

**RAJYA SABHA**

Tuesday, the 30th May, 1967/the 9th, *Jyaislha*, 1889 (Safca) .

The House met at eleven of the clock, MR. CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

**ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS****SUPPLY OF U.S. ARMS TO PAKISTAN**

»150. SHRI K. SUNDARAM: SHRI V. M. CHORDIA: SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: SHRI RAM SAHAI: SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS: PROF. SATYAVRATA SIDDHANTALANKAR: SHRI V. V. RAMASWAMY: SHRI ARJUN ARORA: SHRI P. K. KUMARAN: SHRI RAJNARAIN: SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: SARDAR RAM SINGH: SHRI NIRANJAN VARMA: SHRI A. D. MANI: SHRI RAM CHANDER: SHRI SURJIT SINGH  
ATWAL: SHRI P. ABRAHAM:

Will the Minister of EXTERNAL AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Government of the United States of America have decided to resume supply of spare parts for lethal weapons to Pakistan;

(b) if the answer to part (a) above be in the affirmative, whether the Government of India have lodged any protest with the Government of U.S.A. if so, in what terms and what is the reaction of U.S. Government thereto; and

(c) whether the Government of India have invited the attention of the United Nations in the matter, and if so, what is its reactions?

The question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri V. M. Chordia.  
635 RS—1

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI M. C. CHAGLA): (a) to (c) A statement is laid on the Table of the House.

**STATEMENT**

As the House is aware, the United States Government were providing practically the whole of Pakistan's military equipment requirements for several years and also began some military assistance to India in 1963. At the time of the conflict between India and Pakistan in August-September 1965 they decided to suspend all types of military supplies to both countries. This decision ruled out both lethal as well as non-lethal equipment, both grants and sales. In February, 1966, they decided to resume the supply of non-lethal equipment to both countries on the basis of cash or credit sales. They have now announced that in respect of the other types of military assistance they used to provide prior to the 1965 suspension, they will not resume any supplies, lethal or non-lethal, on the basis of grants. They have, however, removed the restriction on the sale of spare parts for equipment so far supplied to either country.

Having been unfortunately the victims of Pakistan's military aggression, we have been consistently pointing out to the U.S. government the dangers to our security which would result from any accretion to Pakistan's military strength which will inevitably result from the reactivation of Pakistan's military machine built up of arms and armaments received as aid from the U.S.A. We have pointed out to them that Pakistan is the only beneficiary of the latest U.S. decision since we had not acquired any appreciable quantity of U.S. arms, while Pakistan would be able to restore and increase her offensive strength against us. The U.S. authorities have informed us that the supply of spare parts is subject to a case-by-case examination of all requests, and that each case will be decided bearing in mind various considerations. They have

also assured us that this policy is directed solely to serve the interests of peace and to reduce tension, and that they do not intend to act to the detriment of our security interests.

Remembering the misuse of U.S. arms received by Pakistan, against India we have the most serious misgivings whether the effect of the new U.S. policy will prove to be in conformity with their declared objectives.

We do not consider this a matter which needs to be raised in the United Nations.

**श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरङ्गिया :**  
क्या श्रीमान यह बतलाने की कृपा करेंगे कि जैसा कि इसमें आप ने मंजूर भी किया है।

"Remembering the misuse of U.S. arms received by Pakistan, against India we have the most serious misgivings whether the effect of the new U.S. policy will prove to be in conformity with their declared objectives."

तो ऐसी स्थिति में हम कौन सा ऐसा दूसरा मार्ग ठीक समझते हैं या इसके बारे में क्या कुछ विचार किया गया है कि हम उनके शब्दों का कैसे पालन कर सकते हैं या हम उस से मुकाबला करने की क्षमता पैदा कर सकें इसके लिये हम दूसरी कौन सी योजना बना रहे हैं।

SHRI M. C. GHAG<sup>T</sup> A: As we have pointed out, on the last occasion when the Kutch conflict took place, the Indo-Pakistan conflict took place in 1965, we had the assurances of Gen. Eisenhower that the arms supplied to Pakistan will not be used against us. Those assurances were not kept. We know it to our cost. We pointed out to the U.S. that any assurances given by Pakistan will not be kept. As regards what alternatives we are thinking of, the alternatives are first, that we should have the strength enough to

stand on our own feet and the other is to strengthen our defence.

