

अध्यक्ष महोदय आप हां या ना सुनकर कहिये । कल मैंने 377 के अन्तर्गत अछूतों और हरिजनों का प्रश्न उठाया था । (व्यवधान)

MR. SPEAKER: No. You write them.

श्री मनोराम बागड़ी : अध्यक्ष जी, आपको क्या हो गया है, आप मेरी सुनते नहीं हैं जो भी इस कुर्सी पर बैठता था वह मेरी सुना करता था । (व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं बहुत सुनता हूँ, आपको महाराज । (व्यवधान)

श्री मनोराम बागड़ी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, एक 15 साल की मुसलमान लड़की का ...

अध्यक्ष महोदय : उसके लिए मोशन दीजिए ।

श्री मनोराम बागड़ी : उसके लिए घर मंत्री के घर पर घरना दिया, है, सात-आठ सोशलिस्टों ने सत्याग्रह किया है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप मोशन दीजिए ।

श्री मनोराम बागड़ी : मैं इस सवाल को लेकर सदन त्याग करता हूँ ।

12.10 hrs.

[Shri Mani Ram Bagri then left the House]

MR. SPEAKER: Now Shri Indrajit Gupta. Calling Attention.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Harish Chandra Singh Rawat.

12.11 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

REPORTED DECISION OF UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT TO TERMINATE NUCLEAR FUEL SUPPLY AGREEMENT

SHRI HARISH CHANDRA SINGH RAWAT (Almora): I call the attention of the Minister of External Affairs to the following matter of urgent public importance and request that he may make a statement thereon:

"The reported decision of the United States Government to terminate the agreement for nuclear fuel supply to Tarapore Power Plant and the reaction of the Government thereto."

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO): India and the United States of America entered into a Nuclear Corporation Agreement in 1963 which was to remain in effect for 30 years. Among the basic features of this agreement were the following:

(1) that the United States would supply low enriched uranium for Tarapur Atomic Power Station during the period of the Agreement;

(2) that India would only use enriched uranium supplied by the United States for this Power Station until 1993;

(3) that the United States fuel would be under suitable safeguards. (By mutual agreement the implementation of these safeguards were transferred to the International Atomic Energy Agency in 1971).

2. Deliveries of nuclear fuel for the Tarapur Atomic Power Station were originally to be made on demand. Subsequently, on the basis of the report of two US experts a schedule of deliveries was agreed upon, in September 1976. Since 1975, the US Government changed its internal procedures which resulted in some delays in receipt of the fuel. In 1978, the United States passed legislation which *inter alia* made it necessary for the purchasers of nuclear fuel supplies

[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao]

and components after September 1980 to accept more stringent safeguards provisions, including the opening up of all nuclear establishments to international safeguards. We pointed out to the United States at that time and frequently thereafter that such domestic legislation could not be retroactively applied to an already existing and currently valid agreement which has the force of a treaty as both Governments have completed the necessary constitutional procedures. However, since that time delays in sending fuel supplies became more protected, Government has registered its protest over these delays on several occasions, and has also pointed out that the application of new and extraneous considerations was unacceptable. As the House is aware, in June 1980 President Carter approved two licences for annual shipments which were due in 1979 and 1980 by over-ruling the Nuclear Regulatory Commission as required under the U.S. law applicable at that time. These licences were subsequently approved by Congress. The US administration gave a commitment to the Congress at that time that future shipments of fuel would attract the more stringent provisions of the 1978 legislation. The shipment for 1979 has been received but the shipment for 1980 is still to be sent to us. An application for licence for fuel made in September 1980 for subsequent supplies is still to be acted upon by the US Government.

3. As the delays in fuel supplies were causing difficulties in the running of the power station, we had formally asked the United States Government for assurances of uninterrupted and timely fuel supplies during the life-time of the above mentioned agreement. While the United States Government formally intimated to us that under the agreement no assurances were necessary, we were given to understand informally that continued supplies would not be easily forthcoming hereafter because

of their legislation. Subsequently, it was suggested that we might hold discussions on this question. Accordingly a delegation led by the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission went to the United States for discussions on April 16 and 17. During these discussions the Indian side indicated that they would like continued implementation of the 1963 agreement provided no extraneous considerations were permitted to interfere in its performance. The United States side indicated that they could not hold out any such hope for further fuel supplies as they were bound by their existing laws and suggested that we might consider, as one possibility, an amicable termination of the agreement. Our delegation has reported on these discussions which are now under the consideration of the Government. Further discussions with the United States will take place shortly in India.

