

12.07 hrs.

MESSAGE FROM RAJYA SABHA

[English]

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

“In accordance with the provisions of rule 127 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to inform the Lok Sabha that the Rajya Sabha, at its sitting held on the 7th August, 1985, agreed without any amendment to the State Financial Corporations (Amendment) Bill, 1985, which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 24th July, 1985.”

MR. SPEAKER : Now, we will take up Calling Attention.

SHRI P. NAMGYAL (Ladakh) : Sir, I have a point of Order. Sir, I have tabled a question some time back on the same subject. I would like to submit that I am not against the subject being discussed now in the House. It should be discussed. I am very much concerned about this. But my point is that I have tabled a question on the very same subject about a month back. A couple of days back I have got a letter from the Question Branch of your Secretariat that under Rule 41(2) sub-clause (xix), my question would not be admitted. The Rule says :

“(xix) it shall not refer discourteously to a friendly foreign country ;”

So, Sir, if my question was rejected, then on the same plea this should also be rejected. I do not know how this has been allowed. I want your guidance, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER : This is not the time for discussing it. You can come

and discuss this with me in my Chamber.

SHRI P. NAMGYAL : All right, Sir, I will come and discuss it with you. But, Sir, I should be allowed to speak on this.

MR. SPEAKER : No, no. You will not be allowed to speak on this.

SHRI P. NAMGYAL : Then, Sir, you can allow it to be discussed under Rule 193. This is an important subject. Without any reason, my question was rejected on the same subject.

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Namgyal, will you take your seat now? We cannot do it.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur) : It is a valid point.

SHRI SURESH KURUP (Kottayam) : Sir, you must look into the circumstances why it was rejected.

MR. SPEAKER : We might have made a mistake.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Now Mr. Bhattam.

12.08 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTERS OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

[English]

Situation arising out of Pakistan's attempt to develop Nuclear Bomb and supply to them of Krypton electronic Triggers by the United States of America

SHRI S. M. BHATTAM (Visakhapatnam) : Sir, I call the attention of the Minister of External Affairs to the following matter of urgent public importance and request that he may make a statement thereto :

[Shri S. M. Bhattam]

“On the situation arising out of Pakistan’s attempt to develop nuclear bomb and supply to them of Krypton electronic triggers by the United States of America and the action taken by the Government in regard thereto.”

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI KHURSHID ALAM KHAN): The non-peaceful dimension of Pakistan’s nuclear programme has been a matter of concern for India. Contrary to the claims by Pakistan’s leaders, available evidence and public statements by Pakistan scientists suggest that Pakistan has been pursuing the objective of acquiring the wherewithal to manufacture nuclear weapons. Government have also been concerned at the regrettable attitude of certain countries which have chosen to turn a blind eye to these moves by Pakistan which could only have the effect of encouraging it to go ahead in this direction.

Reports which have appeared from time to time in the international media in this regard, particularly about the clandestine procurement of nuclear equipment and components by Pakistan, have reinforced our apprehensions. Of immediate relevance are the case of a Pakistani national who was caught in the process of smuggling krytrons from the United States to Pakistan and the recent report by the ABC correspondent John Scali that Pakistan had carried out a non-nuclear explosion using krytrons of U.S. origin. While the U.S. State Department has been unforthcoming on the revelations made by Scali, we hope that the United States, resulting from PM’s discussions with President Reagan, will exercise its influence to dissuade Pakistan from pursuing the course.

Our concerns on this subject which have been conveyed on different occasions to the Government of Pakistan at various levels were reiterated

during the recent visit of the Foreign Secretary of Pakistan.

Government are concerned at the likelihood of Pakistan acquiring nuclear weapons which would result in a qualitative change in the security environment in our region. India remains committed to developing nuclear technology for peaceful purposes. However, we cannot but take into account these developments in our neighbourhood which have grave implications for our security. I wish to assure the House that Government have been keeping, and will continue to keep, a constant vigil on all developments having a bearing on the country’s security.

