

**THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE
MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY
AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI SHEILA DIKSHIT) :**
Sir, the Minister for External Affairs against whom this item is listed is Mr. Natwar Singh. He is on his legs in Rajya Sabha. He cannot be expected to run away from there.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA : Where is the Cabinet Minister ?

(Interruptions)

SHRIMATI SHEILA DIKSHIT : Sir, we have a Cabinet Minister here. If you like we can start the debate and..

(Interruptions)

SHRIMATI SHEILA DIKSHIT : Sir, the hon. Minister, Mr. Natwar Singh has come. Let us start the debate now.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Kali Prasad Pandey you may continue your speech next time when this item is again taken up. Now the House will take up discussion under Rule 193 regarding recent deliberations in the US Congress on South Asia. Shri S. Jaipal Reddy may initiate the discussion.

16.25 hrs.

**DISCUSSION ON THE STATEMENT
RE : RECENT DELIBERATION IN
THE US CONGRESS ON
SOUTH ASIA**

[English]

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY (Mahbubnagar) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, the whole nation is profoundly perturbed...

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur) : Even Tiwari.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : ...over the obnoxious and outrageous move of US Senate Committee for Appropriations to equate India with Pakistan on the nuclear question. Though it is a bolt from the blue, our nation is not surprised. This move of the US Congress fits in with the general pattern. It is in perfect conformity with the time-honoured approach the United States

adopted towards the problems in this region.

Today, the whole nation reacts against this cutting across all party barriers. Never has India felt so much insulted and provoked as by this move since perhaps 1971 Bangladesh War. The equation is illogical and immoral. India has had nuclear weapon capability at least since Pokaran implosion in 1974. But India has unilaterally and scrupulously refrained from using this know-how and capability for military purposes. India, at the same time, has been consistently opposing the nuclear non-proliferation treaty as it is discriminatory, and as it is weighted in favour of the big powers of the world. This has been the stand of our nation irrespective of who was in power. I may recall that Mr. Morarji Desai as Prime Minister snubbed the then US President Jimmy Carter in 1977 on this question.

India has developed this capability all on its own while Pakistan has been resorting to stealing spree of nuclear weapon materials. The latest instance was Arshad Pervez case. Ironically, the trial of Arshad Pervez is starting today in Philadelphia. Some of us have always felt the United States has been deliberately turning a Nelson's eye to this nuclear ambition of Pakistan. It has always adopted double standards on this question. Soon after Pokaran implosion the United States unhesitatingly went back on a contract to supply enriched uranium for a US-supplied plant at Tarapur. Now it is admitted among experts in the United States that Pakistan has a workable nuclear device and America is back to its age-old game. It again wants to turn the blind eye. Now with this move, our nation has got the worst of both worlds. We have been pleading that the Symington Amendment should be applied in the case of Pakistan and Pakistan should not get any military aid.

The latest move is clear to release the stalled 4.02 billion dollars military and economic aid to Pakistan, which includes the dreaded system called AWACS which could totally upset the apple cart or the balance of forces in the sub-continent. I do not know why the US Congress wants to insist on treating India on par with Pakistan. India is a big country which has developed its own capability and built up its own infra-

structure. I do not know why America insists on treating China on a different footing from that of India on this question.

'Our Prime Minister cannot be faulted for not making an effort at improving the relations between India and the United States. He has the distinction of making three successful and well-publicised trips to United States during the last three years. No other Prime Minister has had this great distinction. After his three pilgrimages what did we achieve? On the return of his latest trip from the United States, our Prime Minister has assured our country two things.

Firstly, he said that the Vice-President of America, Mr. George Bush assured him that CIA had not played any destabilising part in India. He also assured in the same serious manner that CIA would not also play any such part in future. Our Prime Minister commended this assurance of George Bush to the whole nation. He did not merely convey it; he commended it. Another important thing that was assured was that there would be a change, a dramatic change in the attitude of the United States authorities to the nuclear ambitions of Pakistan. In retrospect, our Prime Minister sounds like a gullible convert and a naive diplomat. There is an impression in the country that the accord on Sri Lanka was inspired by Washington. In fact, when this accord was reached, some American politicians ran into raptures over the pacific implications of that accord to such a degree that they even thought of recommending the name of Mr. Rajiv Gandhi for a Nobel Prize for Peace. I am not able to understand why our young, dynamic Prime Minister with more than 80 per cent of strength in this House cannot stand up to arm-twisting tactics of President Reagan. He has given an impression to the nation that he cannot stand up and talk in the White House. Some of the people are also drawing an unflattering inference about his dangerous vulnerability to international blackmail.

I do not want to say that this vulnerability has been generated on account of spate of scandals that shot to surface in the recent months. Sir, it is instructive for us to note

that Symington amendment is applicable to Pakistan but unfortunately it is being informally waived in favour of Pakistan and illegally applied to India. Sir, on account of this move Pakistan would continue to get all that President Zia has been bargaining for. But India's access to high technology will be restricted. What is more, Mr. Chairman, Sir, India's access to concessional finance from such world institutions, like the World Bank, IMF, IDA will also be adversely affected. Sir, this is being seen as a great diplomatic breakthrough pulled off by General Zia. The U.S. Congress man, Mr. Solarez said :

"This came about on account of successful lobbying efforts of Mr. Dennis Neil, the lobbyist for the Pakistan Embassy in Washington."

What are the levers that General Zia is able to operate on in United States. All of us in this House would like India's relation to be improved with the United States. A big country like ours cannot antagonise a super power like America beyond a point. But this friendship cannot be forged at the cost of fundamental principles to which our country is committed at the cost of vital interest of our nation.

General Zia is able to get what all he wants because of the strategic importance the State Department assigns to Pakistan in view of what is going on in Afghanistan. The U.S. Senate Appropriation Committee while recommending this Bill stated, in so many words, "that the resistance movement in Afghanistan was growing and at this point of time the United States could not afford to weaken its relationship with Pakistan". This strategic importance of Pakistan is so overarching in this context that the CIA has gone to the extent of organising illegal purchase of weapons even from India for the mujahids in Afghanistan. I do not want to go into what appeared in today's papers. The Speaker in the morning said that the External Affairs Minister in the course of his reply would refer to the point. I would like to know as to how this sale took place?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE
 MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
 (SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH) : I am sorry,

[Shri K. Natwar Singh]

I did not hear it. What was the point ?

