

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

I. Recent visit of Prime Minister to United States of America and Japan

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now we go to the next item. Minister of External Affairs will make a statement. (Interruptions).-

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: On a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: One by one so that I can hear some of the leaders.

SHRI HARKISHAN SINGH SURJEET (Punjab): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I want to make a submission that an unheard of procedure is being adopted. Whereas it was the Prime Minister who visited U.S.A. and it is she who should make a statement in the house so that questions can be asked and some answers can be got in clarification, it is the External Affairs Minister, who neither accompanied her nor would he be able to make the position clear on clarification. It is a very wrong procedure that is being adopted and even for the dignity of the House, she should have herself come and made the statement. This is not to show any disrespect to the External Affairs Minister, Or to anybody, or the subject matter. We want to lodge our protest against the procedure. It is in protest against this, so that the earlier procedures are adhered to, the dignity of the House is maintained, we are taken into confidence in this matter and we are allowed to ask important questions, that we are walking out from the House and we do not want to take part in these proceedings, irrespective of the opinion we hold on the visit. (Interruptions)

(At this stage some Hon. Members left the Chamber)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now this matter has already been raised and the Leader of the House has ex-

plained the position and the precedents in this matter. So there is no point of order now because of the precedents that the Leader of the House has already cited.

THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE (SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE): Sir, I would like to make one submission. The hon. Members will recall that they themselves wanted to have a statement on the visit of the Prime Minister to the U.S.A. (Interruptions)...

SHRI SHIVA CHANDRA JHA (Bihar): And by her.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: So, it is not that the Government *suo motu* decided to make this statement. In response to the demand of hon. Members of this House, I informed them that the Minister of External Affairs will make a statement on the visit of the Prime Minister to the U.S.A. In the past it had been done. Sir, if you recollect, even when discussion was taking place between the Prime Minister and President Brezhnev during the visit of the latter to India, I myself informed the House, as the Leader of the House, some of the aspects of the discussion. In the past it had happened.... (Interruptions) ...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Have some patience.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Sir, I I can't help the agitation of my hon. friend, Mr. Bhattacharya. In the past it had happened.

So far as clarification is concerned, perhaps hon. Members will agree with me that this clarification is sought and replied to by way of convention and custom. As it is today, so far as the Rules of the Rajya Sabha are concerned, they are clearly indicative that when a statement is made by a Minister, no clarification will be done. But we have accepted this practice as a method of convention. It would be unfair and undesirable on the part of the hon. Members

sitting opposite, who demanded a statement from the Government on the visit of the Prime Minister to the U.S.A., when the Foreign Minister is about to make the statement, that they will take some plea and they will walk out. If they want to make a political issue out of it, they are free to do so but on my part I would like to place it on record that it is nothing improper, it is perfectly in order, it meets the situation fully. In the past it was done and—I am repeating it—this statement is coming not *suo motu* from the Government but in response to the demand made by the Opposition. ... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI (Madhya Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the Leader of the House is very correct that in this particular case it was the House and, particularly, the Opposition, that had demanded that after this important visit by the Prime Minister to the States it is in the fitness of things that she comes to the House and makes a statement. Then, day before yesterday it was announced in the House that the External Affairs Minister would be making a statement on this. We reacted immediately and we pointed out that there is some slight impropriety in this. In this particular case it is not like Mr. Brezhnev and the Prime Minister meeting here and the Commerce Minister or the Leader of the House telling us something about it. But the statement is to refer to the visit of the Prime Minister to the United States. I used the word "intriguing" that day because in this case the External Affairs Minister was to accompany her to the States. In fact, he had planned to visit even Trinidad and Tobago along with this visit. He had, in fact, conferred with the Prime Minister of Guyana at the Non-aligned Meet and said that he would visit their country but suddenly we were told that the External Affairs Minister was not accompanying her and then,

