

Motion for election to the Spices Board

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE , MINISTRY OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY (SHRI JAIRAM RAMESH): Sir, I move the following Motion:

"That in pursuance of Clause (b) of Sub-section (3) of Section 3 of the Spices Board Act, 1986 (No. 10 of 1986) read with Rules 4 (1) (b) and 5 (1) of the Spices Board Rules, 1987, this House do proceed to elect in such manner as the Chairman may direct, one Member from among the Members of the House, to be a member of the Spices Board."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

Motion for election to the Rubber Board

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, MINISTRY OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY (SHRI JAIRAM RAMESH): Sir I move the following Motion:

"That in pursuance of Clause (e) of Sub-section (3) of Section 4 of the Rubber Act, 1947 (24 of 1947) read with Sub-rule (1) of Rule 4 of the Rubber Rules, 1955, this House do proceed to elect in such manner as the Chairman may direct, one Member from among the Members of the House, to be a member of the Rubber Board.

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

SHORT DURATION DISCUSSION

Indo-U.S. Nuclear Deal

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA (Jharkhand): Sir, I am grateful to you for fixing a date, though belatedly, for a discussion on this very important issue of national concern. I am also grateful to you, Sir, for having permitted me to initiate this discussion.

Sir, as is well-known, our nuclear programme, like our foreign policy, has always been based on a national consensus and, even today, the issue that we are debating in this House is an issue of national importance. I propose to approach this task not in a partisan manner, but in as objective

a manner, as fair a manner as possible and clearly I expect that those who will respond from the Government side will also keep this in mind and respond to our concerns taking this as an issue today of supreme national importance. Sir, India's nuclear programme, as we are all aware, has been fashioned by our leaders ever since this country became independent. It was Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the first Prime Minister, and Homi Bhabha, the eminent nuclear scientist, who prepared the three-stage nuclear programme for India. The first was pressurised heavy water reactors; the second part of it was the fast breeder reactor programme; and the third phase is the phase of the thorium programme. And, in all these, our scientists have played a stellar role. The entire technology of the pressurised heavy water reactors, the entire technology of the fast-breeder programme and the entire technology, which is in the process of development in this country, regarding the thorium programme, are based on the research carried out by our scientists. There has been no foreign participation; we have not borrowed technology from anyone. The programme of India is an entirely indigenous programme, and it is a matter of great pride and satisfaction for all of us that it is the scientific capability of Indian scientists which has provided this glory, this satisfaction, to India.

[MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

Now, therefore, to talk in the context of this deal of India's nuclear isolation, of the fact that we have been denied technology from abroad, of the fact that we have been handicapped because of the denial regime, I think, is not acceptable to us. We have never been dependent on foreign technology, and let us resolve that we will give the fullest opportunity to our scientists so that this country does not come to depend on foreign technology as far as the nuclear programme is concerned. We are also aware that we have never accepted discrimination. We did not sign the NPT because we were against the discrimination which was built into the Treaty; we raised our voice against that discrimination; we have raised our voice all along in international fora. We are also aware that the 1974 tests, which were conducted, when Shrimati Indira Gandhi was the Prime Minister, has led to the creation and the setting up of an entire international nuclear architecture most of which is based on controlling India, keeping India under check. The impetus for that architecture was provided as a result of the 1974 tests, when we defied

the world and went for tests. Similarly, when we went for nuclear tests in 1998, we faced a barrage of opposition; we faced the U.S. sanctions in the economic field; we faced sanctions from the various countries of the world. It appeared for a moment as if India was under siege. But resolutely, determinedly and with courage, we faced those challenges, and I am glad to say that we overcame those challenges without submitting before any foreign power or anyone else. Then, our hon. Prime Minister went to the U.S. thirteen months ago in July of last year, and he came back with a nuclear deal. I would like to state, on behalf of my party, that we oppose the Accord of 18th July, 2005 and I have no hesitation in telling this house today that we had opposed this deal from the beginning. We have never been in any doubt about the deleterious impact of this deal and, therefore, we opposed this deal. So, let it not be said that we have changed from our position then, or, ever. Sir, we opposed the deal because we believed that it was meant to cap India's nuclear weapons programme, our strategic programme. Sir, what was the significance of the May, 1998 tests, apart from the fact that we declared to the world that we were now a nuclear weapon State, that we came out of the closet? Sir, to my mind, the most important significance of the 1998 tests was that we demonstrated to the rest of the world that India believed in the concept of strategic autonomy. And, as far as our national security was concerned, we were determined to maintain this at all costs. We have kept that space for ourselves. There is no way in which that space, Sir, can be taken or can be surrendered to anyone else. We also defined our nuclear doctrine in very clear, unambiguous terms. The world today, Sir, is not in doubt about the nuclear doctrine of India, and I am happy to say, I am very satisfied that this Government also has accepted the nuclear doctrine that we enunciated and left behind. What are the three pillar, Sir, of our nuclear doctrine? The first is, 'no-first-use'. It is only a country like India that can come out with a concept like 'no-first-use'. Then, the second was, we will not use our nuclear weapons against non-nuclear weapon State. This was also a contribution that India has made to the global lexicon of the nuclear debate that we shall not use our nuclear weapons against non-nuclear weapon States. And the third part, Sir, of our doctrine was that in case someone did attack us, dared to attack us with nuclear weapons, then, in retaliation, we will use our nuclear weapons, and inflict unacceptable damage on that enemy; unacceptable damage on that enemy. And, this is how the concept of the credible minimum deterrent,