4. It will be the endeavour of the Government to reach a satisfactory conclusion of our discussions with the United States while at the same time preserving our national interest. As I have informed the House on an earlier occasion, it is our intention to keep the Tarapur Power Station functioning normally, no matter what the outcome of the discussions may be.

SHRI A. K. ROY (Dhanbad): I have got a point of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No point of order is allowed during the calling attention.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I have not allowed it.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Please sit down. It is something which concerns the Ministry of External Affairs.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: All right.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I have decided about it. I have not allowed it.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Anything that he says will not go on record.

(Interruptions)**

श्री हरीश चन्द्र सिंह रावत : मेरा विदेश मंत्री और उनकी सरकार के राजनयिकों की क्षमता पर अग्राध विश्वास है और हम समझते हैं कि हमारे राष्ट्र के हितों को सुरक्षित रखने में वे पूर्णतः सक्षम हैं। यह सवाल जितना नाजुक है उतना ही हम समझते हैं कि हमारी भावनाओं के साथ भी, सारे राष्ट्र की भावनाओं के साथ भी जुड़ा हुआ है। तारापुर विद्युत संयंत्र को आणविक ईंधन सप्लाई करने का जो सवाल है उससे हमारे देश को भावी विकास को रूखा रेखा सम्बन्धित है। सवाल आज तारापुर के विद्युत संयंत्र को आणविक ईंधन सप्लाई करने का नहीं है। इसके पहले भी जब भी हमने पब्लिक सैक्टर का विकास करते की कोशिश की है और हमने पश्चिमी देशों से, अमरीका से मदद चाही है तो उन्होंने कभी वांछित सहयोग नहीं दिया। किसी तरीके से उन्होंने तारापुर विद्युत संयंत्र के बास्ते आणविक ईंधन सप्लाई करने का हमारा प्रस्ताव स्वीकार किया था और हमारे साथ एक करार किया था। यह करार 1963 में किया गया था और तीस बरस के लिये था। उस करार में यह स्पष्ट का गया है कि तीस साल तक, 1994 तक जहाँ अमरीकी ईंधन की सप्लाई करने के लिए बाध्य है वहाँ हम भी किसी दूसरे देश से ईंधन नहीं लेंगे। लेकिन 1977 से लगातार अमरीका की तरफ से इसमें कुछ न कुछ बहाना बनाया जा रहा है। कभी व बातचीत करता है, कभी वह कुछ संकेत देता है और कभी उन संकेतों को भी वापिस लेता है। हमने बातचीत भी उससे की है। प्रधान मंत्री स्तर पर भी इस संदर्भ में बातचीत हुई। 1978 में प्रधान मंत्री अमरीका की यात्रा पर गए थे। यह कहा जा सकता है कि

तब एक प्रकार से उन्होंने क्लिकुल अमरीका के सामते घुटने टोक दिए थे। उसके बावजूद भी अमरीका ने इस संयंत्र के लिए ईंधन की सप्लाई के मामले में हम तरीके से कुछ न कुछ टालमटोल ही की है।

मुझे एक शंका होती है और मैं समझता हूँ कि इस शंका में सब शरीक होंगे। आज भी जब अमरीका का हमारे साथ बातचीत का दिखावा कर रहा है, ऐसा लगता है कि उससे इरादा बना लिया है कि उसने ईंधन सप्लाई करनी ही नहीं है और हमको उसने बावचीत में उलझाए रखना है। क्या ऐसा करके वह हमारे परमाणु ऊर्जा के विकास के कार्यक्रमों; व्यवधान पैदा तो नहीं करना चाहता है, उनमें गतावरोध तो नहीं डालना चाहता है? यदि यह सत्य है तो मैं विदेश मंत्री जी से जान चाहता हूँ कि क्या हमने जो हमारे वैज्ञानिक; अग्राध क्षमता है और उनकी क्षमता पर सारे राष्ट्र को विश्वास है, उसका उपयोग करके जो वैकल्पिक साधन हों सकते हैं, क्या उनको हम विडलेप करेंगे या किसी दूसरे राष्ट्र से, किसी दूसरे मित्र राष्ट्र से जो ह; ईंधन सप्लाई करना चाहता जो, उससे ईंधन लेंगे? हमने अमरीका के साथ जो करार किया है वह - समझता हूँ कि एक अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय संधि के अन्तर्गत आता है और जिससे हम प्रतिबद्ध हैं, इसको हम समाप्त करेंगे? चूँकि करार भंग करते की बात हमारी तरफ से नहीं बहिक अमरीका की तरफ से हुई है और अमरीका ने व्यवधान पैदा किया है, तो क्या हम इस बात को लेकर अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय कोर्ट आफ जस्टिस के सामने जाएंगे ताकि हम उनको यह बता सकें कि किस तरीके से अमरीका और दूसरे बड़े राष्ट्र हमारे साथ व्यवहार करते हैं?