after her return from there, instead of the Prime Minister coming to the House and apprising the House as to what exactly happened, we are suddenly told that the External Affairs Minister would do it. Even after that, day before yesterday, the Opposition unanimously demanded from the Government that it reconsiders its stand in fairness to the House, in all propriety, as a matter of etiquette, because this pertains to the Prime Minister's visit and so let the Prime Minister come and inform the House. We once again are confronted with the same situation and we are not trying to make any politics out of it, we are not trying to make any plea out of it and, therefore, the moment the Leader of the House stood up I requested my colleagues to sit and let us hear what he has to say. After listening to him I came to the conclusion that the reasonable request of the Opposition is being deliberately flouted—deliberately. And this I regard as contrary to conventions, contrary to practice, contrary to customs. Therefore, I find myself unable, without meaning any disrespect to the person of the External Affairs Minister, to accept it lamely and so we of the Opposition decide to walk out of this House when the statement is being made. (*Interruptions*) And, furthermore, it is not condescending to the Opposition if we are allowed to make enquiries, if we - are allowed to put questions after the statement has been made. I am aware of that rule; and despite that rule, it has been the invariable practice of this House that whenever a Minister makes a statement, all Members of the House belonging to the Opposition, belonging to the ruling party, are given an opportunity to ask questions. The fact that this is there, this is the practice, this is not an obligation to the House, any condescendence on the basis of which this kind of stand can be taken. Therefore, I am sorry we are not able to participate. (*Interruptions*,)

(At this stage, some hon. Members left the Chamber)

SHRI SHRIDHAR WASUDEO DHABE (Maharashtra): Mr. Deputy Chairman why should we not extend the sitting of the House when the Lok Sabha is doing so, so that the Prime Minister can make the statement? (Interruptions) In view the stand of Government we also walk out.

(At this stage some hon. Members left the Chamber)

SHRI B. D. KHOBRA (Maharashtra): When the Prime Minister had gone to the United States..... (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That point has been ruled out. The Leader has made the position clear. The Minister will make the statement. (Interruptions) If you do not want to hear..... (Interruptions)

SHRI B. D. KHOBRA: We are also going out.

(At this stage, some hon. Members left the Chamber)

श्री शिव बन्धु शास्त्री : ... (व्यवधान) ...
यह सदन का अपमान है (व्यवधान)
.... सदन की गरिमा का खून कर रहे
हैं : (व्यवधान)

(At this stage, the hon. Member left the Chamber)

श्री राजेश्वर सिंह (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
श्रीमान् (व्यवधान) आप ज्यादाती
कर रहे हैं (व्यवधान) आप
हमारी भावनाओं को दर्दना चाहते
हैं (व्यवधान) मेरी बात
सुनिये (व्यवधान)

(At this stage, the hon. Member left the Chamber)

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO): As the House is aware, the Prime Minister paid an official visit to the United States from 27th July, 1982 to 4th August, 1982 at the invitation of President Ronald Reagan. On the way back she broke

journey in Tokyo for a day at the invitation of the Prime Minister of Japan, Mr. Zenko Suzuki.

The Prime Minister's talks with President Reagan covered a wide range of subjects and were marked by warmth and openness. They were followed by a working lunch with the Secretary of State, Mr. George Shultz. She also had very cordial informal meetings with members of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives and the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. All these meetings were useful in the furtherance of the object of the visit, namely putting forward India's basic policies, obtaining a better insight into the policies and concerns of the United States, and generating greater friendship and understanding between our two countries.

Reference was made by the U.S. President to India's Commitment to democracy and non-alignment. The Prime Minister emphasised the role played by our economic planning— with its emphasis on self reliant growth with social justice—in the strengthening of democracy. The discussion of the international scene included an interchange of assessments of the situation in Afghanistan and West Asia, with special reference to Lebanon. They were agreed that solutions could be found only through political negotiations. President Reagan's attention was drawn to India's concern at the increased flow of arms into our region and to our opposition to foreign interference of any kind. It was pointed out in particular that India's misgivings over the acquisition of sophisticated weapons by Pakistan arose out of past experience of such weapons having been used by Pakistan against our country.

The role of international financial institutions in promoting economic development was also discussed. Concessional assistance is needed by developing countries, like ours to keep the debt servicing burdens low

[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao]

and to finance investments in areas of social development. These are areas where private capital would not be forthcoming. India had made good use of the I.D.A. funds, and a reduction of these funds from the previously assured levels would upset our planned programmes. While noting these points, the President mentioned the constraints of the American budget.

