

RAJYA SABHA

Friday, the 5th October, 1982/16 Asvina,
1904 (Saka)

The House met at eleven of the clock,

Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

*81. [The questioner (Shri Bhagatram Manhar) was absent for answer vide Col, 30-31 *infra*]

Supply of Nuclear fuel for the Tarapur Atomic Power Plant

*82. SHRI SHIVA CHANDRA JHA:†
SHRI SURENDRA MOHANTY:

Will the Minister of EXTERNAL AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

1) whether it is a fact that during the recent visit of the Prime Minister to the U.S. the question of supply of nuclear fuel for the Tarapur Atomic Power Plant was discussed with the U.S. authorities and it was decided that France would supply the nuclear fuel in place of U.S.;

(b) whether it is also a fact that France has put new conditions, other than the agreement reached between U.S. and India in 1963 for the supply of nuclear fuel for the Tarapur Plant;

* (c) if so, what are the details of new conditions put forward by France for supply of the nuclear fuel and what is Government's reaction in this regard;

(d) whether the issue has been sorted out after the recent visit of the French delegation to India; and

(e) if so, what are the details in this regard and by when supply of nuclear fuel is likely to commence?

†The question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri Shiva Chandra Jha.

1288—1.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO):
(a) Discussions had been going on between Indian and US officials to resolve the problem arising out of the inability of the US Government to supply enriched uranium for the Tarapur Atomic Power Station (TAPS), in terms of the 1963 Agreement. Subsequently, in July, 1982, the US Government proposed that if India agreed France could take over (as a substitute for USA) the responsibility of supplying enriched uranium for the TAPS in the framework of the 1963 Co-operation Agreement and the safeguards Agreement of 1971 which flows therefrom. The 1963 Co-operation Agreement would remain intact in every other respect. India agreed to this arrangement after it was confirmed both by the USA and France that the latter would make supplies of enriched uranium in the framework of the 1963 Agreement and the Safeguards Agreement of 1971.

(b) to (e) As a follow up, a delegation of French officials visited India for discussion which have not yet concluded. In view of this, it would not be possible to give any further details nor to set a definite date for the supplies to commence.

Sir, this is the answer as of today because the discussions are still going on. So, we could not say anything more definite than this at this moment.

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : उपसभापति महोदय, जब यह जाफर अमरीका ने किया हिन्दुस्तान को कि उसकी जगह पर फ्रांस न्युक्लियर फ्युएल सप्लाई करेगा भारत की तारापुर एटोमिक प्लांट के लिए 63 के एग्रीमेंट के मुताबिक और जिस रूप में भारत ने उसको दोनों हाथों से ग्रहण कर लिया लार्डक मन्ना विद बोद दी हैडस, मुझे बड़ी हैरानी हुई है। जब बात अखवार में आई तो यहां पर मैंने कहा, आप रिकार्ड देख लें इट इज ट्रुप और जो घटनाएं घटी है उसके बाद ने जिस रूप में भूलभुलैया के चक्कर में यह आ गये हैं। यह अमरीका का माउस ट्रैप

था कि फ्रांस उसकी जगह पर न्यूक्लियर सप्लाय करेगा भारत को तारापुर के लिए लेकिन हैरानी इसलिए और हो जाती है कि कुछ ऐसी बातें हैं फ्रांस और उसकी न्यूक्लियर पोजीशन को ले कर जो मैं नहीं समझता कि विदेश मंत्रालय के लोग नहीं जानते हैं। ऐसी बात नहीं है। यह एक मंत्रालय है जो बचा हुआ है अभी बिलकुल चौपट होने से और मंत्रालय जब चौपट है ही। प्रधानमंत्री ने कुछ को तो सर्टिफिकेट दे दिया है जैसे रेल मंत्रालय के बारे में है लेकिन मेरा अपना भी है मंत्री से लेकर अफसर लोग जो हैं यह मंत्रालय ठोड़ा बहुत बचा पाए है। कोई इन-कम्पिटेंट हैंड्स हैं, ऐसी बात नहीं है इसके कहने की जरूरत नहीं है मैं ही कहता हूँ मैंने भी देखा है सब मिशंस में अधिकारी कम्पिटेंट हैं उनमें सउत्साह है, यंग हैं देश के लिए उत्साह है, सारी जानकारी उनके पास है। लेकिन इतना होते हुए भी क्या उनको या भारत सरकार को पता नहीं है फ्रांस जो है वह न्यूक्लियर पावर का जो लंदन क्लब है जिसमें यू.के., फ्रांस, यू.एस.ए., यू.एस.एस.आर. मँबर है। नतीजा इसका यह होगा कि उसकी आर्ब्लीगेशन और कंडीशंस के मुताबिक फ्रांस कुछ नहीं करेगा जब तक यह दोनों रजामंद नहीं होंगे इसलिए फ्रांस का देना भी वही कंडीशन के साथ होगा जैसे जैसे अमरीका घुमायेगा वैसे वैसे फ्रांस घुमेगा। यह तो एक बात है। दूसरी बात यह है कि खुद इन्होंने कहा और हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने भी कल ही मेरे एक प्रश्न के जवाब में कहा है कि 63 के एग््रीमेंट के मुताबिक ही फ्रांस देगा। इन्होंने भी गौरव के साथ कहा कि 63 के मुताबिक देगा। अब 63 के मुताबिक देगा तो 63 एग््रीमेंट में कौन सी दिक्कतों थी जिससे अमेरिका नहीं दे रहा है। एक

