

Fourteenth Lok Sabha

Session : 8

Date : 23-08-2006

Participants : [Prabhu Shri Suresh](#), [Khanduri AVSM](#), [Maj.G Bhuwan Chandra](#), [Singh Shri Mohan](#), [Mahtab Shri Bhartruhari](#), [Chandrappan Shri C.K.](#), [Acharia Shri Basudeb](#), [Yadav Shri Devendra Prasad](#), [Sharma Shri Anand](#), [Singh Dr. Manmohan](#), [Badnore Shri Vijayendra Pal Singh](#)

an>

Title : Discussion regarding Indo-US Nuclear Agreement.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (BANKURA): Mr. Chairman Sir, I rise to raise a very important issue in regard to nuclear deal with United States of America.

For the last one and a half month, we have been discussing and demanding that there should not only be a discussion but also the sense of the House should be taken. Why have we been asking for the sense of the House on this particular issue? Since when we have been asking that the sense of the House should be taken on Indo-US nuclear deal.

SHRI ADHIR CHOWDHURY (BERHAMPORE, WEST BENGAL): Sir, just a minute!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat. He is not yielding.

SHRI ADHIR CHOWDHURY : Sir, how can he say that it is a deal; whether it is contracted or not? It is yet to be disposed of. At this juncture how he is able to define this as a deal?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA : Sir, the hon. Prime Minister made a statement in this House on 29th of July; then in the month of August and then again in the month of March. What the hon. Prime Minister has stated in his statement that he made on 29th July? I quote: "I can assure the House that we have never made nor will we ever make any compromises in so far as our fundamental strategic needs are concerned. Our inheritance gives us confidence, our experience gives us courage, our belief gives us conviction to assert today that our nation stands on the threshold of an even better future."

These are the concluding remarks of the hon. Prime Minister that he made on 29th July 2005. After the US President's visit in the month of March, the two House Committees, one of Senate and the other of the US Congress, deliberated and drafted a Bill. Sir, when we found that there were a number of departures in both the Bills and these departures are on some of the important issues pertaining to the deal, then we felt that there should be a discussion and concern of the House should also be expressed.

Sir, the Indian Parliament does not have any power, under the Constitution, with regard to the ratification of any international agreement. We have been asking for this since 1994 when World Trade Organisation Treaty was signed. Parliament was informed but never any international treaty

was ratified or approved by the Indian Parliament. The American Parliament has the power, but we do not have.

Sir, the system is there that both the Houses, Senate as well as US Congress, pass the Bill, then it is reconciled and then it becomes an Act. We have already stated and while replying to the debate on the same issue in the other House, the hon. Prime Minister has replied to all the nine points that we have stated as to where are the departures. But the main concern that we have expressed, in regard to this deal and the way the statement is being made by the Senator, is whether we will be able to maintain our independent foreign policy. I can give you one example.

This is regarding Iran; it is not regarding gas pipeline but the condition that has been incorporated there in their deal regarding India's support to Iran. This will affect our independent foreign policy. Why are we asking for independent foreign policy? In National Common Minimum Programme, it has been enunciated that we will have an independent foreign policy. Since Independence, we have been pursuing independent foreign policy because of our national interest. What have we seen in case of Iraq and in case of Iran? After the July statement, and when there was voting in International Atomic Energy Agency, we found that we sided with the United States of America. We supported the resolution moved by US and P 5. That was not expected before that. When we were trying to bring gas from Iran *via* Pakistan which we need, we supported America's stand in regard to Iran. There we find that the independent foreign policy has been affected.

We have been expressing our concern. We have developed independently the first breeder reactor in our country. After 1974 nuclear tests and Pokhran nuclear tests, restrictions were imposed on us. In spite of the restrictions we independently developed, our scientists independently developed the first breeder reactor. Our scientists had done a commendable work. In both the deals, USA is shifting the goalpost. The Prime Minister very categorically stated on 29th July – the concern we have expressed – that India will not compromise its strategic interest.

The House Resolution says:

“India has a foreign policy congruent that of USA and is working with US in key foreign policy initiative related to non-proliferation. Such co-operation will induce the country to give greater political and material support to the achievement of US goal and regional non-proliferation objectives, specially with respect to dissuading, isolating, and if necessary, sanctioning and containing States that sponsored terrorism and terrorist group that is seeking to acquire nuclear weapon capability or other weapons of mass destruction capability and the means to deliver such weapons.”

This has been incorporated deliberately in the Bill. What does it mean? After the reconciliation of both the Bills, it will become an Act. I want to know whether this Bill will be binding on us or not.

There are some provisions which are not binding. If these provisions are not binding, what is the necessity of bringing these provisions and to incorporate them in the Bill itself.

Sir, it is very much clear about the motive behind the United States of America as to why they want to bring such a provision and why they want to incorporate such a provision in the Bill itself.

Sir, it further says:

“Secure India's full and active co-operation in efforts to dissuade and isolate and if necessary, sanction and contain Iran for its effort to acquire weapons of mass destruction including nuclear weapons capability and means to deliver weapons of mass destruction.”

This is what has been incorporated in the Bill. So, what will happen? The Prime Minister, while replying to the debate, has stated that even the Legislatures of other countries passed a Bill, make legislation and that would not be binding on us. But our apprehension is that when such a provision has been incorporated with certain motive, if we do not accept such a condition, then what will happen to the deal itself? ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Nothing will go on record except the speech of Shri Basu Deb Acharia.

*(Interruptions)**

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA : Sir, I would like to know whether this is not a clear departure from the Agreement or not. The Prime Minister, while replying to this debate, shall clarify this point.

There are other such provisions. Section 4 (2) says:

“If nuclear transfers to India are restricted pursuant to this Act, the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 or Export Control Act, the President should seek to prevent the transfer of India's nuclear equipment material or technology from other participating Government in NSG or some other source.”

Sir, these are the extraneous provisions that are being incorporated in the Bill. Further, it is said that India is to identify and declare a date by which India will be willing to stop production of fossil material for nuclear weapons, and is to be encourage to do so unilaterally.

Then, Section 103, Sub-section 9 lays down that ‘ exports to nuclear fuel to India should not contribute to or anyway encourage increases in the production of India of fossil material for non-civilian purposes. If these provisions are finally

*Not Recorded.

incorporated in the Act, it is presumed that after the reconciliation, in the Draft Bill which both the Committees have prepared, all these provisions are contained in the Draft Bill. Our apprehension is

that when this would be reconciled and when it would become an Act, all these provisions would be incorporated in the Act itself.

Therefore, if these provisions are incorporated in the Act, whether it would not hamper our research and development in the atomic and nuclear energy.

Sir, the hon. Prime Minister had clarified that it would not be accepted. While replying to the debate in the other House, I would quote what he has said.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Acharia, your allotted time is over, and it is an extra time for you.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA : No, Sir. I have spoken, so far, only for 10 minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Your allotted time is already over.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA : I have just started, Sir. I have to deal with many points.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please continue. I have given you only a warning that your time is running fast.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA : You have given me a warning only. That means, I can speak for another 15-20 minutes.... (*Interruptions*)

While replying to the debate in the other House, the hon. Prime Minister said: "If US Congress, in its wisdom, passes the Bill in its present form, the product will become unacceptable to India." We congratulate the hon. Prime Minister that he candidly has stated that the product will become unacceptable to India in its present form. Diplomatically, it would be difficult to change it later. Hence, it is important for our Parliament to work out and insist on ground rules for nuclear deals at this stage itself.

When it will be unacceptable, then what would happen to the deal? If we do not accept it, and our Prime Minister has already spoken to President Bush, what he said in the other House that he has conveyed that some extraneous provisions are being incorporated in the Bill, which we do not agree. In spite of that, this is being done in the United States of America. It is because of that we have been asking that the sense of the House should be taken in order to strengthen the hands of our Prime Minister. When the US Congress can deliberate, discuss and incorporate extraneous conditions, then why can we not here discuss, have a unanimous view and sense of the House?

That can be sent to the US Congress, and that would have strengthened the hands of our Prime Minister in regard to conveying our strong message to the United States of America. But unfortunately this has been not done. But we have accepted what he had stated there. That can be accepted as the sense of the House because a unanimous view has emerged from among the Members of the other House.

There are implicit and explicit concerns. Regarding implicit concerns, I have already stated about our foreign policy. I have also stated what has been incorporated in the Bill. What we have been seeing is that how our independent foreign policy is being affected. There is a need to have a better relation with Russia and China so that we are able to bargain with the United States of America.

Then, one important aspect of this deal is about the energy security, which our Prime Minister has time and again emphasised that we need energy security. He has not touched that aspect.

MR. CHAIRMAN : You have taken 25 minutes.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA : We have made a target of 10,000 megawatts by 2015. Today, in regard to nuclear power, the percentage of nuclear power is only 2.5 per cent. The total generation of nuclear power is 3,335 megawatts. We have thermal power. We have hydel power. We have an untapped hydro potentiality of more than 1,00,025 megawatts. When we have a huge hydro potentiality, why should we go for nuclear power? Nuclear power is the costliest among thermal and hydropower. The per unit cost of nuclear power will be Rs.6. Why does the United States of America want to help our country in regard to nuclear power? In the last 30 years, the United States of America has not set up a new nuclear power station.

Now, if we go for nuclear power, say 10,000 MW, our target is to have 15,000 MW by 2020, the United States' interest lies in selling their old, worn out breeders for our nuclear power plants. There will be a problem of disposal of nuclear waste. We have some nuclear power plants which we have developed with our own technology in spite of restrictions imposed by United States of America and other countries. In spite of that we have developed them. While we should go for nuclear power, why should our country depend on the United States of America in regard to nuclear power plant?

I want to make one point clear. We are against stockpiling of nuclear weapons. We have the capability. But we do not want that somebody should put restriction on our capability. ...
(Interruptions)

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI): Sir, my only appeal, with respect to Shri Basu Deb Acharia, is that this is a short duration discussion and we have to accommodate other speakers and to ensure that the debate is over in another two hours. Therefore, I would appeal to all, including Shri Basu Deb Acharia, to reduce the time so that all Parties can participate in the discussion and we can finish the debate. It is a short duration discussion. ... (Interruptions)

SHRI ADHIR CHOWDHURY : Sir, has Shri Basudeb Acharia exempted China from stockpiling nuclear weapons? ... (Interruptions)

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA : Do not talk of China. We are not discussing China here. ...
(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Basudeb Acharia, you have already taken half-an-hour. Please conclude. Please cooperate with the Chair. If you do not finish now, we will not be able to finish it in time. That is what I can tell you.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA : Our scientists have also expressed their reservation and the hon. Prime Minister, in his meeting with the scientists made certain points. Like the concerns that we have expressed, they have also expressed their reservations. The other day the hon. Prime Minister had a discussion with them. He definitely discussed with them and has seen that their concerns are addressed.

The hon. Prime Minister has clarified it in the other House. But while replying to the debate, he has stated a very important point in regard to our strategic relation with the United States of America. He has also expressed concerns. He has stated that the Government will not accept any such extraneous conditionalities if it is incorporated there. While saying so, the hon. Prime Minister has stated that India will continue to have a strategic relation with the United States of America. He has also stated that that relation will depend on our enlightened national interest. If we have a strategic relation with the United States of America, we have our experience as to what we have seen in Iraq and in Iran and in Lebanon very recently. Without the support from the United States of America, Israel would not have attacked Lebanon.

What are we seeing in a small country like Cuba? With these experiences, if the Prime Minister feels that our national interest can be protected by having strategic relation with United States of America, I would like to ask him how we can think of a strategic relation with America on seeing, when after the agreement was signed, how certain conditionalities are being incorporated in order to make our country subservient to USA. We will not be able to help ourselves if we do not reject the Bill itself. If the USA do not agree to delink those provisions from the Act when it would be passed and the deal will have the final shape and if they do not agree to delink those conditions, what will the Government of India do? The Prime Minister may clarify how our national interest can be protected in having strategic relation with USA, with such conditions as are being imposed. I would request the hon. Prime Minister to clarify about it in this House while replying to the debate.

My request to the Prime Minister is that when the debate is concluded and he replies, his reply would include the sense of the House, the concerns expressed by the Members in regard to departure, in regard to certain conditionalities that are being imposed, in regard to our research and development in nuclear power, our independent foreign policy and the policy which we are pursuing. We have not signed the NPT because of our policy of one universal ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please conclude.

... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA : Sir, if we want ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nothing will go on record except the speech of Shri Basu Deb Acharia. Please conclude now.

(*Interruptions*)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now Maj. Gen. (Retd.) B.C. Khanduri will speak.

... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA : Sir, please give me one minute. I am concluding. ... (*Interruptions*)

Sir, we do not believe in a discriminatory regime. Our policy has been for a universal ban. I would request the Prime Minister to clarify whether the policy which we have been pursuing will be hampered or not. I hope, the sense of the House would be expressed by the Members of the House and that will strengthen the hands of our Prime Minister in regard to the nuclear deal.

*Not Recorded.