SHRI S. M. BHATTAM: Pakistan is fast threatening to become a nuclear power and acquire nuclear capability. Pakistan is making feverish attempt and preparing for manufacturing a nuclear bomb. Our Prime Minister recently mentioned that Pakistan was very close to making a bomb. In fact, it has already acquired a bomb; it is in possession of a bomb which is prepared by it.

The American Broadcasting Corporation recently made an announcement to the effect that Pakistan had successfully conducted a test with Krypton electronic triggers for a nuclear blast in Kahuto nuclear complex.

This has changed the situation and upset the balance militarily and politically in the South Asia. The Ambassador of Pakistan recently stated that Pakistan had acquired capability to produce two atom bombs in a year.

Pakistan has five nuclear installations, out of which one is subjected to international inspection and safeguards.

12.10 hrs.

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

Pakistan set up a uranium enrichment plant at Kahuta. This plant produces

90 per cent of the enriched uranium necessary for preparing a nuclear weapon. Pakistan also built a re-processing facility capable of producing plutonium which can be used for nuclear bombs. On account of this, it is in fact the nerve-centre for Pakistan's nuclear weapons. Now, at the top of all this, Pakistan has successfully conducted a test for triggering of a device for nuclear blast. In fact, it can even explode a bomb.

At the same time, we cannot forget that Pakistan had attacked our country thrice in the past and that being so, it is a veritable threat to the safety, security and independence of this country. We have to take a serious note of this. What does our Prime Minister say about this? What is the reaction of the Government? The Prime Minister said at one time that he was worried and very much concerned about it. He expressed the grave concern of the nation and in fact he has stated that it would tremendously change the military balance in this sub-continent. What exactly are we going to do? It is no good announcing or saying that we are thinking as to what we should do, we have not made any decision about it and we are thinking about it. That was the statement made by the Prime Minister at one stage. May I respectfully say that there cannot be any vacillation in this regard? There should be no ambiguity, no uncertainty and we must be very clear and categorical about our approach attitude. Our decision should be firm and very clear and the nation should know about it. If the Government are thinking about it, may I ask whether the Cabinet has exercised its mind over this? Is the Party in power considering the matter and if so, what is its decision? Has the Government taken the opposition into confidence and consulted the leaders of the opposition to deliberate on this issue? Why cannot the Government themselves come forward with a White Paper in this regard and subject it for discussion? Can we not arrive at a national consensus on this matter? I suppose that it is necessary to arrive at

a national consensus very soon on this problem and on the basis of the firm decision taken in this regard by all parties concerned, by all the people interested in the welfare of our nation, we will have to march forward in the desired direction, in the direction which is decided upon.

There are two or three alternatives before us. Either we can make a bomb, or once again reiterate our own ethical stand and say that we are not interested in going in for a nuclear weapon, or we can go in for a protective umbrella of some other country, which we are not prepared to do, for the obvious reason that we are a non-aligned country and a founder-member of Non-aligned Movement. The question now at this moment is not whether we can afford to have a nuclear bomb, but whether we can afford not to have a nuclear bomb. Sir, our previous experience goes to show the need for self-reliance on matters like this. Let us see what Pakistan says. The President of Pakistan says that they have every right to make a nuclear bomb. In fact he says that India has started a world-campaign against Pakistan but they are not going to retrace and they will continue to forge ahead and they are going to march forward in this direction. It is a clear and categorical statement made by the President of Pakistan. The Foreign Minister of Pakistan stated that even after 1985-87, Pakistan would continue to receive massive military assistance from the United States of America.

If I get a little into the past, Mr. Bhutto, we remember, said at one stage that Pakistan will go in for a nuclear bomb even if it comes to Pakistan living on grass and leaves. That is the basic approach.

Pakistan's forces, as it is, intruded in the Siachen glacier region of Ladakh; violating Indian air space many times. A bitter, silent battle is now taking place in that region. Pakistan is again trying to occupy an area near Karakoram Pass. This is

[Shri S. M. Bhattam]

the situation in our relations with Pakistan at the moment.

