

Stationing of Nuclear Missiles on Indian Territory

+
*273. **Shri Madhu Limaye:**
Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia:
Shri S. M. Banerjee:
Shri George Fernandes:

Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that both U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. have suggested stationing of the missiles of both countries, with nuclear war-heads, on the Indian territory to make the guarantee against nuclear attack or threat of it "credible"; and

(b) whether Shri L. K. Jha, Secretary to the Prime Minister was authorised by Government to indicate India's tentative acceptance of the suggestion?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri M. C. Chagla): (a) and (b). No, Sir.

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या सरकार के विभिन्न प्रवक्ताओं ने बार-बार यह नहीं कहा है कि चीन में जो आणविक हमले का खतरा है, उन हमलों से जब तक संरक्षण नहीं मिलता है या कोई आणविक छत्र या गारण्टी नहीं मिलती है, तब तक हम आणविक हथियारों के प्रसार को रोकने सम्बन्धी सन्धि पर हस्ताक्षर नहीं करेंगे। मैं मंत्री महोदय से यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि आणविक छत्र या गारण्टी से उन का क्या मतलब है।

Shri M. C. Chagla: I think I have stated on the floor of this House more than once that the question of security is quite different from the question whether we sign the treaty or not. We had the discussion on this here the other day.

The question of signing the treaty or not signing the treaty depends upon the merits of the treaty, apart from the question of security. The two must

be kept apart. If the treaty is not acceptable to us, if it is not in conformity with the UN resolution, if it does not lead to general and comprehensive disarmament, if it impedes research for peaceful purposes, we shall not consider the treaty acceptable.

श्री मधु लिमये : मेरे प्रश्न का जवाब नहीं प्राया है। मैंने यह पूछा है कि सरकार की ओर से बार-बार जो आणविक छत्र-संरक्षण पर घमंसेला- या गारण्टी की बात की जाती है, उन से सरकार का क्या मतलब है।

Shri M. C. Chagla: There has been no talk of any nuclear umbrella.

श्री मधु लिमये : शास्त्री जी ने कहा था और मंत्री महोदय कहते हैं कि कोई बात नहीं हुई है।

Shri M. C. Chagla: My own impression is that Shastriji did not say that he had ever discussed the question of a nuclear umbrella. It was put out in the British press... My impression is, and I speak subject to correct on...

Shri Nath Pai: We can help the hon. Minister. Shastriji used the word 'shield' and not 'umbrella'.

Shri M. C. Chagla: I am talking of the nuclear umbrella.

श्री मधु लिमये : यह तो शब्दों का खेल है।

मंत्री महोदय ने शब्दों "निक्युरिटी" की चर्चा की है। क्या वह इस सदन को बतायेंगे कि "निक्युरिटी" से उन का क्या मतलब है? वह आणविक हमले से किस किस का बचाव करना चाहते हैं और उस के लिए वह क्या इन्तजाम कर रहे हैं?

Shri M. C. Chagla: We are considering that problem independently of the treaty. I agree that it is a very important matter for us to consider, namely what our security will be

against the possibility of Chinese nuclear attack or even Chinese nuclear blackmail; that is a matter of vital national importance.

श्री मधु निमये : कर क्या रहे हैं ?
मंत्री महोदय तो साधारण बातें कह रहे हैं। प्रश्नों का जवाब घाना चाहिये। वह तो साधारण बातें कहते रहते हैं कि हम मोच रहे हैं, हम चिन्ता कर रहे हैं, हम गौर कर रहे हैं, सम्भारता के साथ गौर कर रहे हैं। तो थाश्चिर उस का नतीजा क्या है ? या सरकार फिर देश को विदेशी ताकतों पर निर्भर बनाना चाहती है ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : श्री बनर्जी।

Shri S. M. Banerjee: The hon. Minister has just referred to the agreement or the treaty. May I know whether before the treaty is signed, it is likely to be discussed in this House and the opinion of this House obtained?

Shri M. C. Chagla: The question of this agreement has been discussed in this House and in the other on more than two or three occasions and the Government of India have given certain assurances as to what the treaty should contain before we will consider signing it. We have also said that we will not take any decision unless we see the form and shape in which this treaty ultimately emerges. Today it is at a very preliminary stage. Our representative in Geneva has made a statement setting out India's case. But beyond that, the discussion of the draft treaty has not progressed.