MAJ. GEN. (RETD.) B. C. KHANDURI (GARHWAL): Sir, I am thankful to you for permitting me to speak on the discussion regarding Indo-US nuclear deal, which is an event of far reaching consequences. I am also thankful to Shri Acharia for two things. Firstly, he has initiated the debate. He seems to be lucky with the draw because he gets his priority under Rule 193 very often. Anyway, he started this subject, and I am thankful to him. Secondly, I am also thankful to him for taking just 40 minutes, and leaving some time for the rest of us. ... (*Interruptions*)

This Deal, which is under consideration and scrutiny at various levels in both the countries, is of historical importance. It is a matter of serious concern for us. This Deal not only has historical importance, but it has far reaching political as well as national security implications. Therefore, any lapse or laxity on our part, knowingly or unknowingly, in dealing with the issue, and having the final terms worded properly would have very serious consequences. I am saying this because it will not only affect our national security, but it will also affect our defence preparedness. Hence, we feel that all those people who have national interest in view will certainly have a critical look at this Deal. We should not only see as to what it contains, but also see the positive view.

We have to take cognisance of the fact that today India and USA are the two biggest democracies of the world. We have also to take note of the fact that today US is -- whether we like it or not -- the only super power in this unipolar world. But at the same time, we must also remember that India is also emerging as a world power, and a super power. Therefore, we feel that we should have good relations with the USA in the international scenario, but it should not be at the cost of our security. We should not be treated as unequal friends, but treated on equal terms and as equal friends on all issues.

We do not share the views of those people who are opposing this deal just for the sake of opposing it. Nor are we with those people who think that USA is Evil just because it does not gel with their own concepts and their own thinking, which is not only outdated and outmoded, but is internationally a failed concept of peoples welfare and development.

In our opinion, the Indo-US deal was moving on the right direction. But, unfortunately, as we went along, various signals that are emanating, particularly, from the USA indicate that we are now diverting from this right direction. Sometimes, we also get the feeling that it is being done by unfair means. These unfair means could be blackmailing, pressurising, hoodwinking or a combination of some of these. It is this concern, as is said, which, particularly, emanates from the USA and more so from the House of Representatives of the USA, namely, the Congress, which has caused a lot of concern and doubts in the minds of common Indians, and the nationalist Indians. These doubts lead us to believe that probably we are going to have this Deal on unequal terms. Probably, USA wants to impose certain constraints and restrictions on us; and dictate terms to us with particular reference to not really undoing, but disturbing our nuclear weapons programme. Therefore, as I said, it is a matter of great concern to any nationalist or any person who has national interest in view.

This Deal has been discussed in detail in the Rajya Sabha, and the hon. Prime Minister had given a very detailed and exhausting reply. In his 70-minute speech, which became very exhausting, sometimes, I am told, the Prime Minister has attended to many of the queries. I will come to that a little later. I would like to bring to your attention one thing that he said. It looked very odd, and pardon me if I am making a comment on it. He said:

“We must never forget that the primary motivation of India’s nuclear programme was the production of energy; Defence came much later.”

Very humbly, I would like to put across to you that this must have been true at that point of time, but today, without any disrespect, I would say that this is an outdated concept. Gone are the days when the weapon system did not take the priority. Today, the political power in the entire world is flowing out of nuclear, shall I say, gun. Then, we just cannot afford to put our Defence requirements any lower than the energy requirements. In my opinion, the Defence requirements, the nuclearisation programme, the power that we can show to the world comes first and over and above everything else, including energy requirements. Therefore, I felt really surprised that if this was the intention of saying that it continues even today, I would disagree with that.

The main theme of our deal has been that we want energy security. I understand that energy security is important, but as I said just now, we cannot do it at the cost of national security; we cannot do it at the cost of more important and urgent things that are being faced all over the world, particularly by us.

We are told that we have got a very low record in utilisation of nuclear energy. The installed capacity of some of the countries in the world, as given by the Nuclear Energy Institute, Washington DC, is like this: USA has got 19.9 per cent of the total production of nuclear energy; France has got 17.8 per cent; U.K. has got 19.4 per cent; Russia has got 15.6 per cent; China has got 2.2 per cent as against India’s 2.8 per cent. We are not as bad as we have been projected to be. It is not that if we do not have this energy security from the USA, India will just collapse. I do not think that it is the correct scenario.

The next thing that I want to bring to your notice, Mr. Prime Minister, is that, as we understand from this Deal and whatever information we have been given, we are to get 20,000 MW of nuclear energy after this Deal, that is, by 2020. Apart from the economic side, which I understand -- it has not been clarified, but these are conjectures -- the separation will cost around US \$ 40 billion, then further installation and production will cost anything up to US \$ 60 billion to US \$ 80 billion, approximately making it US \$ 100 billion. We will get that after 2020, if everything goes all right and if the negotiations are all right. The ideal conditions will give you that. As against this 20,000 MW, India has an assured potential of about a lakh MW of hydel power, leave alone coal, solar energy, wind energy, which are in abundance. I do not think any country in the world is as lucky as we are in these matters. Nature has given so much. I do not know why we are bending backwards for the nuclear energy, when we have hydel power in abundance. Why are we not harnessing it? All these years, we have not harnessed it.

In my own State of Uttaranchal, a small State, it has got a potential of about 40,000 MW to 50,000 MW of assessed hydel power, which is not being utilised. We have coal, but there are certain objections and other problems in regard to that. Hydel power is a very clean and cheap power, besides wind and solar energy.

I am not against nuclear energy, but let us not depict a picture that we will be destroyed if we do not get this 20,000 MW of power at a cost that is prohibitive and under conditions which we do not know.

I would say that – if I may use the words – ‘energy security bogie’ should not be taken too far. Even at this stage, I would again request the government to give a serious thought to this aspect of energy that is available with us. It is not only cheap, neat but it is also under our own control. It is not under anybody’s dictates. Therefore, this aspect of nuclear energy needs should be taken in proper perspective.

As far as economic aspects are concerned, I have just given some figures, which shall be corrected, if I am not wrong. Anyway, it will be at a very large cost, apart from the risk involved with nuclear installations.

I am thankful to the Prime Minister that in the other House he has given very specific, categorical assurances. I wish he had given these assurances a little earlier. A lot of confusion was created earlier because of some discussion in the US, including in their Congress; some talks in India and some interpretation. But he has given some clarifications. I am only repeating those here to convey that these have certainly cleared some of the doubts and fog. He has given us categorical assurances that there will be no compromise to India’s sovereignty and autonomy of decision making; annual certification; scrutiny of either our nuclear weapons programmes or safeguard to nuclear installations; allowing American inspectors; and, lastly, no effect of proposed US legislations on India’s sovereignty. Shri Acharia was also just referring about this.

These are nice assurances. The only thing is, I still hope that the other side, that is, the US also would take note of it. At no stage, at no point of time and under no condition, are we required to compromise even a little bit on these issues. I hope you will make sure of it.

About these clarifications, as I said, we thank you and we compliment you for these. But, as a small aside, I hope you do not mind – there are two observations which you made are I think coming from you are little surprising.

Firstly::

“I may be late comer into politics, but I have the privilege of belonging to a Party which fought for India’s freedom.”

It was not a programme of the Congress Party, it was a national movement. Everybody fought for it. ... (*Interruptions*) I do not think at your level, you should have used these as an argument to strengthen your position. ... (*Interruptions*)

THE MINISTER OF OVERSEAS INDIAN AFFAIRS (SHRI VAYALAR RAVI): What is your objection to it? Everybody took part. ... (*Interruptions*)

MAJ. GEN. (RETD.) B. C. KHANDURI (GARHWAL): I am not a very old politician. You people know much more. You must have taken part in the Indian freedom movement in your own way. But it was a freedom movement. Now all those people have gone to various parties. ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Clear-cut policy is required.

... (*Interruptions*)

MAJ. GEN. (RETD.) B. C. KHANDURI : But the Prime Minister of a country talking this way is not correct. ... (*Interruptions*)

गृह मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री श्रीप्रकाश जायसवाल) : देश के मूवमैन्ट को कांग्रेस ने अपना मूवमैन्ट बना लिया, इसी बात को माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा, इसमें आपका ऑब्जेक्शन क्या है, यह बतायें?

मेजर जनरल (सेवानिवृत्त) भुवन चन्द्र खंडूड़ी : मैं आपको अपना ऐतराज बताता हूँ, इसे आपने हथिया लिया। आप कह रहे हैं कि आपने इसे अपना मूवमैन्ट बना लिया... (*व्यवधान*)

श्री श्रीप्रकाश जायसवाल : उस समय आप लोग कहां थे? तब आप जिस पाले में खड़े थे, आप हथियाने की स्थिति में नहीं थे।

मेजर जनरल (सेवानिवृत्त) भुवन चन्द्र खंडूड़ी : मैं तब सोल्जर था और यूनिफॉर्म में था।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nothing will go on record except the speech your speech. You please conclude. You have made a very categorical statement.

(*Interruptions*) *

MAJ. GEN. (RETD.) B. C. KHANDURI : Respected Prime Minister, now that your people are taking so much objection to my submission, let me also remind that this is the Party, in which you belong to, which also imposed Emergency. Are you proud of that? ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do not bring party politics. Let us discuss the issue.

MAJ. GEN. (RETD.) B. C. KHANDURI : It is all right for us to talk. But for the Prime Minister, it does not look nice.

I want to seek some clarifications. I have gone through your assurances and clarifications made in Rajya Sabha. I am not repeating those. I am just listing those out. Somebody may kindly take a note of it. My first query pertains to an interview given by Mr. Ashley Tellis. As I understand, Mr. Ashley Tellis is a senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in Washington, DC. He worked overtime along with United States Under Secretary

Not Recorded.

of State Nicholas Burns and Indian Foreign Secretary Shyam Saran to seal the India-US nuclear agreement. He gave an interview to Mr. Omkar Singh. There are two or three questions, which I want to bring to your notice and seek clarifications on. I quote the excerpts from the interview:

“Mr. Omkar Singh: Why was no deal struck then with the Vajpayee Government?

Mr. Ashley Tellis: The deal could not be reached because the Vajpayee Government did not offer much to the US in exchange for the agreement. We got more from the Government of Dr. Manmohan Singh.

Mr. Omkar Singh: What is it that you wanted from the Vajpayee Government and could not get?

Mr. Ashley Tellis: I am afraid, I cannot answer this question.

Mr. Omkar Singh: Did Dr. Singh cave in easily?

Mr. Ashley Tellis: I would not say that. There were long discussions before the agreement was reached.”

Could you kindly clarify what are the things which you could cave in but the NDA Government did not? Were these matters of such interest that the NDA Government could not cave in but you could?

Second, I have talked about the cost of separation. The financial cost of separation, as I understand is 40 billion US dollar. You could kindly clarify it. Similarly, installing our own nuclear power plant, as per my assessment costs about 100 billion US dollars. I would like to know from where would the Government find this huge sum. For all these years, the Government had been saying that it does not have the hydel power or development of coal and things like that. How is the Government going to find this 100 billion US dollar? And what will be the time frame for delivery of this famous 20,000 MW of nuclear power?

Third, why have we accepted such a water-tight separation plan, which does not apply to Nuclear-weapon-States? You might say that we are not a nuclear weapon State but, Sir, we are in our own way, in that category. You could kindly clarify that.

Fourth, why the fast breeder programme, which is based entirely on our own technology, has been offered for safeguards in future in the separation plan?

Fifth, why the CYRUS experimental reactor, producing a third of our weapons grade plutonium had been included in the list of civilian facilities and the fuel core of APSARA was being sought to be shifted from its present location?

Next, this one is again interesting. The US Secretary of State Condoleeza Rice's testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on April 5, 2005 where she said and I quote:

“We have been very clear with the Indians that the permanence of the safeguards is permanence of the safeguards, without condition.”

I would like to repeat this: “The permanence of the safeguards is permanence of the safeguards, without condition”. She further says:

“In fact, we reserve the right, should India test, as it has agreed not to, or should India violate in any way IAEA safeguard agreement to which it would be adhering, that the deal from our point of view would at that point be off.”

Finally, Prime Minister, Sir, you have told us many times that the test ban on us is not acceptable to you whereas Madam Rice says that it is. You may clarify, whom do we believe. And also, if what she says is wrong, has India taken it up at official level and contradicted her statement?

In conclusion, Sir, I have tried to convey the sentiments of the people of our country, as I said in the beginning, who have national interest in mind. I am not scoring points here but in the national interest I have tried to convey some points to you and I hope and pray that these will be taken care of not in the party interest but in the interest of the nation. Unfortunately, non-clearance of some of the doubts being raised here, also adds to the confusion. The confusion has become more confounded.

17.00 hrs.

Probably, this could have been avoided if Parliament had been taken into confidence at various stages. That you have to decide but certainly this confusion should not be allowed to prevail any more.

Sir, I hope the Government would give due consideration to what I have said. I would conclude by quoting a few lines from an article by Shri N. Ram, Editor of *The Hindu*. Again this is a

matter of concern for all of us. I hope and pray that whatever his forecast is, it does not come true. He has said:

“When future historians write on the negotiations of the India-United States civil nuclear deal, they will marvel at the way the American side made full use of its legislative process to rewrite vital portions of a settled agreement while the Manmohan Singh Government was pushed on to the back foot at every point.”

