CALLING ATTENTION TO THE MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

Need of having a National Consensus for India's Nuclear Policy with reference to Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty—Contd.

The House reassembled after lunch at thirty seven minutes past two of the clock, The Vice-Chairman (Miss Saroj Khaparde) in the Chair.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): Dr. Biplab Dasgupta.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA (West Bengal): Madam, this is one of the very few issues on which we, in the Opposition, do not have much disagreement with the formal policy of the Government of India. The-way our policy has been articulated in the statement, which has been circulated, we give our full support to the Government on this issue. This Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1970, which has now been reviewed has created two types of nations. We have the nuclear haves and the nuclear have nots. The nuclear haves can go on testing, can go on stock-piling, can go on expanding their capacities and their activities - *are* not subjected to any inspection by the International Atomic Energy Authority, whereas in the case of the nuclear have-nots, their environment is being checked, they are being closely monitored as to whether nuclear activities are taking place or not. In this way two classes of world citizens have been created—one, which belongs to the nuclear nations, and another which does not belong to the nuclear nations. This is highly discriminatory. For instance, whenever it suits the American or Western interests, whatever support is necessary is given to those powers, which want to develop their nuclear capability. Take the case ci South Africa. Until very recently, until the time when it was realised that South Africa would become a nation dominated by the Black majority, until then the development of nuclear capability of South Africa was being pursued without having regard to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Similarly, for a long time, nuclear assistance was given to Israel by the Western countries. Nuclear technology has been given to it, enriched uranium has been given and all possible help has been given to the Israeli Government to develop their own nuclear capability. The same applies to South Korea. In the cases where they have their own interest, they are not bothered about the Non-Proliferation Treaty. While South Korea has been dealt with leniently, North Korea has been treated differently. Israel has been dealt with leniently, but not Iraq. And as far as India and Pakistan are concerned, even in the case of Pakistan, they have now made all arrangements for a one-time exception to the Pressler Amendment so that Pakistan, even without going through the process and in spite of having the nuclear capability, will still continue to have the American assistance, because they are now applying a one-time waiver to the Pressler Amendment.

Now, the point I am making is this that this Act classifies the world citizens into two categories, "haves", with nuclear power and "have-nots", without nuclear power. It cannot be accepted by us. It is correct on the part of the Government to reject this Non-Proliferation Treaty. It is also important for us to take stock of the situation. What has happened since the first Act was signed in 1970? Article 6 of the 1970 Agreement has certainly divided the nations into these two categories countries with nuclear powers and countries without nuclear power. But they have also made some promises. Some 25 years ago the nuclear power States made certain promises. One of the promises was that the nuclear arms race would be stopped. The second was that there would be a general nuclear disarmament. The third was general and complete disarmament. But none of these has been actually fulfilled by those countries...*(Interruptions)*... Madam, could you kindly stop them from discussinhg? I am having

some problem in concentrating? If you don't mind, please stop them.

I remember, when the United States alone was having nuclear power from 1945 to 1949, they used their nuclear power to blackmail the other countries including the Soviet Union to accept many of their demands in the situation which arose after the war. Since 1949 there was no nuclear monopoly. But there was duopoly. Now we have what' you call it in economics, oligopoly. That means five or six countries are having nuclear capability.

I would like to say whether it is monopoly or duopoly or oligopoly, they are all bad for the simple reason that they do not really perform the function of a nuclear deterrent. There is a theory of balance of terror. That is nuclear power is in the hands of so many countries, then, the nuclear power would not be used. This may not be the case because the nuclear power can be used by way of accident. There have been many such cases where the radars which are there to monitor the coming of the planes from the other side gave wrong signals. For example, when big birds were coming, they thought that some planes were coming. So they gave a general alert and all preparations were made. But only at the last moment that order was called because the mistake was realised. The nuclear powers themselves do not want it, but by sheer accident it can happen. Those who read about the military strength of other countries tell us whenever any weapon is developed, the weapon of mass destruction' was used sometime or the other. It has happened when the new machine guns and tanks and other things came. There was a feeling that they were so powerful that they would never be used. But these have been used. Even nuclear weapons were used by the Americans in Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945 in the closing stages of the war. The position that the Government has taken is quite laudatory and it has been supported by all of us. But we should also ensure that the Government doesn't get derailed from this position. We have a fear that the Government might get derailed for a variety of reasons. One is there is a constant pressure being put on the Government. I remember in the last year when the Prime Minister was on a visit to the United States, some pressure was put on us to suspend the tests of our missile programme. Similar pressure was put on us when some negotiation was taking place in London to induce us to accept a certain agreement even before the Prime Minister went there. So, these pressures will continue to be put on us; I do not know. Maybe the Foreign Minister may enlighten us whether any pressure has been put on us this time or not to join this club of NPT members because 178 countries were forced to sign this Treaty. They had many reservations earlier. When the negotiations started in April, quite a large number of countries which belonged to the Third World, Asia, Africa and Latin America, were opposed to it. They expressed their opposition to it very clearly in public. It was articulated. Later on, pressure of all kinds was applied. Blackmailing was done. In many other ways, they were pressurised not to persist in their opposition. And it was accepted. I would like to know this from the Foreign Affairs Minister. Maybe he will not give the answer. Maybe, some pressure was put on us. It is possible. Just because the western countries wanted Israel to be an exception, they wanted India also to continue to have this kind of an isolated position because that allowed them to continue their support to Israel. If it is a fact that much pressure has not been put on us, it is quite possible that it is largely because they wanted Israel also to have nuclear capability, maybe, also Pakistan. This is a point on which one has to be very, very careful. In the past, so much of pressure was put. For instance, even for the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, there was resistance so that we might not use nuclear power. On the cryogenic rocket controversy, we should not forget

that the western countries forced the Russians to cancel the agreement with us. We have got some cryogenic rockets, but not the technology. That technology is denied to us because of the fear that we might use it for war purposes. Because of that fear, even peaceful use is not permitted. Recently, the Russians have come to an agreement with Iran on some nuclear reactor. That is also not being permitted by the United States. Pressure is being put on the Russians to cancel the agreement. My point is, this pressure will continue to be there because they want to have a monopoly, not only of nuclear weapons, but even of peaceful use 'of nuclear energy. That should be resisted.