With reference to our economic policy, the Prime Minister pointed out that in a developing country like ours it was necessary for the Government to regulate the allocation of resources and channel investments to priority areas. This policy had taken our economy forward towards self-reliance, especially in agriculture, and given it a stronger production base and a more diversified industrial structure. The very advance had enabled us to relax some regulations and liberalize some procedures, without however detracting from the basic framework of our policy. Setting out the role of our public sector from which the private sector had also benefited, we indicated that private foreign investment would be accepted as a vehicle of transfer of technology and promoter of exports. An exchange of visits to look further into the possibilities of economic cooperation has been envisaged.

Among other measures agreed upon for strengthening bilateral relations were;

(i) The establishment of a high-level joint committee to expand cooperation in Science and Technology;

(ii) a decision to intensify cultural exchanges, focussing on 1983-84, when there would be a special exhibition of Indian art; and

(iii) the institution of a Nehru Studies programme.

Honourable Members would have seen reports that we were able to resolve the long standing controversy over supply of nuclear fuel by the United States for the Tarapur Atomic Power Station. India and the United States have agreed that fuel for Tarapur will be received from France under IAEA safeguards with the framework of the 1963 INDO-US agreement, which continues valid till 1993. As regards reprocessing the spent fuel supplied for Tarapur, we have reiterated our right to start reprocessing when we deem it necessary. The Americans, I may add, have a different point of view. But this difference of opinion on this matter is not something new. What is important is that even though this difference remains, the major point of friction has been removed while safeguarding our interests and our principles and ensuring the full and unimpeded functioning of the Tarapur plant.

Apart from the talks with Governmental leaders and elected representatives, the Prime Minister addressed a meeting organised by the Foreign Policy Association and the Asia Society in cooperation with the Far East America Council of Commerce and Industry and the India Chamber of Commerce of America. She also addressed a meeting of the American Association for the advancement of Science and met various important personalities of the academic and cultural world and of the Press. The spontaneous welcome given by the people of the United States was impressive. Particular mention should be made of the meetings with Indian scientists and businessmen, who expressed great keenness to participate in the further technological development of the country.

While in New York, the Prime Minister exchanged views with the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, on the International situation. The Secretary-General expressed deep concern over the growing tensions in the world and

felt that the United Nations should be given greater authority to take steps to prevent the outbreak of hostilities.

The Prime Minister's visit to the United States at the invitation of the American President took place after an interval of 11 years and was essentially a visit of goodwill and friendship. It served this purpose effectively and constructively. As is well known, we and the United States have our differences and our perceptions vary on certain issues. However, our two peoples share a common dedication to democracy and its values. It is also a fact that India's development programme has, over the years, received assistance and cooperation from the U.S. Therefore, the objective during the Prime Minister's talks with President Reagan and his colleagues was, while acknowledging frankly our areas of disagreement, to try to build upon areas of agreement in such a way as to develop a more friendly and cooperative relationship.

In a world of great diversities, it is obvious that tolerance of differing views points and understanding of each other's perceptions could alone constitute the broad basis for amicable relations and cooperation among nations. As the Prime Minister pointed out during her visit, the development of our friendship with one state does not and ought not to exclude or be at the expense of friendly relations with another. This policy of ours has been clearly enunciated time and again. We judge each issue on its merits taking into account the interests of our nation and of world peace. There were several indications during this visit that this policy is being recognised, and with India's role as a factor of stability and motivation in the broader international context. We hope that Indo-US relations will be informed by this new spirit hereafter.

The Prime Minister's halt in Japan was originally in transit, but the in-945 RS—14.

invitation of Prime Minister, Suzuki enabled her to stop overnight. A keen desire to strengthen bilateral cooperation and work together for preserving peace and ensuring a better life for all characterised the conversations with Prime Minister Suzuki. The Prime Minister was glad to find a good appreciation in Japan of our need for developmental finance.