As I said, I hope and pray that this would not come true.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI ANAND SHARMA): Sir, this august House is witnessing this debate on this issue of critical national import which Gen. Khanduri rightly pointed out for the fourth time. Parliament is the highest forum of discussion and debate in our democracy. The very fact that this Prime Minister and this Government have come before the Parliament for the fourth time in 13 months underscores the highest respect that the Prime Minister and the UPA Government accords to the institution of Parliament. We have adopted a transparent approach in dealing with matters of national importance and national security to take the Parliament into confidence about the on-going negotiations for the full civilian nuclear energy cooperation with United States of America and other international partners. We have tried to allay any apprehensions or misgivings or fears which people may have through these discussions. For the last few weeks, there has been a built up; there has been a campaign; and concerns have been expressed both in the media and also by leaders of the political parties belonging to the entire political spectrum from Left to the Right.

Last week in the Rajya Sabha – it was referred to by Shri Basu Deb Acharia – there was a marathon debate for eight hours and to my mind rightly so all issues were settled. The Prime Minister had categorically and convincingly clarified the Government’s position and India’s position. I am very happy to note that what was said there and the assurances made there also found reflection in Shri Basu Deb Acharia’s speech and also in what Gen. Khanduri had said.

It is important for us to remember why is this debate is taking place. It is because of the follow up of the July 18 nuclear understanding which was reached last year between President Bush and the Prime Minister and which was defined in the Joint Statement which was signed then. It is also the on going legislative process in the US Congress and the negotiations between India and the IAEA aimed at eventually concluding India Specific Safeguards Agreement with regard to our civilian nuclear facilities. As I was mentioning that the criticism is there and also support is there. Criticism is acceptable in a democracy.

MAJ. GEN. (RETD.) B. C. KHANDURI : But support is not.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Support is welcome and criticism also, provided it is *bona fide*. It is like what we have seen today. There are certain clarifications which are sought. I am sure, the hon. Prime Minister would convince this august House like the other House and in the past in both the Houses of Parliament.

Let me say that this path is acceptable when we talk of demand for a debate because the Parliament has a right to be informed and the Parliament has a right to debate. We have a parliamentary system of Government and as per our Constitution, this is the highest forum. The hon. Prime Minister and the Government are answerable to Parliament and to this august House and are accountable to this House.

Therefore, on what we were hearing earlier, there were demands emanating from various quarters outside the Parliament and from within the Parliament that there should be a sense of Parliament and there should be a sense of the House. That was, to my mind, a borrowed expression. What was being criticised as some references which were merely declaratory in character or exhortations in the on-going debates in the House of Representatives which has passed a legislation in the Senate with the sense of the Congress, that was being super-imposed here or sought to be super-imposed as a sense of the Parliament. That would have amounted to turning our system upside down.

Sir, as I said, in our parliamentary democracy, the hon. Prime Minister's assurance and here repeated assurances to both the Houses of Parliament, is the final word. That is the sense of the Parliament and that is the sense of the country. There has, never, been any departure from this assurance. There is no dilution and we were left wondering as to what has happened in the interim period which necessitates this criticism and also to some extent a hostile propaganda and that is what we have to be careful about. We have to draw a distinction between criticism, concerns and a motivated partisan political propaganda to confuse and mislead the people. That is what had to be answered and that is what has to be rebutted.

Sir, through you, I would like to say to this august House that we all belong to the same country. We have the same commitment with regard to India's interests and India's national security. We may be on this side in the Government today and our friends on the other side. They were in Government for six long years. What was happening during that time, which however was never converted into a partisan political debate where accusations were not levelled about bartering away India's interests or compromising India's security. This is what must be avoided in any political debate. We have to draw the boundaries. A debate on this issue has reminded us once again as to what should be the parameters and to what extent we should go while criticising each other. We should refrain from attributing motives or questioning the intent, especially in this case, when we have a Prime Minister who has the credibility, whose integrity is respected not only in India but the world over. Also, if I may say, why should there be apprehensions and concerns that the autonomy and the integrity of India's strategic nuclear programme will be compromised and fears that India's independent foreign policy is being compromised? What had warranted all these observations? We fail to understand it?

A reference was made by Maj. Gen. (Retd.) B. C. Khanduri about the Congress Party and the hon. Prime Minister having claimed with pride that he belongs to that Party. Yes, it is Congress-led UPA Government. We do have a very proud legacy and a very proud history both as a Party and as a country. The Congress Party, our leaders, our forefathers had the good fortune and the courage to sacrifice, to challenge the mightiest of emperors and then to lead India to its freedom.

That Party and the Government, which is led by the Congress cannot compromise with India's independent foreign policy, cannot compromise with the integrity and the autonomy of our strategic nuclear programme.... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Nothing can go on record.

*(Interruptions)**

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is not proper. Mr. Minister, you can continue.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: I would just briefly mention that it is important to recall why and for objective is India seeking the full civilian nuclear cooperation. It is also for the dismantling of a discriminatory and iniquitous global regime.

The Indian nuclear programme is six decades old. It was the vision of our first Prime Minister Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and Dr. Homi Bhaba. It was their commitment to make India nuclear capable. There were many generations of scientists who worked hard to achieve that objective. It was in 1974 that the dream was realised. The commitments were fulfilled. What our scientists had done was demonstrated to the world. In Pokhran-I, when the first detonation took place, Shrimati Indira Gandhi was the Prime Minister of this country. She had the courage to make a very loud statement to the world that India has the capability and India has the determination to pursue an independent path in its own national interest. That message reverberated the world over. It led to the imposition of sanction, the denial of technology, the denial of fuel, the denial of dual access technology which did affect not only the nuclear programme to some extent which it was meant to but also the space programme and other critical scientific research programmes. Our scientists worked in a very adverse situation in what we have described as not only a denial regime but virtual nuclear apartheid. They overcame that and made India nuclear capable. They mastered the fuel cycle. Last year, when the hon. Prime Minister signed the Joint Statement, the July 18 Statement, implicit in that was a recognition of the fact that India is a country with an

*Not Recorded.

advanced nuclear technology, India is a country with a dedicated military nuclear programme and the Indian scientists are in a position to work along with the scientists of the rest of the world for future generation technologies. That is why, we have been invited to join the ITER Project, we have been invited for the FUTUREGEN Project. Once the restrictions are lifted and full civilian nuclear cooperation takes place, our scientists would also be able to contribute, in a major way by sharing their experience, by sharing their knowledge, with the world community in the progress of what this world needs for the future generation technologies.

There are many people who ask what is happening; where is the need or compulsion for nuclear cooperation why, what we have, that should not be continued when we have our own

nuclear programme. I will say one thing that the *status quo* would be hurtful to India's national interest because that would be a continued denial to our nuclear scientists and, for that matter, to our country of the cutting edge technologies which India must access to fulfil its quest to be a knowledge super power in the 21st century. As I said, today when, with respect others have recognised India's capabilities and also the fact that India is a military nuclear power, we must also remember one thing. Doubts were raised by Shri Basu Deb Acharia and Maj. Gen. Khanduri saying what would happen to our strategic programme. So, what has been done is in conformity with the reciprocal commitments which are integral to the July 18 Statement, the integrity of the strategic programme has been fully protected.

The freedom of our research and development programme has also been protected. We have also repeatedly reiterated our commitment to our three stage nuclear development programme. I need not go into the details of it here today, but it will eventually lead to breeder reactors with thorium as fuel.

Sir, the Separation Plan, as such, clarifies the position and clarifies all doubts, if there were any. In March this year, the Prime Minister tabled the Separation Plan both in this House and in the other House. We have kept out completely the fast breeder reactors, the proto-type fast breeder reactors and the indigenous research from any inspection, from any future safeguard arrangement. The Separation Plan is meant for only the civilian facilities which have been determined by our nuclear establishment. Those would only be subjected to inspection. The Separation Plan has been worked out by those scientists who have the oversight of our strategic programme. Surely they know what they are doing. There are 14 facilities which have been put in the Civilian List and 8 facilities have been put in the Strategic List with all the linking facilities both upstream and downstream. So, we do not see where any dilution is there, where any compromise is there.

MAJ. GEN. (RETD.) B. C. KHANDURI : But our eminent scientists expressed grave reservations. Now you are painting a very rosy picture. If it is so, then why all these eminent people, all retired Chairmen of Atomic Energy Commission are objecting? I would like your clarification on that.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Sir, we have the highest regards for nuclear scientists. The country is proud of them. This Government has always taken on board their concerns. Let me tell Gen. Khanduri that their concerns never reflected a partisan agenda. Let me also tell him that our eminent scientists, while seeking some clarifications, while raising some concerns, welcomed the July 18 understanding as a historic breakthrough in the same statement. But I was pained that that statement was distorted and selectively quoted to create an impression that the scientific establishment was having some reservations about July 18 Joint Statement.

MAJ. GEN. (RETD.) B. C. KHANDURI : But July 18 was signed before these concerns were expressed.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: I am referring to them. If you read that statement, in that statement itself they had welcomed it and termed it as a historic breakthrough. I am referring to the same statement which you are referring to. I am not referring to last year's statements.

Sir, here I may also say that many issues, which have been raised, will surely be answered, but I will quickly refer to a few. First and foremost, since a question has been raised both by Gen. Khanduri and earlier by Shri Basu Deb Acharia on those issues which pertain to the ongoing legislative process in the USA and whether any compromise has been made by and since what was said by some Senators in the USA was quoted here, I would like to make it clear that the legislative process in the USA, as we had explained earlier in this House and in the other House, is different from our Parliament. They have the House of Representatives which has one version of a Bill which they have passed, but the Senate has another Bill with the same stated objective. But when we look at the body of the draft legislation, that is different. When that will be passed, then there would be a conciliation process which would lead to the final legislation and that would seek to empower the US Administration and the US President with an India-specific waiver authority to enter into a bilateral agreement. That is what the position would be. We are at this stage here today where the Senate has not passed the Bill. Then we have three more stages to go. What we are concerned with would be the agreement under 123 which will facilitate full civilian nuclear cooperation. That agreement would be signed between two sovereign States.

The hon. Prime Minister has made it clear and the Government has made it clear that we will not accept any additional conditionalities, there will be no additional obligations. The Agreement, which India will sign, will be within the templates of July 18 Agreement.

MAJ. GEN. (RETD.) B. C. KHANDURI : What has Condoleeza Rice said? She has said that it will be always like this.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: I do not know. I have never said anything offensive. I have great regards for Gen. Khanduri.

MAJ. GEN. (RETD.) B. C. KHANDURI : I do not mean anything offensive at all. He was making an argument. I have not raised the issue of legislation. I know the process.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: I am not answering this.

MAJ. GEN. (RETD.) B. C. KHANDURI : I am just saying कि कॉन्डोलिसा राइस ने जो कहा है, उसका जवाब दीजिए।

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: I like Gen. Khanduri always smiling.

As I was saying that that is what India will be bound to.

As far as the legislative process in any legislature is concerned, with all respect to that legislature or to other legislatures, the hon. Prime Minister has made it clear, and our position has been stated in both the Houses earlier. We are not bound by the legislation of any foreign legislature. That is what our position is. The Agreement, which India will enter into, will be the final one.

There are certain things which have been said. I will only refer to two or three. The first is about safeguards arrangement. The Safeguards Agreement, India will enter into, will be with the

International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) will be India specific with regard to our civilian nuclear facilities. Also there will be a inter-locking mechanism, the Safeguards Agreement will also have a multi-layered fuel supply guarantee. There will be uninterrupted fuel supply.

17.22 hrs.

(Shrimati Krishna Tirath *in the Chair*)

Secondly, what is very important and which I must underscore is that India will have the legal right to build a strategic fuel reserve for the life time of the reactors which we will be placing under the Safeguard. We are not taking any chance of future interruptions or denials and that would be built in these guarantees, even under the bilateral agreement which India will sign with the US. We would like to assure the House that the Government and our negotiators have taken all these aspects into consideration while we are referring to these Agreements.

Another reference was made about sequencing that whether, while we are talking to the IAEA for India specific safeguards, it would be different from any other safeguard arrangement of non-nuclear weapon States because India's military nuclear programme is acknowledged and recognised. So, as far as the sequencing part is concerned, it is in a phased manner. It will be from 2006 to 2014. Out of 14 of the facilities, six are already under International Safeguards Arrangement and the remainder eight will be under Safeguards Arrangement between next year and 2014. There is no question that before an agreement is reached, our facilities have been placed under Safeguards Arrangement. That is not the case. The assurance was given by the hon. Prime Minister was that India will place the facilities under IAEA Safeguards only after all restrictions are lifted. That commitment stands.

With regard to the inspection also that he has mentioned, it will be only through IAEA and it cannot be the inspection by any country.

MAJ. GEN. (RETD.) B. C. KHANDURI : I complimented the hon. Prime Minister for saying that.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: I will just say in the end that when we talk of the FMCT, it is a multi-lateral treaty, which will be negotiated in Geneva. India's position remains very clear and very firm. We will negotiate along with other countries. But that is not a treaty, which India will negotiate bilaterally with US.

