

Fourteenth Loksabha**Session : 7****Date : 11-03-2006**

Participants : Singh Shri Uday, Singh Dr. Manmohan, Yadav Shri Devendra Prasad, Mahtab Shri Bhartruhari, Chandrappan Shri C.K., Gao Shri Tapir, Swain Shri M.A. Kharabela, Nikhil Kumar Shri, Gowda Dr. (Smt.) Tejasvini, Pal Shri Rupchand, Tripathy Shri Braja Kishore, Sharma Shri Anand, Fanthome Shri Francis, Sibal Shri Kapil, Verma Shri Ravi Prakash, Mufti Ms. Mehbooba, Badnore Shri Vijayendra Pal Singh, Salim Shri Mohammad

an>

Title : Discussion on the statement made by the Hon'ble Prime Minister on 7.03.2006 regarding Civil Nuclear Energy Cooperation with the United States, in the context of the recent visit of the President of USA.

MR. SPEAKER: Now, we will take up item No. 21, namely, discussion under Rule 193. Shri Gurudas Dasgupta.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI): Sir, I would like to make a submission before the discussion starts on this issue. Today, this discussion is taking place in response to the desire of a section of the House under an appropriate motion, and our hon. Prime Minister is also very keen to reply to the same. But today is Saturday, and we have to accommodate the hon. Prime Minister to reply in this House as well as in the Rajya Sabha. Therefore, I will request the House to conclude the discussion by 5 o'clock in order to allow me to bring the hon. Prime Minister to this House at 5 o'clock to respond to the debate. I am saying this because he has to go to the Rajya Sabha also. Sir, we should try to do it.

MR. SPEAKER: Do you want the reply of the hon. Prime Minister at 5 o'clock?

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI: Yes, Sir, at 5 o'clock today.

MR. SPEAKER: All right, we shall try to adjust accordingly to start the reply at 5 o'clock.

Shri Gurudas Dasgupta -- not present

Shri C. K. Chandrappan to initiate the discussion on this issue.

SHRI C.K. CHANDRAPPAN (TRICHUR): Sir, I stand to raise a discussion on the Statement made by the hon. Prime Minister on 7.3.2006 regarding the civil nuclear energy cooperation with the United States in the context of the recent visit of the President of the USA.

Sir, in the statement, the hon. Prime Minister has explained about the various decisions taken by the two Governments during the course of the discussions. It was a nuclear energy agreement, and there were also certain agreements regarding agriculture, knowledge economy, trade and business between the two countries, and arms deal too. These are the main items, which the hon. Prime Minister had included in the course of discussions, and on which they had come to an agreement. It was agreed upon that the civil and other reactors will be separated, and separation was successfully done according to India's choice. This is what the hon. Prime Minister had stated.

Now, the last part of the statement described the two countries as 'democracies in the world' which will strive to achieve the common cause of fighting against terrorism, and preserving democracy and democratic institutions in the world.

Sir, these agreements apparently look very good, and they got such a big publicity that they were termed as historic, unprecedented, etc. I would like to say that there is conspicuous silence in the statement about one issue. ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Please maintain silence in the House.

SHRI C.K. CHANDRAPPAN : A point was always raised in the recent past with the Heads of visiting States or Governments -- during discussions with the hon. Prime Minister or other important Ministers -- about India's claim to have a seat in the United Nations Security Council (UNSC). I do not know whether the Government has raised this issue with the hon. President of the USA as there is a conspicuous silence on this issue. Probably, it was not raised or if it was raised, then probably, they did not agree to it. I feel that it is a serious omission with regard to India's own interest, and its legitimate claim to have a place in the comity of nations. The Congress benches very eloquently spoke about this during the debate on Motion of Thanks on the President's Address, namely, that this is one issue on which we would approach the nations of the world for support[\[ak7\]](#).

Probably, your Government did not approach on this issue to have an opinion from the United States of America. Whatever it is, the Joint Communiqué is silent about it.

About all the other things spoken in the Joint Statement, I have certain things to say. When you look at it historically, it may be very good to speak in terms of civility or talking things in nice terms so that the President of the United States or his supporters might feel very happy about what the Indian Parliament discusses. But I would like to remind you that Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, I hope, the Congress benches are still proud of Pandit ji, refused to shake hands with Mussolini when he came to receive Pandit ji at the Airport in Rome. It was a very surprising thing. But Pandit ji told that he would not shake hands with a Fascist. He did uphold the great Indian tradition of our Freedom Movement, and the values it cherished.

Here, such fanfare was made when Bush came. In this world, as it is today, which is described as a unipolar, he is the President of the mightiest of the mighty States, I do not mind that we spread red carpet to receive him. I must say that he gave a parting kick when he made his speech in Purana Qila, which is after the agreement

was signed, everything was spoken nicely, everything was done nicely, and after so much of toast being raised. The last part of the Joint Communiqué says:

“We should stand together to fight against terrorism, protect democracy.”

What Bush said, I am quoting from his speech.

“India’s leadership is needed in a world that is hungry for freedom. Men and women from North Korea to Rome to Syria to Zimbabwe to Cuba yearn for their liberty. In Iran the proud people is held hostage by a small clerical elite that denies basic liberties, sponsors terrorism and pursues nuclear weapons. Our nations must not pretend that the people of these countries prefer their own enslavement. We must stand with reformers and dissidents, I underline the word ‘dissidents’, and civil society organisations and hasten the day when the people of this nation can determine their own future and choose their own leaders. These people may not gain their liberty overnight, but history is on our side.”

Sir, this speech was made not in Washington, this speech was made not in New York, this speech was made where he was the Chief Guest in Purana Qila where when pleasantries were said, he said, “I am coming here as a friend. Martin Luther King said that he would come to India as a pilgrim. I am coming here as a friend.” And the friend said this!

Mr. E. Ahamed, the Minister of External Affairs was in Iran. He was in Iran embracing the leaders of that State and came and reported back, when we were discussing Iran issue in Parliament, that the Iranian leaders are happy about the position India takes [\[R8\]](#).

Now, here is our guest President Bush, utilising the opportunity we provided to him here, stating that in Iran a minority clerical sect is administering. He called upon India to stand with them to liberate those people. He wanted India to rally with the dissidents. Do we agree with this? A feeble statement was made by the Ministry of External Affairs after he left for Pakistan - I should not say that I have not seen that - that we do not agree with that. That shows the unequal nature of the friendship you are creating today. You are creating a new friendship with a nation which wants to be the

Chief International Police today, arrogates itself to positions where it decides which is a rogue country and which is a good country, where democracy is there and where democracy is not there, where regimes have to be destabilised and where army has to be sent for destabilisation.

They decided to send army to Iraq despite the fact that the United Nations did not agree to that. This House condemned in unequivocal terms sending of army and stationing of army in Iraq. But the USA did it and it did it with the help of NATO. Their missiles flew over India from that far off island in Indian Ocean the Diego Garcia where they have their military base. Their missiles flew from Europe. One of the ancient civilisations was bombed to rubbles. That civilisation that was there, probably during the period of our Gangetic civilisation, on the banks of the Euphrates and Tigris was bombed to rubbles. There was no sanction of the United Nations.

What was the reason they gave? The reason they gave was that there were weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. Who said that? CIA did and nobody else said that. The United Nations Inspectors did not say that. They repeatedly said that they could not find any weapons of mass destruction. There is a Chinese proverb which says that if you want to kill a dog, call it a mad dog and beat and kill it. On the same lines, the CIA said that weapons of mass destruction were there in Iraq and you have beaten and killed Iraq.

Saddam Hussain is in prison. I am no fan of Saddam Hussain. But he was the elected leader of that country. You may not like the elected leaders of many countries, that is a different matter. But in a democratic world, you have to have elements of tolerance and a democratic sense which our new friend President Bush and for that matter the United States do not have. That is my complaint. There my right doubt also as to what extent they would respect the commitments they have made to this country. They may not honour them. Somebody said, "Oh! President of the USA. They will not honour". Yes, that is their tradition. I can cite any number of examples about the agreements that they dishonoured, international agreements. I can cite any number of destabilisations they made in the world during half a century. The destabilisation was made everywhere with a purpose [\[KMR9\]](#).

This has a purpose behind unseating a Government that was progressive. That necessarily should not be that of the Communists. In the Fifties, just after the Second World War, when new nations were coming up with new aspirations like India, what happened to the Prime Minister of Iran, Mohd. Mohasseddeq, who nationalised the British oilfields? I think, you remember that. What happened to him? The Anglo-British combine unseated him using the military power. Sir, two years later, in the backyards of the United States in Guatemala, a new Government was elected by the people and that Government was not liked by the Multi national companies selling fruits. They are called the United Fruit Company, a multinational company. They did not like the Government and they wanted the Government to be overthrown. Then came the United States and bombarded that country and that Government was unseated. That was in the Fifties.

Now, we are discussing this in March, 2005. On 16th February, there was an election in Haiti, a small island in the Caribbean. In Haiti, the Government of Aristidi was overthrown last year by the United States. His own man with massive majority, inspired the forces of democracy and got elected on 16th February. Thus, probably again facing another destabilisation.

We received Mr. Fidel Castro. He was made the President of NAM in Delhi. Indira Gandhi handed over the Presidentship to Mr. Fidel Castro. Mr. Fidel Castro, from day one onwards when he came to power in 1959 till today, he is under US blockade. His life is threatened and he is threatened with war. What right the United States has got to do all these things? Is it not well known that in the Seventies, the CIA instigated and directly intervened and upset the whole political system of Chile and unseated Mr. Allende, President of Chile. Not only that, he was killed. That is the history of the United States. I do not want to narrate further.

In the last century, more than 100 destabilisation acts have been done in their own backyards of South America. Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia are located 3,000 kilometres away from the United States, which fought for their freedom. You know that probably more than a million US army men were sent there and for years they

remained there. They had used all kinds of weapons, probably, except the nuclear weapons. What for they were there? Explanation was given that these countries were hampering the security interests of the United States.

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Chandrappan, I do not wish to interrupt you. But the discussion is on civil nuclear energy cooperation. You have taken 20 minutes.

SHRI C.K. CHANDRAPPAN : I will not take much time.

I am saying that this is a nuclear treaty we have entered into with a friend whose tradition is such that they never honour. They never give respect to their partners – big and small. We may be thinking that we are a big country but they care too hoots for all that. That is the history of that country. That is why I say that whatever good things are said, they may not come true.

Secondly, when the President of the United States landed in Delhi, Press lauded his magnanimity[s10]. He came and quietly went to sleep. Everything was left to Condoleezza Rice saying that no hitch should be there tomorrow morning. He woke up and asked whether there was any hitch. Probably there was no hitch or whatever hitch was found, was removed and the Agreement signed. What a wonderful person he is! What a wonderful Agreement it is! The Treasury Benches were in ecstasy but unwillingly India was made to become part of the global strategy of geo-politics that the United States wants to have. They want an alliance desperately. I am not saying this. Their senior leaders including President Bush said it, to contain China. They say, after the collapse of the Soviet Union, after the cold war, they do not want another contender in the world and so, they want to contain China. They want also to see -- Russia is not doing well – that Soviet Union is no more there. They want new friends in Asia. They have Pakistan with them. But Pakistan was always with them. But, they want India to be with them. When, our friends from the BJP, sitting here, were in power, they were trying to take India to the United States' table. They did not succeed. Now, to my great surprise, this Government have done that. They have taken India to the stable of the United Nations global strategy of containing China, containing Russia and to have an upper hand in politics in this Asiatic region. That is a danger that we see in the Joint Statement. They have bartered their independent foreign policy. That is our complaint. ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: For records sake, 'you' will mean, 'the Speaker'.

SHRI C.K. CHANDRAPPAN : I do not mean you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Then say, 'the Treasury Benches'.

... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI C.K. CHANDRAPPAN : Sir, the Government has bartered the independent foreign policy, that has been continuing for decades since the time of Independence. This foreign policy of peace, solidarity and the policy of disarmament, that stood against the arms race, has been bartered for a little nuclear energy and arms which they are sending to us and probably will instigate arms race in this part of the world.

My third point is this that we have bartered our independent policy of non-alignment, peace and disarmament. We have seen that. When I quoted President Bush, I must say that it is his audacity that after such a grand reception, the nice words and everything, it is almost like a kick on our face. He said that he was inviting us to come with him and stand in the fight against countries who have regimes that he did not like. They did not like their destabilisation. They want an ally in India. Therefore, my contention is that the Statement speaks good things, but the Statement is silent about India's place in the Security Council.

There is another aspect also in the Asiatic region. Our Prime Minister spoke about our extended neighbourhood. He speaks about our enlightened national interest. There is Israel in the extended neighbourhood. Just after Iran and Syria, one comes across Israel and just on the borders of Israel, recently a very important development took place. Hamas has been elected to office in Palestine

[p11]

.

What did Israel say? The Ministers must have read it. All of them must have read it. Israel told the Hamas Prime Minister : "You might have been elected but our sharp shooters will shoot you down." It was said about the Head of a State. Well, we will not feel so surprised because Yasser Arafat was one of the world leaders we honoured. He came to the Central Hall and spoke to this Parliament. He was given a red carpet welcome. It is all right.