Let us now examine our relations with other neighbouring countries. Our relations with neighbouring China have not yet reached cordiality. Even our relations with Bangladesh are not that good. United States has in fact signed a pact recently with China, i.e. a nuclear agreement; and there is no provision in that agreement, as it is conveyed to the Press, about prohibiting China from passing on this nuclear technology and other nuclear material to any other country of its choice. We are very well aware of the fact that China has been passing on for some time its technology and methods of making a nuclear bomb.

So, this is the scenario; this is the background against which we have to take a decision. I have tried carefully to follow some of the recent pronouncements of the Prime Minister—both during his tour abroad, and also after that. Perhaps he has got reasons to feel convinced. He had a serious of protracted discussions perhaps with the American President; and he feels convinced that the American President does, and he is going to do all that is necessary to dissuade Pakistan from going nuclear. That is the point which he has been making of ten clear. Even in the statement which the Minister has just now read out, he made it clear that the American President has made it clear in so many terms that he would try and dissuade Pakistan from going nuclear.

At this stage, a common man, a lesser fry like me has some doubts in mind. It is not America which is responsible for abetting and conniving at the nuclear ambitions of Pakistan? Its nuclear objectives are being promoted and supported, clandestinely or otherwise, by America itself. The krytron trigger devices have been clandestinely smuggled from America itself. It is not a gain, the best gain

which has given them the technology for preparing a nuclear bomb? That being so, how do we expect that America will necessarily come to our rescue, and actively support our stand, and effectively check Pakistan from going nuclear?

What is our past experience? What does it say? In the past, America has given massive military aid to Pakistan, and they have reiterated more than once that the aid given to Pakistan will not be used against India. But then, that that assurance never came true. The military aid given to them was definitely made use of against this country. Again in the past, when we had the attack from Pakistan thrice, America did not take a friendly, helpful and cooperative stand. It took a hostile attitude towards this country.

May I, in this connection, refer to the former President Mr. Nixon? He stated in a Press interview that at one stage during the year 1971, America wanted to make use of the nuclear weapon against India and that is the attitude of America towards India. That being so, how can we rely on what is now stated by the American President? Even recently, if I look back, when Pakistan tried to enrich uranium and set up a plant for the purpose, at that time, the then President got up and blocked the military aid to Pakistan. But, then, again, President Regan has revolted against this stand and has removed that blockade and has ensured military aid to Pakistan. That being so, there is no use in relying on their assurance given by America in this regard.

It is necessary that we take an independent stand and try to protect our interest to the extent we can by taking necessary steps in this regard; and let us not vacillate in any manner on this crucial issue which is vital for the security and future of this nation.

Some people may argue that nuclear weapons would not increase security; they do not constitute adequate deter-

rent. But then the experience in certain countries has totally rejected this argument. Nuclear weapons have ensured security and stability in Central Europe and Sino-Soviet Border. The importance of deterrence also cannot be under estimated. Now, there is a war between Iran and Iraq. People may ask what would happen if these two countries possess nuclear weapons? The answer is simple. In that case, there could have been no war at all. In case Japan had a bomb, America would not have ventured to drop a bomb on Japan. It is a balance of terror that made Russia and America realise the need for peaceful coexistence and detente.

There are certain new points which require to be studied before crucial decisions are taken on this issue. I would like to add that nothing is more sacrosanct and more sacred than what I think the nation's freedom, its security and integrity. Anything and everything that is necessary to protect the interest of this country should be done and ought to be done, and there is no question of going back on that. The government cannot fail the nation, the government has to alert itself, rise to the occasion and do the needful in the matter.

