36

investment amounts to Rs 4,04,727 crore. Sir, I do not see anybody is swallowing anybody else. Then, the total number of 2,078 Letters of Intent have been issued, envisaging a total investment of Rs. 58,149 crore in the private sector in industries where licences are needed. Therefore, the total is......(Interruption)

## [Translation]

SHRI RABI RAY: The hon. Prime Minister has given an example of soft drink industry. I would like to know the details in this regard.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: They have invested Rs. 5 lakh crore and we have invited a foreign capital investment of Rs. 35 thousand crore only. You will come to know that none is swallowing anyone. Our people are very happy and they express their happiness whenever they meet us.. (Interruptions)

## [English]

About employment, Sir, some calculation has been made. We have arrived at the figure ....(Interruptions)

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE: World Bank has commented about tempo.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: About 41 lakh jobs which have been calculated have been created as a result of the investment decision and from that we have called out this figure.

### Leakage of Radioactive Water

\*43. SHRI LOKA NATH CHAUDHURY :

DR. LAXMINARAYAN PANDEYA:

Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state :

- (a) whether the International Atomic Energy Agency and the Atomic Energy Regulatory Board had known about the leak of radioactive water in Tarapur for more than a month before it hit the world headings;
- (b) if so, the reasons why the information was kept secret;
- (c) whether India and US have agreed on nuclear safety aspects;
  - (d) if so, the details thereof;

- (e) whether any responsibility has been fixed for this accident:
- (f) the action taken by the Union Government to control the leakage of radioactive waste water and loss suffered due to leakage; and
- (g) the steps taken by the government to compensate the victims/displaced farmers?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE PRIME MINISTER OFFICE AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY AND DEPARTMENT OF SPACE AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (SHRI BHUVNESH CHATURVEDI): (a) to (g) A Statement is laid on the Table of the House.

#### STATEMENT

- (a) The Atomic Energy Regulatory Board (AERB) knew about the incident in which some radioactive water leaked out of the Waste Immobilisation Plant at Tarapur. The AERB had reported the incident to the IAEA.
- (b) There was no need to publicise the event, since systematic measurements had clearly established that this incident had not resulted in any radiological impact in the public domain, the release having occurred well within the premises of the plant.
- (c) and (d) India and the U.S. discussed nuclear safety aspects during the visit of energy Secretary Ms. Hazel O' leary to India in July 1994 and February 1995 and it was agreed that both sides should identify areas of cooperation in the field of nuclear technology, particularly nuclear safety.
- (e) The incident is a minor one and has been categorised at the lowest level, i.e., No.1 in the international nuclear events scale of the International Atomic Energy Agency. There is a standard procedure for reviewing such incidents through standing safety committees constituted by the AERB. By its nature, it cannot be attributed to the fault of any particular individual.
- (f) As soon as it was detected, the affected area, which is well within the premises of the plant, as well as the source of leakage, were isolated. The contaminated soil of a small area was removed. There has been no loss on account of this incident.
- (g) The question of compensation does not arise as the investigation clearly show that the incident was of a minor nature and occurred entirely within the

Oral Answers

exclusion zone of the Tarapur Atomic Power Station. The level of radiation was such that it could have absolutely no adverse effect on the health of the villagers. There was also no need for any persons being displaced because of the incident; as there is no human habitation within the exclusion zone.

Oral Answers

SHRI LOKANATH CHAUDHURY : I want to know from the Minister when actually the leakage took place and what was the time difference when it was detected. If it was detected, why it has come out in the foreign press?

If according to understanding, it would have no impact on public health, how could it get publicity in the foreign press before it was published in our press?

MR. SPEAKER: You are holding the Government responsible for what appears in the newspapers!

SHRI LOKANATH CHAUDHURY : I am not holding the Government responsible. They might have thought that it would have no impact. But how could this matter come out?

SHRI BHUVNESH CHATURVEDI : The incident was reported on 22nd May 1995. After due verification and examination, it was reported to the international agency in July first week. How can I say as to why the world Press took it that way? But our submission is that it has not affected the life and the water in the area.

SHRI LOKANATH CHAUDHURY : It is reported that 3.5 tonnes of earth has been taken out just to stop the contamination. 3.5 tonnes earth has been taken out and it is also said that the wells were isolated. The second thing is that they say that it will have no effect. But the doctors do opine that the effects of radioactive substance do not come immediately. They come even after 35 years, after a long period. So, I want to know how the Government is so sure that it will have no impact on the health of the people.

SHRI BHUVNESH CHATURVED1 : After enquiry & examination by the Atomic Energy Commission and also by other agencies, both have come to the conclusion that it has no effect because the incident did not take place in the area. Whatever happened was inside the campus.