There has also been a reference to the tests and detonation and there has been a reference to many other issues. I would not like to raise any partisan issue, but, I would like to draw the attention of the House, particularly, Gen. Khanduri. For the sake of records and for the benefit of this House, let me say that while this Government is committed only to the voluntary unilateral moratorium. That we would continue with the voluntary moratorium. There is no provision in the US legislation under consideration, which requires India to abjure the right. When the unilateral voluntary moratorium was declared by India, in September 1998, the then Government, the then hon. Prime Minister had made an offer in the UN General Assembly to convert the unilateral moratorium into a *de jure* one, which virtually amounted to signing the CTBT which was taken further. I have the

quotation.... (*Interruptions*) Please do not shake your head. I can quote his speech. That was made at the United Nations. ... (*Interruptions*)

MAJ. GEN. (RETD.) B. C. KHANDURI : It was not a condition from USA. It was a voluntary imposition of the State. It was our own; we could have changed it any time we wanted.... (*Interruptions*)

MADAM CHAIRMAN : Please do not interrupt.

... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: I think, for the benefit of the Members it is important for me now to refer to this. Madam, I quote from the speech of respected Vajpayeeji, the then Prime Minister, in the UN General Assembly in September 1998. He said:

“Accordingly, after concluding this limited testing programme, India announced a voluntary moratorium on further underground nuclear test explosions. We conveyed our willingness to move towards a *de jure* formalisation of this obligation. In announcing a moratorium, India has already accepted the basic obligations of the CTBT.”

MAJ. GEN. (RETD.) B. C. KHANDURI : It was a voluntary imposition of the State. ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Madam, I may also say, as I said right in the beginning when I started, that the hon. Prime Minister and this Government have repeatedly come before the Parliament. There was a time when for 11 long months there were talks between the then Foreign Minister of India and Mr. Strobe Talbott. This Parliament was never informed; this country was never informed. We were kept in dark. Today, we see the Delegations of Malhotraji's Party – you all were there – in the newspapers going to Rashtrapatiiji petitioning against this Government as if we have done something which totally compromises India's sovereignty. But, at that time I would have respected all my friends on the other side if they had protested and demanded what was transpiring between the two, between hon. Jaswant Singh ji and Strobe Talbott. ... (*Interruptions*) The country had to wait not for 11 months but for years. ... (*Interruptions*)

MADAM CHAIRMAN: Please do not interrupt.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: I am grateful to both my friends here. I am grateful to both of you. It is because, firstly, for years the country was in dark and we had to wait for Strobe Talbott to write a book and publish it. We had to buy the book and read it as to what was committed and what was offered including the CTBT offer. Secondly, you asked me, when we were on the other side, why we did not raise it. This is the difference between you and us. We do not carry out a partisan propaganda.... (*Interruptions*)

17.30 hrs.

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

Madam, I just quickly refer to one more thing, that is with regard to – what was said about – the certification. The Prime Minister had made it clear that any annual certification would be contrary to the spirit of July 18 and even a mention in the non-binding section will be unacceptable to India. This has been clearly conveyed by the Prime Minister; this has been clearly conveyed by the Government. There should not be any doubts on that score. India is very clear about its status, that is, of an advanced nuclear weapons country, an advanced technology country, which enjoys the same rights and benefits as the other.

One thing is very relevant and I leave that for the Prime Minister to respond, which he has done very convincingly in the other House, and that is about the need of nuclear energy. It has been questioned that we have hydel energy. Khanduri ji, you come from Uttaranchal. I know that your State has enormous hydel potential. I have the good fortune of belonging to Himachal. We also have a huge potential which we have exploited to some extent. We are not disputing that hydel potential should be exploited or saying that bio-energy should not be explored, and renewable means of energy should not be accessed to. But what India would need for its energy security would be an ideal energy mix, an ideal fuel mix, which must also include the nuclear energy. If we only keep on referring to that we have huge resources of coal, then dependence will be on fossil fuels and coal – in any case these are depleting – we have to look at the environmental hazards and the costs involved. Similarly, with hydrocarbon reserves, the cost is rising. Today we know what is the cost of one barrel of oil we do not know what the prices would be in future, and then there would be pressure on the hydrocarbon reserves too. So, accessing clean technologies and accessing nuclear technology would be relevant.

Sir, what I am saying is that 46 years ago, in this House, on the 10th of August, 1960, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, whose vision it was to make India a nuclear capable State, said:

“We are equally determined not to be left behind in the advance, in the use of this new power. Also in spite of an apparently large supply of coal in India, it is not really large enough for the future. Therefore, there is no doubt that we should lay the foundations for atomic power and go ahead from now on.”

That is what Pandit ji had said in this House.

I would urge all the Members that after the hon. Prime Minister has spoken today – that earlier assurances have been strictly adhered to – let us all reflect that should we allow a partisan political debate or propaganda which eventually ends up hurting the interest of this country. Why I say that it is hurting the interest of this country is that there is a propaganda against us, against the Agreement on civilian nuclear understanding with the United States of America, which is carried out by those who are opposed to India, those who do not want India to access the cutting edge technologies, and those who do not want India to have the fuel. I am referring to our immediate neighbour. Lobbies are there. I am not talking of those who have reservations because of their proliferation concern. There is an active lobby which has been working. Yes, Pakistan has been active. While we debate in this country, let us not say anything which eventually is twisted, used and misused by India's opponents. Let us speak in one voice when it comes to India's interest.

Sir, I will conclude by quoting, and rightly so, our greatest Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, who had said:

“A large country like India must act with an inner conviction of its strength. I have tried to devote my life to build a tolerant India, a secular India and a peaceful India. I wish to continue to work for it and devote all my energy for it, and if necessary, die for it. Let us not be bogged down in petty squabbles which diminish the nation. Let us deploy our strength to face the issues which affect the long-term interests of our people.”

श्री मोहन सिंह (देवरिया) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, भारत के प्रधान मंत्री जब पिछले साल 18 जुलाई को अमेरिका के राष्ट्रपति के साथ परमाणु ऊर्जा आपूर्ति के संबंध में समझौता करके आये थे और जब इस सदन में उस समझौते पर चर्चा हुई थी, तो हमारी पार्टी ने उस समझौते का पुरजोर समर्थन किया था। हमने केवल इस आधार पर समर्थन किया था कि अन्तराष्ट्रीय मामलों में भारत के सम्बन्धों के सवाल पर भारत में हमेशा एक आम सहमति रही है और आज दुनिया की सच्चाई है। एक जमाना था जब द्वितीय विश्वयुद्ध के बाद दुनिया दो हिस्सों में बंटी हुई थी। भारत एक नया राष्ट्र था, नयी आजादी मिली थी। हमें हमारे राष्ट्र के हितों की रक्षा करते हुए, दुनिया के किसी खूंटे में न बंधकर, अपनी ताकत से भारत का निर्माण करना था और ऐसे में गुट निरपेक्षता की विदेशनीति हमारे लिए एक सार्थक विदेशनीति मानी गयी जिस पर हमारा देश लगातार अमल करता आ रहा है। लेकिन जब कभी भी भारत पर संकट आया, हमें लगा कि हम ताकतविहीन हैं तो किसी भी ताकतवर मुल्क ने हमारी मदद नहीं की। जब वर्ष 1962 में हमारे देश पर चीन का हमला हुआ, तो ऐसा कहा जा रहा था कि हमारा साथी देश, मित्र देश सोवियत खेमा है, लेकिन उसने भी अपना पल्ला यह कह कर झाड़ लिया कि चीन हमारा वैचारिक भाई है और भारत हमारा दोस्त है, इसलिए हमारे लिए चुप्पी साध लेना ही बेहतर है, इस तरह हमारी पिटाई होती रही। हमारी मदद में गुट निरपेक्ष आन्दोलन के ही देश आए, खासतौर से श्रीलंका की प्रधानमंत्री सिरिमावो भण्डारनायके आगे आई थीं।

वर्ष 1971 में जब बांग्लादेश की आजादी का संघर्ष हो रहा था, तो भारत ने उसमें मदद की और उस मदद के बाद अमेरिका ने अपनी नौसेना का सातवां बेड़ा हिन्द महासागर में भेज दिया था। अमेरिका ने डिगो गार्शिया में अपना एक स्थायी अड्डा बना लिया। भारत ने इस संघर्ष में कामयाबी हासिल की और विश्व के सभी संघर्षों में सबसे अधिक युद्धक-बन्दी इस युद्ध में भारत ने कैद किए थे। इसके साथ ही दुनिया के नक्शे पर भारत की मदद से एक स्वतंत्र देश का उदय हुआ था। हमारे देश की प्रधानमंत्री ने उस समय ठीक ही समझा कि दुनिया ऐसा न समझ ले कि डिगो गार्शिया में अमेरिका द्वारा सैनिक अड्डा बना लेने कि आद और एक बहुत बड़ी ताकत के हिन्द महासागर में आने के बाद भारत कोई डरा हुआ देश बन गया है, इसलिए पोखरण-1 भूमिगत परमाणु परीक्षण हमारे देश ने करके दुनिया के सामने अपनी ताकत का खुलासा किया। इसके साथ भारत ने दुनिया को यह संदेश दिया था कि किसी भी आक्रमण का मुकाबला हम अपनी ताकत से कर सकते हैं। इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब कभी भी जरूरत पड़ी, भारत जिन उसूलों पर खड़ा है, उन उसूलों के लिए हमने अपनी आवाज बुलंद की है। साठ के दशक में जब मिस्त्र के राष्ट्रपति अब्दुल गमाल नासिर के समय में, मिस्त्र ने स्वेज नहर का राष्ट्रीयकरण कर लिया तो फ्रांस, ब्रिटेन और इजरायल ने मिलकर मिस्त्र पर हमला कर दिया। उस समय भारत अकेला देश था जिसने उस हमले के खिलाफ अपनी आवाज बुलंद की जिसका नतीजा यह हुआ कि ब्रिटेन की जनता ने अपने ही प्रधानमंत्री का घर घेर लिया। भारत ने पूरे विश्व में ऐसा जनमत तैयार किया कि मिस्त्र पर तीनों देशों का यह आक्रमण तत्काल स्थगित हो गया। उसके कुछ ही दिनों बाद जब पूरी दुनिया तनावग्रस्त थी, अमेरिका के टोही विमानों ने रूस में प्रवेश किया और उनको रूस द्वारा मार गिराया गया। उस समय राष्ट्रपति डि गॉल ने फ्रांस में ख्रुश्चेव और बुल्गानिन की एक बैठक बुलाई, जिसके बारे में कहा जाता है कि यह अमेरिका और रूस का शीर्ष सम्मेलन था। यह फ्रांस का पंचाट था, लेकिन वह वार्ता विफल हो गयी। उस समय भारत के प्रधानमंत्री जवाहर लाल नेहरू ने

संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में दोनों की एकता के लिए प्रस्ताव रखा। उनके प्रस्ताव पर चर्चा हुई और उससे जो तनावग्रस्त दुनिया में शिथिलता का वातावरण जवाहर लाल नेहरू जी के प्रयास से पैदा हुआ।

मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि अपने राष्ट्रीय हितों का बलिदान किए बिना सच्चाई के साथ भारत अपने उसूलों पर खड़ा है। उसके लिए आवाज़ बुलंद करना भारत की प्राथमिकता थी और हमारी स्वतंत्र विदेश नीति का एक आधार था। इसी बात को लेकर किसी भी अंतर्राष्ट्रीय मोड़ पर भारत सरकार ने देश में एक राष्ट्रीय सहमति बनाकर अपनी विदेश नीति का संचालन किया।

कुछ इसी तरह की परिस्थिति मिडल ईस्ट में आई। हमारा मानना है कि पश्चिमी एशिया को हमेशा अस्थिर करने के लिए अमेरिका का एक ऍडयंत्र रहता है। इस सच्चाई को मानकर चलना होगा कि छोटे-छोटे देश जो उसके साथी हैं, उसके साथ रहना चाहते हैं, इजराइल जैसे देश परमाणु बम में शक्ति सम्पन्न राष्ट्र हो सकते हैं, उसमें उसको एतराज नहीं होगा। लेकिन कोरिया, भारत नहीं हो सकते। अंदर ही अंदर परमाणु बम बनाने की क्षमता पाकिस्तान ने, हमारे पड़ोसी देश ने किस की मदद से प्राप्त की, दुनिया को इस बात की जानकारी है। ऐसी परिस्थिति में भारत ने दुनिया में अधिक से अधिक मित्र बनाते हुए अपनी स्वतंत्र विदेश नीति पर चलते हुए अपने राष्ट्रीय उसूलों के साथ समझौता नहीं किया।

अमेरिका के साथ हम टकराव के पक्ष में नहीं हैं। उसे भी मित्र मानकर जितनी भी आर्थिक और सामरिक तरक्की करने की जितनी भी बातें हों, हमें उससे मदद लेनी चाहिए। लेकिन हमारे जो पश्चिम और दक्षिण एशिया के देश हैं, उनमें अमेरिका की दखलअंदाजी को भारत को स्वीकार नहीं करना चाहिए। इसी परिप्रेक्ष्य में यह जो हमारा समझौता अमेरिका के साथ 18 जुलाई को हुआ, उसे इसी नजरिए से देखना चाहिए।

