

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Any Member of Parliament, whether belonging to the ruling party or to the Opposition, is free to move any privilege motion against anybody, and it is entirely the prerogative of the Chairman to accept it or to reject it. If you feel that there is impropriety, you can do so. I cannot comment on it.

I am going ahead. Mr. Gopalrao Vithalrao Patil, please speak.

PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA: Is it proper or not?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I will not comment on the floor of the House whether it is proper or not when we are going to discuss the NPT.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANT

Need of Having a National Consensus for India's Nuclear Policy with Reference to Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

SHRI GOPALRAO VITHALRAO PATIL (Maharashtra): Sir, I beg to call the attention of the Minister of External Affairs to the need of having a national consensus for India's nuclear policy with reference to Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE): Madam Deputy Chairperson.

India has pursued a consistent and principled policy on the subject of nuclear disarmament and the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. The policy enjoys national consensus.

When the NPT negotiation concluded in 1968, the subject came up for discussion in the Lok Sabha. Prime Minister Indira Gandhi had then stated that the NPT "in its present form, does not fully conform to the principles enunciated in the GA resolution No. 2028". She pointed to the discriminatory character and said that India shall "continue efforts for nuclear disarmament because it is

only through nuclear disarmament that discrimination would be eliminated and equality between nations re-established". Mrs. Gandhi also reiterated that the Government of India do not propose to manufacture nuclear weapons and assured the House that "the best interest of the country and of world peace" would guide the decision.

India has not become a Party to the NPT. However, India remains committed to non-proliferation. In our view, the NPT is a flawed treaty because it legitimises nuclear weapons in the hands of five countries. It allows these countries to continue expanding their nuclear arsenal with the development of ever more lethal nuclear warheads. We would like to see genuine non-proliferation which can be ensured only when the nuclear-weapons states agree to give up their nuclear arsenals and eliminate them under international verification. Prime Minister Narasimha Rao, speaking as Foreign Minister, in 1982, in the United Nations, pointed out that "unfortunately, the NPT was based on the faulty notion of checking horizontal proliferation alone without placing simultaneous and equal curbs on existing nuclear-weapons states". Therefore, while rejecting the NPT, India has pursued disarmament initiatives aimed at the complete elimination of all nuclear weapons within a timebound framework.

In keeping with this approach, in 1988, the then Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi presented an Action Plan for a Nuclear-weapon-Free and Non-Violent World Order. The Action Plan called for initiation of multilateral negotiations for elimination of nuclear weapons to be achieved by year 2010. With the end of the Cold War and the ideological conflict that lay behind the East-West confrontation, there exists a new opportunity to turn back the nuclear arms race. In 1992, speaking at the UN Security Council Meeting, Prime Minister Narasimha Rao called for advancing the target date for a

of

nuclear-weapon-free world to the end of the present century.

The Hon'ble Members would note that Government's policy has remained consistent throughout these decades. We have reiterated that India will not sign the NPT in its present form. We have also rejected the idea of any unilateral restrictions on India's nuclear programme which remains geared exclusively for peaceful purposes. We will continue to take initiatives, with other likeminded countries, to move forward towards creating a world free of nuclear weapons.

उपसभापति: श्री गोपालराव विठ्ठलराव पाटिल, आप 15 मिनट बोलिए, उसके बाद क्वेश्चंस करेंगे। No disturbance for a maiden speech.

SHRI GOPALRAO VITHALRAO PATIL (Maharashtra): Madam Deputy Chairman, a national consensus for India's Nuclear Policy with reference to Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty is a matter of urgent national importance. It is a prime national issue. This issue is on our national agenda. This issue is going to affect not only India but also the Non-Aligned Movement countries, the Third World countries and the other countries. Therefore, we have to look into this issue very seriously. The NPT has failed in its three major objectives. One is achieving of nuclear disarmament, achieving non-proliferation and achieving cooperation for peaceful uses of nuclear energy. These are the three basic issues on which this NPT has failed. Rather the NPT is followed more in its breach than in its observance. Therefore, this Treaty has miserably failed to achieve nuclear non-proliferation and to remove the fear of a nuclear war from the minds of the people of this world. The NPT is unjust, iniquitous and, most important, discriminatory. It has divided the world into nuclear haves and nuclear have-nots who will not have the nuclear option even for peaceful purposes at any time in future. Therefore, this has jeopardised their freedom, security and sovereignty. At the same time,