SHRI KHURSHID ALAM KHAN :

We entirely share the sentiments expressed by the hon. member, and have taken very serious note of what has been stated. It is a fact that all the evidence indicates that Pakistan's nuclear programme is not peaceful. Actually, what they have been doing and what claim they have been making during the past few months clearly indicates that their programme is not peaceful. Particularly here I would like to mention that the enrichment of uranium is not really necessary for Pakistan, because Pakistan's reactors only need natural uranium and heavy water. The Pakistani President mentioned that the enrichment of uranium is only 5 per cent which is not of weapon grade. But once they know the technique or the know-how naturally whether it is 5 per cent or whether it

is 95 per cent, they can do it. Our apprehension is that their programme is not all that peaceful and they have been doing something and stating something else. There seems to be wide gap between what they do and what they say. Pakistan has been making all types of statements and some times it appears that they are blowing hot and cold together. On the one hand they say that all their programmes are for peaceful purposes, and on the other they also say that they have got a right to make a bomb. They have got enriched uranium. Their scientists have been making claims that they are in a position to achieve their objective. Naturally it is their object. But neither their programmes nor their intentions are peaceful.

It is correct that Mr. John Scali has reported in the BBC about the material used by Pakistan for an explosion. Mr. Scali, I believe is a person who has got contacts. I believe he has been the United States Ambassador to the United Nations. What he says naturally has some basis and this was also corroborated by Mr. Hersh, another well-known correspondent. Our Government is very much concerned about all this and the only thing that I would like to mention here is that we have our own options but it will not be possible for me to disclose the details about it or to say as to what is our capability or what is our capacity. The only thing that I would like to mention is that our capability was demonstrated in 1974 and actually what we have not been doing is, as scientists of the country; across the border have been making bold and tall claims, that they are much advanced than India in nuclear programmes. I would like to say that if they have this illusion I would leave them to their illusions.

I entirely agree with the hon. Member that India will never agree to have any country's nuclear umbrella because we have confidence in our preparedness, our own armed forces and our own capability and capacity.

[Shri Khurshid Alam Khan]

We do not need any other country's umbrella.

I would also submit very humbly to the hon. Member that we should not under-estimate our capability or capacity in this regard. It is correct that Pakistan has been getting massive aid from the United States. In 1981 the massive aid they received was of the order of 32 billion dollars. Out of this about 50 per cent was for the supply of sophisticated and offensive weapons to Pakistan. We understand that Pakistan is trying to continue to get additional aid for six more years from 1981, that is, up to 1987.

They have also suggested that they might be given a package deal consisting of about 4.5 billion dollars. Our understanding is that the United States has agreed to provide additional aid to them. It is also a fact that Pakistan has been trying from various sources to get financial as well as technical assistance for the nuclear programme. One of the instances is Nazir Ahmed Vaid who tried to smuggle out 50 krytrons from Houston and then he was indicted. In such indictments the normal punishment for a person is about 20 years imprisonment. But he was given only two years imprisonment and this was further reduced to the period he had already spent in jail. So within three months he was sent back to his country.

I have seen the statement of Mr. Nixon where he said that he had the intention of using the bomb in 1971. But it is for Mr. Nixon to elaborate what he means by this, how he wanted to use it and against whom?

I would like to assure the hon. Members that India's security will not be neglected in any way. There can be no complacency about it. As I have said in the beginning, our options are clear and certainly we would see that whatever our options are, they are such that India's security, unity and

integrity is safe and secure in every case, at every stage and against every country.

SHRI S. M. BHATTAM : The Minister has revealed that acquisition of nuclear capability by Pakistan has introduced a qualitative and substantial change in the military balance in our region. The Prime Minister also has agreed that it is very difficult for us to remain indifferent to this and that we will have to counter it. That being so, you may have several options open. But then you have to take a firm, solid and positive decision in this regard and arrive at some specific conclusions. Do you want to do that? If so, when do you want to do that?

The Minister of Defence, while presenting the Annual Report to Lok Sabha, made a reference to the nuclear capability of Pakistan. He also invited a national debate on the matter. Is it the present policy of the Government not to do that, not to arrive at a national consensus in the matter? Does the Government take upon itself the entire responsibility of taking a decision on this issue without reference to anybody whatsoever? Do they want to keep everything close and confidential and keep it secret with themselves? Do they take the entire responsibility for the future of the country without reference to any other political party or anybody else? Let that be made clear.

SHRI KHURSHID ALAM KHAN : Initially I had mentioned that the sentiments of the hon. Members of this House would certainly be taken into consideration by the Government. I said that the Government's options were open. I am sure, the hon. Members would not like me to disclose our options and plans because these are all such matters in which we would not like to go in details here.