अभी कुछ समय पहले हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने राज्य सभा में जो वक्तव्य दिया, उसके लिए हम उन्हें बधाई देना चाहते हैं। उस पूरे भाग में भारत के पुराार्थ की झलक मिलती है। दुनिया में किसी भी ताकत के सामने भारत नहीं झुक सकता, उसका एक-एक शब्द और अक्षर हमें यह पढ़ने को मिलता है। इसलिए हम आज यहां जो बात कहने के लिए खड़े हैं, उसमें यह भी कहना चाहते हैं कि जो वचन भारत के प्रधान मंत्री जी ने हमारी संसद के दूसरे सदन में दिया है, उस वचन पर उनको अडिग रहना चाहिए। हम अपने मित्रों से भी कहना चाहते हैं कि इस देश की आस्था और आत्मा, इस देश की भावना का प्रतीक यह संसद है। जब इस संसद में भारत का कोई प्रधान मंत्री वचन देता है तो उस पर अविश्वास करने का हमारे पास कोई कारण नहीं रहता, हमें उस पर विश्वास करना चाहिए। हम अपेक्षा करते हैं कि जैसा आज संदेश आ रहा है अमेरिका से कि भारत के प्रधान मंत्री और अमेरिका के राष्ट्रपति के बीच जो समझौता हुआ, उसमें कुछ कतर-ब्यौत होने वाली है, उस पर भी ध्यान देना होगा। एक सेंस डवलपड हुआ, अमेरिकी कांग्रेस ने पास किया, अमेरिकी सीनेट की उस पर मोहर लगने में परेशानी हो रही है। हम चाहते हैं कि भारत की संसद का एक स्वर अमेरिकी सीनेट के सदस्यों को सुनाई पड़ना चाहिए कि भारत की जनता और संसद भारत के प्रधान मंत्री और सरकार के पीछे खड़ी है और उसमें किसी भी प्रकार की कतर-ब्यौत को हम स्वीकार करने वाले नहीं हैं। हम इसी मकसद से इस बहस में हिस्सा ले रहे हैं।

प्रधान मंत्री जी अमेरिका में राष्ट्रपति के साथ मिले थे। इस सदन ने प्रधान मंत्री जी के प्रति भरोसा व्यक्त किया था। उन्होंने जो कुछ समझौता किया था, इस सदन का बहुमत उनके साथ था। इसलिए बाहर यह आवाज़ जानी चाहिए कि बहुमत नहीं सर्वसम्मत् रूप से सारा देश और संसद इस समझौते साथ है। प्रधान मंत्री जी की बात के साथ-साथ यह संदेश भी जाना चाहिए था।

जब हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी अमेरिकी राष्ट्रपति से मिले, उन्होंने इस बात पर आश्चर्य प्रकट किया कि भारत की संसद में वाजपेयी जी ने इस समझौते का विरोध किया है। हमें इस पर आश्चर्य है कि उन्होंने अमेरिका के राष्ट्रपति के साथ वहां हुई मुलाकात में यह विचार व्यक्त किया था। हमें अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि भारत के प्रधान मंत्री जी द्वारा व्यक्त किया हुआ यह आश्चर्य कम से कम मेरे जैसे व्यक्ति को अच्छा नहीं लगा, जो प्रधान मंत्री जी के बारे में शुरु से ही अच्छी राय रखता है। इसलिए हम कहना चाहते हैं कि उन्होंने जो वक्तव्य राज्य सभा में दिया है, भारत सरकार उस पर डटी रहे। पूरा देश, पूरा सदन और कम से कम मेरी पार्टी जो अधिकांश मामलों में इस सरकार का विरोध करती रहती है, इस सवाल पर आपके साथ रहेगी। यह वचन देते हुए मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूं।

श्री देवेन्द्र प्रसाद यादव (झंझारपुर) : उपाध्यक्ष जी, यह राष्ट्रीय और अंतर्राष्ट्रीय महत्व का विषय है और यह कोई दलगत मुद्दा नहीं है। भारत-अमरीकी परमाणु करार पर, 18 जुलाई को जो संयुक्त बयान आया, उससे जिन दलों को शंका या संशय था वह शंका और संशय भी निर्मूल हो चुका है। माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी का वक्तव्य, पिछले दिनों दूसरे सदन में हुआ है, उससे देश के स्वाभिमान को बल मिलने के साथ-साथ देश की जो विदेश-नीति है, गुट-निरपेक्ष नीति है, उसकी घोषणा का काम भी माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी ने स्पष्ट रूप से किया है। इसलिए पूरी तरह से कुछ दलों को जो शंका थी, वह निर्मूल हुई है।

भारत-अमरीकी-परमाणु-करार में एक चीज शुरू से कही जा रही है कि इससे भारत को एनर्जी के मामले में सिक्योरिटी मिलेगी, लेकिन इस पर एक तरह की बात आई, क्योंकि इस पर हमारे वैज्ञानिकों का मत भी आने लगा था। इससे देश में एक कंप्युजन का वातावरण बना। लेकिन माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी ने पूरी मजबूती के साथ जो वक्तव्य दिया, उससे मेरा स्पष्ट मत है कि वैज्ञानिकों ने हाल में जो चिंता व्यक्त की थी, यूपीए सरकार ने और माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी ने उन बातों का संज्ञान लिया है और अमरीकी राष्ट्रपति जॉर्ज बुश को व्यक्तिगत तौर पर, भारत की जनता की भावनाओं से अवगत करा दिया है। माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी ने, भारत के हितों को, जिस मजबूती के साथ रखने का काम किया है, वह इतिहास में दर्ज होगा। वैसे भी भारत के पास यह अधिकार था कि अगर 18 जुलाई के संयुक्त वक्तव्य में, उसके मानकों के साथ किसी प्रकार की छेड़छाड़ होती है तो भारत उस संधि से अपने हाथ खींच सकता है। कुछ लोगों को पता नहीं क्यों शंका हुई और तरह-तरह की बातें क्यों आने लगीं? कुछ लोगों को रात में भी शंका होने लगती है लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जहां हमारे देश के सम्मान और शान की बात हो, स्वतंत्र विदेश नीति की बात हो, गुट-निरपेक्षता का सवाल हो, वहां दलगत भावना से सोचकर शंका करना, देश के साथ न्याय नहीं है।

परमाणु एनर्जी से हम ऊर्जा प्राप्त करना चाहते हैं, चाहे पानी से ऊर्जा लाने की बात हो, तो ऐसे मामलों में भी संदेह करना इंसाफ नहीं है। भारत ने, 18 जुलाई के बाद, इस मामले में नाभकीय संयंत्रों से सैनिक और असैनिक क्षेत्रों में वर्गीकरण की अपनी योजना को कागजों पर मूर्त रूप देने और अमरीकी प्रशासन को अवगत कराने के अलावा कोई ज्यादा बड़ा कदम नहीं उठाया है लेकिन अमरीका ने कानून बनाने के साथ-साथ, नाभकीय आपूर्तिकर्ता से भी संपर्क साधा है, जिसके फलस्वरूप ही रूस ने तारापुर रिएक्टर के लिए ईंधन जारी किया। भारत की तुलना में, अमरीका इस संधि में आगे बढ़ा है। किसी कारण संधि में कोई व्यवधान आ जाता है तो भारत की अपेक्षा अमरीका को ज्यादा नुकसान होगा। मैं इस बात को यहां दर्ज कराना चाहता हूँ। इसलिए माननीय मित्रों को इस बारे में संदेह नहीं होना चाहिए।

मेजर जनरल (सेवानिवृत्त) भुवन चन्द्र खंडूड़ी : हमें संदेह नहीं है, आपके दिमाग में फितूर हो रहा है।

श्री देवेन्द्र प्रसाद यादव : आपकी बात ठीक है।... (व्यवधान) मैंने आपका भाषण सुना था। मुझे कोई कन्फ्यूजन नहीं है। आपका भाषण रचनात्मक था।

17.50

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

मैं कुछ टिप्पणी नहीं करना चाहता हूँ। हरिन पाठक जी आपको बोलने के लिए उकसा रहे हैं।

MR. SPEAKER : It should not provoke any nuclear matter!

श्री देवेन्द्र प्रसाद यादव : अध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारा पूरा विश्वास है कि भारत के स्वतंत्र परमाणु कार्यक्रम में तथा स्वतंत्र विदेश नीति में कोई हस्तक्षेप नहीं हो पाएगा। किसी भी तरह के हस्तक्षेप की कोई गुंजाइश नहीं है। जिस तरह की दृढ़ता सरकार ने दिखाई है, जिस प्रकार से प्रधानमंत्री जी का वक्तव्य देश के सामने आया है, हमारे देश की सम्प्रभुता और देश हित पर कोई आंच आने वाली नहीं है। देश के प्रमुख वैज्ञानिकों की जो चिंता है, उसे भी ध्यान में रखते हुए प्राथमिकता दी गई है और उनसे भी विचार-विमर्श हुआ है तथा आगे भी होगा। देश के व्यापक हितों के साथ किसी भी प्रकार का समझौता नहीं हो सकता है। हम लोग तथा सम्पूर्ण देश प्रधानमंत्री जी के इस दृढ़ विचार के साथ खड़े हैं और इस देश में वैदेशिक नीति के मामले में, परमाणु निशस्त्रीकरण के मामले में, भविष्य में भी परमाणु विस्फोट के बारे में अपने देश के अधिकारों पर कोई एक तरफा रोक स्वीकार नहीं करने के संबंध में, जो पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू जी का संकेत था, 1962 में जो उन्होंने स्पीच दी थी, जो रास्ता उन्होंने तैयार किया था कि परमाणु ऊर्जा से ही देश की मजबूत नींव रखी जा सकती है, इस बारे में देश को तैयार होना चाहिए। मैं समझता हूँ कि वह जो रास्ता अपनाया गया, वह रास्ता हम लोगों के लिए आज भी प्रेरणा स्रोत है और हमें उस रास्ते से भटकना नहीं चाहिए। भारत ने 1974 के परमाणु विस्फोट के बाद लगाए गए तकनीकी प्रतिबंधों के बावजूद जो उपलब्धियाँ हासिल की हैं, वे बेशक प्रशंसा के काबिल हैं। लेकिन इस बात को नहीं भूलाया जा सकता कि उनकी बुनियाद उस प्राविधिक अंतर्राष्ट्रीय सहयोग पर टिकी थी, जो होमी भाभा के प्रयासों की देन थी। तकनीकी प्रतिबंधों के 32 वर्षों के बाद आज अमरीका के नेतृत्व से भारत को मुक्ति मिलने की सौगात है क्योंकि यदि किसी पूर्वाग्रह के आधार पर इस भारत-अमरीका परमाणु करार को खारिज कर देंगे तो विज्ञान और तकनीकी के क्षेत्र में दूसरी महाशक्तियों से सम्पर्क का मौका खो देंगे, यह मेरा मानना है। हमारे देश का आर्थिक विकास, विदेशी निवेश, व्यापार, परमाणु ऊर्जा, पनबिजली के मामले हैं, इनके लिए निश्चित रूप से संधि में संयुक्त वक्तव्य दिया गया है। अपने आप में उसकी परिधि में रहकर और जिस मजबूती से प्रधानमंत्री जी ने अपने विचार व्यक्त किए हैं और साफ-साफ कहा है कि हम देश के व्यापक हितों से कभी भी कोई समझौता नहीं कर सकते हैं। यहां तक कि परमाणु हथियार कार्यक्रम के बारे में खुद भारत ही आकलन करेगा और हमारी सम्प्रभुता अक्षुण्ण रहेगी। इसमें कोई समझौता नहीं हो सकता है। इतना ही नहीं यदि अमरीका ने कोई चाल चली तो भारत अपना राह चुन लेगा। इससे ज्यादा देश की मजबूती, देश का स्वाभिमान और शक्तिशाली देश का प्रमाण और क्या हो सकता है। इसलिए सदन में दिया गया जो वक्तव्य है, मैं समझता हूँ कि उस पर प्रधानमंत्री जी अटल हैं और पूरा देश उनके समर्थन में खड़ा है। पूरा देश इस सवाल पर प्रधानमंत्री जी के साथ है और हम सभी संकल्पित हैं कि इस राह पर उनके साथ रहें।

इस करार में मजबूती से जो देश के व्यापक हित हैं, उनका संरक्षण करें, इसी तरह देश के स्वाभिमान को बनाए रखें और दुनिया में अपनी पहचान को बनाए रखने का काम करें। इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ।

SHRI SURESH PRABHAKAR PRABHU (RAJAPUR): Sir, this agreement that has been signed between India and the United States, which the Prime Minister presented before the Parliament on the 18th of July, has three components. There is a relationship on economic issues; there is a relationship related to the nuclear and civilian energy and, as a result of this, there is a relationship which emanates into strategic relationship. So far, we have been discussing largely the nuclear and civilian issue because it has become a symbol of the relationship. One of the clauses of the agreement stipulates that we must separate the civilian nuclear capability and the military capability. It assumes a more serious implication, as far as the strategic relationship goes.

