

भोपाल तक लायेँ और बड़े डेम बनाकर इस योजना को क्रियान्वित करें।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now we have some Special Mentions which are left. Shall we take it after the legislative business? We have clarifications on the Statement made by the External Affairs Minister. But I must remind the Members that he has to go back to the Lok Sabha at 2.15 p.m. At 2.30 p.m. he has got the same discussion there. He has to be released from here. So let us confine ourselves to minimum questions and specific questions.

CLARIFICATIONS ON THE STATEMENT BY MINISTER—Chinese Nuclear Test and C.T.B.T.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE (West Bengal): Madam Deputy Chairperson, I congratulate the hon. Minister for keeping this House informed by making a *suo motu* statement on 31st July, 1996, after his first statement of 15th July, 1996. While making his statement, the hon. Minister referred to new developments since his last statement and he has referred to, in this statement, the 45th nuclear test conducted by China as a new development. In between, there has been another development since his statement made on 31st July.

As per the report of UNI, while reserving the US stand before a Congressional Committee, US Secretary of State has come upon India if I may be permitted to say so and use a strong word, 'very heavily'. This statement, to my mind, was unfortunate and uncalled for. Why I am saying 'unfortunate and uncalled for', is, USA is a country which has conducted almost half of the nuclear tests. Out of 2047 tests—overground, underground—which have taken place, 1032 are accounted for by USA alone. And after doing all such exercises if they come and use—if the UNI report is correct—phrases like 'US was equally determined not to allow a single nation to prevent US from reaching a Test Ban

Treaty and open it for signature by all nations in September'. He has recognised the concerns of India; one about the 'entry into force' clause over which we have very strong objections, as per the present formulation and which is unprecedented in international fraternity. That is, while we are not going to be a signatory to the Treaty, but we have to take some obligation, if this clause is inserted, which is unheard of and which we are legitimately objecting to. The second is about the time-frame. To my mind, here too, we have not only been misunderstood, our position has been misinterpreted. We did not go to the Geneva Convention with a pre determined view about the time-frame. We made it abundantly clear while the negotiations were going on, protracted negotiations, over the years, that this is a matter which is negotiable. But there must be a linkage. We do not want any further non-proliferation treaty. The way the Test Ban Treaty is coming, it is nothing but another non-proliferation treaty. There must be some linkage and what would be the modality of that linkage could be negotiated but with the nuclear disarmament. In this connection, if one nation takes a view—whatever be the compulsions, their electoral compulsions or otherwise; I am not going to comment on it—that they will exercise their sovereign right and try to do whatever they consider best for themselves and for the international community and they will not allow other nations to exercise a similar option, it is simply not acceptable. Therefore, in that connection, I would like to know from the Minister, as per the UNI report—and we also read in the newspapers, the Minister also mentioned in his statements, that he had held discussions with the Secretary of State while he was in Jakarta... What was the response of the Minister? Perhaps, I can presume that the response was not available to the United States Secretary of State' otherwise, perhaps, his reaction would not have been so strong. But at the same

time, we would like to know if it is possible for the Minister to give us some details. And in this connection I would also like to take this opportunity of assuring our commitment to this policy, reiterating our commitment to the policy which we are pursuing about which there is a national consensus. And on this issue, Madam, the Government should take a firm stand because the whole country, the whole Parliament is behind it. And when I am saying so, I am just not trying to sound pompous. I am fully aware of the problems which we may have to face and the type of problems particularly in regard to the transfer of dual use technology about which we are suffering as we are not a signatory to the NPT. But many years ago, when a debate took place on the floor of the Parliament the then Prime Minister pointed out that to maintain national dignity and sovereignty. Sometimes some suffering at some quarters is not undesirable. We have been advised by the US Secretary of State that India should not follow the path of isolation. We are not following the path of isolation. We are talking of the conscience of the world. As the Minister has stated in his statement many of the non-aligned countries are in agreement with our views, with our stand; but they may have some other compulsions for not exactly dittoing the position what we have taken. And I am sure that it is not isolation, we are not isolated; we stand on a firm footing and that footing is on moral grounds. India is a country which talked of the test ban in those days' language 'standstill arrangement'-as early as 1954. Therefore, we should tell the US administration very firmly "Thank you for your advice but, sorry, we cannot take that advice." Thank you Madam, for giving me this opportunity.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri K.R. Malkani.

SHRI K.R. MALKANI (Delhi): Madam Chairperson, we are grateful to

the hon. Minister for making a second statement on CTBT before this House in the course of one month. It shows the importance India attaches to this CTBT. Our position, the Government's position, and the position of all parties—the national position—is that we will not sign CTBT and we will keep our nuclear option open. However, I am sorry to say that I sense a certain weakening in the official position. The hon. Minister in his statement has said that India cannot sign the Treaty in its present form, which means that if the form is changed a bit and the substance remains the same, we will be willing to sign it. I think we should

avoid all such ambiguities. Are you going to accept this thing if they just dot the 'i's and cross the 't's? Would you then go along with them? I am also surprised that the hon. Minister is dismayed by what China has done in staging its further test. I am dismayed that he is dismayed. China knows what it is about; China knows its own interest; China thinks straight and acts strong. I am sorry to say we seem to think in circles and we go wobbling. The real and the only right response for India would be, in this situation, to go nuclear. We do not have to be dismayed; we do not have to sit in a corner and cry. The hon. Minister has also said that we remain fully conscious of the evolving security situation. I am afraid we are quite unconscious of the security situation in our area. If we are really conscious we will go nuclear immediately.

Madam, there are basic objections to this draft treaty. We cannot accept it even if, in case, they make some formal changes; some changes in the form.