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : 60,000 rifles have been diverted from India to rebels in Afghanistan. When Shri Natwar Singh was in the House, the Lok Sabha Speaker said that the members while speaking on the issue could also refer to this and could well expect a well-considered reply from the External Affairs Minister on this question.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Not only that, he said that the statement would take care of the point also. It is not there in the statement.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH : With very great respect to the hon. Speaker. I may say that my statement does not refer to this and quite honestly, I have no idea how the two are related.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Maybe there is a communication gap between him and Parliament.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH : I am sure that the concerned Ministry will make a statement, if it is necessary to do so. It does not fall under this issue.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : It is very necessary that the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs communicates to the concerned Minister as to what the observations of the Speaker are, so that it could have been included in the written statement itself. This crisis of communication is terrible in this House.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Sir, it is necessary for the Government to investigate as to what went awry with this illegal diversion of 60,000 Indian rifles to Afghanistan. The British citizen, who had the arms licence and who purchased from India, himself lodged a complaint. The purchase took place sometime in 1983 and they were shipped on November 14, the birthday of Jawaharlal Nehru. But the complaint was lodged by Mr. Turner who made the purchase, with the British Intelligence Authorities that these were illegally diverted as early as January 1984. The Government of India could not be in the dark about the far

reaching implications of such a nasty deal. What is important for all of us to note is that Pakistan has a far better organised lobby in the United States. It is reported that Mr. Dennis Neil the Pakistani lobbyist was seen working with the sub-committee staffer formulating anti-India and pro-Pakistani stand. I suppose we also have a well furnished mission there and I do not know what they are doing there. This Committee while recommending the Bill praised Pakistan's role in Afghanistan. They went a step further and said that Pakistan played a helpful part in the Persian Gulf as well. This, of course, was not seen by anyone of us here. We know that Pakistan has a 10,000 strong army—its elite force—in Saudi Arabia to give protection to the royal family in Saudi Arabia. Since Pakistan was not prepared to annoy Iran in any way, it in fact asked the Government of Saudi Arabia not to involve its elite force in any conflict with Iran. In fact, we were told that this 10,000 strong elite force of Pakistan, which has been in Saudi Arabia along with heavy tanks for the last so many years, is on its way back to Pakistan. Yet, the United States Senate Appropriation Committee saw a great virtue in the role played by Pakistan Government and army in the Persian Gulf.

The Committee felt while recommending this Bill that Pakistan is being driven to developing nuclear bomb on account of India's reluctance to enter into Nuclear Proliferation Treaty. This is adding insult to the injury. Pakistan, over the last 15 years, since the days of Bhutto had been threatening the world with its own bomb—I do not want to call it as an Islamic Bomb.

SHRI G.G. SWELL (Shillong) : He called it.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Bomb is bomb. Whatever name you may give it.

If Pakistan develop atom bomb I do not know why our country should be so much discouraged. I may, in this context, mention very respectfully that I am not afraid of atom bomb of Pakistan. The only way to let Washington know our position is to tell them, it is Washington which stands to lose more than India, if Pakistan develops the atom bomb. In my considered view, I believe that our Prime Minister made a

major, serious strategic error whenever he went to the United States and made a major issue of Pakistan's atom bomb. That way we walk into the trap laid for us by both the United States' State Department and the Government of Pakistan. This is not a partisan issue. Whatever mistake that may have been committed by any Government, we will have to act unitedly; we will have to tell the world, and the United States in particular that if this move is eventually formalised into law, it will be treated as an unfriendly act against the country.

The relationship between India and United States which has been none too happy in the last so many years will take a turn for the worst instead of taking a turn for the better. All of us feel that our relationship with the United States must improve but there is a limit to the price we can pay as a nation. The latest move of the United States, apart from discriminating against our country, is amounting to an affront to our nation. Therefore, whatever be our other differences, a message must go from this House that the whole nation is concerned at this outrageous move of the U.S. Congress and if the move is not nipped in the bud, the relations between India and United States will never remain the same.

SHRI DINESH SINGH (Pratapgarh) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, much has already been said about this proposed Bill by the speaker who preceded me and it would not be my effort to repeat that. This unfortunate proposal by the Committee of the Senate is indeed a proposal which has very far-reaching implications. I think, we should calmly and carefully consider all aspects of it. What has this proposal to say? It says that the United States' Government which will be the executive of the Senate Bill will not provide any assistance to any of the two countries on the sub-continent if they continue to make weapon-grade nuclear fuel. It also says that the United States' representatives in the international bodies will vote against any assistance to the two countries, if they continued with this programme...*(Interruptions)* out of American funds. It is a major fund, How does one differentiate between an American fund, and a non-American fund?

Also, for the first time it equates Pakis-

tan's nuclear weapons programme with India's peaceful nuclear programme; and all these three aspects are of utmost importance to us. I am one with the hon. Member Mr. Reddy in his suggestion that this is indeed a slap to the growing Indo-American friendship. It was our hope, after the visits of the Prime Minister, and earlier by the Minister of State and their conversations with the American Administration, that the American Administration would also benefit in the growing relationship between India and the United States. This, unfortunately, has not been taken care of in the proposal that will now go before the Senate.

Various reasons have been given for this proposal in the Senate's sub-committee's report, and they are all now in the newspapers. One thing that we have to bear in mind is that Pakistan has opted to be a client-State of the United States, a position which India can never accept for itself. The United States recognizes this. This has been accepted by President Zia himself when he has said that Pakistan will serve the interests of the United States in this region. Therefore, there is a clear distinction between America's relations with Pakistan, and America's relations with India. Pakistan is an ally, India at best could be considered a friend. And this is not an overnight development. This has been a conscious American policy from the time India and Pakistan became independent. The Kashmir issue is an example of American favour to Pakistan. A continuing tilt towards Pakistan was maintained all along, and this Administration's policy has not been any different.

To add to the strategic importance of Pakistan, which the United States attaches, particularly after the change in Iran, there is an additional interest in Pakistan. The sub-committee's report—and I quote from 'The Hindu' of 6th December—says :

"Pakistan remains our sole military partner in the region working to restrain Soviet expansion."

Mark the words 'military partner' and 'restrain Soviet expansion'. This is an agreement in the context of Super-Power rivalry, contrary to the rules of the non-aligned movement. How Pakistan can remain a member of the non-aligned move-

[Shri Dinesh Singh]

ment, after a role that it has acquired for itself is also a matter that we should consider and take up seriously at an appropriate time. Then greater importance that the United States is attaching to Pakistan at the moment is Pakistan's strategic importance to the United States and the need to continue the US-Pakistan relationship. The war in Afghanistan is going particularly well for the Mujahideens and Pakistan's assistance has been an essential element to that success. This is also from the report of the Sub-Committee to the Senate. Therefore, there is a growing partnership between the United States and Pakistan. The difficulty arose when it became clear to the world that Pakistan was having a nuclear weapons programme and was on the verge of making a bomb ; maybe they have a bomb by now. In any case, according to newspaper reports, they have tested two parts, which put together will constitute a nuclear weapon.

Then came various revelations of Pakistan trying to smuggle technology and material to complete its nuclear weapons programme. Obviously, the United States was embarrassed and they had to decide what they had to do. They stopped their so-called aid temporarily ; it was not stopping of the aid because much of the aid was already in the pipeline, and it would have taken 105 odd days to be delivered ; and before that was over, now they have cleared Pakistan for 4 billion dollars aid in the next 5-6 years. Now it is quite clear that America recognises that India's nuclear programme is a peaceful programme ; all our nuclear establishments are very well-known to the United States and in fact to the world as a whole. Their reports are regularly published ; whether it is Bhabha Atomic Research Centre or any other nuclear establishment. The Department of Atomic Energy publishes an Annual Report which gives all the details. On the other hand, Pakistan's nuclear programme is a secret programme. The people working there are also isolated from the rest of the public. It is quite clear that there is a difference between the two programmes. Our programme is an open one. Then there is a question of safeguards which have been so much highlighted. It says,

"Even in the case of the safeguarded

Pakistani facilities as at Karachi, the International Atomic Energy Agency reported that inspections revealed discrepancies which could not be explained."