Sir, was born. Why have we been talking about the credible minimum deterrent? We have been talking about this because the credibility of our deterrent must be maintained at all costs, at all times. This is something that India cannot surrender to anyone, and this is a judgement which India will make, from time to time, and nobody else will make it on behalf of India. Why did we oppose the July 18 Agreement, Sir? Because we felt that it was going to perpetuate that discrimination against which this country, cutting across political party line, through all the Governments had opposed internationally all along. Why did we oppose it, Sir? Because the cost of separation — we were told — between civilian and military will be enormous. And, I am sorry to say, Sir, that though the Separation Plan was shared by the Prime Minister with this House in March and May, the cost of that separation is something which has not been mentioned ever in this House. The Parliament of India has not been taken into confidence with regard to the cost of this separation. We also opposed it, Sir, because from the very next day, not one week, not one month, not two months later, from the very next day, i.e., 19th of July, 2005, diametrically differing interpretations of the Deal started appearing from the US side. You will recall, Sir, that on the debate which took place in this House, last year, on the 4th August, 2005, our Deputy Leader, Shrimati Sushma Swaraj had participated in that debate. At that time, she quoted the US Deputy Secretary of State, Nicholas Burns who had said within 24 hours of the Deal, and I quote, "What was significant about yesterday's Agreement is that India committed itself in public very specifically to a series of actions to which it had not previously committed itself." Actions which will, in effect, in a *de facto* sense, has India agreeing to the same measures that most of the NPT States have agreed to." She quoted this and she ended her speech by reminding the Prime Minister that the deal that he had entered into would lead to complex interpretations, will lead to different interpretations and today, Sir, as we discuss this deal thirteen months down the line, we are aware of all the complexities which have entered this deal.

Sir, I would also like to take the House into confidence, through you and make, with great humility but with all the force at my command, that the basic reason for this deal that our Government would like us to believe, namely, that it would provide India with nuclear energy and energy security, is fundamentally flawed. It is fundamentally flawed. How can India have energy security on the strength of imported reactors and

imported fuel? Would we not be critically dependent on import for that energy security? Has any country based its security concerns or its security considerations on imports from third countries which are uncertain?

Sir, analysts have compared the cost of producing electricity from various sources. Coal-based thermal power plants cost Rs. 4.5 crores per MW; combined cycle gas turbine running on gas or naphtha cost Rs. 3 crores per MW; indigenously built nuclear reactor costs about Rs. 7-8 crores per MW; and imported nuclear reactors costs Rs. 10 crores per MW; This is the most expensive form of energy for which we are bargaining.

So, at this rate, Sir, 20,000 MWs of additional power by 2020 would need an investment of 2 lakh crores of rupees by this country. Two lakh crores in the next fourteen years! And we are worried about the rising costs of petroleum crude and gas! What about uranium which we propose to import? Uranium prices, Sir, have gone up by 70 per cent in the last one year from US\$ 21 to US\$ 36 per pound. I would like to quote Dr. A. Gopalakrishnan, who in a recent article talked about the energy mix which every country goes for; and, he has said that at any given time, the best qualitative combination of electricity from various sources is something which we should decide about. Indigenous coal, imported coal, hydro-power generation, from national water systems, hydro-power from neighbouring countries, indigenous nuclear programme, based on three-stage programme — wind, solar and biomass resources. Then he goes on to say, "Even with a renowned economist as Prime Minister as Chairman, his trusted follower as Deputy Chairman, and energy economist as Member-Energy, the Planning Commission has failed totally in initiating such studies or basing their policy pronouncements on the basis of such wisdom. The report of the Expert Committee on Integrated Energy Policy, put out by the Planning Commission in December, 2005, is full of generalities and platitudes for the future and does not address the energy mix or the role of indigenous versus imported energy technologies. So, on what basis is the Prime Minister expounding on the need for 30,000 or 40,000 MWs of nuclear power as an essential element for ensuring energy? Why not a figure like 15,000 MWs or 70,000 MWs? Instead, the Prime Minister's over-enthusiasm for nuclear reactors of the imported kind can only be explained as a deliberated attempt to spread out a welcome mat for foreign nuclear firms to sell their wares in India and to

make the questionable case for promoting the nuclear deal." These are not my words, Sir, these are the words of an eminent scientist that this country has produced. Sir, when this country was developing, it has not developed as much as it has developed today, when we were leading what the eminent thinker Deen Dayal Upadhyayji described as a ship to mouth existence, that the ships loaded with the wheat of PL-480 used to come to our ports and then used to go straight to the mouths of the hungry millions. When we led a ship to mouth existence, India did not bend, no Government at that time bent no Government accepted anything which was inconsistent with the dignity and the sovereignty of this country. Sir, I will refer only in brief, in passing that the PMO, Sir, came out with a backgrounder and I suppose any document which comes out of the Prime Minister's Office is owned or will be owned by the Prime Minister. In that document, Sir, on the 29th July last year, at place after place, after place, after place it has been said in response to imaginary questions that India is going to be recognised as a nuclear weapon State, India will be recognised as a nuclear weapon State. If many of us, Sir, in this country believed in the assertions of the Prime Minister's Office, in that background, are we to be blamed for misunderstanding the nature of the deal? But I would also hasten to add that at the same time the American officials including their Secretaries before the media, in their speeches before thinktanks and in the evidence and testimony before the Congressional Committees repeatedly said that our understanding was flawed; they had a completely different understanding of the nuclear deal and its basic objectives, and the divergence between the Indian position and the US position kept on widening day after day. Sir, we are reading in the media and elsewhere that we will not accept departures from the July 18, 2005 agreement or the statement that the Prime Minister agreed to in Washington. Sir, my case is, forget about departures in the future, the departures have already taken place from 18th July till today as we debate it on the 17th of August. The departures have taken place. And what are the departures, Sir? We have already accepted a watertight separation plan, which does not apply to nuclear weapons States. We are all aware of the fact that the nuclear States have the flexibility to transfer their facilities from civilian to military whenever national security considerations so demand. Therefore, the question of our being able to do so has been quashed for all times to come. We have accepted safeguards agreement in perpetuity. The safeguards agreement that we