PROF. P. J. KURIEN (Idukki) : Sir, I was carefully going through the Minister's statement. It is said here, "While the U.S. State Department has

been unforthcoming on the revelations made by Scali, we hope that the United States, resulting from P.M.'s discussions with President Reagan, will exercise its influence to dissuade Pakistan from pursuing the course". Our Prime Minister visited United States and had very useful and meaningful discussions with U.S. President and I wish that his hope should come true. I wish that Pakistan be dissuaded from manufacturing nuclear bomb. But in this connection I would like to say that I do not understand how is it that Pakistan was able to get these equipments. They are saying that these were smuggled from United States. How is it that they were able to smuggle against such tight national security in the United States? I cannot escape thinking that this is with the connivance of the United States behind this. I may be wrong but I would like to know whether this aspect has been taken up with the United States Government. If these nuclear devices are being acquired by Pakistan by stealing or by smuggling, is it not the moral duty of the United States to take a strong view and to use all the force they are having, to stop Pakistan from making a nuclear bomb? I would like to know whether we are taking up this matter with the United States. Whatever it may be, the fact remains that Pakistan has gone nuclear. They have already conducted a non-nuclear explosion, that is enough for assembling an atom bomb. Recently I read a statement in one of the newspapers in which one of the leading scientists of Pakistan is reported to have stated that Pakistan is one among the five or six countries with regard to the process of enriching uranium. It is true that the President of Pakistan has stated that they are only enriching uranium to the extent of 5 per cent or 10 per cent, meant is done for peaceful purposes. But they have the capability to enrich uranium to the extent of 90 per cent or more in order to manufacture nuclear bomb. Therefore, there should be no doubt that Pakistan has acquired the capability of manufacturing the nuclear bomb. Therefore, we need not have any doubt. The fact is that they have already gone nuclear.

This being the case, what should be our policy? That is what we have to think about. Can we go on discussing the pros and cons of making an atom bomb and thus waste our time. Can we just keep quiet, closing our eyes to these realities? Some people say that we cannot afford to go nuclear because it is very expensive. But, to my mind, it appears that the main question is whether we can afford not to go nuclear in the present context. The hon. Member who spoke before me has already explained in detail the power imbalances that can create the security hazards. So, what is the alternative with us? Are we going to believe that Pakistan will abide by the statement of its President that it will not manufacture a nuclear bomb, or are we going to believe that in the event of their manufacturing a nuclear bomb, they are not going to use it against us or are we going to rely on the assurance that President Reagan will dissuade Pakistan from manufacturing an atom bomb, or if they have already manufactured, President Reagan or for that matter any other country will be able to dissuade Pakistan from using it against us? The answer is very clear if we view it on the basis of past experiences. I do not want to go into the answer, because it is very clear to every one.

I would also like to know whether our Government is contemplating to have dialogue with Pakistan to arrive at certain agreement say a nuclear free zone agreement or so, but I want to tell the Government that since Pakistan has already conducted an explosion, even if there is an agreement, it can conduct such explosions again in secrecy and assemble nuclear weapons and keep them in secrecy. Therefore, even an agreement with Pakistan for a nuclear free zone or any other agreement or pact, will not serve our purpose.

As the hon. Minister has already ruled out, and as everybody knows, we cannot go in for a nuclear umbrella or protection from any other country,

[Prof. P. J. Kurien]

because that will be at the risk of our own freedom. Therefore, what is the alternative before us? That is what I want the Minister to clarify.

As it has already been said by the Minister thanks to the farsightedness and wisdom of our late Prime Minister Indiraji we got the capability of nuclear explosion in the year 1974.

We all know that in spite of our categorical assurance that we have no intention of manufacturing a nuclear bomb and our nuclear capabilities will be used for peaceful purposes, how sharply certain countries reacted with all the furor. As a result of that Canada withdrew its assistance which it had offered for our nuclear projects. And now when Pakistan has exploded how they have reacted. This makes clear their discriminatory attitude towards us. So, whatever it may be, now we have got technical capability of manufacturing nuclear bomb. We may not be having the process of enrichment of uranium, but I am sure we are having plutonium devices not only for nuclear, but even for hydrogen bomb. Our capability and technical know how are enough.