it has established nuclear monopoly, nuclear imperialism and nuclear hegemony of the permanent Members of the Security Council, that is, the United States, Russia, Britain, France and China, the nuclear weapon States, the so-called Members of the London Club. Now, nuclear proliferation has increased vertically as well as horizontally. Before signing of the Treaty, it was said that there were 10,000 nuclear war-heads. Some people say—there might be some variation in the figure—that there are 65,000 nuclear war-heads at present. This is most dangerous to the security of the world. With nuclear weapon States and horizontal proliferation—"horizontal" means the people who never had any nuclear weapons are also having—Pakistan, Israel, South Africa and some other countries of the CIS, Ukraine, Byelorussia, Kazakhstan and other threshold countries like North Korea, Iraq, Iran, Brazil and Argentina are trying to acquire. The real threshold countries are India, Germany and Japan. We are censuring this NPT that all the clauses of the NPT are being flouted and violated by the five nuclear powers and particularly, articles 1, 3, 4 and 6 are being violated. These nuclear weapon powers have created a safeguard mechanism in the form of International Atomic Energy Agency to look into and inspect the nuclear facilities of the non-nuclear States which are not having nuclear weapons. But the International Atomic Energy Agency has no right, has no authority to inspect the facilities of the nuclear haves. This is discriminatory. India's stakes are very high. India's destiny, future progress, sovereignty, geopolitical strategy, security and independence will be affected by this Treaty and hence India has wisely taken the decision not to sign this Treaty along with Pakistan and Israel. Pakistan has not signed the Treaty because India has not signed. Israel has not signed the Treaty because it is surrounded by the Arab countries and there is a threat to its existence. But India has not signed this treaty because it says that the treaty is discriminatory and

is not universal. India has a consistent policy of using nuclear power for peaceful purposes and that is the reason why in 1974, India conducted a peaceful nuclear explosion. After that, the world was censuring India whereas America has conducted 49 peaceful nuclear explosions without being condemned. India is condemned! However, India has not left its peaceful path. But, now, India is the only country which is not participating in this Nuclear Non-proliferation Conference at New York even as an observer and that is the reason why we have not been able to influence the other non-aligned countries not to sign this treaty. Now, there is a sea-change in the world at the end of the Cold War. The previous enemies, before the end of the Cold War, are now partners for peace in the changed situation. Our old friend, the Soviet Union, bound by a treaty, has disintegrated and therefore, there is no nuclear protection to India. At the same time, our neighbourhood has changed. A hostile Pakistan, with whom we have fought three wars, is already on the verge of becoming a nuclear power. Already reports say that Pakistan is having nuclear bombs. As everybody is aware, Pakistan is a theocratic State with faith in Muslim fundamentalism. Already it has thrust a proxy war in Kashmir with terrorists, mercenaries and militants—some of them hired from other countries. Pakistan will not hesitate to unleash nuclear terrorism. This should be taken into account while formulating our own policies.

Another important country in this region is China. We should have parity with China, and not Pakistan, as far as nuclear deterrents are concerned. Recently, as late as two days back, China has conducted a nuclear test, blatantly violating the moratorium placed by the world community on the testing of nuclear weapons and making a mockery of the NPT. Just now tests are banned under the NPT and China has conducted a test! China is already having full nuclear deterrents with ICBMs. We have had one war with China. Thousands of square kilomet-

res of our area are in the possession of China in the North-East, in Arunachal, and the Ladakh area, the Aksaichin area of Ladakh. Therefore, we have to preserve the honour, dignity, pride, culture and tradition of our great motherland India. Hence, there should be a National Nuclear Policy. And that should be that India will be a nuclear power with deterrents; India will produce missile material, will manufacture nuclear bombs with atom and thermo-nuclear, that is hydrogen, bombs; India will produce and deploy various missile systems, as we are doing, like Prithvi, Agni, Trishul, Akash, Nag, Asthra, etc. It is essential because of the changed national security threat perception. There is no other option for India. We should abandon our nuclear 'brahmacharya' as early as possible because the whole world is now not believing in it and our own people are doubting it.

That is why I am saying that India should abandon its nuclear 'brahmacharya.' I have called the attention of this august House for a national debate on this vital issue. All political parties in the Parliament should come to some consensus approach and declare to the signatory nations of the world, who are gathered in New York, that India will have the nuclear option in its own national interest without paying any heed to any pressure from any quarters. India is for peaceful uses of atomic energy in power generation, in medicine, in agriculture, in industry and in nuclear submarines. In this world, the modern countries are producing about 33% of their energy from nuclear fuel. Nuclear fuel stockpiles are maximum with these nuclear weapon States. Even if we are lured into signing the next Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, the nuclear material from these warheads will be so much that it will last for 100 years. The powers, who are not having any nuclear fissile material production facilities, will be deprived of this thing. Here also the nuclear NPT is discriminatory. One clause contains that nuclear energy could be transferred for peaceful

uses and for production of nuclear energy. It has got many other uses also. But the advanced States have been indulging in proliferation with nuclear countries alone, for example, the USA has supplied the technology for manufacturing atomic bombs to Britain and many other countries in the world. China has supported the nuclear policy of Pakistan and helped it in having deterrents in the form of bombs as well as delivery systems. It has supplied M-1 missiles to Pakistan. It has also supplied other missiles, Haf-1 and Haf-2. Similarly, Russia has supplied nuclear technology to North Korea and so on and so forth. Thirty-eight thousand kilograms of highly enriched uranium were missing from the American reactors. It was amazing. It was 20 years back. Where did they go? The whole world know. They went to Israel and now Israel is a nuclear power having, they say, 100 bombs. Similarly, the technology for peaceful uses of atom is also not provided to the States which have signed the nuclear non-proliferation treaty. This is also very discriminatory because this is a dual USE nuclear technology. It can be used for peaceful purposes and, at the same time, it can be diverted for manufacturing nuclear weapons. That is the argument of these States. Therefore, there are two or three things here, which are more important, Madam.

