

15.11 hrs.

**DISCUSSION RE : SERIOUS SITUATION ARISING OUT OF THE REPORTED EXPLOSION OF NUCLEAR DEVICE BY PAKISTAN AND THE SUPPLY OF AWACS AND OTHER SOPHISTICATED ARMS BY USA TO PAKISTAN.**

[English]

**SHRI BALWANT SINGH RAMOO-WALIA** (Sangrur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to discuss a serious situation arising out of the reported explosion of nuclear device by Pakistan and the supply of AWACS and other sophisticated arms by USA to that country.

Sir, late Prime Minister Indiraji has warned the world that Pakistan is accumulating arms and certain foreign powers are supplying in big quantities of arms to Pakistan. Today, while initiating this discussion, Sir, I place a note of warning to the whole of the country as to which side the situation is taking shape.

Sir, it is reported that Pakistan has acquired nuclear bomb status. When this news or information was published, everybody among us was of the opinion that President Reagan will take serious note of it. But to our utter surprise, it happened last week that the Reagan Administration certified that Islamabad had the non-nuclear status and consequently, allotment of \$ 600 million worth of arms was sanctioned to Pakistan.

Sir, on the one hand, we are the champions of peace, we are the champions of Non-aligned Movement in the world. India had never attacked her neighbours. There are many small countries neighbouring India but there is no threat, no risk, no danger at the hands of our great country, to them. It is because, we believe in co-existence, we believe, in theory that everybody has the right to live. But, Sir, it is very clear that since 1953, when Pakistan entered into a pact with the U.S.A. there had been continuous accumulation of arms endangering or threatening the security of our country. Now, sometime ago, AWACS air-borne warning system and radar planes have been given to Pakistan. These planes can collect information from

within other countries up to 200 kms, I may be corrected, if it is 400 kms. So, these are also being given to Pakistan. It is written that Islamabad is now only two screw-driver turns away from a full-fledged bomb. So, Sir, this is a very serious situation. Previously, Iran had been the base of American to use American arms and use American influence in Asia and surrounding countries. Iran was the basis earlier. But after the fall of the Shah of Iran, in the same pattern, the full-fledged use of Pakistan territory is being made by America for her evil design. The threat to our country is not only with the arrival of arms. I here want to take up jointly the matter and the intention of Pakistan as well as supply of arms by the imperialists to it. There are many forces, and many powers in the world who are jealous of our great country. They want that India should not grow, should not develop. Out of that jealousy, they are supporting the vested interests and opponents of India. Now, Pakistan is consistently trying to destabilise our country by sending infiltrators. There had been two wars with Pakistan in the previous years. During these wars, all these arms which were got from America were used against our country, even though the U.S.A. and other imperialist countries had given an assurance that these arms would not be permitted to be used against India. But even then, they were used against us. On the one hand, Pakistan is getting arms and, on the other hand, Sri Lanka is getting arms from five countries. Who are supplying arms to Pakistan? Israel, China and South Africa, Pakistan and U. K. all these countries are supplying arms to Pakistan.

Pakistan's intervention is not now any secret thing. The Prime Minister had many times discussed the issue with Pakistan authorities and the Head of the Pakistan Government. The Prime Minister should not keep any secret. If at all needed, the Prime Minister should come out with facts which are needed foremost for the sovereignty of this great country. The Pakistanis, directly and indirectly, are destabilising our country. Take the case of Western border. There is a rumour that Indian nationals in thousands went to Pakistan after Operation Blue Star. The Government of India should collect those figures. Those people are now imparted training in sophisticated weapons and are being

sent back to our country to create chaos and to kill innocent people. Pakistan is giving training and supplying arms to these people. It is also giving them money. A few days back in the Golden Temple, certain posters were seen bearing the slogans of Khalistan and these posters were published in a printing press at Lahore. This is a very serious situation. Punjab Chief Minister told me a few days back that people who crossed over from Pakistan to India have been arrested and they revealed during interrogation that they were trained in Faisalabad, Multan and in other cantonments. They were the people to whom Pakistan said "Go into that country and have communal killing of one community." These revelations are also on the record, as told to me by the Chief Minister.

I read a statement of Shri Subramaniam Swamy that during his meeting with Gen. Zia, when the Ambassador of India was also present, Gen. Zia admitted that his country has acquired the capacity up to 90 per cent enrichment of uranium. That was admitted by the Head of the State in the presence of our ambassador. The ambassador must have passed on the information to the Government of India but the Government of India has not become serious or taken any action.

Pakistan is misusing the religious and other aspirations of our country. Pakistan is leaving no stone unturned to destabilise and disunite or break our country and is putting threats to its integrity and unity. With the achievement and acquiring of the status of a nuclear power by Pakistan and having quantities of arms, the threat has become more serious.

I will make two or three suggestions. The first point is that Indian nationals are there who can be used and who are being used against the major and vital interests of our great nation. According to the Simla Pact, certain measures should be taken and this Government should make sure that Indian national who have crossed over the border to Pakistan should be brought back - anyway even if some high-level talks are to be conducted with the Government of Pakistan. After the war of 1965 and 1971 many people were brought back. In Punjab, the activities of Pakistan are more serious in nature.

Punjab had been a sword of India; I wish it will be the sword of India in future also. During the 1965 war, our sisters, mothers and women-folk of Punjab went to the last bunker to serve the Indian soldiers, to help their soldier brothers. The wish of the Pakistan is that these sentiments should go. We should not allow Pakistan to do that. I request that the nation needs reassurance from the Government keeping in view this threatening situation on the borders of the country.

Sir, this concern is not only the concern of certain political parties but this is a concern of the country as a whole. Will the Government explain and satisfy the country through this House as to what concrete measures are being taken to face the threat of the security of the country?

The second point is : what steps are being taken to stop Pakistan from interfering in our country? They are instigating anti-national forces in Punjab, Jammu and Kashmir and other parts of India. What steps are being proposed to inspire and mobilise the people of Punjab in defending our country's border and defeat the designs of Pakistan. Though I am sure that this country had survived throughout the very hard days of the history for centuries in the past, and this country will survive in future also but yet this is the foremost duty of the Government to carry the whole of the nation with them and come out with a concrete measure to defend this country, keeping in view the serious situation in Pakistan due to the supply of sophisticated arms, AWACS and equipping Pakistan to have a nuclear bomb.

PROF. G. G. SWELL (Shillong) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, unfortunately I believe, unwittingly, a red herring has been drawn over the question of the detonation of an explosive device by Pakistan by out of turn statements by some of our scientists. It would appear as if there was no such explosive device and that the whole thing was an earth-quake. Sir, the United States' Defence Intelligence report, the Special National Intelligence Estimate of the USA are not yellow-paper agents. These are extremely prestigious organisations and part of the establishment of the American Administration. And when a report from

[Prof. G. G. Swell]

their source appear in a prestigious American paper like the Washington Post, we should take note of it. The world has taken note of it. I would like to put the record straight. It is true that during those days of September 19 to 21, there was an earth-quake at a place called Wamai Post near the North-West Frontier area. And that earthquake was duly recorded by our seismographs in the Gauribidanur Seismic Centre in Bangalore. But, at the same time, in those days, there was an explosive device detonated by Pakistan. But since this device was to test the trigger, it was exploded not under the ground but just beneath the surface or on the surface, and the device did not have a nuclear charge. Now, an explosive like that would not set off seismic waves and, therefore, it was not recorded by our seismographs. There was no doubt that there was an explosive device and the whole intention was to test the trigger which should be used when the bomb is put together.

Now, all knowledgeable people in the field of nuclear science in the United States have come to this conclusion that Pakistan is just two screw-turns away from having a complete nuclear bomb. They have mentioned that it has got sub-assemblies of this bomb at different places and any time, within a week's time, they can put the sub-assemblies together and have a complete bomb.

Sir, I would like to draw your attention that even the spokesman of the State Department of the United States had only said that the report of Pakistan having had an explosive device was speculative. They did not say that it was not true. If they were sure that it was not true, they would have said so. The most they said was that it was speculative. And when President Reagan, on October 27,—if I am not mistaken about the date—issued a certificate so that certain payments could be cleared in aid to Pakistan, he had only said that Pakistan did not have the bomb. Well, technically, yes; they do not have the bomb. But they can put the bomb together within one week. This is the position. This is the new situation that we are facing.

I know, my time is limited. Well, the deal for supplying AWACS aircraft to Pakistan was struck only recently during the visit of the Secretary of State for Defence of the United States of America, Mr. Weinberger, only last month. The deal to supply the AWACS aircraft followed a nuclear device that was exploded by Pakistan. And somewhere else, somebody, near to the establishment of the United States, had said that, even if a nuclear bomb was discovered under the basement of President Zia, the U. S. Administration would not come down heavily on Pakistan. Therefore, it is very clear that the United States administration is taking a very indulgent view to the prospect of Pakistan acquiring a nuclear device.

Let us understand what are these AWACS aircraft. Somebody has described the AWACS aircraft as an electronic platform. What do the AWACS do? They are an aircraft keeping floating in the air. They can see and spot an object about 500 kms. away. I don't know from Lahore or Rawalpindi how far that will be towards India. I think, it would go beyond our off-shore installations in Bombay. It can go upto Bangalore. Everything could be seen, our air-fields could be seen, our military-fields could be seen, our military movements could be seen clearly as a picture before you. Over and above seeing all these things, the AWACS aircraft—the full title is Air Watch and Control System—issue instructions to their forces on the ground to take action. What does it mean? It means that in the event of hostilities, if any aircraft takes off from an Indian air-field, it would be seen by Pakistan immediately and would be interdicted. Any military movement that we have would be seen by Pakistan clearly and immediately instructions would be issued by Pakistan to take counter-action against it. That is the situation in which we are.

I don't know when these AWACS aircraft will be supplied to Pakistan. In my view, these aircraft could be supplied tomorrow, if necessary because the Americans have made it clear that in the first instance they would like the American military personnel to operate these aircraft. They already have these aircraft—I think about five—in Saudi Arabia and they could easily be flown to Pakistan any time. From that it follows

that America would establish itself as a base in Pakistan. It has been said that if three of these AWACS aircraft are operated it would be necessary for about 300 military personnel to be stationed at a particular place.

It means another qualitative change in the military situation in this region in which America itself would be involved, American personnel would be involved. If tomorrow three AWACS aircraft are to be used in Pakistan, it would mean that immediately 300 American airmen, mechanics and others would have to be stationed in Pakistan.

Sir, you have heard about the air field Mauripur from where certain sophisticated aircrafts of America—the P-3, Orion, Surveillance aircraft have been operating. They are operating now approximating to the sophisticated 42 aircraft flown by Garry Powers and shot down over the Soviet Union. He operated from Afghanistan in these days. The same situation is taking place around our border. This is a new situation in which we are placed.

I would like to draw your attention again that it is not only aircraft, not only indulgence to Pakistan to have a nuclear bomb but the USA is also supplying Pakistan with the most sophisticated tank that they have. They call it an MIAI tank. America has not given even to her NATO allies. These tanks would be available to Pakistan. I was told Mr. Weinberger said as much to our Ambassador in Washington that Pakistan needs these AWACS planes because of the situation in Afghanistan. The simple question is if you say that they need all these sophisticated arms because of the situation in Afghanistan what are these tanks for? These most sophisticated tanks that you are giving to Pakistan MIAI which you have not given to Britain and West Germany what are these tanks for? Are these tanks to climb up the Khyber Pass and operate on the mountains of Afghanistan? Does that make any logic? It is as simple as that. These weapons can be used only in the plains of Pakistan and the plains of India. And when you say the AWACS planes are only to watch the movement of aircraft in Afghanistan the AWACS planes can also watch the movement of aircraft in India.

I would like to put this question both to the Pakistanis and the Americans. Is it their case that they would like to fight a full war against Afghanistan and the Soviet Union? If you are not going to do that and Pakistan has said in so many words that they are not thinking in terms of an open warfare with the Soviet Union and they are not in a position to do that then why all this? I would make a statement today that all this is a part of an American geo-strategic interest. All this is a part of what America has been saying, a strategic consensus and a rapid deployment force. I would put this question through this House if it can reach the American Press and Mr. Reagan. Last year I was in the United Nations and I heard what he said in his reply to the Soviet Union's proposal for nuclear disarmament and we know what has happened in Reykyabik. The Americans ran away from disarmament.

I must here express my compliments to the Soviet Union for having put concrete proposals on the table for the reduction of nuclear arms and total elimination of medium range and short range nuclear weapons in Europe without even taking into account the nuclear armaments of U. K. and France. They proposed 50 per cent reduction of inter-continental nuclear devices. These are very concrete proposals. There is no reason why America should not accept that but President Reagan ran away from that with the result that there is a stalemate. The strong point that Reagan always makes is that the Soviet Union is creating regional instability, He says that unless and until there is reduction in regional instability, there cannot be a question of trust of America in the Soviet Union. He mentions Afghanistan, Kampuchea, Ethiopia and so many others. I would like to put this question to the President of America: "What are you doing in the Indian sub-continent by infusing arms and weapons to Pakistan? Are they not creating another region of instability? Does this serve the cause of peace?"