**श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरङ्गिया :**  
क्या श्रीमान यह बतलाने की कृपा करेंगे कि एक ओर विदेश मंत्री की हैसियत से आप भी यह उचित समझते हैं और मैं भी इसको आवश्यक समझता हूँ कि हमारे देश की रक्षा की दृष्टि से हम को मजबूत होना चाहिये और दूसरी ओर यह जो आटम बम वगैरह के बारे में डिस्अमार्मिंट कमेटी है उसमें हम प्रस्ताव करते हैं कि आटम बम जिन्होंने नहीं बनाया है उन्हें नहीं बनाना चाहिये और फिर हमारे यहां पर बजट में सुरक्षा के खर्च में कमी की जाती है, तो ऐसी स्थिति में हम कौन सा ऐसा कदम उठा रहे हैं कि कम खर्चा करते हुए हम अपने देश की रक्षा कर सकेंगे।

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: As regards the cut in the budget and what defensive steps we are taking, my colleague, the Defence Minister, is the right person to answer. With regard to the Non-proliferation Treaty, no Treaty has yet been tabled. I have given the assurance to this House that whatever decision we arrive at will be in the national interest. We will decide our attitude after we have seen the form and shape the Treaty will take and there is no commitment on our part that we will sign any Treaty that might be tabled at the Committee of Treaty.

**श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरङ्गिया :**  
कमजोर होने के नाते और कमजोर राष्ट्रों का संरक्षण ठीक तरह से हो सके, इसीलिये यूनाइटेड नेशंस आर्गनाइजेशन में हम हैं। और मुल्क भी उसमें हैं और हम भी उसमें हैं। जो देश अपने शब्दों का पालन किसी तरह से नहीं कर सकते, अपने कहे हुए मन्त्राहिदों के अनुसार चलते नहीं, तो इस बात को दृष्टि में रखते हुए कि हम शक्तिशाली हैं नहीं और हमें अपना डिफेंस

करने में तकलीफ होती है क्यों नहीं इस प्वाइन्ट को यूनाइटेड नेशंस आर्गनाइजेशन में उठा करके हम इस बात का प्रयास करें कि वे जो शब्द कहे और जिन बातों का आघार ले करके वे पाकिस्तान को आर्म्स सप्लाइ करते हैं उनका पालन वे ठीक तरह से करा सकें।

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: We have given careful thought to this question whether the U.N. can be brought into this question. The assurances given by Pakistan to the U.S. were bilateral. The help that the U.S. is giving to Pakistan is bilateral and the arrangement which it has suggested to us is also bilateral. We find that this is not a matter which can be agitated or ventilated in the U.N. forum. This is a matter of diplomacy between ourselves and the U.S. and other countries and we are pursuing all diplomatic methods to see that injustice is not done to our country.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: Sir . . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to exhaust the Members that are here and then I will give others the opportunity. Diwan Chaman Lall.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: I would like to ask my friend if he would look at the statement where it says:

"and that each case will be decided bearing in mind various considerations."

What are those various considerations?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: Well, the U.S. has broadly told us what the considerations are. They have indicated a case-by-case study of every help given to Pakistan and also they have indicated that they want to maintain a military balance between India and Pakistan. Whether such an assurance or study by the U.S. will achieve the objectives, I have grave doubts.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: May I ask him if he will be kind enough to look at the statement again where it says:

"They have also assured us that this policy is directed solely to serve the interests of peace and to reduce tension . . . ."

How is my friend going to justify the giving of these spare parts to Pakistan as on the basis of 'serving the interests of peace and reducing tension\*?'

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: The hon. Member will not ask me to justify it. This is not my view. This is the view of the U.S. which I have given. In our opinion, in the opinion of the Government . . . .