We may be lured into signing the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. But here also their obligation of disarmament is not honoured by the States which are having nuclear weapons. For example, in START-I and START-II they have undertaken to destroy 21,000 warheads. But it seems that not a single warhead has been destroyed up till now. Similarly, these States may lure us into signing the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty without giving any actual assurance of total elimination of nuclear weapons from this planet. Therefore, even the other treaty, which is a cut-off treaty for the production of fissile materials, is also more harmful to countries like India because of the very fact that once we don't

produce the fissile materials, we will not be able to use them for peaceful purpose. We are having many reactors producing electricity and energy for our own country.

At the same time, we are lucky that there is nothing in the nuclear technology which is unknown to this country. This is the statement of Shri P. Childambaram, Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission. He said, "We are having fast breeder reactors wherein we can use fuel which is the spent fuel in the ordinary reactors. Therefore, we are having a second channel of fuel mechanism. How can we abandon all these things when there is a global change in security perceptions? Our neighbourhood is hostile. We have got no friends in the World." I congratulate this Government because it has not bent under pressure. The coming events will cast their long shadows. Therefore, India will be isolated in future. The pressure is likely to increase. For example, in December, 1993 a resolution was passed in the United Nations according to which there would be total nuclear disarmament. But the NPT which was signed by more than 170 countries was extended recently in America. Now, the danger is this. There is another treaty which is known as Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. They have said that before 1996 this treaty will be passed. We will be forced to sign this treaty. What has happened to those treaties. We know that a horizontal proliferation has taken place. Countries which were not having nuclear weapons are now having nuclear weapons in spite of the NPT. These countries are Israel, Pakistan and South Africa. Before independence, South Africa was having a nuclear weapon. But they dismantled the atom bomb because they knew that it would be transferred to the Blacks who are now ruling. So much discrimination is there. So, India should have second thoughts on it. We have missed the bus once. But, if we miss the bus a second time, we will have to catch it running; otherwise it will be too late. It will have dire consequences. Therefore, I would

like to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that we should have our nuclear option, our own choice, keeping in mind our national interest. Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you, It was his maiden speech. Good speech. Now, Shri I.K. Gujral.

Hon. Members, at 1.30 p.m. we have to adjourn the House for lunch. We took some time for settling the House.

SHRI SUNDER SINGH BHANDARI (Rajasthan) Zero Hour.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Not Zero Hour. I don't want to legitimise it... It was the concern of the Members who were worried over some issues. Some day you can be worried on some issues.

SHRI SUNDER SINGH BHANDARI: Then change the rule.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We don't change the rule. We respect the sentiments of our colleagues. That is all. Only this much we can do. We respect the sentiments of each other and don't mind ourselves so much.

I wanted to know this. Are we going to adjourn for lunch or are we going to encroach upon the lunch hour?

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Let him speak.

SHRI DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He will speak. I am asking it in advance. I don't want to interrupt any other speaker.

SHRI INDER KUMAR GUJRAL: (Bihar): Madam, I have heard the hon. Minister's statement. But that does not reduce my anxiety. I appreciate the firmness which the Government has exhibited. I also appreciate the statement which the Prime Minister made yesterday in the other House. He said that his rejection of the NPT in the present form was both firm and total. I appreciate this. I also appreciate the fact that the Government of India has rightly understood that the new arrangement, as it was in the last arrangement, is a very odd animal. It allows a vertical

proliferation all the time. What does it mean? It basically means that all those powers—five, particularly—who have the nuclear weapons, may go on piling more and more. The strange irony of life is that while they are piling up nuclear weapons, on the one side it was said that SALT I and SALT II have been signed. But all the same it goes on. Therefore, the piling up goes on mounting. It is a matter of satisfaction that the Indian Government, over the years, and I say all the Governments over the years, have built some sort of a national consensus on this issue. I think, therefore, this Government is also following it. The NPT was not visible at the time of Nehru. But his attitude was very visible. Nehru knew from the very beginning the type of discrepancies that were growing. We had not yet experimented with the nuclear power. At the same time, the indications were there. Jawaharlal Nehru had spelt out our policy on the atomic bomb, or whatever it was called later on. Mrs. Indira Gandhi, I must say to her credit, went a step further. She made it technologically feasible for us to use the nuclear power, yet abstaining from making nuclear weapons with a great deal of courage and remarkable vision. At the same time, she was able to stand up and say that the NPT was an instrument that was not acceptable to us. Unfortunately, it so happens that the world situation is such and has been such, particularly during the cold war it was such, that a type of hypocrisy continued the world over. Those powers which were fighting the cold war amongst themselves did not hesitate in going on building even more deadly weapons. I remember, in 1980, Senator Percy was the Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Senate. I went to meet him in Washington. Accompanying me was the former American Ambassador to the Soviet Union. He was my colleague. We went together. And we asked him one question. The total number of weapons available with the two Super Powers at that time were so much that they could

