Pakistan by the United States. But that submarine was useless against the Soviet Union or China which was not operating either in the Arabian Sea or in the Bay of Bengal; it was specifically against India. After the India-China war when we wanted certain lethal weapons for use against China, we were not given, not even American rifles were given to us. Does that not show the anti-Indian stand of America?

Sir, certain radar sites were set up in Pakistan and they all confronted India. There was a radar site in Multan and that site was utilised

for what purpose? For striking down the plane in which the former Chief Minister of Gujarat, Mr. Balwantrai Mehta, was killed. Then, when our Minister for External Affairs went to Washington, they talked sweetly. The President met him. But they kept him completely in the dark and in a dubious way supplied arms to Pakistan. Does that not show the real intention of the United States of America? They have been functioning in a completely anti-Indian and unfriendly way to us. Is it not time that we told them frankly, all your actions all these years have been anti-Indian and to help a certain power, which is not to the benefit of India?

Sir, when my friend says that Mr. Nixon is going to China, it is not to see either the cultural revolution or- the Chinese culture. He is going there because China has now got nuclear bombs, because of the eleventh test that they are performing on their nuclear bomb. It is a hard fact which counts.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, how America is behaving is not clear. Even on the 5th July, the State Department spokesman said that they had not till then got the text of Mr. Yahya Khan's speech which he made on the 28th June. With all their communication links, with all their scientific advancement they could not get a text of Mr. Yahya Khan's speech till the 5th of July. So this is how they are functioning. M. Deputy Chairman, is it not time that we also function, in this game of balance of power, in order to safeguard our interest? Is it not time that we also have understanding with the various Asian countries. After all, understanding is growing between the Soviet Union, Japan and North Vietnam. Is it not time that we too have a proper understanding of the whole situation and have a dialogue with them? Russia is having a dialogue with Japan. Is it not time for us to have a four-power dialogue between Russia, Japan, North Vietnam and China? That time has come.

Sir, we know that no power in the world functions just on ideology. It functions for a country's real interest. Bangla Desh, if it becomes free, it will change the balance of power in Asia which America does not want, which the imperialist countries do not want. Therefore, is it not in the interest of India that Bangla Desh comes into existence because its very existence is for the existence of India? Mr. Kissinger and Mr. Nixon are not oblivious of this, and that is why they are trying to play it up. May I know whether

India will look to its own interes ? Whatever Ir dia does for Bangla Desh today it will be doing for its own self.

(*Times-b;ll rings.*) Mr. Deputy Chairman, it is said that Mr. L.K. (ha is doing good work there. He may *b<'* doing good work. But what is the use of keeping him there when ths information that *hi* gives is useless ? I do not think it is any use keeping him there. Why not get him back because we know America is determined to pursue its policy ? Therefore, utilise Mr. L.K. Jha elsewhere. Do not keep him there. It is time that we act and act in our own interest. Bangla Desh is going to act as balance of power and the power which America is trying to disturb will be harmful to India. Therefore, India has to stand on its own feet. Then alone will we achieve a proper solution. Nobody else will come to our support.

SARDAR SW ARAN SINGH: I have very carefully noted his views. He has not asked any question. Therefore, there is nothing for me to reply.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : You answered Mr. Bbupesh Gupta. Why do you not answer him ?

SARDAR SW ARAN SINGH : It is difficult to understand what you say.

SHRI CHITTA BASU : Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am constrained to say that the Statement made by ihe hon'ble Minister in reply io the Calling Attention does not measure up to the requirements of the situation. On the other hand, the statement is insipid, weak-kneed and capitulating. And that naturally causes anger not oniy among the Members of this Hous¹, but it also causes frustration amon? the people outside:

Sir, may I know from the hon. Minister whether he agrees with me that it has been the constant policy and endeavour of the United States of America to arm Pakistan so that Pakistan can wage war against India at a : imt of their choice ? It has been the policy of the United States of America- to continue to supply arms to Pakistan right from the year 1954 and tha money value of the arms so far supplied to Pakistan comes to about two billion dollars. And not only that, some other NATO and CENTO countries have also teen obliged as third parties to send arms to Pakistan. Therefore, it has all along been the principle and policy of the United States of America to strengthen Pakistan against India. And it is known to all that all the

damages suffered by Pakistan in 1965 have been recouped by the supply of spares and military hardware by the United States of America. To-day it is estimated by all that the striking capacity of Pakistan has far exceeded its 1965 position. In this context, may I know from the hon. Minister whether he agrees with me that this arms supply from the United States of America to Pakistan is perpetuating genocide in Bangla Desh and they are perpetuating aggression on Bangla Desh and also on our country ? Is this not the proper time for us to say that our cause is the common cause of the people of Bangla Desh because both of us have been victims of common aggression by the United States of America ? If so, does not the Government consider it appropriate to recognise the sovereign Democratic Republic of Bangla Desh and offer them all kinds of military aid so that they can vacate the aggression from the soil of Bangla Desh and we can also ensure the security and integrity of our country ? Is it not in our own interest that the sovereign Democratic Republic of Bangla Desh should be recognised immediately ? If so, would the Government consider this the appropriate time, particularly- after the continued supply of arms by the United States of America to Pakistan . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The hon. Minister has replied to that question.

