

(e) (i) A statement regarding Review by the Government on the working of the Mishra Dhatu Nigam Limited for the year 1986-87.

(ii) Annual Report of the Mishra Dhatu Nigam Limited for the year 1986-87 along with the Audited Accounts and the comments of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-5426/87.]

(2) (i) A copy of the Annual Report (Hindi and English versions) of the Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses New Delhi for the year 1986-87 along with Audited Accounts.

(ii) A statement (Hindi and English versions) regarding Review by the Government on the working of the Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses, New Delhi, for the year 1986-87.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-5427/87].

Statement correcting reply to Unstarred Question No. 4472 re. occupation of government accommodation by MPs/ex-MPs.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRI DALBIR SINGH): I beg to lay on the Table a statement (Hindi and English versions) (i) correcting the reply given on 7th December, 1987 to Unstarred Question No. 4472 by Shri Manvendra Singh regarding occupation of Government accommodation by MPs/ ex-MPs and (ii) giving reasons for delay in correcting the reply.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-5407/87.]

11.08 hrs.

MESSAGE FROM RAJYA SABHA

[English]

SECRETARY-GENERAL: Sir, I have to report the following message received from the Secretary-General of Rajya Sabha:—

“In accordance with the provisions of sub-rule (6) of rule 186 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to return herewith the Appropriation (No. 5) Bill, 1987, which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 7th December, 1987, and transmitted to the Rajya Sabha for its recommendations and to state that this House has no recommendations to make to the Lok Sabha in regard to the said Bill.”

11.09 hrs.

STATEMENT RE. AGREEMENT BETWEEN GENERAL SECRETARY GORBACHOV OF USSR AND PRESIDENT REAGAN OF USA ON ELIMINATION OF LAND-BASED INTER-MEDIATE NUCLEAR MISSILES

[English]

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH): On 9-12-1987, PM made a statement in both the House of Parliament on the signing in Washington on 18-12-1987, of the INF Treaty between General Secretary Gorbachov and President Reagan. In response to requests for certain clarification in the Rajya Sabha, PM assured the House that a comprehensive statement would be made shortly. I am making this statement in fulfilment of that assurance.

The Treaty provides for the elimination of all land-based intermediate and short-range nuclear missiles having a range between 500—5500 kms, and deployed by the two sides.

[Shri K. Natwar Singh]

anywhere on the globe. The Treaty further prohibits the parties from producing these missiles in the future. It specifies that neither party shall produce or flight-test any intermediate or short-range missiles or produce any stages or launchers of such missiles.

The intermediate range missile systems are to be eliminated in two phases over three years and the shorter range systems within a single 18-month period. The intermediate range missile systems covered by the Treaty for elimination are the US Pershing-II and Ground Launched Cruise Missiles and the Soviet SS-20, SS-4, and SS-5 missiles. The shorter range missile systems covered are the US Pershing-1A and the Soviet SS-12 and SS-23 missiles. The Treaty provides for specific commitment and procedures for the elimination of missiles, launchers, support structures and support equipment.

The Treaty is of an unlimited duration. However, a party may withdraw from the Treaty if it decides that extraordinary events related to the Treaty have jeopardised its over-riding interests.

An unprecedented feature of the Treaty is its elaborate provisions for verification including on-site inspections, in order to monitor compliance with it. A separate Protocol to the Treaty sets forth the procedure for conducting agreed on-site inspections, including short notice inspections and continuous monitoring.

First of all, in order to verify the initial exchange of data on the specifications and locations of the missiles, the two sides have the right to conduct on-site inspections of agreed locations listed in the Memorandum of Understanding, within three months after the Treaty enters into force.

Secondly, there is a provision for the verification by the two sides of the destruction of missiles and launchers at the

specified sites where they would be collected for elimination.

Thirdly, after the missiles, launchers, equipment and support facilities are eliminated, the parties have the right to conduct on-site inspections to observe that the prohibited activities have actually stopped.

Fourthly, the Treaty provides for both sides to establish a system of resident inspectors, continuously to monitor missile facilities on each other's territory in order to ensure that these facilities are not performing any INF-related role. The Treaty identifies for monitoring sites where intermediate range missiles are now being produced as well as those where long range missiles are produced currently but which can also be utilised for producing intermediate range missiles.