इंटरनेशनल इंस्पेक्शन की बात आती थी, जिसको आप मान नहीं रहे थे। यदि फ्रांस भी देगा तो वह इंटरनेशनल इंस्पेक्शन की बात लायेगा जिस पर आपको एतराज होगा। तो यह सब बातें थी। इन सब बातों का क्या सरकार को पता नहीं था और यदि उसने आफर किया तो क्या आपने अमेरिका को कह दिया, तब तो मैं मानता हूँ कि यूनिलेटरली आपका एग््रीमेंट आप खत्म कर रहे हैं ताकि हिंदुस्तान फ्री हो जाता, फ्रांस से अपनी बात करने में। तो इस रूप में इस ध्योरी में यह एक ट्रेप था, क्या आपको इसकी जानकारी नहीं थी, यह मेरा पहला प्रश्न है ?

श्री पी० बी० नरसिंहा राव : मैं दूंगा आपको जानकारी। यह हमें भी मालूम है और फ्रांस को भी मालूम है कि लंदन क्लब के सिलसिले में उनकी क्या जिम्मेदारियाँ हैं। इसके बावजूद जब फ्रांस कहता है कि वह हमें सप्लाय करेगा तो हम मानें कि न मानें ? जाहिर है कि हम मानेंगे। हमने माना। आज कोई कठिनाई आती है तो इसका अर्थ या तो नहीं होता है कि हमारा जो पहले एग््रीमेंट था यू.एस.ए. के साथ वह समाप्त हो गया। वह तो नहीं हुआ, वह अपनी जगह पर है। मैं यह कह चुका हूँ कि एक सप्लायर की जगह दूसरा सप्लायर आ रहा है, बाकी सब बातों में पुराना जो हमारा करार है वह बाकी है। आज की स्थिति में हम यह देख रहे हैं कि फ्रांस ने जो कहा था, जो वचन दिया था कि वह सप्लाय करेगा, उस वचन पर वह पाबंद रहेगा कि नहीं। इसी के बारे में चर्चा हो रही है, इसी के बारे में बातचीत हो रही है। तो इसमें हमारा नुकसान क्या है यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आया। फ्रांस ने कहा कि मैं सप्लाय करने को तैयार हूँ, यूनाईटेड

स्टेट्स ने हमसे कहा कि फ्रांस सप्लाई करने को तैयार है, हमने कहा कि तैयार है तो हम लेने को तैयार हैं। वह नहीं तैयार होता है, कोई दूसरी कठिनाई आती है उस पर वह काबू नहीं पा सकता तो फिर जहां की तहां चीज रह जाती है और फिर हमारे जो आप्शनस हैं वे अपनी जगह पर रहते हैं। यह आज की स्थिति है।

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : अब स्पष्ट है अगर मैं थर्ड नाइव का इस्तेमाल करूं कि बातचीत में और एक्सप्रेशन में कितना नाइव और कितनी नैविटी थी, तो ठीक है। चूंकि फ्रांस अब इन बातों पर जोर दे रहा है परसूट क्लोज और परपेच्युटी क्लोज पर तो क्या आपने उसका ध्यान दिलाया कि 63 के एग्रीमेंट में परसूट क्लोज भी नहीं है और परपेच्युटी क्लोज भी नहीं है तो यह कहाँ से नुम ला रहे हो... (व्यवधान) मुनिये, बात तो खत्म होने दीजिए। दूसरा, अमरीका इंटरनेशनल इंस्पेक्शन की बात करता था और वह करेगा ही और फ्रांस यदि परसूट और परपेच्युटी क्लोज हटा भी देता है तो इंटरनेशनल प्लान की बात को करता है, उस पर भी आप राजी नहीं होंगे तो किस तरह से आप इस तर्क से बचने जा रहे हैं? और आखिरी बात है, उपसभापति महोदय, मान लीजिए कि यह बात ठीक भी कर लीजिए तो आपका अपना 'माथम' जो है इंडिजिनिस जिससे तारापुर को चला सकते हैं तो वह बात कर रहे हैं या नहीं कर रहे हैं, कितनी बात कर रहे हैं कितनी नहीं कर रहे हैं?