The draft is an instrument for nuclear non-proliferation horizontally and not vertically. It attempts, like the NPT, to prevent more States from acquiring nuclear weapons, but it makes no attempt to prevent the existing nuclear weapon States from adding nuclear weapons to their arsenal and improving their quality. We have had SALT-I and SALT-II. But

not one stom-bomb had been dismantled by these people. They go about saying--the United States has also said--that they would need these weapons for another, at least, fifty years. They have no intention of dismantling their nuclear arsenal.

The draft prohibits nuclear explosions, but does not prohibit the testing of nuclear weapons in laboratories and on computers. Thus, countries like the U.S.A., France and, perhaps, the U.K., being technically advanced, would not be constrained from further developing their nuclear weaponry.

Madam, the draft CTBT is not linked, as we wanted, to the elimination of nuclear weapons globally, within a specified time-frame. In fact, more than one nuclear weapon power has made it clear that nuclear weapons are a currency of power. They want to use their giant power very much like a giant. The U.S. Defence Secretary has said that they would need these nuclear weapons, at least, for the next fifty years and beyond. This is nuclear apartheid which we can never accept.

There is a peculiar entry into force (EIF) provision in the draft CTBT. It states that the treaty would come into force when the five declared nuclear weapon States and the three threshold nuclear weapon States, i.e. India, Pakistan and Israel, would have adhered to it. If, within three years, such adherence has not taken place, the signatory-States to the treaty would get together to consider what 'measures' should be undertaken to bring the treaty into force. This is an infringement of the sovereign right of a country to decide for itself which international instruments it would adhere to and which it would not. Further, the use of the word 'measures' come dangerously close to 'sanctions'. This is a threat to India and I think we should stand up to this threat and call their bluff. We can never submit to this blackmail.

Madam, today, India faces a dangerous security environment as never before. The nuclear weapon States will not let go of their nuclear weapons, and there is no possibility of general and complete nuclear disarmament. They want to maintain their nuclear hegemony and leave us naked in a nuclear jungle. Two of our neighbours, namely, China and Pakistan, are nuclear weapon States; one, declared; and the other, clandestine.

उपसभापति: मलकानी जी, यह हम लोग इसकशन नहीं कर रहे हैं फारेन पालिसी और सी-टी-बी-टी पर।

According to our tradition, only questions are put. I have already requested the House. The hon. Minister has to be free by 2.15 p.m. You look at the clock. I have fifteen names before me.

SHRI K.R. MALKANI: Madam, I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether the Government is willing to stand up to this blackmail. I would, in fact, suggest that we should go nuclear. We should sign this agreement only as a nuclear weapon country.

It is being said that if the entry into force provision were amended to leave out India--this is some Indian spokesman saying--the Indian delegation would abstain. It is being said that if this reference is deleted, the Indian delegation would abstain and allow the draft treaty to be forwarded to the U.N. General Assembly.

I would like to know from the hon. Minister as to what our position is. I would suggest that we should stand up to it and say 'No', and not abstain. Mere absetention is not enough. Madam, I am reminded of what happened in the olden times. When the Britishers gave us the Communal Award, our leadership said: 'We neither accept nor reject'. If you do not reject, you acquiesce. In acquiescing, you eventually accept it gracelessly. I think we should be able to stand up to this threat. There should be no 'ifs' or

buts'. We should be able to talk straight and think straight.

It has been said by our friends in America that we should give it as an election gift to President Clinton because this would help him to get reelected for another term. I hope Mr. Clinton gets elected. But it is not a part of our business to do anything to help or hurt anybody in any electoral contest anywhere in the world. I would therefore say, please come out clearly; and I would suggest that the Government move to get a resolution passed by the two Houses to say that we shall not sign the CTBT even if there are a few formal changes. That is all I have to say. Thank you very much.

SHRI SURINDER KUMAR SINGLA (PUNJAB): Thank you, madam. I join my colleagues in complimenting the hon. Minister for External Affairs for making suo motu statement and updating the whole country on Government thinking on the CTBT.

Madam, other colleagues of mine have expressed certain apprehensions. This is today's paper, reporting the US's tough and combative position of issuing threats to India. We must respond very strongly that we are not likely to be blackmailed, we are a nation of 90 crore people and can take care of ourselves.

The hon. Minister's statement is quite comprehensive and particularly states that "India has taken a very consistent and principled position on nuclear disarmament." It did not start today. It started in 1954 with the late Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. So, our position is clear. My colleagues have already raised certain questions, and I have some other questions to raise and do not want to duplicate what they have already raised. A part of the statement rightly asserts, "Such testing programmes inevitably give rise to questions relating to India's national security. While we have adopted the policy of restraint after demonstrating our capability, we remain fully conscious

of the evolving security situation." Here my question is two-fold: Firstly, I want to ask, is the Government convinced that the world is actually moving towards total elimination of nuclear weapons when they mention something like rationalization/adjustment after which the stockpile of nuclear weapons has come down from 25,000 to 4,000? Is it true that the rationalization/adjustment has decreased the stockpile of nuclear weapons from 25,000 to 4,000? I am asking this question to know whether there is a serious attempt or not, because saying something and doing something else are two entirely different things.

My second point is, a lot of people are now saying that the old Cold War has reallended and the natural corollary is that we do not need nuclear weapons. Still, my senior colleague, Mr. Pranab Mukherjee, has amply demonstrated that the USA is the largest nuclear weapon testing country. Nearly 50 per cent of the tests which were conducted, both in the laboratory and in the field, were by the US alone. So my question is, do you really find that what they are saying and what they are actually doing is a mere propaganda plank and meant for not allowing other countries to join the nuclear power club?

My third point is, it is true that quite often we have been saying that we will not close our options and we have an option to go nuclear. Is it not the time today to go nuclear and to declare that we are going to be nuclear, even if other do not? You answer my first two questions on their intention and the reality.

