

clause consideration of the Bill.

The question is:

"That Clauses 2 to 5 stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted

Clauses 2 to 5 were added to the Bill

The question is:

"That Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill

SHRI B.K. GADHVI: I beg to move:

"That the Bill be passed."

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI SHEILA DIKSHIT): I would like to propose that we now adjourn for lunch. We can reassemble at 2.45 P.M. and continue the discussion under 193.

13.45 hrs.

The Lok Sabha adjourned for Lunch till forty-five minutes past Fourteen of the Clock.

The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch at forty-eight minutes past Fourteen of the Clock.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

DISCUSSION RE: RECENT DELIBERATIONS IN US CONGRESS ON SOUTH ASIA - *CONTD.*

[*English*]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: We will now take up Item No. 16 - Further discussion on the statement made by the Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs in the House on 7th December 1987 regarding the recent deliberations in the U.S. Congress on South Asia raised by Shri S. Jaipal Reddy on that day.

Shri Indrajit Gupta may speak.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Basirhat): Sir, this is one of the rare occasions when the Treasury Benches and the Opposition find themselves speaking on the same wavelength and joining together to express the outraged public opinion of this country against the perfidious action which has been taken by the United States Senate Committee. I do not want to cover the same ground again, which has been ably dealt with by many members who spoke yesterday. It is an ironic fact also that the United States is showing its teeth to us on the very day when in Washington, a historic treaty is being signed which is at least a very significant step forward in humanity's quest for nuclear disarmament. Many people in the USA are reportedly showing their teeth to Gorbachev also. They would like to show their teeth to him. But we have done nothing to warrant such treatment. Now, the feeling that I got from listening to the hon. Members who spoke, including the hon. Minister, was that there was a kind of sense of shock as though we were taken by surprise. We never ex-

[Sh. Indrajit Gupta]
pected this. So, if you will excuse me, I must begin by saying one or two things about this. Why should there be a feeling of surprise? Why should there be a feeling of shock? It is due to the fact that during the last one and a half months ever since the Prime Minister returned from Washington some sort of an atmosphere of complacence has been consciously developed in this country by the Government's spokesmen, by certain sections of the Press, trying to give an impression that there is going to be some kind of pro-India shift or a turn around in the American traditional attitude towards India, especially where Pakistan is concerned. I think it is high time to shed illusions. The Poet said "Hope springs eternal in the human breast". But I find that "Hope springs eternal at least in the breast of those gentlemen who inhabit South Block." Repeatedly over the years there come periods when some kind of illusions are fostered. One such illusion is that now Americans are going to take more friendly and cooperative attitudes towards us - I am speaking of the American Administration of course - and that now things will be much easier. I believe that this agreement, rather understanding, had been reached there on the transfer of this Cray XIV Computer, although it was not exactly the more sophisticated type which we had wanted. They were not agreeing to transfer any technology in the beginning, now this agreement or understanding to transfer this Cray XIV machine - computer - and more important than that the concept of defence co-operation - co-operation in the field of defence - between India and the USA was very much propagated in this country. That is something new. We all know that in Pandit Nehru's time and Indiraji's time, there did come certain occasions when some desires were expressed to acquire certain equipment. It was only a question of acquiring defence equipment from the U.S.A. But the Minister knows very well that none of those proposals has fructified basically due to the

fact that the Americans imposed certain conditions which were totally unacceptable to us and which were inimical to our security interests. Now, we were told that they have agreed to give us high technology items in the field of defence for the Light Combat Aircraft, for the new tanks and so on. Within a short space of time, it is only one and a half months since the Prime Minister paid a visit to Washington, i.e. on the 22nd October Air Marshal De La Fontaine was sent to U.S.A. perhaps to concretise further what items of technology which are not available to us - according to the Prime Minister - from any other source and what items of technology are to be transferred for our Air Force. Now, the Press reports that within a few days, the Chief of Army, General Sunderji is also about to go there for similar type of talks regarding the Army.

The first thing I would say is this: Of course, I do not expect it to be acceptable to the Government. We are having a debate. It is good. The unanimous voice of Parliament is something which, I suppose, even the American Administration cannot lightly brush aside. But one thing that I would say is this. The present situation should become clearer. What exactly do these people want to do? The amendment that has been brought, as far as I understand it, calls for the total ban on the export licences for technology transfer. Strange. One and a half months ago, we were told something different. Now, there has to be a total ban on export licences for technology transfer, unless India and Pakistan enter into a bilateral agreement to reduce tension, and to curb the nuclear race. In this situation, why should the Chief of Army Staff go there, I do not know. What technology is he going to ask for, and what is the worth of that technology which they may promise or assure—if this is the meaning of the amendment? They have gone back on everything. Therefore, I would suggest that in addition to whatever opinion is articulated here in this parliamentary

debate—I do not suggest you should recall your Ambassador or do some thing like that; after all, it is only the Senate committee which has appeared on the scene up to now—please do not, at least in this current situation, send the Chief of the Army Staff there, to negotiate for more technology. They have said that technology transfer is banned, unless you agree to sit with Pakistan. It is a humiliating thing.

Secondly, I believe that Government of India has been led up the garden path by all this talk of a pro-India shift in U.S. policy; and the Prime Minister also said this when he came back: one of his statements was that the United States wants, or expects India to play a more leading or dominant role or something, in South Asia. What is that? Who do they want us to do, we do not know; and why should we do it just because they want it? We are prepared to do whatever is in our national interest, and what we construe to be in the regional interest. But this statement was made without any further elucidation or explanation. And how is India expected to reduce tension? Whatever tension is there in this area, is primarily due to the arming of Pakistan by America. That is the root cause of the tension. The root cause of the tension is due to the fact, as somebody said yesterday, that Pakistan has replaced Iran, the old Shah of Iran's regime, as the policeman in this region to guard the interests of the United States. That is the root cause of the tension.

Then it was also said that Mr George Bush has assured the Prime Minister that the CIA is not upto any dirty tricks as far as India is concerned. Well - I do not know.

It is very disturbing for us suddenly to read in the papers - of course this refers to something which happened some years ago, viz. the fact that 60,000 Lee Enfield rifles have disappeared from our Jabalpur arsenal, and they have been diverted by the

original purchaser who was a British arms agent....

SHRI G.G. SWELL (Shillong): They were sold, not diverted.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY (Katua) Sold to disappear.

SHRI G.G. SWELL: They were sold...
(Interruptions)

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: It may have gone to Pakistan; but I want to know what is the condition in our country where a foreign arms dealer comes here; and somebody gives him the information: 'If you go to Jabalpur, in the Army depot there, you will find 60,000 rifles.' Who told him that? Who are these moles working inside our defence structure?

(Interruptions)

I do not know. I would have expected that this news which has come out so prominently, deserves at least some clarificatory statement or explanation from the Defence Minister. We have been asking for it, the last two or three days but nothing is happening. And in another two days the session will be over.

15.00 hrs.

So, the fact of the matter is that the Senate panel wants to bail Pakistan out. It wants somehow or other to clear this \$ 4.02 billion of military and economic aid which has been already appropriated, sanctioned for Pakistan but was temporarily held up. That blockage is required to be cleared, that is the main motive behind all this manoeuvre which has been carried out. A plea has been invented that aid should be resumed to Pakistan, because India refuses to sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty, and is itself allegedly going in for a nuclear programme, which

[Sh. Indrajit Gupta]
we are not going to subject to international safeguards or inspection. Therefore, we are now on a par with Pakistan. It is not a par, actually because the Americans know very well what Pakistan is doing. So, I would urge upon the Government that under no circumstances — under no circumstances — we should agree to be equated with Pakistan on this nuclear issue. This is mischievous thing that is being done. And this Pakistan's nuclear capability is being used as a lever to bend India to the United States' will. Military and economic aid to Pakistan is not an act of generosity.

This is a part of the global strategy of the Americans. If necessary, all those things like the Symington Amendment and other things have been waived, or will be waived any day in order to allow....

(Interruptions)

SHRI G.G. SWELL: They want to make it a dead letter.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: They have already made it a dead letter. Now, it was reported in the Press and repeated here by the Minister that President Reagan is reported to be very much concerned at the fact that this Senate Committee has done like this and Indians are very angry.

SHRI G.G. SWELL: He has told them!

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: I went through those Press reports again yesterday. If you read it carefully you will find that there is no first hand evidence whatsoever that President Reagan has expressed concern. It says, "He was reportedly concerned". This may be a story put out by the United States Information Service. He wanted to dis-inform us.

SHRI G.G. SWELL: The American

Ambassador Mr. Gunther Dean has told Mr. Natwar Singh.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: What talk they had, Mr. Gunther Dean and Mr. Natwar Singh, he can tell us. Mr. Gunther Dean's job in this country has certain parameters, after all. He has not been made the Ambassador of U.S. for nothing. One job is to sell multinational companies to us, of which he has done a pretty good job, which I will not speak about, on this occasion. And the other is to give this kind of reassurances to our Government, all the while perhaps chuckling up his sleeve that "these fellows are really suckers who fall for every trick that we play on".

SHRI G.G. SWELL: That is the worst part of it.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: That is, in my opinion, the worst part. I am not very much afraid of this Senate Committee. Our country is big enough and our people are strong enough to resist any threat of this kind of threat. But if some of our own people start spreading these ideas here, in the country lulling our vigilance by a sense of complacency that the Americans are changing their stand and they are going to be less pro-Pakistan and more pro-Indian and are now going to give us technology even in such vital sectors as our air defence and our military defence, — I will say "please do not gamble with our security, do whatever else you like, do not gamble with our defence security." These people are not to be trusted round the corner. You will enter into some agreement with them for defence and when the time of crisis comes they turn their back upon you and then you will be left high and dry.

I do not want to take more time. It is wrong, in my opinion, to isolate this Senate Committee completely from the United States Administration, as though the Administration knows nothing about it, it is innocent, standing above the Senate

Committees and all.

Sir, I just want to read out a short excerpt published by a well-known correspondent from a report in Washington. This is what he says:

"The entire process - a major lobbying effort - was made possible through considerable influence and pressure by the administration. The administration did not want to take a chance on Pakistan being disappointed with a singling (out) on the nuclear issue. The strategy was to link India with Pakistan to win a trade off. The amendment negates previous amendments which hamper the flow of aid to Pakistan especially in the current perspective of high technology and defence transfers to India".

So, please also don't be lulled into complacency by thinking that the administration and the Senate Committee are two independent entities, which don't have anything in common in their thinking and approach.