श्री पी० बी० नरसिंह राव : श्रीमान, यदि हम नाइव होते तो पहले ही यूनाइटेड स्टेट्स से कहते कि अब हमको दूसरा सप्लायर मिल गया है

इसलिए आपका और हमारा करार खत्म हो जायेगा। हमने यह नहीं कहा... (व्यवधान)

श्री उपसभापति : इनकी मुनिए।

श्री पी० बी० नरसिंह राव : हमने सभी अपने जो आप्शनस विल्कुल खुले रखे हैं। आप जो कहते हैं कि एक सरकार अपना बनाया हुआ नियम बदल नहीं सकती, यह सही नहीं है। यूनाइटेड स्टेट्स ने भी बदला है, फ्रांस ने भी बदला है, कोई भी सावरेन सरकार अपने रूल को बदल सकती है यह एक पोलिटिकल मामला होता है। अंततोगत्वा यह बेजब कानूनी करार का मामला नहीं होता। हमारे संबंध राजनीतिक जो होते हैं उन संबंधों का प्रश्न होता है। तो उस का भी उस में पुट है। सब बातों को मद्देनजर रखते हुए मैंने अपने आप्शनस को खुला रखते हुए इस बात पर चर्चा की है। अब वह और क्या करेंगे...

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : परसूट और परपेच्युटी क्लोज...

श्री पी० बी० नरसिंह राव : मैं यहीं कह रहा हूँ कि अमरीका के साथ हमारा करार हुआ था। उन्होंने रिप्रासेसिंग के बारे में बड़ी चर्चा की थी उन्होंने, कहा था कि रिप्रासेसिंग आप नहीं कर पायेंगे। फ्रांस ने कहा आप कर लीजिए, हमें कोई एतराज नहीं है। एक बात टल गयी। इस प्रकार जब हम ने फ्रांस से बात शुरू की तो एक जो जटिलता थी वह तो टल गयी। दूसरी कठिनाई यह आई कि 1993 के बाद क्या होगा। उस में हमारे जो राय है उस पर हम अटल हैं। उस को कहाँ तक वे मानेंगे, उस में कहाँ तक अपनी पॉजिसी में लचक लाते हुए रास्ता निकालेंगे, यह देखना है। उसी के बारे में चर्चा चल

रही है। इस में हम जल्दी क्यों करें, या इस के बारे में कोई नतीजा क्यों अभी से निकालें, यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता। वास्ता चलने दीजिए। हमारे सब अप्पान्स हमारे सामने हैं। आप माक्स का कहते हैं, वह भी मौजूद है। जो हम कर सकते हैं करेंगे। यह आश्वासन कई बार दिया जा चुका है इस सदन में।

SHRI SURENDRA MOHANTY: Sir, the position is rather intriguing, from the answers of the hon. Minister. Now, he says that the U.S. has declined and has suggested another country, namely, France, to supply enriched uranium, within the parameters of the earlier framework. May I know, what are the specific reasons for the refusal of the U.S. to supply and why, in view of its refusal, it has suggested another country to supply enriched uranium under the same conditions? Part (b) of my question is this. Now, the hon. Minister is self-complacent. He says, do not worry. May I know, how long the present stock of enriched uranium is going to last, in Tarapur, and what is the time bound programme for its replacement? Then, lastly, I would like to know...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have asked so many questions.

SHRI SURENDRA MOHANTY: Sir, I am concluding. As you can see from the question list, the question is longer than my supplementary.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, you may interrupt the Members only to the same extent as you interrupt the Minister. When the Minister is speaking, you stop others from interrupting. Now, when the hon. Member is asking questions, you go on interrupting him.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He cannot ask so many questions.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Who says he cannot? %|/

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He cannot. He can put only one question.

SHRI PILOO MODY: No.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No. It is not for you to say like that.

SHRI PILOO MODY: This has never been the precedent. Nobody has ever asked only one question.

SHRI SURENDRA MOHANTY: Sir, let me conclude my question.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hi? cannot be allowed to put so many questions,

SHRI PILOO MODY: He can. Mr. Mohanty, you ask as many questions as you like.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You are not in the Chair.

SHRI PILOO MODY: I would not sit in that Chair for all the tea ill China...