The Prime Minister has invited President Ronald Reagan and Mrs. Nancy Reagan, as also Vice-President George Bush of the United States to visit India. She also renewed the invitation to the Prime Minister of Japan to visit this country. Sir, having made this Statement, I would like to add on a point of personal explanation, that for the last 21 years I have not accompanied the Prime Minister on any official visit. I really fail to understand why this particular visit should be considered as anything special. It is only in the minds of those who perhaps want to make an issue out of it. I have not accompanied her on any official visit except where we had our own conferences, except where we had separate meetings of our own heads of missions; even in those instances I joined her but I did not accompany her. This is the style of our Prime Minister's functioning. There is nothing new in this. And then I would like to clarify in regard to my visits to Trinidad and Tobago that they have nothing to do with the present visit of the Prime Minister and there was no intention on my part to visit Trinidad and Tobago while I was accompanying the Prime Minister to the United States. Those visits still stand, those invitations still stand and I am going to make those visits as early as possible.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, some honourable Members wanted to ask clarifications. Some of them are not here...

SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN (Tamil Nadu): Sir, I gave my name...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: AH right.'

SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN: Sir, I must at the outset congratulate Mr. Narasimha Rao for making this statement. I for one do not believe in questioning the propriety of the Prime Minister in taking or not taking whomsoever she wants. This is not for any person to question. It is the prerogative of the Prime Minister and I do not question that. By and large, I must say that by this visit after about eleven years Mrs. Gandhi, who in the recent past has been visiting the various capitals of the world has definitely contributed to the growth and betterment of the image of India, I think I am joined by millions of our countrymen when I say I am proud that Mrs. Gandhi is making her presence felt among the working leaders. Definitely by this she has boosted the image of India and I congratulate her for this.

Coming to the Statement itself, there are three points which I would like to observe. Mrs. Gandhi has reiterated during her visit that India and USA share a common dedication to democracy. These are the two biggest democracies of the world, and I am very glad to see that. The other more important thing which must, I think, set at rest the very many doubts raised, is she said that friendship with the USA does not mean enmity with the USSR. This has been very clearly stated—that development of our friendship with one State does not and ought not to exclude or be at the expense of friendly relations with any other. This brand of India's continued non-alignment, made by great leaders like Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru has been kept up.

There are two points on which most of the Opposition friends, who are here and who are not here, would like to seek some clarification. One is about the controversial Tarapur Agreement. You know that there were a lot of hitches. Of course, the problem has

been resolved, but it has been resolved in a very circuitous way. It is coming through France. May we know from the External Affairs Minister why this was so and why a direct agreement with the USA was not possible? *

The other thing which is not so encouraging is what is stated in paragraph 4 of the Minister's statement. This was about the need for assistance by developing countries. When we asked for development assistance which is being put to good use by us, the U.S. President's reply was a negative one. The statement says:

While noting these points, the President mentioned the constraint of the American budget.

It actually means 'no'. I would like to know whether the External Affairs Minister, will, during his other meetings with lesser dignitaries than the President, press for this assistance so that we may be able to get assistance from IDA and other international financial institutions.

SHRI GULAM MOHT-UD-DIN SHAWL (Jammu and Kashmir) Madam Prime Minister deserves congratulations for her successful visit to the United States of America. What have to ask is not a question. What, want is an affirmation from the Government on our stand vis-a-vis Kashmir. Kashmir is a problem in the sense that Pakistan has illegally occupied a portion of that State and this to our mind is an injustice to us, and for its vacation the Simla Agreement is there. It is a bilateral agreement between Pakistan and India and the portion which is in their illegal occupation must be vacated. How to do it Through negotiations. I was listening to the All India Radio which relate the Press Conference of Madam Prime Minister. There was a question Madam, how are you going to solve the Kashmir problem? And the answer was: "We have no Kashmir problem. To my mind, as far as the meaning is that is concerned, it is clear. But can give rise to misconception and

misgivings. If there is no Kashmir problem, what is the Simla Agreement for?" We have here a proviso to article 253 which says: "Provided that after the commencement of the

Constitution----- no decision about the disposition of the Jammu and Kashmir shall be made by the Government of India without the consent of the Government of that State". I am sure the Government of India does not intend to make any disposition whatsoever with regard to our State because that is part and parcel of the Union. But as far as this reply is concerned, namely, that we have no Kashmir problem, kindly elaborate it and make it clear that as far as that illegal occupation is concerned that has to be done away with through negotiations,

SWHET GHULAM RASOOL MATTO (Jammu and Kashmir): We congratulate the Prime Minister on her very successful visit. Reports through T.V. and the radio have given a clear indication of the success of her tour.