SHRI CHITTA BASU : He has not answered this question whether he considers it appropriate to-day to accord recognition to Bangla Desh beacust we have been victims of common aggression by the United States of America. They have committed aggression on our soil and they have also committed aggression on Bangla Desh. Are we not prepared to make common cause with the people of Bangla Desh so that the aggression by the United States of America can be vacated from the soil of Bangla Desh and we can also ensure the security and integrity of our country? I would also like to ask whether in the changed context of the world situation which has particularly been brought about by the axis being established between the United States of America, China and Pakistan, the requirement has become all the more immediate for the recognition of Bangla Desh. May I also know from the hon. Minister whether it is a fact that the United States of America has offered military aid worth 5 million dollars to India ? If that is so, will the Government of India reject that offer with the contempt, it deserves ? May I

also know from the hon. Minister why, even after all these things, the Government does not declare this act of the United States of America as an act of hostility, an unfriendly and warlike action against India? Why is he not plucking up courage to declare it in clear and plain terms. Will the Government say that in retaliation, they are determined to take certain actions, namely, stopping repayment of loans, stopping all kinds of negotiations with the U.S.A. and confiscating all American interests in this country, because America should be told in the language that it understands? Will the Minister clarify all these points?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : It is true that from the time in 1954 when the United States started arming Pakistan, Pakistan has already received from the United States military equipment worth between US \$1,700 million and US \$2 billion, and this enabled them to have the real basis of their Army, their Navy and their Air Force, and this enabled them to build their war machine. About the question of recognition, he has spent quite a good part of his speech on this. I am sorry I have nothing to add to what I have already stated on the question of recognition. There is no use linking the same question with several other matters. That is the basic, substantive, question and we do not do justice to this question by linking it with the United States or with China or with any country supplying arms to Pakistan. That is a separate, substantive, question about which I have already stated Government's position, and I have nothing more to add. Lastly, he asked one specific question as to whether India...

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव (बिहार) : उसको रिकिग्निशन नहीं देने के कारण अमरीका अभी हथियार दे रहा है। अगर आप रिकिग्निशन बंगला देश को दे देते तब आपकी बात में दम होता।

मैं यही कह सकता हूँ कि आपका अन्दाजा इसके मुतालिक कतअन गलत है।

would like to say that this mention of US \$5 million worth of aid to India I have also read in the newspapers and their statements. There is no truth in this...

SHRI CHITTA BASU : Are you going to reject it?

3/Rajya Sabha/71—5

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : There is no truth in it. What I have to do with resenting? We are not taking anything.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI: He says "reject", not "resent".

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: There is nothing, we are not taking anything.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI: Even if it is...

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: What do you mean by "even if it is..."? All these are hypothetical things to be answered by the Opposition.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: What about your attitude?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: About our attitude with regard to the US supply of arms to Pakistan I have already stated and I would like to repeat that in the present stage this amounts to helping the military rulers, of Pakistan to carry on their atrocities against the unarmed people of Bangla Desh, and it has always been, and is more so now, a threat to India because on Pakistan's own showing they have no enmity with any other country except India. So any accrual to the arms strength of Pakistan is directly a threat to us and is for this reason that we have not left any of these countries, which are supplying arms to Pakistan, in any doubt about the danger that we face on account of any accrual to the military strength of Pakistan.

May I, Mr. Deputy Chairman, submit for your consideration that we have heard a fairly large number of observations and that really the same questions are being repeated again and again? I would like the Chair to exercise some discretion and decide as to whether any new idea or new question is being asked or whether the same thing is put over and over again.