आज के ही अखबारों में आया है कि अमरीका ने पाकिस्तान के साथ कोई शर्त नहीं रखी है कि वह अपने यहां अणु बम नहीं

(श्री हरीश चन्द्र सिंह रावत)

बनाएगा जबकि इस शर्त से हम बंधे हुए हैं। उसने हमको जब से आणविक ईंधन देना बन्द किया उसके बाद एक हजार पाउंड से भी ज्यादा यूरेनियम की सप्लाई उसने डैनमार्क, फ्रांस और पश्चिमी जर्मनी आदि को की है। लेकिन हमें ईंधन देने की बात वह वहीं करता है। इस वास्ते यह जो संघ है यह भेदमलक है, यह जो व्यवहार है यह भेदमूल है। इस संदर्भ में मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि भारत सरकार क्या सोचती है ?

श्री पी० बी० नरसिंहराव : इस छदान-कर्षण प्रस्ताव का सम्बन्ध जैसा कि मैं कह चुका हूँ एक करार से है जो हमारे दोनों देशों में 1963 में हुआ था।

12.25 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

अब उस करार का क्या भविष्य होता है, वह टिकता है या नहीं इसका फैसला बहुत जल्दी होने वाला है। हमें इस बात की चिन्ता नहीं है कि करार टिकता है या नहीं। हम केवल यह जानना चाहते हैं कि टिकता है या नहीं टिकता है। यही आज हमारी उदाहिष है। हम किसी अदालत में नहीं जाना चाहते, कहीं शिकायत नहीं करना चाहते। उसमें हमारी कोई दिलचस्पी नहीं है। हम इसी बात में दिलचस्पी रखते हैं कि इधर या उधर उसका फैसला हो जाय, और वह समय बहुत निकट है, यह मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ। और इसका पाकिस्तान वगैरह से कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है, वह अलग प्रश्न है। इस करार के बारे में बस इतनी बात है।

SHRI B. V. DESAI (Raichur): Sir, I have heard the statement of the Minister wherein he has mentioned that there is going to be an amicable termination of the agreement. When our representatives were here in USA, a news item appeared that they have abrogated unilaterally the treaty

which we had entered into with them in 1963. It was for 30 years. Probably that is their method to inform us that they intend to abrogate the treaty. But actually, how best this agreement is to be terminated, the External Affairs Minister said that they are going to discuss. But we are all agitated now best our interest will be safeguarded even after the termination of this agreement, because when an agreement is there right from the beginning regarding the supply of uranium and in regard to so many other matters, there were more chances for the Government of India to abrogate the contractual agreement rather than the other side. I say this because as per article 2, uranium will be made available in accordance with the terms, conditions and delivery schedules. In the delivery schedules, from 20 weeks to 104 weeks is the delay. It is in that range. Therefore, the contractual obligation was violated by the United States. Because of the local Act which they have passed they are not in a position to supply us the uranium, which is required by us for our peaceful atomic reactor. After this abrogation, there are one or two points which have to be thrashed out and amicably settled so that in the process the interests our country are not jeopardised.

One point is regarding the spent fuel. It is very strange that after unilateral abrogation of the agreement they claim the right for international inspection as well as for the spent fuel. In fact, our Government have already stated that the United States have no right in that regard, we are the owners and we have full title on it. I would request the hon. Minister to specifically mention in this august House that we are not going to budge an inch on that.

The second point is about international safeguards on the American fuel already shipped. It is so very strange that unilaterally while the

super-powers and some other countries have got the right to make atom bombs etc. the Non-Proliferation Treaty has been made applicable to all other countries, mostly developing countries, including India. Since we did not agree to sign it, therefore this trouble has come. I want a specific statement from the hon. Minister that he will not agree to international safeguards, so far as the other installations are concerned.