The hon. Minister has mentioned about Tarapur reprocessing. I would request him to inform us of one thing. We say that we have the right to reprocess it. If America comes in our way of implementing our Borsammp, what will be the stance of the Indian Government? Secondly, the Prime Minister had raised the question of arming of this region by the United States. What is the reaction of the United States on this is not clear.

RHET TARTSHNA CHANDRA PANT (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, the Prime Minister has handled this visit with her usual sure touch in foreign affairs. Within the limitation of differing perception of the TJA and Inliq to which the Foreign Minister has referred, the visit has been very successful and satisfactory to the personal level. I think she has struck a very good rapport with the President. And, Sir, I think there is a better appreciation of India's position on various matters, amongst the people of the United States and this itself is a very great gain which

needs to be followed up, because, apart from the Governments which get committed to certain positions because of certain compulsions the people of the countries matter a great deal in a democracy and I think that her visit has strengthened the understanding of the people about the policies of this country which I consider, as I said, as a great gain.

Sir, the specific point for clarification to which I would like to refer is the Tarapur agreement. Now, there are two aspects: One is that under the Tarapur agreement, the spare parts for Tarapur were also supplied under the 1963 agreement with the USA. So, will the USA continue to supply the spare parts or will the spare parts now be supplied by France? This is one question. The other question is that the French Foreign Minister, when he was here in Delhi, I think, said in a Press conference that the agreement with France would have to be renegotiated. And, Sir, when his attention was drawn to the agreement between the United States and India, he said that it was a matter between these two countries and it did not concern France. Now, would this mean that the entire agreement would have to be renegotiated with France and, in particular, on the question of reprocessing the spent fuel, would it mean that we are free to process the spent fuel which is already there in Tarapur through the use of which is the enriched uranium supplied by the USA? Or does it mean that the question of reprocessing would have to be taken up afresh with France for the fuel to be now supplied by France? Would that be a correct interpretation? Or are we free to reprocess the spent fuel which will emerge after France supplies the fuel?

Then, Sir, the other thing is about the IATTA satellite. When we reprocess the fuel and take out Plutonium and use it in our installations, our own installations, would the safe.

euclidean, follow and follow to these installations so or would the safeguards on be applicable to Tarapur

once the spent fuel is reprocessed and we are free to use the plutonium as we like? These are the specific questions that I would like to ask.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Minister.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, as expected, the questions raised mainly pertain to the Tarapur arrangement. I do not call it an agreement as yet because there is an agreement already and this is only an arrangement, and how this will be dovetailed into the old, the existing agreement is a matter for the exports to consider and I am sure that is going to be done in the next few days or weeks.

Sir, I would like to inform the House that on this very question all the necessary clarifications have been given already by the Prime Minister herself when she intervened in the other House and also by the Minister of State for Science and Technology, Shri C. P. N. Singh. However, I would like to recapitulate what has been said in my own way.

Sir, I would recall a statement made by me on this question at a time when the very same controversies were looming large and several Members of the House, of both the Houses, expressed doubts as to what is going to happen to the agreement. I shall take the Members back to the earlier months of 1981 and, even before that, the last quarter of 1980, when there was a demand from several Members of both the Houses that since there has been a delay in the shipments of uranium, we should unilaterally abrogate the agreement and start reprocessing the spent fuel. And the entire responsibility would, therefore, lie on the United States because they have defaulted in performing their part of the Agreement. It was at that time that we were

faced with this question as to what we have to do. One way was to abrogate it unilaterally as was being demanded by several Members of Parliament and, may be several others. The other was obviously to pin them down to continue shipments so that a point is reached where, if they are not able to continue the shipment any more, the responsibility for abrogation lies squarely on them, and not on us, because this is not just a matter of one agreement, one single isolated agreement between the two countries. This is a matter which is impinging on the relations of the two countries generally. Therefore, Sir, as I had stated at that time in Parliament referring to the delays, I would like to read a few lines, and I quote, Sir:

"As the delays in fuel supplies were causing difficulties in running the power stations, we had formally asked the United States Government for assurances for uninterrupted fuel supplies during the lifetime 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, 1981. During these discussions. ."