For 13 years after the Treaty enters into force, the United States and USSR are entitled to conduct a specified number of short notice inspections per year at agreed locations. National Technical Means (NTM) of verification will continue to be used as the principal method of monitoring compliance with the Treaty. The two parties have undertaken not to interfere with each other's National Technical Means of verification and to take specific steps to enhance each other's ability to monitor by NTM.

The talks between USA and USSR to limit their nuclear forces had begun in Geneva in December, 1981. It remained suspended after November, 1983 when USSR withdrew from these negotiations following the decision by the United States and NATO to deploy Pershing-II and Ground Based Cruise Missiles in Western Europe. The negotiations were resumed in January, 1985 following an agreement reached between the Foreign Ministers of the two countries. The objective of the negotiations as agreed between the two Foreign Minister was to "work out effective agreements aimed at preventing an arms race in space and

terminating it on earth, at limiting and reducing nuclear arms...". Further, the two sides expressed the belief that the negotiations "should lead to the complete elimination of nuclear arms everywhere."

At the Summit meeting between US and USSR in Reykjavik in October 1986, the two leaders came very close to a far-reaching agreement that could have paved the way for complete elimination of all nuclear weapons. However, the agreement could not be clinched because of the unwillingness on the part of the United States to accept restrictions on its Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI) Programme and the insistence by USSR that its Reykjavik offer was a package deal that could not be discussed piecemeal.

Prospects for an agreement on Intermediate Nuclear Forces improved after USSR announced, in February this year, that it was willing to delink negotiations on INF from its demand for curbs on the SDI programme.

USSR further agreed to drop its earlier demand that the nuclear arsenals of UK and France be included within the scope of these negotiations. The United States subsequently suggested that shorter-range missiles should also be covered by the Treaty. USSR agreed to this demand in July 1987. Finally, USSR also agreed to extend the coverage of the prohibition from Europe to the whole world, as preferred by the United States in an attempt to allay the misgivings of some countries friendly to it, that an agreement on Euro-missiles would mean a deflection of pressure elsewhere. With this "global double zero" offer by USSR, the way to an INF Treaty was cleared, though a number of problems, particularly those relating to

verification and the pace and time-frame of destruction, remained to be resolved. In the detailed negotiations, both sides accommodated each other's concerns and made the concessions necessary for reaching a final agreement on the Treaty.

The significance of the Treaty lies in the fact that for the first time, there will be an actual reduction in the number of nuclear weapons deployed and the elimination of one category of nuclear weapons altogether. Earlier agreements between the two Super Powers had merely set limits or ceilings to the expansion of the existing arsenals of nuclear weapons. Moreover, the Treaty demonstrates that given the political will, doctrinaire considerations such as the imperative of "nuclear deterrence" or technical problems such as verification, need not stand in the way of nuclear disarmament. Though the Treaty covers a very limited number of nuclear warheads—about 2,000 out of the total of almost 58,000 in the possession of the Super Powers—its political and psychological significance transcends the number. It opens up prospects for undertaking more far-reaching measures of nuclear disarmament. Finally, the improvement in the relations between the two Super Powers that this Treaty reflects, cannot but have a positive impact on the general climate of international relations and security.

The INF Treaty is also significant for the unprecedented verification procedures provided in it. These provisions will go a long way towards restoring confidence between the two Super Powers and paving the way for concluding agreements on the elimination of other categories of nuclear weapons. They also constitute an important breakthrough in disarmament negotiations in general.

As the House is aware, ever since Independence, India has attached great importance to the objective of

[Shri K. Natwar Singh]

nuclear disarmament. This has been a major plank of our foreign policy. As early as in 1954, Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru gave a call for the banning of nuclear weapon tests. Since then we have been one of the staunchest proponents of a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). We believe that this would be the most important step towards curbing the qualitative refinement and continuous modernisation of nuclear arsenals. India played a leading role in getting a resolution adopted by the General Assembly in 1965, declaring the use of nuclear weapons as a crime against humanity. We have also taken the initiative in putting forward a number of proposals for halting the nuclear arms race and preventing nuclear war. These proposals, which include non-use of and freeze on nuclear weapons, have been adopted year after year in the form of resolutions by the General Assembly of the United Nations, by an overwhelming majority.