Now I do not know what the Government proposes to do apart from this, they have sent a protest note, Mr. Gunther Dean has been given a dressing down by Mr. Natwar Singh, our Ambassador in USA is supposed to have delivered a very strong protest, we are protesting here on the floor of the House. Sir, if they heed our voice, well and good for the time being. If they do not heed our voice or suppose they play another trick that is to say, 'All right, in your case these technology transfers of that computer and this, whatever we want to give to your airforce and army, we will not revoke that - that will go through but the other part which

links our nuclear programme with that of Pakistan and is meant to twist our arms in order to change our policy that remains - suppose if they do that and if that part of it remains and the technology part of it is relaxed, then what will be the Government's stand, I would like to know your reply.

Now-a-days we have become ardent disciples of and devotees of technology. We cannot exist without modern technology.

PROF. N.G. RANGA (Guntur): How can you?

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: I did not say we could exist. I only said, it need not be US technology. The United States is not the only country in the world which has technology. Anyway, these are my submissions Sir.

I join with all other Members of other parties in expressing - not my surprise or shock, I am not in the least surprised or shocked - but in voicing my very strong condemnation of the policy and practice being followed by the U.S. Administration and I urge upon the Government to shed its illusions and to stand fast and stand boldly. The whole country is backing them up. They must have the confidence that they are speaking and acting in the name of the nation. They should stand fast and see to it that we do not in any way weaken or succumb to this kind of blackmail.

SHRI G.G. SWELL (Shillong): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, Mr. Indrajit Gupta has voiced certain fears and apprehensions. I think I would share with him in those fears and apprehensions. I would begin by saying that I regret to detect a certain amount of confusion, a certain amount of wishful thinking on our part, in the face of this latest form of skull duggery by the United States of America.

[Sh. G. G. Swell]

15.10 hrs.

[SHRI SOMNATH RATH *in the Chair*]

Only last month, or a little more than a month ago, our Prime Minister was in Washington. He came back in an apparently upbeat mood, at least so far as from what we have read in the press of what he said. He was reported to have said that our relations with the United States have started warming up and that we are going to get from them technology, certain defence items which were not available anywhere else in the world. After this, this resolution or the language of the Senate Committee - and I believe by today the whole of the Senate would be putting its stamp of approval on this because they are taking it up today - by which not to speak of defence items and technology not available anywhere else in the world, but even whatever little aid has been there will be cut off - not only cut off but certain international financial organisations like the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the Asian Development Bank would also be told to cut off financial assistance to us, if we do not do certain things, or if we do not toe their line. If this is not treachery, if this is not scatology, if this is not kicking us in our pants after patting us at our back, I do not know what it is. That is why, I feel so outraged. But I would say this. We are not surprised. We do not need to be dejected or to be surprised. This is a hard hard real world of politics, international politics. We have to face it and accept it and take it in our stride. But we have to be clear-headed. We have to understand why the Americans are doing this. Would you say that this is only the doing of the Senate of America? A kind of red herring has been drawn across this House and across the country to say that President Reagan is concerned about us. A kind of attempt at distinction is being made between the Administration of America and the Senate. I would say that this would be a very

simplistic way of looking at things. I say that this is a ruse being played by the Reagan Administration. And as I said again and again from my seat here, the American Administration, the Reagan Administration is using the American Senate as a stalking horse in order to do the things that it has always wanted to do. I would like you Mr Natwar Singh to analyse this. There are two sets of so-called resolutions or languages adopted by the two Houses of the American Congress - the House of Representatives and the Senate. A few days ago, the House of Representatives have adopted a resolution where it spoke only of Pakistan. There it is said that if Pakistan continues with its pursuit for a nuclear weapon, then this 4.2 billion dollars aid to Pakistan in the pipeline would not be available to Pakistan. I hope Mr. Natwar Singh will bear me out that this is exactly the position of the House of Representatives. But a few days later, a totally different set of language or resolution was before the sub-committee of the Senate and then before the full committee of the Senate, in which a link was established, a link was forged between Pakistan and India, and India is placed in the same position with Pakistan as far as aid is concerned. Why this change? Why this second thought when the matter comes before the Senate, from where it emanates? I would put this to Mr. Natwar Singh that what President Reagan had wanted to do, what the American Administration had wanted to do to make this 4.2 billion aid to Pakistan, now jeopardised by a resolution of the House of Representatives is sought to be to overcome and, therefore a new set of resolution altogether is before the American Senate. Therefore, the whole thing must have emanated from their Administration itself. Now I would like Mr. Natwar Singh to ascertain two facts. The United States Assistant Secretary of State Mr. Robert Peck has said this a few days ago, - before this resolution or whatever it is; they call it a language - to be added to the resolution. It came into the Press. He had

said: "United States massive aid for Pakistan was necessary on account of long-term Soviet threat to Pakistan in the general region." It is no longer Afghanistan. So far we say Afghanistan because Afghanistan poses a threat and, therefore, arms have to be given to Pakistan. Now the language has changed. Now they say: "United States massive Soviet aid to Pakistan was necessary because of the long-term Soviet threat to Pakistan in the general region." We know what the general region of the strategic concept of America is. We know about the central command, and Pakistan is only a milepost in that central command. The language has changed. Why? Well, I think another official of the American Administration, Under Secretary Armacost had gone on record and said that Soviet Union is drifting to a non-conditional withdrawal from Afghanistan. We know what the Soviet Union has offered to do. We know what Secretary General Gorbachev has said. They have put a time-table for withdrawal from Afghanistan. It was sixteen months and now they say they are prepared to reduce it further to eight months. There is no doubt that the Soviet Union today is in a position to withdraw from Afghanistan. The Americans themselves are convinced about it and that is why this official, Mr. Armacost has said that Soviet Union is drifting to a *non-conditional* withdrawal from Afghanistan. The American Administration is in jitters. If the Soviet troops withdraw from Afghanistan, the bottom falls off from under their feet. There is no other justification for them to induce massive military aid to Pakistan. The situation has changed. It is no longer Afghanistan. Now, it is the Soviet Union, the long term threat of the Soviet Union in the general region. I hope Mr. Chairman you will not stint for time. I would like to put it to you that if Afghanistan had not been there for the strategic interest of America, America would have invented Afghanistan in order to serve her geo-political strategic interest. We know the militant things that President, Zia-ul-

Haque had been talking that if you don't give us the aid, we will go somewhere else. I think the Minister of State for Defence or the Foreign Affairs State Minister of Pakistan had said "the help of America to Pakistan is only 20%, we do not need it. We do not need your aid".

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT (Arrah): They steal it.

SHRI G.G. SWELL: But now, Sir, despite all, if Pakistan is lost to the USA, an outpost of their Central Command in this region, it will be a terrible loss and, therefore, don't blame the Senate. It is all along the American Administration which has been facing trouble with the Congress over the Symington Amendment. They have given a waiver for six years. That has expired. They would like the waiver of Symington again. But the American administration knows that getting their approval for the waiver of Symington Amendment for another six years on behalf of Pakistan is today an impossible task for the Reagan Administration. An American military analyst had said that Pakistani scientists have positioned two-halves of the core of a would-be nuclear bomb in a test that produced radiation levels indicating it could be detonated. Mr. Natwar Singh, you know about the principle of nuclear bomb. You have got a critical nuclear mass. You enclose it within conventional chemical explosives....

SHRI BIPIN PAL DAS (Tejpur): You are going into the details.

SHRI G.G. SWELL: So, Sir, this is the whole idea behind Krypton triggers that we talk about in this House. This is the whole idea behind the flash 'X'-ray camera. They got all these things in position, according to the American military intelligence and this position is accepted by America that Pakistan has now in possession of this nuclear material which can be compressed into a

[Sh. G. G. Swell]

super-critical mass and explosion can take place. The American Congress knows this and therefore, they are not going to give President Reagan a waiver of Symington Amendment for another six years. This is a very clever way of getting around and getting the things done. The Americans have started talking about the hideous dilemma in which they are. They are eager to give this money to Pakistan, they have to make Pakistan a force in their geo-political strategy. They cannot do that by waiving that Symington Amendment and therefore, this was the best way of doing it by linking India with Pakistan by saying that India has plutonium. Everybody knows in this world — the Americans know it — that for decades we have been having our nuclear plants for the generation of power and electricity. And we know that one of the by-products of those nuclear plants is plutonium, you cannot escape that. It is there, and the plutonium we have can be utilised for the next phase of nuclear energy production. The world today is moving towards what they call Fast Breeder Reactors. And the material for Fast Breeder Reactors is the plutonium. Fourteen years ago we have exploded or imploded a nuclear device under the ground for peaceful purposes. Over the years after that we have developed our launching capacity, we have sent space satellite, we have been able to send satellites into space ourselves, which indicate our capacity to launch a nuclear warhead if we want. But over these 15 years we have not done anything and nobody in the world have spoken a word that we have ever attempted to make a bomb. Pakistan has never made a secret of its desire for a bomb. Right from the beginning the late Prime Minister Bhutto said, 'We would eat grass, but we must have a bomb, the Islamic bomb'. The nuclear Czar of Pakistan, Dr. Abdul Qadir Khan, stole that technology from Netherlands and every time the press comes out with more thefts. All this was for the purpose of building a bomb. Is it

justified for America today suddenly to wake up and to do it right on the heels of our Prime Minister's visit to America and say that 'you India also, are producing a bomb,' accusing us of something about which they know very well we are not doing, to put us in the same basket and to say, 'we are going to cut off all aid to you, but if you go on pursuing with building a bomb, we cannot stop aid to Pakistan'. This is the whole meaning. And here we started talking about the concern of President Reagan and all that. Mr. Natwar Singh received the American Ambassador who conveyed that President Reagan is deeply concerned about it. You know very well that the credibility of President Reagan is at the nadir. He is not only a lame-duck President, but a hobbled President. His own Congressional Committee over Iran Contra affair, has said about him in so many words. I would not use the word "liar" because that would be unparliamentary. But his own Congressional Committee has said in so many words that he was mounting untruth: that he did not exercise his power to control his officers: That certain officers of his were doing things behind the back of the Secretary of State, Mr. Shultz. Over the issue, Secretary Shultz threatened to resign a number of times. They were doing things behind the back of the Defence Secretary, Weinberger and everything was done with the knowledge of the President. This is what the Congressional Committee has said. But for the fact that he is a lame-duck President, perhaps it is a fit case for the American Congress to bring impeachment against him. But here we go about and say that the President of America, President Reagan is concerned. He is kidding us. Therefore, let us know the fact as it is. This is what I would like to say. We have to decline aid, if necessary. We do not mind. It is shocking; it is shameful; it is scatological about their action. And you know it, gentlemen. If you do not know the meaning, go to the dictionary and find out what is this. It is scatological action.