In these 25 years, no progress has been made as far as nuclear disarmament is concerned or even as far as the dismantling of the armament industry is concerned. If you look at the situation, you will know the way it has developed. The armament industry is one of the most powerful industries in the United States. Even one of the former Presidents of the United States, who was himself a military general, Gen. Eisenhover, used the expression 'the military industrial complex'. He also said that the defence industry was a powerful industry in the United States. They finance various Members of Parliament also there. And they press'ur-ise the Government to put more money on war budget so that all the expermien-tations with nuclear weapons or other weapons can continue. That has been the case during the Iran-Iraq war. These two countries were at war. I do not know why. But both the countries had got their armament from the same consortium of defence manufacturers in Europe. The defence manufacturers' consortium sat monthly in Europe and decided how much of armament should go to Iraq. And how much should go to Iran? The same consortium took care of that. As we know, immediately after the peace initiative of the President of the Soviet Union, Gorbachev, certain agreements were made between the United States and the Soviet Union. Immediately, there was a panic in the armament industry. There was a kind of dismay in the armament industry because the demand was going down. For that reason, there is a suspicion that maybe, the Iran-Iraq war, with all its devastations and destruction, was partly necessitated by the need of the American defence industry to make use of whatever stockpile they had of armaments and also for experimentation of arms. As long as the defence industry continues to remain as the largest industry of a multi-national character, there will be tremendous pressure, if not for a nuclear war, at least for local wars. And local wars cannot be stopped until and unless this kind of disarmament comes about.

Now, r~ would like to know from the hon. Minister whether, when discussing with the United States, he raised these questions. For instance, now that they say that there is no Cold War, why is the NATO still there? Why should not the NATO be dismantled now that there is no Cold War? These questions should be put. I know that the External Affairs Minister has taken a lot of initiative in sitting with the countries which are located on the coast of the Indian Ocean. There was a proposal mooted by the Indian Government in the 1970's and also in the 1980's to declare the Indian Ocean as an area of peace, a zone of peace, where no nuclear-power vessel should be permitted to go or where no nuclear equipment should be permitted to pass. Now I understand he has sat with some of the countries. I would like to know whether the issue has been raised to make the Indian Ocean free of nuclear power. Take, for instance, Diego Garcia, which is an island in the Indian Ocean. Why should it still continue as a military base of the United States? Why can't any move be made by us to ensure that this military base does not continue any more and we become free of any fear of nuclear holocaust of any kind? That should be ensured by our foreign policy.

Just two more points I would like to make, Madam. One point is this. I am very happy that on this issue the Government has decided to go it alone. Not alone, maybe, nine or ten countries are there. One hundred and seventy-eight countries are on the one side. Despite that, India very bravely and very courageously has taken an independent position. I congratulate them for this. Despite the pressure—maybe, a lot of pressure was put—India has refused to become a member of the club of the non-proliferation treaty members. But my question is: Can't we hve the same kind of independent position on other policies, for instance, on GATT, on WTO, etc? Whenever such questions were raised our Foreign Minister, who was earlier the Commerce Minister, who was very much involved in the economic policies, himself was saying, "We Will be isolated." He keeps on saying, "We will be isolated. We should go along with them. How can we fight?" All these things have been talked about when he comes to the economic policy. When the Government can take a strong position on nuclear policy, why can't it take a strong position on economic policy? If such a position had been taken, India would have been respected. In the WTO matter, how many countries are supporting us? The moral pressure you are putting, the moral authority you are showing, is going to work in the long run. That is the kind of position that one has to take not only on the nuclear issue but also on GATT, on WTO and on other issues so that we can show that we can take a position where we will not be made to work under the diktat of the IMF and the World Bank. Why can't such a position be taken? Last year we have made this point that if that is not done...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): You told me that you would take only two minutes.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Last two points, Madam. I covered one. The other remains.

The last point is this, if you don't have any independent economic policy, you cannot have an independent foreign policy. So, if the independent economic policy is withdrawn, is forsaken, is no longer there, the independent stand on foreign policy cannot be continued for long. What I am saying is this. To ensure that our position on NPT remains consistent for years to come, to ensure that many countries in the world join us in standing on our legs and fighting the so-called new world order, which is being imposed by the United States, it is not enough not to sign the nuclear non-proliferation treaty. We should strengthen our economy. We should strengthen our economic base. At the same time, we should also ensure that we take an independent economic position at international fora. Only then it will be possible for us to be consistent and to make both of them viable at the same time. Thank you very much.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): Shri Sanatan Bisi.

SHRI SANATAN BISI (Orissa): Thank you, Madam, for giving me this chance. So far as the statement made by the hon. Minister is concerned, I have gone through it thoroughly. So far as para 2 and para 4 are concerned, there is nothing new. So far as the nuclear policy is concerned, these things have already been stated by our former Prime Ministers, Indira Gandhi and Rajiv Gandhi, and by the present Prime Minister. So, there is nothing new. What I would like to say, Madam, is whatever the policy, which is being made, and whatever has been stated by the hon. Minister, initiatives should be taken to implement them. The statement is completely silent on the initiatives which need to be taken. As far as our policy is concerned, the policy is not being implemented. It remains like that from the day it was adopted. Another thing, which I want to submit, is that our Prime Minister has stated in the Lok Sabha that presently we don't have a national security policy,