Having said all that, we would, of course, like to hear from our Government how they are going to face that situation. I know it is not an easy question to answer. I know also that even if the Government has certain ideas, cannot come forward with those ideas

[Prof. G. G. Swell]

here and put them on the Table of the House. We have to think seriously what we can do, but we have to make a distinction between the American administration and the American people, we have to make a distinction between the American people and the American President Reagan, who today is a lame duck President. The people of America have shown their loss of confidence in him by returning the Democratic Party to a majority in the Senate and in the House of the Representatives. They have shown their disillusionment with his cowboy mentality riding on a horse and blazing his gun away to the wild west. This is the kind of attitude that he has towards problems. But I think, when we say all this, we still have to reckon with the consensus of the American people. Let us seriously make an effort and reach the American people and reach the American Congress and to say that this sort of thing does not serve the cause of world peace. At the same time, let us unite our people and make them aware of the danger that faces our country.

15.48 hrs.

[SHRI SHARAD DIGHE *in the Chair*]

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Bolpur): Mr. Chairman, Sir, it is quite proper that we should discuss a very serious situation that has arisen in view of the recent developments in our neighbouring State. The news that has come out about detonation of a high explosive device in September this year is a part of Pakistan's continuing efforts to build an implosion type nuclear weapon. This follows a conscious and deliberate attempt on the part of USA to supply sophisticated arms to Pakistan whose intentions with regard to their use are really no secret.

So far the supply of sophisticated arms and other arms to Pakistan from USA has been to the extent of 3.2 billion dollars during 1981 and 1986, and the amount of 4.02 billion dollars is for the package of 1987 to 1993. This is the magnitude of the arms supply to Pakistan. Apart from that, from the reports it appears that the USA

Defence Department has approved a further supply of arms of over 100 million dollars in the shape of supply of armed personnel carriers and 159M Howitzers. This is in addition to the packages that I have already mentioned. This is supplementary to that.

Now Sir, so far as the armoured personnel carriers are concerned, as has been rightly pointed out, these cannot be used in Afghanistan because of the particular nature of terrain of that area. These can only be used against our country.

Since 1981—I would like the Hon. Minister to state whether our information is correct or not—the USA has supplied to Pakistan 40 F-16 aircraft, 20 AH-15 attack helicopters, 100 M-48 A-5 tanks, 75 M-113 A-2 armoured personnel carriers, 24-ton missile vehicles with over 1005 missiles, 100 howitzers of 155 MM (self-propelled) and 75 towed 155 MM howitzers and 40 light inch howitzers (self-propelled), etc. These are the types of armaments and quantity of armaments that have been supplied by the United States to Pakistan. Over and above this, there is the recent decision of America to supply this AWACS to Pakistan, which can only be used for the purpose of keeping a watch over our defence preparedness and on our installations. Every thing will be clear to them. So far as their preparedness is concerned, it is rightly pointed out that it is just 'two screw-driver turns from having a bomb'. It is also stated that so far as the F-16s are concerned, they are already in a position to carry nuclear weapons. It has also been found from the US documents which were captured by the Iranians in the US Embassy in Tehran that there were clear indications that these F-16 aircraft had been supplied to Pakistan only for the purpose of using them against our country and not against Afghanistan. So, there is ample evidence and material to prove that this arming of Pakistan is done only with the sole objective of destabilising our country because it is against the interests of US to have a strong India which is dedicated to the objectives of NAM. So far as the role of USA is concerned, we must have a proper perspective and understanding of the situation. Sir, so far as USA is concerned, there was a recent visit by the Defence Secretary to India. I/would

like to know very categorically from the Hon. Minister what was the nature of the discussion between our Government and the Defence Secretary? I know, it will be said, it is confidential. But the intentions of Mr. Weinberger, the US Government vis-a-vis supplying sophisticated arms and weapons to Pakistan is not kept secret, it goes to the Press in Pakistan and makes its intentions clear and the whole justification supposed to be given to the world at large that to meet the so-called Afghan incursions on Pakistan territory, these highly sophisticated modern weapons are necessary. Sir, what did he tell us and what did we tell him? Did we tell him that this will have serious effect on our relations which will embitter the relations and seriously affect the mutual relations?

It will be an unfriendly act so far as our country is concerned. Was it made clear? I find that the Hon. Minister has said in the other place that we should be soft in words, but hard on facts. But what is meant by hard on facts? We know that we should ascertain the facts. I believe we must be careful about the facts. Now, are these facts which we gathered from different sources—we have no access to your sources—correct or not? If these are facts, then I take it as very hard facts. On these acts, how long will you go on with your softness? That is why, in connection with this, there is another very important aspect and that is, there has been an interview in a Press Conference by Mr. Armitage in which he has given an impression that India—our country—would probably like or prefer patrolling to outright supplies of AWACS to Pakistan. This is a very serious thing. It has gone on record of the Defence Department there.

Sir, with your permission, I would like to read what Mr. Armitage has said at a press Conference on the 24th of October that both USA and Pakistan had agreed to concentrate on the immediate need to improve Pakistan's air-borne early warning capability along the Afghanistan border using the most cost-effective means available. Are specifically the AWACS as differentiated from HAWKEYS being discussed for supply. Mr. Armitage's reply was.

"We are talking about AWACS type of capability have been determined, if

there is a great need for airborne early warning system the problem is to try to find one that is cost effective and technologically effective."

Then, he goes on to say to a specific question—I read out from the Reports of the other House—put by an American Journalist namely, whether Indians prefer surveillance rather than to give it. The response of Mr. Armitage was, you probably ought to ask them the question. I think, probably one could assume they would like that better, that is India would like patrolling and that Pakistan and America can carry on patrolling even near our borders instead of giving them actual supplies. This is a very serious matter. I would like to know whether the question of supplying AWACS was discussed or not, and whether this impression was given by our Government to the U. S. Government: "If you think so, you can carry on with your patrolling activities; but do not make actual supplies of AWACS," This has gone on record. This is known to our Government. We want a categorical, statement on this.

16.00 hrs.

Mr. Weinberger has not kept the intention of the U. S. Government a secret. He has reiterated U. S. Government's determination to supply this sophisticated aircraft, when our Ambassador Mr. Kaul met him, although it was pointed out to him that it would create a total imbalance in the respective positions of our country and Pakistan. But justification is being made. The Afghan problem is there, so far as Pakistan is concerned, but that can never justify the supply of such a type of sophisticated aircraft or arms or APC etc. tanks to Pakistan.

I am reading from a report which says: "The American decision as underscored by Mr. Weinberger continues to be the stand in Afghanistan. Mr. Weinberger who has the reputation of being doggedly anti-Soviet on matters of arms control, sees Pakistan as not only a frontline State against the Soviet Union, but also as a base which the U. S. could use in times of need."

[Shri Somnath Chatterjee]

This is the real objective of U. S. intentions or U. S. actions in this part of the world. Here, our country has to be very firm. We know that there is not only the intention; but there is a continuous attempt to create difficulties for us. We know how Pakistan, and for that matter even the training schools in USA are being utilized for training terrorists who are being sent here, to create difficulty, to give encouragement, to give support and actively carry out secessionist activities. We have to be extremely cautious about it, and remember their attitude towards us. In this situation, we have not only to make our intentions clear to the U. S. Government, whose imperialist war-mongering is obvious. It is really known. There is no suppression of it. Let us not lay much hope and faith in the change in the Senate structure, because so far as their attitude towards Pakistan and India is concerned, we do not suppose there will be any real, substantial change in that attitude. And on that basis whether President Reagan has become a lame duck President or not, does not matter. But the question is that we have to be firm. We have to make our intentions very clear, and we have to follow it up by our actions. We go to them for technology. We are clamouring for super computers. You cannot be firm with people whom you are approaching for the purpose of importation of know-how and technology. At the same time, you cannot deal with them strongly so far as supply of arms to Pakistan and to other places are concerned.

On this point, we have always strongly supported the Government, i.e. in our policy of non-alignment, although we are saying that in the Government there is not a proper appreciation when they try to bracket the friend of this country Soviet Russia, which has always proved to be a friend, and call it a Super Power, as if the idea is to set off one Super Power against another Super Power.

But here we see the difference in the approach and attitude of Soviet Russia and the U. S. imperialism. We are deeply concerned about this. I do not want that we should be rude in our words, but let there

not be any obsession with words which show our softness so far as our strength is concerned; our strength has to be both moral as well as a physical strength. Certainly, we do not want to match so far as militarisation or supply of arms to Pakistan by USA is concerned because that would affect our developmental activities. We are concerned about it. We do not want to divert funds for armament; we want to utilize it properly. But a situation is being created where our nearest neighbour has always taken an attitude of hostility and they are trying to destabilise our country. Obtaining supply of arms can never be used for any bonafide purpose and on the plea of tackling Afghan situation; they will all be pointed towards us. Today, almost the entire western India upto the central India, even upto Bangalore, will be completely open to them. This is the seriousness of the situation, and Weinberger comes here, gives all sorts of lectures here and there as if he has come here only to teach us something good about defence and about armament; and then he goes to Pakistan and justifies the supply of these arms on the plea that these are to be only used against Afghanistan. Kindly remember that for continuing financial assistance to Pakistan, President Reagan has to give a certificate under the US law that there is no use of nuclear weapons or in a position to use nuclear weapons. Now, on the 22nd of October—according to the report—he has given a certificate that Pakistan is not in a position to have any nuclear weapons. But by that time, even before that, a month and a half before, this detonation had taken place which is stated to be implosional type of a nuclear weapon; it is just a few days' time for them to have a fulfilled nuclear weapon. This is the government, this is the Head of the State with whom you have to deal; and any softness towards them will be dangerous for us; that is why; we want to warn this government, our government don't try to have good commercial relationship with them. You cannot be strict with them, strong with them while you have to deal with your foreign relationship where our interests are seriously concerned. You cannot have a stick and carrot policy, so far as USA is concerned. They will not give us a stick for the time being; they will go on giving us carrot; and they will give this stick to Pakistan to beat us with. You ought to

realise this. They did not believe in that. Therefore, we do not want to arm ourselves at the expense of our development; we should not adopt such a policy. But so far as the government is concerned, taking advantage of superior military position or military hardwards, arming another country for no obvious reasons than to utilize them against our country so that this country's interest is weakened, our development work is halted so that we may go to America for the purpose of sustenance, we must be seriously concerned about it.

16.10 hrs.

[SHRI N. VENKATA RATNAM  
*in the Chair*]

SHRI DINESH SINGH (Pratapgarh) :  
Mr. Chairman, Sir, Pakistan's accumulation of armaments beyond its legitimate defence requirements is a matter of concern to us and not only to us but to other countries in South Asia, and in the neighbourhood of Pakistan. But I am not going to go into the details of Pakistan's acquisition, nor am I going to join the debate whether Pakistan has exploded a nuclear device or not. To my mind, what should be of great concern to us is the deteriorating security environment. We have now two neighbours : China in the North, Pakistan in the West which have nuclear weapon capability. This takes into account almost the total of our land border. And, therefore, we have to give a serious thought as to how we are going to deal with this problem. I am quite confident the Government has given some thought to it, because it is not some thing that has happened suddenly. It has been a continuing development in this region. And I hope, therefore, that the Government's response will also be a considered one and that we shall not rush into any situation which might create more difficulties for us. Let us look at the situation in its broader context and I would wish to take this House a little back in history. Even before independence Pakistan was conceived as a Western force projection in South Asia, in the Gulf and in West Asia. Mr. V. P. Menon has brought this out very clearly in his book "The Transfer of Power". It has nothing to do with our policy. It is a consequence of

the Western defence projections. It would be a serious error to assume that the United States chose Pakistan as its security partner because India was not available for the purpose. The Americans had their lessons in Pakistan's strategic significance from the British who had designed a cooperative role for Pakistan in the Western strategy in the sub-continent in West Asia and in Soviet Central Asia. It is further supported by the U. S. Joint Chief of Staff Memorandum of 24th March 1949 which said, and I quote :

"The Karachi—Lahore area in Pakistan may under certain conditions become of strategic importance. In spite of tremendous logistic difficulties this area might be required as a base for air operations against Central USSR and as a staging area for forces engaged in the defence or recapture of Middle-East oil areas."

Therefore, it is a continuing policy of the United States and whatever our fond hopes may be of the changes in the Senate in the United States, it is not going to alter the strategic considerations of the United States. And, therefore, we have to take a wider view of the developing situation.

In these circumstances, a new element has been introduced : the importance of the Indian Ocean. The British did not talk of the importance of the Indian Ocean in 1949 because at that time the British controlled the Indian Ocean. Now, the Indian Ocean has become of great importance because the submarine-based missiles are capable of hitting strategic targets in Central Soviet Union from the Indian Ocean. Therefore, a new element in their strategic conception is the importance of the Indian Ocean and a further emphasis on the importance of Pakistan.

The United States has another interest in Pakistan and that is Pakistan's Islamic character. A policy statement of the United States State Department dated 1 July 1951 said :

"India's execution of its policy of consolidating the princely states and its inflexible attitude with regard to

[Shri Dinesh Singh]

Kashmir, may indicate national traits which in time, if not controlled, could make India Japan's successor in Asiatic imperialism. In such a circumstance a strong Muslim bloc under the leadership of Pakistan and friendly to the US might afford a desirable balance of power in South Asia."