Thirdly, since we have already got the technical know-how to run our reactor, there are two or three alternatives open to us for fuel after abrogation of the treaty. One is, of course, our own fuel which we have already tested. If there is any delay in getting it we should get it from some other country. In this connection, I would submit that, although we are very friendly with Soviet Russia, we should get the fuel from other countries also so that our supplies could be diversified.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I have succinctly stated what exactly happened at the discussions. I shall not go into the speculation in the press, both in the United States and here, because there is no point in doing that. The U.S. side said that, according to the laws applicable to them, which all of us know, it will not be possible for them to continue supplies of fuel. We told them that their laws are a matter of their concern, but that they cannot have any retro-active application on the Agreement, which was entered into in 1963. So, this is the matter which was discussed.

They suggested as one of the alternatives, one of the ways out, a termination by consent. That has been reported to the Government by our delegation. It is under examination. Therefore, the point is very clear, that we are examining the pros and cons of how this suggestion made by them could be implemented. There may be other suggestions; when we

discuss, they may perhaps try to salvage the agreement; it may or may not happen. But I am not prepared to say that this is the only alternative, and that is where the reports appearing in the press are not fully correct. It is not as though that was the final thing done by them, and there is nothing else to consider. Maybe we have come to a point where such a termination will become a reality and we will work out under what conditions this reality has to be fully realised. That is a matter which will be discussed at the next stage.

But, as I said, it is not true that this has been unilaterally abrogated by the US Government and that we are in a helpless position of not being able to do anything.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY
(Bombay North East): Unilateral with your permission.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: No, it is not unilateral with our permission; it is not unilateral at all. It cannot be unilateral.

In regard to delays, I have already said that the delays have been inordinate. In some cases we have even pointed out that they have been so inordinate that they almost amount to default. This has been happening. But that is past history. Now the latest position is, as I have stated, we are at this stage of termination having become more or less a possibility, a distinct possibility, and we have to work out the details.

In regard to the spent fuel, I have already stated in my previous statement, and I repeat it now, that the alternatives available to us are well-known, they have been tested, there is no difficulty about that, and we shall see that even if this supply to Tarapur from the U.S. is stopped, Tarapur will not stop. We have said this, and the policy of the Government of India has been that we shall

[P. V. Narasimha Rao]

not be a party to the NPT Agreement, we are not going to sign it. This has been the standing policy of the Government and there is no change in that policy.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE (Howrah): Sir, this stand of the U.S. Government should not be considered in isolation of their general policy and the strategy. When the agreement was signed, the conditions imposed were quite clear. They wanted to prevent proliferation and production of atomic bombs, and the attitude suddenly changed when there was an explosion in 1974. Everybody remembers that. And subsequently the attitude of the American Government was to impose more conditions on India, as is clear from their subsequent act of 1978, and in the Minister's statement this has been admitted also. The procedural changes are deliberate. The intention is, 'If not termination, at least delay, put them under pressure so that we can blackmail and make them agree to the conditions which they want to impose.' What happened when it reached a stage of almost deadlock during Carter's regime? I shall read out a press report published in the *Times of India* dated 27th June, 1980, as follows:—

"The Carter Administration today implored Congress not to block its decision to sell enriched uranium to India, arguing that a supply cut would set back nuclear non-proliferation and U.S. strategic interests."

This is to be noted because the supply of uranium to Tarapur is linked with their strategic interests. What are their strategic interest? I am not going to read the details, but some relevant passages, which I quote below, will enlighten us:

"The Deputy Secretary of State, Mr. Warren Christopher, told the House Foreign Affairs Committee

in his prepared testimony that the President's decision to sell 40 tonnes of fuel for the U.S. built Tarapur nuclear power reactor would not weaken U.S. non-proliferation policy.

"On the contrary, the best way we can advance that policy is to continue our supply relationship", he said...

"India which exploded a nuclear device in 1974, has refused to forewear future tests or place all of its nuclear facilities under international safeguards, saying its nuclear activities would be for peaceful purposes only."

This has irritated them. From that time, their attitude has been very stringent.

Again I quote:

"Mr. Christopher said: "If we disapprove these shipments, India is very likely to consider itself free of its obligations under the 1963 agreement (to build Tarapur and supply the fuel)".

In that event, India might reproaches the U.S.—origin fuel in India and use the plutonium in the Tarapur reactors, which would be an unfortunate precedent, he added."

"The plutonium, which can be used in weapons..."

He expressed an apprehension. Then he says:

"In the light of the turmoil in Iran and the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan, "We consider it vital to bolster our relations with this region, particularly with those countries, such as India, which can promote security and stability in South Asia."