annihilate the entire world 13 times. The question arose: Why kill the killed again? How many times can you kill the world? It did not stop. SALT I and SALT II came. A very strange type of curtain has been drawn to make us believe that the world has already started moving towards non-proliferation of weapons reductions. The reductions are marginal and these are not going to help in any way. On the contrary, at the moment we are seeing that the situation is now going in a opposite direction, particularly, with the collapse of the Soviet Union. Now you find that in Central Asia, in the former Soviet States, even in Ukrain and elsewhere, all these weapons and fissionable material are proliferated. The worst dimension of it is that there is no reliable inventory available. One does not know who has what. Even the owners do not know how much they have. One does not know or does one know who has what capacity. We notice that weapons are being carried from Ukrain to Russia. Russia says that they do not have the capacity to take them. They do not know how to safe guard care of them. Therefore, some aid is being given by the Americans for building storage. When the demolition of the weapons begins, a new situation arises. Mountains and mountains of fissionable material that they do not know how to manage. I was hoping that this NPT Conference would attend to these problems. I was hoping that they would draw the world's attention to these issues. I was hoping that a world consensus would evolve as to how we should together meet these dangers. On the contrary, the effort was made to create a situation to enable the powers that be to remain powerful. In this also manifestal internal contradictions. France went to elections only a week back. Mr. Chirac got elected. What is the first statement made? The first statement he makes is: "I am going to renew and revive the tests again." This first challenge came even while the NPT Conference was being held. This is what one major partner of

the P-5 was doing. Another partner, China, goes one step further. It performs an underground test and throws it on the face of the Americans. What do the Americans say? One of our newspapers has rightly pointed out today and I quote:

"Low key US reaction to the Chinese test - The spokesman says that it is particularly disappointing that China has not joined the test moratorium. However, the US handles such problems with China on low key because China has no inhibition in reminding the US that it has carried far fewer tests than the United States has..."

That is the situation. China tells US: "You are a bigger criminal than I am." America is hesitant to tell China, "Please stop it". Both get together and tell us, "Don't make weapons. NPT is very sacrosanct". France also joins. Britain—of course, poor—they seldom speak. But they also do the same. Therefore, you analyse all the five one by one. I am not talking of Russia deliberately because they are in a different situation. But kindly keep one thing in mind. What is helping Russia to survive even today as a power despite all the disarrangement, disarray of their economic situation, internal disquiet, is this. They tell the powers that be that your powers shall not come to our borders let your NATO treaty arrangements may be what they are, but you shall not go beyond a point and that is effective deterrence. Deterrents are not used only when wars are there; deterrents are used as an instrument of policy also. That is what we are seeing today—how it is being used. We witness a dramatic. That dramatic aspect was that while they were drafting—I was told by the Press—a comprehensive statement. Somebody said, if you want to mention India, you will have to mention Israel also. Now that is a sacred cow. Therefore, they have to stop short of that. They don't mention Israel and, therefore, we too are left out, at least for the time being. I

would also draw your attention that would be an exposure of the American intentions. Benazir Bhutto, for whom I have great respect and who is my personal friend also, was recently in America. She met Clinton. What did Clinton promise her? Clinton says: I will go to the Senate and try to get you one time exemption from the Pressler regime. What does that mean? It means that although the President of America is not in a position to certify that Pakistan has not launched on the nuclear weapon programme, even then he will get her one time compromise. Chastity—in their case, it is the nuclear matter; but when it comes to inter-
rests—is also compromisable. This is the situation that we are faced with. It is a different matter that even President Clinton feels helpless in the Congress. It is not to oblige us. If Pressler is resisting or if Presslerites are resisting, it is not to do a favour to India. Their interests are such that they cannot see a third world country becoming nuclear. Therefore, even when they have strategic interests in Pakistan, they cannot go beyond that. But may I caution the Minister? Please take note of the fact that 178 countries have signed the treaty. And all in the background that we were watching, was not voluntary. Pressures were used,