are negotiating or we shall negotiate and finalise with the International Atomic Energy Agency is going to bind India in perpetuity. No nuclear weapon State has ever accepted any obligation in perpetuity. The IAEA inspection, Sir, will also naturally be in perpetuity and reciprocity today, the biggest pillar on which July 18 agreement stood—reciprocity, non-discrimination—that stands on its head today. There is no reciprocity and I will demonstrate and others will demonstrate how. Sir, we have been told that if we are entering into obligations in perpetuity, then their obligation is also in perpetuity to supply us fuel. There is a point, which has been repeatedly made. I would like to refer here to the letter which the hon. Leader of the Opposition had written to the Prime Minister in which he had said that during the hearing of the Senate Foreign Relation Committee on April 5, 2006—this is a very, very important date—Senator Feingold put precisely this question to the Secretary of State, Condoleezza Rice. I quote, "You said that the safeguards will be permanent but India emphasised that these permanent safeguards would be predicated on an uninterrupted supply of fuel for civilian reactors. Now, does that not tie our hands down the road?" This was the question of Senator Feingold and what did Secretary Condoleezza Rice reply. She said and I quote, "We have been very clear with the Indians, that the permanence of the safeguards is permanence of the safeguards." This is testimony of Secretary Rice before their Senate Foreign Relations Committee. It is not a piece of paper floating in the winds of Washington. "We have been very clear with the Indians that the permanence of the safeguards is permanence of the safeguards without condition. In fact, we reserve the right. Should India test as it had agreed not to or should India in any way violate the IAEA safeguards agreement which it would be adhering that the deal from our point of view would at that point be off." This is what she had told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Sir, we were told that as a result of the 18th July deal we would get supply for Tarapur. In a separate communication, which was sent to the Prime Minister, because in the last session I had given a notice of breach of privilege, that communication, Sir, was sent to the Prime Minister. A reply was sent to the Rajya Sabha Secretariat and I was favoured with a copy of that reply. I had said clearly that the Americans opposed the supply of low enriched Uranium which came to us from Russia for Tarapur. They opposed,—much less supporting the supply—they actually opposed the

supply. Where is the 18th July, 2005 Agreement? Sir, finally, we have given a separation plan to the Americans and we believe it has been accepted by them. We have made much of the fact, Sir, that our fast breeder programme is not going to be placed under safeguards. But, you read that document. The document which the Prime Minister shared with this House and you will find that immediately after we have said that sentence that we were not going to put our Kalpakkam reactor, a fast breeder before safeguards, we have gone on to say that in future all civilians fast breeder reactors will be put under safeguards. Isn't this a contradiction? The fast breeder programme is Indian technology. Why are we putting it to intrusive IAEA inspection through a safeguard agreement and through an additional protocol? This is an explanation which the Government will have to provide to this House. Sir, the first Waiver Bill which was submitted by the US President to the US Congress in March this year was a three and a half page document. That has swollen to and expanded to a 23 and a half page document, both before the Senate and the House. Why, Sir? It is because a number of conditionalities had been added by both the Committees, both the Houses before they agreed to look at or pass this. What is the reality check, Sir, at this stage? The reality check is, the House of Representatives of the US Congress has passed the Bill. We have the text of the Bill passed by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The Senate, we understand, may consider it in September and pass it. Then, the two Houses will go into conference to reconcile differences, if any, and then, Sir, the US Congress will finally adopt the Bill. Now, we know the House Bill. We know the Senate Bill. The House Bill has been further strengthened in the course of passage because one amendment by one of the Members has been accepted which makes the conditionalities more onerous. The Senate Bill, Sir, from all experience that we have is going to go through the same process and the final product is going to be far more onerous for us than we imagine even at this time. If we want to delude ourselves, if the Government wants to delude itself, if the House wants to delude itself, if the whole nation wants to delude itself, then, therefore, the end product of the US Legislative process is something that we should wait for. Then, I will say, Sir, that that will be not only a futile wait, it will be a dangerous wait because our House, Sir, our Parliament will only meet in November again, towards the third week of November. By then, the deal might be done and we will be left with nothing but *fait accompli*. So, Sir, whatever caution, whatever precaution has to be

taken has to be taken now, unless we decide to bury our head in the sand in the face of the approaching, gathering storm. Sir, today, everyone seems to be protesting. Our scientists have come out; most eminent nuclear scientists of this country have come up with a statement two days ago. Defence analysts are protesting, pointing out the pitfalls. Other knowledgeable people are protesting. Why, Sir? Why are they protesting? It is because we feel that assurances given by the Prime Minister to this House, to the other House, to the people of this country had been completely broken by the Americans. Today, if the Prime Minister of India is at the North Pole, the Americans are in the South Pole.

This is the difference in the position. I will quickly recount, because I would like to leave enough time for my friend, Mr. Arun Shourie. The Indo-US nuclear deal is about non-proliferation. It is not about nuclear energy. The separation of our facilities between civilian and military has been done at the behest of the US. And, the Congress of the US is going to sit in judgement over that separation plan as and when it is submitted to them. May I ask, what was the need for announcing the closure by 2010 of the Cyrus Experimental Reactor? What was the need to shift the fuel core of Apsara from its present location? Why have you done it, if there is no pressure? Sir, the US, I have already said, actually, opposed the supply of fuel by Russia to Tarapore. The sequencing of various steps, I have said already, stands on its side. India is not going to be recognised as a Nuclear-Weapon State. The deal is going to bind us in perpetuity. There is no exit clause. We are required to identify and declare a date by which we will be willing to stop production of fissile material for nuclear weapons, even unilateral, forget about the FMCT. And, one of the determinations, which the US President is required to make, in writing, before the US Congress is this. What does it say? It says, 'The Report shall also include—(1) An estimate of the previous year of the amount of uranium mined in India; (2) The amount of such uranium that has likely been used or allocated for the production of nuclear explosive devices; (3) The rate of production of (i) fissile material for nuclear explosive devices; and (ii) nuclear explosive devices; and, (4) An analysis as to whether imported uranium has affected such rate of production of nuclear devices.' This is the kind of intrusive, detailed requirement of the US Congress. Not once, but, every year, before the 31st of January or, by the 31st of January. It is annually. It puts a ban in perpetuity on nuclear testing, which goes even beyond the CTBT. And, I am sure, my other colleagues will explain how it

goes beyond the CTBT. the deal is entirely one-sided. As I have already mentioned, even the supply of fuel in perpetuity is not assured. It does not assure full civilian nuclear cooperation.