SHRI DINESH GOSWANI (Guwahati):
You please explain it.

SHRI G.G. SWELL: Scatological is something to do with the ass hole of the Americans. It is something that comes out of the ass hole. What the Americans have done to Pakistan, are we on the same league with Pakistan? Pakistan is the client State of America today. It is wedded to America. Pakistan cannot take any foreign policy decision without looking over their shoulders to what their elder brother in Washington will tell them. They are eating out of the hands of the Americans, whether it is weapon or whether it is anything. I think, William Casey, the late Director of the CIA had gone on record to say to the reporter Bab Woodward who had just written the book "Veil The Secret Walls of the CIA" that CIA has the largest contingent in Pakistan in the whole world. It is the security; it is the weapons of the CIA that are keeping up the President Zia-ul-Haq in position against his own people. When they put India in that league, what kind of help do we have from the Americans? And it is so measly. A few days ago, it was heard that some kind of aid of 50 million dollars would be cut down to 30 million dollars. We can very well do without that also. We could have returned it.

I think, time has come to assert ourselves. If President Reagan has told our Prime Minister, "Please play a bigger role in the region", I think, this is the role we are going to play that we shall assert our independence and give away all the aid that Americans given to us. Let us stand on our own feet.

I think, it is an illusion to say that certain technologies and weapons available in America are not available anywhere else in the world. If they are so, they would not have even given them to their NATO allies. Will they give to us? Are we going to agree to that short of thing? We have had the case of

Bofors, we have got the case of Submarines, there are certain procedures which you have to go in order to obtain weapons from outside.

Is it not so? I think we are not going to do anything in a surreptitious manner and pay the price, with this kind of treachery that America has done.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): Unparliamentary word, Bofors!

SHRI G.G. SWELL: Now I come to the end. I thank you very much for allowing me.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Don't finish of Mr. Natwar Singh.

SHRI G.G. SWELL: No. He is a good friend of mine. Why should I? I am only talking out.

Now, we are clinging today to a slender hope. The House of Representatives has one set of resolutions, one language, only about Pakistan. The Senate speaks about India and Pakistan. That is the difference. But, it is not the final word. The final thing will be when the Congress as a whole adopts the resolution and, therefore, we envisage some kind of a negotiation between the two Houses of the American Congress as to what should be the commonly agreed form. Perhaps we should give president Reagan a chance. If he is concerned about it, let him show his concern by using his presidential prerogative by trying to knock out everything mentioning India in the Senate Committee's resolution and bring it nearer to that of the American House of Representatives. Short of that, I think we must live with the reality and assert ourselves.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI (Guwahati): Mr. Chairman, merely some unanimity is been in this House, a House in which there are so many political parties with such differ-

[Sh. Dinesh Goswani]
ences of perception not only of internal matter but even of foreign relation and I hope the Government has got a message that this House wants to convey not only to the United State but also to the Government itself.

Yesterday some of the Members were discussing on this John Dennis senate Appropriation Committee's report which it has adopted without any discussion. Mr. Daniel in a sub-committee's report has expressed shock and surprise with the decision of the United States. I am in agreement with both Mr. Inderjit Gupta and Mr. Swell but I am not at all surprised. In fact, I was rather surprised, when the Prime Minister, after coming from United States expressed the opinion that the relations between United States and India are likely to take a new turn. My admiration to the Prime Minister is manifold that here is a Prime Minister who merely by shaking hands with Mr. Reagan could change the American policy which even a Prime Minister like Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru or all the subsequent Prime Ministers could not do. I am not surprised. In fact, I am slightly relieved in the sense that my assessment of the United States global strategies and policies stand confirmed today.

15.38 hrs.

[SHRIMATI BASAVARAJESWARI *in the Chair*]

I felt after the Prime Minister's statement that probably I shall have to re-read all the documents, all the books available on the global situation and international relationship, because it appears that our Prime Minister as such does not have the capacity to know that by merely shaking hands with Mr. Reagan, he can change the American policy. After all, what the sub-committee has said? Has it said anything new? I do not think that Daniel in his sub-committee report has said anything new. It has only reiterated

what the American Administration has been all along telling us and the world. I will just quote one observation from the sub-committee's report:

"The sub-committee claims that events this year have made clear both Pakistan's strategic importance to the United States and the need to continue U-Pakistan relationship."

After all, the United States' global strategy has been that they want to play a role of a policeman in the entire world and for playing that role of a policeman in every region, they want some allies and not friends. In this region, particularly after the ouster of the Shah of Iran, the United States feel that Pakistan is their ally and they will go the whole hog to help Pakistan in whatever manner it is possible and if some bar of law comes, then that bar will be waived on one pretext or another. The Sub-Committee's recommendations and the approval of the Appropriation Committee are confirmation to that aspect. In order to prove that and in order to substantiate that, certain arguments have been advanced in the Sub-Committee's recommendations. What are the arguments? They are: "That Pakistan will not stop unless India is stopped from the nuclear arms race". We have made it clear that India does not want to make a bomb. We have made it clear that India wants to use the nuclear capabilities for peaceful purposes. Then the Sub-Committee's report says that the war in Afghanistan is going particularly well for the Afghan Mujahideens and therefore help to Pakistan is necessary. I am in agreement with Mr. Swell that America in the heart of hearts wants the Afghanistan situation to continue as such because that gives them a ground for their own base in this sub-Continent. Then the arguments says: "Don't cut-off the aid of Pakistan as it will not be in the vital interests of the United States and because of the Symington Amendment and the reasons well known, the legitimacy can-

not be questioned for granting aid to Pakistan. Therefore, equate India and Pakistan knowing fully well that Indian people, the Indian Parliament will not permit this Government to succumb or go down to the United States pressure with the result that, that will be taken as a lever to give aid to Pakistan. Very surprisingly, the naivety is expressed when the Sub-Committee's report says that the root cause of nuclearisation of Pakistan is the nuclear competition between India and Pakistan. Therefore, I am not surprised. In fact, I am also not at all-as my previous speaker Mr. Swell has said-prepared to put any credence to that newspaper report that Mr. Reagan has expressed concern because certain facts also must be taken note of. One is that the John Dennis Appropriation Committee has accepted the Sub-Committee's recommendations without any debate and discussion. Apart from it, there was an amendment from Mr. Solarz who is a Congressman and after moving the amendment, he was reported to have told the Press that he has given this amendment: to quote his own words: "I have taken this decision not because I believe that they are in the best interests of India but because I believe they are in the best interests of America. He further said that he will take up other issues also like the establishment of a separate special bureau for South Asia where 5 billion people live. But this amendment was not moved. In fact, I do not know about it. The report says that he was pressurised and prevented from moving this amendment. Therefore, a lot of underground activities has gone into the Sub-Committee's recommendation and also the Committee's own activities to see that it goes true so, that Mr. Reagan gets a leverage to say that after all if the United States' Senate Committee, which is such an important Committee, has made certain recommendations, therefore the recommendations should be given the force of law. After all, we have got our own past experience. We have seen how this Symington Amendment was

waived. We have seen the role of the United States in the past. Mr. Jaipal Reddy has laid stress on them. I do not want to repeat them. But the entire report of the Sub-Committee, if one looks to it very carefully, it says that the arguments advanced are totally hollow. For example, the Sub-Committee's report says: that Pakistan's quiet assistance to the United States in the Persian Gulf is one of the reasons as to why this recommendation has come. We know what type of Pakistan's assistance was in the Gulf and Mr. Jaipal Reddy has mentioned yesterday that after all, Saudi Arabia has taken the position that Pakistan's soldiers are to come back.

Therefore, I do not think that there is much scope for discussion or debate here. The question is: what are we supposed to do now? I believe that the whole purpose of it is, firstly, to ball out Pakistan from the possibility of any bar on aid-Pakistan must be given aid, so that the United States can have its own area of influence in this region-and to arm twist India, to prevent, if possible, transfer of high technology to India, to prevent bilateral aid, however nominal it may be, to India. But I think the most important is that the United States wants to convey this message to Mr. Natwar Singh and our Government: "Please turn a blind eye to the United States-Pakistan relationship; this relationship is a relationship on a firm footing and for maintaining this relationship and for assistance to Pakistan, no United States law will come in the way; even if you want some advancement in our relationship, that will not be at the cost of the U.S.-Pakistan relationship; therefore, forget about our own relationship". That is the message which the United States wants to convey to us. And I believe that our Government, while dealing with the United States, must remember about the American perception regarding the geo-political situation and its assumption that America has their role to play, the role of a policemen all round the globe, and so long as that assumption continues, we must be prepared or we

[Sh. Dinesh Goswami]
must remain prepared for a particular type of relationship with the United States. Mere hand-shake between Mr. Rajiv Gandhi and Mr. Reagan is not going to improve that situation. Now, the question is: what do we do? I think, this message has gone loud and clear to the hon. Foreign Minister and this Government that we must not, under any circumstances, succumb to any type of arm-twisting by the United States...

PROF. K.K. TEWARY (Buxar): Neck-twisting, not arm-twisting.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: We have conveyed, times without number, our intention for a friendly hand to the people of America. We believe that, among democracies, the two important democracies of the world, if possible, should work together, but unless the United States changes its own global policies and its own global approach, that is not going to be there. After all, I am not one who is expecting much of a change because the hawk in the U.S. Administration is President Reagan himself, and to feel that he is going to change or he is concerned, at least that does not lend any credence to me.

We should also convey to the United States Congressmen and to the Senators that their policy of arming Pakistan or their own approach to Pakistan is self-defeating from the United States' own interest. I believe there has been some sort of a short-coming in our lobbying and in our approach to the United States Congressmen and Senators. How is it that Pakistan has a much better lobby? Why is it that more number of Democratic Senators and Congressmen today are not raising their voice against this type of approach of the U.S. Administration.

The third point I would like to make is that the Committee's recommendation also wants to convey that tomorrow their aid from the IMF and the World Bank might be cut off.

In fact, when the aid of IMF was discussed and debated in both Houses, a number of Members, not only from the Opposition but also from the ruling Party, pointed out the danger of too much of reliance on aid from the IMF and the World Bank, but that was brushed aside. After all, we must remember that America has its own sphere of influence on the IMF and the World Bank, and I believe that when we think in terms of formulating our own policy of international relationship, we cannot divorce it from the economic relationship. It is high time that we reduced our dependence on the loans from the International Monetary Fund from the World Bank, and the policy of self-reliance which has been diluted to some extent in the recent past must be put on the forefront because if India has stood against the onslaught from Pakistan, against all these pressures, it is because of the policy of self-reliance that was advocated and practised right from the beginning. Any dilution on that policy will be at the cost of our national integrity. I am in agreement, Madam Chairman, that we should cancel Sundarji's trip to United States because after all that is one form of protest which we can show and it is necessary to show some protest.