That means spent fuel rods had been diverted to some other place. This is Pakistan's record on agreed safeguards. What further safeguards can the United States Government apply to Pakistan to ensure that there would be no diversion of atomic weapons fuel from the enrichment plant to the nuclear establishment ? Therefore, it is quite clear that the United States accepts that India is not moving in the direction of a nuclear weapons programme while Pakistan is doing exactly the same, that is moving towards a nuclear weapons programme. Therefore, they have brought this amendment knowing full well that India would not accept to sign nuclear proliferation treaty because it is unequal. Therefore, there would be full justification for them under this amendment to give assistance to Pakistan knowing that Pakistan is engaged in a nuclear weapons programme.

17.00 hrs.

The situation is quite clear. There is no doubt in my mind that it is an acceptance of Pakistan's nuclear capability and also of finding a way to assist Pakistan in America's global strategy and getting over the earlier restrictive legislation.

As Mr. Reddy has pointed out, this is not the first time when America had gone back in situations in which they had made commitment to us and withdrawn. The example of Tarapore is an excellent example of retrospective legislation passed after the event had taken place.

Now the situation as it is has to be taken into account. This amendment has to go before the Senate. From what one reads in the newspapers the United States President is somewhat concerned at the far-reaching implications by this proposed amendment. The Prime Minister has also brought to the notice of the U.S. President the strong feelings in this country and this Government in this matter. The logical thing to do would be to convey to the United States Government, to the United States people and to the United States legislature the feelings

of the Indian people in being let down, in being cheated, in being humiliated in the manner in which the United States Senate is now to consider this amendment.

There are two choices before us : One is to accept this situation, eat the humble pie and bow down to the United States, which I hope this House, this Government and the country will never accept. And I congratulate the Minister for the bold statement that he has made this afternoon quite clearly indicating the Government's view on this.

The second option we have is to stand by our policies. The United States is not the only arbiter in the world. Its awesome military power is not limitless. With all its power—military, financial, political—it could do nothing in Viet Nam. The people of Viet Nam told us and the world that the determination of the people to remain free is far greater than the military weapons used against them. India has a much wider industrial base, a much larger population and much greater capability. Are we going to be humbled in this manner? And, I would say, "No", Sir. We should firmly stand and tell the United States Government that India cannot be taken for granted, it cannot be humiliated in this manner, that we are a free people and we will remain a free people and we can look after ourselves.

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY (Kurnool) :
Mr. Chairman, Sir, the House Committee's recommendation and the Senate Committee's recommendations have come as an anti-climax to the Joint Statement made by the President of the United States and the Prime Minister in Washington, in November.

It may be relevant for me to quote President Reagan and also the Prime Minister when they made that Joint Statement in Washington. President Reagan said :

"Today the Prime Minister and I also discussed East-West relations and the prospects for a historic treaty eliminating an entire class of intermediate range nuclear missiles in the United States and the Soviet Union.

The Prime Minister emphasised India's long-standing encouragement

of such efforts to reduce and eliminate nuclear weapons. In this context, I urge that India and Pakistan intensify their dialogue to build greater mutual confidence to resolve outstanding issues and to deal with the threat of nuclear proliferation in the region.

We also discussed the tragic situation in Afghanistan and strongly endorsed movement toward a political settlement, a settlement that would remove all foreign troops from that country and permit its people to live in peace as citizens of a neutral country and free from outside intervention.

On the subject of U.S. security assistance to Pakistan, I assured Mr. Gandhi that our objective is stability and reduced tensions in South Asia and that our assistance is not directed at India."

Earlier, the President had stated :

"Beyond such concrete achievements, there are powerful political, economic and cultural currents that are drawing our two societies into closer collaboration. Our shared dedication to democracy is paramount among these currents. We are also building on a strong foundation of cooperation in the fields of science, technology and space which permits us with confidence to set ambitious new goals. In this connection, the Prime Minister and I have agreed to the following :..."

Of course, he has referred to the various nine points of the agreement. But he has emphasized that we have our shared dedication to democracy as paramount among these currents.

I also quote the Prime Minister. This is what the Prime Minister has stated.

"We have agreed to collaborate at the frontiers of technology. We have reaffirmed the tradition of scientific interaction which has been the hallmark of our relation-

[Shri E. Ayyapu Reddy]

ship. The growth in high technology, trade and transfer has been a source of considerable satisfaction. I hope that the United States would recognize India not just as a market but as a partner in technological progress. In the field of bilateral trade and investment, we have agreed that much can be done to expand the present level of activity. We will encourage increased interaction between our trading entities.

Having successfully launched our cooperation for the light combat aircraft project, we have now agreed to explore other avenues in the field of defence. This is yet another step forward. I am confident that after our talks today, we will be able to place our relationship on a more enduring basis...

Our deliberations today also covered the situation in Afghanistan. We agreed on the need for an early political settlement there and support the efforts of the U.N. Secretary-General. I believe that a just solution must ensure a sovereign, independent and nonaligned Afghanistan. Foreign intervention and interference must cease. The Afghan refugees must be allowed to return to their homes in honour, dignity and security. We would welcome any earnest effort in this direction.

We had a frank discussion on the dangers of nuclear proliferation, both horizontal and vertical. My country has consistently recognized that a secure world order cannot be built on nuclear weapons. Our action has spoken louder than any words in expressing this commitment. We do not have nuclear weapons. We do not want nuclear weapons. And we certainly do not want nuclear weapons in our neighbourhood..."

SHRI BIPIN PAL DAS (Tezpur) : You

express your own views.

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY : I am only recollecting the statements.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Even if you drop one page, they do not know.

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY : After this, there was a lot of optimism exhibited in India, that there has been a breakthrough in the relationship between India and U.S.A. In fact, most of the editorials said that even the cynics would have to concede that the relationship between the USA and India is definitely taking a turn towards better improvement. Above all, the Prime Minister created an impression in various press interviews and statements given by him that USA has now a better understanding of the dangers of Pakistan developing a nuclear weapon. He has clearly emphasised that there is a better understanding on the part of USA administration in USA. That is the impression he was able to tell that there was a better appreciation of India's stand. That was probably on account of the fact that there was temporary suspension of the aid programme intended for Pakistan. That suspension was in September. But nobody expected that again USA Senate Sub-Committee as well as the House Committee would go whole hog in supporting the aid to Pakistan. If it was merely giving this aid to Pakistan to the tune of \$ 4.02 billion, probably we would have taken that it was mere continuation of the old policy. But even that we did not expect because the impression given by the Prime Minister after his recent visit was that there was appreciation of the India's stand about their giving military aid to Pakistan. And that too on account of the fact that Pakistani agents were caught red-handed in indulging violation of the American laws.