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: Has he drawn the attention of the U.S. to this particular aspect?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: We have, as strongly as possible, that far from serving the cause of peace, far from reducing tensions, the new policy which the U.S. has adopted of supplying Pakistan with spare parts will threaten peace and add to the tensions between India and Pakistan.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: Is he taking any steps to strengthen the Defence Forces of India in view of this particular aspect of the problem?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: I could not follow the question.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: Is my friend taking any steps to strengthen the Defence Forces of India in view of this renewed danger and the threat to the security of India?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: The defence of India is in the very safe hands of my very able colleague who is present here and I am sure he is doing everything possible to see that the Defence of India does not lag behind any advance that Pakistan might make in its military potential.

**श्री राम सहाय :** क्या माननीय मंत्री जी से मैं यह जान सकूंगा कि जैसे पहले हमेशा अमेरीका वाले पाकिस्तान से कुछ ऐसे अर्थोरेस लेते रहते थे या ऐसा कहते रहते थे कि हमने पाकिस्तान से अर्थोरेस लिया है और वह जो सप्लाय उनकी है वह भारत के विरुद्ध इस्तेमाल नहीं की जायगी, तो क्या इस बार भी कोई ऐसी अर्थोरेस पाकिस्तान से ली गई है या पाकिस्तान ने कोई अर्थोरेस दी है, इसके बारे में कोई जानकारी आप को है ।

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: As far as we know, no spares have yet been supplied to Pakistan under the new policy and we do not yet know whether, when the U.S. says that she will have a case-by-case study and maintain a military balance between the two countries, the U.S. will try to get an assurance from Pakistan • but assuming it does, what is the value of that assurance? The assurance was there, it was violated, blatantly violated in the Indo-Pakistan conflict.

**श्री राम सहाय :** क्या मैं यह जान सकूंगा कि उन अर्थोरेसों के खिलाफ पाकिस्तान ने काम किया और उस पर भी जब उन्होंने इस तरह की सप्लाय पाकिस्तान को देना स्वीकार किया है तो क्या आप ने इस प्वाइन्ट को प्रिजेंट किया है कि पाकिस्तान ऐसी अर्थोरेसों का पालन नहीं करता है, इसलिये उसको ऐसी कोई सहायता नहीं मिलनी चाहिये !

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: I assure the House that every possible point of view has been presented both to the Embassy here and to the State Department in Washington. We have pointed out what happened in the past and how assurances were violated. We have pointed out the effect of this new departure on the part of the U.S. policy. We have pointed out that the U.S. says that the purpose of its policy is to keep down the

arms race but the result of this policy would be to increase the arms race and we have pointed it out as forcibly as we possibly can.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS: Whether the Minister agrees or not, India has been outwitted both diplomatically and militarily. May I know from the Minister whether in relation to Pakistan there has been a little bit of shift in the policy of the USSR? It is evident from the visit of Mr. Pirzada to Moscow and from the communique that was issued in which there was no mention of the Tashkent Declaration there. It is evident in the case of Nepal also because there was a recent agreement between Pakistan and Nepal to have microwave communication facilities between East Pakistan and West Pakistan. That is so in the case of the Arab world also because the hon. Minister knows that during the Indo-Pakistan conflict the Arab countries played a role of neutrality. May I know from the hon. Minister in view of these facts, the attitude of Britain and the U.S.A. on the one side and the shift in the policy of the USSR on the other and the attitude of the Arab countries and also Nepal, whether the hon. Minister is trying to develop fresh contacts in international politics in the interests of the security of this country?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: Sir, I do not accept for one moment the suggestion made by my hon. friend that there is any shift in the policy of the USSR. USSR continues to be as friendly to us as she was all these years. Our relations are very close, as close as can be expected between two countries.

With regard to Nepal, Nepal is an independent non-aligned country and if she wants to have some economic co-operation with Pakistan, it is not for us to tell Nepal that she should not do so.