I also had the occasion to read somewhere that there is some talk that the balance of our foreign policy has been lost to some extent, and it has become partial and the balance should be restored. After all, it is disparaging, with all respect to my Janata friends, we talked of genuine non-alignment. After all, non-alignment does not mean that India must maintain equi-distance between different powers. Non-alignment means that we judge each issue and its merit and take our own decision on the basis of the merit of the issue. We should not, under any circumstances, talk of loss of balance in our foreign relationship merely because somebody pats us on our back. After all, the foreign policy has stood the test of time, has served this country well and any talk of genuine non-

alignment or loss of balance will be greatly detrimental to the interest of this country. I believe that what has happened in the United States Senate Sub-Committee and the Appropriation Committee is going to be passed with or without some modification and should give us new relationship in that direction. I will conclude by saying that the House stands united today behind the Government that we will not succumb to any arm-twisting by any power, however powerful it might be and we must prepare ourselves economically, politically and otherwise to see that we stand up against all sorts of arm-twisting.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT (Arrah): Madam Chairman, I will begin by the last sentence of the Hon. Member who preceded me. Today, unitedly we stand to condemn this Resolution of the Committee of the Senate because this Resolution which has bias and animus against India. Mr. Indrajit Gupta said, "it should cause no surprise." I do not know who was surprised. Nobody is surprised by this Resolution. And even in the statement of the Minister, he expresses regret; he expresses concern and nowhere he has expressed that there is surprise. It is a fact that those who are and particularly we who have been at the receiving end from the US, in the long history, we cannot be surprised by this latest turn of the Indo-US relationship. This Resolution has brought crisis in the Indo-US relations, the crisis which threatens the basics of the relationship between India and US. If it is allowed to go, we cannot see any relationship between these two countries. We are not dismayed by crisis. Since Independence, we have gone through very difficult times. And, if I may say so, we love, crisis. We are least concerned about these crises, the outcome of these and the consequences. And when 800 million are united, as the whole House is united today, no power on earth can keep us away from our path that we have chosen. Luckily, the foreign policy of India is based on certain high

principles, the principles which we have followed and which have been laid down by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the principles of peaceful co-existence, non-alignment, policy of peace and friendship with all other countries. In that background let us distinguish between our Prime Minister's pursuit of friendship with that of the United States of America. They should not be distinguished by some of the twists and turns that are inevitable or innate in the American system, in the American policies, in the American pursuits of their international policies. It is because of the twists and turns, it is because of the fallacy in their perception, the basic fallacy in the American perception, that has brought about crisis all over the world. It has brought about crisis in the relationship between our two countries.

Think of the 50s when the American John Foster Dulles said 'neutrality is immoral, non-alignment is immoral'. Then the word 'non-alignment' was not born; we called neutrality. The word 'non-alignment' was born in 1961. He said that neutrality is immoral. Those who are not with us are against us. All this blandishment of power and domination, awesome power-as Shri Dinesh Singh said yesterday-awesome nuclear power, they possessed. The military industrial complex that they have is awesome. But that is the main element in the American system that is creating all the distortions not only in their strategic perception or global perception of foreign policy bringing about crisis all over the world, but this also has brought distortions in their domestic situation, in the relationship between one wing of the Government and the other.

If you see the Resolution, it has said one aspect. The only thing is that we are not surprised; but we are bewildered at the way things happen in that country.

First it was said that the House of Rep

[Sh. B. R. Bhagat]

representatives passed a resolution which spoke of the report to be submitted to the Congress on the level and quantity of uranium enrichment which Pakistan has reached and this report will be unclassified. This has to be an unclassified report. This means that Pakistan will never get a certificate from the President or the administration so as to get the aid of 4.02 billion dollars or so, which stands suspended for a few more days. That is the urgency of the second resolution because the period of suspension is going to be over and unless it is extended, something has to be done. Therefore, the other resolution was adopted first by the Sub-Committee on December 1st and later on adopted by the Committee. This resolution headed by a Democrat Senator John Stennis was adopted without discussion, you can imagine this. It was adopted without even having a debate and without any amendments to the anti-Indian elements in the resolution. It was passed in a hush-hush, in a conspiratorial manner. Imagine, a body like the Senate, the most powerful Congressional body—more powerful of the two—which can challenge the Presidential power in the system of checks and balances in the American polity functions in this manner! Can you imagine this?! Does it happen in any civilised country of the world? They think that they are above everyone, America is above everyone else. They are beyond any law, they can do whatever they like and that is what has happened.

16 hrs.

In the 50s they said that if anybody is not with them, then they are against them. They are trying to roll back the carpet of communism, they are trying to contain communism. On the percept that they were containing communism all over the world, they built up a chain of security pacts and bases and all other things. The SEATO and CENTO, many of them died, except the NATO. But

how many crises they created for every country which stood up—India in particular which stood up against them? This is wrong. Pandit Nehru said it repeatedly. In Vietnam when people of Vietnam defeated them squarely and completely Pandit Nehru in this House said repeatedly this is wrong. You cannot contain. It is for the people of any country to decide what form of social or political system that they will have and not the might of any power. But this is the crisis that they created. Imagine the type of crisis they created during the Bangladesh regime. The Seventh Fleet was here and they posed the biggest threat. Again the scenario is being repeated today. Here again the whole House has stood as one man against any threat to this country as 800 million people and the entire Parliament is condemning strongly this Resolution of the Senate Committee. So this is the scenario.

It goes to the great honour and credit of this country and our people that we prefer honour. Indian nationalism will not compromise with any force of denomination. Today they are threatening to suspend aid or assistance. Rather they say directing the voice and vote of the American representatives, multi-lateral agencies. But what happened during the Bangladesh regime may I remind the House? They did, in fact, unilaterally suspend all assistance to us. Did we care? If we did not care then why should we care now? We cannot care. Therefore, this is the situation today. I have no doubt the Government will communicate the mood of the House as has been expressed and the unanimous united feelings of the people expressing their abhorrence at this Resolution. The mischievous and insulting part is the linking of the Pakistan nuclear programme which is a clandestine weapon programme. Everything, you know, is by stealing. Dr. Abdul Qadir Khan was declared the biggest thief of the century by the European magazines. He was declared the biggest thief of the century by Netherlands and

other governments. Now the case is pending but such is the compulsion and the myopic view of the American foreign policy that they cannot distinguish between what is good or what is bad. India's nuclear programme is peaceful. The whole world accepts it. It is open. We want to pursue our independent policy in economic measures, in political life and non-alignment. Basically we do not want to compromise our basic right to decide things for us. We consider NPT is discriminatory and in favour of those who are the nuclear powers. They do not want to give right to those who want to develop nuclear energy or nuclear capabilities for peaceful purposes. They want to put curbs on us. Because of this basic discriminatory element we are opposed to it. It has no relation with either Pakistan. This treaty has been described as a matter of regional consequence, a regional perception. This issue of non-proliferation problem, the Americans in their wisdom has described as something like regional perception of this particular India and Pakistan equating India in their American mind. They accept it privately but in their heart of heart they believe or they want to believe. And this is the premise of this resolution that both India and Pakistan have a nuclear weapons programme. Therefore, they are equating both and they have devised this position that it has a regional perception. When Mr. Armacost, Under Secretary of State, came here, he made a vague effort. He came to Delhi and then went to Islamabad. He tried to bring about some sort of an agreement between India and Pakistan that both agree not to some international safeguards in which they should be assured that they are not following the weapons programme.

Well, they were totally told that we don't have any programme and it has nothing to do with any regional perception or even a time perception because our opposition to nuclear proliferation is based on certain principle which is there before Pakistan started

this, or before the Afghansitan question came or before any scenario or any political or geo-political situation or military situation developed in this part of the world. So, there is no question of any regional perception or there is no question of anything else. Therefore, this is the basis on which this had been done.

16.06 hrs.

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

But what is most objectionable? I gave you certain examples. But today the Americans' foreign policy is basically an imperialist one if you see it functioning in political, economic and in other aspects.

Yesterday, a reference was made. I think, Mr. Jaipal Reddy rightly said it that they want to control everyone, including the United Nations. What is the idea behind it? The United Nations now has a majority of the non-aligned nations. They are taking decisions independently. Therefore, they are against the United Nations and they have tried to curtail the funds. They have stopped the funds. Now they have released a small portion of it again linking with certain other things. But imagine what was the grievance against India. One of the reasons is that you are voting against United States. Therefore, it is a negative factor in the United States because India is voting against the United States and more in favour of the Soviet Union. We were saying that there are no bilateral issues in the United Nations. All issues are multilateral and general. The issues are of war and peace: the issues are of non-aligned movement; issues are bigger. Therefore, in those issues, it is the United States which is voting against us and the Soviet Union is non-aligned. Now there is a complaint. This is of the mind. A country which has enormous power-military and industrial complex-that governs the country,

[Sh. B. R. Bhagat]
that rules the country, that rules the Congress; they rule the President. They try to manipulate the President. You can see these distortions.

I will give you another example. It was said yesterday also. But I would say that in his first term, President Reagan addressing the Christian community-the evangelist group, a purely religious body-said: "Soviet system is an evil system and it has to be ended." Imagine the threat given by President Reagan "and it has to be ended", that is, the carpet of communism has to be rolled back. From 50's, they did not learn anything. They tried to contain communism and enter into agreements with them-SALT-I, SALT-II and various other things. I don't know in what wisdom who wrote his speeches but certainly this is the fang of the military industrial complex.