श्री राजनारायण (उत्तर प्रदेश) : क्या सरकार इस बात को समझती है कि वह लोग मूखों की दुनिया में निवास करते हैं जो यह समझते हैं कि इस समय अमरीका पाकिस्तान को हथियारी सहायता नहीं देगा। (Interruption) मैं फिर दुहरा देना चाहता हूँ। क्या सरकार इस बात को स्पष्ट समझती है कि वे लोग मूखों की दुनिया में निवास करते हैं जो यह समझ रहे हैं कि इस समय पाकिस्तान को अमरीका हथियारी मदद नहीं देगा। अपना दिमाग साफ

[श्री राजनारायण]
रखना चाहिए। इसलिए इस बात को यदि हम साफ समझ गये कि पाकिस्तान को अमरीका का हथियार देना अमरीका के लिए कर्तव्य है तो इस प्रश्न पर इस सदन का इतना समय नष्ट नहीं होना चाहिए। मैं यही बात आज रूस के लिए भी कहता हूँ कि वह लोग मूर्खों की दुनिया में निवास करते हैं जो यह समझते हैं कि रूस भी पाकिस्तान को हथियारी मदद नहीं देगा। मगर जब से निक्सन साहब ने चीन जाने की योजना बना ली तब से रूस के बारे में मैं यह कहूँ या नहीं कहूँ इस बारे में थोड़ा सा हिचक रहा हूँ। मगर मैं रूस के बारे में भी यही बात कहता हूँ। अब यदि यह बात सही है तो भारत की सरकार ने इस राजनीतिक स्थिति का अध्ययन कर के अब तक अमरीका के इस हथियार देने के काम को ले कर इसको अमैत्रीपूर्ण काम की घोषणा क्यों नहीं कहा? क्या अब भी भारत की सरकार सफाई के साथ दुनिया को बतायेगी कि पाकिस्तान को अमरीका द्वारा हथियार दिये जाने के काम को भारत अमैत्रीपूर्ण काम समझेगा और समझ रहा है। इसमें शब्दों को इधर-उधर घुमाने का कोई सवाल नहीं है।

मैं एक और बात इसी के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ। मैं सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह जी की इस बात से सहमत हूँ कि अमरीका द्वारा जो हथियार दिये गये थे या जो हथियार दिये जा रहे हैं और रूस के द्वारा जो हथियार दिये गये थे, आप कहते हैं कि वह अप्रैल, 1970 के बाद से नहीं दिये गये, लेकिन वह सब मिल कर स्वाधीन बांगला देश के नरमेघ के लिए जिम्मेदार हैं। यह बात ठीक है। मगर यदि हम यह कहें तो क्या यह हमारी धृष्टता होगी कि भारत की सरकार की दुर्बल नीति, भारत की सरकार की नरुसक नीति, भारत की सरकार की राष्ट्र-हित-विरोधी नीति ने भी स्वाधीन बांगला देश में नरमेघ कराया और करा रही है। मैं सफाई से कहना चाहता हूँ और सदन के सम्मानित सदस्य इस बात को सुनें कि अमरीका तो पापी है ही, मगर भारत की

सरकार भी पापी है। भारत की सरकार इस को माने। क्या भारत की सरकार के हाथ स्वाधीन बांगला देश के शहीदों के खून से रंगे नहीं हैं...

एक माननीय सदस्य : नहीं।

श्री राजनारायण : हम कहते हैं कि हैं और देश की जनता कहती है कि और इस बात को अगर किसी को समझना हो तो वह हमारे साथ चल कर उसे समझ ले। अगर यह बात सही है तो...

सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह : गलत है।

श्री राजनारायण : बहुत बड़ बड़ कर वह बातें न कहें। अपनी हैसियत को समझ कर कोई बात कहें। उन्होंने कह दिया कि हम अपने राजनीतिक हित में सब बातें करते हैं। क्या जब भारत सरकार ने तिब्बत को चीन के हाथ में दे दिया था तो वह राष्ट्र-हित में था? क्या भारत सरकार ने 1965 में जो समझौता कर लिया था वह राष्ट्र-हित में था? क्या 1962 में जो कुछ हुआ वह भारत के हित में था? यह बहुत बड़ बड़ कर बातें करते हैं कि यह सरकार वही करती है जो कि भारत के हित में होता है। मैं कहता हूँ कि यह सरकार वही करती है कि जो भारत के अहित में होता है और मैं समझता हूँ कि जितनी जल्दी यह सरकार इस बात को समझ लेगी उतनी ही इस देश की भलाई होगी। घमंडपूर्ण बातें करने से ही अपने कर्तव्य की पूर्ति नहीं होती।

एक माननीय सदस्य : अभी तो आप वही कर रहे हैं।

श्री राजनारायण : तो मैं कह रहा हूँ क्या यह सत्य नहीं है कि इस शरणार्थी समस्या को पैदा करने की जिम्मेदारी पूर्ण रूप से भारत की सरकार की है?