presently we do not have a national council, presently we don't have a policy on defence. We are having certain documents regarding defence. So, in view of the circumstances, why the nation is kept in the dark in respect of these things, I would like to know from the Minister, as far as the initiatives are concerned, what our next basic programme is. With these words I finish. Thank you, Madam.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Pondtcherry): Madam, this is a very important issue which is being discussed in this House. The Government of India has a consistent policy, that there should be no discrimination between the haves and have-nots. What is happening is five super powers who are acquiring the nuclear weapons system, have been pressurising the developing countries to sign the NPT saying that these countries should not go in for the nuclear weapons system. The developed countries say, "Yes, we are having more than 7,000 warheads. We will reduce them. But as a developing country you should not go in for nuclear tests." This kind of discrimination is there. The developed countries are putting pressure on the developing countries not to have nuclear weapons. The Government of India is opposed to it. This has been there right from the period of Indiraji. The hon. Minister was kind enough to quote in his statement Indira--ji's version of India's stand on the Nucu lear Non-Proliferation Treaty. Madam, the document which was presented by Shri Rajiv Gandhi in 1988 is the guiding principle for the Government of India on the NPT. The United States is putting pressure on India. When Robin Raphael visited India, she said, "There should be a bilateral agreement between India and Pakistan." But our country stood firm. We said "We will not sign a bilateral agreement with Pakistan and if it is a question of NPT it should be on global basis." Madam, 178 countries have signed the agreement. This agreement will be there for years to come. Rut India and 11 other countries have n ot signed the NPT. They have taken a position that they will not sign the NPT because *it* is discriminatory and it is not equating countries whether they are big or small. The Prime Minister has rightly observed:

> "NPT has failed either to check nuclear proliferation or achieve disarmament and there is no reason why a Treaty like this should continue indefinitely."

In May, 1995, when the discussion took place, there was no unanimity even among the countries who signed this agreement. The United States mounted pressure on some countries to sign this agreement. Therefore, the position of the Government of India has been vindicated right from the period of Shrimati Indira Gandhi and Shri Rajiv Gandhi. Yesterday, in the other House the Prime Minist ter made India's stand on NPT very clear.

Madam, Pakistan has admitted in the international fora that they have got nuclear capability.

3.00 P.M.

India has to meet the challenge. Pakistan which is our neighbouring country is encouraging terrorist activities in our country. Its mercenaries are infiltrating into the country. Pakistan is threatening India's position. I would like to know what position the Government has taken. What is the stand taken by the Government of India to counter Pakistan which has acquired nuclear capability. This has been admitted by the leaders of Pakistan in international forums. There is another aspect to this. China recently conducted a nuclear explosion. It was observed by Australia. China is not a party to the NPT. China and Pakistan, which are our border countries, have nuclear capability. It is said that China has passed on part of the nuclear technology to Pakistan. It has provided Pakistan with M—11 missiles. In such a situation, what is our strategy to safeguard our borders? Is the Government of India mobilising countries which have not joined the NPT? I would like to know what attempts the Government of India has made to unite the countries

which have not signed the NPT so that they can raise their voice unanimously. I am glad to say that we were able to withstand the pressure put by the USA to sign this bilateral agreement. This is a great achievement for our country. But when our neighouring countries have acquired the nuclear weapon system, what is our stand? This is a crucial question which the hon. Minister must answer. What is the reaction of the Arab countries? I would like to know the reaction of Pakistan which-has also not signed the NPT. The USA had mounted pressure on Pakistan also for signing the NPT. The pressure has been mounted by the USA on Israel also. What is the stand taken by other countries, including Pakistan in this regard? Is the Government of India going to mobilise these countries? Our stand is very clear and it has been appreciated by some of the countries which have signed the NPT. The countries that have acquired nuclear power are pressurising other countries which are not having nuclear power, not to acquire it, without themselves- eliminating the nuclear weapons that are there in their own country. Therefore, it is a serious matter. It is not India alone that is concerned about it. India's policy is very clear. Yet, I would like to know what the Government of India is going to do, because 178 countries have signed the NPT. One of our neighbours has acquired nuclear power We say that we use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. That has been India's stand right from the beginning. In this connection, I would like to have the reaction of the Minister.

SHRI MISA R. GANESAN (Tamil Nadu): Madam, thank you very much for giving me this opportunity to participate in this Calling-Attention discussion.

Madam, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty was first proposed by our beloved and lamented leader, Jawaharlal Nehru in 1954. In 1954, when the US conducted nuclear explosions in a place called Bikini, our great leader, Jawaharlal Nehru,

proposed the "Standstill Agreement' on testing.

In the "fifties, the move was seen as a means to halt the arms race then taking place to develop more powerful atomic and thermo-nuclear weapons as well as to stop the pollution of the atmosphere with radioactive fall-out resulting from at moshperic testing.

In the late 'fifties and 'sixties, the negotiations were conducted in the context of a moratorium on testing and a disarmament agenda involving disucssion on stopping the production of fissile material and nuclear warheads in the three existing nuclear weapon states, USA, USSR and UK. None of these negotiations led to any satisfactory agreement. Nuclear testing continued unabated. In 1963, a Partial Test Ban Treaty came into existence which limited the nuclear testing to underground locations, thus, preventing any radioactive material fall-out from test sites crossing national borders. Though the preamble to the Treaty contains the pledge to end all nuclear testing, it has not worked out.

Besides, by the mid-sixties, attempts to reach a treaty on general and complete disarmament were replaced by a step-by-step approach, i.e., the idea of negotiating arms control and disarmament in successive stages. The NPT, apart from other structural and functional weaknesses, is inherently discriminatory. While it allows the five nuclear powers to maintain nuclear weapons, it prohibits the non-nuclear—weapon countries from joining the nuclear club. The disputes over this issue at the time of the formulation of "the Treaty led to what because Article VI. Accordingly, the parties including the nuclear powers, are obligated to pursue negotiations in good faith on measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament.

But the implementation record or Article VI proves how false it is. Between August 6, 1963 to December 31, 1992, an estimated number of more than 1,335

nuclear explosions took place, which were carried out by the USA, the USSR and the UK including China. Madam, China alone had conducted 38 nuclear explosions, 23 atmospheric explosions and 15 underground explosions.

Now, Mr. thomas E. McNamara, the Assistant Secretary of State, U.S.A. says that India will join the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty which is now a permanent disarmament fixture.

Madam, our senior colleagues, Dr. Bi-plab Dasgupta and Shri Inder Kumar Gujral rightly mentioned about the cryogenic engine deal? What happened to the cryogenic engine deal? We are going to use those cryogenic engines only for our space programme. But, under the Missile Technology Control Regime, the United States of America pressurised the Russians and they stopped the supply of the engine and also the transfer of technology to India. Why? It is because we have successfully launched the Prithivi, the Agni and the Akash missiles and this has created an apprehension in the mind of the United Slates that India is going to become a super power and that they can use this missile technology. That is why they put pressure on the Russians and they stepped the supplies. The whole of our space programme came to a standstill. The USA does not want India to develop its space or missile technology. So, we have to keep this in mind.