Therefore, there have been two major considerations in trying to build up Pakistan as a friend—the first consideration being a strategic projection of force and secondly to use Pakistan to control not only the sub-continent but also West Asia.

India never opted to be an imperial power as had been feared by the United States but Pakistan has been projected as an Islamic power. Today, Pakistan has military cooperation with 22 Islamic countries spanning over two continents. Therefore, the United States and its western allies have been consistent in their policy so far as Pakistan is concerned.

This projection of the United States has also had its impact on the domestic scene in Pakistan. A democratically established Government was thrown away and a dictatorship was installed. A nexus was built up between the clergy and the military power and Pakistan in its own country started adopting an Islamic character beyond its normal development as a modern country.

The US force projection of Pakistan did receive a set back in 1971 in the Indo-Pak war and in the liberation of Bangladesh. It was immediately recognised in the United States. It is interesting how President Nixon, who was in favour of a tilt for Pakistan, impishly went to the United States Congress and on 3rd May, 1973 stated :

"The United States will not join in any groupings or pursue any policies directed against India."

They recognised India immediately as a South Asian power and went to assure India that they will not undertake any policy which

will be harmful to India. This statement, I am afraid, was rather short-lived. Afghanistan situation provided them with an opportunity to prop up Pakistan as a rival power again.

Much has been talked about Pakistan's nuclear bomb and the anti-nuclear proliferation attitude of the United States, and I would like the House to judge this for itself. It was in October last year when Pakistan's nuclear capability was brought to the notice of the United States by us. The reaction of the American President was most interesting. President Reagan refused to restrain Pakistan in its nuclear weapons programme and, in fact, asked Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi to reach bilateral agreement with Pakistan before it was too late. It is an interesting statement. They are conscious of Pakistan's continuing programme of nuclear weapons production. They do not wish to restrain it because they wanted it to play a rival role. But they asked Rajiv Gandhi to come to terms with Pakistan so that Pakistan and India are equated in strategic terms so far as the projection of Pakistan in South Asia and West Asia is concerned.

What happened in Pakistan is well known to us. Pakistan signed the Mutual Security Agreement with the United States in 1954. It joined the two military blocs CENTO and SEATO. But over a period of time they realised that it was going to be counter-productive, that Pakistan had to live in an environment which was asking for peace which was against military blocs, and it recognised the force of the Non-Aligned Movement and, therefore, wanted to come into the Movement. It gave up its membership of CENTO and SEATO but did not abrogate the Mutual Security Agreement which it signed with Pakistan. We welcomed Pakistan in the Non-Aligned Movement in the hope that it will strengthen Pakistan's independent foreign policy and that it will take its rightful place as a major power in the sub-continent, working for peace and stability. But the situation has changed again. The United States has made a statement that Pakistan's bases would be available to the Rapid Deployment Force, and that it has been included in their central command strategy consideration.

It has also now offered Pakistan AWACS. I shall not go into the details of the capability of AWACS. My friend, the Hon. Member, Professor Swell has explained to the House in very great detail what its implications are. But my fear comes not from individual acquisition of weaponry, as from the totality of the policy in which we are now facing a very difficult situation. Pakistan's willingness to participate in the U. S. strategy will deprive Pakistan of its independent foreign policy in relation to larger third world considerations and this is of utmost importance. It could go beyond East-West military cooperation and aim at serving U. S. economic interests in the developing world. Pakistan's association with United States in relation to East-West conflict could project itself in the North-South relations, and this situation in a very close neighbour, with which we hope to establish very friendly relations, would be most unfortunate. Now I have talked of the situation as it exists.

What are the options before us? Actually I would wish to leave it to the Government to point out what they would do. I wish only to spell out a few options that we have.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : They will say that the matter is under consideration.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : They can consider it and say later. We are not in a hurry. It is a continuing problem. However, there is a silver lining. We have now entered into a co-operative arrangement under SAARC. Fortunately SAARC is free from bilateral disputes. It provides an excellent opportunity for all countries of South Asia to get together at the highest level, at the summit once a year and at the ministerial level, Council of Ministers twice a year and in a large number of Committees and workshops which take place. It brings people nearer. It removes the fear that exists between them and the suspicion that fear creates. I have also every confidence that the people of Pakistan would wish a free foreign policy, a non-aligned programme and this we must encourage in every form we can. Without interference in the internal affairs of Pakistan, we have to assist Pakistan in building institutions which

will give it self reliance, which will take away its dependence on foreign powers.

PROF. N. G. RANGA (Guntur) : There is little hope. It is only a hope.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : No, Professor. We have to live in hope. What else do you want to do?

We had wars with Pakistan. That did not solve the problem. We have to try and live together. Merely fighting with one another is not the answer. There is no doubt that we have to strengthen our own defence and even more so our economy to take care of our defence but we have also to assure Pakistan that India's strength is not against Pakistan. That India's strength will lead to greater co-operation in which Pakistan will itself find its own strength and not be afraid of India's build up.

We must also, as has been pointed out by the two Members who spoke before me, try to reach the American people. America, despite policies of Government of the moment is a democracy where the people do assert themselves. We have seen this in different spheres. We have seen this in their domestic spheres. We have seen this in their foreign relations sphere. We must go to the American people and put it to them, whether they would wish to see South Asia as a peacefully co-operating area or an area of competition in which South Asian countries confront one another all the time. Will that be helpful for global peace or would it help in destroying global's peace.

Very soon we shall have the pleasure of receiving here the Secretary General of the Soviet Communist Party Mr. Gorbachov who himself has certain proposals regarding Asian security. I have no doubt that Government will give its utmost consideration to it. We shall see what are the plus points in that. We must ensure that Asia's peace and co-operation is not disturbed.

In the end I wish to say that the situation like this has to be considered in its depth and its seriousness. We need not panic. This is the time to give full

[Shri Dinesh Singh]

support to our Prime Minister in his policies to strengthen this country so that we are able to meet the challenge from wherever it comes.

[Translation]

\*SHRI M. SUBBA REDDY (Nandyal) :  
 Mr. Chairman, Sir, the supply of most sophisticated and deadly weapons to Pakistan by Americans is of vital concern to us. Right from the beginning, Pakistan has been treating India as its main enemy. Despite best efforts by India to normalise its relations with Pakistan, it was trying its best to hamper our relation. For the past 20 years many incidents took place proving the intentions of Pakistan beyond doubt. Pakistan has been training terrorists from Punjab for quite some time now. Its intention is to destabilise the country. In the name of combating Afghanistan Pakistan is importing most sophisticated weapons from America. Every one knows clearly that the imported sophisticated weapons are going to be used against India. India is a non-aligned country and has been in the forefront of the non-aligned movement. It is irony that while we are professing peace and trying to establish normal relations with every body, Pakistan is becoming more and more belligerent by importing sophisticated weapons from the West. If it is not to fight with India, where is the necessity for Pakistan to go for such a big arms import? The conciliation efforts by India proved futile. Pakistan is in occupations of a large chunk of territory in Kashmir. Very recently a road also has been constructed in that area for the free movement of arms and ammunition. The intention of Pakistan is quite clear. It wants to grab Kashmir at an opportune time. The situation prevailing today calls for a greater vigilance on the part of India. We must get ready to face the impending danger. We too should procure such sophisticated arms to meet the threat from Pakistan. China too has been building roads across our borders. The collusion between China and Pakistan calls for a greater vigilance on our

part. Pakistan is also trying to incite violence in Kashmir. So the danger is looming large over our country. We have to save the country at any cost. Now the time has come to get ready to meet the challenge by equipping ourselves with equally modern weapons. When Pakistan throws the gauntlet, we have no other go but to pick it up. Pakistan wants to threaten India by importing deadly weapons from their American friends. Pakistan does not believe in the policy of peaceful co-existence and that is the reason why it is importing arms on such a large scale. We must be cautious of the purpose for which Pakistan wants to import arms. Hence we cannot afford to be ill-equipped. We have to be well-equipped. We have a bitter experience of war with China. We had to pay a penalty for our complacency. We cannot afford to be complacent thinking that Pakistan is a small country. There are various types of snakes. A snake smaller in size may be more poisonous and dangerous than a bigger snake. Hence we have to be careful about Pakistan also. India cannot remain silent spectator. If we depend on our non-alignment and neglect our defence requirements. We may have to pay a heavy price for it. Non-alignment has meaning only if others respect it. Hence we should remain alert. Pakistan is waiting for an opportune time to destabilise our country and get benefitted by it. That is the reason why it is providing training to the terrorists in Punjab. Had it not been for the support given by Pakistan, the terrorists could not have crossed the border and enter Pakistan. It is evident that Pakistan is providing both moral and material support to the terrorists. Recently an Indian plane was hijacked by Pakistan. This proves the point Pakistan will go to any extent to destabilise and disintegrate India.

Sir, India should acquire nuclear weapons. We may have different political parties in the country. We may have different ideologies. But we are one in protecting India from internal and external dangers. We must watch the movements of Pakistan carefully. Pakistan has been giving the lame excuse of Afghanistan for acquisition of arms. But there had been rarely any clash between the two countries. Ultimately these weapons are going to be used against us.

\*The speech was originally delivered in Telugu.

The arms and ammunitions recovered from the terrorists in Punjab bear the Pakistani marks. Still the terrorist activities are continuing unabated. Innocent people are being killed there every day. The situation is very grim there. Punjab problem is no ordinary problem.

India is the only country which is following non-alignment sincerely. It is not easy to protect the border extending upto 4000 kms. Hence we should at least now try to procure the arms as sophisticated as the arms procured by Pakistan. The situation is tense along the borders of Pakistan. Incidents of killing innocent persons are taking place every day. Hence, as Shri Vajpai had suggested yesterday the entire border area must be handed over to the army.

India cannot afford to be compacent. India has to be vigilant. Pakistan was taught a lesson earlier. Yet it continues to be unfriendly with India. We have to be beware of poisonous snake lest it may bite us any moment. We have to take all precautions.

America believes in imperialism. It wants to expand its imperialism. Pakistan is a part of their imperialistic strategy. America encourages small countries against the big countries in order to destabilise and ultimately grab them. They provide arms to small countries to work against big countries which do not tow the American line. We should take note of the design of the imperial powers. India should be cautions. Nuclear and powerful weapons which these countries possess must also be acired by India. I hope at least now, India will become alert, and take all the necessary steps to meet any threat from any quarter.

I thank you very much for giving me this opportunity and with that I conclude my speech.

[English]

SHRI K. P. SINGH DEO (Dhenkanal) :  
Mr. Chairman, Sir, I like to congratulate the vigilance Press on having brought this very important and crucial subject which

concerns not only our national security but also has a bearing on the international situation and is having global and strategic implications. I also congratulate the Hon. alert Member on having raised this discussion.

This is something which is being carried on for sometime. It is not something new. But the fact is that, it has come at a time when our country is passing through a very critical stage, in the sense that we are in the midst of a geo political and geo strategic environment, surrounded from outside by political system which is quite different from ours, whether it is a military dictatorship or monarchy or authoritarian regime, who are inimical to India's prosperity, strength and development.

It is in this context that this subject has come up and I am glad that the learned Prof. G. G. Swell has clarified certain aspects of the implosion and explosion of the trigger device and the earthquake. But, at the same time, one of the questions remains rather unanswered and there is room for doubt because the press publications have brought out that there were explosions between 18th and 21st of September whereas the earthquake has taken place on the 19th September at 11.55 A.M. GMT.

I hope the Hon. Minister while replying will enlighten the House and take us into confidence whether there is any doubt about the date and the time between the press reports and the statements which have come out from our scientists.

Quoting our scientists, the Pakistan Prime Minister has been quick off the mark to deny any such explosion or testing of nuclear device.

If we take a look at the track record of Pkistan over the last 30-40 years, we would note that it is a story of perfidy, deceit, deception and treachery. The latest situation is only an addition to it. While they have been talking about peaceful relationship with India, we have been subjected to three wars in 1947, 1965 and 1971. In the last one, unhappily, Pakistan was dismembered into Pakistan and Bangla-

[Shri K. P. Singh Deo]

desh and, although public memory is short but, this sort of aspect is not easily forgotten and that may be one of the reasons why overt and covert attempts are being made against India to destabilise various aspects of Indian life.

While Pakistan has been talking about the spirit of Simla agreement and bilateral agreements, they have been harping in the United Nations resolutions on Kashmir over and over again. They have been helping terrorists and extremists with shelter, harbours, training and motivation of various kinds and infiltration, smuggling and gun-running between our borders. Then they have played a dubious role in the various hijackings which have taken place.

While they have very intelligently joined the non-aligned movement and even attended the Seventh non-aligned movement at Delhi, they have been waxing eloquent about peaceful uses of nuclear energy. The Chairman of Pakistan Atomic Energy Commission has been boasting in the International Atomic Energy Authority meetings in Vienna, how they have taken the most difficult route to achieving nuclear technology, that is the enrichment of uranium and how it is a Herculean task and how in spite of the impediments put by various developed countries, nuclear countries, they have achieved considerable success as far as the enrichment of uranium and also the reprocessing is concerned.