While we need to move forward with the United States, which is the largest economy of the world and being the largest science and technology hub of the world, it lies in India's interest that we

must collaborate with them in India's interest, on India's terms, on such issues that concern India, and we should try to take the relationship forward in such a way that it will benefit India.

I would like to remind you that the First Green Revolution that took place in India also happened essentially because of cooperation that was offered by the US at that time. M.S. Swaminathan and C. Subramaniam played a key role in that; and technology and transfer of technology, in a great deal, also happened from there. Therefore, it is really important that we must strengthen the relationship in such terms that will benefit India.

In foreign policy, it is important that we must look at rest of the world from India's eyes and wherever it converges in India's interest, we should try to collaborate and cooperate.

Here, on the energy front, which is essentially the heart of this Agreement, India has, unfortunately, been secluded from accessing fuel for firing its rockets for a long period of time. In fact, India needs huge levels of energy -- more than 10,000 MW to 15,000 MW every year. We have been planning to add 10,000 MW, and we are not even going up to 40 per cent of that for a variety of reasons. We clearly need to look into that because power is one of the key concerns of India. While doing that, it is important that we must develop an energy mix. How do we go about with an energy mix? Do we need one energy against another? We need all forms of energy that are available within the country. We need hydro, thermal, renewable and we also need nuclear. Why do we need nuclear energy? It is essentially because the world is facing a serious challenge of climate change. The green-house emission has created a huge crisis in the world, which humanity has to now face. Probably, the whole humanity will not be there on this Planet in the next few years' time. We, in India, are facing this problem because of floods and the syndrome of drought which recurs time and again, which is also because of the effect of climate change. Nuclear energy is one of the cleanest forms of energy. It does not emit green-house gases. Therefore, we need that energy as well as we need, as my colleague General Khanduri was saying, hydro energy. We also need thermal energy because coal is going to be the mainstay of India in the energy sector contributing to more than 50 per cent of it until 2050 when we may have a significant contribution coming from other sectors. Therefore, we need this energy. Therefore, this energy cooperation with the US is welcome.

What is really concerning is the implication of this Agreement, snowballing of this implication on the strategic sector. To make sure that we are not solely guided only by looking at energy issues, we must converge with them while making sure that our own long-term strategic interests are in no way compromised.

18.00 hrs.

Therefore, I look forward. The Prime Minister has already made a very categorical statement, which, I again welcome it. But I am sure, this new process in the next few weeks are very crucial when the US Congress would legislate on this issue. It is now Senate and also the Congress, House of Representatives which are deliberating over it. I am sure, there is going to be a compromise between the Houses to decide conflicting issues that would emerge. But I hope that the Prime Minister would be able to make sure on behalf of India that India's interest is not compromised. I am sure that the Prime Minister made a very clear statement. From our side, within these four walls and nothing more, I would like to know, suppose, for some reason, the legislation does not conform to our concerns and within the parameters that we already stipulated, whether we will be walking out of this agreement? There are so many other implications of this agreement. As I said, it is just the nuclear-civilian agreement. We have another agenda with the United States which goes beyond this agreement. Whether we would be compromising on that or whether we shall try to

emerge in a way that would make sure that all our concerns are properly addressed, all the interests of India are properly protected and would be able to move forward?

SHRI VIJAYENDRA PAL SINGH (BHILWARA) This subject was discussed in Rajya Sabha for eight hours. You want to really curb it. This is a very important subject. We would like to speak on it.

MR. SPEAKER: Do not use such things which are not relevant.

... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VIJAYENDRA PAL SINGH : You must give us time.

MR. SPEAKER: We know that. Now, let him speak.

SHRI B. MAHTAB (CUTTACK): I stand here to deliberate on the Indo-US Nuclear Agreement. After a marathon discussion on the Indo-US Nuclear Agreement in the other House, Prime Minister's reply should have allayed all doubts. But the situation is not so. What I understand from the hon. Prime Minister is that, whatever the US Congress may legislate on the issue, India is bound only by the July 18 Agreement, the Prime Minister signed with the US President. In other words, New Delhi will not accept any changes that the US Congress might make in the Agreement compromising India's national interest. If this is so, say this in clear terms.

I would say that India's nuclear programme is acted solely by its own legitimate concerns. We cannot allow a situation whereby foreign officials enjoy free access to Indian nuclear facilities. The proceedings in the US House of Representatives on the trajectory nuclear deal thus raise suspicions that the US may have a larger role in the implementation of the deal than has been presumed going purely by the text of July 18 deal. It is also a worry that development of Indian nuclear deterrent would suffer a set back with the US indirectly seeking a cap on India's nuclear weapon programme. But we should make it amply clear that we cannot accept any constraint on this issue.

My humble opinion is that, July 18 deal would benefit both India and the United States. We are emerging as strategic partners. It is the result of an 'out of the box' approach to nuclear and technological challenges we face in our bid to emerge as an economic giant by the end of the first quarter of the 21st century. We were informed that the Left was happy with PM now, after, at last, his reply in the other House. Yet, this discussion has been initiated by the Left.

I have three points to make. Among our nuclear scientific establishment, sections of the academia and some of our political parties, both on the Left and on the Right, there is an understandable fear of the Indo-US nuclear deal getting India entrapped. The fear is understandable because of the

history of past 60 years. Even after nuclear tests in 1998, during the Jaswant-Talbott talk, the US always attempted to get India into the CTBT and to cap, reduce and roll back Indian nuclear arsenal. Successful US administrations have consistently aimed at curbing Indian nuclear arsenal. US will always try to advance United States interest. They are still out to sustain their pre-eminence in the international system but let us not be blind towards the US strategy towards India that has changed because of the change in times and circumstances. Those, who have reservations on the Indo-US Nuclear Deal, also should become aware to the fact that Russia, which is now emerging as the leading energy power, fully backs this Indo-US Nuclear Deal and so do the European Union and Japan.

In our country, we should give some thought to the changes in time and circumstances which have brought about this attitudinal change all over the world. There is no bipolar world with two adversarial blocs, but a balance of power system exists today in which no major power considers any other as an adversary. It is a globalised world in which there is a great deal of inter-dependence among the major nations of the world. Trade between United States and China is growing year after year. The US and Russia manage together a space station. There is a common research project on the thermonuclear energy with participation of all other powers and now of India as well.

The equation of today's India with other major powers of the world, including the United States, is different from what it used to be before economic liberalisation. Today, our country has more Foreign Policy options, in a world of balance of power, than it had in a bipolar world. The United States, Russia and the European Union treat our country as a strategic partner. Even China is engaged today in a strategic dialogue with us. The Indo-US Nuclear deal recognises the existence of the Indian nuclear arsenal. India could serve to promote a better balance in Asia and the world.

Sir, I have two questions. It is learnt that Saudi Arabia's oil production has peaked and will soon be on a downward trend. The same is true of other oil producers of that region. This does not mean that oil wells are about to run dry. But that, more oil is being pumped out than new sources discovered. It is important to recognise that it is not a political problem but a resource problem brought on by the supply-demand equation.

Over the coming decades, the world will increasingly have to shift from fossil energy to non-fossil energy. Despite fond hopes about windmills and solar energy, the only viable and proven source of non-fossil energy is nuclear power. One day the transition will take place. Should we evaluate the proposed Indo-US Nuclear Deal against this background? What will be the cost? The economic implications of this transaction are incalculable. Demand for energy is growing in India. Should we treat it as an opportunity? If so, for whom? Is it for the industrialists of the United States who are engaged in energy industry, particularly the nuclear industry?

I am aware that this agreement is complex but one thing stands out that it calls on India to stop its Thorium based research and development in exchange for Uranium based technology and fuel, which is to be supplied by the United States. The central theme is, 'yes' to Uranium and 'no' to Thorium. Let the Government say in clear terms what we will be sacrificing while relying on American business to supply its future non-fossil energy needs?

India has substantial thorium reserves but little uranium. India has technical capability in building reactors based on the thorium cycle. But are we being swayed by Western lobbyists?

MR. SPEAKER: Please conclude.

SHRI B. MAHTAB : Sir, I have a last point to make.

MR. SPEAKER: Your last point was very long.

SHRI B. MAHTAB : Therefore, the basic question regarding the Indo-US nuclear deal is whether we really need it. Some say that the deal will give boost to our power sector, but the question is whether nuclear power is an economically viable proposition; whether any risks are involved to the human population in the process of producing energy through nuclear power; whether political and strategic issues favour our country; and whether this is the only alternative available. I need not go into all these questions. These are the questions which are before this country and this House today. I come to my last query.

MR. SPEAKER: The word 'last' has a meaning.

SHRI B. MAHTAB : Sir, this is the 'last'. I would like to know whether the countries which have installed nuclear power reactors are phasing them out. Has not a single plant been built or planned in the US for the last 25 years? Is this the same in United Kingdom? *The Financial Times* has reported that no nuclear power stations are likely to be built in the United Kingdom for at least a couple of decades to come. In the United Kingdom, the last reactor built was in 1995. In France and Germany no new nuclear power stations are being built for more than a decade. Then why are we rushing in? I conclude by saying a quotation which the Prime Minister may ponder over:

“Stay committed to your decisions but stay flexible in your approach.”

This should be our path in today's international relations.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Chandrappan, you have four minutes but I will give you five minutes. Please conclude within that time.

SHRI C.K. CHANDRAPPAN (TRICHUR): Sir, I have not yet started.

MR. SPEAKER: Therefore, I am telling you before you start.

SHRI C.K. CHANDRAPPAN : Sir, actually while raising this discussion if we express our apprehension, it should not be taken as a reflection of our lack of confidence in the Prime Minister. We have great confidence in the Prime Minister. I remember in the other House while the debate was going on, he said that let the legislative process be completed. He was referring to the legislative process that is taking place in the United States. He said that once it is completed, we will then determine whether there are elements which go

beyond what we have committed on July 18 last year. That was a very re-assuring statement that he has made. Actually we congratulate him for making that very bold statement about the Indo-US Agreement but then the apprehensions are coming because we are dealing with another partner and not our Prime Minister alone or India alone. We are dealing with a country, namely, the United States that has a track record which is not in any way very enviable. That is why, we are raising this apprehension.

Now one of the questions that the scientists raised when they issued their statement was that we cannot accede to any restraint in perpetuity on our freedom of action.

This is about our strategic requirement of nuclear energy. I would like to know whether the new legislation that the United States is on the way of enacting would give us the freedom to go ahead with our strategic requirements. The other point is that there need not and should not be any subject of external control.

Sir, in regard to supply of nuclear fuel I understand that once we have entered into this agreement the other countries would be free to sell to us nuclear fuels like Uranium. But there have been statements made in the Congress in the course of the debate that there would be restrictions on other countries in selling nuclear fuel. I would like to know if this apprehension of ours is real or not. Probably, the hon. Prime Minister will be able to enlighten us on this point.

Sir, just now my friend was mentioning about very advanced research that we have been conducting in the field of nuclear energy development out of Thorium. There is an apprehension that we may lose out on the advantage of achievement of such nuclear energy development out of Thorium. I hope, the hon. Prime Minister would like to clear this point to us.

MR. SPEAKER: Please conclude now. This is just the warning bell.

SHRI C.K. CHANDRAPPAN : Sir, this is my last point.

MR. SPEAKER: In the nuclear age we should be very time bound.

SHRI C.K. CHANDRAPPAN : Sir, I am trying to co-operate with the Chair.

Sir, we are dealing with a country like the United States, a country which has a very tricky approach to other nations. It has not only an unreliable past, but also an unreliable present. They try to twist arms of her friends. We expressed our doubts last year also when we had a discussion on the subject of voting on Iran. We were forced to vote on the question of Iran in the IAEA. I would like to know if we would tolerate such kind of arms twisting, or we would take a more independent policy in this so called uni-polar world about which there have been so much of a talk all around.

Sir, the hon. Prime Minister is visiting Havana to attend the Non-aligned Summit. Now, if the Non-aligned countries could be persuaded to rally behind India and they could all take a firm stand on following an independent foreign policy, a policy free of imperialist machinations, then that would serve as one of the guarantees and India, in turn, would also find many friends who would support the cause of India in the world. I hope, the hon. Prime Minister will take a firm stand and take this country forward in the path of Non-alignment.

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Vijayendra Pal Singh.

SHRI VIJAYENDRA PAL SINGH : Sir, before I start, I would like to know the time allotted for me so that I can frame my points accordingly.

MR. SPEAKER: It is eleven minutes.

... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VIJAYENDRA PAL SINGH : Sir, I stand to speak on a very important issue in the Indo-US nuclear deal of 18th July which is going to be having a very long ranging effect in India not only on the energy sector but also in various other aspects, most importantly on India's vital national security interest which is of immense importance and prime concern to us.