As regards the Arab world, I think our relations with the Arab world

have been friendly and are friendly and as close as they can be.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAB. There is a difference between being friendly to both and being friendly to one country. May I know from the hon. Minister whether it is not a fact that the USSR which was always utilising the veto in our favour and which has been advocating that Kashmir is an integral part of India—the hon. Minister must be knowing this—has not for the last one year said that Kashmir is an integral part of India? May I also know from the hon. Minister whether it is not a shift in the policy of the USSR as far as Pakistan is concerned and whether they want to be friendly to both the countries and not friendly to India only?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: That is not correct. You do not go on repeating something which you have said several times. The attitude of the USSR with regard to Kashmir is the same as it has been ever since this problem cropped up between us and Pakistan. Today the attitude, which is clear and unequivocal, of the USSR is that Kashmir is an integral part of India and the USSR has never deviated from that policy.

SHRI V. V. RAMASWAMY: In view of the unhelpful attitude of the U.S.A. may I know from the Minister, in order to strengthen our own defences, if necessary whether our country will seek the aid of any other friendly country?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: Sir, we will approach all friendly countries in order to strengthen our defences. What the approach should be and what assistance should be obtained is more for my friend and colleague, the Defence Minister, to say than for me.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: The statement says that America gave India some military assistance in 1963. May

I know what is the quantum of the assistance which the Government of the United States gave to this country in 1963 in terms of rupees, annas and pies and secondly, the statement says that the Government of the United States decided [to] suspend all types of military supplies to both India and Pakistan in 1965. If that is so why was the Government of the United States allowed to maintain the huge military mission in India even after it had suspended whatever little military aid that it gave to this country in 1963-64?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: With regard to the first I have not got the actual figures of the quantum of the aid that the United States gave at the time of Chinese aggression. If my hon. friend will write to me or put down a question I will be able to give him the figures:

With regard to his second question, the American military establishment was continued to supervise whatever assistance or aid had been given by the United States during the Chinese aggression but as the hon. Member knows they have now decided to close this mission because no more aid is being given to us and the policy is merely to give us spares not on a grant basis but on a cash basis.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: I want to know the expenses of the military mission, its size, the number of personnel involved and whether they spent on the so-called supervision more than what they gave us.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: I have not got the figures.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमान्, मैं सरकार से यह जानना चाहूंगा कि क्या सरकार को यह पता है कि जो उत्तर इस सवाल का सरकार ने दिया है वह स्वतः अपने में कन्ट्राडिक्टरी है। उसमें तीन असंगतियाँ हैं। पहले पार्ट में सरकार यह कहती है कि यूनाइटेड स्टेट्स पाकिस्तान को बराबर सैनिक सहायता देता चला आ रहा था। मैं यह जानना

चाहता हूँ कि कब से सहायता देना चला आ रहा था और कितनी सहायता दी। भारत को केवल 1963 में कुछ सैनिक सहायता प्राप्त हुई। इस सवाल का जवाब मंत्री जी ने दिया कि उनकी जानकारी नहीं है कि 'कुछ' की मात्रा क्या है, वे नोटिस चाहते हैं। फिर अमरीका सफाई से कहता है दूसरे पार्ट में कि वह स्पेयर पार्ट पाकिस्तान को दे रहा है। क्या मंत्री जी इस बात को समझते हैं कि कभी कभी स्पेयर पार्ट पूरी मशीन से ज्यादा खतरनाक होता है? पहले अमरीका ने बहुत ज्यादा सैनिक सहायता दे दी, बड़ी बड़ी मशीन, बड़े बड़े टैंक दे दिए। अब जो तमाम बिगड़े हुए टैंक होंगे उनको दुरुस्त करने के लिये सारे स्पेयर पार्ट अमरीका पाकिस्तान को दे रहा है। यह स्पेयर पार्ट का देना इस मौके पर ज्यादा खतरनाक है अपने मुल्क की सुरक्षा की दृष्टि से, मगर मंत्री जी ने इसको बहुत ही लाइटली लिया है जैसे सरकार के कान पर जूँ भी नहीं रेंगती। स्पेयर पार्ट का अमरीका से पाकिस्तान को जाना पाकिस्तान से 1965 की लड़ाई के समय में भारत के वीर जवानों ने जो पाकिस्तानी सैनिक हथियारों को खराब किया था उनकी मरम्मत करने के लिये हो रहा है। सरकार कहती है कि यह इतना सिगनीफिकेन्ट मैटर नहीं है कि हम इसको यूनाइटेड नेशन्स में उठाना पसन्द करें। क्यों? आज भारत की सुरक्षा, सरकार कहती है, खतरे में है, सरकार कहती है कि अमरीका जिस ढंग से पाकिस्तान को मदद दे रहा है उससे उसकी सैनिक शक्ति में बढ़ोतरी होगी, ताकत बढ़ेगी। इन तमाम बातों को जानते हुए भी मुल्क की सुरक्षा के प्रति अगर सरकार सचेत है तो मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि इस सवाल को यूनाइटेड नेशन्स में उठाने से सरकार गुरेज क्यों करती है? क्या यह सरकार की पिग्गैडिडनेस (सूकर मस्तिष्कता) नहीं है?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA; Sir, I have carefully listened to the hon. Member's question. He said there was