"India has moved from an uncritical view of events in Afghanistan to one opposing the Soviet intervention and calling for prompt withdrawal."

They welcomed once a slight change in the Government of India's stand in regard to Afganistan and they want to push you to further change in regard to relations with Pakistan. India was playing a moderate role in the non-alignment movement. They want that India should play a moderate role. What is the main content of non-alignment? The main content of non-alignment is anti-imperialism, anti-colonialism. But if anti-imperialism is watered down, then they are free to pursue their game.

Prime Minister had made statements. Government of India also made statements that the world situation has reached a stage when any time war may break out; and American imperialism is merely trying to create that condition by further strengthening their base in Diego Garcia, despite repeated opposition by U.N.O., by all the non-aligned countries, by all littoral countries. **Despite** that, they are strengthening the base with further nuclear weapons. Why is it? They want to blackmail. India is one of the targets of their blackmail.

Secondly, very recently, they have decided to set up Rapid Dispersal Command in the Gulf area. You might have seen that in the newspapers. They are sending arms to Pakistan. Why? They want to create a situation in South East Asia, a situation of destabilisation.

In this respect, I think our understanding is the same. But this is their strategy. This is their foreign policy. That is why on the one side they are telling that they want to terminate the agreement and you are showing a weakness, saying that you do not want to terminate. Your statement says that you want to keep the agreement continuing. So, they will take advantage of this weakness. You will again go on talking with them for getting some concessions out of them. You require a firm stand. But your state-

ment says that you are interested in continuing that agreement.

DR. FAROOQ ABDULLAH (Srinagar): It is in the interest of India. It is for the national interest.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: For the national interest! But what is their interest?

DR. FAROOQ ABDULLAH: The same as Russia's.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: The same as Russia's? No. Some agencies in India are very active to strengthen American game here in India. Soviet Union have stood firmly for making the Indian ocean a zone of peace, the Americans are developing nuclear base. Are Soviet Union and America the same? A person who says that both are the same, they are indirectly justifying U.S.A. ...

DR. FAROOQ ABDULLAH: Who denies that Russian vessels are in the ... (Interruptions)

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: This is where lies the real weakness. You do not say American imperialists as imperialist power, as war-mongers, who are creating situation for leading the whole world to a precipice of war.

About this outlook of parity that Soviet Union and America are the same, this is what the American imperialists want. This is supporting the American imperialist game in an indirect way. This is what is happening. The Government of India must be very vigilant about this type of activities and policies. We do not want to come out openly against American imperialism, and their dangerous game in the world. American imperialism is the only threat to the independence of all the countries of the world. This is absolutely clear. Anybody who vacillates to denounce American imperialism should be considered as an indirect accomplice of the acts of American imperialism. I openly say this.

[Shri Samar Mukherjee]

A stage has come to clearly demarcate between this policy and the policy of peace. That is why the American strategy must be kept in mind. We want that there should be a clear termination of the agreement. Quickly you terminate it. You are absolutely free to move in your own way and come out of all the obligations. It is a good thing that already some indigenous fuel has been developed. I read in a newspaper that some mixed oxide fuel has been developed. Already our scientists have developed it. Why shall we give way to this American pressure? We have shown our weakness that we want to continue this agreement and they are bluntly saying that they want termination of the agreement. So, our position is a weak position and their position is a firm position. We are on the defensive. Why are you on the defensive? That is why I want a reply from the hon. Minister as to what is the basis of further negotiation. It must be made completely clear. You should in no way submit yourself to the blackmail of American imperialism.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, I would request the hon. Member to come back to the subject of the Calling Attention. We have said, as I have read out just now:

"During these discussions, the Indian side indicated that they would like continued implementation of the 1963 Agreement provided no extraneous considerations were permitted to interfere in its performance."

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: That they have made clear.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (Basirhat): What are those extraneous considerations?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Let me complete,

Extraneous consideration No. 1 is that they are taking refuge behind the

1978 law which came subsequently and about which we said, "We are not bound by it". If they agree to this, we agree to have the agreement continued. If they do not agree to this, we have already said, we are not interested in continuing the agreement if it is made subject to the subsequent legislation. Therefore, who is one the defensive and who is on the offensive is very clear from this. Either they have to retrace their steps from the effect of subsequent legislation and make our agreement immune from the effect of this legislation in which case it will continue or, otherwise, the possibility they have suggested, of termination, is going to be the scenario.