In Ramallah in his last days he told that 'probably he was not a person shedding tears.' But he said this in such a manner that how the Head of a State was treated by Israel with their tanks surrounding his palace and made him a virtual prisoner. Israel

has stockpile of nuclear arms. They are threatening Iran by saying: “If you go ahead with your nuclear programme, we may strike the manner the pre-emptive strike we have done in case of Iraq.” But our Government said nothing about it. Their Joint Statement did not utter a single word of concern about that development in this part of the extended neighbourhood. So, it is the extended neighbourhood where freedom is being attacked; destabilisation effort is being done all with the support of the USA. Without the support of USA, Israel cannot exist. It is a surrogate country existing with the support of the USA. Is it that we are not concerned about it.

When the BJP people were in power, they tried to take the policy a little forward India-Israel Axis. It had all the support of the USA. Mr. Brajesh Mishra went to Washington to negotiate that. But somehow time was not in their favour. But I would like to know from the Government whether they are also going to do that after this. I think, it is a dangerous thing and we cannot ignore it. We may get nuclear power generation facility. I do not know whether we will have facilities for re-processing the nuclear wastes. That depends. We have kept our fingers crossed. The US Congress is not like our Parliament. It is all powerful, constitutionally so.

MR. SPEAKER: We are also powerful.

SHRI C.K. CHANDRAPPAN : We are not so powerful, Sir, I am sorry; because our Constitution does not say that a Treaty has to be ratified by Parliament.

MR. SPEAKER: Our Constitution makers did not make that.

SHRI C.K. CHANDRAPPAN : We can make it.

MR. SPEAKER: But that does not mean that we are not powerful.

SHRI C.K. CHANDRAPPAN : So, I have moved an amendment to the Constitution. If you kindly permit, we can discuss it.

Sir, if their Parliament, the US Congress does not approve, everything falls through. It has happened in the history. About agreement of any country with USA, when the US Congress disapproves that or refuses to ratify, it falls through.

MR. SPEAKER: All Constitutions are different. Our Constitution is different. But that does not mean that our Parliament has no power.

SHRI C.K. CHANDRAPPAN : We have this power that we can discuss it and talk it out. But their Parliament can decide 'yes' or 'no'.

MR. SPEAKER: Then, do you want to follow that?

SHRI C.K. CHANDRAPPAN : No. I think, in this regard specially after certain experiences, I would like our Parliament to have such powers so that behind the back of this country things should not happen as the WTO Agreement was signed. The peasants are perishing. We can only discuss it but there is no ratification. Now, behind our back, the US Accord is being signed. We can only discuss it.

So, I would say that with crossed fingers probably, you are praying that wisdom should dawn on the US Congress so that nothing untoward happens to the Treaty. With these words, I express these apprehensions about the unequal nature

of the Treaty. They want a partner who always refuses whatever they do not like; and now dangerously so, they are calling us to go forward with them to fight for destabilisation of the regimes they do not like. These are our serious apprehensions. This is why this discussion was raised.

Thank you very much for your patient hearing.

12.00 hrs.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN (BALASORE): Sir, the BJP as the initiator of the process of strategic cooperation with the United States of America, whom the then Prime Minister Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee had termed as India's natural ally, is gratified by the development. This joint statement is an explicit confirmation by the present UPA Government of the continuing validity of BJP, NDA Government's strategic initiative of deepening, broadening and strengthening relations with the United States of America. This is the direction in which the BJP-NDA Government has set the entire policy. The joint announcement of 2nd March reaffirms the centrality of that policy. But, Sir, the only yardstick of objectively assessing, evaluating and commenting on this important announcement is India's national interest, very purposively explained by the hon. Prime Minister, the enlightened national interest. Based on this, it is our view that the Government has surrendered on many counts and these are the concerns, though we support this Agreement, which I shall basically express.

The Prime Minister rests his argument on two bases; availability of nuclear energy and the energy security of this country. What are his arguments? His arguments are; coal-base thermal energy is a polluter, gas is more costly but nuclear energy is clean. These are the three basic points on which he establishes all his arguments. Let us see what is the position of nuclear power in India now.

The nuclear power energy in India constitutes less than three per cent of the energy basket of this country. Let us go to the Annual Report of 2004-05, of the Department of Atomic Energy. It says that the Nuclear Power Corporation of India operates 14 reactors; two boiling water reactors and 12 pressurised heavy water reactors. What is the total capacity of these 14 reactors? It is 2,770 megawatt. In addition to that, India is also going to be engaged in the construction of eight nuclear power reactors with a total capacity of 3,960 megawatts. So, altogether there are 22

reactors and their total capacity is going to be 6,730 megawatt. The Government has set to achieve a target of 10,000 megawatt of power generation by 2010 and thereafter to achieve setting up of a few more reactors of 5,40 megawatts each like TAPP III and IV. These TAPP-III and IV projects are the largest indigenously designed and built nuclear power reactors of this country. According to the Annual Report of the Department of Atomic Energy, the gestation period of these reactors is about 50 months and they are one of the bests in the world[R12].[R13]

This is the strength of our nuclear scientists and the technologists. It has happened because of the capability of our nuclear scientists. It is because of them that we have today been described as a responsible State with advanced nuclear technology. But my point here is that even if we achieve 10,000 megawatt of nuclear energy by 2010 or 20,000 megawatt of nuclear energy by 2020, it will at best be a small contribution to the total energy need of India. It will be not more than 10 per cent of the total need. Our potential for hydro electricity is huge. There is also the possibility of having non-conventional energy like wind energy. So, it is a very wrong premise to say that it is only the nuclear energy which can sort out the problem of India in the next two decades. We do not believe in this.

Now another point on which the hon. Prime Minister's speech rests is that the nuclear energy is clean energy. It is not like coal. The United States is the biggest polluter on this planet. It has not signed the Kyoto Protocol. Our emission of green house gases is 0.05 per cent of the total US emission. So we have to think of this. Who is polluting this world? It is not us. It is the United States of America. The clean coal technology is available elsewhere in the world. We can adopt it. It is available in South Africa. The environmental issue could be taken care of by thermal and also by clean coal technology. So to say that the clean energy is only available out of the nuclear technology or nuclear power, for me, it is not true.

The next point is that we will have nuclear power but at what cost. What is its cost? For a target of 40,000 megawatt of installed capacity by 2020, the total

additional investment required would be Rs.2,40,000 crore. Is it a very small sum? We want electricity but at what cost? This is a stupendous cost. This is only the installation cost of the reactor. What about the cost of the uranium? Nobody knows what would be the cost of the uranium. What we have heard is that the cost of uranium has gone up by three times. So, the capital cost involved in a nuclear project is very high and the fuel cost is also equally high. As per the Annual Report of the Department of Nuclear Energy, we have not exploited our uranium mining capacity. There is only one mine in Jadugoda in Jharkhand from where we have our uranium and elsewhere we have never tried.

As regards thorium, it can also work as fuel for the nuclear reactor. The two-third of the world's thorium deposits are available in India. It is a chance given to the scientists of India to become self-sufficient. If you utilise the thorium deposits that are available with us and if you utilise the uranium then I think India will be self-sufficient in this field and India will not be critically dependent on any of these nations of the world for its nuclear fuel and energy.

As per this Agreement, neither India is having energy security nor it is going to be self-reliant in the energy security. It is basically a programme of imported fuel and imported reactors[r14].

This is exactly what is going to happen. How can India, on one hand, be perpetually dependent -- that is another problem -- on imported reactors and fuel and also, on the other hand, talk about energy security and self-reliance in this regard? These are two contradictory things. I would like to appeal to the hon. Prime Minister to reply to this point when he replies to the debate. What has been our experience in the past? All of a sudden, just like as it happened in the case of Tarapur power plant of stopping fuel supply, it can happen again in future. This is my apprehension and also the concern of my Party. The hon. Prime Minister should reply to this.

The next point is, what is India's standing in the nuclear field? We agree that there are three phases of India's nuclear development programme. Initially, pre-1974, it was an independent era. We did not have any restrictions on us. We developed our nuclear energy programme independently. We, with the help of other countries, developed it. We had the Apsara reactor with the help of Canada; we had our reactor in

Tarapur with the help of USA and we had our reactors in Kundukulam with the help of the then USSR. That was the first phase.

Now, second phase started when tests for the first time was conducted in 1974 in Rajasthan. The second phase was the era of sanctions. That was the noon of a nuclear winter. That was the time when India was being described as an international pariah. This happened during that time. That was the second phase. But this was also the time when nuclear technology blossomed. The scientists who were denied access to nuclear technology mastered this art of nuclear technology in all fields and we were even using our indigenous nuclear technology for strategic purposes. That was the second phase. The regime of international denial became a source of great strength for India. We became self-reliant and our scientists brought this glory to this nation. I could say that this was the best period with regard to nuclear technology that India had.

The third phase started post-Pokhran in 1998. We became practically a *de-facto* nuclear weapon State in 1998. There were more sanctions, more denials, but we faced them. Our situation did not deteriorate. Within two years of this nuclear denial, the then President of the United States of America, Mr. Bill Clinton, after imposing economic and technological sanctions on India, visited India. It so happened because we stood our ground. We gained from our strength and from our foreign policy to have the minimum strategic deterrence.

Sir, with regard to NPT, I would like to submit that we have not signed the NPT because we thought that it was discriminatory and so we did not sign that. Take this example. It was signed in 1971, some 34 to 35 years back. It recognised two categories of State, one is the nuclear weapon States and the other category of States that it recognised was the non-nuclear weapon States[[snb15](#)].

In 1998[[bru16](#)], we declared that we are also a Nuclear Weapon State. Even though we have proved ourselves to be a Nuclear Weapon State, we have not still joined the non-proliferation regime. Our Prime Minister declared that India is a responsible nuclear power. I have already mentioned that NPT has divided the world into two categories, namely, Nuclear Weapon States and non-Nuclear Weapon States.

But after we tested our device in 1998, we became the third category. The world saw the third category State emerging. This is a non-signatory State to NPT but a Nuclear Weapon State. By 1998, all the five countries having nuclear weapons were signatories to the NPT. In 1998, we became the sixth State having nuclear weapons almost officially but we are non-signatory to NPT. By signing the present agreement, we are doing so without being recognised as a Nuclear Weapon State. That is our objection. We are actually a *de facto* Nuclear Weapon State but in this agreement, we have not been accepted as such. That is our objection. We are actually being given a second class status in this agreement. We have been treated as a poor cousin of the United States of America. Why do I say this? It is because now we will have to sign the India Specific Agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency. We have to sign one India Specific Agreement with the IAEA. India Specific talks are to be negotiated with the IAEA because we are not a nuclear wapon State. We will have to sign an agreement which no other five countries having nuclear weapons have done. They do not have an agreement like this. They have no agreement with the IAEA like the India Specific Agreement.

Now, as per this agreement, what are we going to do? We have to voluntarily place our civilian nuclear facilities under the IAEA safeguards. In future, we have to sign and adhere to an additional protocol with regard to the civilian nuclear facilities. These are the two things to be considered here. We will have to sign one India Specific Agreement and voluntarily, we have to separate civilian and military nuclear facilities and we also will have to sign one additional protocol in future with the IAEA.

Sir, my basic point and the point of my Party is that when there should be an agreement with any other country, it should rest under reciprocity. This should rest on parity. It cannot be an agreement with unequals. It should be an agreement with the equals only. Now, what happened in this agreement? In future, we are volunteering to place our civilian nuclear facilities and programmes in a phased manner under the safeguards of the IAEA.

My question here is this. Has the US made such a separation between its civilian and military nuclear facilities? Has it done that? They are also Nuclear Weapon States and we are also a Nuclear Weapon State. Why should we do something which they have not done? Has the US brought into force the additional protocol signed with the IAEA? Has it done that? It has merely signed it but has not implemented it. No nuclear power has separated the military and civilian nuclear facilities in actual practice including the USA. They have merely signed it. The five countries, namely, USA, Russia, China, France and UK have signed additional protocols with the IAEA. I agree with this. But neither Russia which has signed it on the 22nd March, 2000 nor the USA which signed it on the 22nd September, 1998 have brought this into force[[bru17](#)].

Even while signing the Additional Protocol, the United States of America, consistent with the rights of a Nuclear Weapon State, has chosen to limit or deny access to IAEA safeguards. I would like to emphasise this point. The United States of America has got the right to deny access or include or exclude any inspection activities on the basis of its national security exclusions. They have signed this Additional Protocol with the IAEA. The United States of America says that it has got the right to deny access to any international inspection in future. But what will we have to do? We will have to voluntarily place them under the international inspection, that too perpetually, for all the times to come. Is it based on parity? Is it based on the policy of reciprocity? The USA, in particular, will not provide the IAEA information which are of direct national security significance to it; it can deny access to activities and locations which are of direct national security significance to it; and it can exclude inspection activities that are inconsistent with the national security exclusions. The USA has already told that whenever we think that it is against our national interest, we will refuse it. They can very well say that the IAEA cannot come and inspect it.

The IAEA now applies safeguards at only four US facilities out of the 250 civil nuclear facilities that the US has made eligible for the IAEA safeguards under its Voluntary Offer Agreement with the IAEA. The US is having 250 nuclear facilities. It has declared that they are all civilians. But it has allowed inspections only at four facilities. So, for them it is good. But for India it has to be in perpetuity. This is what the present position is.

In more than two decades, the IAEA has conducted inspection only at 17 of these facilities in all these five Nuclear Weapon States combined together. The IAEA has conducted inspections only in 17 of these facilities. But in our case it is intrusive, that is, the inspection can be conducted at any time, anywhere. Whenever they want to conduct an inspection, they can do so.