Although in 1984, the United States Government did warn the Pakistan Government and its Heads of Administrations and stipulated four conditions in which they would withdraw all aid in case Pakistan did go ahead with reprocessing of its wastes, if it did go ahead with nuclear testing of its device and if it would continue with this enrichment programme, if it would have an open testing. In spite of all these conditions, they have been flagrantly violated. No American reaction as in 1972 when Mr. Henry Kissinger flew down to Islamabad to warn the then Prime Minister Mr. Bhutto that they would make a horrible example if they did not stop, enrichment programme

and also the reprocessing of Uranium, was forthcoming now. No such action or reaction or response has come in spite of the fact that they are very much aware of the clandestine manner in which Pakistan has been getting the technology and the various sophisticated parts and sub-assemblies which have been beautifully brought out by the British Broadcasting Corporations film on the Islamic bomb which many of our Hon. Members have had the facility of seeing here in the Central Hall of Parliament. This has happened sometime in 1978-79. The film was made available. It is not for the first time we are discussing the subject. But it has come at a very timely juncture. The previous speakers have already mentioned that there are only two screws away from the device and bomb.

Now, Sir, having just a bomb is of no consequence without the delivery system. Going by the published materials available to everyone both from the general Press as well as from institutions who deal with it like the Institute of Defence Studies as well as the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, it is now crystal clear that Pakistan does possess the other system as well as they are on the threshold of exploding a bomb. This delivery system is also capable of delivering tactical and even strategic nuclear pay-load. Although we need not be alarmed or panicky but this is the time for introspection and to see how we can meet the situation.

I would also like to take into consideration the role of the various developed countries whether we call them super-powers or whether we call them 'highly industrialised nations'. Also, the world in general is aware of the movement for disarmament which has taken a passive nature although the movement for detente and disarmament is growing in the world but it has not had the desired amount of success in preventing the proliferation as well as the worsening of the strategic environment in various places and as pointed out by the learned Professor as destabilisation of regional areas—whether it is in our continent or elsewhere but it is a most dangerous event taking place in our sub-continent. It affects every life of our country, every citizen of our country.

Now the latest offer by the U.S. and the certification by the President of the United States to Pakistan and the promise of 600 million dollars in the wake of the 3.2 billion dollars which has been given in the last five years and the 4.2 billion dollars coming in the next 5 to 6 years is not very clear whether the AWACS i.e. Airborne Warning and Control Systems, which is sought to be given to Pakistan as the published reports indicate, is part and parcel of that. As has been brought out by various Members, this sophisticated and highly complex command control and communication system will make a sea-change in the entire security environment and will also induce an arms race amongst the various developing countries including ours. This, to my mind, is another way of following the Von Clausewitz theory, that war is a continuation of the State policy by other means. That means, it will force us and other countries of this Sub-Continent into diverting the valuable resources from development to national security or to defence needs. If we see the type of equipment and weapons which have been given, we will find this. One is the Harpoon Missiles which cannot be used anywhere but in the sea, and over and over again spokesmen from our Government have raised it in this House that it cannot be used either against the Soviet Union or against Afghanistan; it can only be used against us and our Navy. The M1A1 Abrams heavy tank, which the learned professor was mentioning can only be used in the plains, and the only plains available are the plains of the Punjab, Gujarat, J and K. and Rajasthan. F-16C can be used against both sides, against Afghanistan or against us. We also know that Stinger Missiles were used in Siachin Glacier in Ladakh and not in Afghanistan. These latest and highly sophisticated weapon systems which are being given will be playthings in the hands of those people who do not know how to use them and will be used against us as we have seen in 1965 and 1971 to the detriment of both the nations and to their economy.

Along with the formation of the Central Command and the Rapid Deployment Force of the United States, this area which had been free from nuclear threat will now have this threat for times to come. And we have to ponder over it, and Government will have

to do some serious thinking how to neutralise and how to minimise its effect, the threat which is on our country.

If we also compare India's track record, as far as nuclear energy development programme or use of nuclear energy is concerned, we will see that, right from the early Fifties or even the late Forties, we had taken recourse to borrowing technology from Canada, the United States, France and other advanced countries—as for as nuclear energy was concerned—but today we are in a position where we have not only added to our indigenisation efforts and innovated and reached a position of self-reliance in technology but we are also in a position where we can help other third world countries. In the last general body meeting of the International Atomic Energy Authority in Vienna, the super powers were not keen to transfer technology to the poorer and the developing third world countries who are at the moment suffering from shortage of funds as well as energy, but on the other hand pressure was put on India to sign the NPT which India, rightly, has been refusing. And it goes to the credit, of our scientists that we made a commitment on behalf of India that we would share our technology and our expertise in the field of nuclear power generation with the developing third world countries at a time when nobody was willing to share it with them. While we have been keeping up to our principles and thesis of peaceful use of atomic energy and have gone ahead with Fast Breeder Technology Reactors in the field of industry, in the field of agriculture, life systems, in the field of medicines, we have also set up research centres for the Fast Breeder Technology Reactors. We have, by our tolerance and principled stand not gone in for the Uranium Enrichment Facilities which our scientists are capable of. This, I suppose, is being taken as a weakness and not as our principled stand. Therefore, this advantage which is being taken by the United States of America and Pakistan must be taken serious note of.

It is another matter of serious concern and of significance that the stepping up of arms race as well as the stepping up of activities to destabilise our country were intensified in 1980 and more specially after the 7th Non-Aligned conference here in Delhi in

[Shri K. P. Singh Deo]

1984 which saw the assassination our former Prime Minister Smt. Indira Gandhi.

The latest was on the 2nd October, 1986 where even 24 hours before, the whole world knew that there was going to be a dastardly attempt. This is an indication about the conspiracy and the ethos which are going on at the moment to destabilise our country by making targets of various people in administration, in public life and in the military life of our country who have done their yeomen's service to the country. They are being systematically removed from the face of the earth. This is something which we have to take due note of because this is having an effect on our stability, on our unity and integrity as well as national security aspects of both internal and external.

What are the options open to us? The options open are that in the event of the qualitative changes both both in quantum and quality, we shall have to be stepping up our defence efforts and we shall have to modernise and improve our thrust as well as the national security requirements. We shall have to update and make it more sophisticated to be in a position to neutralise the AWACS or other sophisticated systems which are being introduced into this environment. We shall have to spend a tremendous amount on civil defence measures which hitherto have been neglected in order to be ready for a nuclear environment as Europe has done or other countries have done where we are dismally unprepared. This is something which the Government will have to take note of.

As far as the nuclear options are concerned, the Prime Minister only recently has made it abundantly clear that we have kept our options open. Now, with this latest incident, we shall have to do serious thinking whether we should subject ourselves to nuclear black-mail and nuclear diplomacy or whether we should seriously go ahead with our nuclear programme to see that we don't face disastrous consequences.

Finally, at a time when SAARC as well as the Secretary-General and the Prime Minister of the USSR will be visiting India, I do hope and I am confident that the

Government will take it up very strongly on these aspects both with the Prime Minister of Pakistan as well as the Prime Minister of the USSR. Apart from following our stand that we like to solve all our problems through peaceful negotiations, we should not be found wanting in strengthening our armed forces and our will of the people to face the challenges which would be forthcoming.

17.00 hrs.

SHRI BRAJAMOHAN MOHANTY (Puri)  
Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have been listening to the debate for the last one hour. I am afraid we have not the courage to say a spade a spade. I would recall one incident when Mr. Truman vacated the office of Presidency in USA the Press people asked him one question, namely, Mr. Truman when you are instrumental to the use of atom bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki are you not sorry for that? Mr. Truman's reply was 'no'. I am not sorry because if I had not used that the war would have prolonged and more people would have been killed than the people who have been killed because of the atom bomb at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. So there is a clarity of thinking.

I do not think that USA will do away with their global diplomacy inspite of our persuasion. What is their global diplomacy? A secret document has been published in American newspapers about the new guidelines for the US aid. What are those guidelines? The States which are promoting the strategic interests of the USA will be given aid and in that category come two-three countries like Egypt, Isreal and El Salvador. The second category of countries are those who are friendly countries and have offered bases in their countries for USA. Those countries will be supplied arms and aid and in that category comes Pakistan. My submission would be let the Foreign Minister check it up whether Pakistan has already given an airport base near Karachi which is being frequently used by USA.

I wonder how Pakistan continues to be in NAM movement. I demand that Pakistan should be expelled from NAM movement. The third guideline is that they must give aid to the countries which ultimately will open up markets to the affluent countries of

the North and also that should be channelised through the private sector and not the public sector. According to USA public sector is in efficient and private sector is efficient.

This is the situation. We should not think that we can influence USA to change their global diplomacy. The other point is are we to alienate USA? That is also not possible because USA today stands at the centre of modern technology. All over the world all the countries are rushing to USA for technology. China is 15 years behind the modern technology that the super-powers have. For their F-8 aircraft China is now negotiating for electronic device with the USA. Negotiations are going on with the USA. USA gave assurance to the ASEAN countries that the weaponry being supplied to China will not be used against them. But unfortunately, when the Vice-President of USA visited India and a question was put to him about the assurance for the arms being supplied to Pakistan, he did not give an assurance. The earlier assurance had been violated. This time they were reluctant even to give the assurance.

In this background, the greatest danger comes from the Chinese collaboration with Pakistan. The United States of America and China have entered into nuclear cooperation agreement, and as per the report of the Washington Post, with the assistance of China, the manufacture of atomic bomb is being done in Pakistan. That is the intelligence report which has been disclosed by the Washington Post. That is the situation.

I am very happy that the CPI-M leader, Shri Namboodiripad has clarified the position. According to the report in the Indian Express dated 10th May, 1985 Shri Namboodiripad said at a public meeting :

We see a global conspiracy of US imperialism encircling India, judging by events in Pakistan, Sri Lanka and elsewhere..... 'Hitlerism' had taken a new birth in Mr. Reagan and the US was threatening all peace loving people of the world. He claimed that General Zia of Pakistan or Mr. Jayewardane of Sri Lanka should not be looked

upon as individuals but part of a global conspiracy of US imperialism."

I agree with him only with one addition —with collaboration of China...  
(Interruptions).

I want a national consensus about our attitude so far as defence of our country is concerned or so far as national security is concerned. We should have the courage to call a spade a spade. If we do not have that courage, only God can help us.....  
(Interruptions). Even with one sentence they get alarmed.

In this connection, I would like to mention about the Resolution of the Janta Party. They have made an appeal in the Resolution to neighbouring countries, namely Pakistan and China that they should not allow India to be the arsenal of weaponry. I am quoting it from here, so that I am not misunderstood :

"The final resolution as adopted by the party accused the Congress of continuing to ('misguide' the people by referring time and again to the 'possibility' of invasion across our frontier."

They say this, as if we are doing it. Further :

"As far as threats to India from across the border are concerned, the Janta Party has expressed the 'hope' that the present regimes of 'Pakistan, China and other neighbours would not plunge this subcontinent into mini nuclear race "

They have made an appeal to Pakistan and China to help us not to go nuclear. Whatever it may be, Shri Jaipal Reddy is a revolutionary young man sitting in the left and he will see that it is rectified.

What we are concerned is that there should be unity of approach in India to this problem so that we are able to fight the American imperialism. The attitude should crystalize and let us analyse things one by one. Is there a threat or not? If there is a threat, how to counteract that. So far as

[Shri Brajamohan Mohanty]

nuclear threat is concerned, Pakistan admit that they have got the capability of enrichment of uranium to the extent of 93.55 per cent. If 90 per cent uranium enrichment is achieved, one has the capability to manufacture an atomic bomb. They have got that power. Whether *Washington Post* is correct or not is not the point. If not today, tomorrow, they will manufacture the bomb. So far, Pakistan has the power to manufacture one bomb per year. USSR has 2700 and USA also has 2700, whereas UK and China have 300. On one side, this gives rise to a question of ideology and on the other, security of the country. In the year 1939 this crisis did take place. When the question of supporting the war came up, Gandhiji went one way and the Congress Working Committee went the other way. Gandhiji stated that non-violence was his creed whereas the Congress Working Committee stated that non-violence was their policy. In 1981 when Janata Party was discussing about the policy on nuclear atomic bomb, Shri Morarji Desai stated that he would not go in for a bomb even if the whole world goes nuclear. But the party took a different stand.

If Pakistan manufactures an atomic bomb, we have to reconsider this matter and we have to keep our options open. This is a very delicate and sensitive question and in this regard we have to give guidance to history and we should not be guided by history. Our experience must be taken into account. This is why, my submission is that there should be a national unity in our approach. This is not a matter which could be confronted with smiles and in a joking manner. If Pakistan goes nuclear, we have to take a firm decision. Let the Government spell out their alternative policies. The Indo-Soviet Treat will not be of any assistance to us if Pakistan starts a nuclear war against us because there is nothing in the Indo-Soviet Treaty which will come to our rescue. We have only two options. Either we must go in for a nuclear bomb or we must have some other alternative system of defence. I would like the entire House to have one united stand in this regard.