Lastly, even China and Russia claim eliminating the nuclear weapons to be the ultimate goal. But, in view of the latest test by China, the 45th in that category, are we to believe that they are really going in for final or total elimination of nuclear weapons? In fact, I would really like to add my concern on this. That is why I am saying that we have to go nuclear.

would really like to quote a very eminent thinker of India, K. Subramaniam, to really demonstrate India's concern:

"The prospects of an on-going nuclear disarmament are only in the imaginations of those willing to suspend their disbelief and reconcile to accept nuclear servitude for ever. All colonialism begins in the minds of those willing to be colonised. That helped our ancestors. But let us not allow that to happen to our generation and to posterity."

In this kind of a context, I appeal and ask of the Government: is it not the time to declare our intentions today that we are also going nuclear? Thank you.

DR. BIPLAB DAS GUPTA (West Bengal): Madam, it does not always happen that a former Minister and a current Minister agree wholeheartedly on a sensitive subject. It has happened. It also does not always happen that the Government and the Opposition sides are also together on a particular issue. The surprise of surprises is, keeping in mind what has happened over the past few days, I am Mr. Singha are on the same boat rather.

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY (Andhra Pradesh): This a direct fall-out of nuclear disarmament.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: We have already discussed this question of CTBT a few days back. This is the second statement in 15 or 16 days. But, perhaps, already there is need for a third statement. This morning we saw in the papers that the United States Administration, through its Secretary of State, Mr. Warren Christopher, has said:

"India will have to sign the Treaty. India will have no option. They will have to sign the Treaty."

This is an arrogance of power that they want to impose their will on us. They have an opportunity because, in case they get the Treaty signed by others, then, under clause 14 or article 14 of the Draft Treaty, where you have this entry into

force provision, they can impose their will on India because, then, the other nuclear powers can gang up together and impose their will on us. So, this fear is now very much a reality. I want to know from the Minister whether, in the face of such a threat, we are going to stand firm or not. Today this House is going on recess for three weeks. We want the Minister to remain firmly committed to the position that he has taken that we would not yield to pressure. A lot of pressure is going to come. A lot has already come, and a lot more is going to come. So, this thing should be made clear during the clarification to be made by the Minister, that we are adhering to our commitment.

What are these commitments? One is that we do not want this world to be divided into nations who are nuclear "haves" and those who are nuclear "have-nots." This is not something which we want. We want a world which is not only not having any nuclear monopoly of some countries but also which is free of any fear of nuclear holocaust.

We want the entire stockpile of nuclear armaments, which is there in the world, to be completely destroyed. This stockpile consists of 55,000 nuclear warheads, which are 16 lakh times more powerful than the bomb, which was blasted in Hiroshima. They can destroy the whole world 50 times over. We do not want that this stockpile continues to remain. Therefore, we want complete nuclear disarmament. Pending that, we are keeping our options open. It does not mean that tomorrow we are going to explode a nuclear bomb. Maybe, our friends from BJP want to do so. We certainly do not want, but we want to keep our options open.

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI: There are many good things which you do not like.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: I want the options to be kept open so that, if

needed; we can certainly go in for that option. That is the point I want to make.

My second point is that when it comes to nuclear diplomacy or other kind of foreign policy issues, including defence, part of the problem on defence in certain way can be solved through our professional and skilled diplomacy. We should understand the game the Western powers have been playing. They certainly have vested interests in protecting their armaments industry, which is, by far, the biggest industry in the world. About 40 years ago, a very well-known erstwhile President of the United States, President Eisenhower, made a statement. There he talked about the military industrial complex consisting of major armaments manufacturing companies. They influenced the political opinion within the United States and abroad to strengthen their position so that more money was allocated on defence. That military industrial complex is now trying to keep the worst thing in some way or the other. They want India and Pakistan to fight with each other. If they do not fight, they should maintain the condition of antagonism as far as possible so that both India and Pakistan go to them for purchase of arms. My question is whether that is benefiting the people of India and Pakistan. Certainly it is not. Certainly we do not approve of the way the Government of Pakistan has been functioning. They are devoting 26 per cent of their Budget allocations on defence, which is very high proportion of their allocations. If it is at the cost of the allocations on health and education of the people of Pakistan. They could have allocated that amount on health and education instead. But, we also spend a lot of money on defence. Our allocation is 14 per cent, which is three times what we spend on defence and education of the people of India. My point is when we are thinking of this option, we should certainly keep in mind that the money we spend on defence is in a sense, a wastage. Yes, we have to allocate on it, because

we have to defend our country. That is a different point. But, if it is possible, through amicable discussions and dialogues with Pakistan, we should try and bring about a situation where we will not complete for arms with the result that will not benefit the armament industries of the West. Through dialogues and discussions we may be able to sort out most of our problems. That would, probably, be the best solution and we should look for it. If we look at the recent World Development Report released by the World Bank, we will find that India is the 22nd poorest country in the world. Out of the other 21 countries, which are below India, five are Asian countries, one is a Latin American country and the rest are African countries. We may be proud that we are richer than Bangladesh, Nepal, Bhutan and Laos, but is it something to be proud of? That is why I have raised this question. We should try and find out how we can reduce our defence expenditure.

My next point is on China. The heading of the Statement says: "Chinese Nuclear Test and C.T.B.T." In the text there is no mention about the Chinese nuclear test. My point is it is not that China alone has conducted tests. Of course, it has conducted the most recent test. It is possible it may not go in for further tests. That is a different question. They might have done so to have a balance. Within the nuclear club, there is so much of disparity. The United States has conducted more than half the tests. The Russians have conducted 715 tests. Then, the French have conducted tests. There is a competition for tests within the nuclear powers. China has conducted one or two more tests to bridge the gap with the West. That is also a part of their tactic to reduce their nuclear monopoly. Even in the previous regime when Pranab Babu was the Foreign Minister, I feel that he did make some effort to improve the economic relationship between India and China by opening up the border trade and other things. To a certain

extent, there is some relaxation. I hope that our new Foreign Minister would also continue to see to what extent the economic diplomacy would help us to obviate the need to go in for such a heavy expenditure or to go in for a competition in the arms race which is not going to help anybody.