The IAEA inspection is very nominal in the case of the USA, Russia, China, UK and France because they are Nuclear Weapon States and are recognised as such under the NPT. Will India get the same treatment as a Nuclear Weapon State from the IAEA?

I am very happy that the hon. Prime Minister is present here. I would expect that a clarification will come when he replies to it at the end. I hope he will address our concerns. It clearly shows that it is a discrimination against India.

There is one more point which I would like to point out. Nuclear Weapon States can declare one facility as civilian and in future can change it to military. They can declare one nuclear facility as civilian and if it does not suit them they can change it to military. For example, the USA can declare one facility as civilian and if it does not suit that country they can change it to military and thereby exclude it from international safeguards. Can we do so? We have said that we will leave it for inspection in perpetuity[\[r18\]](#).

My another point is that there is a fixed life for a reactor. USA has also agreed that it will supply nuclear fuel to these reactors in perpetuity. But there lies the catch, because every reactor has got a fixed life, around 25 years. So, when it will cease to function after 25 years, since we have placed it under perpetual international safeguards, the IAEA will have the right to intrude and to inspect it even after 25 years. Spent fuel in a nuclear reactor is a precious thing. So, the safeguards will continue even after the longevity, with the afterlife of spent fuel. That is what I explained.

Now, I would come to the most important point about this deal, where we have a very strong objection also. This deal effectively caps our nuclear weapons capability

because out of 22 nuclear facilities, we are handing over 14 as civilian for international safeguards to the IAEA for any intrusive inspection, at any time. In perpetuity, the fissile material available for our strategic work will not be available. This is where our objection is.

We have already decided that we will close down the CIRUS reactor by 2010. But, we have not declared that we are going to replace it by anything. We are not bringing in any replacement. Nuclear reactors cannot be built overnight. So, we should have come up with another new reactor in place of CIRUS reactor, which we are going to close down by 2010.

Now, Sir, six reactors are going to be imported. But they will also remain under perpetual safeguards. So, that is capping our strategic programme; it is going to be restricted. Depending upon our threat perception, we cannot have the independence of determining our minimum credible deterrence. That is our most important point, and objection too here, that in future we will not be in a position to determine what minimum requirement, strategic requirement, with regard to the nuclear weapons we must have.

Now, India will have India-specific commitment with IAEA, which is a multilateral body. Yes, we are having an agreement with the United States of America, but that is a bilateral agreement. But when we enter into an agreement with IAEA, it is going to be a multilateral one. My point is that if something wrong happens in future, we have said that we can walk out of the agreement with the United States of America because it is a bilateral agreement. Can we do so by walking out of IAEA which is a multilateral agreement? Will it be possible? I would like a clarification from the hon. Prime Minister on this.

Sir, I have already told that the main deal rests on reciprocity, on parity. The hon. Prime Minister said that our separation would be voluntary. We can dare say from our party side that we do not think that the separation was voluntary. It was forced on us because they have already discussed with the United States of America. First, it was discussed with the United States of America and then only we declared that this is our Separation Plan. So, it is discriminatory because it does not recognize India as a

nuclear weapons State. Our demand is that no restriction should be put on our nuclear weapons programme. We very strongly feel and say that in future no restriction should be put.

But, I am very sorry to say you, Sir, the United States of America is trying to impress upon their own Congressmen that they have succeeded in limiting our nuclear capability [[mks19](#)].

They are selling this argument to their Congress. They are saying: “Even though India is not a signatory to the NPT, we have been able to limit their nuclear weapons capability.” That is the story they are selling to their countrymen to get it passed through their Congress. That is one of the most frustrating things for India as far as our party is concerned.

I mean to say that there should be friendship with equality. There should be no subordination or superior relationship. Friendship should be on equal terms. We should not cap our nuclear programme. I would accuse that this UPA Government has gone out of its way to befriend the United States of America which we would not have done. The NDA, the BJP Government would not have done that. We would have agreed to place only three facilities under the international safeguards. We would never have gone beyond this which this Government has done. I will take three or four minutes. I will complete my speech. From our Party only two Members are there to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: I did not say anything.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : That is what we would have done. Our point is that it has gone out of its way to appease the United States of America. Take the example of China. Why I am saying is that we must have a credible nuclear deterrence. You take the example of China. We are nowhere near China in missile technology. India's foreign policy is not Pakistan-centric. We do not simply depend upon what Pakistan does. We have to see somewhere else also. The Europe has already lost the momentum. So, it is China, India and the United States of America which are going to compete in this century to become the world leaders. As I said, already, the Europe has lost the momentum. It is far behind. So, we should get ready for that eventuality.

I will now just make the last two points. With regard to NPT, it says that all Nuclear Weapon States should destroy their stockpiles; they should go for total disarmament. It was first signed in 1970. But thirty years have passed. There has been no movement in this regard. So, India is a responsible Nuclear Weapon State. We have already declared that we will have no first use of it; we will have no use of it against any non Nuclear Weapon Country. So, I would appeal to this Government that India should take the lead for the disarmament of the world. A nuclear weapon free world is what we actually require. So, India should take the lead. Please take the examples of Japan and Germany. Without even having the nuclear weapon, they have attained greatness and prosperity. So, Sir, I appeal to this Government that it should also take the lead and see that India becomes a leader of disarmament.

I now come to my last point. I am very much surprised that this Government says - just like our Government said – that it is a historic occasion by just inviting Mr. George Bush. It is very much surprising that their own allies, the Leftists were having an agitation. They were having an agitation all over this country. They say that they are supporting this Government but they are just opposing it. I was very much surprised when I saw a photograph which appeared in the newspapers that in Mumbai, when the Leftists were having a rally, there was a banner which said: “We will become the suicide bombers.” ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI : Are you opposing or supporting it? I am a little bit confused. I can understand what they say.... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : That is what I want to know.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI: If you yield for a moment, I will put a question. Did you advise your concept of nuclear weapons free State in 1998 to the then Prime Minister Shri Atal Bihar Vajpayee?... (*Interruptions*[\[R20\]](#))

MR. SPEAKER: No, it is for him to reply.

... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : Sir, I have... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VIJAYENDRA PAL SINGH (BHILWARA): Is it right for the Minister to intervene like that?... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: It is because he yielded.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : It is a very good thing, Sir.... (*Interruptions*)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप बोलिए।

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : No, I would complete because I have nothing more to say.... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: No, I am not stopping you.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : My point is this. I do not know whether he was present at the time when I just commenced my speech. I said that the BJP as the initiator of the process of strategic cooperation with the United States of America, whom the then Prime Minister Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee had termed as India's natural ally, is gratified by the development. This is the first sentence I said, Sir.

THE MINISTER OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY AND MINISTER OF OCEAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRI KAPIL SIBAL): Are you supporting?

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : But, I said that we have our concerns as an Opposition Party. As the principal Opposition Party, these are our concerns because we feel that India has surrendered to United States of America on many counts. I would like a clarification from the hon. Prime Minister.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI : Sir, I would like to appeal through you to the House that this short duration discussion began at 11.30 am and it will be nice if the House agrees, through you, that we skip the lunch hour so that the harmony of the debate continues. They can conclude by 3.30 pm or 3.45 pm so that the hon. Prime Minister, as I have said has to reply at 5 p.m., can pre-pone his reply. I have seen the list of the speakers.

प्रो. विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा (दक्षिण दिल्ली) : रिप्लाइ कितने बजे होगा।

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI: After 3.30 p.m.

PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA (SOUTH DELHI): Any time? Fix a time.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI: Exact 3.30 pm or after that because five or six minutes might be here and there... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Not many speakers are there so it maybe early also.

THE MINISTER OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY AND MINISTER OF OCEAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRI KAPIL SIBAL): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was listening with rapt attention to both Mr. Chandrappan and Mr. Kharabela Swain. As far as my good friend Shri Chandrappan is concerned, I thought that the debate was on the statement of the Prime Minister on the 27th of February and the 7th of March in respect of the civil nuclear energy cooperation with the United States of America. Instead we got a conspectus of US foreign policy over the last 55 years. As that is not the ambit of this debate, I will choose not to respond to all the Statements made by my learned colleague except to say that the Congress Party has always learnt from history and in the dynamics of the present situation, wishes to protect the future of our country. I was also a bit confused by Mr. Swain's very valuable contribution this morning because I do not know really where his party stood. I think it is important for the country to know where the BJP stands. Where the NDA stands? Are you for the deal or are you against the deal? I think it is important for them to have made that clear at the initial intervention that they made.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I just wish to go back in history because I do not think we can understand the entire conspectus of this deal without going back a few years. I go back to the time when we attained independence. At that point of time, we were the ones who talked about nuclear non-proliferation. We were, in fact, the initiators of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) in 1954 itself. It is because we realised what devastation Hiroshima and Nagasaki caused to the world. So, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru as leader, at that point of time, called upon all countries to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty[\[a21\]](#).

Unfortunately, that never happened and the United States, after Hiroshima and Nagasaki, had a programme called 'Atoms for Peace'. They wanted to project to the world that nuclear energy can be used for peaceful purposes also. In that context through the 'Atoms for Peace' programme, they wanted to extend support to the less-developed world and gave us \$80 million on soft terms to set up a nuclear reactor at Tarapur, constructed by General Electric.

Then, we signed and we were the first country to sign the Partial Test Ban Treaty of 1963. Thereafter, things changed and the reason why things changed was on account of three events. Unfortunately Pandit Nehru passed away. He was a firm believer in non-proliferation. Second, in 1962 we were involved in a conflict with a neighbouring country. In 1964, which is a very important date, China conducted nuclear tests and we realised that our security was in danger. Though we were great believers in non-proliferation, we were also great believers in ensuring that nothing should happen which can impact adversely on the security of our country. Therefore, in terms of the Tarapur project, which was a project for peaceful purposes, for civil nuclear energy, we set up a Reprocessing Plant at Tarapur as also the Cirus Research Reactor at Tarapur which enabled us to use reprocessing facilities for the purposes of our security concerns. That was the beginning of a weapons programme for India.

Then came the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty in 1967 and, as everybody knows, the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty created a regime of nuclear apartheid. You have the 5 nuclear States and the rest of the world as non-nuclear States. The 5 nuclear States perpetuated their nuclear power and I dare say that after 1967 till 1995, 35,000 nuclear tests were conducted by various nuclear powers. That is the extent to which the nuclear powers were, in fact, amassing nuclear weapons.

In the context of what had happened in 1964 and 1962, we realised that we were at the receiving end of the nuclear apartheid regime and we could not expose our security to a neighbour with nuclear weapons. Therefore, we decided to move forward not to become a nuclear weapon State, but to have the capacity to produce nuclear weapons. I am giving this background because that is the background in which we must understand the 1974 tests.

We demonstrated to the world that we were not going nuclear because they were referred to as ‘nuclear tests for peaceful purposes.’ If you remember, those were the very significant words used by Mrs. Indira Gandhi. She said: “These are nuclear tests for peaceful purposes.” Therefore, we wanted to tell the world that we have the capacity, but we did not want to become a nuclear weapon State because we were firmly committed to a weapons-free world, we were firmly committed to a non-nuclear world regime. That happened in 1974 and the only consequence of that was that after the 1969 Tarapur Agreement with the United States and Canada, we did not get any fuel supply till the Agreement ended in 1993[\[k22\]](#).

[\[r23\]](#)We realised that we needed to actually be prepared to protect our security at any given point in time. So, I give credit to the scientific community of this country, who despite the gravest of odds, prepared our country to have the capability to meet any challenge that came from this part of the world. I want to stand here today to congratulate the scientific community for having enabled us to do so.

Mr. Speaker Sir, it is important to remember that despite the nuclear test for peaceful purposes in 1974, India was ready to embrace the nuclear non-proliferation regime. I would like at this point to comment and to quote what Rajiv Ji said way back on June 9, 1988 at a special session on Disarmament in the United Nations. That was a very historic speech and this is what he said:

“We are approaching the close of the Twentieth Century. It has been the most bloodstained century in history. Fifty-eight million perished in two World Wars, 40 million more have died in other conflicts. In the last nine decades, the ravenous machines of war have devoured nearly one hundred million people. The appetite of this monstrous machines grows on what they feed. Nuclear war will not remain the death of a 100 million people or even a 1000 million people. It will mean the extinction of 4,000 million. The end of life,

as we know it on our planet Earth, we come to the United Nations to seek your support. We seek your support to put a stop to this madness.”

I say this because even after the nuclear tests, Rajiv Gandhi was wedded to a non-proliferation regime.

Let me tell you a very interesting thing, which he said and which really is the heart of the matter that differentiates us and the BJP. In that very Address to the United Nations, he said:

“Corresponding to such commitment by the nuclear weapon States, those nations – and he was referring to India – which are capable of crossing the nuclear weapon threshold must solemnly undertake to restrain themselves. This must be accompanied by strict measures to end all covert and overt assistance to those seeking to acquire nuclear weapons.”

There was a dual message in this. The message was that we are at the threshold, we know how to produce nuclear weapons, but we are exercising a policy of self-restraint. But let this not allow other nations to assist some nations in acquiring nuclear weapons. It was a message to the world that our policy was a policy of restraint and that we still believed in non-proliferation.