17.12 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER *In the Chair*]

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY (Mahbubnagar) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, it is only in April that we had a full-dress debate on the defence preparedness of our country. I will not be guilty of exaggeration if I say that a sea-change has come about in the external security environment of the country just in the last few months. I would go to the point of saying that the sharp deterioration that has come about in the strategic environment is perhaps the worst now, since the Indo-Pak war of 1971. In my view, this deterioration has come about on account of three major developments. Firstly, the proven nuclear weapon capability of Pakistan; secondly, the prospect of supply of AWACS to Pakistan; and thirdly Chinese intrusion sometime in May into the Sumdorong Chu Valley and other parts of Tawang district of Arunachal Pradesh. These three developments, through each is important in itself, are in fact, in my view basically inter-linked.

Sir, everybody quoted the *Washington Post*, but they did not mention the name of the correspondent. The name of the correspondent was Barb Wood ward. It was he who exposed the Water gate and more recently the dis-information programme of President Reagan. Sir, he says that the Nuclear Test in Pakistan took place between September 18 and 21. One cannot dismiss the report of such a correspondent lightly. But I was surprised to note though a sort of explanation which was offered by Prof. Swell, though indirectly, that the Chairman of Bhabha Atomic Research Commission, Mr. Iyyengar, said that they were not nuclear tests and they were only seismic shocks. We have fortunately in the House right now, the ex-Minister for External Affairs—they keep on changing so often that the country cannot keep track of them—but presently his incarnation is Minister for Nuclear Energy. Therefore, he should be able to answer this question.

PROF. G. G. SWELL (Shillong) : At least that was an unwitting red-herring.

**SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY :** I did not say that for casting a reflection on you. I merely said this, to seek clarifications from the Government in regard to the statement of the Chairman of Bhabha Atomic Research Commission.

Now Sir, as has been mentioned earlier reports submitted by the special National Intelligence Estimates of United States cannot be taken lightly and they had been consistently warning the Administration of America that all the activities of Pakistan have been in total and flagrant contravention of assurance of Pakistan that it would not make the bombs. In spite of that, President Reagan has always deemed it fit to give certificate as required under the U.S. law and under what is called Samington Amendment, to say that Pakistan does not have a bomb. It may be technically true, I do not know but their own nuclear plant in Pakistan at Kahuta has enriched uranium upto 93.5 per cent. To produce a weapon what is required is only 90 per cent level enriched uranium. Even the expert opinion in the United States is no doubt divided. But the division of opinion in regard to this affair in the United States is rather narrow. One view is, that Pakistan is close to making the bomb. The other view is that the bomb has been almost made but sub-divided into various units which can be put together in a week's time.

So, in other words, the expert consensus in the United States also is that Pakistan has developed nuclear capability. One wonders, it is very intriguing to note, why the White House is deliberately turning a Nelson's eye to this effort or to this process in Pakistan. There is room to believe that U.S. will not really mind Pakistan going nuclear.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER :** Please be brief.

**SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY :** I have to answer the arguments of Mr. Mohanty.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER :** You don't answer Mr. Mohanty. The Minister is going to do it. Please be quick.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Basirhat) :** There should be an equitable allotment of time. It has not been done.

**SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY :** This is not a partisan bone of contention. The whole House is one. I would request you to be considerate.

It is very important to note that a U.S. State Department official was subjected to disciplinary action by the Reagan Administration for leaking out certain documents concerning Pakistan's nuclear preparedness, to South Korea with a view to dissuading South Korea from supplying high technology to Pakistan. For this, that official should have been complimented, but instead the Reagan Administration chose to proceed against that official.

As has been rightly mentioned by Shri Singh Deo Ji, it is not the bomb alone which is important. They have also developed the delivery system. As of now, as is known to us from authentic sources, they have developed a triple delivery system, Mirage-III, Chinese A-5 fleet and F-16s.

I now come to AWACS. I do not want to go into the technical details, but I can state one thing without fear of contradiction, that no weapon systems supplied by USA to Pakistan in the last 35 years is as devastating in its potential as AWACS. It can tremendous havoc. When our own Ambassador met Mr. Weinberger recently, he told that the AWACS gave a multiplier effect of five times. If they have 40 F-16s in Pakistan, they can do the job of 200 F-16s with the AWACS aircraft. So, whatever little superiority we might have laid claim to in Air Force so far has been offset, if not overwhelmed. Therefore, to me at the moment what is more important—I may be forgiven for saying this—than the nuclear preparedness of Pakistan, is the readiness of US to supply AWACS. It will lift the arms race in the Sub-continent to a totally different level altogether. Therefore, in my view, we must make this a major issue with the U.S. We must be capable of mounting a major diplomatic offensive. If the Minister thinks that we must have one more Festival in USA, we shall stage that. But we must

[Shri S. Jaipal Reddy]

do something to prevail upon the Administration in USA to see that AWACS is not provided. In case AWACS is provided, we will have to go in for counter-electronic measures; and that would mean a tremendous diversion of our resources from development to defence.

I do not mind if our Government does not acquire super computers. I do not know what their real worth is. But then, if we are to acquire super computers by signing the General Security of Military Information Agreement.

It will be a totally different proposition. I don't think that we should sign this agreement to acquire super computers. I have read somewhere that when the United States gave super computers to its closest ally Britain, it did not trust Britain; they posted their own Personnel. If the United States Administration did not trust Britain in regard to super computers, are you trying to delude yourself into believing that Reagan will trust you ?

In April, when we were discussing the Defence demand, the present Minister of External Affairs, Mr. Eduardo Faleiro, was waxing eloquent about India's determination to evict China from every inch of occupied territory. He has since become a Minister of External Affairs. He did not know that at about the same time, Chinese were entering into Sumdorong Valley. When we went for Seventh round of talks, we knew well that they had further infiltrated. I would like to know from the Government as to why the Government entered into talks with China at all ? I am not referring to settlement of border dispute; I am insistent on stringent observance of actual line of control; I am of the considered view that the *status quo ante* at least in regard to actual line of control must be restored.

I must say one thing in fairness to our Prime Minister that no other Head of our nation travelled so much abroad in so short a time. It is undoubtedly a matter of great distinction; and I may even say that no other nation's head travelled so widely. We have been told about many of his bold

and wide ranging foreign policy initiatives. What are the results ? I see them lying, all round us in a shambles. Mr. Weinberger came here to Delhi to give super computers so that you can have meteorological forecasts. But he went to Islamabad to give them AWACS. No Prime Minister can concentrate completely on External Affairs Ministry. But there should be some stability. I am talking of ministerial stability in the External Affairs Ministry; and we know how this lack of stability in Home portfolio has affected levels of our efficiency. Our external security can never be complete unless we see to it that the forces of disruption in our country are kept at bay. It will not be disclosing a national secret to say that pro-Pak elements in Kashmir Valley, which is on the border of Pakistan are active. I do not want to import any domestic controversy into the discussion on foreign policy, but I would like to say that the present arrangement of coalition in Kashmir,—we may discuss it on a different occasion—will not weaken pro-Pakistan elements. I am afraid, it has the potential of strengthening pro-Pak elements. I do not like to say more than that just now.

I do not know from what resolution of Janata Party Mr. Mohanty quoted.

I may tell you, Sir, the Janata Party always has been of the view that the nuclear options must be kept open, must be kept actively open. It redounds to the eternal credit of Morarji Desai who was then the Prime Minister, that he told Jimmy Carter that he would not sign the NPT under any circumstances.

In view of the new developments, I believe that we must actively keep considering the options in this area.

Sir, I am again back to AWACS.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Please conclude.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : The Government of India and the people of India must make it clear to the people of the United States that the supply of AWACS to Pakistan will be an unfriendly nay hostile act, against our country.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT (Arrah) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, we have a very serious challenge to our security. But I am happy and I think the House will also be happy that the demonstration of unity in this hour of great threat to our security will be an answer to all those who are combining to weaken India to de-stabilise first internally and to dismember if they can, from outside.

And this is the strength of Indian democracy which we have. We have never failed and on this critical issue the whole House is one, the Indian Parliament is one, the people are one and I think the message will go to all the quarters whether in Washington or in Islamabad or to others who are trying to weaken India.

This question is merely technical, whether Pakistan has a bomb or AWACS. And although the reports say that Pakistan is on way every inch of its progress towards acquiring a nuclear device, nuclear bomb explosion, publish more in the United States of America and the United States Congress has been more exercised time to time, than us. Of course we are all concerned, but we are not alarmed. We are not in a panic. This great country, it has inherent strength. We know the threats and we know the dimensions of the threat, the qualitative and quantitative aspects of it. But we are not alarmed. We are not panicking. But words of panic have come even from the people of United States and the United States Congress.

You remember Jack Anderson report when the Nuclear Cooperation Treaty between United States of America and China was signed by President Reagan in Beijing. He raised this and some Senators also raised it, the Chinese are involved in helping Pakistan in providing the enrichment facility, for their enrichment plant and the ratification of the Nuclear Cooperation Treaty between the U.S.A. and China had to be delayed because the Reagan Administration had to convince its own Congress that China is not involved in nuclear proliferation because this brings in the U.S. laws.

And, therefore, so far as this House is concerned, the Members raised from time to

time, it had been stated that—expressed an opinion—it is not a matter of surprise today that Pakistan is a few screw turns away from the bomb, or a few weeks from assembling the various components of the bomb. It is not a surprise to any one. We have been saying that Pakistan has adopted this option. You remember, in 1972 the then Prime Minister of Pakistan said that Pakistan will make the bomb even if it has to eat grass.

AN HON. MEMBER : What ?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : Eat grass.

This was the statement made in 1972 and that was an overt statement, open policy of going for the bomb in order to achieve parity with India, military parity and other parity, on all counts with India, that Pakistan will go anywhere seeking the achievement of bomb and making of bomb. This was the overtone. After this—this is a known fact and this is an important fact; since no Member has mentioned it, I would like to spell it out a little more and that shows what is the real position about it—Pakistan took a clandestine route of making a bomb. Why ? Because it was afraid that it had been the main benefactor from which it was getting enormous military and economic aid and the Simlton Amendment, the law in the US will come in the way of providing aid. It wanted both ways—eating the cake and having it too. Therefore, it took a clandestine route. Overt arrangements became covert. Since then, if you see, they followed the two track way—of acquiring clandestinely weapon grade plutonium—one track—and the other was of acquiring more sophisticated technical know how and actually the facilities for enriched uranium plan. Both ways it followed. You can see the famous nuclear metallurgist, Dr. Abdul. Qadir Khan, who has been described in the western press as the greatest spy of the century and he has been tried in various courts—Belgium and other countries—for trying to smuggle, which he succeeded ultimately with the connivance of the companies in those countries and also with the complacency of the governments in those countries, the centrifuge enrichment programme, a very important element towards acquiring the enrichment plant. This is what he was trying. Then again his another

[Shri B. R. Bhagat]

accomplice, Mr. Abdul Aziz Khan, was arrested in Canada in 1980 at the Montreal Airport for attempting to export 19 boxes of inverter component. That is another component which transforms energy from very high voltage to very minimum and vice versa. Thirdly, in the United States, Mr. Nazir Ahmed Vaid, made an attempt to smuggle 15 to 20 krytrons. That is a triggering device which, as Mr. Swell as rightly said, may be a non-nuclear component of a nuclear bomb. And it is rightly described by the Chairman of Atomic Energy Commission, Dr. Ramanna, when he says that they have not detonated a bomb. That means, they have indulged in explosion of a triggering device which is essential for perfecting the triggering of a bomb. This is a non-nuclear component, triggering of which may send seismic ways which are not attracted or detected by the verification system.

Pakistan has been pursuing a policy of acquiring a bomb and now they have reached a penultimate stage. They have everything ready in sub-assemblies.

Already there are two opinions in the United States according to the report that has been published by the US Intelligence Agency that either Pakistan has already a crude type of bomb kept in sub-assembly which they can just assemble in one week or they have are on the threshold of acquiring a bomb. So, just to meet the technical requirement of US law, they are keeping everything ready in sub-assemblies. The President has to certify in the beginning of the financial year and that is what he did on the 27th.

And there again you see how the wording of the certificate is. He has certified that Pakistan 'currently—the word 'currently is important—does not have a bomb. He may have a bomb a week after. Therefore, he meets the technical requirements. So, I feel the situation in United States has changed. President Reagan's unlimited power over foreign policy and security options are not there now because the Senate is controlled by the Democrats...*(Interruptions)*.