Madam, we have to be very careful in the NPT also. What happened in the past two and a half decades, clearly proves to the world that the NPT v as discriminatory against the nuclear havc-riots. The Treaty has not helped the cause of disarmament. It has also not prevented the countries from becoming nuclear, defeating the very purpose for which it was signed.

Madam, the Treaty has failed in its objectives. Why should it be extended indefinitely? I request the Government not to accept it. In the recently-concluded HPT Conference at New York, nothing useful has come out for the cause of disarmament.

Madam, the Minister has made a statement and I welcome what he has said in its last line, "We will continue to take initiatives with the other like-minded countries to move forward towards creating a world free of nuclear weapons" We have to fulfil this statement.

SHRI N. GIRI PRASAD (Andhra Pradesh): Madam, I am clear that the Government has taken a right decision in not signing the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. In spite of many countries, 175 or more couantries, signing the NPT, our country's not signing that treaty has conveyed some message to the people. But, before that there was a lot of confusion in our country. The media carried divergent information or news items that the Government was having some negotiations with the U.S. or some other countries about signing the treaty on certain conditions. Even the signing of this treaty was linked with the signing of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. I don't know how the Government is going to synchronise the provisions in the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and in this NPT. The hon. Minister's statement does not give any indication as to what happened during those negotiations. One hon. Member here mentioned that there was some *quid pro quo* between the Government and the other side, maybe the United States on this subject. So, there are many doubts about these negotiations. The Government has failed to take into confidence the people and Parliament about the negotiations betwen the Government and the United States or other nuclear powers about signing of this treaty or about reaching some agreement on the disputed points. Moreover, the United States or other nuclear powers were never sincere in their effort in controlling or achieving complete nuclear disarmament. During these 25 years, as was rightly pointed earlier, there has 'been a four-fold increase in the nuclear arsenal. Though there was some

agreement in this regard between the United States and the Russian Federation, the former Soviet Union, but that agreement has not been able to reduce the intensity of acquiring more weapons. There has been some reduction in the ceiling limit. The Government did not take up this issue with the non-aligned countries or did not campaign very much because of the fear that they may be treated badly by the United States and also because of the close links that we have developed with the United States in military, economic and political fields. The Government was afraid of taking a clear-cut stand on these issues. Our biggest failure in this respect is that we did not mobilise a single country of the Non-aligned Movement. In spite of big conferences being held in Delhi and other places and in spite of our best relations with them, we failed to mobilise them. I know, the United States was resorting to pressure tactics, bullying many countries and arm-twisting many countries, not only India but also smaller countries which are more amendable to such pressure tactics. What are the attempts made by the Government to forestall or stop this? Certain countries tried to gain some concessions in the treaty. So, not only the Government failed to take into confidence the people, but it also failed to mobilise other non-aligned countries. So, I would be sceptical if the Minister says that our country will continue its policy of mobilising the like-minded countries. They did not mobilise any country so far. How can we. say, how can we believe that our country will do this with sincerity, effort and with confidence? I think the countries which have signed this treaty have not gained anything. In fact, I read it in the newspapers which say that the signing of the treaty is a gain for the United States, but a loss for the humanity. So, they will not achieve anything. They will continue to have monopoly on nuclear weapons. With that they will try to stop other countries from {acquiring. They will never try for disarmament. Unless all Governments try to save the planet from nuclear destruction or nuclear holocaust, unless the people are educated morally, I think the U.S.A. or any other nuclear weapons country will go on building up its arsenal without any reduction. In spite of article 5 of the NPT which clearly says that the weapon States have to negotiate in good faith, they my continue negotiations in good or bad faith and that is the only x»ndi»'on imposed on them. Since there 5 no more Soviet Union which can talk on equal terms, they will always try to pressurise the Russian Federation on many things as they have done in the cases of cryogenic rocket engines for our country and the peaceful atomic station tor Iran. They may do it like this. Then what is the reaction from our side? Why should not the Indian Government, in spite of the big support they are having and the consensus it has, take the initiative exhibiting more courage in dealing with the U.S.A. at least in safeguarding our own interests?

My suggestion to the Government is that it has to mobilise the opinion of like-minded countries in this respect. In addition, they should try to mobilise wider public opinion not only in our media but also among the well-informed or well-intended mass organisations in this field. There are many NGOs, the Non-Governmental Organisations.

I think, we must build bridges with them in order to mobilise all such forces so as to bring the mass movement to achieve general nuclear disarmament. Otherwise, the people, countries and the planet will face a serious problem of existence. That is why my request is that we should not only mobilise countries, but also the people and the political parties. Then only we will build bridges with other organisations all over the world.

Lastly, I would like to say that the* Government should come forward with a resolution to be moved in both the

Houses of Parliament, as we have passed a Resolution on Kashmir, so that the intentions of the Government are clear. The Minister making a statement here and the Prime Minister replying to some debates in the other House is not enough. The problem will not be solved like this and the people will not be enlightened on this. Unless the Parliament makes a soleman declaration about our desire to have general disarmament we will not be able to educate the people. If we do that, the other nuclear powers will also get a proper signal from India.

Thank you very much, Madam.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): Mr. Digvijay Singh, not here. Mr. Minister.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI (Maharashtra): Madam, before the Minister replies or after his reply, I have to ask some clarifications. Shall I ask them now? I was given permission by the Deputy Chairman in the morning.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): Why do not you ask right now?