In this context a question is what can we do or what we have to do. Can we allow ourselves to be left to the nuclear blackmail by Pakistan? A nuclear weapon is not a weapon of war alone. It has over-riding importance. A country possessing a nuclear weapon is definitely at a psychologically superior position. We have to settle so many issues with Pakistan. And when we are going to face Pakistan armed with a nuclear weapon, what will be our position with respect to Pakistan. In that event I am sure not only because of change in balance of power, but psychologically also our position will be weaker. So, this aspect has to be taken into consideration.

One may well ask, what is the use of nuclear weapon; how can you use

it. Correct. One may not use it. America is having nuclear weapon. Russia is having nuclear weapon. Why America is not using nuclear weapon against Russia? Why Russia is not using nuclear weapon against America? The reason is very simple. It is because of the suicidal character of the nuclear weapons. If America were to use nuclear weapons against Russia, they are afraid because, it may lead to their own self-annihilation. Therefore they will not use it. This terror is the greatest deterrent against using of nuclear weapons. This is all what I have to say. We have experience with Pakistan for the past so many years. We cannot rely on their word. We cannot rely on their argument. If they are having nuclear weapons, who is to dissuade them from using them? US can never dissuade them from using nuclear weapons. The greatest deterrent against use of nuclear weapons is the terror which it will be generating. So, if we are also having nuclear weapon, that will be the greatest deterrent. Therefore in the light of this I would like to ask from the Minister: Should we not go nuclear?—Not for using nuclear weapon but for preventing others from using it against us. The options are with the Government. It is for the hon. Minister to take the House and the entire people into confidence and tell the House that these options will be used in order to protect the integrity and sovereignty of the country. If you are not going to do it what alternative action are you going to take? Ours is a non-aligned country; we stand for non-alignment. We cannot have any nuclear umbrella from any other country. Therefore, I would like to ask the Minister: What is the alternative that you are going to take, if you don't want to go in for nuclear weapons? This is what I would like to know from the hon. Minister.

SHRI KHURSHID ALAM KHAN: I would like to inform the hon. Member what I have said earlier, that we have our own options. We give the highest regard to the views of hon. Members of this House. Naturally the views expressed by hon. Members of

the House have to be taken into consideration by the Government on all such matters. There should be no doubt at all about it. Therefore, it should be enough if I say, we have the option and we give the highest consideration to the views expressed by hon. Members of the House.

It is a fact that when our Prime Minister was in the United States he spoke to President Reagan and President Reagan gave a categorical assurance that he would do everything possible to dissuade Pakistan from pursuing its non-peaceful nuclear programme. I am sure that assurances given by President Reagan as President of a democratic and great country would be fulfilled. I am sure he would like to pursue the matter and see that assurance is fulfilled as far as possible. It is a fact that Krytons and other components have been used. I have already mentioned that Pakistan has been trying to acquire them from various sources. Otherwise it was not possible for them, as his colleague has said, to undertake an explosion recently. They could not have done without that. No doubt it is also not very necessary that a bomb should really be tested before it is used. I will remind the hon. Member that the first bomb used in Hiroshima 40 years ago was not tested. Only the component was tested and once the components were satisfactorily tested the conclusion was that the bomb would also be effective.

Whatever Pakistan may say or do, Pakistan cannot influence our decision. Pakistan cannot influence the decision that we have to take in the interest of our country, in the interest of the unity and national integrity and the sovereignty of our country. We know what we have to do, we know what action we have to take and Pakistan or any other country will never be able to influence us in this regard. Pakistani Scientist A. Q. Khan said that Pakistan is among the 5 or 6 countries which have the know-how or the technology for enrichment of uranium. Well, they have joined that club, I do not know they might say, but I would like to

mention only one thing that though we also have very top class scientists in our country, they do not make any such bold claims or they do not speak in such a fashion. This is the way of life across the border their scientists normally do, let them do it, and as I said, if they want to live under that illusion that they are very much ahead of us, let them live under that illusion and they will come to their senses when there it actually comes to the crunch.