AN HON. MEMBER : House also.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : In the House it is already there and now in the Senate also. President Reagan is there only for two more years. Therefore, I think here is a point for us, for—those who are working for a different kind of world, who are working for peace, for nuclear disarmament, who are working for de'tente, who are trying that the two great powers, United States of America and the Soviet Union, should meet in a submit, first tackle the question of nuclear disarmament and then of all the regional conflicts and create conditions of peace. There is a hope and we have to work in that direction. Therefore, the point I am making is that we are faced with a situation where we have to live with a nuclearly capable Pakistan, even if Pakistan does not actually have a bomb today, at this hour of time. This changes the complete security dimensions for this country. Some of our colleagues here from both sides have pointed out to that. But the point is that we have to contend with it. It is not Pakistan we have to contend with, but it is the force behind Pakistan that we have to contend with. And what is the force behind Pakistan? The mighty United States of America. And what is the United States of America's perception? This is very important. We have to choose our options and play our diplomatic initiative. We have to determine the parameters of United States of America's policy. A well-known strategic consensus, strategic perception in this region is that they are determined to build Pakistan a militarily strong Pakistan. Pakistan is using Afganistan situation to its maximum advantage. In the repeated meetings, in the proximity talks held under the aegis of the General Secretary of the United Nations, it is a known fact, it is a recorded fact that whenever there was a situation of a break through towards a political solution of the Afganistan question, Pakistan always withdrew because Pakistan was not interested in having a solution. They want to take the maximum advantage. Their perception is to be on equal footing, if not on higher footing. They want military parity with India and always poses a threat to India. They want to determine the relationship on their own terms. But it is the U.S. perception we are concerned with. Think of the dynamics of the international situation. The Members have spoken about the strong mighty Weinburger's visit. I do not know what happened.

Whatever might have happened. I am quite sure the Minister is not going to disclose that. But one thing is very clear and it has come out from his own statement that he is one person who is a purveyor of power, diplomacy through power, and he is the representative of the military-industrial complex of America, and, therefore, they are trying to do this with Soviet Union but with no results. Whatever is happening, they think in their conception, a strategic perception in their relations with the Soviet Union—another mighty power. They think that because in their perception they are stronger in economic power, they will be able to lead wide the Soviet Union if they accelerate the harmful arms race. They spend trillions of dollars—not billions, trillions of dollars—on their STI and other initiatives, and they think that the Soviet Union, in their weakness, will accept their supremacy of high technology. This is the language I think in this country people should understand—the real meaning of high technology. Through high technology they are trying to dominate the world. This is what they are trying to do with the Soviet Union. Imagine, what they can do to India. Their perception of India is, they may say so; they are saying, they are expressing all friendship to us—good words—co-operation. We also reciprocate because India's basic policy is to have friendship with all. India's basic policy is to have peace, nuclear disarmament, non-aligned movement, to sign the declaration. All these we do. We are also interested in having good co-operative relations between United States and India, but at equal footing. This should be understood in this House, it is the Soviet Union and Soviet Union alone which is interested in the emergence of a strong, united, democratic and progressive India which can play a role for stability of peace and co-operation and equal development in the international economic field. It is no other country. Every other country because of their high military industrial complex, they want to manipulate. They try to manipulate with the Soviet Union. Imagine, why should they not try to manipulate with India. And through Pakistan they can do. They can give Light Combat Aircraft. They can give us Super Computer but at their own terms. I warn the Government. They would like to instal their man there where their super computer is. That should never be accepted. We will give

them the guarantee. India has a wonderful record. We will not pass on information. There will be no leakage. We have not indulged in this kind of thing. This is a country with certain high moral value. But certainly we will not accept anything which is derogatory to the national interest, to the image and honour of India. It can do that. They will arm Pakistan to their teeth. This is what they have done. More than nuclear Bomb-AWACS. Imagine. Beautifully Prof. Swell has explained in one word the stationing of their AWACS. This will mean to strengthen five times the Air Force capacity of Pakistan, apart from their Air control or surveillance and other things. We have to match them. It is to weaken India because we have to critically divert. It is a very critical situation as we have to divert our resources from development to Defence. That will hurt us. That is what they want. Therefore, this is the situation. We should not be alarmed and we have to live with this situation. But we have to work hard. Not being alarmed, not being panicky, we have to take a mature decision. What are the mature calculations? Here again I say the consensus of the House, the unity of the House, the unity of the people of India is very important. Should we have a nuclear Bomb or not? This decision should not be taken out of panic. On our defence requirements, our defence strategic requirements the decision should be unanimous. There should not be any division on this. Because, this is a matter which effects our resources diversion from development to defence.

The Prime Minister himself said that Pakistan is going nuclear, Pakistan is acquiring nuclear bomb. We have to fundamentally apprise ourself of the situation. Prime Minister has said that he is aware of the situation and this Government is aware of the situation. Parliament will not agree to compromise in any way the defence needs, the defence requirements, the strategic considerations of the country. But our work requires another field. We have to be active in another field.

A choice was made—we will have to talk to Pakistan. Certainly, we shall talk to Pakistan. SAAC provides a forum in which there are areas of co-operation in which we can do that. But we cannot lower

{Shri B. R. Bhagat}

our guard so far as our defence requirement is concerned *vis-a-vis* Pakistan. We have been cheated several times, we have been attacked several times, we cannot lose our sight on this. But certainly we will work. Therefore, what is important is that it is not only the military might, but the unity of India, the economic strength—India has emerged in the world today, not only in South Asia but in the world today, whether in the non-aligned forum or within South Asia, as a leading power, a progressive power. It had moral force before and it has moral and material force today. It is a strong power. We have to maintain our strength and that is the only answer to all these establishing factors.

Lastly, I would say, we have to keep up the initiative. General Secretary Gorbachov is coming, he is the only hope for mankind. From the initiative he has taken, he is the hope of mankind and he has great hope from this country. In his Vladivostok speech he threatens his crusade for the security in Asia and Pacific. He says, 'Great India and the democratic force.' He has great hope from us and we have great hope from him and it is a very fortunate thing. It is the only silver lining among the dark clouds that he is coming over here. We have to discuss this and therefore, we have to be together. India has to take the initiative so that in the world the powers or those who are still hesitating are forced to come to the nuclear disarmament and towards peace and solution of all problems through discussions, through these meetings, so that whether it is Afghanistan or Nicaragua or any other country, all problems can be solved politically so that there is no scope for this, and we have to work towards this. We are in the right direction and we are in the right company, and this is the line that we should take. There is no cause for worry although the situation is quite serious, but we must take it as a mature nation, as a strong nation, as a nation with a future and as a nation which has certain firm commitments towards peace and security.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI (Guwahati):  
Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I am not an alarmist and it is not with a

sense of panic that I have approached this debate. But the fact remains that the security environment in this country and the sub-continent today is probably at its worst, much worse than when we were dragged into an armed conflict with Pakistan in 1965 or even that of 1971 when the United States 'Enterprise entered the Bay of Bengal. This situation has arisen primarily for two reasons. It is because of the arming of our neighbour Pakistan with sophisticated weapons by the United States and the United States' increased military presence in the region. Today our entire land and sea border is vulnerable to nuclear attack. In the Indian Ocean itself during the last decade the United States' military presence is multiplied by 20 times. The number of combat vessels of the United States, according to a very conservative estimate, is 60 and apart from it there are 30 vessels fully equipped vessels of Britain, France, Australia and New Zealand. The amount that has been earmarked by the United States Administration for arming this region has been raised by many hundred million Dollars. Added to it we have got the internal problem of Punjab on the North and an explosive situation that may develop in the South because of the Sri Lanka situation the end of the tunnel of which seems to be far away. But the fact remains that one can draw a tall list of designs of U.S. imperialists. The designs are manifold designs. Firstly, arming of a country or increasing military environment of defence insecurity in a particular region help the United States military industrial complex because it can continue to sell arms to the developing countries. Added to it, it leads to economic domestic weakness in the developing countries because even today we have been compelled to spend much more than we can afford for our defence purposes and because of the new security environment we shall have to spend much more. And that seems to be the demand of the House. Let us also not forget that during the last decades, no major war has taken place either in Europe or in the developed countries but more than 120 or about 130 wars and arm conflicts have taken place in the developing countries, primarily because of the intervention of United States. And this has been done with the sole purpose that these developing countries cannot achieve economic self-sufficiency and independence.

I have spoken about the North. But even in Sri Lanka, there is military base of United States a Australia. Even in the name of internal security, we have heard that Israeli Mossad have entered in Sri Lanka. Therefore, our own security perceptions have become very gloomy.

Mr. Bhagat has pointed out that after all, it is a known fact that Pakistan was going nuclear and for the last about 10 years, clandestinely they were trying to make themselves equipped with nuclear weapons. It is a known fact. In fact, Abdul Qadir Khan was banned by the Dutch Government, a few years back because he was transferring the nuclear secrets to Pakistan. In this clandestine attempt by Pakistan to acquire nuclear bombs, Pakistan has clandestinely gone to companies of Netherlands, Switzerland, West Germany, France, Britain, Belgium and Canada. According to newspaper reports—one has no reason to doubt these reports—that Pakistan nuclear capability of producing the bomb has been contributed by companies who have worked dubiously and clandestinely in these countries. And I have got a question to ask the Hon. External Affairs Minister and the question is that when these things are known to this country, and known to this country so long, what diplomatic offensive did we take with Netherlands, Switzerland, West Germany, France, Britain, Belgium and Canada to see that Pakistan could not acquire the nuclear capability. It is no use Mr. Bhagat telling us today that it is a known fact that Pakistan was getting nuclear. If it is a known fact and it was a known fact because every young boy who reads newspapers knows it, why was no diplomatic offensive not taken on the part of our country because with some of these countries, we have got definitely very friendly relations? It is also a matter to note, as has been pointed out by newspaper report that some of the companies which have been found violating even the important nuclear agreements, their punishment has been only to the extent of something like 15 months imprisonment or a fine of \$15,000, when the amounts involved in these clandestine operations were many hundred million dollars. After all, when you talk of extradition between one country and another, why could we not for the sake of international

peace, approach these countries and point out to them that if these countries do not sufficiently safeguard their capabilities, and their nuclear know-how and the capabilities are permitted to be transferred to Pakistan, it creates an atmosphere of instability in the region, and therefore, they should prevent it? At least, to our knowledge, up till now, the External Affairs Ministry have not given any information to us that any effort in that direction has been made so far. I do not know whether we took up the matter seriously with the Dutch Government when this gentleman Abdul Qadir Khan, whom Mr. Bhagat described as the greatest spy of this century was banned from entering Netherlands because he was transferring technical know-how of a nuclear bomb to Pakistan.

Sir, it is also a fact—that has been reported in *Muslim* today in Washington—that the American Administration will turn a blind eye or will not come down heavily, if a bomb is found in Zia's basement. And I have no hesitation in my mind that in spite of all the changes that have taken place either in the Congress or in the Senate, ultimately an amendment to that Act even may be brought in order to help the Pakistan Administration. It is because, American's perception in this region is totally different from our own perception. And that has been further confirmed because America has lost Vietnam, because America could not prop up Marcos in Philippines, because America could not keep the Shah of Iran there and therefore they are relying more today upon Pakistan. In spite of changes of Parties in the American domestic policy, I have a feeling that in the name of containing communism in Afghanistan, American Administration will ultimately be able to give support to Pakistan in the manner that it has been given today.

Now the question that confronts us is was what are our options? Obviously, we must not have a panic reaction. We can go nuclear and the option must be kept open. But the fact remains that if every country goes and enters into this nuclear race, where does mankind go. This is a basic question to which we must address ourselves. Today in Europe a popular movement on the biggest scale has come against deployment of nuclear

[Shri Dinesh Goswami]

missiles. We have seen this from newspaper reports and on the TV and even in Copenhagen I had the opportunity of witnessing one such demonstration in a small city where thousands of people marched against the deployment of nuclear missiles. If that is so, why cannot we appeal to the people of Pakistan and around neighbouring regions, the dangers of all of us going nuclear? If Pakistan and India go nuclear, there will be a nuclear race in the subcontinent itself. I am not asking you to close the options. I am not saying that we should make a declaration like Shri Morarji Desai that at no point of time we will manufacture a bomb. But I believe that the time has come that for the sake of international peace, a kind of peace offensive should be launched in this subcontinent similar to the peace movement which is growing in Europe. Equally, I believe that our diplomatic offensive on the security of the sub-continent has been on a low key. We have taken up very seriously, many of the important questions at international level as Head of NAM the question of South Africa and the question of Palestine. Rightly so. But, we feel that by the same diplomatic offensive, we have not taken up the questions of security dangers to our region. It may be that we feel embarrassed to take up our own case. It may be that we feel that our own case should find a secondary place. Because we have been threatened today, we should not give the security perception of this region a secondary place to other more important international issues. Let us not forget that if the World War III starts at any point of time, it would be because of the quarrels or war between the developing nations. That danger is there and, therefore, what I feel is that in the list of priorities at non-aligned meet and also at other international forums, the question of peace and security in the sub-continent should find a place of importance and priority along with the other questions that we have projected so far. I feel that much more diplomatic offensive is necessary from the Government of India in this regard.

With these words, I thank you.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : It is already 18.05 hrs. The House may adjourn.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : The Hon. Minister wants to reply. He is the last speaker.

PROF. N. G. RANGA : When will the Hon. Minister reply ?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : The Hon. Minister is going to reply now. Shri Indrajit Gupta may speak now.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : I am afraid I am the most unfortunate speaker today.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : The House should adjourn.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I hope that the House will accept this thing. ... (*Interruptions*). The Hon. Minister wants to reply today itself. I hope the House will now accept.