श्री जार्ज करवेल्लीच : चीन की ओर से सभी कुछ कर्तव्य से अणु बम के विस्फोट का काम हुआ है, सभी सभी ऐसी खबरें भी आई हैं कि इन्टर कान्तिनेन्टल बैलिस्टिक मिसाइल के टेस्ट करने के काम में चीन में बोग बने हुए हैं। वेरे इस विषयिने में दो प्रश्न हैं (क) यह जो चीन की ओर से अणु बम के टेस्ट करने का काम क्या आई० बी० सी० एन० के टेस्ट

करने का काम चातू है, क्या इस पर संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ या अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र में कहीं भी आवाज उठाने का काम हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार ने किया है ? (ख) यह जो चीन की अणु शक्ति बढ़ रही है, इस को मद्देनजर रख कर क्या हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार ने अणु बम बनाने के बारे में अपनी नीति में कोई परिवर्तन किया है ?

Shri M. C. Chagla: I have read the reports in the papers that very likely China might be able to make use of or launch an ICBM. That increases the threat that we have from China. I fully realise the grave situation.

As far as the question of telling other friendly countries of the situation in which we are placed is concerned, we are constantly pointing out that the explosion by the Chinese of a nuclear bomb poses a very grave and very serious threat to India. As regards Government's policy, it has been enunciated very often by the Prime Minister in this House and elsewhere that at present we have no intention of exploding an atomic bomb.

श्री सिद्धेश्वर प्रसाद : क्या यह सच है कि अणु शक्ति के प्रसार को रोकने के लिये जो मसौदा तैयार किया गया है, उसमें एक धारा यह है कि 1967 के पहले जिन देशों ने अणुशक्ति विस्फोट किया है, उन पर यह धारा लागू नहीं होगी। क्या इस प्रकार के देश यह चाहते हैं कि भारत अणु-शक्ति प्रदेश न बने तथा क्या जब तक यह धारा उस में रहेगी, तब तक भारत सरकार उस पर हस्ताक्षर नहीं करेगी ?

Shri M. C. Chagla: Yes, I am conscious of the fact that the draft that we have seen lays down curiously that any nation which has exploded a nuclear bomb before the 1st January 1966 is a nuclear power. The result is that if the draft goes through in that form, it would mean that China will be a nuclear nation and we, who have

shown great restraint, will be a non-nuclear nation, that China will be under very few obligations and we would be under obligations. Therefore, the question my hon. friend has raised is a very important one which we are considering.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : पीछे समाचार पत्रों में कुछ ऐसे समाचार प्रकाशित हुए थे कि तिब्बत में चीन ने कुछ इस प्रकार के प्रक्षेपास्त्र के झूठे बनाये हैं कि जहाँ से बंद कर वह भारतीय सीमा में लगे हुए 500 मील दूर के नगरों पर आक्रमण कर सकता है। यदि हम में कुछ भी सत्यकांक्ष है जोकि भारत सरकार ने अपनी जानकारी के आधारे पर प्राप्त की होगी, तो क्या उससे बचाव के लिये भारत सरकार ने किसी तरह का कोई प्रयत्न किया है, जिससे भारतीय जनमानस पर जो प्रभाव इस समाचार का पड़ा है, उसका स्पष्ट और मजबूत भाषा में किसी प्रकार निराकरण किया जा सके।

Shri M. C. Chagla: Apart from what appeared in the newspapers which I have read and hon. Members have read, we have no official information from our intelligence sources or from any other country officially as to the preparation by China of launching pads. A particular report in the newspapers says that such launching pads have been noticed in certain parts of China, which would indeed be a very serious threat to us.

As regards my hon. friend's question as to what we are doing to allay the fear roused in the minds of our people, I full understand the apprehension he feels. I am sure my hon. colleague, the Defence Minister, is doing what he can to safeguard the security of our country.

Shrimati Sushila Bhatnagar: The hon. Minister stated that there is no connection between signing a treaty and security. I would like to know precisely what the signing of a treaty is meant for. Is not the treaty meant

to enable us to become stronger and ensure the security of the nation? I would like to know whether every treaty which is signed is not meant to be either beneficial or harmful to security?