And this is the crucial part.

"...During these discussions, the Indian side indicated that they would like the 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 all these discussions which are now under discussion of the Government."

Sir, the discussions did not centre round just one alternative, but one of the alternatives, and that was termination. So we had always kept our options open. We could terminate the Agreement by mutual consent if there is no other way, but before doing that, before proceeding to do that, we should exhaust all possible alternatives of keeping the Agreement alive till 1993. So the option was there from the very beginning and there was no closed mind in regard to these options on either side. These discussions went on and on, and there were several alternatives, which were indicated, which were examined, and not found to be feasible. Some of them were found to be feasible. The alternative of substituting another supplier, keeping all the other ingredients of the Agreement intact as before, was considered—a little before the Prime Minister visited the United States. It was there under discussion, under examination, for some time. But it was more or less brought to a conclusive stage before the visit took place. Now, the position is this. The agreement continues until 1993. But if there had been no switch of the supplier from one to the other, there would be no supplies from the United States. Therefore, initially and throughout, our approach had been not to abrogate it, not to let it be abrogated by force of circumstances and to salvage the agreement as far as possible, a wish which was reciprocated from the other side.

If this had not been there, an abrogation would have taken place. Since this desire was there to keep the agreement going until its originally intended life was over, this had to be thought of. In fact, there were some other suggestions. There was also a suggestion that their 1978 legislation could perhaps be amended in order to save this agreement or agreements like this. It was done in some other cases. So, at some point of time, it was pointed out that if in other cases it was done, why not in this case? Several alternatives were discussed informally. Finally, this was considered to be mutually convenient. Therefore, the first point which needs to be noted is that nothing has changed except the supplier. But when we substitute one supplier for another, there has to be a whole set of arrangements legally binding and all consequential matters have to be tied up. That tying up has not started yet. The whole process is going to start within the next few days.

The Foreign Minister of France came here. Before coming here, he had made some statement in Korea which had given rise to certain doubts. But, I am glad to say, after coming here, he was quite categorical in saying that France was not going to impose any additional conditions, either for reprocessing or for supply or for anything else. That is what we wanted from him. I do not think he could have said anything more than what he said in order to satisfy us that France would not try to impose any new conditions when we enter into this new arrangement, including in regard to reprocessing. As I have made it very clear in the statement which I have just read and in the ensuing debate, there is a difference of opinion with the U.S. On that. About reprocessing we say that it is our property. We can do what we like with this. In re-

gard to what happens after 1993, our view is very clear. It is that after 1993 nothing remains. There is no question of pursuit. There is no question of this stuff being subjected to anything. Therefore, after 1993 there is nothing left to pursue. The whole agreement just lapses and, therefore, the obligations, the duties or whatever is envisaged in the agreement would lapse automatically. This is our view. The U.S. view is slightly different or may be very different from this. But these views have been expressed. These discussions have taken place. These differences have persisted for years and years. There is nothing new in that. But while these differences are being sorted out or while they are not being sorted out, the Tarapur Station has suffered. This was the most important thing that we had to see because there has been a commitment to Parliament on behalf of the Government that we shall see that the Tarapur Station functions. This commitment has been given to both the Houses time and again. Therefore, this was a matter which presented some amount of urgency. And in this respect, there is nothing that has changed to the disadvantage of India. We have taken care to see that the conditions under which the new supplies would be made are in no way more onerous or less advantageous to India than the conditions contained in the 1963 Agreement. This is the position, Sir. And, therefore, there is no question of this new arrangement leading us to any new difficulties or new complications or, new conditions being imposed on us.