SHRI G.G. SWELL : Stealing !

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY : I do not want to use any word like that. I will say, violation of the American laws.

SHRI G.G. SWELL : He is on trial.

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY : The case is still there.

SHRI G.G. SWELL : The case has started...(Interruptions).

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY : The case has started in US court. As an advocate I would not be in a position to say that he has already committed an offence. Whatever it may be, there was a charge that he was violating the American laws.

17.13 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

So that was the impression that had been created. Now, all of a sudden we find that there was not only full support of Pakistan's aid programme, both military and economic, but a step against India. An Anti-Indian stand was displayed by the US Senate in saying that India should also subject itself to the same conditions, practically asking India to sign the non-proliferation treaty if it wanted any technological help or scientific help or aid or US assistance in future. But one redeeming feature or at least one ray of hope is that the US Senate has yet to accept this recommendation of the Senate Sub-Committee. It is going to debate and discuss this issue on the day when the summit takes place i.e. tomorrow. So it is time that we should certainly convey our feelings to the US Senate that any approval by the US Senate of the recommendations of the Sub-Committee will endanger the relationship between India and USA very damagingly. The statement of the Minister that India will never accept or never change its stand on the Non-Proliferation Treaty is quite welcome and every party joins in supporting the statement as made in para 3. India can never change its policy that has been enunciated for a long time and it will stand by that policy. Without any difference of opinion in this country we will stand by that statement. But we have not been told in the statement what has been the reaction of the U.S. President and of the U.S. Foreign Relations Department, and of the Ambassador. We have merely been told.... (Interruptions).

SHRI G.G. SWELL : They are making the Senate as a stalking horse.

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY ; We do not as yet know because if the President has

got a commitment to the statement which he has already made in Washington, if he stands wrongly and sincerely by the statement made by him, it will not be impossible for him to carry the Senate with him and make the Senate reject the new anti-India proposals that have been recommended by the Sub-Committee. It would have been better if we had been told about the reaction of the President. It is merely stated that "The Prime Minister has conveyed our concern to President Reagan. I too have told the US Ambassador that the consequences of the proposed congressional actions should be viewed in the perspective of our bilateral relations and remedial measures should be considered urgently". This sounds rather pessimistic. It looks as though the reply from the USA has not been very encouraging. If that is the position, naturally we have to think of other methods and other changes in order to meet the situation. The caricature here in the Hindu shows the unfortunate position or rather the pitiable position in which the US-India relations are today. The caricature says—This is what Reagan appears to be saying—"Oh...come on, Rajiv...Think of all the nuclear disarmament summits you can arrange with Pak in picturesque places." ... (Interruptions).

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : That is their inference. I thought you are addressing him so informally.

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY : No. That is their inference. I hope the situation will improve and the same will have its effect on the U.S. Senate and there will be a perceptible change for the better in Indo-US relations after the Summit. It is rather unfortunate that India should meet with this type of hostile attitude from the U.S. Senate Committee just on the eve of the Summit meeting. We hope that the Summit will improve the relationship, and the improvement in the super powers relationship will result in a totality of change in Indo-American relations also. Thank you.

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD (Bhagalpur) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, it is again my misfortune, since 1954, to see the Indo-US relations on the rock. Sir, in 1954, in the development stage, India wanted a steel plant. Americans agreed to give it. But at the very start, at the first lot, arm twisting

[Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad]

came and late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru from that seat made that statement to refuse the steel plant. He went to America. Everywhere he was asked a question "what for have you come? What do you want from us?" Shrimati Indira Gandhi also went to America. She was also asked the same question again and again and both replied "we want your friendship, nothing else." The American Administration did not understand it. In 1971, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the then Foreign Minister, Sardar Swaran Singh was tossing his glass on the capital hill with the high-ups in America and on the high waves two ships including 'Padma' were carrying arms to Pakistan in the name of transistors and radios. Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I can quote instances after instances where Indian people, Government of India, have tried their best to have friendship with other democracies, with the American democracy. But the American Administration have got a knack or have got the will and deliberately tries to spoil that relationship. There are instances which can be said like this and this Congressional legislation is another example of destroying that relation. What a blanket example of supporting Pakistan in making the bombs and squarely laying all the responsibility at our door. Since we are talking to them, not signing non-proliferation treaty, therefore we are encouraging Pakistan to make the bomb and all this legislation.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, it is an attempt by the American Administration to escalate tension in South-Asia. I charge the American Administration that they do not want the people in South-Asia to live in peace among their neighbours. They do not want us to prosper, they do not want rather not only South-Asia but the Third World countries, those countries who are non-aligned, to prosper and have a good equitable economic development. It is a remote pressure on Comrade Gorbachyov in Washington to give an undue concession. Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, it is a subtle way or a crude way of releasing the fabulous 4.02 billion dollars to help Pakistan. It is a crude method to absolve the guilty and punish the innocent. Therefore, for us, it is an insult to equate us with Pak in making bomb and we not making bomb, my friends,

talk very diplomatically. I say that Pakistan has a bomb.

Khan, the father of the bomb, the nuclear weapon, had accepted it in an interview, later on rescinded it, Gen. Zia had agreed saying, 'I have bomb', later on to confuse the matter he has said, 'No, no, we have the capability of the bomb'. So, Khan and the President of Pakistan have agreed that they have a bomb with them. They have already done it, it is with them. I want to say at this moment, at the outset, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, we are committed to the peaceful use of nuclear energy, but as far back as in 1967, I had put in an amendment in the Durgapur Session of the Congress—of course, not accepted then, I was asked to withdraw—that 'we do not want to make the bomb, but we keep our option open in case our integrity, our unity, is threatened' and that is being threatened today. I know bomb is no reply for bomb. My friends will tell me, and I will agree to a great extent with them, but the question today is, nuclear club continues in this world, in spite of all agreement that is going to be at Washington meet, of the intermediate and the medium range missiles being destroyed and the long range later on, the fact remains that America is supporting many countries in this world. There are at least definitely South Africa, Israel and Pakistan, all definitely making the bomb. That gentleman Pervez, that thief who stole from the international market the material for atom bomb, is being tried today. But I say in this House that he will not be punished. It is a ruse of America. As a matter of fact, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, when Pervez was caught, the American opinion I say—I differentiate between American people and the American Administration, I have always differentiated the American people—the American people's opinion was outraged by this.

SHRI G.G. SWELL : What about Dr. Abdul Qadir Khan ?

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD : Yes, I said that. Mr. Deputy-Speaker, it was only to assuage the public opinion of America that Pervez was brought to trial, that is No. 1. And promise was made of 105 days ban, now expiring only in January, only after a few days, 105 days ban on the aid. But

when Pakistan through this lobby, through personal message to Reagan, Zia to Reagan and all this and that, the strategy, then the Afghan question, then the Gulf war, when all this was brought to him, he said okay, and this is an advice which is not subtle but very crude, everybody can understand that this is a device—this legislation—to help Pakistan to bale out, to queer the pitch for him, to give the fabulous support of four billion dollars including not only development, but to make a bomb also. One already made, and many more to come, and therefore, now this legislation comes and tells us that we should have a talk, an agreement between us about nuclear non-proliferation in this part of the world.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, this is the arm-twisting of India. Well, our friend Jaipal Reddy referred in a left-handed compliment to the Prime Minister about his visit.