Now the same President Reagan today is having a talk and signing a treaty which is described by everyone else obviously as a historic treaty, with General Secretary Gorbachev. Now, another report coming from Washington says that this has a linkage. They tried to bring about the linkage between Pakistan and India's nuclear programme but there is a linkage with what is happening today, the historic event of the first every treaty for elimination of nuclear arms. SALT I and SALT II were for limitation of arms but this is a treaty for elimination of arms. In this they are going to discuss the deep cuts in the strategic missiles. It is expected that President Reagan may visit Moscow either in spring or in summer so as to bring about 50 per cent cut in these strategic missiles and the General Secretary, Gorbachev has a proposal; he has announced it that so far as Afghanistan's regional question is concerned, he is prepared to withdraw provided there are conditions for non-interference and the people of Afghanistan will be allowed to have their own

Government or their system which they want and there is no other outside interference. This again is not to the liking of the people-what is called the conservative elements whether they are in the Senate or in the Congress or in the administration. It has all happened as you know. It all happened with the departure of the Defence Secretary, Weinberger. You know that there is a general talk in Washington that the entire American system is divided between what are called the Hawks and the Doves and at one time the leader of the Hawks was Weinberger and the Doves, the more reasonable elements, were led by the present Secretary of State, Carlucci. These days Mr. Weinberger had departed from it and President Reagan has found it possible. It has also come out in the Press that in Reykjavik, President Reagan has agreed to the proposals made by the General Secretary, Gorbachev for a step-by-step elimination by the end of the century. It was one-to-one talk. Only when they realised that President has gone too far and Weinberger. was sitting on the other side, he said, "No, no, we cannot accept it." Then, at the last moment they brought out the SDI. These are all accepted facts. These element, as I call it, the military industrial complex whom Dinesh Singh described as awesome military power, are totally devoid of human sense. They are just brute nuclear forces, they have no sense of history, they have no humanism, they just want to dominate. This is, unfortunately, the ugly side of the American system. This imperialism is in action today. This accepts authority from none except its own. They think that they are vital because Pakistan has been rightly described as a client State and Pakistan is following the American policy. President Zia himself said that they are doing what the Americans want them to do in this region. This quiet assistance may be quiet in the Persian Gulf or invisible in Washington or in the Capital but it is not that much invisible in the Persian area and it has been said rightly that the Saudis are an-

noyed with Pakistan's role in playing the second fiddle to America. They have asked their troops in Pakistan to withdraw. There is one element, the conservative element, which is responsible for this resolution. Their interest lies with Pakistan; Pakistan may be their ally or client.

Secondly, President Reagan may not go too far and they may not go too far, and, therefore, there is already an opposition, there is a proclaimed opposition in the press and in the Senate of their signing this treaty. They have not only expressed warning, but they have expressed opposition and there is a talk and they are mobilizing opinion, that even though the treaty may be signed, but it may not be ratified. It will take effect only if it is ratified by the Senate. This element is working that even though they could not stop the treaty being signed, they will see that the situation is not there for the treaty to be ratified.

They have tried to create this linkage with Pakistan and with one stroke, they have scuttled the relations with India. Even if the scuttling of relations serves the interests of Pakistan, their ally, they want to show that they stand by their ally and also to show that President Reagan is not the last word. They are going to oppose it. That is what the system is.

The crisis has been created as a result of the basic fallacy in the American foreign policy. This is not the only crisis in the Indo-US relations. One President said that that we would get a steel plant, the other body, the military industrial complex refuted it. I can give you a number of examples.

Another point that you can see is that America's relations with any other country in the world, big or small, are not based on the basic principles of international law, on the basis of mutuality of interest and equality of status. There are never equal relations. Can

you say that the relations between the United Kingdom and the USA are based on equality? If anybody believes that it is equal relations, I can take him to the debate that took place when the American planes 111 flew from the UK base during the Libyan crisis, during attack on Libya and what Mr Kinnop of the Labour Party described Margaret Thatcher. I would not use that expression. That is not permitted in our House, but that was used in their House. He said that they were no longer an independent country; they serve the interest of America. That is the relation the America's have. I would give you another example. Is the relationship between American and Japan, which is now by all standards an economic super power based on equality? Do you know the amount of arm twisting that is going on in all the systems, trade, economic and others with Japan?

We are, therefore, not surprised, we are bewildered how foolish the American Senate is. We are not surprised, we are bewildered. The answer is clear and the House has given the answer. I would not repeat it. It is for them to decide whether they want to pass the resolution if the President wants to veto it. Under their system, sometimes the Senate vetoes the President, and sometimes the President vetoes the Senate. In this case the President wants to build up whatever talks recently he had with our Prime Minister. You cannot blame our Prime Minister. Hon. Americans say that India's major role is for stability, for peace and it has a progressive and dynamic role. They recognize it. They say that they want to build good relationships with India; that they want to improve their relationships with India. The President and the other leaders say that they want to have better relations with us. They say that their perception has changed. But how can you blame the Prime Minister for that? They know the dangerous realities of the nuclear world. They know that no nuclear war can ever be won and that if there is any

[Sh. B. R. Bhagat]

such war there will be no survivals. There are many such examples like in Vietnam; the 800 million people in India. So, like these there are many such realities all over the world which will force them to change their views. They will have to change their views because this is a fight to the finish. It is an imperialist action. Unfortunately, we are at the receiving end. But the 800 million Indian nationals, the strength of the democracy of India will not surrender, will not compromise and will not accept any resolution like this. It will give them a fitting reply. It is up to them to decide whatever they want to decide. Whether they want to keep this resolution or whether they want to give aid; it is up to them to decide. We have never accepted aid with strings and we will never accept any Congressional aid.

SHRI SALEEM I. SHERVANI (Badaun): Sir, I am extremely grateful to you for giving me an opportunity to participate in the debate. I heard the views of my senior colleagues with interest and I share their concern and anger. Sir, one fails to understand the American policy. They call themselves a 'Democracy'. But there have been enormous instances where they backed the rebels, they backed the dictators. In fact they are prepared to back a Government which would follow their policy in totality. Their attitude of 'Holier than thou' has been exposed on many occasions. Only a month ago the Congress man, Solarz who is the Chairman of the House of Representative Sub Committee on Asian and Pacific Affairs said and I quote:

"What the US needed from Pakistan was not the assurances about their nuclear programme but action."

He further said:

"That the termination of all aid to Pakistan would be guided by what Pakistan

does and not so much by what Pakistan says."

This was what happened a month ago. A month later the decision of the Senate Panel on Foreign Aid to equate India's peaceful nuclear plans with Pakistan's clandestine effort to make a nuclear bomb is most illogical. It even defies rational thinking. Anyone can see, but provided they want to see, that India's nuclear programme has clear cut peaceful aims, that is to keep pace with the world's scientific and technological advance purely for peaceful purposes while the Pakistan's nuclear programme has just one motive, that is an anti-India Defence motive. Sir, is the American Government so blind that they cannot see through the Pakistan's game? Can they not see through Pakistan's clandestine effects? Pakistan's lies, their stealing, their various contradictions which their top nuclear scientist, Dr. Khan has made and what President Zia has said from time to time? I would like to quote here About 3 years ago their top nuclear scientist while giving an interview to *Nawa-i-waqt Pakistan* on 10th February, 1984 said:

"As far as we are concerned, by the grace of god we have left India behind by many years in Uranium enrichment and we feel convinced that so far India has not made any advance in this field. Such a big success in such a short time is the result of General Zia's personal interest and encouragement. "He not only encouraged the scientists and engineers, but gave all those facilities and considerations which became the base of the success of this extremely difficult task."

Sir, their own President, President Zia while giving an interview to *Washington Times* on 12th July, 1984 said:

"We have the nuclear capacity. But our financial resources do not permit us to

make the atom bomb."

Denying that Pakistan was on the verge of making the bomb, he said:

"I wish it were true."

On 30 March 1987 while giving an interview to the *Time Magazine*, he said:

"You can virtually write today that Pakistan can build the bomb whenever it wishes."

Only a few weeks earlier, their scientist Dr. Khan while giving an interview to the *London Observer* said:

"America knows it. What the CIA has been saying about our possessing the bomb is correct, So is the speculation of some of the foreign newspapers."

He further said:

"They told us that Pakistan could never produce the bomb. They doubt my capability. But they know now we have done it."

So, what more proof does anybody need? Their own people, the top official on nuclear non-proliferation in the Government, Ambassador Richard Kennedy openly said:

"Pakistan's assurances are indeed most unreliable and with the information in the possession of the Administration, the President is not in a position to give a certificate to Pakistan in good conscience."

They admit everything. But still their decision to go ahead was just an excuse. They had all intentions of releasing this massive military and economic aid to Pakistan. The only reason why they are doing

this is because they see India coming in the way of America's global ambitions. They want to pressurise us by retarding our economic progress, they want to pressurise us by giving such massive arms aid to Pakistan, by changing their laws and by waiving clauses, their pretext being Afghanistan, while some of the arms they are giving to Pakistan cannot be used against Afghanistan, These arms cannot be used in that particular terrain. They can only be used against India.

Sir, I would not like to take much time of this august House. But I would definitely like to express my sentiments and I am sure that these are the sentiments of all the members here as well as the people of this country. I feel strongly that we cannot allow Pakistan to be stronger than India militarily and equipment-wise. We should be prepared to make any sacrifice that is needed. Even if it means reducing our expenditure on other items, we should be prepared to do so. I would like to go a step further and say that we should take a fresh look at our nuclear programme and even if we have to make the bomb, this is the time to do it. I very strongly feel for it.

Sir, I am proud of the stand that the Government of India has taken in this matter. We have lodged a very strong protest. Our Ambassador spoke to the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Armacost. He said:

"You have allowed Symington amendment and other provisions barring military and economic aid to a country that pursues nuclear weapons path after the adoption of these laws. As result of that law, you have certain problems with Pakistan. the Pakistanis have compounded your problem by stealing things from you. It is upto you whether you enforce you law or not. But if you try to drag us into this, because you cannot enforce your law against Pakistan, it is unacceptable to us. If you

[Sh. Saleem I. Shervani]

impose any kind of restrictions on us because of your relations with Pakistan, it will have major consequences on our bilateral relations."

I would appeal to our Government that we must lodge the strongest protest possible. We must convey our feelings to the American Government. We should mobilise hundreds and thousands of Indians who live in America to organise 'protest rallies' in different cities. We should expose the policy of the Reagan Administration before the American people themselves. It is hightime that the American Government stops fooling its own people and the world.

Thank you Sir.

SHRI N.V.N. SOMU (Madras North): Mr. Chairman, much has been said about this problem. The Prime Minister's recent visit to America was described as a resounding success. It was hailed like anything. Now, it seems to be a total failure. It is a failure of our foreign policy, I want to say with much regret. We were under the impression that our relationship with the U.S. would improve but it is becoming worse. The Prime Minister's assessment is totally wrong. It shows that the Prime Minister has no assessment on men and matter. The Prime Minister Mr. Rajiv Gandhi reported to have stated that the U.S. wants us to play a bigger role in this region and cited Indo-Sri Lanka Accord also. I want to ask: is it on the advice of the U.S. that IPKF was sent to Sri Lanka and you invited Jayewardane for the Republic Day? We are spending Rs. 3 crores daily. Rs. 300 crores were spent, which is a criminal waste. Not only that, the invitation to Jayewardane to the Republic Day celebrations in India is adding insult to the injury. It is just piercing a weapon in the wound. It is an onslaught on the feelings of the Tamils. The Tamil race will never forgive Mr. Rajiv Gandhi. Not only that, the hon. Member Shri

Azad has talked tall about Indo-Sri Lanka Accord.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Tamilians should not tolerate Reagan also.