SHRI ZAINUL BASHER (Ghazipur) : I want to speak. Some other Members also want to speak.... (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Two hours time is allotted.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI SHEILA DIKSHIT): I am going to lay the facts and it is for the House to decide. The Hon. Minister has to reply today because he has to go to the debate from 12 noon onwards to the Rajya Sabha tomorrow. So, we will not be able to continue this debate tomorrow. So, if the Members want to sit till 10 or 11 O'Clock, well, it is up to the Members to decide. We cannot have it both ways. We cannot finish the debate at 18.15 hrs or 18.00 hrs sharp.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA (Bankura): He can come back from the Rajya Sabha debate.

SHRIMATI SHEILA DIKSHIT : Please give me a moment's time. The Business Advisory Committee there has sanctioned or allotted 1200 to 1300 hrs and then between five and six. It would be nice if the debate that has been debated today in the Lok Sabha is covered. This is my request.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : We will finish it today. Whoever want to speak, let them be brief.

PROF. N. G. RANGA : The subject is like that.

*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Tomorrow it is not possible. Now we are finishing it. If you are brief, it is possible. If everyone wants to take 20 minutes or so, it would not be possible.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Sir, we must keep the Press-men also in view. They have to go and report.....

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : That is not our problem. That is an entirely different thing. Let them publish it tomorrow, if they want. Now, Shri Indrajit Gupta can speak.

*(Interruptions)*

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Basirhat) : Sir, at the fag end of the debate I do not want to tax the patience of members of the House and therefore I will be very brief, hoping for some adequate response from the Treasury Benches to the various very serious and important points which have been raised by various speakers on both the sides. The first thing I want to say is that a very unprecedented and very significant and very ominous, to my mind, development took place recently : that was the first time that this country had a visit from the United States' Secretary of State for Defence. No previous United States' Defence Secretary has ever visited our country. It was not worth their while to visit. Because in one area at least in one sector of defence matters we have followed consistently a policy of not permitting any kind of link-up or tie-up or any kind of penetration of the United States. This policy has been followed from the time of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. And I do not want our country now, in the name of high-technology to sell its soul for the sake of a super-computer. That also, you may never get. Why did Mr. Weinberger come here ? I want a reply to this question. He came. He did not come on his own. He was invited. Why ? He was given a red-carpet welcome. He was taken to see some of our

Defence installations I do not think that has anything to do with a super-computer-including our aeronautics plant at Bangalore. After he came back from Bangalore to Delhi, he said—he was quoted rather as saying : "he was very much pleased with his visit". Immediately after meeting the Prime Minister, he said his visit "will be effective in improving the relationship of the U. S. Military with the Indian Military". What does all this mean ? Are we not to have some explanation or some clarification from the Government ? For the first time there was an attempt—whether it will succeed or not, I do not know. I hope it will not succeed—that in some critical areas, in defence apparatus, one being the Light Combat Aircraft and may be acquisition of some other weaponry, we are now thinking opening the gates for the first time in our history to the United States knowing fully well what their policy is—so many people have spoken about it. I do not want to repeat that—knowing fully well what their global strategy is; knowing fully well what their attitude towards India has always been and knowing fully well what their attitude to Pakistan has always been. I want to know why he was invited here. Why he was taken to our Defence installations ? Why he was given this red-carpet welcome ? And the tragedy of the whole thing is from the Government's point of view that after he went straight from Delhi to Islamabad the next thing we knew was that he was offering Zia-ul-Haq AWACS, a new thing which has added a new dimension to the whole security environment in this region, a major thrust in altering, I should say, the geo-strategic environment in this region and what might be described as a quantum-jump in highly sophisticated military technologies which go far beyond the legitimate security requirements of Pakistan. This was what we got from him. We brought him here, we dined and wined him, we feted him. When he went, he had a complaint of upset-stomach on the last day and he could not attend the last meeting. He flew from here straight to Islamabad, and the next thing that we got on our head was this AWACS for Pakistan. I am very much troubled and worried about this because it never happened before. Now, the only beneficiary of his visit has been the Pakistan dictator. According to the reports—I am not an expert on this; we are all going

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

by what we read in the press—instead of the E-2C Hawkeye AWACS which was rejected earlier by Pakistan, the United States is now willing to supply A-3A Sentry which is a more sophisticated and capable AWACS aircraft.

The point is, the Indian Air Force has a system of defence on our western border, and that entire system is now being thrown open, giving Pakistan not only the advantage of interception but, if they want at any time to have a pre-emptive strike against our bases—I do not want to go into all that; it has all appeared, what the capabilities of this AWACS are—then all our main bases, whether it is Srinagar or Pathankot or Amritsar or Delhi, Hindon, or Ambala or Jodhpur or Jamnagar, to mention a few of them, can all be pinpointed and watched by this AWACS aircraft flying along the border, say, one kilometre or five kilometres inside Pakistan; they can watch the movement of every aircraft from any of these fields. Now, what is to be our response to this, I do not know. I have no idea. Government should tell us. They cannot spell out here obviously. Are we to go in for some type of equipment which can counteract the AWACS? Obviously we have not got any such equipment here, nor can we manufacture it with our present resources and capabilities. Then are we to be driven and pressurized by this development to spend large sums of money to acquire from abroad some types of equipment which will counteract this AWACS? I do not know. But it is a very serious state we are reduced to. Rs. 8000 crores a year is the figure that our Defence budget has already reached. This year I am sure it will be higher. This is part of the game to drive the developing countries into an arms race which will compel them to divert their already scarce resources into these things instead of using these for development and to meet the needs of our poverty-stricken people. This is also part of the game of imperialism. So, this is a very serious matter and I think, the immediate threat is from AWACS. And what is more, it appears from the press reports that the Americans have said that they may not be able to supply Pakistan with their own AWACS immediately, but in the interim period

Pakistan has asked for the United States AWACS aircraft with United States personnel to operate on this Indo-Pakistan border until they are in a position to acquire their own aircraft. What does it mean? It means that Pakistan, whether they decline it or not, is becoming a part of this CENTO, the U. S. Central Command. The interim arrangement, as somebody said, would mean virtually a United States base in Pakistan. It is also something new. When we were having a long controversy and debate as to whether we should have a treaty of friendship and cooperation, Pakistan always used to counter it by saying that they want a non-aggression treaty. Nobody could understand clearly what was the difference between the two. Now it is quite clear.

I think from our side we had made it quite clear that the basic thing in any treaty that the two countries sign should be that neither side would give any part of its territory for foreign military bases. That is the thing they never agreed to. They went on saying non-aggression pact and we went on saying treaty of peace and friendship and cooperation which would include a specific commitment not to allow foreign military base on the soil either of India or of Pakistan. They never agreed. Now we can see what is happening.

So, we will have to think afresh, no doubt. Our defence policy, our foreign policy, our whole international relations' policy require to be gone into in great depth and we cannot afford to take a very long time about it as to what we are going to do.

As far as the Bomb goes, I have to state, many members here have stated, even those who have said that we should keep our options open, that we should not be panicky. After all, China has developed the bomb long ago and other countries have got their bombs. Pakistan obviously is trying to manufacture a bomb—whether they have actually done it or not, or whether they are on the verge of it, I don't know. I also do not know whether they are two screw-driver turn away. How many screw-driver turns away are we? If we want to develop a bomb, I suppose, we are not behind Pakistan. The point is we should not be stampeded and

allow ourselves to be stampeded into a nuclear arms race because we do not believe that this is going to add to our security. This is a wrong idea to think that we should join the band of nations which depend on the balance of terror and live under a balance of terror and think that, that will be the more effective deterrent. I think that philosophy is not going to work out in the world anywhere.

Mr. Goswami has also referred to the great big peace movements which are taking place throughout the world today. Mr. Dinesh Singh spoke about trying to reach out to the American people. It is a very good idea, I agree. But what about trying to reach out to the people of Pakistan who are opposed to Zia-ul-Haq. There is a big movement going on in Pakistan for the restoration of democracy. People are coming out on the streets facing bullets and lathis with great courage. There, everybody is not a Zia-ul-Haq. There are ordinary people who do not want war with India, who do not like the way their military government is behaving and who do not like a growing American presence there. They are trying to speak out, they have been vocal, they are fighting they are demonstrating just as people are demonstrating in United States of America against Reaganism. Those are the people who are our potential allies, who stand for peace and who stand for friendly relations. So, we must think of a way of reaching out to those people. I think, definitely we should not be stampeded into a nuclear arms race. I am saying that we should carefully consider all the implications that is there. Afterall, there are very small neighbouring countries also with us. We are the biggest country in this part of the world. We also should not do something which will only make others more suspicious and apprehensive to us. This is also a consideration that we have to think of.

I will only say that some initiative is required on the Indian Ocean question. Indian Ocean area has become, as many members have said, a highly dangerous and explosive area for our security. The Prime Minister, Mr. Rajiv Gandhi speaking in a function, I think in Australia, is reported to have said that it is time that all the countries who are littoral countries bordering on the

Indian Ocean should take some collective initiative to bring about some kind of a dialogue on the Indian ocean even if some people are trying to obstruct it. That conference could have been held years ago. It was approved by United Nations. It could not be held upto today because the USA is not willing to take part in such a conference. Everybody else including the Soviet Union is ready to participate in such a conference. Now what are we to do? Are we to go on waiting indefinitely like this? I would say Government should seriously consider some initiative which India has to take of bringing together the governments of these littoral States of the Indian ocean as many of them as can be mobilised for a conference which should spell out what is meant by a zone of peace and what do we want to do in the Indian ocean. I am quite sure you will have the full backing of the Soviet Union. Mr. Gorbachow is coming. You can speak to him about it and also so many other States of Asia, Africa and South East Asia who are all deeply concerned about this region. We should not make ourselves the victims of a sort of veto by the USA just because they want to sabotage the conference all the time. That is one line on which, I think, we should try to proceed. If AWACS has to be countered it cannot be countered by appeals and philosophy and such like things. It is not a question of some distant threat or a threat from distant land. It is offensive military hardware which is being given by the Americans to Pakistan. To that extent I suppose we will have to willy nilly do something to counter it. Much as I deplore the huge investment of scarce resources which will again be required but that is the plight we are in.

Finally, Sir, we have been told that what was discussed with Casper Weinberger is confidential. It cannot be revealed. Okay that only adds to our suspicions. Mr. Weinberger is known to be one of the biggest hawks in Washington. In the whole military industrial complex there are two-three renowned hawks and Mr. Weinberger is one of them. If you may remember last year when Mr. Reagan flying to Geneva for the first summit meeting with Gorbachow it was Mr. Weinberger who arranged the so-called leakage of a letter or a document to the world Press in which he

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

had asked Mr. Reagan to be cautious when talking to Mr. Gorbachow not to fall in his trap and not to agree to something which later on the US would regret. Before the meeting began and while Mr. Reagan was in the plane on his way to Geneva it was this gentleman who did his best to sabotage the whole thing. He is called here now. Why? He is Defence Secretary. That means he is coming here to discuss Defence matters with us. We have never discussed Defence matters with USA before. We have never tried to bring them into our Defence apparatus. So I want an assurance from the Government that we are not going to allow this to go on. These loopholes have to be plugged. On the one hand you accuse the US of building up huge military complex in Pakistan and on the other hand for the sake of some super computer—I do not know for what purpose you want it—we should not make concessions in the military sector at least to the United States. That is all I have to say at the moment because I do not want to take up more time. We would like to know from the Government something about what they are thinking to meet this very very grave situation.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE  
MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS  
(SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH) : Mr. Deputy  
Speaker, Sir, we have had this afternoon a  
very high level debate on matters of great  
national import. Two former Ministers of  
External Affairs have participated and I do  
envy Shri Bhagat for the uninhibited way that  
he was able to speak. He is now not sitting in  
the South Block. We heard a distinguished ex-  
Ambassador of India speaking on the subject  
a former Minister of State for Defence and  
a distinguished galaxy of leaders of the op-  
position parties, and last but not least Shri  
Indrajit Gupta, who sought information as to  
why Mr. Weinberger came here. He came  
here because in 1985 during the visit of Shri  
Narasimha Rao to the United States he was  
invited to come here and the invitation was  
renewed this year by Shri Bali Ram Bhagat.  
His visit was handled by the Ministry of  
Defence and not by the Ministry of External  
Affairs. I am not passing the buck; I am  
just giving the facts.

With regard to the debate, I am very  
glad to say that the House is unanimous on  
the developments that have taken place in  
the last few days. Mr. Weinberger came here.  
He said nothing about AWACS and then he  
went to Pakistan and that is when we heard  
about it. And when we heard about it, we  
made the necessary protest at the highest  
level including to Mr. Weinberger himself.  
Ambassador Kaul saw him yesterday and he  
saw Mr. Armitage also.

I have been in this game a little longer  
than some of you might imagined. I have  
just got the text of Mr. Armitage's press con-  
ference. Mr. Armitage actually went on to  
say that the Secretary, Mr. Weinberger en-  
deavoured to reduce regional tension and  
remove some of the mistrust that exists be-  
tween these two countries as well as  
between China and India. This is difficult to  
believe that Mr. Weinberger's visit to Pakis-  
tan and the offer of AWACS was to reduce  
tension in this region. Congratulations to  
Mr. Armitage !