श्री सीता राम केसरी (बिहार) : गलत। यह पाकिस्तान की सरकार की जिम्मेदारी है और यह सब कहना उनके हित में नहीं है।

श्री राजनारायण : क्या यह सही नहीं है कि 25 मार्च से 15 अप्रैल तक एक शरणार्थी

भी बांगला देश का भारत में नहीं आया। जब भारत की सरकार ने उसको मान्यता देने में देर की और जब पाकिस्तान की पलटनें आधुनिक हथियारों से लैस हो कर वहां चली गयीं और जब वहां के लोगों ने देखा कि हमारे पास सुरक्षा के कोई साधन नहीं हैं तब वह बड़े पैमाने पर वहां से भाग कर भारत में आने लगे।

श्री सीता राम केसरी : यही बात पाकिस्तान कहता है और वहीं आप कह रहे हैं।

श्री राजनारायण : इसलिए मैं सफाई से कहना चाहता हूं यह एक सवाल नहीं है, यही एकमात्र सवाल है कि भारत की सरकार ने जो बांगला देश को मान्यता नहीं दी, भारत की सरकार ने जो बांगला देश को नैतिक, भौतिक और सामरिक सहायता समय पर नहीं दी, यही कारण है शरणार्थी समस्या का। क्या मैं यह पूछ सकता हूं कि अगर यह सही है और भारत की सरकार इसको मानती है तो भारत की सरकार को बांगला देश को मान्यता देने का कब उचित समय आएगा! क्या इसकी सरकार के पास कोई सफाई है, सरकार की कोई दृष्टि है कि मान्यता देने का उचित समय कब आता है!

श्रीमन्, मैं इस समय अपने मित्र भूषेण गुप्त की सहायता लेना चाहता हूं सरकार के द्वारा। क्यों नहीं भूषेण जी रूस को कहते कि रूस तेरे लिये यह उचित समय आ गया है कि तू इन्दिरा को सलाह दे कि बांगला देश को मान्यता दे दें; क्योंकि अमेरिका चीन में गया।

आज भारत की सरकार इस बात को देख रही है कि नहीं कि अमेरिका चीन और पाकिस्तान का एक ब्लाक बन रहा है। अगर इसको देख रही है तो यह जो आज तक रूसी एजेंट यहां पर थे हमारे मित्र भूषेण गुप्त क्यों नहीं आज अपनी एजेंडी ठीक तरीके से करते, क्यों नहीं यह रूस को कहते हैं कि ए रूस तू बांगला देश को मान्यता दे दे। क्या सरकार ने भारत की कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी से इस तरह का कोई सुझाव किया है कि भारत की कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी अपना कोई

आदमी भेजे और कोसीजिन साहब से बात करे और उनसे कहे कि कोसीजिन साहब अब कोई विलम्ब के, एक पल की देर किये बिना, बांगला देश को मान्यता दो, हर प्रकार की हथियारी सहायता दो और भारत को कहो कि अब समय आ गया है कि एक मिनट, एक पल भी भारत की सरकार बांगला देश को मान्यता देने में न हिचके।

श्री उपसभापति : ठीक है, अब आप बैठिये।

श्री राजनारायण : घबड़ाइये मत। सब से पहले मेरा था, मैंने सबसे पहले टेलीफोन में कहा है लेकिन पता नहीं हमारा नाम दसवां क्यों आ गया। तो मैं यह और पूछना चाहता हूं कि क्या भारत की सरकार इसको भी देख रही है या नहीं कि अब एक स्थिति वह भी आ सकती है कि सम्पूर्ण मुस्लिम राष्ट्रों का एक ब्लाक बन जाये और मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि भारत की सरकार को और सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह जी को बली खां का वक्तव्य याद है कि नहीं? अभी बली खां साहब ने कहा कि यह जो स्थिति पैदा हो गई है इससे दो विकल्प निकलते हैं कि या तो 15 अगस्त, 1947 के पहले की स्थिति हो जाए या इस्लामी ब्लाक बन जाए, जिसका कि पश्चिमी पाकिस्तान भी हिस्सा बने। यह तमाम जो आज दुनिया में बातें हो रही हैं इसको देखते हुये भारत की सरकार क्या कदम उठाना चाहती है। और सब से बड़ी बात, श्रीमन्, यह है कि क्या भारत की सरकार को इस बात का अहसास हो रहा है या नहीं कि आज ताना-शाही शक्तियां स्वाधीन बांगला देश में उभर रही हैं जिनका एकमात्र काम है मुर्जाब की निन्दा करना, अवामी लीग की भर्त्सना करना और बांगला देश के लोगों को यह भान कराना कि अवामी लीग ने, मुजीबुर्रहमान ने, भारत सरकार के इशारे पर, असमय में, तुम लोगों को फंसा दिया और भारत की सरकार ने तुम लोगों की मदद नहीं की। तो आज स्वाधीन बांगला देश में लोगों में भारत के प्रति घृणा पैदा हो रही है।