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You cannot dictate like that.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SURENDRA MOHANTY: Don't be arbitrary to me. Let me conclude my question.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If you take half-an-hour and ask so many questions.

SHRI SURENDRA MOHANTY: I have not taken half-an-hour. All right, I do not ask.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Mr. Minister, he has not asked any question. Do not answer. Why you are answering?

SHRI SITA RAM KESRI: Because you ask.

SHRI PILOO MODY: If you want to be a Minister, *chup baitto*.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, to the extent the hon. Member has asked the question, it is my duty to answer it. It is common knowledge that the U.S. expressed their inability to supply fuel to Tarapur as a result of their domestic legislation. We have very clearly told them that their domestic legislation cannot be retroactive. We said, a legislation which was passed in 1978 cannot have any effect on an agreement which was entered into in 1963; therefore, until 1993, no domestic legislation can have any adverse effect on the supplies. They said, they could not agree to this, because, their Congress would not agree to this. As a result, we reached a kind of stalemate. We stuck to our guns. They went on expressing their inability. So, it is during this discussion of how to get over this difficulty and save the Tarapur Agreement. I may in this connection remind the House that our stand has never been to break it unilaterally. Our stand has always been to keep it going because the Tarapur Agreement has certain elements which are advantageous to us and we would like to retain them right up to 1993 if we can. Since this was not found possible from the other side, they said, can you accept a substitute supplier subject to the same conditions and terms as 1963 Agreement? Now there was nothing on the face of this proposal to reject it. We wanted the supplies, we wanted no change in the terms and conditions. Both these aspects were being met by this new proposal. Therefore, we said, we are prepared to consider that. But we also took care to see that we did not talk only to the U.S. We also started talking to the French because we wanted to know whether the French are really in a position to step into the shoes of the U.S. as substitute suppliers subject to the same terms and conditions in the Agreement. We wanted to make it doubly sure. Now it is in this process that certain difficulties have come up. We hope that these difficulties will be got over.

SHRI SURENDRA MOHANTY:
What are those difficulties?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: The difficulties are that now the French seem

to think that they will not be able to supply according to the 1963 framework. They are trying to impose a condition which was not there, according to the original understanding, that is the condition of post 1993 position. We have told them that this is not a condition which is acceptable to us. We are not going to accept it. We stick to the 1963 framework as it is. Either it goes through or it does not go through. Either way we are not going to change our stand. This is the position.

With regard to actual supplies, I would like to say that that aspect has nothing to do with the Agreement because we want the Agreement, we want supplies as soon as possible, because we do want the fuel in order to keep the Tarapur plant going. That is why we have entered into all these new discussions in order to see whether supplies could be resumed as quickly as possible. I could not say how long the Tarapur plant would last on the existing amount of fuel. That detail is not with me.

SHRI PILOO MODY: If that detail is not available with you, what is the time span of your agreements? Can you have the agreements for ever?

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI:
Sir, the hon. Minister has explained in detail both the questions and the supplementaries and I only want to know from him on specific issues.

Now you yourself are giving a contradictory statement. At the outset you said that the Government gained one point in finding France ready to step into the shoes of the USA in view of the 1963 Agreement, and in the 1963 Agreement along with other safeguards the reprocessing right was there, as per the Indian Government's contention which is given in the Washington papers. When the Prime Minister visited the USA, that was the attitude of the Senators in the USA but we thought that when the Prime Minister herself has declared it, the view of the Government must be clear that they have every right of reprocessing. But again in the same breath you say

that France has objected to the reprocessing right, whether it is with the Indian Government or post 1993 or whatever it is. So, I want a categorical answer whether the reprocessing right has been accepted by the USA and also by France. That is my first point. Along with that I wanted to "know, as has been pointed out that the entire Tarapur plant is working at a capacity of 40 to 50 per cent, whether the statement of the Prime Minister that it will last up to 1984 is on the basis of the present capacity utilisation, or any increased capacity utilisation is envisaged. In this connection, I would like to know whether reprocessing will also be the right of the Government.

And the last point, Mr. Minister. . .
(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: How many points you want to put? This is a different question you are putting. If I say that, you will get agitated.

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: Why noi, sir?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, please.

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: Whether for the Tarapur the USSR is going to supply. . . (Interruptions)

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I Jiave not heard the third question.

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: I want to know. . . (Interruptions) Madam, why are you shouting unnecessarily. The Minister has asked me.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Tarapur is tickling her.

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: Whether in the recent discussions with the USSR, the USSR is going to supply enriched uranium for the Tarapur plant, I would like to know whether it is a fact.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Let me take the third question first. The

answer is in the negative. That is simple.