All that changed in 1998. The difference between them and us is that we believed in non-proliferation, we still believe in non-proliferation. But they changed the whole paradigm of India’s nuclear policy without understanding the import of the restraint reflected in the words of Rajiv Gandhi. That is where you brought upon India and brought upon the people of India, the sanctions which were the consequence of your act in 1998.

But much happened after 1998. In 1995, unfortunately, the 1967 Treaty was extended without any limit[\[r24\]](#).

So, the nuclear apartheid regime was made limitless, was granted unlimited extension and we realised that India was not in a position to secure its concerns unless

India was able to manufacture nuclear weapons. I remember that on the 11th of May 1998 the kudos that the then NDA Government and the BJP showered on itself as to how they were the ones who were able to actually cross the Rubicon by pushing the button. I have to say that you may have pushed the button, but everything till the button stage was done by us. You should have given us credit and given the credit to the scientists of this country for what they did and the leadership of this country for what they did. You never did so. That is why, today, for the first time I am placing before this House the historical context in which this agreement has been entered into with the United States of America.

What was the nature of the sanctions regime and what did we have to go through, I think it is important for us to remember that. You should realise that we were denied cryogenic engines. I just want to explain as to what is a cryogenic engine. It is the use of liquid oxygen and liquid nitrogen to provide greater lift when you launch a spacecraft. This denial had a great negative impact on our space programme which is put to multifarious civilian uses. Today, our space programme through remote sensing can locate water catchments. Our space programme through remote sensing can tell us the extent of forest cover. Our space programme is the basis of the communications system that we have in this country. But we were denied the cryogenic engines because of the policies that you entered into. Though cryogenic engines are not used for launching of missiles because liquid nitrogen is not used for the launch of missiles, yet we were denied this technology. There were export controls imposed upon us. Today as the world moves along, huge technological developments are taking place because of high computing capacities of super computers. We were denied all the super computers because of the decision that you took. Today, the capacity of super computers is in teraflops. We could not even get into this country, import into this country a low capacity cray's computer, super computer. If you look at all the hardware, you look at all the bio-tech sector in this country, the information technology sector in this country, all the hardware is based on super computing. We could not import any of these into our country. Not just that, Sir, we could not use these technologies, and many of these are health-related technologies which allow the use of radiation to detect many things. We could not import PET scans and TEM scans. These are all nuclear laser technologies which could be put to dual use. In the area of food processing and agriculture, for safety and security, we could not use these technologies to increase the shelf life of our agricultural produce. You know that large

quantities of agricultural produce go waste. We could not use spectroscopic techniques for security. What is it that I am trying to say? It is because of your decision in 1998, not after 1974, after 1998, that we were subjected to all these restrictions.

SHRI VIJAYENDRA PAL SINGH (BHILWARA): May I ask you one question?

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: No. I am not yielding.

MR. SPEAKER: He is not yielding.

... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: No. Sorry.

... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: It will not be recorded.

(*Interruptions*)* ...

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: I am not yielding.... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Vijayendra Pal Singh, he has not yielded. Sorry. Please cooperate.

... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Please do not record anything. Nothing will be recorded.

(*Interruptions*)* ...

MR. SPEAKER: He must yield. You know that.

... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : It is not a High Court or Supreme Court. ...
(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Please do not record anything.

(*Interruptions*)* ...

* Not Recorded.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: I never interrupted you. ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Will you please take your seat? This is not the way. A very important discussion is going on. He has made a very good speech. Do not spoil his speech.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Sir, this is one aspect of the matter that we were denied civilian use of technologies over the years, which could have had a very positive impact on the developmental needs of our country. But there was another imperative that was facing us. Let me tell you about that imperative. The other imperative that faces us is this. I want to give the figures now. The fact of the matter is that our energy needs by the year 2025 are going to grow exponentially. At the moment we produce about 1,30,000 megawatt of electricity, if you include captive consumption. But by the year 2025 we will probably need three to four times that capacity. Where are we going to get that capacity from? It is very important to understand this issue.

As far as the oil producing countries are concerned, I may mention to you, Sir, that five oil producing countries in the world produce 64 per cent of all the oil in the world. Twenty-five per cent of that 64 per cent is produced by Saudi Arabia alone. Iraq produces 10 per cent. UAE produces 9.3 per cent. Kuwait produces 9.2 per cent. Iran produces 8.6 per cent. The total is 64 per cent. This is a limited resource. Other countries in the world whether it is South America or the Nordic countries or in Siberia, they produce a very small quantity. This is a limited resource.

As China and India grow in prosperity and as the bludgeoning middle class increases in numbers, we are going to need more and more energy. Where are we going to get this energy from? It is not going to be provided by the oil producing countries because their production levels are going to go down and the consumption levels will far outreach the supply levels. So, we will have to look for alternative sources of energy.

If you look at the United States today, if you look at their energy consumption levels, they are also increasing exponentially. So, their demand will be on the rise. We will all be competing for the same energy resources in the Middle-East, which, as you know, today is in the midst of all kinds of conflicts and controversies. So, we cannot

get an assured supply of energy. If we cannot get an assured supply of energy, the people of this country cannot progress. So, energy is at the heart of development.

The 1998, 11th May nuclear blasts did not enable us to secure the energy resources that were necessary. So, we need to actually secure those resources. But at the same time, as we secure those resources we need to protect ourselves because there is a security threat that we see around us. So, we cannot give up our military programme and we must compromise on the civilian programme for larger uses of energy. It is a simple equation. The imperatives of our national interest demand it. I think, at this point, ... (*Interruptions*)

Shri Swain, why do you insist? I will explain. If you listen quietly, you will understand what I am saying. If you interrupt, you may not understand and sometimes, you know, it is difficult. Get your mind cleared of the cobwebs and you will understand[[lh25](#)].

13.00 hrs.

I have great respect and I give great kudos to both the Prime Minister of India and the Head of the UPA, Mrs. Sonia Gandhi for taking this momentous decision. I believe that the ultimate measure of the maturity of a political party is not where it stands in moments of comfort but where it stands in times of challenge and controversy. These are challenging times. These are controversial times. Our Party stands steadfastly for the future of India and for the future of our people, and I congratulate the Prime Minister and Mrs. Sonia Gandhi for that.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is in this context that we must analyse the agreement that has been entered into, our security needs, our civil nuclear energy needs, the future of this country and how we can reach development at their doorsteps of the common man. Now, what have we done in the separation plan? What we have done is the following. Mr. Kharabela Swain was wrong when he said that he would have given only three nuclear facilities for safeguards. He probably does not know that, as I talk, before this agreement, four nuclear facilities are already under safeguards.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : I know that. I have said it also.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: You did not say this. But anyway I am glad you know it.

MR. SPEAKER: Yours is such a scientific speech. We could not follow it.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: You would have given three more or three less. But anyway, that is neither here nor there.

What have we done? Of the 22 facilities, we say that 14 of them will be allowed to be put under the civilian nuclear safeguards. ... (*Interruptions*) Yes, it is for perpetuity. Do you know what is perpetuity? The nuclear reactor has a limited life. So, perpetuity in this context means the life of the nuclear reactor. If you say I will live in perpetuity, it means till I die.

MR. SPEAKER: You address the Chair.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: So, perpetuity, in this context means the life of the nuclear reactor. I think you should understand that. Under this agreement, what am I entitled to have? I am entitled to have as much stockpile of uranium that I want for the life of the reactor. I can buy as much uranium from anywhere in the world. There is no bar on me. There is no bar on India.

Secondly, I will have a bilateral agreement with the United States to ensure stockpile of supplies of uranium for the reactors which are put under safeguards. That is number two. If there is any interrupted supply in respect of those stockpiles, I have an assurance in a multilateral agreement with the IAEA that they will arrange for them. Even if that fails, there is going to be a 'Friends of India' agreement in terms of which Russia and other countries will ensure that there is no interruption of supplies. Even if that fails, the Prime Minister in his statement has said that we have the sovereign right to do the best that we can for our country. What is it that we have compromised on?

Now, see the positive side of it. What is the impact of this on our energy requirements? We have a continuous stockpile of uranium. May I just mention that in this country we have 95,000 tonnes of uranium? If you use up all the uranium, 95,000 tonnes, we will be able to produce energy of a total of 12,000 megawatt. That is all. If we use up all our uranium resources, we can produce 12,000 megawatts of energy.

Now, what are our energy requirements? At the moment, if you include captive consumption, we have 1,30,000 MW. By 2025, it will be 3-4 times of that capacity. The nuclear energy only comprises 2.7 per cent of the total production of energy. Once

we get a continuous supply of nuclear fuel, we will be able to use that nuclear fuel for continuous supply[m26].

We can build many more reactors, put them in the civil-nuclear field and get more resources. I was very happy to note that John Howard, the hon. Prime Minister of Australia before he departed from Australia, made a particular statement saying that it was not willing to supply. But when he was in India I saw a very distinct change from the statement that he had made before he departed from Australia. The Western world is fully cognisant of the importance of this agreement. ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: How long would you take?

... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Sir, I will conclude within ten minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: There are another five speakers from your party.

... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: I will conclude within ten minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: So, you can continue.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Sir, I will conclude soon. So, we will have continuous supply of energy. What is it on the military side? What is that we have done on the military side? That is very important and I think we must explain that. On the military side, it is our prerogative not to include certain facilities in the civil-nuclear energy programme. So, we can continue our research and development in the manner that we want. We can continue without capping. We are not testing any more, but we can continue to use the nuclear fuels that we have for our weapons programme without carrying on any nuclear tests. The United States does not carry on nuclear tests, but they are carrying on with their weapons' programme. For any future facilities it is our

decision whether we want to put them under the civil-nuclear energy regime or under the military programme. That is our choice. So, the future is protected.

Sir, more important than that and this is heart of the matter that we have a three-stage nuclear energy programme. First is the use of pressurised Heavy Water Reactors by using uranium. Now, what is this pressurised Heavy Water Reactor and I want to explain this. They are fuelled by natural uranium and they generate electricity and the spent fuel is rich in Plutonium. That is the first phase of our nuclear energy programme. In the second phase, this plutonium is used as fuel in Fast Breeder Reactors to breed U-233 from thorium. In other words, the Fast Breeder Reactors use thorium and if you take the fuel which is rich in plutonium and Fast Breeder Reactors, it produces U-233 which is fissile material, which is the second stage of our programme.

As you know, the Fast Breeder Reactors are outside the civil-nuclear energy regime. They are outside safeguards. We will make sure about that. Then, the third stage of our programme is with the use of Advanced Heavy Water Reactors. We burn U-233 with thorium and extract --and that is most important -- about 75 per cent of the power from thorium, instead of the less than one per cent of the power extracted from U-235 in Light Water Reactors. In other words, the quantity of power produced in the third phase would be 75 times more which will take care of our energy needs not of today, not 50 years hence, not 100 years hence, but for a long long time to come for future generations. Why? It is because we have 3,00,000 tonnes of thorium in this country which is one-third of the total supplies in the world; the largest supply is in Australia, the second is in India. So, what is it that we are doing? We have protected our civil-nuclear energy programme, we have protected our weapons programme and we are protecting the future generations of this country. What more do the people of this country want and what more do political parties opposing us want? We would not want to be slaves of the past, nor do we want to be slaves of the ideologies of the past and we do not want to be slaves of political opportunism, as we see across us. We want that this country moves forward. We want that the common man in this country gets what he needs for his daily living. We will use all our might, all the technologies in the world to reach him[R27].

Sir, just a few words and I have done.

The civil nuclear energy deal is just a part of what technologies can bring us and the advantages that we can give to our people. It opens up – and I do not say open *sim sim* – it opens up huge possibilities of transfer of technologies in the field of agriculture, in the field of health, in the industrial field and in the sphere of environment.

Another agreement that we have entered into is with the Generation-4 Programme and the NEXT-GEN programme. What that means is – zero emission if you use coal. I congratulate the hon. Minister of Finance that he has already set apart 20 billion tonnes of coal for the purposes of using technologies of this nature to have zero emission through the use of these technologies. It is not just a civil nuclear energy deal. The possibility of transfer of technologies opening up for use of the common man will become a reality.

Sir, I want to end by quoting the words of Talleyrand. He said : “The art of statesmanship is to foresee the inevitable and to expedite its occurrence.” We are seeing the inevitable in front of us, the inevitability of making this country a great nation. We want to expedite its occurrence.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL (HOOGHLY): Mr. Speaker, Sir, my eminent colleague Shri Kapil Sibal, towards the end of his speech, mentioned that it was not a simple case of civil nuclear technology deal but a gamut of issues relating to agriculture, research in biotechnology and many more areas as has been mentioned in the hon. Prime Minister’s statement. Our discussions cover the expansion of our in the field

of agriculture, economic and trade cooperation, energy security and clean environment, strengthening innovation and the knowledge economy, issues to global safety and security and on deepening democracy.

There are so many areas. Firstly, let me start with the other areas before I come to the civil nuclear energy deal. As per the discussions that have taken place and in the meetings of the CEOs you find that there are reports about cooperation. The CEO of Walmart, the CEO of Monsanto have been present and some reports have been prepared. It is more or less a roadmap to the future of our agriculture, our agricultural research and how we should move. The apprehension is that agricultural research for a country like India may be moved from the public domain to the private sector. It will be dominated by the multinationals.