श्री सीता राम केसरी : गलत।

श्री राजनारायण : इस बात की जानकारी सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह लें। यह सारी बातें जो कि वहां हो रही हैं। और मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या सरकार को इस बात की जानकारी है कि यह जो नोब्राखाली का एरिया है वहां एक लिबरटेड एरिया घोषित कर दिया गया है, वह एक मुक्ति क्षेत्र घोषित कर चुके हैं, और अगर ऐसी स्थिति आ गई और चीन का कुछ दूसरा सब हुआ तो वह लिबरटेड एरिया को मुक्ति क्षेत्र मान कर के मान्यता दे देगा? अगर वह मान्यता दे देगा तो भारत कहां रहेगा? तो भारत की सीमा पर एक नियतनाम बन जायेगा? मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार को इसका अहसास हो रहा है या नहीं? और अभी आठ या नौ पार्टियों ने मिल कर के वहां एक तिकड़म की है कि हम लिबरेशन के लिये लड़ेंगे। क्या सरकार इस बात को जान रही है कि मान्यता देने में जो विलम्ब हुआ है वही मूल कारण बना है इस तरह के गठजोड़ का। और जो गठजोड़ अबामी लीग के विरुद्ध जाएगा, जो गठजोड़ मुजोबुरहमान के नेतृत्व का खंडन करेगा। इस लिए तमाम चीजों को देखते मैं भारत की सरकार को दोषी पाता हूँ, गुनाहगार पाता हूँ, देश हित के उल्टे जाने वाला पाता हूँ। जितने दिनों तक भारत की सरकार ने स्वाधीन बंगला देश को मान्यता दिलाने में देर की...

श्री उपसभापति : नहीं, बैठिए। आपका सवाल हो गया।

श्री राजनारायण : धन्यवाद मत। यह कोई दाल चावल का सौदा नहीं है। इस देश की आजादी के लिए हम लोग कुछ किए हैं। हम कोई जेलखाने से भाग कर नहीं गए हैं, हमने अंग्रेजी साम्राज्यवाद के विरुद्ध लोहा लिया है। इसलिए हम कहना चाहते हैं : क्या सरकार ने श्री जयप्रकाश नारायण और आचार्य विनोबा भावे के वक्तव्यों को भी पढ़ा है? क्या उन पर उसने कोई ध्यान दिया है। जयप्रकाश नारायण जी दुनिया का भ्रमण करके आए...

श्री उपसभापति : देखिए, इसका पहले जवाब दे दिया है।

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, जरा सुनिए। जयप्रकाश नारायण जी का बयान पब्लिक में हुआ कि बंगला देश को भारत की सरकार मान्यता दे दे तो दुनिया में ऐसे अनेक देश हैं जो फौरन मान्यता देने के लिए तैयार होंगे। जयप्रकाश जी कहते हैं, दुनिया का भ्रमण करने के बाद कि भारत की सरकार मान्यता देने में विलम्ब कर रही है जिसका खमियाऊ देश को भुगतना पड़ेगा—क्या इस बात की जानकारी सरकार को है? सरकार को मान्यता देने में और सभी प्रकार की सहायता देने में क्या आपत्ति है?

इसी के लिए मैं आपको बताना चाहता हूँ कि आज 7 बजे साऊथ एवेन्यू में एम० पी० क्लब में हमने 'बंगला देश को मान्यता दो' इसका सम्मेलन आयोजित किया है। आपको भी न्योता दिया है, आप आएँ। यह नान-पार्टी असेम्बली है। हर व्यक्ति जो इस भावना से प्रभावित है वह इसमें शामिल हो सकता है, इस नाते मैं आपके जरिए इस सदन के सभी लोगों को आमंत्रित करता हूँ कि 7 बजे एम० पी० क्लब, साऊथ एवेन्यू में "बंगला देश को मान्यता दो" सम्मेलन में आएँ...

श्री उपसभापति : अब तो आन बैठ जाइये।

श्री राजनारायण : कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी, जनसंघ, डी०एम०के०, जितनी भी पार्टियाँ हैं वे उसमें आकर सम्मिलित हों।

श्री नेकी राम (हरियाणा) : उपसभापति जी, राजनारायण जी अमरीका की सरकार से चले थे और साऊथ क्लब में आ चले। बहुत अच्छा बोले।

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Sir, in the first part he says that we should not be surprised that the U.S.A. are supplying arms to Pakistan. The whole Calling Attention Notice, was based on this. We were not only surprised but greatly pained. I would like him to share this. . .