# [Translation]

DR. LAXMINARAYAN PANDEYA: Hon. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the hon. Minister had given an assurance in the Rajya Sabha that there was no

possibility of any leakage. We have full control on it. There is not any possibility of leakage in any way. The leakage took place and it created danger to the health of the people in spite of getting certificate from the Regulatory Board. You have now said that this incident took place inside the campus and had not resulted in any radiological impact in public domain but such tragedy occurred in Bhopal also and people are facing its consequences till now. Can the possibility of adverse effects of this incident be denied? Have the International agency accepted it or whether the American Agency with which you have a collaboration examined it, and if-so what are their findinas?

SHRI BHUVNESH CHATURVEDI : Hon. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the International Agency has accepted that there are no adverse effects of this leakage.

SHRIMATI MALINI BHATTACHARYA : It has been emphasized in the answer that the incident is a minor one. But if there is a series of such incidents in different atomic stations, then of course there always remains the fear of a bigger accident happening at some time or the other. So, I would like to know from the hon. Minister how many such incidents have taken place in the last even or eight years, including the reports of cracks having appeared in a number of nuclear reactors in the very recent past.

MR. SPEAKER : You can send the statistics later on.

SHRI BHUVNESH CHATURVEDI : I will send the details to the hon. Member.

[Translation]

SHRI RAM NAIK : Mr. Speaker, Sir, Tarapur Atomic Energy plant is in my constituency. As soon as I came to know about this incident, I immediately brought it to the notice of the chairman of Atomic Energy Commission. I am proud of the progress made by scientists of our country. Many news agencies of foreign countries are jealous of our progress and they portray wrong picture about us. The hon. Prime Minister was not available and I myself gave this information to Shri Chaturvedi ji. He also said that they will conduct an inquiry into this incident. I requested him to pay a visit to the place of incident so that the people are assured and feel themselves safe. Now my question is whether he will give a statement about the security arrangements made there and apart from this, there in the security zone... (Interruptions)

# [English]

MR. SPEAKER: That statement has been made on the floor of the House now.

.....(Interruptions).....

# [Translation]

SHRI RAM NAIK: There are 1300 families in the security zone even today. My question is whether you will try to rehabilitate them somewhere else at the earliest?

SHRI BHUVNESH CHATURVEDI: My submission is that there are no inhabitants in the security zone. They are out of security zone and they have not been affected in any way. That area has not been affected.

#### **AIDS Control**

#### \*44. SHRI TANNA JOSHI :

#### DR. LAL BAHADUR RAWAL:

Will the Minister of HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE be pleased to state :

- (a) the number of AIDS cases along with the number of persons tested HIV positive in each state/ Union Territory at present;
- (b) the number of deaths reported due to AIDS in each state/Union Territory during the last three years:

- (c) the States which are still AIDS free in the country; and
- (d) the steps taken to effectively check the spread of AIDS?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE ( SHRI PABAN SINGH GHATOWAR):-

(a) to (d) . A statement is laid on the table of the Lok Sabha.

#### STATEMENT

- (a) A Statement for the period ending 30th June. 1995 is enclosed (Annexure I).
  - (b) A Statement is given as Annexure II.
- (c) No HIV/AIDS Cases have been reported from the States of Arunachal Pradesh, Sikkim, Tripura and Union Territory of Daman & Diu.
- (d) A comprehensive Programme for the Prevention and Control of AIDS is currently under implementation as a Centrally Sponsored Scheme throughout the Country. The strategies of the programme consist of generation of awareness amongst high risk behaviour and general public about HIV/AIDS, control of sexually transmitted diseases, blood safety and rational use of blood, better surveillance; and diagnosis and clinical management of HIV/AIDS cases.

# ANNEXURE-I

## SERO-SURVEILLANCE FOR HIV INFFECTION

Period of report upto: 30th June, 1995 (Provisional)

|                       | <del></del> |          |                         |  |
|-----------------------|-------------|----------|-------------------------|--|
| S. No. NAME           | SCREENED    | POSITIVE | NO. OF<br>AIDS<br>CASES |  |
| 1. 2.                 | 3           | 4.       | 5.                      |  |
| Arunachal Pradesh     | 4           | -        | -                       |  |
| 2. Andhra Pradesh     | 39157       | 214      | 1                       |  |
| 3. Assam              | 9982        | 6        | 4                       |  |
| 4. A & N Islands (UT) | 360         | 1        | -                       |  |
| 5. Bihar              | . 8401      | 3        |                         |  |
| 6. Delhi              | 307522      | 978      | 82                      |  |