So, we are not at all on the defensive. We have said it as it has to be said. We are negotiating. They say, "What do you do with the agreement?" We say, "Okay, we continue the agreement provided it continues as it continued till 1978." That is all.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: One clarification. In your statement you have made it clear that they want an amicable termination of the agreement. They have already made their position clear. Why under an illusion?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I am not under any illusion. They have suggested something. Our delegation has reported it to us. We are considering it. The next stage will be to discuss with them the modalities of what they are suggesting. This is what is going to happen.

SHRI BAPUSAHEB PARULEKAR (Ratnagiri): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I would invite your attention to the call-attention itself, viz the reported decision of US Government to terminate the agreement and the reaction of the Government thereto. They are the two main issues with which we are concerned in this call-attention.

In this particular reply, the Hon. Minister had only hinted by using the word 'indication' that the United States Reagan Administration is not

willing to make further supplies. So, we do not know whether they have taken a firm decision or not. However, our Government is going to enter into a dialogue with them next month.

In my respectful submission this is a contradiction in itself and, therefore, I would restrict myself to this part of the statement and to the motion which is before the House.

The hon. Minister must have read from the foreign newspapers that U.S. administration has taken a decision to cancel the agreement and the word 'indication' is a good word which the hon. Minister had used. In fact, what remains to be done is the signing of the death warrant of the cancellation of this particular agreement.

But the hon. Minister in a very goody-goody way has said neither 'yes' nor 'no' to the question that is being posed through this call-attention.

I am going to ask him a particular, specific and pertinent question whether the United States Government has taken a decision to cancel this agreement and, if so, what is the use of your further discussions in the meeting that is to take place in Delhi in the month of May?

Before the talks begin, I would like to submit for the information of the hon. Members that it was not on 16th April when our officers had gone to U.S. that this decision was taken. The Reagan Administration claims that they were pushed into a corner to take this decision because of the policies of the Carter Government and because of the 1978 proliferation treaty and had this not been there, they would not have taken this particular decision. In fact, this should have been known to our Government long back.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: How do you know that?

SHRI BAPUSAHEB PARULEKAR: Please bear with me for a moment. I cannot put the question immediately because certain facts have to be given. (Interruptions)

This question was raised six times in this august House during this Session and once in the last session. I would like to give the question numbers, the dates and some answers in short. The number of the first unstarred question was 396 to be answered on 11-6-1980.

Unstarred Question No.	Date to be answered on
1319	25-2-81
1338	-do-
3174	11-3-81
5010	25-3-81

When a pertinent question was asked as to whether it was true or not that a particular Senator had brought to the notice of the Government of the United States that this treaty had been cancelled, the reply given by our Government on 8-4-81 was "India hopes that the United States would honour its obligations".

According to a statement, the Reagan Administration conveyed this decision to our officers 4 or 5 days before the question was replied to.

There is no time for me to put forth all the answers given by the hon. Prime Minister to all these questions. I explained the position when a point of order was raised.

I would like to ask the hon. Minister for External Affairs through you whether it is true or not that an unsigned United States diplomatic communication, known as non-paper, a device used to assure maximum confidentiality, was handed over to Dr. Homj Sethna, India's top nuclear official and Mr. Eric Gonsalves some time in the week commencing from 13th

[Shri Bapusaheb Parulekar]

April, 1981, and if so, whether it will be possible for you to tell this august House the details and whether it is true or not that, in that particular 'non-paper' it is specifically stated that the Government of the United States is going to cancel this particular Agreement. This is my specific question...

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO
rose—

SHRI BAPUSAHEB PARULEKAR:
I have just begun. This is a very important matter...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You must tell him how many questions you are going to ask.

SHRI BAPUSAHEB PARULEKAR:
About five or six.

AN HON. MEMBER: All pointed questions.

SHRI BAPUSAHEB PARULEKAR:
If this is true, I would like to know how is it that Mr. Eric Gonsalves even now claims—unless the reports are untrue—that the Reagan Administration has not yet taken any decision. In this background I would like to know this. Then hon. Minister, in his last paragraph, Paragraph 4, mentions:

"It will be the endeavour of the Government to reach a satisfactory conclusion of our discussions..."