But I would say our Prime Minister, following the traditions of Jawaharlal Nehru and Indira Gandhi, did try his level best to have friendship with the American democracy for the Indian democracy. I must say that was a good gesture. Only a few days back he was there, he might not have gone, but he was there, I am told Reagan was very warm; our Prime Minister kept his cool, but Reagan was very warm. The American press, the media, praised it. They said it is a grand success. And over that grand success now comes this legislation.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Operation successful but the patient dies !

(Interruptions)

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD : Therefore, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I would say that we should continue to make efforts, but we should not be naive, we should not be led to believe in the American Administration.

SHRI G.G. SWELL : This is 'naive'.

SHRI BHAGAT JHA AZAD : All right, naive. The two *angrezi* dons tell me correctly, but I am a Bihari speaking in that accent and I can say, in this country every State-walla speaks in his own accent, not in the *angrezi* accent.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : As a student of English, I can say there is no standard accent.

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD : I am happy that he came in support of me. After all a public worker can support in the face of two professors. (Interruptions). Therefore, I would say, it is not the arm-twisting, but what Mr. Minister had given in his statement is that friendship, durable friendship, healthy relationship between two democracies can come only on mutual interest, trust and confidence. No arm-twisting or high-tech or anything can make friendship Mr. Deputy-Speaker, this legislation means, stiffer action against India. Seemingly it means against Pakistan also. But that is also a ruse. The papers and others have quoted that this legislation means stiffer sanction against both India and Pakistan. No. It is against India only. Against Pakistan, it is only a ruse. This is to hoodwink the public opinion to say that it is to threaten to cut the aid to stop proliferation of Nuclear arms. It says Mr. Deputy-Speaker that they will instruct all their financial institutions in America to pressurise the World Bank and wherever they are members, on the International Monetary Fund and on all others not to give aid to us. It says, it will not give equipment and high-tech to us. It says, no aid would be provided to those who continue with the production of enriched uranium and those who are producing separated plutonium. It is only befooling the world opinion. Pakistan had the enriched uranium and had made the bomb. We have separated plutonium not to make the bomb, Mr. Deputy-Speaker. but to produce the third generation breeders for our power programme, fast breeder. Therefore, there is a vast difference between the two. These great administrators of U.S.A. did not find any difference in these—that one enriched uranium in Pakistan which is used for making the bomb and that separated plutonium in our country which is only used to support our power programme, which is required for fast breeder, for third generation. Why did they refuse to supply fuel for Tarapur ? They had forced us to do that so that our programme can not continue. These are the facts which do speak. It is because, Americans do not believe in facts. They believe in drug-store culture. If you have gone to

[Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad]

America, you will find, for every 100 yards, there is drug-store. Americans, of course, have got enough dollars. But they are only 200 years old civilisation. From Spain, from Poland, Gold Water and others, after persecution, went to America. On the high-sea, of Atlantic, half of them were drowned. They found the land. For years, Mr Deputy-Speaker, they went with the begging bowl to the France,—for the Statue of Liberty they were so proud of.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, all this only connotes that this nation only knows arm-twisting, no love, no friendship. They say, I give you this, instead pledge me your support and friendship ; pledge me your clientele status ; at least ally and the best, be a slave. Pakistan can do that, not India. We shall never do that. India wants friendship and on friendship we can stake anything, Mr. Deputy-Speaker. But America from the beginning of 1954, to this date are always trying to break the friendship ; and we are always trying wherever there are occasions to improve the relations, to improve it. Therefore, what we say is, we are friends, we want to be friends. My friends have said that America is your good friend. It is Americans who gave Jayewardene the idea that you make friendship accord with India. I tell you, Mr. Jaipal Reddy, American Administration are not capable of thinking such a good accord. That is a good accord ...(*Interruptions*). What a laughter, derisive laughter from Mr. Jaipal Reddy. Still he does not believe that in this part of the world, the Accord between Sri Lanka and India is an ideal for the other countries to follow and I can say that Americans can never think in that term. If they had known earlier they might have liked to kill the idea in the Sri Lankan home. Therefore, this is not good to say that.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, therefore, what I say is that this waiver.....

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Does he mean to say that India committed mistake under its own inspiration ?

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD : I can give facts and figures, not the appreciation to the hon. Member. I say it is a good accord.

I did not say it is a mistake. He thinks it is a mistake. I think it is a good accord. Well, appreciation is his, facts are mine.

Therefore, what I say is that even the waiver clause legislation is another ruse to say that. Waiver means the country which does not accept the nuclear programme, then the second country non-proliferation treaty will be given waiver by its President. It is another view. What a diplomatic fraud ! I am surprised how the Congressional Members of the Senate can think in terms of such fraud ! I am told of Press said that the American Congress men are very ignorant. They do not know about India. That is what I have read in the press. Let May God forbid them. Let them be in the nearest cemetery or in the Congress but they cannot befool us, if they are so simple and innocent. (*Interruptions*). Therefore, I have always been saying it.

Therefore, I would say that India would never sign N.P.T. It has refused to sign and it will refuse in the future to sign the N.P.T.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : You do not know your young Prime Minister. Don't say that.

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD : No. We know the young Prime Minister. You may not know him. I know. I know my country. You should know your country. We know our people. We know our Prime Minister. We shall never sign this unequal treaty.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : But we do not know our Prime Minister. We know our country all right.

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD : All right. That is the disparity. In democracy, the opposition should know the Prime Minister and Prime Minister should know the Opposition. But unfortunately in this country, this tiny Opposition do not know the Prime Minister. What can I do ?

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Tiny Prime Minister.

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD : That is the trouble in this democracy and, therefore, the difficulty.

I am saying, therefore, that it is essential for us to appreciate the background, the action so far taken from 1952 by the American Administration, so that we should be careful in future.

Mr. Nixon in 1954 came to Pakistan, went back, and subsequently as Vice-President and the President laid the foundation of the hate India campaign in America. There are many examples. I need not quote them how he did. I do not believe that the American Administration had no information about this legislation. They are not that simple and innocent. Such a far-reaching amendment cannot be taken by the Senate without the previous knowledge of American Administration. Many in this country would not believe it. Oh! They are very simple! The President is expressing his concern about it. We are thankful to the President. Let us see that tomorrow he would be able to persuade his innocent and ignorant Congressmen to understand the far-reaching amendment in America to do that.

Therefore, I congratulate the hon. Minister for his measured, level-headed and sober statement. But I warn him that he should not expect any reasonableness from this kind of American Administration.

I am grateful to the Prime Minister that he has communicated to Mr. Reagan the concern of the Indian people. But I remind him of Tarapur. I remind him of steel plant. I remind him of arms-twisting and I hope that this country and this Government would never submit to any arm-twisting, would never submit to pressure. We will keep our heads high and chest out and warm.