Sir, what are the symbols of our sovereignty which are housed here in this Parliament? To my mind, the most important symbols of our sovereignty are: (1) Our Foreign Policy, the autonomy of our Foreign Policy; and (2) The autonomy of our nuclear programme. And, today, these two symbols of our sovereignty are under threat. I would like to appeal humbly to the House, through you, that knowing the stage that has been reached, shall we swallow this; shall we submit ourselves to this? The Parliament of India does not enjoy the powers of the US Congress, we are all aware of this. But still the Parliament of India is the seat of our sovereignty. Does the Parliament of India not have the need even to be briefed properly? Who has briefed the Parliament of India? Has any Parliamentary Committee been briefed about this deal? Sir, whatever information we have got, has been information coming to us from the US. Very surprising! Our Government has been very, very miserly in sharing information with this House or with the people of our country. It cannot be anybody's case that those who happen to sit in the Government today have all the wisdom and that this Parliament has none of it. And, I would like to quote here what Henry Hyde, who is the Chairman of the House Committee, had to say when he put up this Bill before the Committee. He said, "Over the course of the past several months, the Committee had held five hearings. Benefited from the counsel of a scores of experts, across the country, had numerous briefings by administration of issues and conducted extensive research, notably with the assistance of the Congressional Research Service." We go to our library; we go to our reference service; and we get extracts from newspapers. That is what a Member of Parliament of India gets. No assistance; no briefing, nothing. This is how the Parliament of India has been treated so far. We have had a couple of discussions. But the point is: is that enough? Mr. Henry Hyde goes on to say, "This new Bill is based upon the Administration's original proposal, but has been amended with several significant changes, the most prominent of which concerns the role of the Congress. HR5682, which refers to the Bill, changes the process by which the Congress will consider and pass judgement, *consider and pass judgement*, on a negotiated agreement regarding civil nuclear cooperation with India. To further strengthen the role of the Congress, a number of

reporting requirements and other consultative measures have been added. A Sense of Congress—'sense of Parliament' is a dirty expression, let us not use it—but a Sense of the Congress section has been added that lays out conditions regarding when Civil Nuclear Cooperation with other countries may be in order. In addition, there is a Statement of Policy section that clarified the US policy in a number of areas, in particular the Nuclear Supplies Group, the interpretation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, and a series of goals regarding India and South Asia." Sir, as far as we are concerned—in the Bharatiya Janata Party, in the NDA—we are not against building strategic and friendly ties with the US, let me make it very clear. But such ties must rest on the firm foundation of sovereign, equality, reciprocity and mutual respect. They cannot be built on the shaky foundations of a patron client relationship. The manner in which we voted in the IAEA—not once, but twice—in the case of Iran confirms this suspicion. Now, the Bill calls upon the US President, and I quote, "To secure India's full and active participation in US efforts to dissuade, isolate and, if necessary, sanction and contain Iran for its efforts to acquire Weapons of Mass Destruction." This is the clarion call of the US Congress to the Indian Government, so that when the US says, "Go to war with Iran", we will go to war with Iran; US says, "Send your forces to Iran", we will send our forces to Iran, because our responsibility is to contain and sanction Iran against Weapons of Mass Destruction. Why are the 'non-proliferation Ayotollahs' in Washington quite? They have not criticised the two Bills. They have not criticised because the Congress has met all their requirements. All that they wanted this deal to have has been incorporated in the two Bills. It is unprecedented even in the US history that a legislation has been adopted which targets just one country, and that one country is India. India must not accept these crippling conditionalities. Therefore, what is our bottom line? Our bottom line is: (a) It must involve full Civil Nuclear Cooperation with India; (b) it must accord India the same rights and benefits as other nuclear weapons States; (c) under it, India will undertake only such obligations as adopted by other nuclear weapon States; (d) at any stage, Indian actions will only be reciprocal; and (e) India will accept international inspections on its civil facilities or any other binding obligation only after, as the Prime Minister had said on July, 2005—I quote him—"all restrictions on India have been lifted". In addition, we demand that any Civil Nuclear Cooperation Agreement must provide for uninterrupted and unconditional supply of

nuclear fuel to India; a permanent waiver of relevant US domestic laws without annual review and certification; IAEA inspections of our civil nuclear facilities only as long as the deal holds; Complete freedom to India's strategic and foreign policy options; and an explicitly stated right of India to terminate the agreement on national security grounds. Sir, these are the basic benchmarks to which we must adhere. If these are not adhered to, if these are violated, I have no hesitation in saying, on behalf of the party that I represent, in this House, that such a deal cannot bind India in future.

I have already said that some of our nuclear scientists have spoken against the deal. We read in the media that the Prime Minister was going to call them, meet with them. Then, we read that he is not going to call them. He is consulting the in-house scientific talent that he has. We must heed their advice. Their advice should not be taken lightly. We have been demanding in this House that we must have a sense of Indian Parliament Resolution. That is something that we have been demanding across party lines, across party lines. We must have such a resolution. And, I will go a step forward today and say that we must have a Joint Parliamentary Committee of the two Houses of Parliament which shall oversee the implementation of the Resolution. Nothing less than that is going to satisfy the Parliament of India. The time has come for the Parliament of India to assert itself. We cannot remain mere mute spectators in the light of the developments which have taken place across the seven seas. India cannot bend to the will of the US Congress. And, it is this Parliament which has to assert that India will not bend. Under no circumstances shall India bend to the will of Members of the US Congress. And, that is the message which should go loud and clear from this debate in this House, and let struggle and let the US be warned that the Parliament of India thinks otherwise and let them stop in their tracks and stop putting those humiliating crippling conditionalities on a country like India. Thank you very much, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Anand Sharma.

DR. BIMAL JALAN (Nominated): May I seek a clarification on a factual point, Sir?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No. no. You can seek later on when you speak.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRIANAND SHARMA): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the debate

which this House is having on Indo-US Civil Nuclear Cooperation is not being watched with great interest by the people of this country, but this debate has attracted the attention even outside the shores of India.

A debate in Parliament on any issue which is of critical import for the country is the very essence of democracy. Parliament has a right, I agree with Shri Yashwant Sinha, to be kept informed. Parliament has a right to discuss and Parliament has a right to advice. That is our constitutional system. In a system of Parliamentary democracy, it is the Parliament which is supreme and it is the Government which is accountable to Parliament. Sir, recalling the words of Shri Yashwant Sinha—I agree that we have not gained sudden wisdom by coming to this side and, surely, you have also not gained new wisdom by going to the other side—unfortunately, did not demonstrate when he was sitting here. Sir, the UPA Government has a very transparent approach. It respects the institution of Parliament and nothing more can underscore this but the fact that in the last 13 months, it is the third time this august House is discussing this subject. It was discussed last July. It was discussed in March, and it is being discussed again in August. What more proof of respect for Parliament can there be? What Yashwant Sinha has said, I wanted to deal with it towards the end, but it prompts me to say that when it is alleged that they were not getting any information, the Parliament was being kept out, and, sometimes, some meagre information was given, the rest they got from outside sources. It is this Government and this Prime Minister who have shown utmost respect to the institution of Parliament by giving all information, by laying ...*(Interruptions)*.. No interruptions, it is a gentleman's opinion.