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: The International Relations Committee of the U.S. Congress last night passed by, majority the Foreign Assistance Act which, *inter alia,* contains provisions for defreezing the aid to Pakistan suspended in the October 1990 because of its nucealar programme. Now, they have passed that in the Committee. It will now come up before the House of Representatives. Madam, now, it appears to me, thr»t the U.S.A. is indirectly helping Pakistan to develop her own internal resources for the purpose of nuclear programme. Whatever aid was suspended since 1990, if this is approved, Pakistan will get all the help they were getting earlier. Not only that, even the private agencies would be able to give loans to Pakistan for eneral purpose and as such, they will also ' * able to sell their own resources for the purpose of nuclear" programme. Madam, this is the fate of our country. Pakistan will get huge resources for the purpose of nuclear programme. Not only that, they have not stopped at that, but in a surprise move the Committee has amended the law by which they will deny a part of American aid to India, ignorning loud protests from the Democrats. Madam, I would like to know, and I would like the Minister to clarify whether it is because we are not signing the NPT, or whether it is because we have not yet passed the Patent Law. Madam, it is because of the attempts that are going on in the US. As such, I would like to request the hon. Minister to clarify this. I am very happy that our Prime. Minister has made it clear only yesterday that our missiles programme will not be affected under any circumstances or pressure from any quarter and all the requirements for defence purposes will be met. They will do it. As such I would like to say, Madam, that in the name of the NPT, missiles programme, we shall not get the critical components from other countries. Therefore, we have to be self-sufficient, as far as the defence requirements are concerned.

A 10-year plan has been prepared. I would like that instead of ten years, it should be for. five years. We have to spend much more on our R&D. I would like to know the reaction of the Minister. I am sure that no country, would succumb, at least India would not succumb, to pressures from any quarter, as far as defence preparedness is concerned. This is a sign where it appears to me that America is helping Pakistan. America I would not go to that extent to which others would like to go — does not want a strong India. As such, they are trying to help Pakistan directly or indirectly.

I would like the Minister to clarify all these points.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (MISS" SAROJ KHAPARDE)? I hope nobody is left out. Now, Mr. Minister.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Madam, first of all, I would like to express my gratitude to all the hon. Members who have participated in this Call-Attention discussion. First of all, with your permission, Madam I would like to congratulate the Mover of the Call Attention Motion, who has made his maiden speech. But the way he aritcu-lated his views and placed the whole thing in the proper perspective, it does not appear, at least it did not appear to me, that it was his maiden speech. Rather, it appears to me that he is a seasoned parliamentarian. I think, all the Members of the House will agree with me in extending our congratulations to him. Madam, again, I would like to express my gratitude to all the Members who have participated in this discussion. They have placed the things in the proper perspective and this is one of the rare occasions, if I am permitted to say so, on the floor of this House, where cutting across our party considerations and our limitations, we keep the national perspective, the national interests, before us and we exchange our views very freely and candidly, and, where it is necessary we appreciate the actions of the Government, where it is necessary we utter the words of caution to the Government, and where it is necessary, we express our views and express our expectations, to the Government. I am really grateful to the hon. Members for the way they placed the issues, particularly at the moment, when we are passing through, I would not use the word 'crisis', but some sort of a difficult situation because of certain happenings. I would not like to go back to the history of this and the events which have taken place over the last 25 years as the hon. Members are fully aware of it. But when I made my observation in the beginning of the statement by quoting a paragraph from the Prime Minister's observations I said that we shall outline the broad policy which has been reiterated not only by the Congress Government, but all also for other Governments which have succeeded, as clearly indicated in the policies which we are having. Now, the recently concluded conference on NPT and the indefinite extension as the Prime Minister has very correctly pointed out, are interesting but they really do not signify much because they do not prevent proliferation. Rather, it creates a situation where the nuclear weapons States, those who have nuclear weapons, will be able not only to hold them but also to manufacture, to proliferate, to refine, to stockpile vertically while others will be prevented from doing so. The inadequacy with which the treaty suffered from the very beginning has been perpetuated indefinitely, and perhaps, that is the outcome of the conference.

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATUR-VEDI (Uttar Pradesh): Does the treaty legitimise that kind of a situation?

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: So, the question of India's signing the NPT docs not arise at all. In this connection, it has been asked as to what the reactions of others are, those who have not signed the NPT, including our neighbour, Pakistan. Perhaps it would not be possible or desirable to equate India's position with Pakistan's because Pakistan has a one-point programme, that because India has not signed, Pakistan will not sign. But why we have not signed does not depend on whether country 'A' or country 'B' is signing or not signing. We are not signing because it is not only inadequate but it is also discriminatory and it is really creating two types of States — nuclear weapon haves and nuclear weapon have-nots. It is preventing or perhaps it would be more to say attempting to prevent horizontal transfer but is doing nothing on the vertical proliferation. Therefore, the question of signing the NPT does not arise in case of India. However it is not the same with Pakistan. Now, in this connection, a question has been raised. What initiatives we took in the Non-aligned Movement, what the NAM post-

tion was and what we have done to mobilise the opinion among the non-aligned countries. When the conference was going on and before the conclusion of the conference, the Non-aligned Foreign Ministers had a ministerial coordination meeting at Bandung. In connection with the Fortieth Anniversary of the Asia-Pacific Conference and also the Ministerial meeting before the Non-Aligned Summit which is to take place during the autumn of this year at Columbia. We are not a Member State party to NPT but we participated in evolving a common position so far as non-aligned countries are concerned. But, unfortunately, a concensus position did not emerge because of certain factors. I would not like to go into the details of that. But it was decided that efforts would be made to put some conditions when a final decision about the extention would be taken. Though in the final outcome those conditions did not have any linkage, it was hoped that when the review would take place, it would be possible for the Member-State pending belonging to the NAM to take a common position and India would try to work out, to arrive at a common position as far as possible. But our role will be limited because we are not a Member-State. We are a non-signatcry. So, we will have to operate within the NAM but not in the Conference of the Member State parties. Now let us look at the six conditions which have been highlighted by the NAM and what role India played in working out those conditions. So far as the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty is concerned, as one hon. Member has very correctly pointed out; the first idea was mooted by India, by the late Panditji, in 1954. What was mooted in 1954 has been accepted, by the nuclear weapon States in 1993. Therefore, it is not correct to say that India has not a role to play in evolving this policy. We are working on it and a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Resolution was also tabled earlier. In regard to the second condition, the NAM Member-States have concluded to ban production of fissile material for nuclear weap^dO purposes. This was. also moved by India in 1982 and in 1993, it has been accepted by the General Assembly. Therefore, this is also an area where it is largely because of our own initiative. The third area is, the NAM has asked for the internationally binding security assurances to the non-nuclear-weapon States. We fully endorsed this view. But here' there are two deficiencies. Here, the security guarantees are extended only to the Member-States to .the Treaty. It is not covering the non-Member States, non-Member State parties which, according to us, is against the United Nations Charter itself. Thridly, the crux or the key is that along with those who are having nuclear weapons, there are five Permanent Members of the Security Council. The operational agency is the Security Council. There they have got the veto power. One can easily understand that one is not going to act against the other. Even if four of them wants, the other one will apply the veto and it will practically be nullified. Therefore, it should be universal and it should be extended to all countries, whether they are signatories or non-signatories. The other condition which was suggested by the NAM was that there should be a nondiscriminatory transfer of nuclear technology for peaceful purposes, this is exactly what we are demanding. We have not only demanded it but we have also made it abundantly clear that we will pursue this policy, whatever be the consequences. Here we are not going to subject ourselves to any pressure or any conditionalities. For peaceful purposes, we will continue to carry on our programme, irrespective of what others may think of it. The non-aligned countries have also called for the elimination of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction and this is one of the principal features we have suggested, therefore, the basic conditionalities which have been... *(interruptions)*...