Sir, let me very categorically say that we do have a grave situation of power in this country. People have been talking about the mix. I agree to the way it has been done in the sense that we are depending more on the thermal. We have very little hydel although there is a potential of 80,000 megawatts. But it is an area where the gestation for hydel power plant has been very long. We agree to that. We have lignite in a very limited area and we have not been able to really exploit it. It should be exploited but nuclear is very important. I have been the Convenor of the Standing Committee on Power on nuclear and we have been working on this. We have also thought as to why is that the gestation in the nuclear power projects have been so long? They take 10 to 12 years. We also said that, leaving aside the critical, why do not we privatise it and bring down the gestation period? We have been doing well. It is nothing new that nuclear is a new idea but we have not gone a long way in it.

Let me also put it on record that during the Vajpayee Government, it was Shri Vajpayee who went to Russia and it was he who finalised the Koodangulam Project and so far, the nuclear power plants used to be of only 220 megawatts. For the first time, it was negotiated to 1000 megawatts energy and you are all aware of it.

Let me also put it on record that we are not against nuclear in any way. What we are worried is what the deal is all about. We all have a lot of respect for you, hon. Prime Minister. You are an eminent economist. But I do not know if you are going to fail us in the deal because you are not a diplomat. You have quoted Machiavellian. (*Interruptions*)*

*Not Recorded.

MR. SPEAKER: These are irrelevant.

... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: By these interruptions, you are giving importance to it. I have already deleted it.

... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Please sit down. Personal reference should not be there. You can say that she is an hon. Member of Parliament. That is enough for us. Please sit down. She does not need your help.

... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VIJAYENDRA PAL SINGH : We have Chanakya. You might have quoted Chanakya. We have Bismarck. Chanakya has been the greatest diplomat and Bismarck has been the greatest diplomat. I do not know why you have to really get down to Machiavellian. Everybody knows what Machiavellian was all about, an unscrupulous guy. And that is what you are trying to quote. That is why, we have a lot of concern on this issue. As I have already said, our Party is not against the nuclear deal as such. But our concerns are primarily about the national security interest.

Let me put it on record that I want to salute all our scientists, Dr. Homi Baba, Dr. Vikram Sarabhai, Dr. Sethna, Dr. Raja Ramanna, etc., who have taken our three-stage nuclear programme ahead. What worries us today? This three-stage nuclear programme that we have developed is a unique programme in the sense that no other country has, in the third stage, thorium. Large quantity of thorium is available in India. It is to the extent that world's forty per cent of thorium sources is in India. If you can inject thorium in the third stage we will have an indigenous nuclear fuel.

If that programme is aborted by this deal, then we are going to be in real trouble because America wants to sell their own products and their reactors which have been spelt out earlier. They are hard bargainers. We just want to say: "Please be cautious." It has been happening all over, for very many years. They have done wrongs to a lot of countries. A lot of countries have complained about the way they have their deals. Even in the WTO, as you are well aware, they wanted to arm twist their way in the markets. Why is it that America signed this?

If you go into the details of it, one reason is economics, like selling reactors, and the other reason is to put us in the inspections of IAEA so that they can do their hound nosing on all our nuclear plants. Is that the reason that they have done it? They are not concerned about India having a nuclear power of 30,000 megawatts, etc. They are not interested in that. If you go into the details of it, you will find that this whole deal is one-sided. That is what we are wanting to caution you about. Any deal should always be a two-way street. We feel that this has a tilt towards Americans. That is what our worry is.

Let me also talk about separation that the hon. Minister was talking about. Why is it that the CIRUS Reactor has been kept under the inspections? That is a question that you must answer. Is there any moratorium on the production of fissile material? Have any negotiations been done on the FMCT? What is our present status on the FMCT? What is our status going to be compared to the nations which are signatories of the NPT? Will there be a discrimination of any kind from them? Or will we be at par with them? Subsequently, will the IAEA have a protocol of inspections different from the NPT? Or will it be the same? Will the American inspectors, along with the IAEA, go sniping around, as I had said earlier, all our nuclear facilities?

Fourthly, if there is a shifting of goals which has been much talked about after the reconciliation, what the hon. Minister was talking about in both the Houses – in the Senate and the

Congress – what is the stand the hon. Prime Minister is going to take?

Sir, let me remind you here that the League of Nations which was promoted by one of their Presidents was thrown out by the reconciliation of both Houses. If a situation of that kind happens where are we going to land up?

Lastly, if we go down the memory lane, do you recall Tarapur and our other plants? The fuel was stopped because of some reason or the other. They are going to find some reason or the other to really stop the fuel after we having paid for all the reactors and millions and millions of dollars. If that is the situation and we do not get the uranium and we do not get on to the thorium which is locally available to us, what are we going to land up with?

Sir, these are my queries.

MR. SPEAKER: I am extremely thankful to you for your cooperation.

THE PRIME MINISTER (DR. MANMOHAN SINGH): Mr. Speaker, Sir, as I listened to the debate, I felt being proud to be an Indian. This debate has clearly shown that when it comes to safeguarding India's supreme national interests, there are no party differences. There are concerns, there can be worries, but the nation will speak with one voice in defence of its interests and that is the message that comes out loud and clear. Let me say that I take pride in that. But I also recognise that it casts on me a great responsibility that I should be worthy of this trust that the House has displayed in the motivation behind this deal.

Sir, I will take some time to spell out the big picture as I see it where India is in the world and where we ought to be moving and how we are going to move in that direction. I do recognise that we live in a world of unequal powers and those who are strong have always a tendency to twist the arms of others.

Sir, I recall that as a young boy, I once heard Man Singh who along with Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose was the founder of the INA. In a speech he said in Punjabi: *Duniya Mardi Zoran Noon~Lakh Laanat Kamzoran Noon~*. The world worships the mighty and the powerful; the weak and feeble are always at the receiving end.

I do recognise that we can realise our destiny only by working hard, to become a major pole of the evolving global economy. It is only then that India will acquire that respect, that credibility and that power which is our legitimate goal. After all, we are a country with great civilisational heritage, a country of one billion people with a freedom struggle which should be the envy of every country in the world. But all these wishes can be realised only if India emerges economically as a strong nation.

Today, there is a change in the mood of the world towards India. After the experiences of the last 50 to 60 years, the world today marvels that there is a country like India, a country of one billion people, a country in which you can find all great religions represented in its population mix, a country committed to the rule of law, a country committed to respect for all fundamental human freedoms. The world recognises today that there is no country in the world of India's size, of India's diversity, of India's complexity seeking to social and economic salvation in the framework of an open society and an open economy. That is why there is such great interest.

Whenever a country emerges, those who are in power get worried. But whether you like it or not, I sense today a willingness in the rest of the world to help India to realise its inherent potential

because in India's civilisational heritages, our people have never gone to other countries as conquerors. They have gone as traders, they have gone as preachers, they have gone as men and women of goodwill and the world respects us for that. That is what India is about. That is what Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru said on the eve of Independence when he said: "Our dreams are for India but they are not for India alone. They are dreams for the oppressed world as a whole." So, Sir, I would respectfully urge this august House to recognise the changed mood of the world towards India. This is not to say that power politics is a thing of the past; that there will never be any attempt to twist our arms. We will protect ourselves to ensure against the risks that are there. But it would be wrong for us not to take advantage of the opportunities that are now on the horizon. I sincerely believe that it is in the interest of our country to have good relations with all the major powers. I make no apology that we seek good relations with the United States. The United States is a pre-eminent power. But, for that matter, in the last two years that I have been the Prime Minister, we have made big efforts to come closer to Russia, to come closer to the European Union, to come closer to China, to come closer to the Arab world.

We had the privilege of welcoming His Majesty the King of Saudi Arabia as our honoured guest on Republic Day. When he went back, what did he say to me? He said: "Mr. Prime Minister, the world talks about energy shortage. As long as Saudi Arabia is there, you can take it that we will take care of your energy requirements." So, this may be a unipolar world. But we have operated in a manner which strengthens our linkages with all the big powers, with all our neighbours. We are seeking a new set of relationship with the Asian countries. Let me say that I also consider it our obligation to work hard to normalise, to expand and develop our relations with our neighbours including Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Nepal and Bangladesh. We will remain committed to that. That is our civilisational heritage. That is the meaning of our freedom struggle as I understand.

The second thing that I do wish to say is this. I was born in a village where there was no electricity. I never saw any electricity until I went to study in the neighbouring tehsil headquarters. Our women in rural homes use wood. They spoil their eye-sight in the process. Development will remain a mirage for millions and millions of our people unless we change that picture.

In the old days, whenever one went to the old Soviet Union, it used to be written boldly everywhere that socialism is Soviets plus electricity. The Soviets may have disappeared, but the role of electricity in modernisation and in expansion of economic and social opportunities for the people is a reality and, therefore, if India's struggle for its economic and social development is to succeed, we need ever-increasing amounts of energy.

There are two types of things which are at work today which determine the demand for energy in our country. First is the normal growth process. As growth takes place, commercial energy demand increases roughly at the same rate, if not more than the rate of growth of national income. But in our country, there is the other revolution and that is the modernisation of our rural economy and the replacement of non-commercial energy, like firewood and other non-commercial sources of energy, by commercial energy. So, history tells us that in the process of development, if our economy is to grow at the rate of 8 to 10 per cent, our demand for commercial energy will probably increase at the minimum at the same rate or probably even more.

Sir, questions have been raised whether we need nuclear power. I think Shri Suresh Prabhu knows this area as nobody else does. There have been important studies. I am not claiming that nuclear energy is the only way out for meeting the demand for energy in our country. We have important reserves of coal, we must exploit them. But as I look at the demand for energy, our coal reserves would be exhausted in about 45 years. We have sizeable amount of hydel resources, but they are in distant areas and we all know the type of problems that arise when you make use of hydro potential like resettlement cost, relief operation and also, I think, the costs associated with the risks arising out of being in unsafe seismic zones.

We, now, know, at least, that there is an uncertain future for hydrocarbons. There is uncertainty about supplies, there is uncertainty about prices. The price of oil has increased from less than \$ 30 per barrel two years ago to \$ 75 per barrel and there are very many people who tell me that, probably in a very short period of time, it will increase to \$ 100 per barrel. We are short of hydrocarbons. We consume about 110 million tonnes of oil. We produce only 30 million tonnes. We have not increased our oil production in the last 10-15 years. In this environment, if India's development is not to be frustrated by the shortage of energy, I think, it is incumbent on any Government to think of widening its options with regard to the supply of energy. All that I am saying as to why we need a nuclear deal is that we must ensure that the development of our economy will not be hampered by lack of adequate commercial energy. I am, therefore, seeking to enlarge the energy options that are available to our country. We must utilise those options even if what I am saying about the future of hydrocarbons does not materialise. But it would be imprudent on the part of the Government not to make use of opportunities to widen development options, to widen the energy options. This is the reason why we thought it is necessary to look around if this ambition of ours can be satisfied.

We are short of uranium. Our uranium is also relatively high cost compared to the cost of production in the rest of the world. The available estimates as of now are that we have uranium only for the production of nuclear energy equal to 10,000 MW and that too for a period of only 30 years. I believe, we must take a long-term view of our future possibilities.

If that is the picture, if there are international trading opportunities to increase the availability of uranium for us, if there are opportunities through international trade to promote a mutually beneficial exchange of technologies, that will help India's ambitions to emerge as a major pole of the evolving global economy, we should exploit these opportunities. That is the vision which inspires us to look for opportunities, to remove this nuclear apartheid regime which has stifled the growth of India's nuclear power for the last three decades or more.

Mr. Speaker Sir, hon. Gen. Khanduri quoted to me what I had said in the other House that India's nuclear programme began with emphasis on nuclear energy and that Defence came later. That, I believe, is a correct statement. If you read Panditji's statements, if you read Dr. Bhaba's statement, I think, our emphasis, by and large, has always been on peaceful uses of atomic energy. That is the reason why as early as 1960, India championed the cause of a comprehensive test ban in United Nations Fora. We remain committed to the vision of Rajiv Gandhi for a nuclear free world.

It must be said of the vision of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, of Indira Gandhi, of Rajiv Gandhi that they were idealists, but they also recognised that we live in a very uncertain world. We do not control our environment and who can today say that they were not wise men and women. In the uncertain world that we live in, in a world of unequal power, nuclear weapons are a reality. This country must keep its strategic option and that is why India's programme for strategic assets, nuclear assets was a precious heritage which came to this country, thanks to the efforts of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Indira Gandhi and Rajiv Gandhi.

You have my assurance, Sir, that we will do nothing to hurt this national heritage as long we will work steadfastly for universal, nuclear disarmament. But until, I know that the day is not going to come tomorrow, day after but hopefully some day it will materialise. But until then we cannot give up this strategic option. I assure you and through you, Sir, the House and the country that there is nothing in this nuclear deal which will hurt the strategic autonomy that this country must have with regard to the management of its nuclear weapons programme.

Sir, a number of issues have been raised and I do not think, it would be proper for me to go one by one, the ground which I covered in the other House, but some broad concerns, which have figured in the debate here, I will take them on board^[Rs1]. The first one is the autonomy of our foreign policy. I wish to assure you, Sir – as I said a few moments ago – that this nuclear deal is not a device to be a subservient to any country whether it is United States or any other country. We have a proud heritage, a heritage from our freedom struggle. Mahatma Gandhi said once: “I want to build in this country a house open on all four sides so that winds of change may blow in from each and every direction. But, I refuse to be blown off my feet by any one influence. I must have the courage and the ability to stand on my own feet.” That is the motivation, that is the inspiration for our foreign policy.