We therefore regard the INF Treaty as a vindication of our stand on nuclear disarmament. We can rightly claim that the efforts made by us together with other nonaligned and neutral countries and the peace loving people all over the world, to mobilise international opinion in favour of nuclear disarmament, has played no small role in bringing about this Treaty.

We have therefore, both on our own and as a member of the Six Nation Initiative, welcomed this momentous development. We did so immediately after an agreement, in principle, was reached on the subject following a meeting between the US Secretary of State and the Soviet Foreign Minister in Washington on September 18, 1987. A little later, we joined the leaders of the Six Nation Initiative in characterising this agreement as "a historic first step in the direction of our common goal namely, total nuclear disarmament. Further, in a joint message to President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev on December 7, prior to the Summit Meeting, the leaders of the Six expressed

the hope that the Summit Meeting would yield a spirit in which much more far-reaching disarmament agreements could quickly be elaborated and concluded.

The most important question before us now is whether this Treaty will be followed by more significant reduction of nuclear weapons leading to their complete elimination. Prospects for an agreement on a 50 per cent reduction of strategic nuclear weapons accompanied by an extension of the ABM Treaty for an agreed period of time in order to provide stability, are claimed to be good. However, even if this is achieved, it would still leave large arsenals of nuclear weapons in the possession of the nuclear weapons States.

In considering the long term impact of the INF Treaty we cannot but be concerned by some of the recent trends. While the Treaty eliminates one category of nuclear weapons, the nuclear arms race shows no sign of receding. Efforts are continuing to develop the space arm of the nuclear war-fighting machinery. At the same time, new offensive nuclear weapons are being developed and refined. The technological arms race is proceeding unabated, covering both nuclear and conventional weapons.

We have also to keep in mind that this modest though historic step towards nuclear disarmament has provoked shrill nuclear weapons States like the United Kingdom and France, while welcoming the INF Treaty, have stressed their determination to retain their respective independent "Nuclear Deterrent."

It is therefore clear that the journey towards the goal of complete elimination of nuclear weapons is going

to be a long and arduous one. But there is no alternative to persevering with this journey with renewed vigour and faith. I would like to assure the House that India will continue to pursue through all available means, our long-cherished goal of a nuclear-free world. We will continue to work tirelessly to achieve this objective through the six Nation Initiative, the forthcoming Third Special Session of the UN General Assembly devoted to Disarmament and the Nonaligned Movement.

While working for nuclear disarmament, we have also to think about the management of a nuclear-free society. That is why in his congratulatory message to General Secretary Gorbachev, our Prime Minister stated that the world needs changes of attitude policies and institutions to usher in a nuclear-free and non-violent world, as enunciated in the Delhi Declaration. He then called upon all nations—nuclear and non-nuclear—to engage in a serious dialogue for this purpose.

11.20 hrs.

ALCOCK ASHDOWN COMPANY LIMITED (ACQUISITION OF UNDERTAKINGS) AMENDMENT BILL*

[English]

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY (SHRI J. VENGALRAO): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Alcock Ashdown Company Limited (Acquisition of Undertakings) Act, 1973.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

“That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Alcock Ashdown Company Limited (Acquisition of Undertakings) Act, 1973”.

The motion was adopted.

SHRI J. VENGAL RAO: I introduce the Bill.

11.21 hrs.

COMMISSION OF SATI (PREVENTION) BILL*

[English]

THE MINISTER OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT AND MINISTER OF HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE (SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for the more effective prevention of the commission of sati and its glorification and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

“That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide for the more effective prevention of the commission of sati and its glorification and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto”.

The motion was adopted.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I introduce the Bill.

[English]

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE (Jadavpur): Speaker Sir, Speaker Sir, please allow one minute.

SHRI ANANDA GOPAL MUKHOPADHYAY (Asansol): A serious situation has been developing in West Bengal Sir.

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE Sir, 75,000 workers of public sector units today have gone on strike.

(Interruptions)

SHRI ANANDA GOPAL MUKHOPADHYAY: The employees of all public sector units in West Bengal have gone