SHRI N.V.N. SOMU: Yes. I agree on this. It is said that Jayewardane had tricked Rajiv Gandhi into agreeing to do this dirty work for him and the army was being made to pay the price for the Prime Minister's naivety.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Somu, you try to confine your speech to this subject.

SHRI N.V.N. SOMU: Okay Sir.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY (Mahbubnagar): His position is that Sri Lanka Accord is a result of the growing relationship between Mr. Rajiv Gandhi and President Reagan. It is very much correct.

SHRI N.V.N. SOMU: Mr. Dinesh Singh also said that Americans are not able to win over Vietnam. I can say with more emphasis that no military can suppress the zeal of Tamil Eelam also. I want to say U.S.A. has announced 4.02 billion dollars, nearly Rs. 5000 crore help to Pakistan.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: It is the spirit that is important not the figure.

SHRI N.V.N. SOMU: It will definitely strengthen the position of Pakistan. We must be careful now. It is high time that we should clearly lay down our foreign policy. It is not only a complete failure of the foreign policy but also the failure of Indian Embassy at Washington. The American politics is a lobby politics. Our Ambassador and other officials failed to lobby properly. They failed in their duties. Therefore, I would urge upon you to recall the Ambassador from Washington. It is a very sad thing that the largest democracy in the world and the strongest

democracy in the world are not seeing eye to eye with each other.

Therefore, I would appeal to all the American Senators and the Congressmen to see the reality and act accordingly.

SHRI BIPIN PAL DAS (Tezpur): Sir, I rise to lend my voice of support to the feelings expressed by hon. Members of this House on this issue, yesterday and today. There is no word by which we can condemn the Appropriation Sub-Committee's action in the U.S. senate, in this particular matter. It is outrageous, and it is certainly not helpful to peace in the world. This Parliament represents the opinion of the entire nation—800 million people of our country. We not only condemn this development; I would like to tell USA that we refuse to be cowed down by any military or economic threat.

Mr. Somu has unnecessarily brought in extraneous matters. I do not want to deal with him. We have been following a correct foreign policy all along; and our foreign policy has also stood the test of time. We stand on honour; we shall never sacrifice our honour, our integrity, our sovereignty, our independence for any gain whatsoever, from anywhere. Come what may, we shall stand on our own ground; we have been following this policy right from the beginning, even today, and we shall continue to follow this foreign policy in the future also, whatever Mr. Somu may feel or say.

We shall continue to stand erect on our legs, with our head held high. We shall never compromise our independence and sovereignty for any gain whatsoever, military or economic. We are not upset by this news; at least, I am not. Somebody said that we are upset. I am not upset. I am also not surprised because of this development, because we know very well that the American world view is entirely different from our world view; and the American perception of South Asia re-

gion is also different from our perception. So, there is no reason why we should be completely upset or taken by surprise, by this kind of a development. The USA wants to treat us on equal footing with Pakistan. Nothing new. They have been trying to do it all the time. USA took a stand against us on the Kashmir issue. On the Goa issue, and on the Bangladesh issue. On every subject which concerns our national interests vitally, all along USA has been found to be against our interests. Therefore, I do not think that we should be shocked or taken by surprise.

According to USA, India does not fit into their overall foreign policy framework or strategic framework. According to USA, it is Pakistan which is more important in south Asia, than India. That is their view, their perception; it is not so today, it is going on. And, therefore, in pursuance of that policy if the Senate Sub-Committee adopts a certain resolution, I am not surprised. They want somebody in this region to play their cards, play their game, to be a pawn in their chess-board, to be their client-State. Pakistan has offered itself to be so. Naturally, they will welcome Pakistan, and try to save Pakistan by all means. India has refused to be so. Therefore, they are a little unfriendly towards us, or are not friendly towards us. They suspect us. This has been going on all the time.

I would like to tell you a small incident: In 1971 Indira Ji went to America. Fortunately, I was also there at that time, as a member of the Indian delegation to the U.N. Indira Ji went to America to plead with President Nixon that he should exercise his influence with Pakistan, so that their atrocities in East Pakistan can be stopped, and we may be relieved of the trouble of receiving refugees. That was the only purpose. When she discussed with Mr. Nixon, Mr. Nixon was not responsive at all. And then, Finally, Indiraji put a straight question to Mr. Nixon. I have learnt these things from Indiraji herself. She

[Sh. Bipin Pal Das]

put a question: "Mr. President, Why are you always in favour of Pakistan as against India? Why do you always support Pakistan against India?" Sharp came the reply, "They listen to us, you do not". And that explains the entire policy of America towards this region. "They listen to us and you do not"! America will always support everybody who always listens to them, anywhere in the world. If you show any amount of independence. If you have any self-respect and sense of honour, if you do not bow down to them, if you do not listen to them,—well, President Nixon very clearly gave the message to our Prime Minister. Our Prime Minister came back. He did not stop there. President Nixon wanted to teach a lesson to Shrimati Indira Gandhi. He sent the Seventh Fleet. He perhaps did not know of what stuff Indira Gandhi was made of; he perhaps did not know what inherent strength these Indian people had, this country had, and the Seventh Fleet which came towards Chittagong had to go back with a flattened nose! This is a part of history. After all this, can we hope anything good from America? We should try. I will come to that. Not that we should not try. But I am not surprised, I am not shocked.

The conservatives in the U.S.A. are against this Reagan-Gorbachev meeting, to sign the INF treaty. I have particularly taken note of the timing of this resolution of the Senate Sub-Committee and the way it has been passed, in a hush hush manner, this is very significant. I would like the hon. Minister to throw some light on this subject.....

PROF. N.G. RANGA: That is right.

SHRI BIPIN PAL DAS: About the timing, of passing this resolution and the way in which it has been passed, in a very quiet manner, hush hush manner. Is it only to counter the decision of the House of Representatives? They could have waited for some days more, they could have done it

earlier. Why have they done it just on the eve of the meeting between President Reagan and Gorbachev?

PROF. N.G. RANGA: That is the point; coming elections.

SHRI BIPIN PAL DAS: There is something in it. I have not been able to come to any conclusion. Perhaps by passing this resolution the hawks in America, the conservatives in America want to put a pressure on Gorbachev and Reagan, either not to sign the Treaty or even if the Treaty is signed, when he goes to the House, to the Senate for ratification they say, "Accept this, our resolution, then we shall ratify, otherwise not." Or some such tactics must be there. I do not know. I am not as knowledgeable as my friend Prof. Swell is. I would request the hon. Minister to throw some light on this matter about the timing and the manner in which it has been done. That they will do it, it was know, at some point of time. Some section of American leaders are against us, they are conservative, they are pro-Pakistan. All are known facts. Nothing new. But I am thinking about seriously—I am counselling—about the timing and the way it has been done. And I hope the Minister will throw some light on it. But, has it been done to prevent that trial of Arshed Parvez? Because, if Arshed Parvez is convicted, if the charges against him are proved to be correct, the state of Pakistan will not be free from the blame. Zia-ul-Haq will not escape. That is the concern of the friends of Zia-ul-Haq in America. They are very much concerned. Let Mr. Parvez go to hell. They do not bother, but Zia-ul-Haq must be saved, their ally and friend Pakistan must be saved. That is their concern. Is it because of this they are trying to put some pressure tactics just on the eve of Arshed Parvez's trial. Can it also be deleted?

As I said Sir, I have no illusions about the American attitude towards us vis-a-vis Pakistan, but the timing and the way it has

been done makes me think about it. What may be the reasons? What may be the motivations? I think this timing is very very significant from the point of view of the development on the nuclear disarmament field.

Sir, I would like to ask the Minister one question. In view of the fact that Pakistan has become overtly and covertly aligned to USA. may not be in a formal military way, not a member of CENTO any more, there things are dead. nevertheless Pakistan has become a military ally of USA, in view of that can we permit Pakistan to remain in the non-aligned camp? Can we? Should we not raise this question in the non-aligned meetings?

PROF. N.G.RANGA : Mr. Jaipal Reddy has raised this point. SHRI BIPIN PAL DAS. In view of the arms relations between USA and Pakistan, Pakistan ceased to be in true sense 'a' non aligned country, in my view. Whether we should raise it or not, I think we should create enough public opinion a climate in the non-aligned world about this matter, exposing Pakistan's role in this region or in the gulf region.

Sir, I will end by saying that our policy is, where there is friendship, strengthen and consolidate it further; where there is no friendship, try to build the bridges of friendship; and where there is hostility, try to neutralise it. This has been consistent with our peaceful policy consistent with that policy, we will certainly like to make friendship with America, but not at their dictation or on their terms. When we think of friendship with America, I think of friendship with the American people. Therefore, I would like this Government to publicly tell the American people-the administration may be against us but all the people are not against us- that we want friendship with you, but not on your terms or at your dictation. Sir, friendship is a two-way traffic. It cannot run only in one direction. If they want our friendship, they

should also show their friendship to us at the moment or if they desire to have friendship towards us then they have to scuttle this resolution of the Senate Sub-Committee. This is the only way they can prove to us and to the world that the American people really want friendship with Indians and this message must go from this House and also from the Government.

PROF. N. G. RANGA (Guntur): As can be seen now from the trend of the debate, even the Americans should be convinced that all of us are unanimous in condemning this stand that they have taken, in condemning their way of approach to India, and in condemning the manner in which they have tried to weaken our Prime Minister as well as our Government. But at the same time, I would like to lay stress on two or three things which we ourselves have to do.

It is easy for us all, as things are now, under the stress of this crisis, for all political parties to say, yes, we are all united. But let us not forget the manner in which an atmosphere is being built up in our country that we will not have this Prime Minister, we are going to down Rajiv Gandhi's leadership. How do we expect the Americans to be ignorant about it? They are going to organise huge conclaves at the national level spending crores of rupees, bringing people from all over India with their different flags and make a demonstration here at the Boat Club - God only knows from where - in order to down the leadership of the present Government. Are the Americans, going to be blind? Are we united in this manner? Are we going together? we are going in two different ways- the Rightists on one side and the Leftists on the other side. And what is at the Centre the Congress. Therefore, they want to destroy the centre, weaken the centre. Is that the way that we demonstrate our unity before the Americans. ? This is what we are doing. Let us think about it.