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: We are not questioning...

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: I think you have not pressed the button.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: I have pressed it.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: It has come now.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Madam, the hon. Minister explained at length as to what the NAM had done in this area and in number of areas. The question we have raised today is in the context of the signing of the new NPT. Why did not the Government of India take meaningful initiatives with the NAM countries? Why could not the NAM countries meet? Today, we stand isolated among the NAM countries because all of them became signatories to the NPT. The Minister has not been able to refute the allegation that the Government of India turned a blind eye, and not without some understanding.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: I have not completed my statement. That is why Jaipalji had to intervene, rather, at an early stage. I would cover these pionts also.

As I mentioned — I must dropped a hint there is some limitation because we are not a party to it. We did not participate in the Conference of the countries who were signatories to the NPT. But long before the Conference began, through our normal diplomatic channels, we not only ascertained the views of the Members States exchanged views, but we also wanted to know what position the Member-States were going to take. As hon. Members, particularly, Jaipalji, are fully aware, we know how, during the last six months, the positions have changed. I will give you one exafople.

I will give you an example to show how the positions have changed very quickly. It would not be proper on my part to name these countries. But we have state how quickly the positions have changed. We have seen how quickly the position changed in the case of the Arab League *vis-a-vis* Israel, even at me last moment, the Resolutions which the Arab League countries wanted to move were diluted. Instead of particularly referring to Israel, it was a kind of an omnibus format-peace zone for the Middle-East. All these things are known. Why it happened is also known to all. Therefore, I would not like to go into that aspect.

However, I would like to make one point here. Jagmohanji also referred to it. He asked whether there was any understanding. There is no question of having any understanding. We are not going to subject ourselves to the pressures of anybody to sign the NPT. Therefore, nobody can prevent us from sharing our perception and asking others to have a similar perception. As to whether they would have the same perception or not, it is for them to decide because each and every country is an independent, sovereign, country. But I have a right to say that this is my perception, whether you agree with my perception or not. This is what exactly we did.

What happened ultimately was different. Though we did not influence the decision-making process, surely, we shared our perception and we made it abundantly clear. Even in my statements I made it clear; though, at that point of time, I was not the Minister of External Affairs, I had the privilege of leading the Indian Delegation at the last Session of the U.N. General Assembly, there, in the various statements, and also at the last Ministerial-level meeting, I made India's position quite clear. Our stand is a principled stand. It does not depend upon-whether country A signs it or country B sings it.Our position does not depend upon that. Our position is that unless the deficiencies, inadequacies and the dis-criminatory character of the existing Tre-*aty* are removed 'and unless the treaty becomes universal, non-discriminatory an9 equal and unless these improvements take place, there is no question of signing it Therefore, there. was, no question of having entered into any understanding with anybody.

Jagmohanji raised another issue also. He asked: 'Why did we not table our Resolution, traditional Resolution?'. In fact, we tabled our traditional Resolutions last year, including the Resolution on a treaty to ban the use of nuclear weapons. This resolution was adopted b> the General Assembly with a large margin. Of course, on elimination of the Treaty it was indicated that the nuclear weapon power states were going to oppose it. He is fully aware of it. We tried to evolve a consensus on this issue. When we knew that no consensus was going to be evolved we did not press it further. But we tabled the first resolution and it was possible for us to get it adopted.

In regard to the question of the response of non-signatory countries as I mentioned to you Pakistan's traditional position is known. Here in this connection I also want to make it quite clear that we want it to be universal. We do not want any bilateral or regional arrang-mcnt so far as the nuclear arrangement is concerned.

Keeping that in view one hon. Member asked about the new initiatives we were going to have. We have clearly indicated the new initiatives which we were going to have in the Action Plan which was suggested by our late Prime Minister Mr. Rajiv Gandhi in 1988. They are: to have a totally nuclear weapon-free world and total elimination of all weapons of mass destruction by 2010. Later on our Prime Minister Suggested reducing the time-frame to the end of this century. We would like to work on it. We would like to take initiatives on this. We would like to discuss this and we would like to open a dialogue with others to achieve this objective. This is the objective. We shall have to pursue this and we shall have *to* follow this. Though a consensus has emerged in regard to an indefinite extension every sovereign conscientious country will also like to look at it like to Review it and try to articulate its views which will ultimately get reflected and Which will be nearer to the position which we have taken. Here 1 agree with an hon. Member who has suggested that though India did not get the support of everybody it had given us some strength to Carry on.

In regard to the question of keeping Our options open we have always men-ioncd that India could never aspire to tave or desire to have nuclear weapons. is against our culture it is against our :tho| and it is against our principle to build nuclear weapons. Our nuclear programme is not geared towards manufacturing of weapons but towards peaceful use. Here we would not like to compromise in any way so far as its peaceful use is concerned. Whatever is necessary to carry on the nuclear programme with the objective of peaceful use of this energy we shall have to carry on but so far as weapons are concerned I think here too we have the consensus of the House and that of the nation that we have agreed not to have weapons because we have been talking of creating a nuclear free world since early '50s. That is one of the cardinal principles of the foreign policy which we are pursuing and there is no reason why we shouls deviate from that.