श्री राजनारायण : हमें पेन नहीं है, हमें तो गुस्सा है।

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: He is angered. Good.

About the remaining questions, it is a speech and has got nothing to do with the present Oiling Attention Notice, and I would not reply to all those questions which do not concern the Calling Attention Notice.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, प्वांट आफ आर्डर । मैं आपको बहुत ही अदब के साथ निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि क्या सदन की यही व्यवस्था रहेगी कि सरकार जहाँ फंसती हो वहाँ उत्तर देने में गुरेज करे ? हमारा सीधा प्रश्न है कि इसको अनफ्रेंडली ऐक्ट सरकार ने क्यों नहीं डिक्लेयर किया । इस सवाल का जवाब सरकार सीधे सीधे क्यों नहीं देती ? क्या यह कोई तरीका है कि सरकार कह दे हम जवाब नहीं देंगे । आप उनसे कहिए, क्योंकि यह चेयर का कर्तव्य है इस मामले में सरकार को पुन डाउन करे ।

SARDAR SW ARAN SINGH: We have not left the United States Government in any doubt about our strong feelings against this. It is for us to choose the words. I am not going to accept his words.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Rajnarain said that this act should be met with certain action. The action that has been suggested is to call it an unfriendly or a hostile act. Why this should be confused with this kind of thing that they do?

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI: 'Unfriendly act' has a diplomatic connotation, and, therefore, the Foreign Minister's telling us that 'we have used a strong language' does not satisfy us.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: It is because that it has diplomatic connotation that I am not using it.

श्री राजनारायण : यह सरकार कायर है, यह सरकार नरुसक है, देशद्रोही है, इसलिए जो एप्रोप्रिएट वर्ड है उसका प्रयोग करने से हिचकिचाती है ।

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: These are abuses, and I will strongly protest against these abuses. We know the feelings of the people.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The hon. Minister can give reasons as to why it should not be called as hostile or unfriendly act.

श्री राजनारायण : नो, दे आर द एक्चुअल वर्ड्स, ये भावनाओं के चोटक सही शब्द हैं । ऐसी डिप्लोमेसी बेचते हैं अमेरिकन और ये हम को डिप्लोमेसी की बात बतलाते हैं ।

सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह : मुझ से क्यों गुस्सा होते हो ?

श्री राजनारायण : आप डिप्लोमेसी को कायरता का पर्यायवाची बनाते हो ।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order please.

SHRI M.S. GURUPADASWAMY: Sir, much ground has been covered already. I shall be very brief. I want to pose one question to the hon. Minister. Do we or do we not understand that the present military aid to the military regime of Pakistan has made all the difference between victory and defeat to the popular forces of Bangla Desh? Do we have this basic appreciation of this situation in this light? There is no use baiting about the bush. Mr. Swaran Singh has very cleverly, in a subtle manner said that he is not opposed to the recognition of Bangla Desh. The question is whether we have not lost the opportunity of recognising already. That is the issue before us.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh): We have lost completely.

SHRI M.S. GURUPADASWAMY: I have put it that way. In regard to this particular matter, the military aid by the United States, I only make an observation. I would ask Mr. Swaran Singh whether he would share that observation also. The United States has been following and is still following a policy which is reminiscent of the attitude of what we find in the story of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. The U.S. Government is adopting the same attitude of Dr. Jekyll in some circumstances and the attitude of Mr. Hyde in certain other circumstances. The Government there is playing a dual role, a dual diplomacy—an open diplomacy where they express a lot of sympathy for the refugees, a secret diplomacy where they give all the assistance to the very Government who created the situation. May I know whether this is a price that the U.S. is paying to the political brokerage of the Pakistani Government for arranging the meeting of President Nixon and Mr. Chou En-Lai some time later? Is it the commission or is it the price for this political mediation.

[Shri M.S. Gurupadaswamy]

Sir, I would come to the very specific question. It may be too difficult for us to accept extreme positions. I share the view of the hon. Minister—we would not be able to take a very drastic, draconian action. But I would like to call the bluff, the double standard, the dual role played by the U.S. on this country. At one and they are trying to give us some sort of assistance for the refugees. At the other end they want to support the very regime which is creating this problem. To call a halt to this bluff, Sir, may I ask Mr. Swaran Singh to consider seriously whether we should not stop taking any economic assistance for these refugees? This is a very limited step that I am suggesting. Mere protest has no meaning, has no real value.