The hon. Prime Minister owes an explanation to this House because no report with regard to the knowledge initiative in respect of agriculture has been placed on the Table of the House. In the meanwhile the Government has started acting. That is the most unfortunate part. Even before the other important part of the negotiations have proceeded, we find that 24 Committees have already been set up at the instance of the hon. Prime Minister by the Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission[\[krr28\]](#).

Instead of calibrating the developments taking place in the US, we find that we have already started acting, and this House is quite in the dark. The Prime Minister owes an explanation to this House. What is actually the deliberation with regard agricultural research? What could be the outcome of deliberations with the Monsanto Chief, the Wal-Mart Chief and other good number of CEOs of multinational companies on the basis of which the Deputy-Chairman of the Planning Commission has already set up 24 committees?

There have been some other deals also with regard to our Defence. It is a follow up of the June, 2005 Indo-US Defence Co-operation Agreement. In the meanwhile, there have been joint-exercises, maritime understanding and all these things. We find reports in the papers. I do not know how far they are credible. After so many years, they have agreed to sell F-16 and F-18 fighter aircraft to India, which we have always been denied for the last several decades. Will it not create a new situation? Will it not create an arms race because immediately after visiting India, the US President visited Pakistan? We know their track record and how even conventional weapons were denied to India. They have been strengthening and providing the latest sophisticated weapons to Pakistan. In such a situation, an arms race may build up. The Prime

Minister has not spoken about these things, about the knowledge initiative and about the deals.

The most important part of it is that with regard to democracy, there is a mention in the statement that "..... the Government relating to global security and safety and on deepening democracy...." Only yesterday Nicholas Burns has said in a note given to 14 American Congressmen that if required, as it happened in the case of Iraq, their allies must join with them for just implanting the American brand of democracy. At Purana Qila also, the US President had named certain countries and spoken about regime change. The nation wants to be assured about what this means. Nicholas Burns was openly saying only yesterday and you just relate this with the American President's famous observation 'with us or against us'. When Pentagon has made full preparation for military operation in Iran, with the sort of scenario emerging, confrontation is there.

The Russian proposal or diplomatic initiative was nipped in the bud. We have to also see how the NPT is gradually being interpreted according to the whims of the US. Earlier, NPT was discriminatory between the nuclear weapon States and non-nuclear weapon States. Then, the non-nuclear weapon States were again divided with right for full cycle and right for truncated cycle. Then, again, after the Russian proposal in the case of Iran, it is being said that even more does of uranium enrichment for research purposes under the inspection and supervision of IAEA is not permitted. There is a confrontation.

In such a confrontation, we remember that in the case of Iraq, there had been request for sending troops. There have been denials of the UN and Nicholas Burns has already said that beyond the letter and spirit of the resolution of UN, our allies must go along with us. What does it mean? It is the same roadmap. We are dragging ourselves into the global game-plan of the US. What will happen to the strategic trilateral alliance among China, Russia and India? What will happen to the confidence-building measures we have already initiated and proceeded with Pakistan, with SAARC countries, our small neighbours, our distant neighbours and BIMSTAC[[reporter29](#)].

What will happen to us? Will the philosophy of 'with us or against us' not create suspicion even among our friends that India has aligned totally with the US brand of democracy initiatives?

13.20 hrs.(Mr. Deputy-Speaker *in the Chair*)

I am saying this because India has agreed to join the International Centre for Democratic Transition. We are also aware that Ms. Condoleeza Rice has taken huge amount of funds for change of regime in Iran in the name of restoring democracy. We know that they have particular brand of democracy. They accept if it is military dictatorship, and they accept if it is Shah's monarchy in Iran. But if it is a democracy, which is a reflection of the wishes of the masses of that country, then it is not considered to be a democracy. We know all that happened with respect to Cuba, Venezuela, Brazil, Argentina, etc.

Some people have been criticising us during Mr. Bush's visit to India stating that he is a respected guest of this country, but the Left is demonstrating throughout the country. It is no demonstration or protest against any individual. We neither have any particular liking or any disliking for the individual. We are doing it for the very philosophy; for the hegemonistic design; for the imperialist measures that they are adopting to subjugate the country with an eye to the oil resources and with an eye to other natural resources. If you are with us, then it is all right. Otherwise, you are against us, and you are my enemy. This is their philosophy. There was a mention about the regime change even while he was speaking at the *Purana Qila*. Therefore, the hon. Prime Minister owes an explanation to the nation. Does he conform to the views of the US President? I am asking this because India has already agreed to join the democracy initiative, defence deal purchase, etc.

I was wondering about the main reason for the US going out of the way for agreeing to lift the sanctions, which were prevailing for the last three decades. What could be the reason for it? Firstly, I thought that this strategic alliance is to have a country like India -- on the side of the US -- as the frontal political country to contain China. The word is there that the moment the President had gone, some dignitaries of China have come, and very soon the Chinese leadership will be visiting India. It is high time, after six decades of endeavour that the relationship is normalised. Is it the price that we should pay for an unstable assurance? Though I shall come to this issue later on.

The outcome of this strategic alliance is not only underlining the UPA Government's departure from the commitment to the nation regarding independent foreign policy, which was so long based on national consensus, but it is also isolating it. We were isolated in Vienna when Malaysia presided and underscored about the role of the non-aligned countries. We did not perform as we should have done. What will happen to our neighbourhood, namely, the SAARC, China, etc.? This is the question, which the hon. Prime Minister owes to explain in this House. He should assure the august House that this is not going to be the price for the same.

We are very categorical in our relationships, which we have already established with countries like China, the China-Russia-India trilateral, and all the Confidence Building Measures (CBM) that we have started with our neighbouring countries[\[ak30\]](#).

Now, this Agreement on Civilian Nuclear Energy will have to be seen in this perspective. On our strategic alliance, the Defence deal, the deal with regard to the agricultural research, science and technology, infrastructure, have we acted in national interest? We do not think so. We have compromised in respect of our foreign policy independence. We have compromised in respect of our nuclear strategic sovereign programme. We need a full-fledged discussion on the agreement that might have been entered into in respect of agriculture, biotechnology and in all such areas.

Coming to energy security, I do not agree with the undue importance given to nuclear energy security. Till today, the country does not have any nuclear energy security policy. From the website, I was trying to find out whether Government has any. I found very recently an integrated energy security policy has been put there for discussion. Even without any discussion about our energy needs -- how much of hydro we require, how much of thermal we require, about our coal reserves, our non-conventional energy, and from 2.7, how much we can raise in the near future and the distant future -- the Prime Minister is going on saying, 'energy policy, energy policy'. They have woken up to energy security suddenly. We do not oppose that there should be energy security. India should have its own energy security policy. We do not any disagreement with the policy. This sudden undue importance to nuclear energy raises many questions.

Now, after this 18th July Agreement, Joint Statement, the Left Parties had cautioned this Government that it should be careful, that India has a sovereign nuclear programme, and our strategic programme should never be opened up for inspections. The Left Parties apprehensions and caution was further strengthened by the caution by the scientific community, even the former Chief of the Atomic Energy Commission, Diplomats and many others who were associated with a whole sort of negotiations in different fora. After that, what has happened because of this caution, pressure, and apprehensions were expressed nation-wide? The Government could withstand the pressures of the US with regard to two areas. Out of 22, 14 have been opened up, I shall come to that in a while, and 8 have been kept in the strategic sector, for example, the Fast Breeder Reactor in Kalpakkam. They have also agreed for CIRUS and Apsara to be removed from the BARC arrangement. It raises two or three things. What is the cost involved in the separation because nowhere in the world we have heard that such separation is an easy thing. What is the cost? Who will pay the cost? Then, there will be difficulties with regard to the movement of our scientists from the strategic programme to the civilian programme because nowhere there is any such separation. The Prime Minister can apprise us about the past experience of the countries about this nuclear separation from the civilian programme and from the strategic nuclear programme[R31].

We had just recently refurbished the Cyrus. How much would it cost to shift Apsara and Cyrus from the BARC arrangements?

News has come that just yesterday the Separation Plan has been referred to the US Congress. A list has been prepared. Fourteen representatives belonging to both the Senate and the House of Representatives have been apprised of the details of the Separation Plan and how the US Government looks at the agreement. But we do find that articles have already come in *The Economist* and *The New York Times* questioning as to how India-specific arrangements can be made. They say that India-specific arrangements cannot be made going by the spirit, if not letter, of NPT, until all such facilities are brought under the safeguards. It is a dangerous game we have entered into.

Coming to fuel supply, yes, it is reciprocal. We have the experience of Tarapur. What will happen? The previous speaker, Kapil Sibalji, was saying that we can go to Russia, we can go to France, then we can do that if that is not done, etc. I would say

that the American President has the authority to declare the agreement null and void. Can the Government of India withdraw from it as in the case of NPT. Can we say, 'This far and no further?' We are having difficulties. We have entered into safeguards of perpetuity.

This House has to be convinced about what will happen in the future. We are putting everything in the basket of the US President. We know about the declining popularity of US President. We know what may happen in the US Congress. We have, only two days back, the Dubai World Court's decision. We have the knowledge of China going to buy shares in a multinational oil company. We know that whenever their own interest comes they will jettison other's interests. We want to be informed as to what will happen if this list which has been submitted indicates 'beyond such and such thing'. Such change of goalpost is already there.

Changing the goalpost is very much in their philosophy. It happened in the case of Iraq. It is happening in the case of Iran. One after another they will come out with new arguments and new logic. After that, till you are a client State, they will go on giving you new conditions continuously.

I am just asking as to what will happen? The US President has said that by May you do it and they say, 'It is never possible. We can take more time'. Let them take more time. Then the energy groups are there. Do you think everyone will listen and make it India-specific and do everything? They have their own reading of the situation [\[KMR32\]](#).

China is observing. You are deliberately and intentionally distancing yourself and aligning with the USA, in the game plan in Asia, to contain China. What will happen? It would cause further isolation from us, isolation from other countries. These suspicions are there and already there are statements. It is being said that it is a win-win situation. Fast Breeder Reactors and the strategic programme in regard to 14 are subject to safeguards and they are India-specific. What is it? I do not know what is it. How can it be? But still we say that at the wishes of the US President, it will be like that. All the 45 NSG countries will accept that; the US Congress will accept that; and

the Committee of Senate and the House of Representatives Committee on the subject would accept that. Even then, what would happen at the IAEA? It would come to the 30-Member Committee, which is an autonomous body. In the case of Iran, instead of consensus you go for voting. If you go for voting in such a situation and because of the whims of the America President, we are putting everything in a single basket. We are paying such a heavy price. We are going away from our independent foreign policy.

I am happy that hon. Kapil Sibal was making a reference to the historic speech of Rajiv Gandhi on disarmament in the United Nations. We are rest assured that we have the capability. I was happy because at least some sections of the Congress remember their own legacy but India should have proceeded on the lines and philosophy of total disarmament plan set by Pandit Nehruji and Rajiv Gandhi ji and was enunciated in the United Nations speech. He was making a reference to that. It is an upward down position. Well, some people say that Iran has done. We are holding no brief for Iran. It is a question of sovereignty. We are in favour of total disarmament. Hence, we criticized them in 1998, now, as has been criticized by Shri Kapil Sibal ji.

Our nuclear policy was built on national consensus. Our foreign policy was built on national consensus and now India is aligning itself with the nuclear diplomacy of the USA – minimum credible deterrent. What is this 'minimum' he has asked? But now America is stating as to what is the 'minimum'. By setting the trap, America is saying that this is the 'minimum'.

Today, I was reading about 'proliferation' and that India has a great record in the NPT. Yes, today only the report has come that the UK Government has provided the technology of nuclear weapons to Israel. Violation is taking place, and imposition of conditions on the non-nuclear States is taking place. That is the problem. Now, India is going apart from its own philosophy, its own legacy.

It is being said that in the Atomic Energy Act, 1954, as amended in 1974, Sections 1 to 3, 1 to 8 and 1 to 9 prohibit sale of nuclear technology to countries, which have not signed the NPT. What will happen when these countries refuse to allow full

scope safeguards and develop nuclear weapons in defiance? In this full scope, we have already given the list of eight research bodies which will be under the safeguards[s33].

The technical difficulties are imposed on the cost involved for separation. Apart from that, we are making ourselves dependent, totally dependent on them. What they will do or what they will not do is a different thing. We have to go for the additional protocol. And the Government thinks that it can go on like that. India is also working with US for conclusion of a Multilateral Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty. Is it true? It has come out in certain sections of the American Press that India is supporting to prevent the spread of enrichment and re-processing technique regime and control of nuclear supply guidelines. Along with this, this Multilateral Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty is coming. We do not know anything about it. Nothing is mentioned about it in the Statement. What I want to know is that the Prime Minister must assure this House that no further steps would be taken. We must calibrate ourselves to the developments taking place. We must observe what happens in the Congress. We must take note of what happens in the NSG meeting. We must observe how the International Atomic Energy Body is reacting to the proposals of India-specific safeguards. We have said that no step should be taken.

The Prime Minister owes an explanation as to how the development of our research can be protected from the inspection through IAEA power centre. How can it protect. We do not need to give details of integrity. We want to be assured of it. It can be done. We are a buyer of nuclear weapons. Another partnership is growing and it is being said that nuclear fuel will be shared amongst 11 countries including US, UK, France, Japan and Russia . What will happen to this? What will be the cost of the fuel? And I would like to know whether along with the nuclear reactor, used fuel will be given to us with new type of reactors for which they want to enter into commercial deal. These are very important questions. Our scientists are on the verge of achieving certain very significant thing. In such a situation, I would like to know whether this deal is going to affect our strategic nuclear programme or not.