contradiction in the statement made by me. I have not found any contradiction nor have I found anything in the action suggested. What I had said that that the supply of spares to Pakistan is a most dangerous move because it will reactivate the large military machinery which Pakistan possesses today and which was purchased from the United States. What we have got from the United States is insignificant and may I draw the attention of my hon. friend to the statement which apparently he has not read? Look at the second paragraph. It says:

"Having been unfortunately the victims of Pakistan's military aggression, we have been consistently pointing out to the U.S. government the danger, to our security which would result from any accretion to Pakistan's military strength which will inevitably result from the reactivation of Pakistan's military machine built up of arms and armaments received as aid from the U.S.A. We have pointed out to them that Pakistan is the only beneficiary of the latest U.S. decision since we had not acquired any appreciable quantity of U.S. arms, while Pakistan would be able to restore and increase her offensive strength against us."

So that we fully realise the danger of supplying spares and I agree with my hon. friend that supplying spares is as good as supplying new equipment to Pakistan and adding to her military strength. Now, as regards the next point, my hon. friend has suggested—I do not know why—that we consider this departure in the United States' policy as an insignificant one. Far from it. As I said, we have strongly protested against this policy. The third is with regard to going to the United Nations. I have already given my answer and I need not repeat it.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: I would like to know whether America had promised us some communication equipment in 1962 or 1963, if I re-

member correctly, and whether it is the policy of the Government of India still to pursue the supply of communication equipment from America, or, in view of their latest rather very unhappy attitude towards India we would like to cease obtaining any equipment from the USA. That is No. 1. No. 2 is, the whole object of the latest policy of America is said to be to subserve the interests of peace and reduction of tension. The best way, as is well known, for the reduction of tension and subserving the interests of peace is to see that the open offer of India to enter into a no-war declaration with Pakistan is accepted. Have you ever brought to the notice of America our intention of signing a no-war pact? This is the best way to serve the interests of peace as well as reduction of tension. Have you ever brought this offer of India to the notice of America? I would like to have answers to these two questions.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: As regards the communication equipment, again this is a question which really should be answered by my colleague and friend, the Defence Minister. I am not in a position to answer that. As regards the no-war pact or declaration, we have constantly brought to the attention of the United States how anxious we are to reduce our armed strength if Pakistan would respond and the hon. Member knows—a question comes later on—fewt I took the initiative of writing to the Foreign Minister of Pakistan suggesting that we should sit down and discuss between ourselves, apart from any other question, whether we cannot reduce our armies, because it is bad for India and it is bad for Pakistan. We want all the money we have for our development. We do not want this money to be spent on defence purposes. But the response has been very negative. I have sent another letter and I am waiting for their reaction, but the attention of the United States has been drawn to this correspondence