But it has got to be accompanied by some action even though it is at our cost. We need assistance for the refugees, there is no denying of that fact, but in the peculiar circumstances, may I ask the Government, if the Government has got a sense of duty to the nation or if the Government has got certain standards of its own, whether they will say to that Government immediately that they will not accept any economic aid for the refugees? This is my small question.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: About the first question, I agree that continued supply of military arms by the US to the Military Rulers does make a very significant difference in the situation in Bangla Desh. It heartens them and it gives them the wherewithal. Therefore, from both these angles, this is a situation which is a matter of grave concern to in and to the people of Bangla Desh. It also amounts to arming Pakistan against us. For both these reasons, we are totally opposed to the US supply of arms to Pakistan. The second question he asked is whether the US Government is having a dual policy. The policy is there and you can call it by any expression—Biblical or literary—but the fact is there that they continue to supply arms to the Military Rulers and thus continue to encourage them. The last question that I have asked is whether we should stop the aid that comes to us from the US in the matter of refugees. Let us try to understand the situation clearly. The refugees in India are, firstly, they are Pakistan's responsibility and we have reserved our right to ask for adequate compensation for looking after the Pakistani citizens in India. In the second place, this is very much the responsibility of the international

community. It is no help to India if any country, in response to the call of the UN Secretary-General, contributes to the looking after of the refugees. This is the international responsibility and we should continue to take this attitude that it is for the entire international community to look after the refugees and to bear the expenditure. Let us not mix our sense of pride with this issue which is a hard and naked issue. It is very much the international responsibility and it does not do us any good to feel very angry in this matter. SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Just now the Minister has made a very revealing statement or remark. It is this that they are Pakistani citizens—the refugees—and we reserve our right to claim compensation. The question arises, if we recognise Bangla Desh, they will not remain Pakistani refugees and they would have become the citizens of Bangla Desh driven by the Pakistani aggressors into our country. The question arises—is it precisely because to avoid that situation, that the Government is not giving recognition to Bangla Desh? Though it may not be the case but the way he has put it, the question arises and so I would like a clarification on this.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Why should you make statements which help the other party? Are you helping them or us.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Mr. Swaran Singh, unfortunately the point of view of the Government and we, on the Opposition, on this question, on certain points, differ. Let us remember it. That is not our fault. We wanted to be one with the Government on this question but by the way you are tackling this, you have driven us to this position. That is a very unfortunate thing, regrettable thing, but that position exists now. We have no other option.

Secondly, I would like to ask—though he has tried to bypass the question—if the question of recognition and arms supply is not related. Now, after March 25 if we had given recognition then we would have given them arms. Of course, after recognition it would have become our commitment. Then if the U.S. continued to supply arms to Pakistan, in that case it would have become clear that the USA is supporting Pakistani aggression in Bangla Desh and India is actively supporting the freedom struggle by recognising that country and giving them help. Is it because of that that you are not in a position to go against America? Is it because you are afraid of that that you do

not take up this position ? It is said in the country that the Government of India cannot do without American aid. If that is the position, if America does not want that recognition should be given to Bangla Desh, you are unable to take up a different position.

I would also like to ask another thing. Are you considering any other step except what you say, a strong note? If you are not prepared to precisely define it, at least give us some indication and say whether you are prepared to take any other step to express our disapproval or whether you are confining yourself merely to that note and nothing else. Pakistan has declared a temporary moratorium on debt payments. It says: our economy is in a crisis and we have no foreign exchange. In view of this crisis they have declared a moratorium. As far as we are concerned, the situation is being accentuated by this arms supply, some 70 lakhs have already crossed over the border, and our economy is cracking. Whether we like it or not, the international community is not giving us that help and our exchequer has to bear the burden. I have no worry* on that score: we should bear that. There are horrible conditions there and if occasion arises I will tell the House. How it is a disgrace to the Government and how things are being mismanaged; I am not going into all that just now. Since our economy is cracking, because of this arms supply and the influx of refugees, can we not declare a temporary moratorium on our debt payments to America? Can we not recall Mr. L.K. Jha to express our disapproval, not for Mr. L.K. Jha's work there : that is another question. We can recall our Ambassador and express our protest in that way. You did recall our Ambassador from Peking. I am not asking you to snap diplomatic relations; I am just asking you to recall our Ambassador to express our disapproval. So I say, do something.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : That is now enough, Mr. Ghosh.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : Is the Government aware that our attitude, our tackling these things, our enunciations, are creating a deep suspicion in the minds of the people of India about the Government of India, very deep suspicion ? Are they aware of it, and will they even now reverse it and proceed boldly to give recognition and give arms supply and let the freedom fighters fight out their struggle. India should act as a true friend in their struggle.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : I would like to say that both the premises on which he based his first two questions are completely incorrect. There is no question of India being afraid of the United States or any other country in the matter of taking a decision about the recognition of Bangla Desh. That is a question upon which we will take a decision according to our likes. He may not agree with that, but for every action, to import the United States opposition, to any particular line of action as the reason for the Government of India taking a particular attitude is, if I may say so, completely an embroidery of his own imagination and brain ; it has no substance at all.