Lastly, President Bush has said that India is a wealth-creating democracy and 300 million middle class are eager to buy their washing machine. In such a situation, their eyes are on the Indian market for their military, industrial complex, for producing

nuclear reactor companies. Even in the Purana Quila speech, President Bush has made it clear that the Indian market should be opened up for the FDI in the retail market, in insurance and financial sector. Strangely, instead of waiting for this House to discuss it, some of the steps being taken by this Government will be disastrous. It will affect our self-reliance. It will affect our dignity. It will affect our foreign policy. Do they trust that? Our scientists are seeking visa in response to the invitation from a US university. They are being asked whether they are terrorists. One such scientist is Shri G. Mehta. Our dignitaries including even the Indian Union Minister entering US, have to pass through all sorts of similar humiliation[[p34](#)]... (*Interruptions*)

That is a humiliation for the signatories. Our scientists are suffering when they are seeking visas ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Your party's time was only 20 minutes and you have already taken more than 30 minutes.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : They are the worst violators of Human Rights. In such a situation, to depend too much on US, to trust too much US and to allowing a country like India with their strategic alliance, there is a conspiracy in Asia to contain China and destabilise these countries for hegemonic change. I think the Prime Minister owes an explanation. In our system, there is no opportunity for the MPs to discuss important matters. I demand that there should be a Parliamentary Committee going to the nitty-gritty of the discussions of the Agreement including the civilian deal.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Do you think that this is not the discussion?

... (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: What do you mean by an elaborate discussion. Could there be more elaborate discussion than this ongoing discussion? It is a full-fledged discussion.

श्री रवि प्रकाश वर्मा (खीरी) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आपने मुझे बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण चर्चा में भाग लेने का अवसर दिया है। इसके लिए मैं आपको धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ। आज हिन्दुस्तान में बहुत मंथन चल रहा है और ऐसा लग रहा है कि हम लोग दोराहे पर खड़े हैं। पिछले 50-55 वॉ की जो हमारी लीगेसी रही है, जो एक आत्मनिर्भर रास्ता लेकर चलने की हमारी परम्परा है, उसे बदलने की तरफ इस सरकार ने कदम उठाया है। हमारी जो एक पहचान बनी हुई थी कि हिन्दुस्तान अपने आपको दुनिया के पॉवर ब्लॉक से अलग रखेगा और आत्मनिर्भर होने का प्रयास करेगा, अपने दम पर, अपनी गुटनिर्पेक्षता की नीति के दम पर, अपने महान् वैज्ञानिकों के दम पर और अपने लोक तंत्र के बल पर, उसे बदलने का प्रयास किया गया है।

महोदय, अमरीका के साथ परमाणु शक्ति का विद्युत के लिए उपयोग करने संबंधी जो एग्रीमेंट हुआ है, उस संबंध में अभी हमने विज्ञान और प्रौद्योगिकी मंत्री श्री कपिल सिब्बल जी की बातों को बहुत गौर से सुना। उन्होंने बहुत तरीके से यह जस्टीफाई करने का प्रयास किया है कि हिन्दुस्तान तेजी से आगे बढ़ रहा है, इस पूरे प्रयास में हिन्दुस्तान की ऊर्जा की आवश्यकताएं बढ़ रही हैं और उन्हें पूरा करने के लिए हमें यह परमाणु ऊर्जा शक्ति एग्रीमेंट करना पड़ा। यह लाजमी था। उन्होंने इसकी लाजमीयत पर बहुत जोर दिया क्योंकि इसके बिना कोई दूसरा रास्ता नहीं था। मैं एक बात पूछना चाहता हूँ कि उन्होंने जो बहुत सारे डिटेल्स बताए, वे समझ में आए, लेकिन अखबारों में कुछ और ही बातें लिखी हैं। मैं आपकी अनुमति से कहना चाहता हूँ कि भारत से एटमी संधि करने के खिलाफ अमेरिका की संसद में बिल लाया गया है। मैसाचुसेट के डेमोक्रेटिक पार्टी के सांसद एड वर्ड मार्क और मिशिगन रिपब्लिकन पार्टी के सांसद फ्रेडिप्टोन ने वहां की पार्लियामेंट के अन्दर यह बिल लाया है कि जो ट्रीटी हिन्दुस्तान के साथ हुई है, उसको रद्द किया जाये। ऐसी स्थिति में जो एक्सरसाइज़ हुई है, उसकी सेंक्टिटी क्या है? इसके लिए इतना अखबारों में कहा जा रहा है कि एक महान प्रयास हुआ है, एक महान घटना घटी है, एक बहुत बड़ी डैवलपमेंट हुई है और एक नया आसमान खुल गया है-कहीं यह शेखचिल्लियों का सपना तो नहीं? हमारा पूरा और समग्र प्रयास है कि हमारी अस्मिता, हमारी पहचान, हमारी पूरी लीगेसी दांव पर लगी हुई है।

प्रेसीडेंट बुश यहां आकर एग्रीमेंट करके गये और उसके बाद भी यह चीज सामने आ रही है कि इसे वहां की संसद से एप्रूवल लेना जरूरी है। वह एप्रूवल मिल ही जाये, यह जरूरी नहीं है। ऐसी स्थिति में क्या होगा, इन सपनों का क्या होगा, इस उर्जा आवश्यकता का क्या होगा, आगे जो रास्ता हम लोग लेकर चल रहे हैं, उसका क्या होगा और अब तक हम जिस रास्ते पर चलते रहे हैं, उसका क्या होगा? मेरे पूर्व वक्ता कह रहे थे कि इस संधि के फलस्वरूप साउथ ईस्ट एशिया में जो आशंका का वातावरण पैदा हुआ है, एशिया की जो उभरती हुई महाशक्तियां हैं, हिन्दुस्तान और चीन, उनके जो उभरते हुए रिश्ते हैं, जिस iÉ®ÉÒBÉEä °Éä ÉÊ®¶iÉä ¢ÉxÉ ®cä lÉä, =xÉàÉå <°ÉxÉä ABÉE +ÉÉ¶ÉÆBÉEÉ BÉEÉ àÉÉcÉèäÉ {ÉènÉ ÉÊBÉEªÉÉ cÖ+ÉÉ cè, =°ÉBÉEÉ BÉDªÉÉ cÉäMÉE?[rpm35]

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरे पास राष्ट्रीय सहारा अखबार की कटिंग है। आपकी अनुमति से मैं उसमें से कोट करना चाहता हूँ, इसमें लिखा है - "अमरीका ने भारत को धमकाया, ईरान के खिलाफ वोट दो, वरना परमाणु संधि खत्म"। यह एक कठोर सच्चाई है। जितनी बातें अभी कही जा रही थीं, वे समझ में नहीं आतीं, लेकिन इस

अखबार से समझ में आ गयी हैं। हिन्दुस्तान की विदेश नीति पर दबाव बनाकर वोट डलवाया गया है। ईरान हमारा मित्र देश रहा है। वह एक समाजवादी राट्र है। हिन्दुस्तान ने अपनी तमाम परम्पराओं को ताक पर रखते हुए अमरीका के दबाव में वोट डाला। इसलिए वोट डाला कि उसे ऊर्जा की सिक्योरिटी चाहिए थी। क्या यह वाकई ऊर्जा की सिक्योरिटी है, जो हिन्दुस्तान को चाहिए? मेरे पास प्रधानमंत्री जी की स्टेटमेन्ट रखी हुई है। उसके आखिरी पैराग्राफ में कहा गया है - भारत के लोगों की जरूरतें हमारे अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय सहयोग का मुख्य एजेन्डा होनी चाहिए। यहां पर बड़ी अजीब सी स्थिति पैदा हो गयी है। हमारी कौन सी जरूरतें हैं? क्या ईरान हमारी ऊर्जा की जरूरतें पूरी नहीं कर रहा था? कपिल सिब्बल जी ने बताया कि परमाणु से हम केवल 2.75 मेगावाट ऊर्जा जनरेट करते हैं। प्रधानमंत्री जी ने अपनी पिछली स्टेटमेन्ट में कहा था - इस एग्रीमेन्ट से हमको 40 हजार मेगावाट बिजली मिलेगी। मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि इतनी बिजली तो खाली बिहार अपने कोयले से पैदा कर सकता है। इतनी ऊर्जा हिमाचल प्रदेश, उत्तरांचल, जम्मू-कश्मीर तथा अन्य राज्यों के पानी के रिर्सोसिज़ से पैदा हो सकती है। यह खाली ऊर्जा सिक्योरिटी का मामला नहीं है। मुझे लगता है कि जो मंथन इस सदन में हो रहा है, वह पूरे हिन्दुस्तान में भी हो रहा है कि क्या हिन्दुस्तान ने अपना रास्ता बदल तो नहीं दिया है। बिना पूरे देश की सहमति लिए आज अमरीका हमारा दोस्त हो गया है। हमने एक कहावत सुनी है कि कुछ दोस्त ऐसे होते हैं, जिनसे दोस्ती करने पर दुश्मन की जरूरत नहीं रहती है।

महोदय, हमने इतिहास में पढ़ा है कि पूरे साउथ ईस्ट एशिया में जब भी राजनीतिक अस्थिरता हुई है, उसके पीछे कहीं न कहीं अमरीकन इंटररेस्ट रहा है। इस बात पर हमें गौर करना होगा कि इंडियन ओशन ज़ोन एक बहुत ही कन्फ्लिक्ट का जोन रहा है। अमरीका के कूटनीतिक हित यहां बहुत पहले से काम करते रहे हैं।

*इसके पीछे कहीं न कहीं अमरीकी कूटनीति छिपी हुई थी। साउथ ईस्ट को डीस्टेबिलाइज़ करना अमरीका की पॉलिसी का बहुत महत्वपूर्ण कम्पोनेन्ट रहा है। आज वही लोग हिन्दुस्तान के दोस्त हो रहे हैं।...(व्यवधान)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The names of all those persons who are not present in the House should be deleted from the records.

श्री रवि प्रकाश वर्मा : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, ऊर्जा सिक्योरिटी के नाम पर एक एग्रीमेन्ट हिन्दुस्तान से हुआ है। उस एग्रीमेन्ट के पीछे क्या है, इस बात को बहुत गौर से देखना होगा। ठीक है, इससे थोड़ा सा लाभ हो सकता है, लेकिन सवाल इस बात का है, जैसा मेरे पूर्ववक्ता कह रहे थे कि राट्रपति बुश के साथ वहां की बिजनेस कम्युनिटी के लोग आए हुए थे, क्योंकि दक्षिण-पूर्व एशिया के साथ-साथ हिन्दुस्तान दुनिया का उभरता हुआ बाजार है। हिन्दुस्तान का मार्किट 80-90 हजार करोड़ रुपये का है, जो 13 प्रतिशत की गति से बढ़ रहा है और यह मल्टी नेशनल मार्ट, जैसे वॉलमार्ट आदि के लिए आर्काण का केन्द्र है [\[c36\]](#)।

हम भारत सरकार को आगाह करना चाहते हैं कि जितने भी बहुराष्ट्रीय निगम हैं, सुपर स्टोर्स हैं, उन सबके कन्ज्यूमर गुड्स का जो आउट सोर्सिंग होता है, चाहे कपड़े का हो, चाहे खाने के सामान का हो, वह सब

लेटिन अमेरिकन कंट्रीज़ से होता है, अगर हिन्दुस्तान में बड़े-बड़े बहुराष्ट्रीय निगम आएंगे और अपने बाजार खोलेंगे, क्या आप इस बात की गारंटी दे पाएंगे कि हिन्दुस्तान के दो लाख 36 हजार जो गांव बसे हुए हैं, उन गांवों से उनके सारे प्रोडक्ट्स की आउट सोर्सिंग हो। अभी आप सिर्फ सपना ही देख रहे हैं, मुझे लगता है कि सच्चाई बहुत बड़ी है, जो बहुत दूर है। केवल चीन को बैलेंस करने के लिए, एशिया की जो सबसे बड़ी दो उभरती हुई अर्थव्यवस्थाएं - हिन्दुस्तान और चीन - हैं, उन्हें आपस में बैलेंस करने के लिए, आज अमरीका ने हिन्दुस्तान में कदम रखा है और यह जाहिर करने का प्रयास किया है कि आज वह हिन्दुस्तान का दोस्त है, जबकि सच्चाई ऐसी नहीं है।

हम आपके माध्यम से इस सदन और सरकार को अवगत कराना चाहते हैं। हम अखबार में पढ़ते रहे हैं कि अमरीका अपना पर्सनल ट्रेड ज़ोन बना रहा है। जब डब्ल्यूटीओ पर डिबेट चल रही थी, उस वक्त ये बातें प्रकाश में आई थीं और अखबारों में छपा था कि अमरीका विश्व व्यापार प्रणाली से ऊपर जाना चाहता है और इसी आशय के स्लोगन वहां दिए भी गए हैं। वहां की कूटनीति पूरी धरती पर अमरीकन ट्रेड ब्लॉक डेवलप कर रही है। क्या हिन्दुस्तान अमरीका का उपनिवेश बनेगा, आज यह सवाल सामने खड़ा हो गया है, जिनका जवाब सदन को देना बहुत जरूरी है क्योंकि ईरान, इराक और अफगानिस्तान जो वैस्टर्न एशियन

* Not Recorded.