Shri M. C. Chagla: As I said, the main purpose of the non-proliferation treaty was to advance the cause of general and comprehensive disarmament by preventing proliferation, not merely by preventing non-nuclear countries from acquiring nuclear weapons, but also by compelling and obliging the nuclear Powers to freeze their stockpile, if not to reduce their stockpile. In that sense, it is bound up with security. This is the purpose of this treaty which is being discussed. Pursuant to the United Nations resolution this committee was set up to advance the cause of disarmament. The main purpose of the discussion that is going on is on the question of general and comprehensive disarmament.

Shri Nath Pal: It was claimed on behalf of a spokesman of Government that two Secretaries of the Government and the External Affairs Minister made pilgrimages to the different capitals of the world firstly to interpret and explain India's point of view, and secondly to seek clarifications. May I know why it was necessary for three, two senior officials and the Minister, to go? Does it reflect the usual confusion in thinking on the part of Government? Was it an indication of petty rivalries and squabbles; if it was not, and it was just a straight way of interpreting or explaining India's point of view, what are the clarifications these three dignitaries sought from the countries they visited and they themselves offered on our stand regarding not signing the treaty and our security. I would like a comprehensive reply to my question.

Shri M. C. Chagla: As regards Mr. L. K. Jha's visit, it was specifically to exchange with principal nuclear

power, ideas on the broad problem of security of a non-nuclear Power which is at the same time also non-aligned. The question that he discussed was: what is the security which, not merely India but non-aligned non-nuclear countries have against nuclear attack? There was no question of seeking any guarantee. It was merely an exploratory visit, and he met certain people in different parts of the world. In Geneva, the position was quite different. Representatives of the United Nations who are in the Eighteen-Member Committee waited on the Minister, and the question specifically of the treaty was discussed, not the question of security.

The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shrimati Indira Gandhi): I merely want to add one point. The hon. Member is so conscious of the squabbles and confusion in the ranks of the opposition that he thinks that that is the position here. As far as we are concerned, there is no question of any squabble or confusion of thinking.

Shri Nath Pai: Is that an explanation or just a counter-attack?

श्री नथ पाले : आप लोगों में एक दल होने हुए भी इतने मतभेद हैं कि एक दूसरे को कत्ल करने पर मजबूर हो जाते हैं। कत्ल के बारे में धारणा किया गया है, उनका जब तक उत्तर नहीं दिया है।

Shri Nath Pai: I appreciate the rare repartee from the Prime Minister, but may I request her to shed some light on my question?

Shri M. C. Chagla: I thought I had answered it. If there is any part that I have not answered, I shall be glad to answer.

Shri Nath Pai: He has offered to answer. The Foreign Minister, went, the Principal Private Secretary to the Prime Minister went, and the Foreign Secretary also went. Was it necessary for the three to go?

Could not one have done in these days of scarcity of foreign exchange which Mr. Morarji Desai throws in our face. What did they achieve? He did not reply to that. I accept the contention of the Prime Minister that there were no squabbles, no jealousies, but let him answer my question.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: Is it a fact that during the visit of one of the nominees of the Government of India, Mr. L. K. Jha, the Soviet Government and the United States of America had indicated that they are also likely to revise this non-proliferation treaty in its present form? Has any indication been given about that, and is that the reason why the talk about the stand of India on the non-proliferation treaty is being continued?

Shri M. C. Chagla: Mr. L. K. Jha in his tour of different countries was not discussing the merits or demerits of the non-proliferation treaty. His function was specifically to ascertain from these countries what security would a non-aligned, non-nuclear country have if there was a nuclear attack. That was his specific function which he undertook to do in the talks that he had with various people in various countries.

U. S. Fighter Planes secured by Pakistan

+

*274. Shri Indrajit Gupta:
Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha:

With the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Pakistan has secured a new squadron of U.S. supplied fighter planes which are reputed to be most sophisticated of their kind;

(b) whether India has protested to the Government of U.S.A. against the supply of these planes to Pakistan; and

(c) if so, the U.S. Government's reaction to India's protest?