श्री उपसभापति: प्लीज। जब वे सुन रहे हैं, तो आप भी सुनिए न?

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: May I ask my friend Yashwant Sinha.
...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री रत्नारायण पाणि (उड़ीसा): सर, ...*(व्यवधान)*...

श्री उपसभापति: पाणि जी, देखिए। यह ठीक नहीं है। आपके लीडर्स भी बोल रहे हैं कि
No Interruptions.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Why I say so is this. As Shri Yashwant Sinha was saying this is a national issue. I also do not want to give an impression that it is a partisan issue. Such decision, such policies have

to be backed by a broad national consensus. There has to be an understanding within the country and within this Parliament. But if what was said here was a genuine concern about the institution of Parliament, I would have respected my dear friend, Yashwant Sinha. He had the privilege of serving as a Cabinet Minister, both as a Foreign Minister and as a Finance Minister. At that time, for almost one year there were talks between the then Foreign Minister, the hon. Leader of Opposition, and Strobe Talbott. Sir, let alone this country; this Parliament was never informed and Parliament was kept in dark. Had you protested and demanded that they should inform the country what they were discussing, then, I would have saluted you. But you did not. That was political expediency. Today you have presented a very powerful case and painted a gloomy picture as if India's independence, India's integrity and sovereignty were being sold and compromised. What twisted logics you have given! We had to wait for Strobe Talbott to write a book to get to know what was conveyed. The offer to sign the CTBT was made without informing the people of the country and without informing the Parliament. I do not know how many of the Cabinet Ministers and whether the Cabinet Committee on Security, at that time, was kept in picture when these offers were made. Shri Yashwant Sinha was also talking about the detonation, the U.S. laws, the proposed legislation and that if any detonation takes place or if India were to detonate, the nuclear cooperation would cease. I will deal with that in great detail later. I do intend to do that. But, let me share with this House something which is very interesting. Shri Yashwant Sinha was referring to the May, 1988 Test. Subsequent to that was the unilateral voluntary moratorium declared by the then NDA Government, Sir. Because you were talking about the great achievement, how you protected India's independence, how you braved the sanctions, but you did not bow, thereby implying that this Prime Minister, this Government is bending, bowing and compromising. Nothing could be farther from truth. Sir, I will take you to September, 1998, the UN General Assembly Session where the then hon. Prime Minister, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayeeji, while addressing the UN General Assembly said, and I quote from his speech: "Accordingly, after concluding this limited testing programme, India announced a voluntary moratorium on further underground nuclear test explosions. We conveyed our willingness to move forward to a *de jure* formalisation of this obligation. In announcing the moratorium, India has already accepted the basic obligation of the CTBT." This is the statement of the then

Prime Minister, and I have great regards for him. Yashwant Sinha was there in the Cabinet Committee on Security. As I said earlier, you would have risen in my admiration Yashwantji had you questioned Atal Bihari Vajpayeeji for making this statement without informing Parliament, without taking the Parliament into confidence. And, today, we are listening about Parliament being ignored when the third debate in 13 months is taking place. I am appalled.

श्री यशवंत सिन्हा: सर, वह डाँटे नहीं, तो ठीक चलेगा। ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री उपसभापति: नहीं, ऐसे बोलने की उनकी आदत है। ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री आनन्द शर्मा: सर, अपनी-अपनी आदत है। ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री अमर सिंह (उत्तर प्रदेश): हाँ, डाँटना तो नहीं चाहिए। आनन्द जी, कृपया डाँटिए मत।

श्री उपसभापति: नहीं, वह प्यार से डाँटेंगे। ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री यशवंत सिन्हा: प्यार से डाँटिए। ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री एस.एस. अहलुवालिया (झारखंड): हिमाचली स्कूल मास्टर मत बनिए। ... (व्यवधान)...

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Sir, as I said, this Government has a transparent approach. What we are saying is, the larger issue before this House is that why we are having this discussion. It is clear that it is a follow up of the July 18, understanding on full civilian nuclear cooperation between India and the United States of America. The ongoing legislative process in the United States Congress which was referred to by Yashwant Sinha, which is one of the reciprocal conditions contained in the July 18 statement and understanding; and also, Sir, our negotiations with the International Atomic Energy Agency for India-specific safeguards; there is criticism, there are misgivings, and there are concerns and doubts. One, because the ongoing legislative process and what is being stated by a Senator and by a Member of the House of Representatives are included or suggested for inclusion in what is merely an exhortation or a statement or policy. An impression is sought to be created that these are the new conditions which have been imposed; India has been shackled and the Government has accepted the shifting of the goalposts and new obligations and conditions. Sir, for the benefit of all the hon. Members, let me say that the United States of America and India, we both are democracies, two of the largest democracies in this world today. We

have a different system. The legislative process in the US Congress is different from the legislative process in the Indian Parliament. There, the House of Representatives has its own version of the Bill—the title also is different, the objective would be the same—and the Senate has its own version. The House of Representatives has passed the Bill, the Senate is yet to pass; and then the process of conciliation will be there. That is the requirement of the US Congress which will empower the US Administration and the President with the waiver authority India-specific, permitting them to enter into a bilateral agreement on civilian-nuclear energy cooperation. Sir, Senate is yet to pass it. After that, the conciliation is to take place. Then, we will look at what is the final product. And, then, the Agreement under 123 will be there. The question is, why is this legislative process? It is because as per the July 18 understanding, certain reciprocal steps had to be taken. The US had to amend its laws, because their law does not permit cooperation with the country which does not have fullscope safeguards, that is the nuclear facilities are not under safeguards, a country which is outside the NPT, a country which has detonated, a country which has a dedicated military nuclear programme. What is envisaged there, Sir, is a full civilian nuclear cooperation accepting the fact that India has a dedicated military nuclear programme. That is the implicit recognition when we talk of the separation plan to which India has committed itself, separating the civilian and the nuclear facilities and retaining the integrity, the autonomy of our strategic nuclear programme.