कंट्रीज़ थे, उनका जो हाल हमने देखा है, जिस तरीके से तेल के कारोबार पर जोर-जबरदस्ती, बंदूक की ताकत से वहां अमरीका द्वारा कब्जा किया गया है, उससे इस बात से शंका होती है कि अमरीकन डिप्लोमैसी हिन्दुस्तान को किस तरह मजबूर कर रही है या हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार अमरीकन डिप्लोमैसी के आगे इस तरह मजबूर हो गई है, हमारे मूलभूत सिद्धान्तों से समझौता करने के लिए विवश हो गई है और अपने रास्ते में परिवर्तन करते हुए अमरीकन ट्रेड ब्लॉक में एंटर करने जा रही है।...(व्यवधान) आज इतनी बड़ी दोस्ती हुई है। हमने सुना है कि दोस्ती बराबर के लोगों में होती है।...(व्यवधान)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please conclude now. You have given your name individually. Your name has not come from your Party.

SHRI RAVI PRAKASH VERMA : Sir, I am the only speaker from my Party.

हिन्दुस्तान अपनी जरूरतों के लिए समझौता कर रहा है या अपनी स्ट्रैथ पर समझौता कर रहा है। हिन्दुस्तान की जो जियो-स्ट्रैटजिक लोकेशन है, हिन्द महासागर के ऊपर और हिन्दुस्तान धरती का सबसे बड़ा उभरता हुआ बाजार है, यह हिन्दुस्तान की स्ट्रैथ है, होना यह चाहिए था कि पूरी धरती के जो बड़े मुल्क हैं, वे इस बाजार के लिए आपस में कम्पीटिशन करते और अपनी गरज के लिए हिन्दुस्तान में आते। लेकिन आज परिस्थितियां ऐसी पैदा हो गई हैं कि हिन्दुस्तानियों को अपनी जरूरतों के लिए, जैसे प्रधान मंत्री जी द्वारा कहा गया, उन जरूरतों के लिए, जिनके हमारे पास पहले से ही विकल्प मौजूद हैं, हमें अमरीका के साथ समझौता

करना पड़ रहा है, और ऐसा समझौता करना पड़ रहा है जिसका भविष्य अभी तय नहीं है, उसकी हमने तैयारी करनी चालू कर दी है। क्या इस दोस्ती की बदौलत, अगर यह दोस्ती है, हम सिक्युरिटी काउंसिल में मैम्बरशिप ले पाएंगे, क्या अमरीका हमारा साथ दे पाएगा - यह आज अहम सवाल है। क्या इस दोस्ती की बदौलत हिन्दुस्तान की जो परमानेंट समस्याएं हैं, पाकिस्तान के प्रति हमारा जो संघर्ष रहा है, दूसरे मुल्कों से जो परेशानी रही है, उन्हें हम दूर कर पाएंगे? क्या उस रास्ते पर चलने में हमें कहीं माइलेज मिलेगा - आज ये कुछ महत्वपूर्ण सवाल हैं, जो हमारे दिमाग को मथ रहे हैं और जिन्हें हम इस ट्रीटी के संदर्भ में देखना चाहते हैं। हमें आपके माध्यम से सदन को अवगत कराना है और सरकार से कहना है कि बहुत सोच-समझकर आगे बढ़ें। हिन्दुस्तान की आत्मनिर्भरता का सौदा बहुत महंगा साबित होगा, अगर कहीं अमरीका ने वाकई में आगे जाकर हमें धोखा दिया, जैसे पहले उन्होंने मिडल ईस्ट में किया है, फिर हमारी स्टैंडिंग क्या होगी, किस रणनीति के तहत हम आगे बढ़ेंगे और साइथ-ईस्ट एशिया में, जहां हम महत्वपूर्ण स्थान लेकर चल रहे हैं, हमारा क्या स्थान होगा।

14.00 hrs.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Devendra Prasad Yadav, I would like to inform you that only 11 minutes have been allotted to your party. I think, you would certainly end your speech within 11 minutes.

श्री देवेन्द्र प्रसाद यादव (झंझारपुर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हम आपके आदेश का पालन करने की कोशिश करेंगे।

आज लम्बी कवायद के बाद भारत और अमेरिका ने परमाणु समझौते की बुनियाद, जो 18 जुलाई, 2005 के परमाणु समझौते के कार्यान्वयन पर मुहर लगाई गयी थी, उस पर आज दोनों पक्षों की लम्बी बैठक के बाद, भारत और अमेरिका के बीच सहमति बनी है। अमेरिका के राष्ट्रपति जार्ज डब्ल्यू बुश ने अभी घोषणा की कि हम पृथक नागरिक परमाणु संयंत्र योजना को अमेरिकी कांग्रेस से मंजूरी दिलायेंगे। परमाणु ऊर्जा पर बनी संयुक्त समिति के मुताबिक भारत 22 में से 8 परमाणु संयंत्रों को सामरिक श्रेणी में रखेगा। कोई भी फॉस्ट ब्रीडर रिएक्टर निगरानी में नहीं होगा। साथ ही भारत अमेरिका को यह मनवाने में भी कामयाब रहा कि भविष्य में यदि कोई रिएक्टर बनाता है तो उसकी जो श्रेणी होगी चाहे नागरिक हो या सामरिक हो, उसे तय करने का अधिकार भारत का होगा। दोनों देशों के बीच इस ऐतिहासिक समझौते के अलावा विभिन्न पक्षों में कई समझौते हुए। कृषि विज्ञान, प्रौद्योगिकी, अंतरिक्ष सुरक्षा, स्वास्थ्य आदि इन सब क्षेत्रों में सहयोग के लिए मध्यकालिक और दीर्घकालिक पहल की गयी। दोनों पक्षों के सीईओ के समूह की रिपोर्ट को भी गंभीरता से लेते हुए व्यापार के क्षेत्र में द्विपक्षीय सहयोग बढ़ाने के लिए एक स्टेटमेंट जारी किया गया जिसमें पृथक्करण योजना के तहत, जैसा मैंने पूर्व में कहा कि 22 में से 14 को नागरिक संयंत्र और 8 को सामरिक संयंत्र में डाला गया है। इस सहमति के तहत किसी भी फॉस्ट ब्रीडर रिएक्टर को नागरिक संयंत्र की श्रेणी में नहीं रखा गया है। यह भी कहा गया है कि निगरानी के दौरान उसमें ईंधन आपूर्ति जारी रहेगी।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं बताना चाहता हूँ कि इस समझौते में मुख्य बाधा किन बिंदुओं पर थी। जिन बिंदुओं को हल किया गया, उनमें से दो बिन्दु बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण थे, जिनमें अड़चन और बाधाएं थीं। एक बिंदु यह था कि नागरिक संयंत्र के पृथक्करण और उसकी निगरानी। भारत भविष्य में कोई रिएक्टर बनाता है, तो उसके पृथक्करण का अधिकार किसका होगा? जहां तक बाहर के रिएक्टर आयातित करने का मामला है, उसमें जब तक सेफगार्ड की शर्त नहीं मानी जाती तब तक कोई रिएक्टर नहीं देगा। दूसरा बिंदु था निगरानी के तहत लाने वाले नागरिक परमाणु संयंत्र की भावी ईंधन आपूर्ति। हमारे पास तारापुर संयंत्र का अतीत से अनुभव है। जो वार्ता हुई, उसमें भी दोनों पक्षों की ओर से यह शंका उठायी गयी थी। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह शंका आज भी है कि इस बात की क्या गारंटी है कि ईंधन आपूर्ति लगातार बनी रहे ? इसकी गारंटी कौन देगा ? इसके लिए वे चाहते थे कि जब तक आपूर्ति है तब तक भारत निगरानी की पाबंदी मानता रहेगा। ईंधन आपूर्ति अधिकार एनएसजी द्वारा बंद की जाती है। वह संशोधनात्मक कदम उठाते हुए उस संयंत्र को निगरानी से हटा लिया। द्विपक्षीय वार्ता में सौदेबाजी के दौरान अमेरिका की तरफ से ईंधन आपूर्ति के आश्वासन के लिए कई तरह की शब्दावली का उपयोग किया गया। शब्दों का बड़ा भारी जाल बुना गया। इन शब्दों से कई तरह की शंकाएं उत्पन्न हो जाती हैं क्योंकि भारत इस मामले में एक फीसदी आशंका के लिए तैयार नहीं [\[37\]](#)।

मैं कुछ अड़चन की बात बताना चाहता हूँ कि जो समझौता हो रहा था, उसमें कुछ अड़चन थी। इसीलिए मैंने इस बात का जिक्र किया। तब इसमें यह कहा गया और इस पर सहमति बनी कि अगर ऐसा होता है तो गलती सुधार का अधिकार भारत को होगा। कितनी बढ़िया शब्दावली के बाद थोड़े से शब्दों को और सुधार दिया गया। इसीलिए मैं इस बात को कहना चाहता हूँ, यानी ऐसी स्थिति में संयंत्र की निगरानी सीमाओं से अलग कर सकता है और उस शब्दावली को सुधारने के लिए थोड़ा और एक्सपेंड कर दिया गया। सेंटेंस विन्यास को और सुधार दिया गया और बड़े जोर से, मजबूती से यह कहा गया कि जो ग्लोबल आतंकवाद है, उसके खिलाफ संयुक्त अभियान चलाया जाएगा। यहां तक कि अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय व्यापार में भी कई बढ़ती हुई हिस्सेदारी का जिक्र किया गया और भारत की लोकतांत्रिक व्यवस्था का भी जिक्र किया गया। यहां तक कि राष्ट्रपति जार्ज बुश के द्वारा प्रोस कांफ्रेंस में एक तरफ जमकर भारत की तारीफ की गई और दूसरी तरफ सुरक्षा परिद में भारत के स्थायी सदस्यता के सवाल पर चुप्पी लगा दी गई। एक तरफ भारत की पूरी प्रशंसा और सुरक्षा परिद में भारत की स्थायी सदस्यता के सवाल पर मौन साध लिया गया।... (व्यवधान)

पत्रकार सम्मेलन में राष्ट्रपति जार्ज बुश ने यह भी साफ किया कि भारत के साथ द्विपक्षीय संबंध भारत के ही हित में नहीं हैं बल्कि अमरीका के भी हित में हैं। पूरे देश के सभी नेशनल न्यूज पेपर्स में यह कहा गया। लेकिन अमरीका के लोग यह समझ रहे हैं कि भारत से दोस्ती उनके हक में हैं और यदि उनके हित में है तो मैं एक बात कहना चाहूंगा कि यदि भारत के व्यापक हित में है तो हमारे विद्वान कपिल साहब ने बहुत अच्छी तरह से इस विषय को रखा था। परमाणु समझौता जो हुआ, इस सदन में माननीय रुपचंद पाल जी और माननीय सदस्य वर्मा जी ने कुछ सवाल उठाए थे, कुछ शंकाएं सदन में उठी थीं। मैं सरकार को अपनी एक राय देना चाहता हूँ कि अमेरिकी कांग्रेस से जब तक इस समझौते पर मंजूरी नहीं मिल जाती है, तब तक भारत सरकार इस दिशा में कोई कदम न उठाए। चूंकि अमेरिका का अतीत का जो अनुभव है, उनका मुकरने का इतिहास है कि वह वादा करके मुकर जाते हैं। समझौता होता है लेकिन फिर अमेरिका अपने हिसाब से ग्लोबल विश्व में अपने आधिपत्य के

लिए क्योंकि साम्राज्यवादी देश की दूसरे देशों पर दबाव बढ़ाने की अपनी एक मानसिकता होती है और कई घटनाओं में इस बात का जिक्र हुआ, चाहे इराक का उदाहरण ले लीजिए, सब जगह इस बात का आपको उदाहरण मिल जाएगा। यूएनओ में प्रस्ताव के बिना ही उन्होंने अपनी रणनीति बना ली थी और इसी सदन में एक प्रस्ताव भी पास हुआ था जब इराक पर हमला हुआ था। उनका अपना जो मन होता है, उसी के अनुसार वे काम करते हैं।

इसीलिए हमारा निवेदन है कि अमेरिका के साथ जो भी परमाणु समझौता हुआ है, उसके अनुरूप तुरत-फुरत भारत को कदम उठाने की जरूरत नहीं है। जार्ज बुश ने यहां साफ कहा था कि अमेरिकी कांग्रेस में पहले हम इसकी मंजूरी दिलाएंगे। इसलिए पहले वह अमेरिकी कांग्रेस से मंजूरी दिला ले तो भारत इस दिशा में कदम उठा सकता है। विश्व भर में उनका यह अनुभव रहा है कि वह अपनी बात से मुकर जाते हैं। इसीलिए हम कैसे उनकी बात का भरोसा कर सकते हैं कि अमेरिकी कांग्रेस की स्वीकृति के बिना हम तुरंत त्वरित गति से इस पर आगे कदम बढ़ाएं चाहे न्यूक्लियर तकनीक का मामला हो, चाहे बिना रूकावट के भारत को ऊर्जा प्राप्त हो, उसकी गारंटी भी होनी चाहिए। जो अमेरिका है, वह हमारी उंगली पकड़कर दोस्ती तो कर लेगा लेकिन वह हमारी पीठ भी पकड़ सकता है। इसीलिए मैं अपनी शंका व्यक्त कर रहा हूं कि भारत ने जो छोड़ा है, उसमें अभी एक्सपेंड करने की जरूरत नहीं है जब तक कि अमेरिकी कांग्रेस से इसका एप्रूवल न हो जाए [\[R38\]](#)।