Then, this is also well known and this has been stated several times in both the Houses that in regard to the interpretation of the 1963 Agreement, in two respects there was a difference of opinion between us and the USA. Number 1, in regard to re-processing; number 2, in regard to what is to happen after 1993. When the switching over from the USA to the French was proposed and we discussed it with the French, the French told us that they had no difficulty in our reprocessing the fuel. That is why I said, one of the difficulties has been removed; one of the difficulties is out of the way. The other is still there. That is being discussed,* and we hope that we will find a satisfactory solution to this also. I will not say what will happen if this does not happen. If this does not happen, it is clear that the French participation is completely out of question.

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: So it is clear that we were taken for a ride.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: There is no question of taking us for a ride. We have to go into all aspects and all alternatives. If we are going to get fuel for Tarapur without changing our terms and conditions, this House will agree that it will be a very good solution, and if that solution comes, all of us will be happy. If that solution does not come, we have not lost anything; we would be where we had been and all our options will be open. All this has been explained to the House, several times before and I am only repeating what has been explained already.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: The hon. Minister has stated that in the negotiations the USA told us or our Government that there would be only a change of supplier and no change in conditions. Now Jie says that the French are insisting on new conditions. Does it not imply that the USA is prevailing and that they have taken us for a ride?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: The French are not imposing any new conditions. What they are in fact saying is,

if I may say so—it is very difficult to say every thing at one breath—that after 1993. One kind of safeguards will have to apply. We have told them that this is not our case. We do not agree with any such condition. This condition was sought to be imposed by the USA. Therefore we do not agree. We are not going to agree with the French either. This is the position, it is not a new condition. It was the same difference of opinion which we had with the USA, which, in the case of France, was first said that it would not be there; later on they seem to have had some kind of a second thought although we cannot say that they have finally decided to impose it irrevocably, or consist on it. All this has not happened. It is only at the stage of discussion. As I said, we still hope that this can be got over.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH; Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I need just a simple clarification, is it the Government of India's stand that the 1963 agreement from which the Government of United States has almost resiled is the agreement on which the Government of India stands? There is no legality left in that agreement of 1963. Despite that is it the Government's stand that we will stick to 1963? Just one more question. Is it also not a fact that we are already seeking nuclear fuel supplies from the French Government for the Kalpakkam fast breeder reactor—and we have been seeking it for the past six to eight years—and we haven't yet got the fuel? If, despite that, we move from the United States to France. I would like to understand from the Government why so, given the history of French non-supply?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: There is an agreement entered into in 1963. It has not been abrogated, it has not been varied, it has not been rescinded.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Are you standing by it—because you yourself said that it is as good as dead? It only 'remains to be buried'.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Our stand is that the agreement continues. That is a very clear stand.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH; Now it is clear.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO; Now the only point to be considered was whether in view of the difficulties that were, experiencing in getting fuel for Tarapur according to the agreement in performance of that agreement, we should agree to a via media which was suggested by the United States, namely, that other supplier who is not shackled with any local legislation of the kind which exists in the United States comes to our rescue and supplies fuel for Tarapur with all the other things remaining where they are, what they are. Naturally, if the French tomorrow clinch a deal with us.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: With our experience of French non-supply, if the United States says "Go to France," are you deciding for France?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: The question is not of comparative history. The history with the United States also is very clear. The question is how to get over a particular difficulty with the United States. Now, we don't go into the question of Kalpakkam because that would need another question. I am not competent to say what happened in Kalpakkam. It is a question of the United States, bringing in France and putting France in its own place. It is not a question of an independent agreement between India and France. Therefore, these are two different matters because the United States has agreed that France should come into the picture and France had agreed that it would come into the picture. Then it becomes an agreement between three countries and not two. Therefore, this is a different matter altogether. This has nothing to do with Kalpakkam or our experience with Kalpakkam about which, in any case, I am not able to give any details.

श्री जे० के० जैन : उपसभापति महोदय, कहावत है कि दूध का जला छाछ को फूंक-फूंक कर पीता है। अमेरिका ने भारत के साथ ब्लैक मेल किया तो क्या मंत्री महोदय सदन को

और सदन के माध्यम से देश को यह आश्वासन देंगे कि फ्रांस के साथ यूरेनियम ताने के बका किसी भी प्रकार के बंधन का समझौता नहीं किया जायेगा ? दूसरी बात यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि जो न्यूक्लियर फ्यूल फ्रांस भारत को देना चाहता है तो क्या मंत्री महोदय को इस बात का जानकारी है कि यह यूरेनियम साउथ अफ्रीका से फ्रांस आ रहा है और फ्रांस से हिन्दुस्तान आ रहा है ? एक चीज और मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि भारतवर्ष के अंदर जो माइन्स हैं यानी खनिज की खानें हैं

श्री पीलू मोदी : जैन साहब तो बहुत सी चीजें पूछ सकते हैं ।

SHRI J. K. JAIN: Sir, have you given permanent licence to Mr. Pilloo Mody to speak? Please put a check on him. He is trying to be more indisiplined.