[Prof. N.G. Ranga]

All of us are talking about self-reliance. We are not going to make any appeal to the International Monetary Fund, World Bank and all other international financial organisations. We have to stand on our feet. But at the same time, we will not allow the Government to think of raising funds through taxation. We are opposed to the rise in prices and inflation and all the rest of it. When these friends were in power, were they able to prevent these things? Will they be able to prevent these things even now if by chance they were to come back again? How are you going to achieve self-reliance? My dear friend, Mr. Dandavate, without self-reliance you would not be able to fight the Americans.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: I want self-reliance but the Government wants 'reliance'.

PROF. N.G. RANGA: You could not achieve even a bit of self-reliance at that time. I do not want to go into your performances or lack of performances. But the point is, let us think about it, about ourselves. Are we going to be united as a result of the crisis that is staring us in the faces? It stares at the face of the Communists; it stares at the face of the Janata and it stares at the face of the Congress. We have to think about it.

Some General is going to America. I am not in favour of it. I donot want military experts to go to America and then tell those people, expose to them where are we weak in regard to this technological new offensive, for they would know how weak we are, where we are weak and in what manner. And they can possibly pass on that information to Pakistan and others who are opposed to us, help them to make up form their side and give us a big blow in the tummy. I would rather suggest that our experts should go to such other countries which are willing to give some help in a piecemeal fashion. If it has been possible for Pakistan to gain this capa-

bility not form one country but from many countries, not directly but indirectly, not openly out secretly, should it not be possible would it not be possible for us also to gain that kind of information? Let the Americans be told that we have achieved our nuclear capability through self-reliance, not by stealing , not by lying, not by cheating other people and throwing dust in their faces and not begging somehow or other in a heinous manner. We have achieved it because Indiraji had faith in our scientists. Indira Ji gave every possible encouragement, support and strength to our scientists and helped them to go ahead. It was only when they were ready with the capability that she appealed to the country to stand by her by demonstrating that capability. Let the Americans understand and realise, let our experts, our diplomats and our statesman inform the American leaders at the top on both sides that we can also develop all these things about which we are seeking their support, their help, their assistance, their cooperation. If they are not willing to do so, we would be able to develop it. Let us go ahead. One of our friends had the courage to say that it is time for us to think of the ultimate. It is time for us to think and prepare and get the necessary strength in all those directions in which we have been asking, we have been negotiating with Americans for new knowledge, new secrets. Is America alone in this world? Why is it that Reagan was obliged to meet Gorbachov?

For months they have been saying that they are not going o have any summit. Why have they had the summit? Just before he was going to have it, he was answering his American friends and American enemies also; Oh, all these are war-mongers. I am going to achieve peace and I am going to assure the whole world that it would live in spite of the existence of the knowledge as well as the capability of nuclear power, the nuclear destructive power" He had said all that. So, let them be told that we are capable

of developing it. Let us go ahead with all the strength that is at our disposal, with all the funds also that we can possibly muster, and strengthen our scientists. help them to gain, if not as much knowledge and capability as America has or Russia has, at least as much knowledge and capability as would give us the necessary strength, assurance and confidence to deal with American allies, American satellites, American agents. It is pitiful of these leader of Pakistan- I feel ashamed that they had been with us for some time-to go about saying ;"Yes, we are clients of America. It is in the interest of America that we should be strengthened,, we should be safeguarded, we should be built up in such a manner that we can deal with India. Sir, let the Americans also realise one thing. We have demonstrated our capability so many years ago and all this time we have held our hands. That is not the case with Pakistan and pakistani mind. If we are united here, they are also united against us. Please remember that, it is wrong for us to allow ourselves to be deluded that there are popular Opposition forces in Pakistan against Shri Zia-Ul-Haq and all the rest of them. What did Miss Bhutto say the other day? Have we not read what she has said? She is at the head of a party. Some section of our press is eulogising her, building her up, as if she is going to be an alternative to the present dictatorship. They are all united against us. And what sort of people are they? Have they shown even half the sense of responsibility that we have demonstrated? Is it not a fact that every time they took the initiative in attacking us? So, one bomb in their hand is enough to strike terror right up to Ratlam and converting the whole of this into dust. They are the people who are likely to throw it first in an irresponsible manner. Who would be responsible for it. Let the Americans be told that they would be responsible for humanity as a whole, for the whole of the world. Therefore, it is in their own interest they care for their skins, moral as well as material.

17.00 hrs.

Some of our friends were saying now that Afghanistan question is going to be solved, America would have to depend upon Pakistan alone. It is not only because of Afghanistan but it is also because of Gulf States, also because of American's desire, intentions and plans and games to control the whole of Indian Ocean from Diego Garcia to the Red Sea. Now, they want to build up Pakistan under those circumstances, what is the policy that we have to pursue in regard to China? China was their enemy. Now, she is her friend, But China was sensible enough to allow Pakistan to rush into her embrace for taking over all the area which she had grabbed from us. Should we not think in terms of reaching an agreement, of some understanding with China? Let us take a lesson from Russia. Russia has not been content with only trying to reach an agreement with China too. If it is necessary for Russia to make friends with China, there is greater necessity for us to reach an agreement with China. China may not become our friend, but let not China continue to be our enemy. Let not China at least continue to bolster up Pakistan. Has not China helped Pakistan in regard to the manufacture of atom bomb and all the rest of it? So, in all these directions, my dear friends we have got to think far ahead in a courageous manner. Let us also realise that. We are 800 millions, for purposes of pitting one population against another, it suits some of our people to say that we have reached 800 million. Thank God, we have not yet reached 800 million. What is it that we can do? We have got to face them, we have got to subsidise their food, we have got to subsidise fertilisers which are needed by our 'kisans' we have got to fight and carry on the 'Garibi hatao' programme. Let my friends form the opposition make up their mind in the sincere and patriotic manner not to go on with the kind of play that they want to display here in our country. However, much you may try,

[Prof. N.G. Ranga]

you must be quite sure about it that Congress is going to be in the centre of politics here in our country, Congress is going to be the central political force and around that political force and through that political force you have got to strengthen our country and see that people are safe, not only from America but also from Pakistan, not only from atom bomb but also from the kind of political atom bombs that our friends are trying to develop in our country in such a short sighted manner.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH): Sir, may I first of all thank the hon. Members—Shri Jaipal Reddy, Shri Dinesh Singh, Shri. Bhagwat Jha Azad, Shri Saifuddin Choudhury, Shri K.K. Tiwari Shri Indrajit Gupta, Prof. G.G. Swell, Shri Goswami, Shri B.R. Bhagat, Shri Sherwani, Shri Somu, Shri Bipin Pal Das, Prof. Ranga—for their interventions. Now, I have also listened with great care and with very great respect to the various observations, criticisms and suggestions made by the hon. Members.

I am deeply sensitive to their feelings on this question. And that is why the Government decided to make a *suo moto* statement. We had to keep the House informed in this regard. The statement that I made yesterday in the House was drafted with great care and it says what it says in clear and unambiguous terms and these will not have gone unnoticed to those to whom they were addressed. As implied by all hon. Members, we have to approach this grave matter in a calm, cool, balanced, mature, measured manner as we have done yesterday and this afternoon, bearing in mind our vital national interests and our long-term relations with the United States.

SHRI AMAL DATTA (Diamond Marbour): What are those long-term interests?

You please define what are those long-term interests.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: I will just define them. The long-term interests are that this country's foreign policy is that we should have good relations with the two Super Powers and other countries and if you read the statement of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru when he was discussing Pakistan's military aid by the United States, in every single statement he expressed his view that India desired friendly and good relations with the United States, regardless of the fact that they were in this particular respect militating against the interests of this country; and this applies to both the Super Powers.

1706 hrs.

MR. DUPLY SPEAKER *in the Chair.*

SHRI AMAL DATTA: How do you say they are long-term interests?

(Interruptions)

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: If you think that it is not in our long term interests to have friendly relations with America, I don't agree with you. Even the Peoples' Republic of China wants good relations with the United States and the Soviet Union.

Now, Sir, the time table for this particular matter which is before the Congress, I would like to place before the House because there may be a minor change in this time table, not because of any particular reason although while they are discussing this later in the day, a very historic event will take place in Washington D.C. President Reagan, not so long ago, had referred to the Soviet Union as an evil empire. Today he is playing host to Mr. Gorbachov in Washington. That is what I mean by long-term interests of great nations.

SHRI CHANDRA PRATAP NARAIN SINGH (Padrama) In politics there are no long terms interests.

SHRI G.G.SWELL: This is a long-term interest for all of us.

(Interruptions).

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: I am aware of the fact that there are no permanent friends and no permanent enemies, only permanent interests.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Not vested interests!

SHRI AMAL DATTA: If interests are permanent, they must be vested interest!

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Don't waste the time.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH : Dattaji, I can only give you facts, I cannot give you understanding

SHRI AMAL DATTA: Thank you very much, provided you have it yourself. I do not act for the Government of India; you do. You should have clear understanding.

(Interruptions)

SHRI K.NATWAR SINGH: I don't think you will ever be active in the Government of India at any time, there is no danger of that.

SHRI AMAL DATTA: Your estimate of yourself is not shared by us.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: No I don't under-estimate or overestimate, I am a realist.

Over the next week or so the full proc-

ess will unfold itself. First the Senate will vote on these recommendations, and these recommendations are contained in the continuing resolution, which is to be adopted by the Congress, and this overall Resolution deal with aid allocations to all the countries the world over. And the portion relating to India and Pakistan forms a part of that continuing resolution. Now this resolution will be debated in the next day or two in the full Senate. Then there will be voting because there are two drafts, as the hon. Member has said-one by the House of Representatives, one by the Senate. These two drafts, as I said earlier, relate to the whole package of the United States aid for the Fiscal Year, 1988. Then the Selected members of the two Houses will sit down to arrive at a common draft. And at that time, changes can be made. And that common draft is then sent to the President and this has to happen before the 16th of December.