Sir, one point was raised about the Prime Minister's reply in regard to Kashmir. When he said that we see no problem, she was quite right in the sense that Kashmir is not a problem. It is not a problem.

It is not a dispute. There is a situation there which is quite clearly untenable because Pakistan has illegally occupied part of Kashmir. So, what all needs to be done logically is to vacate that occupation. That is all there is to it. There is thus no dispute; there is no problem. So, when she said 'there is no problem', she was summing up in one short sentence a lot that could be said about Kashmir. And since no supplementaries were put at the press conference—perhaps, they did not know what else to ask after this answer—the questioning on Kashmir ended with that sentence. We all know what our stand on Kashmir is and is going to be. So, there is no need for us to read anything at variance with our stand in what the Prime Minister has said. In a very short sentence she has summed up the whole thing. Therefore, I think, that part of it was well taken care of.

About the IAEA safeguards also, I would like to say that the safeguards are the safeguards contained in the 1963 agreement. Later, the full-scale or full-scope safeguards or the safeguards insisted by the London Club, all these are not to apply to this and we are quite clear on that and we are sure that the other two parties also are quite clear on that. And the fourth party is the IAEA itself. Therefore, there is no ambiguity on any of these points.

SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN:
What about Aid?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO:
Sir, about Aid, we know that the American Administration for reasons of their own have taken rather rigid attitude towards third world countries, towards developing countries. While in the case of India they agree that the aid or the loans given to India have been well utilised and the Development in India has been nothing short of spectacular, they have expressed

their own inability to step up their own contribution and, in fact, in the process of saying so, they have also said that if the West; European countries want to increase or some other countries want to increase, they, viz the U.S. would not come in the way. Therefore, they have made a distinction between a principle and their own inability. In principle, what we could understand from what they have said is that they are not against stepping up of assistance to India and developing countries for the sake of development but they find it rather difficult to join in this aid because of their own budgetary constraints. Now, we shall take them on their word. We shall continue to talk to them. We shall also continue to request other countries to persuade them. This is the only way one can adopt, and therefore, there is nothing for us to feel disappointed about. Naturally, if they had come out positively, it would have been much better. But there is no reason for us to think that this is the result of anything but their own difficulty. Let us take them at their word and, therefore, we should rest content. There is no need of further speculation on this. We have a long way to go. There are other countries which are prepared to play the role of "aid-givers; they are prepared to play a greater role in the development of the developing countries, with particular reference to India. We know all these details and we are pursuing on these lines and I am sure that the difficulty which has been pointed out by President Reagan will be confined only to his own administration and his internal situation, financial situation. We need not really seek to extend that to cover any other country or other countries in the developed world. This, I think, should be the reasonable interpretation which we should accept and, therefore, there is nothing for us to comment at the moment

except that we should continue with our efforts. Thank you.

**Proposal for delinking of
management Of Haldia Dock
Complex from that of Calcutta
Port**

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT (SHRI SITA RAM KESRI): Sir, Haldia Dock Complex is a part of Calcutta Port and is administered, controlled and managed by the Calcutta Port Trust Board in accordance with the Major Port Trusts Act, 1963. There is a Deputy Chairman at Haldia to whom certain financial and administrative powers have been delegated.

In 1975, a two-man Committee, which examined the working and finances of Calcutta Port had, inter-alia, recommended that the Calcutta Port Trust should continue to administer and manage the Haldia Dock Complex for about 3-4 years after it is commissioned. Since the Haldia Dock Complex was commissioned in April, 1977, it was considered appropriate to review the present arrangement on the basis of the experience gained.

Accordingly, a 3 member Committee was constituted in 1981 under the Chairmanship of the Development Adviser (Ports) to examine the likely effects and implications of the Haldia Dock Complex being constituted as a separate Port, or being continued as a part of the Calcutta Port.

The Committee has observed that the functioning of the Haldia Dock Complex as a part of Calcutta Port has, to some extent, adversely affected the development, growth and operations of the Haldia Dock Complex. The Committee has recommended that in order to improve the administrative and operational performance of the Haldia Dock Complex, it should be enabled to function.