Lastly, I would make a very brief point. At the end of the Minister's statement, he has affirmed, "We continue to remain engaged in the negotiations in Geneva in order that our national interests are fully safeguarded." I have no quarrel on that statement. That is okay. We are fighting not only in our national interest, but we are fighting for the global interest. When we are talking about nuclear disarmament, it is not only for India, but we are talking about the whole humanity. So that point should be made. It is not simply that we are looking after India's interest or just because Pakistan has nuclear potential, so should we too have one, just because China has nuclear potential, we should have one. That is the only way you are looking at it. You, must have a much broader view. We want nuclear disarmament because the stockpile of nuclear arms is disastrous to the world. It is pushing us to the brink of a nuclear holocaust. If it does happen, then, the entire humanity would be destroyed. That is why we are opposed to it. When we are talking about keeping our options open, that doesn't mean that we are in favour of some nuclear competition. So that point should be made rather than only focussing on national interest. Thank you very much.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Dr. Gopalrao Vitalrao Patil. Absent. Mr. Gujralji, the way things are going on, it seems very unlikely that you would be released at 2.15 P.M. because Members are making long speeches. So, the House should decide what we should do. Now, the next speaker is Mr. Giri Prasad. Including Mr. Giri Prasad, there are in all ten Members who want to speak.

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: Are they in the House?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think they are here. I have to call of them.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI I.K. GUJRAL): If the House agrees, I can reply to the debate in the next session.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is entirely up to the Members ... *(Interruptions)* ... He needs some time to reply. Mr. Minister, how much time would you need to reply? I know that a lot of questions have been put.

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL: That depends on the queries that they put.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: So far four Members spoke. They all have put a lot of queries. I do not know how we would finish this debate.

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL: My submission in all humility—I hope that I would not be misunderstood—would be a broad spectrum of questions have emerged, unless Members want to say something different. I am submitting this because hon. Members wish that I should reply today. Then, I think that idea may be kept in mind. If the hon. Members wish that I should reply to the debate in the next session, I am willing to do that also. ... *(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is entirely up to the House to decide it because I don't want....

SHRI N. GIRI PRASAD: Madam, I would be as brief as possible.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is not subjected to you alone.

SHRI N. GIRI PRASAD: At the end of the discussion, if there is time, the Minister can reply to the debate; otherwise, it can be postponed. According to my perception, in the best interest of everybody, he should reply to the debate today itself. Otherwise, he has to make another statement in the next

session. On that, we can have further discussion.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Giri Prasadji, the question is we should have the time. We have Private Members' business. What to do? It is entirely up to the House to decide it. I was trying to tell Members to be brief. *Bioliye.*

SHRI N. GIRI PRASAD (Andhra Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairman, today, the newspapers carried one item of news. That is, the US Secretary of State Warren Christopher said in clear-cut terms, "The US is not prepared to agree to total disarmament at the present time. We think that these are quite separable issues". This is a news item that has appeared today. They are very clear. They are not seeing it as a measure of disarmament, but only to ban nuclear tests hereafter.

Secondly, I am not clear about this statement of the US wanting to deply the Theatre Missile Defence System. Some people say that it is a version of the earlier Star-Wars. And Japan is also willing to cooperate with the US, especially, as far as the deployment of these defence systems in Asia is concerned. So far, I was under the impression that Japan was a nuclear-free country and they did not want to meddle in those matters. But, unfortunately, Japan is also being dragged by the US into this so-called defence system. In all probability, it must also be a nuclear defence system.

The third point on which I want to get a clarification from the hon. Minister is how we are going to behave in the Geneva meeting on this issue. Some papers have reported that we are trying to veto the resolution or agreement or we just want to walk out of the deliberations leaving the others to sign the agreement. I do not know what has emerged at the final stage. Because China is objecting to certain representations or the mode of voting about the direct inspection of the sites, there is some move in this direction. There may be some agreement bet-

ween China and other countries. In that background, again, the pressure will be on India. On that occasion, we are the only country, as far as I know. Though our Minister claims that we are not isolated and many countries are in tune with our ideas, as far as I understand, ours is the only country which is taking a different stand and it almost amounts to isolation. If every country signs the agreement and we are outside of it, then, how do you explain it? How do we go about this? I want to know this. Whether it is vetoing or walking out, what does it mean? Whether you veto the arrangement or walk out of the meeting, I do not know in what way our country's security interests are protected or jeopardised in this context.

My last point is, though there is seemingly a consensus on this issue, the consensus is mostly on an emotional issue, of our country not allowing itself to be bullied by the US or any other foreign countries on any matter which concerns our national interest. As far as that is concerned, we are united. Parliament can pass a resolution. But the vital question is, after this, what? We walk out of that arrangement; they may sign and we may be part of the agreement; or we may be outside the agreement. What will happen? The present policy followed, which has been followed for quite some time, for a number of years, is that our nuclear option is kept open. How long does it go on? What is the purpose of keeping this option open? I am not suggesting to go the BJP way. They were clear that our country should go the nuclear way. Even if we go the nuclear way, are our country's interests, at least security interests, protected? Already many powers are there who are armed to the teeth as far as nuclear weapons are concerned. That is why, this question has to be considered in this context.

Madam, Deputy Chairman, my last suggestion to the hon. Minister and to the House is, let us have an enlightened debate on this issue—not confined to

Parliament alone—whether to go nuclear which is in the best interests of our security arrangements. We cannot go on like this keeping our option open, not doing anything. Now, we are losing both the things; we are losing the moral option; and we are losing the nuclear option. Our opinion is not honoured in the international scene. That is my fear. If I am wrong, I will be happy. But the hon. Minister may be kind enough to explain this point. Thank you, Madam.