Then he said that Pakistan has declared a moratorium on foreign debts. They have because they were unable to pay any of those debts, and what I think the hon. Member is suggesting is that though India may be able to repay its debts, it should declare a moratorium with a view to showing our anger or displeasure. Moratorium is never declared to show any anger or any displeasure. It is a decision which is taken on economic considerations.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : We can do it for very pragmatic reasons.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : Why are you crying hoarse ? It is a contradictory statement.

(Interruption)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please listen to him.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : Luckily for us our economy is not such that we have come to such a stage that we should ask for a moratorium. Our economy is in good shape, and for looking after the refugees we do not require any foreign exchange. We require only our own internal resources to look after their requirements of food, clothing, etc. The hon. friend will never believe that. I cannot help him if he takes a completely negative attitude. I cannot give him any help. I know that some parties, some friends, do want to create a situation where they should be able to say that the Indian economy also is in a bad way. It is true that we are facing a great burden on account of these refugees being on our hands, it is a great burden financially, it is a great burden because it causes social and economic tensions ; it is a great burden because it takes all our attention

[Sardar Swaran Singh]

to look after them. But to make a statement of that type, particularly from a leader of the party to which he belongs, does create an impression that this is a situation which can be bought out. This is not a situation which can be bought out and any amount of moratorium or thinking in terms of money as a necessary compensation for India to tackle this problem is an absolutely wrong approach. This is one thing that we have been telling everybody that after all our resources are less and therefore we will find great difficulty in looking after them, but everyone in the world including my friend opposite believes that it is only by money that this problem can be solved. This is the one thing we are telling the entire world...

(Interruption)

This is not the approach and I am not going to accept it. When he talks of deep suspicion amongst the people, against the Government, the people have deep suspicion against the party to which the honorable Member belongs. They do not have any suspicion against us.

PROCLAMATION UNDER ARTICLE 356 OF THE CONSTITUTION IN RELATION TO THE STATE OF WEST BENGAL

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS/
गृह मंत्रालय में उपमंत्री (SHRI F.H. MOHSIN) : Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following papers (in English and Hindi) :

(i) Proclamation (G.S.R. No. 984) issued by the President on June 29, 1971, under article 356 of the Constitution, in relation to the State of West Bengal under clause (3) of article 356 of the Constitution.

(ii) Order (G.S.R. No. 985) dated June 29, 1971 made by the President under sub-clause (i) of clause (c) of the above Proclamation. [Placed in Library See No. LT-554/71 for (i) and (ii)]

(iii) Report of the Governor of West Bengal dated June 28, 1971, to the President recommending the issue of the Proclamation. [Placed in Library See No. LT-555/71].

STATEMENT SHOWING THE BILLS ASSENTED TO BY PRESIDENT

SECRETARY : Sir, I lay on the Table a statement showing the Bills which were passed by Parliament during the Seventy-sixth Session (1971) of the Rajya Sabha and assented to by the President :—

1. The General Insurance (Emergency Provisions) Bill, 1971.
2. The Manipur Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1971.
3. The Appropriation (Railways) No. 2 Bill, 1971.
4. The Bengal Finance (Sales Tax) (Delhi Validation of Appointments and Proceedings) Bill, 1971.
5. The Gold (Control) Amendment Bill, 1971.
6. The Salaries and Allowances of Officers of Parliament (Amendment) Bill, 1971.
7. The Mysore State Legislature (Delegation of Powers) Bill, 1971.
8. The Delhi Sikh Gurdwaras (Management) Bill, 1971.
9. The Punjab Appropriation Bill, 1971.
10. The Maintenance of Internal Security Bill, 1971.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

- I. ANNUAL REPORT (1969-70) ON THE WORKING OF THE NATIONAL PRODUCTIVITY COUNCIL, NEW DELHI.
- II. ANNUAL REPORT (1969-70) ON THE WORKING OF THE INDIAN STANDARDS INSTITUTION, NEW DELHI.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT/औद्योगिक विकास मंत्रालय में राज्यमंत्री (SHRI GHANSHYAM OZA) : Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following Reports (in English and Hindi) :—

(i) Twelfth Annual Report on the working of the National Productivity Council, New Delhi, for the year 1969-70. [Placed in Library See No. LT-604/71].

(ii) Twenty-third Annual Report on the working of the Indian Standards Institution, New Delhi, for the year 1969-70. [Placed in Library See No. LT-553/71].