1.00 P.M.

cajoling was done, temptations were given and the world being what it is, 178 countries have signed. This is the process that begins to isolate India. The isolation will not come directly. World politics is not conducted so brazenly. World politics is conducted in a very indirect fashion and one dimension of it you saw in this morning's press. A resolution has been brought before the U.S. Congress. I do not know whether it has been passed or not, but the resolution is there, that aid to India should be stopped because of India's record of how many times India supported the American positions in the United Nations. They have said, any country—and now India included—which

does not support the American position in the United Nations up to 75%—less than 25% abstentions are permissible—it must be lined up. I hope the Prime Minister and the Minister will assure us that the firmness with which the statement has been made, will be manifested in this as well. We are in a position and we shall be in a position. We are not now an aid-seeking country. therefore, we must firmly stand up. But when I say so, Madam, I have many doubts about, if I may use the word regarding potency of the Government because I have seen it in the last UN session—I was there myself. In the UN session we exhibited our vulnerability in this context. For the first time, we did not move a resolution on disarmament and about fissionable materials under the pressure of America, because America told us, if you do this then we do that. I hope that we will now restore our original context in this and we will stand up where our vital interests are concerned.

Having said that, Madam, I want to take a couple of minutes to draw your attention to our security compulsions. Our security problems are serious. Therefore, because of the security problems, to which I will come in a minute, the pressure is not going to grow so much on the nuclear issue at this stage, as on the missile issue. The missile is now a more important and a priority time on the American agenda, and also of its immediate concern. They are going to pressurise us on that. I am glad that the Prime Minister, yesterday while speaking in the Lok Sabha, said that the Dharti and Agni programmes will continue as they are. I hope it is meant because sometime I get doubtful about it. Another point remains—The cryogenic engine. Who stopped it? Why was it stopped? Even the Russians are being pressurised today. So, challenge to us today is in the sphere of missiles. A new situation has been created around us.

M-11 missiles have been deployed in Pakistan. They took these missiles from China. M-11 missiles have been supplied to Iran. M-11 missiles have been supplied to Saudi Arabia. This is one dimension of it. The missiles are already deployed in Tibet. That is another dimension of it. I do not have to talk about the islands around us where the American bases exist. Of course, the nuclear submarines are there all around us.

Madam, if I may take a minute, I will tell you a story which I experienced myself. It was in 1978. I was the Ambassador of India in Moscow. The Government of India, at that time, asked me to check up with the Soviet Union of that time, if India should have nuclear submarines or not. I went to my friend, Mr. Greshkov, who was the Father of the Soviet Navy, and asked him, "What should be our policy about nuclear submarines?" And he asked a very pointed question, "But what are your objectives? If it is only coastal defence, 'no'; if you are seeing threat elsewhere or are threatened by somebody, then 'yes'." I asked him, "You are a friend. Please tell us what our threat perception should be". He told me at that time that China by then had 20 nuclear submarines and it had the capacity to add two nuclear submarines every year. This was in 1978. I do not know what their total strength now is. Then he turned to me and asked a question, "Why? For whom? Surely, they are not going to attack Australia. And, they can try to obstruct us, the Soviet Union, from going through the Pacific, but we can take care of that".

He said, "Mr. Ambassador, wait and watch, the ultimate objective is to cross the straits and come to Burma and once the nuclear submarines come to Burma and Rangoon is turned into a base, you would be in a situation, not that do I see today." Madam, I had been to China last year. I was told by the Chinese themselves that till last year China had given to Burma weapons worth two billion dollars. I don't know how much

more has been added in this one year. In today's newspaper itself there is a news that a highway between Burma and China has been completed. Now, two billion dollars is one question, but the composition of that supply has to be understood. I don't know whether missiles are there or not what other things are there or not.

Now, turn to the other side. We often talk about Pakistan. I have just now mentioned that M-11 has been deployed. Go to Deigo Garcia—a favourite subject of my friend as well as of mine. What is Deigo Garcia aiming at? Soviet Union does not exist any more. Then why Deigo Garcia? When you are in this situation, what are your security options? Madam, last year, in the month of December, I had the opportunity of talking to three major think-tanks in America and I posed this question. I said, "When we are in this situation what are the security options of India?" In this context, kindly keep one thing in mind. I wrote an article, I mentioned it here, that a major think-tank in America has come out with a perception called, SARI—not sari but SARI—South Regional Initiative. What does it mean? It says very blatantly that the passage to de-nuclearisation of India passes through Kashmir and that is the American policy regarding Kashmir. If we don't take note of it, I don't know who else does? Merely rejecting the NPT does not solve the problem. I gives birth to many more issues. If gives birth to a re-examination of your security perceptions. You must have set some long term perceptions in the near future. Unless we are able to do that we have to think in terms of how do we meet the situation.