We do not need the American aid, high techs because, I believe, it is the man who fights, not the machine. Let America remember the Gnats which killed their Sabre jets. Let America remember the Patton tanks which were killed by the Indian tanks. Let America remember the human hands, the Indian hands which showed them what they were shown in Vietnam.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I hope that the nation—as Mr. Jaipal Reddy has said and I support him—and the entire Parliament of this country is one in this matter, that no

arm-twisting will work. We want friendship and not crying shame. We do not want any aid, there is no question of high-technology, if these are the conditions. There is no question of any condition at all. Friendship is friendship.

With these words, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I would like to end my speech and I hope that the Government will remember the pitfalls that the American Administration has laid for us.

SHRI SAIJUDDIN CHOWDHURY (Katwa) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the so-called Amendment—Nuclear Non-Proliferation Amendment—for South Asia by the Senate Committee is nothing but an affront to our country. On the face of it, it appears that they have equated our country, the nuclear programme, a peaceful nuclear programme of our country with the weapon-oriented programme of Pakistan. But in reality, this is the continuation of the hostile attitude, the policy to threaten and blackmail, the policy to try to put pressure on our peace-loving people, and this has been continuing without any interruption. Now, this is quite an anti-climax because just a few days ago, we heard that there been a shift in the attitude and the perception of the U.S.A. vis-a-vis our country, that they assigned a greater role for India in this region and if I may be permitted to say that, when our Prime Minister was quite euphoric about all these things just after that, comes this news that they have not only equated our country's peaceful nuclear programme, which has been confirmed for so long, with the weapon-oriented policies of Pakistan, but in reality what they are going to do is that they are going to blackmail us on our fascination for high-technology. They want to use this as a lever. On this ground, what they are going to do is that while the Symington Amendment will be applied for India, which is now being extended to high-technology and other areas as also to the economic aid by institutions like the World Bank, the IDA, on the other hand what they can do is this: the Senate Amendment proposes that they can continue aid to that country, meaningfully Pakistan, if that is in their national interest. So, in their national interest, they will continue the aid to Pakistan. But again, in the same interest, they will arm-twist India; they will try to take advantage

[Shri Saifuddin Chowdhury]

of our soft-attitude of our penchant unprincipled high-technology. That is the great danger. I do not bother about what the Senate decides. They are not the arbiters of the world. We are a nation consisting of 70 crores of people. I also condemn and abhor this idea of lobbying in the Senate and in the Congress. What is it that we should be lobbying for? They are a sovereign country. We are a sovereign country. Therefore, there should be friendship. I have no objection to it. They are the people to have friendship with. But what is there for lobbying? I do not know.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE :
Lobbying for money ; for Super-computers.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHURY :
But then, you have to tell that truth. In certain areas you have to be very straightforward. But this is very insulting to say that Pakistan is lobbying and, therefore, we have also to lobby in the USA, and then you complain that we do not find many people who can do that great lobbying in the USA. It is so humiliating ; I just cannot understand this. Have some self-respect for this country. (*Interruptions*) You devise some mechanism. You have to extract funds from these countries which exploited the rest of the world and made money, made assets. You try to extract money from them for the international organisations that have been set up to take care of the needs of the developing countries. I have no objection for that. But all this is very derogatory to the self-respect of our country.

We all know that just a few days ago they have cleared that aid, the 4.02 billion dollar aid to Pakistan.

AN HON. MEMBER : Cleared ?

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHURY :
Yes, both the Houses have cleared...

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Basirhat) :
Temporarily held up.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHURY :
That was held up.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : The Committee has recommended.

SHRI G.G. SWELL : They want to clear this aid. That is why, this ruse. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHURY :
The two Houses have cleared...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : They are removing the hurdles.

SHRI G.G. SWELL : This is a ruse in order to clear the 4.02 billion dollar aid to Pakistan.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Please do not interrupt. Let Mr. Saifuddin Chowdhury say whatever he wants to say.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHURY :
Anyway, their mind is quite clear. They want to continue that aid and they are out to remove the hurdles that may be coming in the way...

SHRI G.G. SWELL : That is the correct position.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHURY : I had read about that in the papers. Anyway, thank you Mr. Swell.

You see how the Senate Committee which is working on removal of the different hurdles that are there are theorising on this aspect. They are saying that it is due to India that Pakistan is going nuclear and in no case the aid should be discontinued. Now, so much have been talked as to why Pakistan is getting U.S. aid and support, militarily and otherwise. Their argument was that it was due to the Soviet presence in Afghanistan. Now the thinking is growing in the Administration that, even after the pull-out from Afghanistan, Pakistan will continue to receive the aid. The whole scheme is very clear. We had enough discussion in this House about their ulterior motives. We have discussed in this House about Indo-U.S. relations some months ago. I am not going to refer to all those things. But the point that comes to my mind is what the people of our country will understand about ourselves. That is very important. That is, our perception about the USA. Mr. Bhagwat Jha Azad had referred to the Steel

Plants, Mr. Nehru's visit, Mrs. Indira Gandhi's visit, and all through how they tried to insult us, acted detrimental to our country's interest and how due to them the tension in our region is continuing, between the two neighbours. Pakistan has no reason to treat us as a kind of hostile country. We could very well be friends. They have offered a 'No-War Pact' and our offer is there for a 'Peace and Friendship Treaty'. But what should be the basis? It is India's contention that no country should allow their soil to be used as a base of another country, another power. This is the simple thing. You may call it a 'No-War Pact' or you may call it a 'Peace and Friendship Treaty' or you may give it a third name.

But these are the basic things whether anyone will allow our soil to be used by foreign countries. That is the bone of contention. When India is ready to declare that, why they are not? That shows that they are nothing but pawns in the hands of US imperialism. This attitude, this kind of perception for USA we are having for long. We are carrying on our campaign with the people to tell what they are actually. Now, from time to time, the Prime Minister says that there is a change in the U.S. perception. Then they get confused. Not only that. The areas that we kept guarded so zealously from the US penetration, one such vital areas is Defence. Now if they can come into Defence for agreement, I do not know what you are doing. That is the most vital factor. You are allowing them and you are so euphoric about it. They are also euphoric. The Ambassador before the FICCI audience will say, "a new beginning." Now in this vital field, you go to cooperate with them, sign agreement with them and what kind of thing, I do not know. But before that there should have been a discussion in this House. But you never bothered about doing that.

Take another area. This Vaccination Programme. Now, I do not know what is that programme. Why did you not come with the full statement about what you are going to do? We see them with suspicion. You take it from us. Their record is very bad. Mr. Dinesh Singh said about Vietnam. They created so many Vietnams; they massacred people mercilessly; they are imperialists. People may be very good. Many are there.