Reference has been made to a particular vote on Iran. We have civilizational ties and links with Iran as we have with the Arab world. We will work hard to strengthen those civilizational and cultural links, give them a new orientation, strengthen our economic links. And the gas pipeline project is a part of that process. We will work to make it a reality. But, that particular vote was in the context of one particular thing that we had to determine, and that is – the international community asked this question – Iran is a signatory to the NPT. Therefore, our view is that it must enjoy all the rights it has as a member of the NPT; it must also honour all the obligations that go with the members of NPT, nothing more and nothing less. Fortunately, things have moved in that direction. Right from the beginning, whether it is in the International Atomic Energy Agency or in the United Nations, we have consistently taken a view that this is not a matter to be resolved by coercive methods; debate, dialogue and discussion is the answer. I am glad, for example that things are moving in that direction. The Iranian Government, for example, have responded constructively to various proposals made by the P-5. And I sincerely hope that this will promote a constructive dialogue among all the interested parties. The problems relating to Iran's nuclear programme can be resolved without exercise of coercive elements which we do not approve of.

Further, Sir, our record in the last two years is an open record. We have made efforts to promote good relations with China. I am very happy that last year Premier Wen came here; this

year we are hoping to welcome the President of China, President Hu Jintao. The Prime Minister of Japan, Mr. Koizumi came here last year. Russian President Putin came here. Our relations with Russia, our relations with China, our relations with Japan, our relations with the European Union, and with ASEAN countries have taken a turn for the better. So, the House has my assurance that independence of our foreign policy and making it subservient only to our national interest will be ensured by us.

A number of questions have been raised with regard to our fast breeder programme. The House has my assurance that the proto type fast breeder programme, that is under way now, will be totally kept out of the purview of any surveillance by any agency.[\[r2\]](#)

If, in future, our programme develops and if we produce civilian fast breeders, we will then decide whether to designate them as civilian or military. So long as they are military, there is no question of putting them under any safeguard. So, I give my assurance that nothing will be done to impinge on the autonomy of the fast breeder programme.

A reference has been made about the three-stage nuclear fuel cycle, whether we have given any commitment or is there anything in this deal which will hurt the growth of thorium as a fuel of the future. There is nothing of that sort contemplated. I do not know where this idea came from. I saw this in *The Hindu* yesterday but as far as I know, there is nothing in this deal which says that we will give up the three-tier fuel cycle. The programme to pursue research in thorium-related technology will not be compromised.

Sir, Gen. Khanduri has asked me about the veracity of certain statements made by one particular American diplomat. I am sorry, I am not able to comment on what he said or what he did not say. He did not confide in me before he went on the television channel. Therefore, I am not able to enlighten as to what did this particular gentleman mean. But I can assure you, I believe if we stick by the July 18th Statement, we have got a very good deal, a deal which I have been told was the ambition of the previous Government to negotiate but which they were not able to negotiate.

The question is, what is our status? Are we going to be regarded as a nuclear weapons State? Let me be very clear. A nuclear weapons State has a particular connotation. Since NPT cannot be negotiated until the whole Treaty can be re-negotiated, I think, it will be wrong on my part to say that we have been given the status of nuclear weapons State, and that fact was reflected in the July 18th Statement. It does not talk of India as a nuclear weapons State. It talks of India as a country with advanced nuclear technology, which should enjoy all the rights and obligations which countries similarly placed enjoy. It will be so because the safeguards agreement that we will sign with the International Atomic Energy Agency will not be the safeguards agreement signed by all other non nuclear weapons States. It will be a safeguards agreement unique to India because India's position is unique. We do not fall into the category of non-nuclear weapons State. The July 18th Statement recognizes clearly and unambiguously that India has a strategic programme, India has a military programme, and that programme is totally out of the purview of any international inspections of any kind.

Sir, questions have been raised[[lh3](#)]. Please forgive me, Sir. I am just searching the relevant papers.

19.00 hrs.

SHRI VIJAYENDRA PAL SINGH : Are you justifying the reconciliation?... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: It does not matter.

... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: He can do that. But he is trying to find out a paper; and he can do. Kindly show this much of courtesy.

... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VIJAYENDRA PAL SINGH : Can you explain about the July 18 Accord as to what is going to happen?... (*Interruptions*)

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH: Sir, a question was asked about the position on moratorium on production of fissile material and what we have agreed to. We have not agreed to any moratorium on the production of fissile material. All that

we have agreed to is the same thing, which the previous Government had agreed to, that we will work towards a multilaterally negotiated and internationally verifiable treaty in this regard. Until that, there is no question of accepting any limit on the production of fissile material.

Sir, a question had been raised about the separation and how costly it will be. Some figures had been mentioned by some hon. Members stating 40 billion dollars as the cost of separation. I do not know where this cost estimate originates. Doubts had also been raised about our accepting the separation of civil and military and nuclear facilities since Nuclear Weapon States do not accept such separation and retain the right to withdraw safeguards from their nuclear facilities. In our case, the July 2005 Statement acknowledges that India should be regarded as a State with advanced nuclear technology enjoying the same benefits and advantages as other States with nuclear technology, such as the United States. The July Statement did not refer to India as a Nuclear Weapon State as this has a particular connotation in the NPT. The July Statement, however, explicitly acknowledges the existence of India's military nuclear facility. This meant that India would not attract full scope safeguard such as those that apply to the Non-Nuclear Weapon States that are signatories to the NPT, and there would be no curb on continuation of India's nuclear weapon related activities.

In these important respects, India would be very much on par with the five Nuclear Weapon States, who are signatories to the NPT. The Separation Plan provides for India Specific Safeguards Agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency, with assurances of uninterrupted supply of fuels to reactors together with India's right to take corrective measures, in the event fuel supplies are interrupted. There is no question of separate agreement in this regard with the United States.

MAJ. GEN. (RETD.) B. C. KHANDURI : Sir, what about the cost of separation?

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH: I would come to it.

Sir, as far as I know, we have taken all precautions in working out the Separation Plan. Whatever costs are there, they are within the realm of practical economics and political calculations. This 40 billion dollar figure, I think, is totally misleading. I do not know what is the basis of that.

MAJ. GEN. (RETD.) B. C. KHANDURI : What is the exact calculation?

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH: Well, I cannot divulge this, I think, at this stage. But there are no unacceptable additional financial burdens, which are being placed on our nuclear programme as a result of dividing our programmes between a civilian and a military programme. I do believe that it is a good thing for our country for the future growth of both our civilian programme and our military programme, that this wall should exist. We have, for example, DRDO, which deals with the missile programme[[KD4](#)].

We have the Space Department which deals with peaceful uses of space technology, and I do believe it has created greater cost consciousness. It has created greater sense of accountability and the same will apply as a result of the two programmes being kept separate. I am satisfied insofar as I have been told that the financial costs of the operations are not, I think, anywhere near the figures which are being quoted.

PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA (SOUTH DELHI): It is 40 million. What is the estimate?...
(*Interruptions*)

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH: As of now, this is something which can be taken care of by the normal programmes of the Department of Atomic Energy.... (*Interruptions*)

PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA : What is the estimate? This is something which is very important. He is making a statement. ... (*Interruptions*)

THE MINISTER OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY AND MINISTER OF EARTH SCIENCES
(SHRI KAPIL SIBAL): Did Mr. Jaswant Singh take it up with Strobe Talbot?... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: No, forget about that. Mr. Malhotra, you have raised a question. The hon. Prime Minister said, we shall be able to provide for that.

... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: All these details cannot be discussed.

... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: You are entitled to.

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH: Questions had been raised about the CIRUS and APSARA reactors. This has been raised in both the Houses. I think Shri Yaswant Sinha raised it in the other House as to why the CIRUS experimental reactor and the Fuel Core of the APSARA have been included in the Separation Plan and whether this will not result in a decline in the fissile material availability for our strategic programme. That is the question. In my statement on March 7, 2006, I had explained the rationale why India had agreed to those provisions in the Separation Plan. The CIRUS reactor will be permanently shut down in 2010. The Fuel Core of APSARA was purchased from France and we have indicated our willingness to shift it from the present location and make it available for placing under safeguards in 2010. CIRUS and APSARA are located in the Bhaba Atomic Energy Centre and we do not want Bhaba Atomic Energy Centre to be subject to any of these safeguards. That is the reason.

Therefore, we have decided to take these steps rather than allow intrusive inspections of nuclear facilities of high national security importance. I would like to assure the hon. Members that these steps do not impact at all on the needs of our strategic programme nor will they hinder on going research and development. If and when required, we have the full freedom to build new facilities to cater to our national requirements.

Questions have also been raised about the detonation of nuclear tests in the future. Sir, we have made it quite clear to the United States that India is not willing to give any commitment about the future tests. All that we are willing to state--and that is the position which was also stated by the previous Government--is 'unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests.'

Now the question arises, what happens if our national security considerations require us to have it? Who can contemplate all the possibilities in the future? I think in that case, we will, of course, have the sovereign right to take whatever measures we can to protect our interests. But I cannot accept... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Very well, it is afterwards.

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH: So, I have stated the position. We are not willing to have it in the Treaty or the Agreement that we will sign. We are not in favour of having a bilateral CTBT. I think that position has been unambiguously made clear to the United States[\[m5\]](#).

About the American inspectors, I have explained that all that we will sign with the International Atomic Energy Agency is an India-specific safeguards agreement and there is no question of American inspectors roaming about our nuclear facilities.

On shifting of goalposts, I stated in the other House that no legislature of a foreign country can bind our country. The sole consideration for us will be our own perceptions of our national interest. But, by the same logic, I cannot prevent the US Congress in its deliberations. Now, if the outcome of these deliberations is a piece of legislation which introduces some extraneous element not envisaged in the July 18 statement, not envisaged in the March separation plan statement, then, of course, we will draw appropriate conclusions. But, I sincerely hope that that stage will not come. I have personally conveyed all our concerns, the concerns which I mentioned in detail in the other

House. I could go on explaining them. But, I think that will take unduly long time. All these concerns have been raised with the United States Government both at the official level and at my level. President Bush has assured me that it is not his intention to change the goalposts which were agreed to in the Joint Statement of July 18.

The Congressional process is still not complete. I cannot predict which way it will go. But if it goes in the direction in which it hurts us or which introduces extraneous considerations into this matter, we will draw the appropriate conclusion. The House can be rest assured that we will do nothing which will compromise the integrity of our strategic programme. There is no scope for capping of our strategic programme. The decision about the future of our strategic programme will be determined by the people, by the Government, by this Parliament and no outside power will have any influence in this regard.

I believe, Sir, I have covered most of the points. With these words I once again thank the hon. Members. I think this debate has been characterised by a common assertion of national will. I thank all the hon. Members. I thank Khanduriji because when Members of his Party spoke in the other House they said that they disown even the July 18 Statement. But when I heard hon. Members on the other side today, I was encouraged to believe that it is still not too late to work for a broad national consensus. I will work in that direction. It is very important that the whole country should speak with one voice when it comes to a matter as important as is sought to be covered by the nuclear deal.

... (*Interruptions*)

PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA : Sir, with all the assurances that the hon. Prime Minister has given to this House and to the country, does he think that the deal will go through and if it does not go through what happens? ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : He has said that if any legislation is passed which is not acceptable, it will not go through. He has said that.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA : Sir, he has said that it will not be acceptable. Then what will happen to the deal? We ask this question. ... (*Interruptions*)

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI): When it happens, then we will consider it. ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI KINJARAPU YERRANNAIDU (SRIKAKULAM): Sir, after the negotiations between the hon. Prime Minister and President George Bush, if the US Congress has modified our Agreement and tomorrow if they pass that draft law as it is, then it will be violation of our 18th July Agreement.

MR. SPEAKER : He has said that.

SHRI KINJARAPU YERRANNAIDU : To scrap those conditions in future will be a big problem for India. If that situation arises, what will be the stand of India? ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : He has thrice touched upon that point. You have not listened to it carefully.

... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VIJAYENDRA PAL SINGH : Sir, we have been satisfied to a greater extent. But the only question that is not answered by the hon. Prime Minister is this.

MR. SPEAKER : Not Machiavellian.

... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VIJAYENDRA PAL SINGH : It is about the inter-changeability of our military plans and the nuclear atomic plants and the nuclear civilian plants [krr6]. Can there be a shift because if we are at par with the countries which have signed NPT, as you had mentioned, those countries have that right to change? Is that a possibility here? Or, have you thought about the inter-changeability? ... (*Interruptions*) We are also supporting this in many ways. ... (*Interruptions*)

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH: It is quite right. ... (*Interruptions*) I am not an expert in nuclear matters. I think, there is a question mark about inter-changeability because we do not have the status of a nuclear weapons State, but there is other feature that we are free to build new reactors and new facilities. It is our prerogative whether we want to call them civilian or military. So, India's options are not being limited.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Members, now there are two other discussions under Rule 193 and also a Bill.

... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Let us take Special Mentions. That is the sweetest subject! Shri Gaurishanker Chaturbhuj Bisen – not present.