DR. D. MASTHAN (Tamil Nadu): Thank you, Madam. First of all, I feel that this vital issue should be approached by everyone, be it bureaucrats, be it politicians, either in power or in Opposition, with a broad mind overcoming the narrow political barriers. There cannot be any ambiguity or difference of opinion about our present External Affairs Minister, Shri I.K. Gujral who has got a great concern for this country, its security and sanctity. It is very clear that in the present situation India has desired not to sign the CTBT, but there are efforts to bypass our country in getting the ratification and taking the CTBT to the United Nations Assembly and getting it passed. How are we going to overcome these hurdles? Already, Pakistan and China have declared that they will not sign the CTBT because India has not signed the CTBT. But as far as Pakistan and China are concerned, all of us are very much aware that they have got enough nuclear stockpile. The US and China have already supplied enough nuclear weapons and missiles to Pakistan. China has got a number of nuclear weapons and even recently they have conducted their latest nuclear test. Is it not a threat to our security? If we are not going to sign the CTBT, how are we going to overcome these problems?

As our hon. Members have already mentioned here, there is a news-item in *The Hindu* today which states: "The US Secretary, Mr. Warren Christopher, has already declared categorically that the US

will not let India block CTBT." I am happy that our hon. Minister of External Affairs has stated in his Statement that many countries have shown an understanding of our stand, but in case the Western countries are going to bypass India in taking the CTBT to the United Nations Council, how are we going to overcome the problem? That is all I would like to ask. Since the time was very short, I was very brief. Thank you, Madam.

SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR (Maharashtra): Madam Chairperson, for a long time I have been an admirer of the hon. External Affairs Minister. Now he has another admirer, Mr. Christopher! Mr. Christopher says, "He is a person of probity and intelligence." What he means thereby it is a left-handed and tongue-in-cheek compliment. "If you are intelligent enough to toe our line," — that is a compliment which is no compliment! Madam Chairperson, to what my learned friend has said just now, there is one thing more to add: "A Republican Congressman told Mr. Christopher that it should be made very clear to India that lack of cooperation on the test-ban treaty would have ramifications across the whole spectrum of Indo-US relations." That is arm-twisting.

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: That is bullying by US. How can they threaten us like that?

SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR: I admire you, Madam.

Therefore, are we going to tolerate it? The question would be another one. They have gone further and said, "We would not change the voting pattern.", meaning thereby India would no more have an option of vetoing any resolution of that nature. My suggestion with humility is: Let us go nuclear. There is a political adage which says: "Always negotiate from a position of power." Let us be powerful so that the bullying, as some hon. Member said, would cease to be. We will not allow anybody to twist

our arms, and if they do it in a matter of change, we will give them a *dhobi pach-char*. That is, Madam, the language used in wrestling.

Madam, is the Government willing to say with confidence that, if need be, we shall be alone, but we shall stand erect? Will the Government take that stand? Thank you, Madam.

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI (UTTAR PRADESH): Madam Deputy Chairperson, I don't want to make any long statment. But I do want to draw the attention of the Minister of External Affairs to two points and to seek clarifications on them. The first point is this. During the discussions which he had with Mr. Christopher in Jakarta, while explaining his position and also while listening to the position of the United States, he must have known what Mr. Christopher really means by saying that India's proposals are impractical. Of course, now he has used a strong word "quixotic". This impracticality is about the time-bound disarmament programme. What exactly did he mean or what did he say about this? When he says this, what is his perception? What is his viewpoint?

I want to draw the attention of the hon. External Affairs Minister to another point also. Of course, Mr. Shirodkar very well brought out the left-handed compliment that had been paid. So far as we are concerned, we fully agree. I don't think that Mr. Gujral needed a compliment from the Foreign Secretary of the United States because the country commends the stand that he has taken. I would also like to tell Mr. Prasad and Dr. Biplab Dasgupta that it is not a question of BJP way. BJP has only one way, the national way and the national interest. Having said that, I would like to mention this. I personally don't have any apprehension that till Mr. Gujral is in the Ministry of External Affairs there will be any weakening of the stand that he has so far taken. But I think that needs reassurance again. I am again saying this

because arm-twisting has also been mentioned and a number of other things have been given in the statement that has been made by Mr. Christopher. I would like to quote. Now the full statement has come in different papers in different forms. I will just quote, "Mr. Christopher said that he hoped India" recognises the tremendous international coalition which wants to take this important step". This is in keeping with the arm-twisting which was mentioned. This is international pressure which was also referred to by Mr. Prasad and it has come earlier also during the discussions. Whatever the strategy, whether it is walk-out-I think he explained it earlier--I think that strategy will continue. Anyway, it is left to the Government. Obviously it seems that they do want to go straight to the General Assembly by promoting some surrogates or like that uniting for a peace resolution which, of course, is for a good thing. They want to circumvent any objection that India may likely to raise. I have no doubt that the External Affairs Minister himself must have taken note of this strategy or rather this stratagem of the United States and he will be taking steps as to how much we can counter it with the kind of friends he has made in Jakarta.

Madam Deputy Chairperson, I do want to raise another points at this juncture. This is about the Kashmir problem. I am not going into the details. The CTBT is all along connected with the Kashmir problem. It was only sometime back that the Ambassador of the United States was in Pakistan on a holiday, on a personal visit, and he was talking about CTBT as well as India's stand.

I just want to say that this is another way, a kind of Pincer Movement, whoever might be behind it.

I quote:

"We believe peace cannot come to Kashmir unless there is an strong understanding between India and Pakistan and unless the wishes of

the Kashmiri people are taken into account."

He again said:

"The US would like to see a dialogue developed which would lead to a peaceful settlement of the problem. His country would simply like to see all men of goodwill engaged in a political process."