Many fought against the Vietnam policy of the Government. That is a separate issue. But when I talk about, I talk about administration. Then you tell us what you are going to do. It is also a very sensitive sector. Many scientists are saying that you should not expose your genetic composition, immune system, anti-body variations to these kind of people. I do not know what you are going to do? You may say that Indians will do everything about joint project programme that you have signed. It says that they would decide which are the people and agencies who will deal from our side of our country. But whether the same is there for our country to decide who the Americans will be there in this? We do not know. We are in the dark totally.

Then comes the Harvard. We raised the question about training IAS, IPS officers. But they said that it is not for them. It is for those who will train them. It is the faculty development. Where is the lack of faculty? What is this? In all these vital sectors—the administration, the defence, the vaccination—in all these you go there and cooperate with them...*(Interruptions)*. About super computers, you have compromised on it also.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : In the name of aids, they are giving us AIDS.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHURY : But you have to have the immunity not to be aided. That is a vital thing.

Now, in the recent times, if I can refer to something....

(Interruptions)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Very sensible speech, Sir. Let him go on.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : That is why, it makes everyone to speak in the middle.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHURY : How in the recent times, the soft attitude, the kind of fascination that has given a

[Shri Saifuddin Chowdhury]

wrong impression to the people. 'How is this ?'

Take another instance. The question of Israel and our relations with Israel. When the Davis Cup play was to take place, we opposed it. Not that that was a very big mistake we are committing, the point is that just before that, during a discussion on the US Congress Foreign Aid Bill, their Congressmen were saying that India was 'isolating Israel'. The South Asian Sub-Committee rapped India for blocking participation by Israel in international academic gathering and short events held in India.

If you have done it on your own, without any strings, I have no objection; but when it comes after this kind of observation, then it is a great insult to us. I don't think something great havoc would have happened by our playing with Israel; but when it comes after this kind of rapping; I don't know what to say about this.

A US Congress Resolution has suggested that, the growth of contacts between Indians and Israelis would benefit both the countries and that the Government of India should facilitate contacts in the future. You have to explain something to us about this.

I don't want to take much of your time. We have taken a principle stand about Non-proliferation Treaty. We also support it because it is the stand of our people. But how dare they tell us that we have to sign NPT? They go on making bombs and exploding them and telling others not to make bombs! I am not just now for making a bomb, and bombs are meaningless—that also I know. When the other Power acquires bomb, then we can see.

We welcome one thing that Mr. Reagan and Mr. Gorbachyov are meeting. They have to go much far and accomplish a non-nuclear world. They have to sign an agreement on that.

Our principles are that we are not to make a bomb and everything will be taken in that spirit. So, the concept of NPT and its contents have to be changed also. It can not be an unequal treaty. It cannot be a

method to what the great scientist Mr. Homi Bhabha said 'a new form of economic colonialisation'.

Though our party principally is not for bombs—we support non-proliferation—yet it has to be on the basis of some principles. We have to exercise our options. Keep it open. It is nothing if they make a bomb, we can make a bomb too; it is a separate question. Later on we can discuss it in our Parliament and take a decision accordingly; but not under the threat of any Power.

When this debate about US Senate Committee's Resolution has come, it has not been made a law till now. Some proposal has been made by the Senate Committee; but we should not fail to generate a kind of condemnation; it is not that we appeal to somebody, we condemn this attitude and that sense of condemnation should go and let them understand. If they want India to be friends, they should act accordingly.

With these words I conclude.

PROF. K.K. TEWARY (Buxar) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker Sir : I join my colleagues in expressing my strong sense of revulsion and indignation at this affront by the Senate's Appropriation Sub-Committee.

The proposal, as it is formulated, is very clear. It is an attempt to indulge in the most brazen blackmail and subdue India; if possible, to make India an annexe of the State Department. I am sure, this House stands united today as this country stood united throughout its history of anti-colonial struggle...and subsequently it sustained the struggle for re-building and re-constructing, India will rise again to the occasion. Through the House I would like to express my firm conviction that the nation of 800 million people with a long and very sustained history of anti-colonial and anti-Imperialist struggle will not submit and succumb to the blandishments of Reagan administration or the American Congress, whether it is Senate or House of Representatives.

18.00 hrs.

Sir, the strength of India is derived from its people and we have the added advantage unlike most of the countries in the third

world of our legacy of Mahatmaji's struggle. Let us not forget that British Imperialism was destroyed largely because of India's anti-colonial struggle. If our independence is threatened—by independence I mean both in political sense and in the sense of deciding on major international issues without interference or pressures from Imperialist lobbies—and, I think, my perception is very clear that this domination intervention syndrome has not changed a bit. The reference to 1952 made by Mr. Azad and subsequent events also prove that the Dullesian concept of international relations, the sheer skull duggery of American diplomacy has not changed.

American chickenery is clear not only in this egregious proposal but their move in other areas also, for example, the attempt to weaken, in fact, to subvert the only system of international peace and stability that is United Nations is known to everybody. If anything proves inconvenient to them or runs counter to the so-called over-riding American national interest, which has been made the basis of all this deception in the proposal of the sub-committee, that is used also to skirt inconvenient international situations such as International Court of Justice.

Similarly, Sir, we have seen how different world bodies have been treated by American administration. So I do not see any perceptible reason or any strong reason for us to be swayed off our feet by angelic innocence or the warmth. It is all utterly phoney.

Therefore, Sir, this latest affront is a very deceptive garb. Besides being crude it is deceptive also in the sense that an attempt is being made on disarmament or non-proliferation treaty. So far we have known that disarmament and the threat to world from atomic weapons is a global question. There can be no regional solution to atomic weapons growing in a particular area.

This Sub-Committee of the Senate has given a very sinister concept to it. That is, number one, India and Pakistan should bilaterally settle this issue; number two, they are reducing it to a regional issue because they want to tie India into knots and continue to equate India with Pakistan.

Sir, I caution the Minister through this

House and through you, Mr. Deputy-Speaker. Maybe I have a hunch but thrice Pakistan has fought against us and committed aggression on our unity and integrity. Our security system has been threatened by Pakistan with American weapons. Afghanistan came much later. Much before Afghanistan imbroglio, way back in the 50's, CENTO and SEATO, the security systems were evolved by the Americans. With the same weapons, they continue. And the infamous tilt in 1971 should be recalled to us. So, thrice we had to make heroic sacrifices and call upon the nation to stand as one person. This House stood as one person. The patriotic people of India stood as one man to defend India's hard-won freedom against this aggression by Pakistan, aided and abetted by American imperialism. A time may come when India's unity and integrity may be threatened by an atomic weapon, gifted by Americans, which is right now taking a menacing form.

I share the apprehensions of my previous speakers that Pakistan has a couple of bombs in the basement. Let us not dispute that and our naivety should not sway us. Pakistan is not the last example. In the past, America is known to have connived and assisted Israel and South Africa, that too in American national interest. What is American national interest? It is Pax Americana, total domination, enslavement of humanity, enslavement of the third world that is synonymous with American national interests. That's why they cling on to bases in Pakistan, then Persian Gulf, Afghanistan. But it started with Iran. Then the Diego Garcia base; all around. Therefore, let us be really very serious about this matter. I for one would not hesitate or would not stop short of condemning in strongest terms the American manipulation.