and our anxiety to have friendly relations with Pakistan and not to add to our armed strength if it is possible.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: It is well known, arising out of the Tashkent Declaration, that normalisation of relations between India and Pakistan was one of the most important attempts made through this Tashkent Declaration. I would like to know what was the attitude of America towards this normalisation process between India and Pakistan and whether the attention of America has been drawn to the fact that the supply of spare parts, under their latest policy towards this question, is acting against the Tashkent Declaration, which had been entered into at Tashkent between India and Pakistan.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: Yes, Sir. We have drawn the attention of both the USA and the USSR to all the steps that we have taken after the Tashkent Declaration to implement it and the negative and unfortunate response we have had from Pakistan and I can assure the House, in fairness to both the countries, that both the countries are most anxious that the Tashkent agreement should be implemented.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Reference was made to our Military Mission purchasing arms on a cash basis at Washington. May I ask the Minister of External Affairs whether there is any noticeable reluctance on the part of the United States Government to supply us essential equipment, which we require? I am told, according to newspaper reports, that only very conventional equipment, which is available in other countries, is being offered by the United States. The second point I would like to raise is whether the Government has received any assurance from the United States Government that the arms, which they are now giving by way of spares to Pakistan, will not be used against India and what steps are taken to see that there is proper

supervision in regard to the use of these arms not against India,

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: As I said, no action has yet been taken, as far as I know, by the United States Government to implement the policy they have enunciated. The policy has been recently enunciated. These questions will arise when they seek to implement this policy. As far as I know, no spares have been supplied to Pakistan—neither have they asked for any nor have they been supplied with any.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: May I know whether the supply of spare parts would create an arms race between India and Pakistan? In view of that, in order to keep peace in this sector, it should be stopped. That is No. 1. Secondly, the hon. Minister says that the United States Government had not kept its promise. May I know whether the Government of India considers this to be an unfriendly act and has that sentiment been conveyed to them? Thirdly, May I know whether the Government would ask the United States Government to close its military mission here, which seems to be almost an interference with our country?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: Answering the third question first, it is part of the policy enunciated by them that they are going to close down their military establishment here. With regard to the other question, as I said, the United States is an independent sovereign country. It has a right to act according to its views, just as we have a right to act according to our views. Diplomatically all that we can do is to register a strong protest and that has been done.

SHRI SURESH J. DESAI: May I know if the Government are aware that large quantities of American military hardware are going to Pakistan *via* third countries and if the Government of India have lodged any protest in this regard with the United States Government and, if so, what is the result thereof?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: Yes, we are aware of this. Whenever it comes to our notice that a country has supplied arms to another country and that country has passed on the arms to Pakistan, we have registered a protest and have also drawn the attention of the United States, if the arms were supplied to the first country by the United States.

SHRI D. THENGARI: The Government of United States is one thing and the people of the United States is another. What steps have been taken to educate and mobilise public opinion in America itself on this point and have we failed on the propaganda front also?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: We have been mobilising and educating American public opinion for many years. Constantly our Embassy has been pointing out to the American public our relations with Pakistan, the signing of the Tashkent Declaration, the steps we have taken to implement them, the negative response which we have received from Pakistan and I can assure the House that as far as publicity is concerned, everything is being done to educate American public opinion.

SHRI R. S. KHANDEKAR: The hon. Minister has said that it is in the interests of both the countries, India and Pakistan, to reduce tension and to reduce armaments and spend that amount for the development of the two countries. Is it the policy of the Government of India that the same policy would be adopted towards China also, so that more amount would not be spent on armaments, but would be utilised for India's development?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: There is no Tashkent Declaration between China and India, and China has not shown the slightest intention of lessening its threat or its menace to us. So the question really does not arise.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This see-saw has been going on for the



last thirteen years since the agreement between Pakistan and the United States was signed. May I know why the Government is not taking vigorous diplomatic action over this matter including educating the United Nations Organisation because this decision of the U.S. Government is a clear violation of the Tashkent Agreement? Not that America is a party to it but America said at least that they stood by the Tashkent Agreement. I should also like to know why the Government should not also take certain steps at the diplomatic level for at least rousing world public opinion against the manner in which the Americans are building up the Pakistani military machine. Finally has it occurred to the Government that the continuance of the Military Mission in India—we are told that it is going to wind up now—I should like to know why it took two or four years nearly to wind up this useless interfering Military Mission which makes the moral position of India very weak in the eyes of the world and makes it difficult for us also to take a firm stand against the U.S.A. over this question of arms to Pakistan.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: With regard to the first, I hope the hon. Member realises that the very basis of the Tashkent Declaration is that discussions of all matters concerning India and Pakistan should be on a bilateral basis, that we should not permit intervention by any third party, and it would not be quite proper and not in the interests of our country to go to the United Nations in a matter which concerns solely India and Pakistan. We have had experience of the United Nations in the past on the Kashmir issue, and the House will carefully consider all the implications of India rushing to the United Nations complaining of a breach of the Tashkent Declaration.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I must make it clear because the Foreign