What does he mean by a political process? Mr. Wisner was ambiguous on the question of elections in the State. Earlier he had made a statement in Kashmir that elections were not an end in themselves. Earlier he had questioned the integrity of the election process. Madam, I had brought this fact to the notice of the House earlier also. At that time....

उपसभापति: चतुर्वेदी जी जय समय की तरफ देख लीजिए।

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI: Madam, I will take just one minute. He said, "The elections are internal matter of India." he added, "Political process should include elections if properly put together." This is a kind of pincer movement. International pressure and pressure with is trying to invoke people of goodwill like my friend Dr. Biplob Dasgupta who is horrified by all the prospects and as an economist he is worried about expenditure, etc. Not only that. A variety of publicity has been started by the USA. Gandhiji's name, Buddha's name and Nehru's name have also been invoked at different times by the US spokesmen. I want to bring to the notice of the External Affairs Minister that Gandhiji had something else to say about Hiroshima.

As time is short, I am not going into that. He talked about hegemony of the United States. He had used the words hegemony of the United States while talking to the US correspondent. Today it is the United States that wants to perpetuate the hegemony of one country.

I hope the External Affairs Minister will be able to resist this not only on his

own but also as an expression of the national will of this country.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now I have three more names with me.

Dr. Naunihal Singh has withdrawn his name because of paucity of time.

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI: Madam, my party is extending full cooperation. Our two Members have withdrawn their names.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But one Member has not come.

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI: Madam, he is there.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But one more is there from the BJP. I have got the name of Shrimati Renuka Chowdhury. She is representing a party. Then Shri Ahluwalia's name is also there. I don't think there will be enough time for the Minister to reply. Shrimati Renuka Chowdhury.

डा० महेश चन्द्र शर्मा : केवल स्पष्टीकरण हो।
उपसभापति: सभी स्पष्टीकरण करने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं।

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY (ANDHRA PRADESH): Madam, thank you very much for giving me this opportunity. I think all of us cutting across party lines are with the External Affairs Minister and India on her stand about CTBT. India is a land of non-violence. Our unclear policy is based on that till today.

Unfortunately, we have neighbours who are stockpiling unclear arms. We have nations which are being empowered by the United States in this bully attitude. India is not going to succumb to unclear arm-twisting or coercion of any kind. Hence I appreciate the stand that we have taken and will continue to do so in the international arena.

The questions and suggestions being made by the United States are going to be viewed in their totality of what they are—thinly guised, ill mannered, illtempered threats towards India and the people of India are going to take cognisance

of this. We will accept it as in direct proportion to the strength that India has as a nation to stand up to global France tirade. We have and China, who are supposed to be taking part in these negotiations, who have had their own unclear explosions. There has not been a squeak from anybody else. We had no choice but to take this stand because our environment has been unclearised by our neighbours and our enemies. So the question of compromise comes too late in the day and India has to examine her unclear options and keep our unclear viability with ourselves as I see it.

2.00 P.M.

Madam, I will now come to the basic points on which I want clarifications:

If we intend to block this treaty, do we seek an option? How do we go about blocking it? What are the mechanisms and what is the alternate policy that we are going to seek? Will the Test Ban Treaty be entered into without an endorsement by the Conference on Disarmament? It is possible for them to endorse this? Is the UN General Assembly capable of endorsing what the Conference on Disarmament has rejected? What steps is the Government taking to see that this will not happen? What steps does the Government intend taking to make sure that the United Nations General Assembly vote is prevented and how does India propose to go about it now in the Conference on Disarmament and not just an the Test Ban Treaty? If we were to examine the scope of this, then we will be ensuring India's sovereignty and integrity. This will not be compromised because no nation is going to compromise its sovereignty just for being nice and pretty nice towards the Treaty. It is not for other nations to teach India about militant non-violence because this is what we stood for in 1988, if I am not mistaken. We entered into this agreement, we signed the NPT because we believed in the concept. But the rest of the countries stood for what they have. They did not

adhere to it. It is 22 years too late for us to go back and say that we are here merely for peace. India will keep her nuclear options open for self-defence. India will keep her nuclear options open because the people have empowered the Government to do so. Thank you madam.

श्री एस-एस० अहलुवालिया (बिहार): उपसभापति महोदया, व्यापक परीक्षण प्रतिबन्ध संधि के बारे में हमारी सरकार ने जो निर्णय लिया है, उसका स्वागत है और सारे विश्व में भारत शांति का दूत कहलाता है उसने हर वक्त यह आवाज उठाई है कि किसी तरह से कोई शांति का रास्ता निकाला जाये किन्तु शांति का रास्ता यह न हो कि हम तो सीटीबीटी पर दस्तखत करें व्यापक परीक्षण प्रतिबंध संधि पर दस्तखत करें तथा और लोग इस संधि पर दस्तखत करने के बावजूद अपना परीक्षण जारी रखें।