Now, the nuclear free zone—this is Pakistan's suggestion. A nuclear free zone or a free zone or a peaceful zone can only emerge by consultations among the countries of the zone. Without consulting anybody Pakistan in 1975 raised this point in the United Nations. Then, how can it be that this can be declared as a peace zone? If a peace zone has to emerge, it has to emerge as a result of the consensus of the people of the countries...*(Interruptions)* Let me finish. When you were speaking, I did not disturb you.

PROF. P. J. KURIEN : I thought I should interrupt you with permission.

SHRI KHURSHID ALAM KHAN : You always have the permission.

This nuclear free zone is really an important matter—and besides this, one thing also has to be taken into consideration. How can this be a nuclear free zone when China is known to be a nuclear power? How can this be a nuclear free zone when we know that there are two super powers in the Indian Ocean and who can say that they have no nuclear weapons in that area? It is also said that Israel has got nuclear weapons. In that case, how can it be a nuclear free zone by just saying that Pakistan went into the General Assembly and said that this should be a nuclear free zone? For a nuclear free zone all these factors and matters have to be taken into consideration and then the consensus has to emerge and only then a nuclear free zone can be established.

[Shri Khurshid Alam Khan]

I would once again like to very humbly tell my hon. friend that we believe in our self-reliance, we believe in our own capability, we believe in our own capacity and therefore, I do not think we have any inferiority complex when we go and talk to the Pakistanis. Never. Because, we talk to them on equal terms. They can never expect us that we will talk to them with any sense of inferiority. We have no inferiority complex as far as Pakistan is concerned, or for that matter, any other country is concerned. We have our own self-reliance, we have our own views and we have very definite views and we have very definite policies. On the basis of these views and policies, only we will talk to them. I do not know whether they have got the self-imposed superiority complex, they might be having it. But then this is an illusion if they have this sort of impression.

There is this theory that the nuclear weapons have proved deterrent in the case of the two super powers because they have been holding these nuclear weapons for the last 40 years. The rough estimate is that there are about 50,000 total nuclear weapons with the five nuclear weapon States. At the moment, out of this 50,000, about 95% are between the two super powers. But they have not been able to use them against each other. I think, this is the theory which some people say that the nuclear weapons prove a sort of deterrent against each other.

Research proves that even if about 10% of this nuclear weapons are utilised, the temperature of the earth's atmosphere will be minus 40 degree and that will mean, this winter will close everything on the face of this earth.

I would also like to mention here that China is a nuclear weapon State. There are some indications that Pakistan in 1975 in Bhutto's time—when Mr. Bhutto went to China, there was some agreement or understanding for cooperation in the sphere of nuclear

programmes. But after that the Chinese authorities as well as the Chinese news agencies have been denying this fact. Mr. Bhutto has suggested in his memoirs that a nuclear cooperation pact had been concluded between Pakistan and China in 1975. However, we have no other information. As I said, whatever the pronouncements which are being made by the Chinese, they say that they are not interested in any cooperation with any country. They believe in non-preference of nuclear forces in this region.

Sir, I fully share the concern expressed by hon. Member and other Members also. I admit that very useful suggestions have been made by the two hon. Members and perhaps the other hon. Member will also make this suggestion. Naturally, the Government has to take into consideration the views expressed by the hon. Members in this House or in the other House because the views of the hon. Members have got to be taken into consideration. But as I said, if you ask me to spell out the details of the options that we have. I would very humbly submit that it would not be in the interest of the nation or in the interest of the safety of the country to spell out these options that we have.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Shri Vishnu Modi—not present.

13.00 hrs.

STATEMENT RE : SITUATION IN UGANDA

[English]

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI KURSHID ALAM KHAN) : As the House is aware, there was a coup' etat in Uganda on 27th July 1985, in which the Government of President Milton Obote was overthrown. Many former Cabinet Ministers left the country or were detained.