I am at a loss to understand this. When the Reagan Administration has taken a decision to terminate, we are hoping that something will come out of this, particular talk. I would, therefore, like to know from the hon. Minister (a) whether this talk will concern about the future of the 1963 Agreement; (b) whether the talk will only refer to modalities and how to

effect disengagement with grace. That is what is expected by the scientists of this country. Nothing is going to come out. Only the funeral procession has to be taken in the meeting that is to be held in Delhi in the next month...

AN HON. MEMBER: In which cemetery?

SHRI BAPUSAHEB PARULEKAR:
That is for the Minister to decide.

The last question on this is whether the hon. Minister will give a categorical assurance that, in no case, the Government of India will compromise on the issue of spent fuel. I am coming to this point in detail subsequently. I would like to have a categorical assurance on this because much depends upon this particular issue of spent fuel. I would like to know whether it is true or not that the Reagan Administration is ready to continue this particular Agreement and supply us uranium provided we agree to two conditions. The first condition is that the United States wants to prevent India from reprocessing the spent fuel at Tarapur. I want to know whether this is a condition precedent, which they have laid down or not for continuing this particular Agreement. The second is that the United States wants Tarapur to remain under international safeguards—to which some reference was made; I would like to add this—on the Canadian parallel when India did not remove international controls on Canadian-built reactors even after Canada stopped supplying the things it promised to provide. This is the second condition which I could find from certain papers. I would like to know whether there is any reference in the 1963 Agreement for permission or prior approval from the United States with reference to reprocessing of the spent fuel.

One more question which I would like to ask is this. When such a matter is being debated here and in the United States and since they know that it will be debated in Par-

liament, the U.S. apologists have begun to argue that we have taken a decision on a similar ground as Russia has taken.

13.00 hrs.

Sir, in that connection, I would like to know whether it is not a fact that the Soviet Union demands international safeguards only on plants which use material related to the Soviet exports while the United States are putting restrictions with reference to the materials which we are getting not only from the United States but from other countries also. There is one more small thing. Assume for a moment that we are going to discontinue this particular agreement, what about the consignments which were sanctioned last year? Whether we are going to get that or whether, after the cancellation of this agreement, we are not going to get those particular consignments which were sanctioned in the year 1979 or 1980—I am not sure about this?

The last two questions which I would like to ask now are:

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: How many questions you will ask?

SHRI BAPUSAHEB PARULEKAR: I have got seven only. The hon. Minister in his statement, at the beginning, had given the basic features of the agreement. He has mentioned three. There are many. In the interests of the country, I would like to ask one question.

With reference to a clause in that particular agreement, whether it is true or not—because we have no authentic information though some people say they are there but I want to have an authentic reply—that in the Original Tarapur Agreement, there is a clause that India will agree to the C.I.A. operating in the Himalayas to monitor Chinese nuclear development in the Nanda Devi. Nanda Devi is there. (Interruptions)

Lastly, as I promised, I was surprised when the hon. Minister read the statement, all my hon. colleagues on the left thumped the desk and clapped. I do not know whether they were happy about that. I would like to know whether G.O.I. is going to protest to this decision of U.S. and if so—in what form was your protest? I would like to know whether our Government will call back our Ambassador from the United States to show our protest. These are the questions which I would like the hon. Minister to reply.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: This calling attention has now become a general discussion.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, I would like to take the last question first. That is about Nandadevi. There is no Nandadevi in the agreement. (Interruptions) One very important aspect of the 1978 legislation is that the safeguards would become applicable after September 1980—not before. Although the legislation was passed in 1978, the effect of the legislation would be applied to shipments after September, 1980. That is why the House may recall that, after September 1980, the matter really became urgent and some improvisation was made as a result of which, two shipments were granted, were licensed. One of them has come, the other I am not sure, is going to come, in view of the changed circumstances, because the whole question is now in the melting pot.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: You are not sure it is going to come or you are sure it is not going to come.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I am not sure it is going to come. I am not saying I am sure it is not going to come; I am not sure it is going to come because the whole question, as I said, is in the melting pot. So, there was no question of our being negligent about it or not taking any steps. In fact in the na-

[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao]

tional interest, when the new legislation of 1978 became applicable, we had taken all possible steps. As a result of that, what I have just said has happened.