Then, he says that in India, the Secre-  
tary's private meeting with Mr. Rajiv  
Gandhi was extended at the latter's request  
to twice its scheduled time. Where does he  
get this from? I am not going to waste my  
time on Mr. Armitage's press conference. It  
is not worth it.

Now, I will, with you permission, Sir,  
deal with matters of importance. These are  
not party or partisan matters, Let me first  
of all make a suggestion that although the  
debate stemmed from certain specific inci-  
dents, namely the proposed sale of AWACS  
to Pakistan and Pakistan's unclear capabili-  
ties, these two issues relate themselves to a  
wider question namely the long-term strategic  
perception of the United States and the role  
assigned to Pakistan within the broad frame-  
work of that perception. That is what we are  
going to discuss. Whether they produce a  
bomb today or day after is another matter.  
What are they trying to do in this region?  
What are their perceptions? I will elaborate  
that, if I may, with your permission.

In recent years, the role of Pakistan has  
appeared to assume greater importance in  
those strategic perceptions of the United

States and we cannot remain indifferent to these developments. I have no doubt that Hon. Members of this House are fully familiar with the course of events when the United States began to supply arms to Pakistan in a programmed sort of way in the mid 50s.

We know Panditji's speeches. I looked them up today. How right he was ! What a vision he had and what foresight he had ! We have since then consistently taken the position that irrespective of the strategic perceptions both of the suppliers of these arms and the receivers of these arms, India had to suffer grievously from the impact of it. That is why we cannot be indifferent. What happens in this part of the world and what arms are they giving to Pakistan ? I do not want to say much about it, except that the proposed sale of AWACS make a qualitative difference and poses a serious problem for our country. As the Hon. Member has stated, there is a sea-change. The sophistication and the capability of these AWACS is mind-boggling.

Pakistan was given 3.2 billion dollars a few years ago, when I was ambassador there. The two are in no way related ! Now we hear that from 1986 to 1993, they are to be given 4.2 billion dollars. The Pakistani spokesman said that even this amount would not be enough to finance the AWACS. So, you can imagine how much is going to be put in the arsenals of Pakistan. And the reason given by Mr. Weinberger is that there are air intrusions from Afghanistan and therefore this will be given to Pakistan.

Now Sir, I have been an ambassador of India in Pakistan and I have had the honour of discussing this matter with President Zia-ul-Haq and I asked him, Sir why are you taking these F-16s ? We are entitled to ask as your good and peaceful neighbour as to what is the purpose of this exercise. Are they going to be used against the Soviet Union ? The answer is obviously no. Are they going to be used against China ? The answer is obviously no. Are they going to be used against Iran ? The answer is no. Are they going to be used against Afghanistan ? The answer is again no. Then, whom are you going to use them against ? Past history

makes us very suspicious of your intentions and we are entitled to question your judgment as to what these arms are for ?"

And now, we have this further step. We are told by a senior member of the State Department of USA that the Defence Secretary's visit eased tension in this area.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : What ?

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH : Eased tensions.

SHRI C. MADHAV REDDI (Adilabad): Eased. e-a-s-e-d.

MR. SPEAKER : Not 'is'. It is the other one. Eased.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH : My friend sitting here has a fairly good knowledge of English !

Now Sir, we have made our anxieties known to the US administration. I need hardly say that the responses we have received do not in any way mitigate our anxieties and our country, as a whole, has to give serious thought and attention to the unfolding situation. Shri Somnath Chatterjee was good enough to refer to a remark that I made in the other House the other day that I would like to be "soft of words but hard on facts." I am also aware that in diplomacy, harsh words do not break any bones any more than soft words butter parsnips I am aware of it. Nevertheless, harsh words or empty rhetoric need not be employed. We have to face this situation as a united nation, as a united Parliament with courage, with maturity and with a stout heart. It is only in this sense that the Government of India, whom I have the honour to represent in this debate, in the absence of the Minister for External Affairs, would not wish to use any harsh words as a means of venting our feelings in solving the grave problem that we face.

I now turn to the legitimate anxiety and concern which we have consistently expressed in this House about Pakistan's attempt to develop nuclear capability in the military sense. Apart from such information as we possess, information flowing from other sour-

[Shri K. Natwar Singh]

ces, more especially from American sources tend to confirm that despite Pakistan's protestations from time to time, there is no let up in the single-minded devotion to proceed with the final stages of acquiring capability in nuclear weaponry. There is no doubt it. Say what they may. Today, the Embassy of Pakistan has produced a press release taking advantage of the perfectly harmless statement made by Mr. Iyyengar when asked what happened on the 19th of September, gave a perfectly scientific explanation which could be elaborated by my colleague, here. But, I would refer to that a little later. However the question is that we have to put Pakistan's nuclear capability in the wider context of the world today. I do so for the simple reason that Pakistan seems to suggest that their development of nuclear capability is a bilateral affair between India and Pakistan. Regretably, it is not. One has to relate Pakistan's nuclear capability to the wider political and strategic framework within which Pakistan is meant to play a certain role. This is what we have to realise. It is no use people saying you sit down and talk with Pakistan and work this out. The nuclear problem is a global problem, and Pakistan has a role to play in it as a proxy of the United States. That is why, it is not a bilateral issue. When they say : "Pakistan and India can sit together and sign an agreement and have an inspection", it is irrelevant.

18.36 hrs.

[SHRI SHARAD DIGHE *in the Chair*]

One cannot therefore divorce our wider concerns and merely look at the tactical manoeuvres of Pakistan to cover up their own designs by offering to us from time to time various kinds of proposals and artificially contrived bilateral contacts which I have just mentioned. Here I am sure, I am speaking for the entire country, I desire nothing more than to have the entire South Asian region as an area of mutual trust, mutual co-operation and development. But such a vision of creating a structure of durable peace is dedicated upon one simple but vital assumption, namely, that Pakistan should cease to be an instrument of translating global concerns of others.

18.37 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

The real problem of peoples of our country and of the South Asian region can certainly be attended to and solved and worked together exclusively inspired by those concerned and those concerned alone. It is in that hope that we have, despite our many reservations, entered in good faith within the evolving structure of SAARC which is meeting at summit level in a few days time in Bangalore. But, if member States of this region cease to be themselves and reflects extra mural interests, obviously, talks about peace, co-operation and development become essays in perception.

Now, Sir, I will come with your permission, briefly as I can, to the points raised by Hon. Members, but I did want to place before you and the House and the country, this whole question of arming Pakistan and Pakistan's nuclear programme in a context which is not simplistic, which takes into account global concerns, regional concerns because this thing has been hammered day in and day out orchestrated let the two sit down together the nuclear issue will not be solved for the reasons that I have given you.

18.39 hrs.

[MR. SHARAD DIGHE *in the Chair*]

Now Sir, Prof. Swell, in his intervention raised many brief points and we entirely share about what you have stated that really it is extraordinary that the world should be told that AWACS are being supplied to Pakistan because they are not to be used against Afghanistan.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : They cannot be used on that border.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH : No. I do not want to take you into details. I have got a whole list of papers here which I could give you as to why this does not make sense even to a layman like me.

Mr. Somnath Chatterjee, again, wanted to know as to what we have done when we learnt about this offer, and to this day. I

must say, to be factual, that the American Ambassador here has told the Foreign Secretary on the 27th, that no decisions have been made about specific systems, and that the whole thing is so far at the exploratory level. But you read Mr. Armitage's press conference, and you may get a different impression. But as of now, they say that it is at an exploratory stage; but we have, even at this stage, made our fears, or anxieties or concerns known.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : What is Mr. Weinberger's reply to our Ambassador ?

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH : I have, in a fairly idiomatic and diplomatic language, said that our anxieties have not been allayed. I do not want to go into greater details.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : Mr. Weinberger told our Ambassador Mr. Kaul that Pakistan needed AWACS. It has been reported recently.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH : You having been the Minister of State for External Affairs, know that these messages come in coded telegrams. I have taken an oath of secrecy as a Minister in the Government of India as you did. I do not think I should quote from that particular cable. But what you said will by and large go.

18.42 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

Similarly, we share the views expressed by Shri Dinesh Singh who himself has a lot of experience. He also touched upon the deteriorating security environment including that in the Indian Ocean, to which Mr. Indrajit Gupta also referred.

There are many Members who spoke. First of all, I would like to thank Mr. Ramoowalia and Shrimati Mukherjee for bringing in this matter under rule 193, so that we could share our perceptions with the House, as also our anxieties and concerns, and look at them in a conceptual manner, not in a manner of panic, not in a manner of being stampeded, as Mr. Gupta said. We

will take it as it comes; we will keep our powder dry. We will discuss with our friends, as to what can be done. We also want to devote as much of our resources and finances as possible, to developmental programmes of our country. But if necessity arises, necessary sacrifices will be made, so that this country is defended; and it will be defended.

Shri K. P. Singh Deo who was very familiar with Defence matters in his incarnation as Minister of State for Defence, has also spoken about the security environment, about the sea-change that this brings in, and generally about the intentions of our neighbour which has been arming itself for the last 30 years, in fact from 1954. Each successive generation of armaments has gone up in its lethal capacity.

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Minister, what is going on in Punjab is a prelude to things to come. So, be prepared.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH : Sir, I would like to confine myself strictly to the subject of this debate.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Punjab is outside the scope of this discussion.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH : He also referred to Mr. Gorbachev's coming here, and to the Prime Minister of Pakistan coming here, to Bangalore. I am sure that when the two Heads of State meet, they will discuss the issues which we are discussing here.

I have heard Mr. Mohanty with great respect. If it was left to any single country to expel one of the members of NAM, then Pakistan probably would meet that fate; but it is not that easy.

You also referred to Sino-Pak collaboration, but that falls strictly outside the purview of what we are discussing here. The Prime Minister spoke about this particular matter some weeks ago in Calcutta in quite clear terms. Now, Shri Jaipal Reddy, I think, you used the phrase 'sea change'. I share your anxiety about what you said. I do not want to elaborate upon it. I don't think the remedy that you probably hinted at is easily

[Shri K. Natwar Singh]

accessible to us or to any country, because of the complexity and the nature of exercise that we have undertaken across our border or will be when this thing will become a reality when it enters into some kind of an agreement. You referred to, if I may respectfully say, or you said that the Prime is travelling a great deal. It would not be pertinent for me to speak about Prime Minister's travel, but I would only say that India had been Chairman of the NAM for three years, and it was incumbent on the Chairman of the NAM to travel and travel all over the world to spread the gospel of peace and non-alignment and development; that is why it had been done. He did not go on a pleasure sojourn. I had been with him. They were not pleasant sojourns, and if he had not travelled, then it would have been a dereliction of duty on the part of India as Chairman of the NAM, that is why it had become necessary to travel. You also referred to NPT. You know that there reasons that we had not signed it and those reasons remain.

I referred to the speech of Shri Bali Ram Bhagat. If I may respectfully say so, it was a pretty good speech.

MR. SPEAKER : Is that all ?

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : He has spent a better part of his life in diplomacy.

[Translation]

SHRI BALKAVI BAIRAGI (Mandsaur) : Sometimes Shri Natwar Singh speaks and sometimes the Minister.....

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH : I am afraid of you. If you start reciting poem, I will be in trouble.

MR. SPEAKER : Completeness comes only when prose and verse are combined.

[English]

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH : Shri Dinesh Goswami referred as to what we have

done with Netherlands, etc. Quite frankly speaking, it was as little as one can do. But the Netherland Government themselves were unhappy with the activities of the particular individual who had abused their hospitality. I would not put it harder than this. Bhagatji has called the name he has.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : I quoted it from the western paper.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH : So, the Canadians were anxious...*(Interruptions)* Nobody wants that this kind of things—proliferation, things should be stolen. If you read today's *Times of India* you will find that it is quite clear that Pakistan Government has been trying to get the necessary ingredients of producing a bomb from whatever source they can. If I may venture a little bit into the field of fiction, if you read Lapier's, Collin's book *The 5th Horseman*, you would be able to know how easy it is to put it together. But do you want to know what the United States would do if this thing happens, because they had made a statement that on the 27th they will refer to the statement of the President of the United States. It is something. Then Washington Post Story said something else and Mr. Narayanan will refer to it since his department deals with that Particular thing. I want to say how grateful I am to Mr. Goswami for raising this question of perception which I had referred in my statement a little earlier, and this is what we have to look at.

What is the alternative ? We have the Six Nation Peace Declaration, which was welcomed by all, welcomed by the Soviet Union, by the NAM. That is the way we can solve some of the problems that we have here.

Finally, I want to once again thank the House and the Hon. Members who have spoken on this vitally important matter and given us an opportunity to share our views, our anxieties and our concern. Let me assure you that no one in the Government takes this development lightly. We are deeply concerned and we shall keep the House informed of developments, whenever it is necessary to do so.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Only one point. What exactly does the Government of India want to do to persuade the United States ?

*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : How can it be said ?

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Our nation must stage a protest.

MR. SPEAKER : They are doing whatever they can possibly do, and I think it is

a good debate. I wish only that the people who have been vociferous yesterday should have been present also, to listen to the fine debate and to this nice answer. But anyhow, that is the way.

18.52 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till  
Eleven of the Clock on Friday,  
November 7, 1986/Kartika  
16, 1908 (Saka)*