The day before yesterday, while speaking here—unfortunately my media friends chose to black me out whenever I speak on security or foreign affairs—I said one thing and I want to repeat that. You cannot meet these challenges without institutions. Mere debates don't help. My friends, the Foreign Minister,

has a very lame duck policy planning unit. It is not his fault. He has come only yesterday. Even one year after the Prime Minister, making an announcement in this House about the setting up of a Security Council, it is still to be done as if our security can afford to wait so long and a Security Council can be set up much later. Can we play with this? Do we have a perception of what the prospects around us are? Is the data available? I told my friend, the Prime Minister, that one thing which is very important and which we should keep in mind, apart from planning for future, is to institutionalise of memory. How do we know what China did in 1978? How do we know what China will do tomorrow? I am not against China, but I think, every country in peace always thinks of threat perceptions and those who don't history is very cruel to them. Today, when I stand here I want to talk about a situation which is now coming to us, i.e., the United States is not going to leave you alone because you have rejected the resolution. They may be very loud. Madam Raphael might come here again and threaten you, but that threat can be dealt with. The arm-twisting always comes indirectly. Is Indian polity — I am talking about polity, not of the Government — ready to resist such arm-twisting? Is Indian polity unitedly...

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: They have already started.

SHRI INDER KUMAR GUJRAL: That is what I am saying. It is not a question of the Government. I think the Indian nation is now going to walk into a situation — it has walked into a situation — you have taken on. They want to stop your missile programme; they want to stop whatever knowledge you have about nuclear power. They don't want any research to go on.

They want you to depend on them for defence and, at the same time, Charar-e-Sharief will come. At the same time, Kashmir issue will be stepped up. I re-

peat what I said, the central point of American policy is that the passage to denuclearisation and add to that, the missile, passes through Kashmir. Look at Kashmir not only as an internal matter, look at it as a dimension of security and once you do that, then, you will be in a position to make the whole policy. I do not mean you go and annoy American or you go and take on America. But develop enough strength internally as a nation. We should know that nations are never defended by weak hearted souls. At the same time, I would say, the modern war is not a Rajput war; only brains help now. It is the institutions which help; it is the policy planning which helps; it is the vision which helps; and it is trying to create a situation where you are never in the wrong or on the wrong side of the situation, that helps.

Thank you, Madam.

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI (Tamil Nadu): Madam, this matter was actually sought to be discussed during the last week. Had it been allowed to be discussed, there would have been an impact on the NPT which was recently signed. Madam, as far as the nuclear armaments are concerned, my hon. friend to my right side says, even for weapon, grade we have to develop. What I feel is, nuclear power should only be for peaceful purposes. At the same time, we have to get the support from the likeminded countries, particularly countries surrounding India. The recently signed treaty has failed to bring a fair and equitable balance of interests. The treaty has become a permanent one but there is no permanent mechanism to monitor or check nuclear States. In other words, this treaty has legitimised the nuclear status of the haves. Even though it is signed by 178 countries, only some 12 countries stood up and recorded their dissent. They are Malaysia, Nigeria, Iran, Iraq, Egypt, Syria, Jordan and Libya. All these countries particularly recorded their dissenting notes. The situation is not conducive. The contents of the article which the

countries have signed are totally discriminatory. Nigeria and Indonesia demanded the compliance with the nuclear treaty obligations. But, now, they have succumbed to the pressure exerted by the U.S.A. The Uruguay demanded a multilateral control mechanism to see that the obligations of the nuclear States are fulfilled without any fail. Instead of that, they have received some tough message from them. Mexico and Venezuela tried their best to stop this type of play but, ultimately, the Head of the team which represent to Venezuelan country, Mr. Adolfo, a die-hard, was forced to resign. The reason was he did not want to be cowed down by the American Power. He was forced to resign. As far as our neighbour, Pakistan, is concerned, it has erected a reprocessing unit facility in 1980 itself with the technological know how of France and Belgium near Rawalpindi. China and Pakistan have already signed an Atomic Cooperation Treaty. After that Pakistan is having a single fissile material production facility based on the gas centrifuge technology. The gas centrifuge technology means — still they have not developed to that extent — now what the Government of Pakistan is seeking for is they want to convert the technology into plutonium. What is the difference between the highly enriched uranium, uranium and plutonium? Highly enriched uranium, if it is used, the warheads will be very bulkier, but if plutonium is used, low-weight bombs can be produced. For that now, from the highly enriched uranium, Pakistan is trying to upgrade the technology to use plutonium. This is the situation. Once they tried it in 1977, but they failed in this respect. Now, Madam, when it is so, in 1980, in the United States, there was the Financial Assistance Act, by which if any financial assistance should be given to other countries, the President has to sign that the country which is seeking aid from US does not have any nuclear power and they will not have. Such a type of an assurance certificate should be issued by the President. But in 1980,