महोदया, 70वीं सदी में रूस आफ वार बनाये गये, बायोलोजिकल वेपन्स बन्द किये गये। उस टाइम यू०एन० की कोई जनरल असेम्बली नहीं थी जो इन वेपन्स को रोक सके। वर्ल्ड के लीडरों ने कानून बनाये, पर क्या हम इसके बावजूद बायोलोजिकल वेपन्स को रोक सके? उसके बाद कैमिकल वेपन कनेवेन्शन हुई अली एटीज में और कैमिकल वेपन्स को भी रोक गया किन्तु क्या हम उसको पूरी तरह से रोक सके? जितने बलशाली और अपने आपको सुपर पावर कहने वाले लोग हैं, इसका परीक्षण करते रहे तथा दिन पर दिन नई तकनीक से ऐसी चीज बनाते रहे। 1988 में रज्जीव गांधी ने एक्शन प्लान दिया कि 10 वर्ष के अन्दर जितने न्यू क्लीयर वेपन्स है, उनको डिस-आर्ममेंट में डालेंगे और खत्म करेंगे। स्टार टी०वी०, बी०बी०सी० ने दिखाया कि आब्सोलेट टेक्नालोजी के न्यू क्लीयर वेपन्स का निरस्त्रीकरण कर दिया है। किन्तु क्या हम चीन को रोक सके, फ्रांस को रोक सके कि लेटेस्ट टेक्नालोजी से वे अग्रेय अस्त्र बनाने से, नाभकीय परीक्षण करने से। आज हमारे पड़ोसी देश चीन में नाभकीय परीक्षण हो रहा है, पाकिस्तान पूरी तैयार पर लगा हुआ है। हमारी आड़ लेकर, यह बहाना बनाकर कि यू०एन० जनरल असेम्बली, यू०एन० सिक्योरिटी काउंसिल में सभी जगह इस पर बहस चल रही है और इस वक्त इसका परीक्षण करके सारे विश्व को एक चुनौती दी है और हमारी आड़ में हमारे मंत्री ने खड़े होकर इसका जवाब दिया है कि हम इस सफर दस्तखत नहीं करेंगे। तब तक नहीं करेंगे जब तक यूनिफॉर्म पॉलिसी नहीं बनती जब तक सारे लोग इसके मान नहीं लेते, जब तक हमारी सुरक्षा की व्यवस्था नहीं होती तब तक

हम इस पर दस्ताख्त नहीं करेंगे। परन्तु क्या आज हम वाकई इस रास्ते पर चलने के लिए प्रस्तुत हैं? मैं मंत्री महोदय से जानना चाहूंगा कि क्या सीटीबीटी में अमरीका का दबाव है? या दूसरी कन्ट्रीज का दबाव है, कई तरह से वे दबाव दे रहे हैं। उन्होंने कैमिकल वेपन्स के बारे में ईराक पर दबाव दिया। उस पर एकानामिक शैवशन लगाया। इस तरह का दबाव वे दे सकते हैं। भारत ऐसे दबाव से लड़ने के लिए तैयार रहे और उसका सही जवाब दे। वह अपनी रीढ़ की हड्डी पर खड़ा हो। भारत क्या अपनी रीढ़ की हड्डी पर खड़ा होकर इन सारी चीजों का जवाब दे सकता है और यह बता सकता है कि जब तक सारे विश्व में इसका प्रयोग बंद नहीं होगा तब तक यह लागू नहीं होगा, तब तक हमें यह मान्यनीय नहीं है। हमारी संस्कृति, हमारी सभ्यता और हमारे लोगों की सुरक्षा के लिए हमें आप्रियास्र चाहिए, हमें न्यूक्लियर वेपन्स चाहिए। हम इसके लिए न्यूक्लियर बनायेंगे, अपने लिए बनायेंगे और भारत गर्व के साथ खड़ा होकर कहेगा कि भारत की रक्षा के लिए इसकी जरूरत है।

डा० महेश चन्द्र शर्मा (रजस्थान): महोदय, मैं केवल स्पष्टीकरण मांगूंगा, वक्तव्य नहीं दूंगा। मंत्री महोदय से मैं केवल तीन स्पष्टीकरण चाहूंगा।

पहला, आपने अपने वक्तव्य में चीन को भी पाश्चात्य साम्राज्यवादी यूरो-अमरीकी आणविक क्लब के साथ जोड़ दिया है। क्या यह जरूरी था? क्या हम अपने इस एशियन साथी को पाश्चात्यों के खिलाफ अपने साथ नहीं ला सकते?

दूसरा स्पष्टीकरण मान्यवर, मैं चाहता हूँ कि चीन ने सी०टी०बी०टी० के इंस्पेक्शन क्लाइज पर, अपनी आपत्ति दर्ज की है। क्या उस आपत्ति पर हमारी कोई प्रतिक्रिया नहीं है? मैं समझता हूँ कि हमें उसकी आपत्ति का समर्थन करना चाहिए।

तीसरी बात यह है कि आपने अपने वक्तव्य में श्री जवाहर लाल नेहरू को संदर्भित करते हुए बात को इस प्रकार से कहा है जैसे सी०टी०बी०टी० हमारे ही कहने से आई है। हमने कोई पाजिटिव ऐक्शन तो किया नहीं है, हम केवल री-ऐक्ट कर रहे हैं। इसलिए मुझे लगता है कि अगर यह संदर्भ न आता तो अच्छा रहता।

मेरी अंतिम बात यह है कि आप किसी के दबाव में झुक न जाइए, सारा देश आपके साथ है। इस प्रकार की संधि पर हम हस्ताक्षर नहीं करेंगे। देश का स्वाभिमान खड़ा रहे, इतना ही बस। धन्यवाद।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now there is no time. The Minister has to reply. And your name is also not with me. I was informed that Dr. Gopalrao Vithalrao Patil had withdrawn his name. That is what Mr. Chaturvedi told me. You may be aware, many Members from the Congress side had withdrawn their names. Mr. Narayanasamy was to speak, but he had withdrawn his name. We should give sufficient time to the Minister so that he can answer all the questions raised by the hon. Members. If you don't want an answer, you just what to say Something, I would call you. Now, Mr. Gujral.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI I.K. GUJRAL): Madam Deputy Chairman, I am grateful for the unanimous voice that is emerging from this House. I think this voice is in consonance with what has come to be, what I would call, the national consensus. It is I think a remarkable merit of the Indian policies, particularly regarding defence and foreign affairs, that whenever it comes to it, we are able to stand together and say in one voice where our national interests are.