Sir, if you allow me, reference have been made to resolutions. One resolution is "House Appropriations Committee proposed language on South Asia Nuclear Issue". This resolution was passed a little earlier than the resolution now under discussion. In the earlier resolution, if one goes through it, there are specific conditions spelt out for American President.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Now you have come to the point. Please go ahead.

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : Specific conditions have been laid down. This amendment, which precedes the present proposed amendment, is an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. This specifically lays down :

"The President shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report containing a factual description of the uranium enrichment at levels which Pakistan has reached as of the time of the report.

This report shall be submitted at the time the waiver authority in section 620E (d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 as amended by subsection (a) of this section is exercised by the President.

The conditions laid down are

The President shall submit to Congress by January 1, 1988 a report detailing :

- (1) the degree to which the Government of Pakistan has cooperated the investigation of the Arshad Pervez case,
- (2) what legal action Pakistan has taken against any Pakistanis who are shown to have been involved in this case.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Where is he reading from ?

SHRI K.K. TEWARY : This is the *House Amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act* which preceded the present proposal. In this case, there is not the remotest reference to India. India does not come into the picture at all. It is only applicable to Pakistan because on the information submitted by their agencies including the CIA, they themselves confirmed that Pakistan has enriched uranium to the level of weapon grade material. On that information, all these conditionalities were laid down but suddenly this somersault takes place and I

will not read out this because it is a longish proposal. I will only read out the last portion of this as to how generous they have been to Pakistan.

India will continue to suffer. India naturally will never submit to the discriminatory iniquitous NPT proposals, the Non-Proliferation Treaty proposals and will never subscribe to that, in order to allow these four billion dollars package to Pakistan, so that Pakistan goes ahead as the client State, as a vassal and not an ally, and that is why if you look for the last two years statements of the American Administration, you can find that Pakistan is no longer referred to as the South Asian nation. It is referred to as the South West Asian nation. They referred to Pakistan as if Pakistan is a part of the Persian Gulf scenario. Therefore, Pakistan naturally is a client State. It is an instrument. It is a cat's paw. Therefore, all the facilities, all the favours are being shown to it and the last part of this resolution will make the matter abundantly clear. It reads :

"The President may waive the prohibitions of Section 669 (A) and (B) of this Act at any time during the period beginning on the date of enactment of this subsection and ending on September 30, 1993, to provide assistance to Pakistan during that period if he determines that to do so is in the interest of the United States."

Sir, the interest of the United Nations over-rides all international considerations of friendship, of peace, stability, disarmament and development. Therefore, it is very clear that Americans policy of world domination, intervention, if necessary that is still continuing and this latest proposal of the Senate Sub-Committee, I think, is the greatest affront to our nation, to our self-respect, and it also introduces a very intriguing element in the entire security environment of this region. There are still some people who feel that the American administration and American Congress have tonnes of milk of human kindness in their heart and that this obnoxious and outrageous proposal of the Senate Sub-Committee will be turned down by the Senate. I must say, Sir, and I am using a very mild word, they are

perhaps overlooking the realities. Some of them are trying to brush the inconvenient and uncomfortable realities under the carpet. I do not want to enter into arguments with my friend Shri Chowdhury and the ebullient Janata Party spokesman, Shri Jaipal Reddy. Whatever the Prime Minister has done, he has done by following the traditions of the great nation. We want peace in the world. We want stability in the world. Therefore, in pursuit of this objective, we are prepared to negotiate with the Americans. We are prepared to tell them that the world vision has to be changed or the centre of the universe, as they think of themselves, is cracking up and this bipolar world is increasingly becoming multipolar. This perception should dawn upon them.

Now, Mr. Gorbachyov is in America. He has emerged as the symbol of peace and stability in the world ; a world free from the threat of nuclear annihilation. Only last month, Mr. Reagan in his unbridled enthusiasm went to the extent of calling the Soviet Russia an evil empire.

SHRI G.G. SWELL : This was said much before. I think about 5 or 7 years ago.

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : This was an repetition. All this has been forgotten. Now the Soviet Russia and America are in the process of negotiating the dismantling of medium range nuclear missiles.

Therefore, India has lead the entire world towards the peace and our Prime Minister's initiative has given new hope to the third world countries and also to the super powers because this is the prelude to create a world environment for peace by mobilising the public opinion. These movements could be mobilised all over the world. That kind of environment has been created by the relentless pursuit of peace by the third world countries, especially by the Non-aligned Movement. We are proud to say that our Prime Minister is the leader of this movement. So, whatever our Prime Minister has done, he has done it in the interest of India and also in the interest of international peace and stability. Ultimately, I am sure that the Americans will see that these kinds of manipulative international policies ultimately fail. Their

supreme achievement of recent years is that they have been the conquerers of Grenada and that perhaps propped up their self respect. But in today's world, the tensions of war have to be eliminated. By creating tensions in this region they will only be harming their own interests, whatever interests are associated with this area and their own country.

But in the end, I must say that we have to prepare ourselves. I do not put much store by any country. No country bails you out when you are in trouble or when you are in difficulties. Therefore, our basic policy should be self-reliance, self-reliance in a very comprehensive sense...

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : But we are heading towards 'Reliance' and not self-reliance !

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : Our basic philosophy, which has been the *summum bonum* of the Indian National Congress and of the successive Governments of our Party is to be 'relied upon' whether it be in the economic field, where we have to a large extent achieved self-reliance, or any other field. But in the field of defence, I must confess that I am not very happy and I am speaking absolutely as a Member of Parliament, not on behalf of my Party. I am speaking for myself. I, for one, do not feel very happy that we allowed our initiative in the nuclear field to slip out of our hands. We were years ahead of China and decades ahead of Pakistan in this field. But now we are facing danger not only from Pakistan due to the fallacy of American perception, but we have to live absolutely in threat or apprehension of some flare up at some point of time with China because we have got this long pending boundary dispute with China. There is also the threat from America with its Central deployment force and also the threat of that super powers' nuclear power base in Diego Garcia. In these circumstances, India's security can be safeguarded only by taking a vigorous patriotic stand and by involving our people and utilising our options which have become absolutely necessary for our survival in today's hostile world. This policy, I think, should be followed and I congratulate our Prime Minister that he has shown the way even though provocations have been enormous. In pursuit of world

[Prof. K.K. Tewary]

peace and in pursuit of our national interest, he explored all possibilities of peace in this region and he has attempted to impress upon the American administration, the American Congress and the people of America that this region as also the other regions of the world need peace and stability in order to prosper and wipe off the poverty and backwardness inflicted upon them by dehumanising colonial system. With these words, I conclude.

18.23 hrs.

BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

[*English*]

Forty-Sixth Report

**THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE
MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY
AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI SHEILA DIKSHIT) :**
I beg to present the Forty-sixth Report of
Business Advisory Committee.

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The House
stands adjourned to meet tomorrow at 11.00
A.M.

18.24 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven
of the Clock on Tuesday, December 8, 1987/
Agrahayana 17, 1909 (Saka).*