So far as the question of our security concept is concerned, Gujralji has dwelt on that issue in a little greater detail. There is no doubt that no country and no government worth the salt can ignore a threat percept and we cannot ignore it. That is why we have made it abundantly clear to the US Administration, and they are fully aware of our concern. I have myself indicated a number of times that with supply of F-16s to Pakistan, the striking powr of Pakistan would definitely incease. India does not want to joint an arms race and divert its scarce resources for military preparations, but, at the same time, we[1] cannot compromise the security and safety of the States. We cannot ignore or threat percept. I need not elaborate on this issue. From 1947 onwards, from a country, not a single bullet has been fired in any direction

other than that of India. This is a historic fact.

This cannot be ignored. Therefore, there is no question of compromising on the threat; percept, and we shall continue to hold it. I think, one need not talk much on it because yesterday the Prime Minister has very elaborately dealt with the subject in the other House.

Madam Vice-Chairperson, I think, I have covered some of the major issues.

Another issue raised by an hon. Member is whether Parliament can express its views. I think, Parliament has already expressed its views, though not in the format of a resolution, but through various discussions. Surely, I would like to talk to my colleagues on the suggestion which has been made. Perhaps, you will accept that I should not....

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: We all support the proposal for a resolution by Parliament. There were only two other occasions on which Parliament passed resolutions. That was in 1962 and then on Jammu and Kashmir. This shall be the third. All the three are equally sacred.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: I will carry the sentiments of this House to the Prime Minister. I think, an announcement like this should net come from me, but it should come from the Head of the Government.

With these words, Madam Vice-Chairman, I once again thank all the members for the points they have raised.

SHRI JAGMOHAN: You have clarified most of the points, but one of the points, which is still lurking in my mind is whether the Government of India will work for a comprehensive international legislation on a test-ban treaty, to have an effective supervisory authority and to mobilise the non-aligned countries' opinion to ensure that disarmament takes place effectively and that the existing stockpile is destroyed. There must be some overall international treaty. We can
work towards that

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Exactly, this is the objective. We should work for a comprehensive test-ban treaty which should be uiversal, which should be non-discriminatory and which should be verifiable.

SHRI JAGMOHAN: The supervisory authority should be effective. It should not be doing what is being done now.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Not only that, I think, it should be universally verifiable. That is the objective. We have also indicated that unless it was universally verifiable and universally non-discriminatory, it would not be acceptable to us. We would like to achieve that objective. For that, discussions dialogues and negotiatios with all the countries, including the NAM countries, will continue.

An hon. Member referred to aid-cuts. Madam, I am afraid, I do not have the latest position and statement in regard to that, but, so far as I understand, it is not always obligatory on the Administration-particularly, this is what has happened— so far as their Constitution is concerned, that they should go by the recommendations of the congress on all matters. I read the news item which he quoted. He is the leader of Democrats. He says that he will take it up again in the next week. That means that the issue has not been finally clinched in the Congress.

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATUR-VEDI: The danger is that there is a majority of the Republicans.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: He said that he was a Democrat and that democrats are supporting India, and the Republicans are opposing India. I find from the newspapers report that the leader of the Democrats says that he will take it up again. Therefore, it indicates that, perhaps, the issue has not been clinched finally. It would not be proper on my part to make any comments' on this as it is still in the congressional process. Thereafter also, we shall have to see the reaction and response of the Administration.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: The statement that Republicans are more friendly towards other countries is not correct in perception. That statement says like that. I remember it very correctly that the Republicans are more friendly and cooperative towards India, but it is reverse.

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुरः (उत्तर प्रदेश) मैं मंत्री जी से स्पष्टीकरण चाहता हूं। आपने कहा कि सी०टी०बी०टी० का प्रारम्भ हमारी ओर से किया गया पंडित जी के जमाने से। इसमें दो हिस्से जो हैं — पहला, सिमुलेशन, दूसरा, अंडर वाटर टैस्ट, यह भी शामिल है। वरना अभी तक तो ग्राउंड पर है। लेकिन उसमें सी०टी०बी०टी० के अन्तर्गत दो टैस्ट और भी बेन होने चाहिए, एक वाटर के अंदर है और एक सिमुलेशन के अंदर में है। मैं समझता हूं कि आपका ध्यान होगा और अगर नहीं है तो इस पर भी आप बताईए कि इस वक्त सी०टी०बी०टी० के अंदर स्थिति क्या है?

Simulation and underwater tests. These are the two more things.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: I think the Comprehensive Treaty would cover these two issue which the hon. Member has referred to.

SHRI GOPALRAO VITHALRAO PATIL: Madam, I would like to ask for two clarifications. One is that we are saying that pressure was not exerted by the United States, but reports percolating in the press and the media indicate that sufficient pressure was exerted on many countries. For example, all the alliances were brought into service to endorse an indefinite extension of this Treaty such as that of NATO, G-7 countries, Japan's objections neutralised, European Union was persuaded to endorse this Resolution. Australia and Canada came to the help of the USA. Similarly the Arab thunder was subdued. Mexico after its economic crisis and help by the USA was subdued and Egypt was warned with aid cut-off. Similarly an impression has been carried in the Indian Press and there is a doubt that a private commitment was apparently obtained from India that it would not do anything to ruin the American campaign to extend the indefinite extension of NPT by interacting with the NAM countries. This is one impression. This suggests that there was some definite pressure on India also and we succumb to that pressure and had a very low profile in this New York Conference. That is the one impression on which I would like to have a clarification

Another thing is that there is a danger of nuclear piracy in this world.Now terrorists of various designs are getting and are having access to fissile material. A few months back we had enough evidence of this. A few of such terrorists were caught in Germany with the fissile material. There is a danger on nuclear terrorism from Pakistan to India also. In this regard what is the policy of the Government of India?