श्री उप सभापति : आप उनको मन सुनिये ।

श्री जे. के. जैन : उपसभापति महोदय, कुछ ऐसे खनिज पदार्थों का काम करने वाले लोग हैं जो खनिज, पदार्थ निकालते हैं और बड़े बयोवृद्ध हैं ऐसे खनिज पदार्थ निकालने वाले लोग मिट्टी सूँध कर बता सकते हैं कि इसमें कौन-सा पदार्थ है । इसलिए मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या सरकार ने ऐसे खनिज पदार्थ निकालने वालों को निर्मात किया है... (व्यवधान) । श्रीमन् यह प्रश्न इसी से कनेक्ट है । विदेश मंत्रालय का भी इससे संबंध है (व्यवधान) ।

श्री उप सभापति : इसका जवाब नहीं दिया जा सकता है ।

श्री जे. के. जैन : मंत्री जी इस बात की सिफारिश कर सकते हैं कि माइन्स से वातचीत की जाय । क्या मंत्री महोदय इस बात की जानकारी दे सकते हैं ? मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस प्रकार के लोग जानकारी दे सकते हैं कि जिस जगह पर यूरेनियम हमारे देश में है । ये मेरे तीन प्रश्न हैं ।

श्री पी. बी. नरसिंह राव : पहला जो आश्वासन मानवीय सदस्य ने मांगा है वह आश्वासन दिया जा चुका है । फिर देना हो तो मैं उसे दोहराने के लिए तैयार हूँ । दूसरी बात यह है कि जो फ्यूल हमारे पास फ्रांस से आया, वह फ्रांस में कहां से आया, यह जानना जरा हमारे लिए मुश्किल है और इसका कोई संबंध भी नहीं है । हमारा जो करार है वह फ्रांस से होगा । फ्रांस कहां से लाएगा, साउथ अफ्रीका से लाएगा या दूसरी जगह से लाएगा, यह चीज सुसंगत नहीं है । जहां तक मैं भयभीत हूँ, उसके बारे में कोई जवाब नहीं दे सकता । तीसरी चीज माइन्स के सिलसिले में है उसका जवाब तो मेरे पास, स्वाभाविक है, नहीं होगा । वह दूसरे मंत्रालय से संबंधित है । अगर आप उनसे पूछ लें तो जवाब मिल जाएगा ।

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : उपसभापति महोदय, यह जो मंत्री हमारे श्री नरसिंह राव जी हैं, ये बड़े कम्पिटेन्ट मंत्री हैं, ऐसा मैं मानता हूँ । सरकार के अन्दर मैं बराबर उनकी तारीफ करता हूँ... (व्यवधान) । लेकिन मैं एक बात जानना चाहता हूँ कि सन् 1963 में भारत सरकार ने अमेरिका सरकार के साथ एक समझौता किया । यह समझौता देश को ऊँचा उठाने के लिए सजबूत बनाने के लिए किया गया । आपने एक प्लान बँटाया । मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या भारत सरकार

को इस बात की जानकारी थी या नहीं कि अमेरिका एक साम्राज्यवादी राष्ट्र है, बल्कि एक साम्राज्यवादी राष्ट्र ही नहीं है बल्कि पूंजीवादी राष्ट्र भी है और हम न तो पूंजीवादी राष्ट्र हैं और न साम्राज्यवादी राष्ट्र हैं। हमारा निहायत एक भूखा देश है जहां पर साधनों की कमी है। ऐसी हालत में आपने जो समझौता किया था उस वक्त क्या आपने इस बात का ध्यान रखा था कि अमेरिका कभी भी इस समझौते से मुकर जाएगा तो हम वैकल्पिक क्या इंतजाम करेंगे ? क्या इस समझौते की वजह से हमारा देश अमेरिका के जाल में नहीं फंस गया है ? क्या सरकार ने ऐसी स्थिति पैदा नहीं कर दी है कि आज सारा राष्ट्र इस मामले में संकट की स्थिति में है ? इसके साथ-साथ मैं यह आशाका भी जाहिर कर रहा हूँ कि जिस अमेरिका ने यह समझौता किया है उसी अमेरिका ने इस समझौते को भंग भी किया है। अब अमेरिका कह रहा है कि आपको फ्रांस माल देने के लिए तैयार है, आप फ्रांस से हमारे समझौते पर माल ले लीजिए। ऐसी स्थिति में क्या मंत्री जी को इस बात की जानकारी नहीं है कि फ्रांस ग्रेट ब्रिटेन और अमेरिका-ये तीनों एक समझौते के तहत हैं और उस समझौते के तहत होने के नाते अमेरिका फ्रांस से कह रहा है कि भारत को उससे माल लेना चाहिए। क्या फ्रांस भी इस समझौते से बाद में नहीं मुकर जाएगा ? क्योंकि फ्रांस . . .