President Bush refused to issue the certificate, as far as Pakistan was concerned. Therefore, assistance was stopped, the financial assistance was stopped to Pakistan. Now, two Congressmen, Mr. Benjamin and Mr. Doubglas, have introduced amendments to this Financial Act, i.e., the Pressler Act. They want to introduce their amendment and thereby they want to establish or restore the *status quo ante*. In case that amendment is passed, Pakistan will get all sorts of help. For example, I tell you, what the States has told, "We will not supply the warheads, we will not undertake any repair of the warheads." But, at the same time, they say, "We will give them military education and training." That means they want that they will not repair the war-heads received if they are received from Pakistan, but they will teach them, they will educate the Pakistans as to how to repair them. This is the content of that. And also even after this particular NPT was signed, the Ambassador of US of the UN Mr. Meddley says, "This is a once in life opportunity and we have been able to capitalise it." That means they have succeeded in the battle. This is what they say. The negotiations started on the 17th April, exactly one month before, the United States wants to see all the people to sign the NPT what action has been taken by Indian to mobilise support in the international arena? We feel and to the best of our knowledge, they have not done anything. I feel that you attempts have utterly failed. Two decades before, what type of support we enjoyed we lost it now. We have completely lost that support. Therefore, I feel if the Government of India had pursued during the past two-and-a-half decades after the first signing of the Treaty and tried to mobilise the support of other countries, this type of a situation would not have arisen at all. Now, what do they say. They say that India may be more or less isolated. Do you know that most of the countries do not want to sign the Treaty because it has become a permanent feature? The nuclear-weapon States have entitled to

manufacture or develop the technology or to pass on the information from are nuclear state to the other nuclear-weapon States. What guarantee are they giving through the NPT to other countries? The nuclear-power States won't use nuclear weapons against the signatory states. But there is another issue. There are some states in the world who are having some clandestine nuclear stockpile. Is the countries which are not declared as nuclear-weapon States use their clandestine nuclear weapons against other countries. What is the remedy for the non-nuclear weapons countries? No umbrella, no remedy, is there. Therefore, what I feel is, not only we have to pursue this but we also ought to get the support from other countries. We have totally failed. At least now, I am asking the Minister, Madam, he must try to get the support from other countries. It is easy to get because most of the countries feel offended because of pressure put of them. In case you approach properly, you will get their support. We know that Nasser, Tito and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru were pillars of the non-alignment movement. They were able to take the other countries along with them. They were able to carry more than 100 countries with them. But what we find is that we are not able to mobilise even 50 countries. In external affairs, we have totally failed in our foreign policy. We feel our embassies have not done their duty or they have not been instructed properly. This is why I feel it is a failure of our foreign policy. It is a total failure. Therefore, I request through you, Madam, that the Government of India should pursue the path which we have already set for ourselves. In 1988, when Shri Rajiv Gandhi spoke in U.N., in the Special session, he mentioned two things. One, between 1988 and 1994 — what we have to do. Cessation of production of nuclear weapons by all the nuclear-weapons States. Two, cessation of production of weapons grade fissionable material by all nuclear weapon States.

The schedule was between 1988 and

1994. What have we done in this direction? They have not complied with our obligations and now they say it is not mandatory. One American official released a statement to the press where in he has said that this is a not mandatory obligation. We can not actually prevent them from producing nuclear weapons. That is what they say. It means, permanently the nuclear-weapon States are legitimising their production of nuclear weapons and developing the technology and supplying the same other nuclear-weapon States. This means the method of arm-twisting has succeeded in the international politics. India is a country of 100 crores and yet we are not able to do anything in the international forum. This is because of the policy that is being pursued by the present Government. Now, I feel happy that at least the Government has not signed this treaty. Had they signed the treaty, just like others did in the case of WTO, we would have been put to much hardship. But, fortunately, we stood by our stand, we declared that this treaty is discriminatory, but we failed to get the support from other countries.

SHRI AJIT P.K. JOGI Madhya Pradesh: Did you expect anything more than that?

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI: Yes, I expected. What we expected was that the Government may get support from other countries. Had we got support from other countries, we would have succeeded in the battle between April 17 and May 12, but we were unable to persuade other countries. Non-aligned countries have failed us totally.

Our future has been doomed because of this. Therefore, the responsibility for this failure lies with the Government. At least, You should wake up now. I hope you would not commit the same type of mistake; I hope it would not recur.

I am happy that, at least, we did not sign the NPT which is discriminatory in character. We should be firm in our stand. The entire country, cutting across

party lines, would support the Government in case they move in the direction of getting the support of other countries. You did not do it earlier. At least now, you should start mobilising the other non-aligned countries and, collectively, pressure should be brought upon the nuclear weapon States so that they themselves come forward to ensure that the nuclear stockpile is eliminated. Unless you do this, there is no hope. If you fail to do it, you would be doing a disservice to the future generation.

Madam, I hope the government would take all these things into consideration and do the best for the nation. Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Yerra Narayanswamy. He is not here.

SHRI AJIT P.K. JOGI: The other Narayanasamy is there.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The other Narayanasamy comes after Dr. Biplab Dasgupta. We have only five minutes left. If Dr. Biplab Dasgupta can finish in five minutes, I can ask him to speak. But if he wants to take a little more time, I can adjourn the House. We can meet after one hour and then he can start his speech.