I am a humble man and it is you strength that strengthens me. It is the support of this House that really strengthens my voice. In all humility I would say that the style of the Indian diplomacy is a part of our national ethos. We do not say strong words. We do not use a harsh language. But we say firmly, decisively what our national interests are. That is the tradition of Indian foreign policy ever since the days of Nehru. This is what, in my own humble way, I am trying to keep up.

3.00 P.M.

Several points have been raised which are very relevant and I will try to deal with some of them. But let me first deal with Mr. Christopher's statement because this is the latest one. If you permit me, Madam, I would submit that we have seen reports regarding observations made

by the US Secretary of State, Mr. Warren Christopher in the Congressional hearings on CTBT negotiations, including India's position.

As the hon. Members are aware, India has followed a reasonable and positive approach throughout the CTBT negotiations. The CTBT was an Indian initiative and we are still a supporter of a CTBT that is truly comprehensive and firmly placed within the framework of nuclear disarmament process. It is incorrect to say, as some have tried to imply, that we have been holding back progress of negotiations. On the contrary, we have flagged our concerns. But to our disappointment, these have not been adequately addressed in the CD. The reports from Geneva indicate that the compromises are being considered to accommodate concerns of other delegations, particularly China. This shows that the Ramaker Text in open to modifications. We continue to hope that our concern as also those of other countries, will be addressed in order to arrive at a genuine consensus. We remain engaged in consultation that are under-way in Geneva.

In my statement on 31st July, I informed the hon. Members that India cannot sign the Treaty in its present form. Further, we cannot permit any formulation in the Draft Treaty text that will impose an obligation on India. If there are attempts to push forward such a text, we will have to oppose such efforts. This remains our firm position.

We have seen Press reports that some delegations are exploring the ways to bypass the CD and bring the Treaty text to UN General Assembly in New York. These are procedural devices. While we will make our opposition to the Treaty known on all fora, I hope the hon. Members will agree that it may not be possible, nor desirable, for me to spell out the details of how we will deal with the situation as it arises.

It is understood by many countries that the approach being adopted by the Draft

Treaty text is unprecedented in the treaty negotiations practice. Yet, they are reluctant to bring in changes because of the rigid positions adopted by a small number of countries. I had in my statement referred to my usefull meetings with a number of Foreign Ministers in Jakarta. As is known, Madam, I had also met Secretary of State Christopher. I must say that it was a pleasant and friendly meeting. While discussing a broad range of issues, we also discussed the CTBT on which we agreed to disagree. The Secretary of State and myself took a broader view of Indo-US relations which are positive and serve the interests of both our countries. In this positive spirit, both of us agreed that the differences on a single issue need not have an impact on our otherwise fruitful and mutually advantageous bilateral relations. This, I think, is my response to Mr. Christopher's observations.

A couple of more points have been raised and I would like to deal with them. A question has been asked about our nuclear option and I would only say this thing that I have indicated in this statement and the previous one that we are conscious of the evolving security situation. Hon. Members are aware that after demonstrating our capability, we have followed a policy of restraint. The right time is a complex issue and would require detailed discussion of our national security environment and the national security doctrine and policy. All I would like to say at this stage is that the Government is fully committed to sustain the nuclear option.

Another question has been asked about softening of India's stand on CTBT. I have said just now but I would like to repeat, and I would like to assure this House that there has been no softening of our position and there shall not be. On 15th July, I had stated that India cannot accept the Draft Treaty text in its present form. What I have stated a day earlier is with relevance to the language relating to the "entry into force" which is a matter of immediate concern for us. I inform the

House that we will not allow such language to go through the Conference on Disarmament because it attempts to impose an obligation on India, despite our clearly stated position.

In my bilateral discussions in Jakarta, I have clearly conveyed that unless these provisions are modified suitably, we will be obliged to block the consensus of the CD. This has also been conveyed in Geneva on 29th of July by our Ambassador.

Another question which has been raised is about the dropping efforts. At present, negotiations and consultations are continuing in Geneva. We have seen Press reports that some countries may seek to bypass the CD and take the issue directly to the General Assembly. While this would be an unprecedented step that is permissible under the rules and procedure of the United Nations General Assembly, I can say and I repeat, that at this stage I would not like to say more and we would like to deal with the situation as it arises. This, I think, would deal with most of the questions that my friends have raised.

I have also been looking at other things and that is about the Kashmir statement by the Ambassador.

Several of my friends have raised this issue. It will be better for me not to deal with that at this stage because I think I am focussing on one issue and that is the statement that I had made about CTBT. May I assure this House before I sit down that is the consensus and the strength of India is now in test. Let us not weaken it for any considerations whatsoever. I know, sometimes there are temptations of one-upmanship, I think we must resist that. I think it is also important for us to keep in mind that ultimately the strong message of India will not be its language, the strong message of India will be its unity and united reaction. Thank you very much.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Gujral Saheb, the House has been able to release you at 2.15.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: Thank you very much. I am grateful to you, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now we have 15 minutes and five Special Mentions are left.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (PONDICHERY): Madam, I am here for my special mention.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You were not present when I called your name.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: I may be excused, Madam.

Granting union Territory Status to Uttarakhand

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (PONDICHERY): Madam, my special mention relates to grant of Union Territory status to Uttarakhand. Madam, this is a burning problem. The people who are living in the Uttarakhand region have already demanded the Government of India to grant statehood to Uttarakhand region. Madam, the then Government headed by our former Prime Minister, Shri P.V. Narasimha Raoji, had agreed for an autonomous council for Uttarakhand when discussions were held. Madam, the people who are living in the terrain region of Uttarakhand feel that they have been neglected by the State Administration and developmental activities are not taking place in that region. Moreover, on the question of reservation, there were some problems in that region.

(THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM) in the chair)

Sir, successive governments of Uttar Pradesh have failed to take care of the interests of the people who are living in the hilly region, and therefore, that demand was made. Sir, when this issue was taken up with the Congress Government at the Centre, two political parties, name-