श्री उपसभापति : क्योंकि मत करिये। इसका जवाब हो गया है।

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : तो क्या आइन्दा भारत सरकार इस तरह का कोई प्लान्ट विधान के पूर्व इस मामले में सतर्क रहेगी कि साम्राज्यवादी राष्ट्रों और पूंजीवादी राष्ट्रों से जब हम कोई भी करार करे तो करार ऐसे न करें जिससे मुल्क हमारा फंस जाय।

श्री पी० बी० नरसिंह राव : श्रीमन् यह तो एक अजीबों-गरीब बात हम मुन रहे हैं कि जब एक राष्ट्र दूसरे राष्ट्र से करार करने लगे तो उससे पहले इस बात की जांच कर ली जाय कि वह साम्राज्यवादी, पूंजीवादी, समाजवादी या कोई भी वादी तो नहीं है। राष्ट्रों के बीच में जो समझौते होते हैं, राष्ट्रों के बीच में जो करार होते हैं वह इस पर आधारित नहीं होते। सन् 1963 में जो हमारा करार हुआ वह 15 सालों तक बराबर चलता रहा, उसमें कोई कोताई नहीं हुई, उसमें कोई भंग नहीं हुआ। 1978 में उनकी कांग्रेस ने अभी संसद ने एक कानून पास किया। उस कानून के सिलसिले में हमारा यह कहना है कि उस कानून को हमारे करार पर, 1963 वाले करार पर आप लागू नहीं कर सकते। उनका कहना है कि हम उसको लागू करने पर मजबूर हैं, इसलिये कि हमारी पार्लियामेंट हमारी कांग्रेस नहीं मानती, इसलिये हमारी लाचारी है।

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : यह जानबूझकर कर किया गया . . . (व्यवधान) . . .

श्री पी० बी० नरसिंह राव : सुनिये। यह जानबूझकर भारत के लिये नहीं किया। जरा इसको समझने की हम कोशिश करें। यह एन० पी० टी० वर्ग रह जो कानून आया वह बाद में आया था। वह भारत के लिये नहीं आया था। उस कानून के तहत यह हुआ है। हमारा जो करार है उसको वह पूरी तरह से अमल नहीं कर सकते हैं, कार्यान्वित नहीं कर सकते हैं, यह अपनी कठिनाई वे बताते हैं। अब हमारे सामने एक विकल्प यह हो जाता है कि हम यह उनसे कहें कि आप अगर नहीं कर सकते हैं तो हम इसको तोड़ देंगे। यह एक विकल्प है हमारे सामने। अब भी है। इस बीच में उन्होंने हमसे कहा कि क्या हम इस करार को बचा सकते हैं, इसको टूटने से बचा सकते हैं।

हमने कहा बचा सकते हैं तो बतलाइये कि कैसे बचा सकते हैं। यह हमारी चर्चा चलती रही। इस दौरान में उन्होंने यह कहा कि हमें जो कठिनाई है अपने कानून से, फ्रांस को ऐसी कोई कठिनाई नहीं है। हम फ्रांस से कहते हैं कि आप सज्जार्ड करे। आप लेने के लिये तैयार हैं क्या? हमने कहा कि करार की जो शर्तें हैं उनमें अगर कोई तब्दीली नहीं होती है तो हमको कोई ऐतराज नहीं होना चाहिए वहां से लेने में। यह वास्तविकता है और असल में इस बारे में ही चर्चा आज चल रही है।