Sir, after the waiver authority is there, the US Administration and the President then will be empowered. That would be the time of an agreement for this bilateral cooperation. Regarding the 123 Agreement, Yashwant Sinha knows everything. Sir our Prime Minister, our Government have made a categorical assurance that whatever agreement India will sign will be with the templates of July 18. In this House two weeks ago, Sir, the Prime Minister had made it abundantly clear that India will be accept any additional obligation or conditionally. And, if I may say so, if the concerns are there—the concerns that were being referred to by the nuclear establishment, by other people—those are *bona fide* concerns. Concerns our hon. Prime Minister also has; and the Prime Minister has unambiguously and firmly conveyed those concerns even to the US President, Mr. Bush, in St. Petersburg very recently, and our officials in their meetings have also made it abundantly clear what India's position is, Sir, we can be faulted if we had conveyed even remotely an

1.00 P.M.

impression that India is prepared to accept any additional condition or obligation. We have not. We can be faulted, Sir, if we have inked an agreement where India's interests have been compromised but we have not. No legislation of any Parliament, with due respect, is binding on this country. India will be bound only by the agreement which India, as a sovereign nation State, will sign. Sir, we have reached a stage almost after six decades where India is acknowledged as a country with a advanced nuclear technology, a country whose scientists have made India proud by mastering the fuel cycle. Our scientists who worked under very difficult circumstances in a regime of denial and discrimination which is rightly termed as 'nuclear apartheid'. Sir, the quest for nuclear technology started soon after our Independence. It was the vision of Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru and also the vision of Dr. Homi Bhabha, the founding father of India's nuclear programme. As for the three-stage nuclear programme, which was being referred to, Sir, we retain our commitment; we reiterate our commitment to the same three-stage nuclear programme, which Shri Yashwant ji was referring to, where, in the first stage, it is the heavy water reactors with the natural Uranium—just to add to that, because you forgot that part—and after that, the Plutonium which comes out of that goes into the fast breeder reactors, and the third stage is that of the breeder reactors with the Uranium 233 when Thorium will be used.

Sir, from whatever little that I know—this is not a subject which I have studied, but I have tried to be educated by our able officials and by the nuclear scientists about what we are doing ...*(Interruption)*... Sir, I am only trying to share what I have learnt with the august House. Surely, if there are great nuclear scientists—I don't claim to be one—they are welcome to their observations.

Sir, I can only say that India is fully committed to this programme. This was the vision of Bhabha and Nehru, as I said earlier. I have also mentioned that our nuclear scientists and establishments worked under the most difficult circumstances; they have done the country proud and we respect them. If they have concerns, we shall address those concerns. But the same nuclear scientists, that Shri Yaswant Sinha was referring to, in their statement, have welcomed the July 18th Statement and termed it as a historic opportunity. Do not go in for selective quotes; please, go by the full text. They have not cast any aspersion on the integrity of this Government. They have not cast any doubt on the intentions of this Government.

Sir, it was in 1974 that Pokharan-I took place. That led to the imposition of sanctions, denial of technology, denial of fuel and denial of reactors. But, Pokharan-I happened when Shrimati Indira Gandhi was the Prime Minister of this country. That was in 1974. Shri Yaswant Sinha, 1998 came 24 years later! That was a courage of Shrimati Indira Gandhi, the commitment of the Congress Party, to India's independent foreign policy and to develop the nuclear technology. We saw the Pokharan-I. Let us not try to deny the facts of history.

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH (Andhra Pradesh): You must continue that ...*(Interruptions)*...

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI (Uttar Pradesh): This should have been continued ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No interruptions, please. No, interruptions, please.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Sir, I would like to say one thing here. Much has been said by Shri Yashwant Sinha; he has raised specific points and said that we have compromised and shackled our strategic programme. He has referred to the Separation Plan. He has referred to the safeguards arrangement, thereby giving an impression that this Government is not mindful to India's needs. India's sovereignty and India's independent decision-making.

Sir, the Separation Plan, which was tabled in this House, which was referred to, is with regard to the separation of the civilian facilities from the military nuclear facilities. So, the Separation Plan itself is a reiteration and a very loud proclamation that India has a dedicated nuclear programme, military nuclear programme, which India wants to separate and keep out from any inspection, from any safeguards arrangement, so that our scientists can continue on this strategic programme uninterrupted. Sir, the Separation Plan has been worked out not by the Prime Minister, not by the Government, but it has been worked out by our nuclear establishments and those scientists who oversee the strategy. They know what they are doing. It is only fourteen of our reactors which are on the civilian list and the eight remain dedicated to the Military Nuclear Programme with the upstream and down-stream linking facilities. The minimum credible deterrence has been maintained. ...*(Interruptions)*...

[17 August, 2006]

RAJYA SABHA

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: Credible minimum. ...(*Interruptions*)...

श्री आनन्द शर्मा: चलिए, क्रेडिबल मिनिमम कह देते हैं।

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी: कह देते हैं, यह आप कोई अहसान नहीं कर रहे हैं।

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Let me say one thing. Our colleagues on this side did not interrupt Shri Yashwant Sinha even once. Joshiji, you are an elder, be kind. ...(*Interruptions*)...