Minister should not make me misunderstood. He can misunderstand me if he likes but he should not make others misunderstand me. I never said that you should go to the United Nations over this matter, in the same way as you went there in 1948 on the advice of Lord Mountbatten. Nothing of the kind. I am asking you to educate the United Nations Organisation against Pakistan by raising this matter as a violation of a bilateral agreement between the two countries, as a provocation by the U.S. against India thereby endangering the peace and security in terms of the United Nations Charter in this part of the world. That is how I want you to go as a pure and simple indicter and accuser of the U.S. Government and nothing else.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: I do not think I misunderstood the hon. Member. With his acute sense of dialectics he has only put in different words what he said before. I have given the answer. As I said, this is a bilateral matter and it is in our interest to keep this as a bilateral matter between ourselves and Pakistan and not allow any interference or intervention by third parties. With regard to mobilising world opinion, we have done everything possible. We have informed all our Missions of the dangers inherent in the departure of American policy.

SHRI A. M. TARIQ: Is it not a fact that when this arms aid was started President Eisenhower gave an assurance to the Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, and the Government of India that these arms would not be used in any case against India, and is it also not a fact that a good number of Patton tanks had been supplied to Pakistan which cannot be used against China but which can be used only against India? If it is a fact, what explanation the American Government has given to the Government of India?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I must request the hon. Member to always sit in his

own seat when he puts the question hereafter.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: I have already answered the question. The whole House is aware of the assurance given by President Eisenhower to our late prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. The whole House is aware that that assurance was not kept by Pakistan and Patton tanks which were intended to be used against Communism were used against us. President Eisenhower had<sup>1</sup> given us an assurance that the arms supplied by the United States to Pakistan would never be used against India, and they were used as we know in large numbers in the Indo-Pakistan conflict. We have drawn the attention of the United States to this. We have protested. More than that we cannot do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Next question.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What about the question about the Prime Minister's House?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is not coming today.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The house problem has been solved? All right.

•151. [Transferred to the 7th June, 1967.]

**CANCELLATION OF 'MAY DAY'  
BROADCAST**

- ◆152. SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: SHRI NIREN GHOSH: SYED NAUSHER ALI: SHRIMATI USHA BARTHAKUR: SHRI P. ABRAHAM: SHRI R. S. KHANDEKAR: SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: SHRI CHITTA BASU: SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: SHRI A. D. MANI: SHRI NIRANJAN VARMA:

<sup>t</sup>The question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri Bhupesh Gupta.

Will the Minister of INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Calcutta Station of the All India Radio suggested certain modification in the script for the 'May Day' broadcast by the West Bengal Labour Minister; and if so, what are the reasons therefor; and

(b) whether it is also a fact that as a result thereof the Minister refused to make the broadcast, and if so, the reaction of the Government thereto?

THE MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRI K. K. SHAH): (a) and (b) Before recording the talk of the West Bengal Labour Minister the Station Director, Calcutta, read the script and found that certain references appeared to violate the accepted code of conduct which inter alia did not permit reference to any political party by name. It is also necessary for functioning of democratic institutions that no party is allowed to attack the Constitution or plead for a change in the Government except through constitutional means. It is also necessary to prevent any aspersion on or derogatory references to judiciary. He requested the Labour Minister for an opportunity for a discussion to be able to bring these points to his notice. The Minister declined to discuss his script and cancelled his broadcast. It was unfortunate that Minister did not give an opportunity to the Station Director and cancelled his broadcast.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is very difficult to ask supplementaries because I have a version of the speech which is at variance with certain material points in the text which he has got. I should like to ask these supplementaries. First of all there was no difficulty in the speech which is contrary to the Constitution, and I am prepared to stand before any legal authority to establish it. The