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Madam, there was no question of having any understanding with anybody in regard to our position. I do not know wheher we call it a low key or high key or medium key.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Or no key.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Yes, no key. We made it quite clear in our participation in the NAM. While replying to my main motion, I said that we share our perception with almost every country, who are concerned and who articulared their views and who have their nuclear policy. Over the months and weeks we shared our perception. We tried to know their perception. We wanted to know what role they are going to play in the conference. So far as the UN Conference is concerned, the hon. Member is aware that we did not participate in it. We are not a signatory and we had not participation in that. Therefore, there is no question of ourselves being subjected to the pressure to take a particular course of action.

In regard to the other countries, the hon. Member would surely appreciate that it would not be fair on my part to comment on what role they play, because

each and every one is a sovereign country and they look at the issues from their own national perspective. In regard to the question of smuggling of the nuclear material, this was one of the points, which we have pointed out to them. We have pointed out the inadequacy of the Treaty that it attempted to prevent horizontal transfer of technology, transfer of material, and there too it failed. It was made quite clear to them that the country which should not have got the technology or the material, got it. They not only got it, but also one of the very important personality who happened to be a former Prime Minister went on record saying that they had developed their nuclear capability.

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATUR-VEDI: Madam Vice-Chairperson, I would like to know from the hon. Minister, in view of the divided stand in the NAM on such an important matter, whether he still feels that the NAM has got any relevance in future so far as important areas are concerned. What is his view on the NAM, whether it is a divided house now or not? This was one of the important matters on which there was some kind of a ...*(interruptions)*...

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Madam, NAM is very much relevant certain issues, we may differ, we may not have a common position, but on many other issues, we have a similar position, a common position and a very firm position. Very recently we had the privilege of hosting the NAM Labour Ministers' Conference to deal with social clause and the GATT. the resolution which we have adopted had its own bearing, and particularly in the context of the New World Economic Order, South-South cooperation has assumed greater importance. If we can build on South-South cooperation where NAM has a very impotant role to play that will put a little muscle to our rhetoric and perhaps we will be able to influence the decision making process much more and in a better manner.

DR. BIPLAB DAS GUPTA: Madam Vice-Chairperson, I feel that our External Affairs Minister has simply ignored the question which I had put. I do not know whether he has done it deliberately or not. The question was very simple. I wanted to know from him whether the Government can have an independent policy with regard to nuclear weapons and take an independent stand even in isolation from other countries in the Third World. About 178 countries are one side and we are on the other side. I would like to know whether the Government will continue to have a policy of dependence on the Western countries for huge doles and so on for sustenance. I would also like to know whether dependency would eventually lead to a situation where they would force us, bludgeon us into accepting the NPT. Are they going to ensure that such things do not happen? That is one question.

The second question is a very specific one on the Indian Ocean. I would like to know from the Minister whether we have raised any demand that the Indian Ocean should be made a nuclear free zone and in Diego Garcia, the military bases that are existing there are not very far from our territory should be liquidated. I would like to know whether we have made any demand or not.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: So far as the last question of the hon. Member is concerned, on India's traditional position of maintaining the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace, I do not think that we should reiterate our position each and every time. There is a traditional position and there is no reason why we should deviate from that position.

I would like to say that there has been one further development particularly in the area of economic cooperation. Very recently some countries had a conference in Mauritius which is known as the Indian Ocean Rim Countries to build up greater economic cooperation among those countries. India is, of course, a participant in it. There some attempts were made to

bring in any extraneous issues. We tried to prevent that. We said that as a beginning, we should start with the objective of building up economic cooperation among the Indian Ocean Rim Countries.

In regard to the first part of the question, I must frankly admit thai I deliberately avoided it. If two teachers engage themselves in the theoretical discussion, perhaps, other Members will not find it very comfortable. So, I thought that I would not refer to it. Of course, it is known to everybody that whether it is our foreign policy or economic policy, nothing is in isolation.

4.00 P.M.

The policy is an integrated one. Therefore, you cannot *\-st compartmentalise it. But, I do not subscribe to the view that our economic policies are dependent on anybody or on any other policies. As our foreign policies are independent, equally, our economic policies also are independent irrespective of the fact that you are alleging me to be a signatory to the WTO.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): I am sure that hon. Members are satisfied by the reply of the hon. Minister.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Madam, only one comment I want to make. Even the Minister, while making the statement in regard to economic independence, was not very serious. ...*(Interruptions).*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): Thank you, Mr. Minister. ...*(Interruptions).*

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Actually, the argument given by the Minister in his capacity as the Minister of Commerce ...*(Interruptions)*... was that unless we signed the WTO, we were going to be isolated, it would be -putting us in a serious position and all that. I am not pressing him on that any more. The point I am making it, it is something inconsistent. This inconsistency hat to be re-

. __ I

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): I think we should end this discussion here with the good humour and good- note of the hon. Minister. Thank you very much, Mr. Minister We shall now proceed to the further discussion on the General Budget.

SHRI S JAIPAL REDDY: Where is the Finance Minister, Madam?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): He is there.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Of course, ray good friend is here. All the same, the senior Minister has also to be here.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: Dr. Shri-kant Ramchandra Jichkar was speaking on this yesterday. He will continue now.

THE BUDGET (GENERAL), 1995-96

DR. SHRIKANT RAMCHANDRA JICKHAR (Maharashtra): Madam, I would just recapitulate the argument which I was trying to make yesterday about Maharashtra's cotton scheme. This scheme came into existence in 1971 to eliminate the middlemen. In the Government of India, there is a feeling that this is a sort of monopoly. I want to make it clear that this scheme, by no stretch of imagination, can be a monopoly. In economics, monopoly is monopoly of production or monopoly of sates. In mis scheme, there is no monopoly of production, nor is there monopoly of sates. Anybody can produce cotton and anybody can purchase cotton from the Federation. What has been done is that the middleman has been excluded. But there is a feeling that this scheme is a sort of monopoly and therefore, whenever the Government of Maharashtra comet to the Central Government seeking permission to extend this schcane every year, we find that the same argument of monoply is made in the secretariat.

Madam, when the scheme began, nine lakh bates.
of cottton were processed. Today, 30
lakh cotton bates are being prooatsed by