Sir, about this non-paper, there seems to be a lot of speculation in the press. I have clearly given what happened during the discussions. Naturally, during discussions, over a period of time, over several days formulations are exchanged, notes are exchanged. They do not form part of the official documents. They are not referred to as official but they are, more or less, exchange of views, exchange of formulation, exchange of notes, and that is why they are referred to as non-papers. Otherwise, they would have been referred to as papers. So, the difference between a non-paper and a paper must be appreciated. That is one thing. About the contents of the non-paper I would like to respectfully submit to the House that since there was nothing officially final as a stand taken by their Government or our Government on a particular matter the contents of a non-paper are in the nature of things which have no real importance. There were many other alternatives and modalities suggested. All of them have been reported to us and we are considering them. They will come up for consideration next month. As was pointed out, even if it is a funeral procession, Sir, the burial has to be decent. We chant 'mantras' even at a funeral procession. Therefore, we have to think of the 'mantras' and the modalities of how this is to be done.

DR. KARAN SINGH (Udhampur): Will you think of re-incarnation also?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: That is why I said that it is at the stage of further discussion. Maybe it is only the modalities of termination that will be discussed but I have said and I have always held the view after reading all the papers that as it happened in September 1980 when no one expected that any shipment

would be forthcoming, when there were Call Attention here, when I was questioned directly as to why we were not abrogating it here and now and I had said that the time had not come according to the Government, after that we did get sanction for two shipments, we cannot predict things with certainty.

Now as was pointed out by Shri Samar Mukherjee—he read out a long list of reasons as to why they wanted not to antagonise India—they may be political reasons. They are political reasons. They are not altruistic reasons. It is possible that under a special set of circumstances the Agreement may be salvaged. I am saying that we need not rule out the possibility until we come to the final act of the drama and that is why I have been careful in making this statement. I have not been absolutely categorical in banging the door. We need not bang the door because we have not violated the Agreement. We have not violated any part of the Agreement. The violation is taking place, for whatever reasons, from the other side. So, we are putting the entire thing on the other side. The result will be the same. This is the approach we have taken which, in my view is the correct approach.

About the spent fuel, I will say that it belongs to us. There is no question about that also. It belongs to us and there is no question of any discussion because what would have happened after 1993 if the Agreement had continued till then would happen now if the Agreement is terminated tomorrow. It is as clear as anything and that has been our stand.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: So, next month you will not discuss about the disposal of the spent fuel.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: This has been made clear already.

Sir, something was asked about some conditions having been imposed for continuing Tarapur safeguards. No such conditions were imposed because

the whole thing is in the melting pot. There is no condition which can save it. Actually what can save this Agreement is an amendment to their 1978 legislation. Nothing less and nothing more than that. And that is not on the cards today. And therefore no other condition can save the legislation. So, this is the position. About the second shipment, I said I am not sure it is coming, because of various reasons.

SHRI BAPUSAHEB PARULEKAR: What about the shipment of the consignments?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: One consignment has come. As for the second, as I said, I am not sure we are going to get it because the whole question is going to be discussed. So, this is the position, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about recalling the Ambassador?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: We have just sent him, Sir.

13.12 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned for lunch till fifteen Minutes past Fourteen of the clock.

The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch at fifteen Minutes past Fourteen of the Clock.

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION BY MEMBER

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Dr. Farooq Abdullah.

PROF. K. K. TEWARY (Buxar): Sir, I have a point of order. Dr. Farooq Abdullah is making a personal explanation presumably because some allegations were levelled against him by an hon. Member on this side of the House. We have come across

many statements of Dr. Abdullah on various occasions.... (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: What is your point of Order? There is no point of order. I have allowed him. Mr. Speaker has already approved this.

PROF. K. K. TEWARY: It is reported in the press... (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: This will not go on record. You wanted to raise a point of order. Under what rule you want to raise it? (*Interruptions*)**

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL (Jai-pur): Sir, it is on the Agenda Paper.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: If you do not agree with this, you must write a letter to me separately. In this House I find that without taking my permission, everybody gets up to speak. As a matter of fact, you should have got my permission before making your submission. You can make your submission only after I have permitted you to do so. But I have not permitted you.

(*Interruptions*)

All of us, including myself, must abide by the rules otherwise we cannot conduct the proceedings of the House in a proper manner.

Now, Dr. Farooq Abdullah.

DR. FAROOQ ABDULLAH (Srinagar): In a statement made on the floor of the House on 23rd April, the Finance Minister referred to the raids conducted by the Enforcement Directorate of his Ministry in Srinagar on 21st and 22nd April on a number of firms ostensibly to unearth black money. During the course of a statement, Finance Minister said that it is reported "the attack took place after Dr. Farooq Abdullah visited the premises which were being searched." I would like to state emphatically, it is

**Not recorded.