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: That is why I am correcting you. You are making a horrendous mistake, and I want to correct you.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Sir, as I was saying, the integrity of the Military Programme has been maintained, kept intact, not compromised. India has not accepted any demand to cap the production fissile material. We have not. As far as the reference to the FMCT was concerned, the FMCT is not a bilateral arrangement between two countries. The FMCT will be a multi-lateral treaty which will be negotiated in Geneva. Yashwant Sinha knows that. India will also negotiate along with other countries. We have our own views. Merely to say to work together with the US and other countries does not mean that we have similarity of views. We will work with all other countries and that is the right way to move forward. To allege that we have agreed to capping, we have agreed to give up our dedicated Military Nuclear Programme, our deterrence, is not correct, and I am just setting the records straight. Sir, I may also add here that a reference was made earlier about the Fast-Breeder Reactor. We are very clear that the Fast-Breeder Reactors are kept out completely. The Prototype Fast Breeder Reactors are not on the table; we are only talking of civilian nuclear energy cooperation. What is indigenous is indigenous, is protected, is kept out. Again India retains the right to construct more reactors in future, both military and civilian, and what would be a civilian reactor in future that would be the sole determination of this country. Now I come to safeguards. Sir, July 18 Statement when it referred to the Separation Plan, it also very clearly referred to the safeguard arrangements which India will negotiate and enter into with the International Atomic Energy Agency for its civilian-nuclear facilities which have been identified in the Separation Plan. I have given the numbers. The Safeguards Agreement that we are negotiating will be India-specific Safeguard Agreement. In the Safeguard Agreement itself, explicit in that is the acceptance of the fact that India has a dedicated Military Nuclear

Programme and that is why we use the word 'India-specific' because that Agreement, which we will enter into, will not be similar to other non-nuclear weapon States since we have a declared weapons programme. Yashwantji, you referred about nuclear weapons States not having any Safeguards Agreement. They do have Safeguards Agreement. But it varies; there is no one standard draft which is applicable to the nuclear weapon States. The Safeguards Agreement which they have, they all have. Now, we are negotiating something keeping in view India's national interest and long-term needs. We will have, in the Safeguards Agreement, if I may add, also multi-layered assurances of uninterrupted fuel supply. Even the Agreement, which we will have with America, if we have one and when we have one, will also have inbuilt fuel supply guarantees. But, with the IAEA, that is what the safeguards arrangements will be, it is not only the uninterrupted fuel supply but also, Sir, India will have the legal right to build a strategic fuel reserve for all the nuclear reactors for their life-time. No other country has this arrangement. Let the people not be misled and misinformed. Let no misapprehensions be created. Out of the 14 reactors, six are already under safeguards. You referred to Kudankulam. So, whether it is Rajasthan-RAPS-I and II; whether the Tarapur-TAPS-I and II; and, also the Kudankulam-I and II, that is very much clear. Any of those reactors for which outside technology or assistance has been there, in the Separation Plan, it is clear that there are six which are already there and the other eight will be put under safeguards in a phased manner between 2007 and 2014. Because much has been talked about the sequencing, that we are already negotiating with the IAEA and that is what US Congress wants, and the Prime Minister had given an assurance of placing the facilities under safeguards only after restrictions are lifted. That is what exactly the position of the Government is, and I reiterate what the hon. Prime Minister had said, Sir, in this House and in the other House in July and repeated in March, that our facilities will be placed under safeguard arrangements only after all restrictions are lifted. As I said, co-operation will be instantaneous after the agreement.

Sir, now, we are discussing the Civilian Nuclear Energy Co-operation. What I am saying, Sir, is that the strategic fuel reserve, which I referred to, the phased manner in which the facilities would be placed under safeguards arrangements, there is a double cushion. As I said, we have taken care of any future interruptions. Just to make it clear, and I

am repeating: the strategic reserve for the entire life cycle of the reactor, so that nobody can say tomorrow that we are stopping fuel supply. We are not going to go through that experience. The Government has taken care. Should this Government, our establishment, be not congratulated for achieving this, for protecting India's national interest, for retaining the integrity and autonomy of a dedicated strategic programme, for ensuring that India is never held hostage when it comes to fuel supply even in future. This Prime Minister and this Government do not deserve unwarranted accusations and the criticism. This House will be doing justice by complimenting the Prime Minister and the establishment for safeguarding India's interest by ensuring that we retain our freedom of a foreign policy, of a decision making and of a nuclear programme. Sir ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Jothi, your name is there. Please, there is absolutely...*(Interruptions)*. It has been decided that there will be no interruptions.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Sir, there are two more things which I need to mention. Sir, I have referred to the detonation in detail. There is a question about what you were referring that the cooperation would cease in case India were to detonate. In any case, there is a huge difference since our position is to continue the unilateral and voluntary moratorium and does not go beyond that. Anything beyond that is unacceptable to India. We are seeking a permanent waiver, an irreversible waiver and also the same rights and benefits that the other Nuclear States have. That is the purpose and objective of this Civilian Nuclear Energy Cooperation.

Regarding this certification which Yashwantji was referring to, Sir, there is some provision in the US law which predate July 18, and, we are clear that any reference to certification is contrary to the spirit of July 18 understanding. Even a mention in non-binding section will be unacceptable to India; even a mention. So, our position is very clear. We will not be dictated as to what foreign policy we have to pursue, we will not be capping our programme and we will not be compromising where India's vital interests are concerned. And, Sir, after all, as I said, discussion and debate is the essence of democracy and it is the right of the Parliament to discuss and to be informed which this Government, and I am repeating it, has done

so repeatedly. At the same time, Sir, there is a campaign, which was built up over the last few months. I use three words: misgivings, concerns and criticism. Misgivings can be genuine, concerns can be bonafide and we have to address those concerns. The Prime Minister himself is very clear, and, as Government, we are also very clear. Criticism can also be bonafide; we don't mind that. But what about the motivated criticism, the partisan political propaganda targeting the Government, targeting the Prime Minister. Sir, let me make it clear that the Congress Party had given the independent foreign policy, which we are proud of, as I said, starting from Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru to Shrimati Indira Gandhi, Lal Bahadur Shastriji, Rajiv Gandhiji and the present Prime Minister. Sir, we do not need any sermons or certification on patriotism or on safeguarding India's interest. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: Is he sermonising us, Sir? *(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please have patience. Why are you getting agitated? *(Interruptions)* No, please sit down. That is his right to speak. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Well, Sir, surely my dear friend's agitation is not going to change the facts of history. They will not be only read by you but by your future generations and my future generations. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: That is what we are reading today. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: That is what you will continue to read. Please don't distort. *(Interruptions)* I come to the last point which I have to mention. Sir, we have a Parliamentary system of Government where the Parliament is supreme. The Government and the Prime Minister are accountable to the Parliament. The assurance being given by the Prime Minister to this august House and to the Lok Sabha should be treated as final. We are using a phrase—this has become a trend—and everybody today talks about the 'Sense of Parliament'. It is a borrowed phrase from US Congress. Like, 'Sense of Congress', 'Sense of Parliament' you want to make. You want to turn our parliamentary democracy on its head. What system would we have when the assurance of the Prime Minister with full sense of responsibility to the Parliament about the sincerity of

the Government, about its commitment to India's independent foreign policy, its commitment to safeguard India's national interests is doubted, is questioned.

