

# News from Senator

# BOB DOLE



(R - Kansas)

2213 Dirksen Building, Washington, D.C. 20510

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE  
WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 1980

CONTACT: BILL KATS  
(202) 224-6521

## SALE OF NUCLEAR FUEL TO INDIA WOULD UNDERCUT OUR NONPROLIFERATION COMMITMENT, DOLE SAYS

WASHINGTON -- Senator Bob Dole (R-Kan.) today voted against the sale of additional nuclear fuel to India, saying that to do so would undercut the Nuclear Nonproliferation Act of 1978, placing the United States in contravention of our own laws.

"The Administration has made its decision in favor of the proposed sale," Dole said. "In doing so, President Carter overruled the unanimous decision of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) that the shipment would violate U.S. interests by breaking the Nonproliferation Act. In doing so, the Administration has overruled the will of the people and the Congress who passed the 1978 Nuclear Nonproliferation Act. In doing so, the President has breached the enforcement of the Nonproliferation Act which the House of Representatives upheld Thursday in a nonpartisan, three-to-one vote of 298-98, which disapproved the President's decision to override the NRC. With our vote today, the fate of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Act and its goals will be decided, along with the destiny of that fuel for India.

"It has been argued that denying India the fuel will ultimately do more or less damage to our foreign policy interests. It is the belief of the senator from Kansas and the other cosponsors of this resolution that the case against the sale to India is ultimately more persuasive, and of more importance to U.S. long-term security goals.

"It seems clear to me that if the Senate approves the sale we will be undercutting the Nuclear Nonproliferation Act of 1978, and will be placing the United States in contravention of our own laws. We will be aiding and abetting India's drive to acquire a nuclear military capability. We will be making a sham of our exhortations to other emerging nuclear powers to join the nonproliferation pact.

"The principle of nonproliferation is too dear a price, and too essential to our long-term national security, to be the questionably effective quid pro quo for India's friendship. Recently India signed a \$1.6-billion arms agreement with the Soviet Union, an impressive display of friendship and cooperation. If we allow the export of U.S. uranium we can not realistically expect that it will result in any significant change in India's foreign policy. It is clear that after the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan the Indians have greater reason to fear for their security and yet, of all the Third World, India protested the least. They have accepted the Vietnamese invasion of Cambodia and the puppet regime installed there. It is quite apparent that India will make its security decisions on the basis of much larger geo-political concerns than our shipment of nuclear fuel.

"Additionally, the United States cannot in good faith continue to supply the nuclear program of India when the Indian government has violated its 'peaceful use' assurances made to the United States under the agreement for nuclear cooperation made in 1963. India's use of U.S.-supplied 'heavy water' during their so-called 'peaceful nuclear explosion' in May of 1974 is a direct breach of our agreement.

"Such use of U.S.-supplied fuel for the production of plutonium is a major threat to world stability. We cannot allow ourselves to be blackmailed on this issue, or the United States and the rest of the world will be subject to a far worse blackmail by nuclear terror in the future.

"The prospects for friendlier relations between India and the United States, never very certain, will no doubt be clouded for the short term by this issue. But, it is also certain that to cave in to a nation that has consistently opposed U.S. foreign policy goals without achieving a commitment on nonproliferation cannot be construed to be even remotely in the interests of the United States."