एग्रीकल्चर के विषय में मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि यह जो समझौता हुआ है, उसमें यह कहा गया है कि डबल्यूटीओ ने व्याख्या की थी और उसमें जिस शब्दावली का उपयोग किया गया था कि जो हमारा एमएसपी है, उस एमएसपी को डिस्टॉर्टिंग सपोर्ट प्राइस कहा गया था, जिस एमएसपी के कारण हजारों किसान आत्महत्या की स्थिति में पहुंच गये हैं क्योंकि यदि किसानों को लाभकारी मूल्य अगर नहीं मिलेगा, खासकर आन्ध्र प्रदेश से लेकर आप देख लीजिए कि किसान आत्महत्या कर रहा है। किसानों को उनका लाभकारी मूल्य मिलना चाहिए। यदि एमएसपी की परिभाषा जो डबल्यूटीओ के समझौते में कही जा रही है तो मैं कहूंगा कि इस पर विस्तार से बात हो जानी चाहिए। जो हमारी सब्सिडी है, किसानों के लिए जो एमएसपी है, उसे ट्रेड डिस्टॉर्टिंग सपोर्ट प्राइस कहा जा रहा है कि ट्रेड में बाधा है और वह कह रहे हैं कि इसे खत्म करो। यानी किसान के एमएसपी को धीरे-धीरे खत्म करो, एमएसपी रिड्यूस करो। यदि एमएसपी खत्म हो जाएगा तो इससे किसान की क्या हालत होगी? हिन्दुस्तान विदेशी कृषि उत्पाद का डम्पिंग ग्राउंड बन जाएगा। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं, यह मेरी शंका है। कम से कम विदेशी कृषि उत्पादन का डम्पिंग ग्राउंड हिन्दुस्तान को नहीं बनने दिया जाए।

दूसरी बात जो विज्ञान के मामले में है। मल्टी नेशनल कंपनी जो 'मोनसान्टो' है, यह सीड्स के बारे में है। कृषि के क्षेत्र में जो विज्ञान और अनुसंधान होगा, उसमें यह जो 'मोनसान्टो' है, हम उसके साथ समझौता कर रहे हैं। गवर्नमेंट टू गवर्नमेंट समझौता है। हमने जो समझौता किया है, क्या हमने प्राइवेट सैक्टर को, मल्टी नेशनल के बाजार को चमकाने के लिए किया है ? यह हमारा इंटरैस्ट नहीं है। कृषि, विज्ञान और अनुसंधान के क्षेत्र में डबल्यूटीओ, खासकर मल्टी नेशनल कंपनी को फायदा पहुंचे, उनके बाजार को चमकाने के लिए हम यह समझौता नहीं कर रहे हैं। इसीलिए हमने यह निवेदन किया है। यह बात मल्टी नेशनल एजेंडा तय करेगा।

हमारी इस शंका को निर्मूल करना चाहिए। Focus from public domain, signs to the private sector. क्या मल्टी नेशनल एजेंडा इसे तय करेगा ? इसे कौन तय करेगा ? इस शंका को निर्मूल करना चाहिए।

अमरीका अपनी समझ के अनुसार काम कर रहा है और हमें अपनी समझ के अनुसार काम करना है। हमारी जो विदेश नीति है, वह स्वतंत्र विदेश नीति है क्योंकि हम यूपीए के न्यूनतम साझा कार्यक्रम से भी बंधे हुए हैं। इसीलिए आगे विकास, उन्नति करने के लिए, प्रदूषण ठीक करने के लिए, ग्लोबल आतंकवाद को खत्म करने के लिए, विज्ञान के क्षेत्र में, ऊर्जा और परमाणु के क्षेत्र में यानी सभी क्षेत्र में देश उन्नति करे, इसके लिए अमेरिका के साथ हमारा समझौता हो, इसके लिए सब लोग सहमत होंगे। लेकिन इस पर राष्ट्रीय सहमति भी बननी चाहिए। सदन में जो वॉयस उठ रही है, राष्ट्रीय सहमति उससे ज्यादा जरूरी है। अमरीका की सहमति से कहीं ज्यादा महत्वपूर्ण हमारी राष्ट्रीय सहमति है, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ। हमारा जो नेशनल कंसेंसस है, वह कम महत्वपूर्ण नहीं है। सदन में एक वॉइस होनी चाहिए, इस विषय पर दो तरह की राय नहीं होनी चाहिए। हम इसमें कपिल साहब से बिल्कुल सहमत हैं कि विकास के क्षेत्र में हमें दलों से ऊपर उठकर काम करना चाहिए। हम इस बात से सहमत हैं। लेकिन हम इतना ही निवेदन करेंगे कि इस प्रश्न पर अमरीका से जितनी सहमति बनी है, उससे ज्यादा इस विषय पर राष्ट्रीय सहमति का बनना भी बहुत जरूरी है। जहां तक हमारे उस बैंच के मित्र का सवाल है, मैं उस सवाल को नहीं उठाना चाहता था क्योंकि हमारा सौ करोड़ लोगों का देश है और सौ करोड़ से ऊपर लोगों वाले देश की सहमति राष्ट्रीय सहमति होगी। यह हमारे लिए महत्वपूर्ण होगी। उस बैंच पर बैठे हुए हमारे तत्कालीन प्रधान मंत्री श्री वाजपेयी जी के समय में भारत और यू.एस. समझौते की बुनियाद रखी गई थी [\[R39\]](#), इससे इन्कार नहीं किया जा सकता, इसीलिए बीजेपी के हमारे दोस्त समझते हैं कि इसकी बुनियाद पहले रखी गयी है। इसीलिए मैं राष्ट्रीय सहमति की बात कही है क्योंकि बुनियाद रखने का मतलब पीछे-पीछे चलना नहीं है। यही तो इनकी हार का कारण बना। इन्होंने नीति तो बनाई लेकिन उसे अंजाम तक नहीं पहुंचा सके। अब उसे कपिल सिब्बल साहब और हमारे प्रधानमंत्री जी अंजाम तक पहुंचाने में लगे हैं।...(व्यवधान)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Yadav, you are going beyond your limits.

श्री देवेन्द्र प्रसाद यादव : इस देश की संस्कृति जनवाद की तरफ रही है।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Yadav, again you are going beyond your limits. You have to address the Chair and not the individual Members.

श्री देवेन्द्र प्रसाद यादव : मैं यहां की संस्कृति की बात कह रहा हूँ। आप लोग साम्राज्यवादी प्रवृत्ति और उसकी मानसिकता को बढ़ावा देने का काम मत कीजिए। साम्राज्यवादी देश अपने हित में काम करता है, लेकिन हमें अपने देश के व्यापक हितों के लिए काम करना है। देश के हितों पर किसी तरह की आंच नहीं आनी चाहिए और उस दिशा में जो भी समझौता होगा, हम लोग उसका समर्थन करेंगे। यही कारण है कि आज यह परिस्थिति बनी है और यह समझौता हमारे सामने आया है। इसके साथ ही सुरक्षा परिद में हमारी स्थायी सदस्यता का जो मुद्दा है, उस पर भी हमें जोर देना चाहिए। आज इसको लेकर तीसरी दुनिया के सभी देश हमारे साथ हैं चाहे वह

वेनुजुएला हो या अन्य तीसरी दुनिया के देश, लेकिन यह विषय सामने आने पर यूएस चुप हो जाता है। इसीलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस दोस्ती की ओर हमें फूंक-फूंककर कदम रखना चाहिए।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You have to address the Chair. Please conclude.

श्री देवेन्द्र प्रसाद यादव : महोदय, अपने देश की जो स्वतंत्र विदेश नीति है, हमें उस पर कायम रहने के लिए एक कठोर संकल्प लेना चाहिए।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, I would like to request Shri Braja Kishore Tripathy to speak.

... (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Nothing should be recorded except Shri Tripathy's speech. Shri Tripathy, your party's time is only five minutes. Please be brief.

(*Interruptions*)* ...

SHRI BRAJA KISHORE TRIPATHY (PURI): Sir, I will try to limit myself to the time limit though a lot of things are there.

Hon. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, we are discussing the statement made by the hon. Prime Minister on 7th March, 2006 regarding civil nuclear energy cooperation with the United States of America. The hon. Prime Minister's Statement is quite disappointing. It creates suspicion in the minds of the people. The hon. Prime Minister lays stress on energy security. Yes, the country needs energy security but it should not be at the cost of national security. Now, the suspicion is that the Government is compromising with the national security. That is the suspicion in the minds of the people.

What is the hidden agenda behind this? The country wants to know about it. We trust our hon. Prime Minister but we must be clarified regarding the real position. To become a nuclear power, the people of this country have sacrificed their lot. They are now suffering from hunger, unemployment and poverty. We have neglected the social sector and development. Our compulsion was to spend more money on Defence

because of the threat perception from our neighbours. We have also been compelled to spend a major chunk of money from our Budget on Defence. The people have sacrificed their lot. But what are they getting?

I just want to take this House to the background of the nuclear policy. On 1st July, 1968, the five Permanent Members of the United Nations Security Council formalised a system of nuclear apartheid by opening for signature the

* Not Recorded.

Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), restricted possession of nuclear weapons to the Permanent Five Members.

It gave signatories the rights of the peaceful use of nuclear technology. The Treaty recognised the P-5, the Permanent Five, as permanent nuclear weapons States and did not provide adequate security guarantees to other countries. That is the reason, India did not signed this NPT. This is the background why we have not signed the NPT because there was no security for other countries, those who were not capable of nuclear power or nuclear weapons. Of course, it has brought many difficulties to the nation. Since 4 decades, no Indian Government has deviated from that line and maintained distance from NPT. In 1974, India conducted first nuclear test with peaceful nuclear explosion. It took India another 24 years to try and force another entry. This time it was more bold and persistent with serial nuclear tests in 1998 when Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayeeji was the Prime Minister. We had witnessed the outrage of the US and other countries. Even then US had been compelled to accept us as a nuclear power. It had recognised India's indigenous nuclear capability. But in India, the nuclear market was not opened up. So, this is the hidden agenda to open up the Indian nuclear market. Everything was opened up in this country except the Defence and nuclear market. This is the hidden agenda to open the nuclear market and now the US, France and other countries are sure to rush. Now, we have the greatest market of the world for the nuclear materials. Hence, this is definitely a big deal for the

interested parties. Now, India would open up 14 of its 24 nuclear reactors to IAEA safeguards. The Nuclear Supplier Group (NSG) will now deal with India. NSG comprising of 45 nuclear supplier States including US have an agreement to coordinate its export control governing transfer of civil and nuclear materials and nuclear related equipments and technology to non-Nuclear Weapon States. So, when in 1998 the world has accepted us as a nuclear power, with this agreement we have converted ourselves to a non-Nuclear Weapon State. Otherwise, there will be no agreement. These 45 countries, NSG and US, will not supply any material to us. We have no hope but take dreams to be secured in energy though we will not get supplies. We shall have to convert ourselves to a non-Nuclear Weapon State. Hence, India will now convert to a position of a non-Nuclear Weapon country and we shall have to accept this position. What have we achieved during the past years, will go away due to lack of foresight of this UPA Government. The key objectives of this agreement, stated in the statement of the hon. Prime Minister, are to separate India's military and civilian nuclear installations so that it would be opened for international inspections. But, this separation is difficult for India. Other Members have already stated that the same reactors produce electricity as well as fissile material for the weapon's programme. So, now from where will we get money for this separation of civilian and military installations and are our scientists equipped with all these things? Now, the Prime Minister stated that it will be effected after 10 years. In 2014, it will come into effect[\[a40\]](#).

But within these 10 years, what amount of money that will be required for this separation? Where will the money come from? This has not been elaborately clarified in the Prime Minister's statement made to this House.

Sir, our future programme is more important. I would like to know whether our country has the right to have more reactors in future or will continue with these reactors. This has also not been clarified. Rather, the Prime Minister stated in his statement:

“India has decided to place under safeguards all future civilian thermal power reactors and civilian breeder reactors.”

So, we are also not hopeful for our future programme. He has also stated:

“We have agreed, however, that the future civilian thermal power reactors and civilian fast breeder reactors would be placed under safeguards...”

So, the entire civilian programme for energy purposes and for military purposes will remain under safeguards. That is what the hon. Prime Minister has stated in his statement.

Sir, I would like to make another very important point about fast breeder reactors. The scientists of our country are mostly worried about the opening up of these reactors for inspection which will affect our indigenous programme. What will be the result of this agreement? Our scientists are very much in a suspicious mood about this agreement. Whatever we have achieved indigenously for the last so many years will go away now. The Prime Minister should clarify this when he replies to this debate.

Sir, our foreign policy is independent and there is a national consensus on it. When the Prime Minister discussed this matter with the United States of America in July last year, he had not taken the Opposition into confidence and he had never discussed this matter with the Opposition. Even before this agreement was signed, the Opposition was not consulted. So, whatever we have achieved on the basis of national consensus on our foreign policy will now go away. This Gove