SHRI JAGMOHAN (Nominated): I will take only five minutes.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay. Mr. Jagmohan will take only five minutes. Fine. That is better.

SHRI JAGMOHAN: Sir, I have a few pointed questions. I do not want to repeat what has been said...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: 'Sir' has to reply. Only through 'Madam', he has to go. He is going directly.

SHRI JAGMOHAN: My first question to the hon. Minister, through you, Madam, is: Is it a fact that there was some sort of an informal understanding between the United States of America and India that 'you don't mobilise the non-aligned opinion and we will not press you too much'? Is it a fact or not that

there was some sort of a *quid pro quo* arrangement? Valid evidence in this regard is available in the sense that no serious effort was made to mobilise the opinion of the non-aligned movement. This has been the major weakness in our stand. I wish to point this out. Has the Government realised that this 'divide and rule' policy has been there since time immemorial? They have adopted the same 'divide and rule' policy here and they have separated us from the main non-aligned movement.

The second point I wish to make is: Has the Government realised the overall objective of the United States of America and its Western allies? That objective is very clear to me. It is that they want to penetrate in to India's economic field. Once they have established levers of control here, they would press you. They would twist your arms and you would have no other option. This is what is happening. We hear from the hon. Finance Minister. He says: 'What could we do? We were indebted; we did not have foreign exchange'. Madam, how can a country whose foreign debt has run into 92 billion dollars have an independent foreign policy? They can switch of anything from the main at any time they like. Your whole economy would come to a grinding halt. Therefore, they are moving according to the plan which they have made.

My third point is in regard to Kashmir. Since 1991 I have been pointing out that we should be very firm in setting the issue quickly. The more you prolong, the more you would be exposing yourself to the danger. Exactly the same thing has happened. We have placed ourselves in Kashmir in such a situation where the United States thinks that it can use the Kashmir issue to put pressure on us. What is this bogey of human rights and so many other things which they have raised? What is all this talk of 'semi-under pressure from other people. You want to keep Kashmir only in name.

You want to surrender everything else. This is a clear American policy. I have got a report, and I can read it out to you, if you like. As early as 1990 the Carnegie Foundation Report says very clearly that the United States and Russia should combine and bring a formal or informal resolution in the United Nations or there should be some other informal arrangement by which pressure should be put on India.

The next question is: what is the American strategy? It is to plant stories of a unclear conflict between India and Pakistan and then pressurise us to agree to this. Seymour Hersh wrote an article in THE NEWYORK TIMES long ago saying that we were on the verge of a nuclear conflict.

The book "Critical Mass" by Burroughs and others came. What was the thesis? They were all concocted stories to say that Mrs. Gandhi was on the verge of bombing Kahuta in 1984. They gave the date as October 24. On 31st October, she was assassinated. Five days before that, she was in Kashmir. The day she was going to bombard Kahuta, she was talking to me in a normal way! She had gone there with her grandchildren to see some portion of Kashmir. She was in such a mood. If this decision had been taken by her, would she be sitting in Kashmir and talking of very ordinary affairs? Would she not tell the Governor of that State, "Look, we are going to do that; it is going to have repercussions in Kashmir and in the North East." What type of stories are floated? That is part of a scheme. It is not a story like this. Then, they say that we were on the verge of a nuclear war.

I was the Governor of Jammu and Kashmir at that time. I know the state of mind of the nation at that time. Whereas Banazir Bhutto was pulling me from that side, you were pulling me from this side. Was it the state of mind of a nation which was going to a nuclear war with Pakistan? So, stories of this type are being planted. This will be another

pressure on you in times to come. We have missed the bus I do not know whether you can retrieve the situation even now. In my opinion, you have already lost the battle by allowing yourself to surrender the Non-aligned Movement. ...*(Time bell)*

Madam, I have one or two points more. I will finish in one minute. I will keep my promise.

The other point is, if we do not test, independence: 'the people of Kashmir should be involved', etc? What is this? The other day, I was shocked to hear the Prime Minister saying: 'Short of independence, we can agree to everything'. This is a shocking statement. You are surrendering your stand, inch by inch, how can we improve our technology? They are not playing the human rights game with China. They are not putting pressures like these on China. So, the bigger issue is that we have totally surrendered. We do not resist the pressures from America. We do not even put our economy right. We do not put our administration right. We are always agreeing with it directly or indirectly. Our attitude is: what can we do in Charar-e-Sharief? These people came as pilgrims. They laid mines inside. What could we do? There was no other option. If we had done this, it would have caused this. If this is the attitude of this mighty nation, would you be able to stand up to pressures from them?

I think, these are the four or five questions which need to be answered. Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House is adjourned for lunch for one hour.

The House then adjourned for lunch at thirty-four minutes past one of the clock.