Now, we have been strengthened by the unanimity displayed in this House and in the other House on this matter that we are all on the same wave-length, we are determined as one people, as one great nation to send our united voice across to the United States Congress to see that even now at this late hour, they can amend and win the goodwill and friendship of 800 million people. If these changes are not made, then the blame will not lie on us, but it will lie elsewhere

Sir, there are three options. In the objectionable portions, the most conjectionable is the introduction of a linkage, for the first time between the peaceful nuclear programme of India and the weapons directed military nuclear programme of Pakistan . That is totally unacceptable and if you read my statement, it has been stated in clear terms, in well chosen words, but without any ambiguity whatsoever. On the NPT, there can be no compromise and there will be no compromise. Let everybody know about it; this House knows about it; this country

[Sh. K. Natwar Singh]
knows about it; and let our friends in the US Congress also know about it. Now, if these objectionable passages with regard to the linkage, if they are removed, then the whole thing is acceptable to us. But suppose only minor changes are made high-tech is removed, conditionality with regard to aid, and then the picture is slightly better. Now, if no changes are made, then as I said, in my statement, that if enacted, this would have adverse implications for our bilateral relations with the United States. These are, Sir, serious words, not lightly uttered, but after due consideration.

I would like hon. Members to refer to one or two other parts of my statement in which we have laid down and said a healthy relationship between two sovereign democracies has to be built on mutual interest, trust and confidence. Devoid of these elements, our relationship with the U.S. cannot prosper, cannot retain its present level much less prosper.

So, we are hoping the efforts that we are making, as I said, in the statement, the Prime Minister spoke to the United States Ambassador here. It was done because we wanted the message to be delivered immediately to President Reagan. The Ambassador saw me. I left him in no doubt, about the feelings, unanimous feelings of Parliament and the people of India, on this particular matter. On December 6, Sunday, the Ambassador personally delivered a letter to me, in my office. With your permission, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I would like to read out some portions of this letter because this is the authentic response of the United States Government to the objections that we have raised on the resolution that has been adopted in the Senate Committee.

The Ambassador said:

"Last Friday evening I met at length with

Prime Minister Gandhi and yesterday, December 5, I met with you at your residence. Both of you expressed to me your deep concern over the current discussions in the United States Congress regarding the U.S. assistance programme for Pakistan as they might affect Indo-U.S. relations. It was with the Prime Minister in Washington on October 20, and I know and was witness to the warmth, cordiality and the determination of the U.S. Administration to continue improving relations with India. The current Public discussions in congress has not yet produced the definitive legislation. I would like to assure you and the Indian Government that my authorities in Washington have been alerted by us and by your representative to your deep felt concerns. In reply, I have been asked by my authorities to convey to you the following views:-

- (1) The President of the United States and his Administration are aware of your position and your serious concerns.
- (2) Our policy remains to continue improving our bilateral relationship. There can be no turning back from this policy.
- (3) We continue to support India's efforts towards self-reliance and are committed to expanding co-operation in a number of fields such as high technology and trade.
- (4) I have seen this to be my mission here during the last two years and committed to the continuation of this course.

"I would like to assure you that the executive branch will work with the

Congress to achieve changes in the proposed legislation to ensure that this policy is implemented.

With warm personal regards.

I remain,

John Gunther Dean."

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: In this reply, the main point of parity of India and Pakistan on the nuclear point seems to be completely ignored, the aid to India.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: This is what I said. That is the package.

SHRI G.G.SWELL: I have to say about what you have read out. I don't like to know whether we are doing anything good. He could convey the contents. But to read out a letter from a mere Ambassador in this House, is I do not know whether we are doing anything right.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: I do not see anything objectionable because the matter is grave and serious and it is conveyed to us by instructions of his Government and not for my private use.

SHRI G.G.SWELL: Americans don't do that. The British would not do it.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: If the Americans do not do that, it is their problem, not ours. It is not a confidential document. It has been conveyed to us.

PROF. MADHU DANAVATE: His contention is the House of Commons would not have allowed it.

SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV(Varanasi): What is the harm in it? It should be known to the people. It is almost laid on the Table.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: Mr. Goswami, you raised a very important point. As I said earlier, if the necessary changes with regard to the linkages are not made, and I think we should be prepared for the worst scenario that they may not be made. If that happens, I have said in my statement that while we do not want to prejudge the final outcome, we shall take the necessary steps and action when we know the final outcome. I do not think it will be alright and proper for me to prejudge or to say, but you can be rest assured that Government is fully aware of this fact that minor changes with regard to high technology and foreign aid might be made but some linkage might be kept and this is where our very grave objections arise to link India's peaceful nuclear programme which is being done for the past several decades with the clandestine military programme of Pakistan. This is where the difficulty is. And this difficulty is not now. As I have said before in the House, we have to look at our relations with the United States in an integrated way. There are two aspects - There is the negative and there is the positive. And the negative aspect is this; for the last 30 years or more, the United States in their wisdom have elected to give military and financial aid to Pakistan which has led to this particular situation, which has led to their going ahead with their nuclear programme, because no restraint has been put on them. It is only recently that Mr. Pervaz and others were caught stealing, that there was some realisation that may be that Pakistan was this is going a bit too far. This negative aspect has now cast a shadow on our relations with the United States - not from today but for the last 30 years and more. Our endeavour has been that in other areas to carry on with the positive aspects. But this is a basic conclusion if on this nuclear programme this linkage continues, then our ties will, I regret to say, be adversely affected.

Now, I would like to refer to some of the points that hon. Members have made. Mr

[Sh. K. Natwar Singh]

Jaipal Reddy, you were good enough to say that... (*Interruptions*) I would like to say that this is not a partisan issue. You said that if the legislation was formalised, then you would consider it an unfriendly act. I do not want to use that language. But I think you are expressing the views of a very large number of people in this country and in this House. Also, you said that India cannot be faulted for trying to improve the relations with the United States. That is what diplomacy is all about. We will continue to do so. We don't want to harbour any ill-will for a great country. And if some great countries like the Soviet Union and the People Republic of China want to improve relations with them, why should not we also? We have good relations for a number of years. There are many positive aspects of our relations with this U.S.A.

Shri Dinesh Singhji has said something. I am grateful to him. He said that this was a ...

SHRI S.JAIPAL REDDY (Mahbubnagar): Mr. Minister, I referred to the unusual optimism exhibited by the Prime Minister on his return from the recent visit to the United States and the way the whole thing has been falsified. Would the Minister please explain?

SHRI K.NATWAR SINGH: No. Sir... There has been such unanimity in this House on the essential basic, serious, grave issue. I do not want to be side-tracked of this. You know what I mean. What I am trying to say is that this unanimity is strengthening the hands of the Government because the message goes to Washington from here that both the Houses of Indian Parliament, without dissenting voice, have conveyed their deep concern and disapproval of what is going on in the United States Congress and their outrage... (*Interruptions*). This is what is important that the message should go

clear as a bell.. (*Interruptions*) Shri Dinesh Singh-Ji in his speech has said that this was an unfortunate proposal. He has said that this should be a set back to our relations. He has been Foreign Minister. He has chosen his words carefully and wisely. We have taken note of them. He has said that this is a part of the global strategy of the United States and that is the fact with which we have to deal with and that is what we have been trying to, for a number of years.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad has also said that this was rather a very good example of how to destroy a good relationship if this thing was passed Alas! Unfortunately I agree with him.

Mr. Saifuddin Chowdhary and Prof. K.K.Tewary expressed similar sentiments. They were only giving vent to their deeply felt feelings which we all share.

Shri Indrajit Gupta said that he was on the same wave length with the Government. I am delighted to have this weighty parliamentary support from so distinguished and senior a colleague here. He said "Hope springs eternally in the South Block" I hope it will continue to do so. I entirely agree with him that the voice of Parliament cannot be ignored. I think, the message that will go from this Parliament will have this necessary effect, and if it does not, then we will pick it up from there; that, I can assure him. He said that there was some feeling of complacency. There is no complacency. Diplomacy is a continuous process. Like a circle it never ends, and only the immature and the non-adult would indulge in an exercise of complacency when the stakes are so high.

I would like to thank Prof. Swell for his intervention. He has a lot of experience in foreign affairs. His main point, and I think he made it very well, was about the linkage to which we have taken objection and he analysed what this linkage meant. He also re-

ferred to the Afghanistan problem and the timing of this which has been raised by a number of people. We have also been observing as to why this particular time was chosen. I do not want to give any explanation because I am not responsible for the timetable of the legislative business of the United States Congress. But if you look at the past, you will find that the legislative time-table or proceedings were rather unpredictable and the pendulum swings from one extreme to the other when it is least expected. So, this matter apparently came up very suddenly. You can look at their relationship with China, with the Soviet Union, etc., etc. there have been various continuing legislations in the past. But about the timing, whether there was any effort to try and influence. Mr. Gorbachev by saying, "Here we are; we are giving this package of 4.02 billion dollar aid to Pakistan; we are also having linkage with India and Pakistan" if that was the effort- I am not, for a moment, saying that that was the purpose; this has been suggested and we have also been examining it- all I can say is that I would want to credit the policy makers at Capitol Hill, the White House and the State Department with greater foresight and greater wisdom...

SHRI G.G.SWELL: I did not make that point.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: Somebody else had made it. Shri Dinesh Goswami has said that there was a rare unanimity in the House, and he was entirely right. He wanted to know what our response was going to be and I made it quite clear what it would be when we know what the final outcome is.

There was some reference made to the visit of the Chief of Army Staff to the United States. I am not aware of it, but I shall certainly convey the feelings...

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Kindly keep it in mind.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: We, certainly, will. I do not want to make any commitment on behalf of the Government without approval. But I do assure the House that it will be borne in mind if the final outcome is not satisfactory.

Shri B.R. Bhagat said that there was a crisis in the Indo-US.S. friendship. I hope it is not a crisis. I hope this can be resolved to our mutual satisfaction and to our mutual benefit.

I would, finally, refer to the interventions by Shri Shervani and Shri Somu. Shri Shervani was good enough to say that we were doing our job not too badly and he also spoke about the situation in Afghanistan which is well known to the House. I am afraid I do not share the views of Mr. Somu when he says that it has been a failure of India's foreign policy.

Shri Bipin Pal Das who himself was a Minister in the Ministry of External Affairs, wanted to know if there was anything about the timing of the Resolution. I have already said that we have looked at it. We sincerely hope that this was not the purpose. Whatever the purpose was, its effect has been adverse on our relationship. That is the most important part; that is the serious part.

Finally, I would refer to Professor Ranga. Sir, I am very grateful to that you lent your voice to this debate, to the unanimity that has been witnessed in the House. With your great experience and wisdom, we all listened to you with very great respect and with very great care.

Now, I would like to conclude not in a pessimistic note, not in an optimistic note but in a realistic note that India desires friendly and mutually beneficial relations with the United States of America. But we will not allow pressure from any direction to affect the fundamentals of our foreign policy.