SHRI PILOO MODY: While the Minister's concern may be for sophisticated diplomacy, my concern is that Tarapur should be supplied with fuel. First of all, to accept at face value that a talk between India and the United States, between our Prime Minister and the American President, can commit the French to a particular line of action, is, I think, somewhat presumptuous. And if you were persuaded to believe that the French had agreed under the persuasion of the United States to reader supplies to us under the terms of our original agreement, then I think you were perhaps persuaded out of a sense of anxiety to arrive at something. And for you to declare it prior to having it checked with the French was, I think, stopping a little out of line. This is my attitude to it. The more important thing, therefore, is the supply of fuel to Tarapur. I think by now you are aware, because you have said it so many times in so many words, that the Americans are not going to perform their part of the agreement. It has been made amply clear to you. They had made it amply clear to the previous Government, and they have made it amply clear to you. Therefore, to go on maintaining that we would like to see that this agreement continues, that we would like to see that it is enforced, is, in my opinion, somewhat childish. Childish in the sense that it is to say "No, I want it; we are right; we must get it," when the other fellow says "No way; you are not going to get it". The fact still remains that you have not got an endless time-frame to

ensure supplies to Tarapur. I think by now you have become aware of the fact that under the terms of the 1963 agreement, there is almost no place in the world where you will be able to get this fuel; in my opinion, not even from the Soviet Union. That in an opinion. You know much more about it. Therefore, in consistency with our own stand, to which I have no grudge that you have taken a stand like that. You should take adequate steps now, here and now, to arrange for supplies indigenously by doing whatever is necessary—I do not want to go into it—instead of going on delaying it and harping on the agreement and lulling us all into a sense of false security that supplies will be effected.

Therefore, I want to know from the Government, not necessary from only the Minister of External Affairs, I want to know from the Government whether they are seriously applying their mind to effect supplies for Tarapur either indigenously or have they made other arrangements or have they very good reasons to believe that somebody will effect supplies to them, or whether they are going on negotiating from country to country in an endless time-frame?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: It may be recalled that in January 1980 while we were told by the United States that they have domestic difficulties, even while they were telling us so, they had released two shipments out of which one had come. Three months prior to that, in this very Parliament, there was a lot of pressure brought to bear on the Government to say that since they are not going to supply any fuel, you have to abrogate the agreement. During that period I had occasion to tell Parliament that the time has not yet come to abrogate the agreement unilaterally. After that, within three months, we got one shipment. The other shipment did not come. And we got into some difficulties. We anticipated that these difficulties would recur. There was no way out of these difficulties so long as the American side said that they are bound by their subsequent legislation with which we do not agree. We do not agree that the legislation should be retroactive. So, that was

the difference of opinion. And we told them that we will have no other option but to abrogate it unless you find a way of saving it. This is what we have been telling them. There is an implication in a unilateral abrogation of an agreement by one side. We do not wish to get into the consequences of a unilateral abrogation without exhausting the possibilities of saving the agreement. It was in that connection that this new proposal came. Now, this new proposal is not going to end in an endless search for suppliers one country after another. This has come now. It appears that France first agreed to supply fuel, maybe, at the instance of the United States, subject to the same conditions and terms as in 1964 agreement. If they have an after thought and if they go back on it, as I have just said, all our options would be open and I would like to assure the honourable that this is not going to be a wild-goose chase, this is not going to be an endless search for alternative suppliers.

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: Do you think that France is such a country which will understand and appreciate everything?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is enough. Let us go to the next question.

Capacity of Major Ports for Handling Traffic

*83. SHRI SUKOMAL SEN; Will the Minister of SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT be pleased to state:

(a) what is the capacity of each major port for handling traffic port wise;

(b) what steps have been taken to enhance the capacity, port-wise;

(c) what is the Sixth Plan outlay for the ports, port-wise; and

(d) what is the expenditure incurred during the first two years—port wise, of the Sixth Five Year Plan period?

THE MINISTER OF SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT (SHRI C. M. STEPHEN); (a) and (b) A statement marked Statement-I containing the information port-wise is laid on the Table of the Sabha. [See Appendix CXXIV, Annexure No. 22].

(c) and (d) A statement marked Statement—II containing the information portwise is laid on the Table of the Sabha. (See below)

Statement-II

Sixth Plan outlay and Expenditure for Ports during first two years of Plan

Name of the Port	Sixth Plan outlay (1980-85) (Rs. in crores)	Plan Expenditure (Rs. in lakh)	
		1980-81	1981-82
Calcutta/Haldia	83.00	1648.30	548.69
Bombay	68.78	206.74	269.06
Madras	54.18	330.95	1352.33
Visakhapatnam	71.33	701.36	1036.83
Cochin	54.22	381.57	1221.53
Kandla	46.42	429.94	1038.96
Mormugao	25.05	237.01	353.79
Paradip	60.87	1009.86	298.00
Tuticorin	25.57	645.45	607.91
New Mangalore	31.84	495.76	995.41
Nhava Sheva	30.00	2.96	23.53
TOTAL	551.20	6689.92	9051.04