After listening to what I have said, that there is no shifting, there is no departure and we remain committed to what we have said, you will hear the Prime Minister later, and, I would urge with all respect and humility to all my friends to please respect that. Let us not, for the sake of our partisan politics, create an impression that India's interests have been compromised nation wide. Thank you Sir.

श्री अमर सिंह: उपसभापति महोदय, बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद। मेरी त्रासदी है कि जब भी महत्वपूर्ण विषयों पर मैं बोलने के लिए खड़ा होता हूँ, तो इधर और उधर के बाद, बीच में खड़ा होता हूँ। मेरी चादर...(व्यवधान)... देखिए, मैंने आप लोगों को डिस्टर्ब नहीं किया।...(व्यवधान)...

श्री उपसभापति: ज़रा खामोश रहिए।

श्री अमर सिंह: तो मेरी चादर बिल्कुल कोरी है। न तो मैं विदेश मंत्रालय में पहले बैठ था, न आज हूँ और न निकट भविष्य में कोई संभावना है। आदरणीय यशवंत सिन्हा जी ने जो सारगर्भित वक्तव्य रखा, उन्हें अपनी कार्यशैली का अनुभव है, क्या-क्या उन्होंने विदेश मंत्री की हैसियत से किया? अभी हमारे साथी आनन्द शर्मा जी, तो हमें डांट रहे थे, इन्हें अब अनुभव हो रहा है। उन्हें विशेषज्ञों का समर्थन और सहयोग था और आपको मिल रहा है, लेकिन मैं बहुत विनम्रता के साथ कहना चाहूँगा कि Sense of House के लिए आपको बहुत आपत्ति है। आप कह रहे हैं कि Sense of House की क्या आवश्यकता है? मैं कहना चाहूँगा कि इराक के बारे में Sense of House हुआ था या नहीं? अभी लेबनान के बारे में Sense of House हुआ था या नहीं? यह एक महत्वपूर्ण मसला है।...(व्यवधान)... पीओएके के बारे में भी अहलुवालिया जी ने ठीक कहा। तो संसद की इतनी अवमानना-मैं हाथ जोड़कर कहना चाहता हूँ, कृपापूर्वक कहना चाहता हूँ, आप आज के दिन विदेश राज्य मंत्री हैं, आप यहां पर विदेश मंत्री की हैसियत से अपना वक्तव्य दे रहे हैं, कांग्रेस के किसी अधिष्ठता, कार्यकर्ता या नेता की हैसियत से नहीं। इधर के साथी Strobe Talbott से मिले, उधर के साथी Condoleezza Rice से मिले, हम तो न Talbott के चक्कर में, न Rice के चक्कर में।...(व्यवधान)...

श्री राजीव शुक्ल (महाराष्ट्र): आप बिल्टन के चक्कर में हैं।

श्री अमर सिंह: हां हैं, लेकिन Talbott और Rice के चक्कर में नहीं हैं।...(व्यवधान)...आप चाहते हैं कि आपको नहीं बोलने दिया, तो हम भी नहीं बोलने देंगे।...(व्यवधान)...

श्री उपसभापति: शुक्ल जी, बीच में टोका-टोकी मत कीजिए। देखिए, यह डिबेट ... (व्यवधान) ... शुक्ल जी, मेहरबानी से... It has been agreed that this debate is a very serious debate and we will participate seriously. ... (व्यवधान) ...

श्री अमर सिंह: और अगर आप चाहते हैं कि सदन न चले, तो सदन नहीं चलेगा। अगर आपकी इच्छा है तो मैं यह पूरा कर दूंगा। ... (व्यवधान) ...

श्री उपसभापति: प्लीज़ आप आगे बोलिए।

श्री अमर सिंह: वर्तमान nuclear deal ऐसे समय सामने आई है, जबकि संपूर्ण विश्व की राजनीति unipolar दिख रही है। अमेरिका का साम्राज्यवादी आचरण अपने चरम पर है और सिर पर चढ़कर बोल रहा है। गुटनिरपेक्षता और स्वतंत्र विदेशी नीति से पलायन का भय हमारी विदेश नीति के लिए बहुत भयावह हो रहा है और यह हमारे देश के लिए, उसकी प्रभुता, स्वायत्तता और अखंडता के लिए खतरा बन सकता है। आज मुझे नेहरू जी की बहुत याद आ रही है। उनके गुटनिरपेक्ष आंदोलन की बहुत याद आ रही है। नासिर, टीटो और नेहरू का गुटनिरपेक्षता के लिए जो सम्मिलित प्रयत्न था, उसकी बहुत याद आ रही है अपने राजनीतिक पुरखों की विरासत से जो आप विचलित हो रहे हैं और पलायन कर रहे हैं, उसके लिए बहुत क्षोभ हो रहा है। इसके लिए मुझे कुछ प्रमाण देने की जरूरत नहीं है, मैं तो मूर्ख और अज्ञानी हूँ, मैं आपकी तरह विद्वान नहीं हूँ। ... (व्यवधान) ...

श्री उपसभापति: अमर सिंह जी, मुझे देखकर बोलिए, इधर-उधर मत देखिए।

श्री अमर सिंह: जी, आपको देखकर ही बोल रहा हूँ। मैं मूर्ख और अज्ञानी हूँ, कम जानता हूँ, तो मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे जैसे करोड़ों लोग, साधारण लोग दुनिया में इस पलायन को इसलिए मान रहे हैं, अगर आपने ईरान के विरुद्ध वोट नहीं दिया होता, तो यह संशय नहीं होता। आज Sense of House की डिमांड नहीं होती, आज कोई चिंता नहीं होती। एक पलायन आपने कर दिया और Sense of House से आप जितनी घृणा करें, यह Sense of Nation हो गया है—ईरान में मत देने के कारण, ईरान के विरुद्ध अमेरिका के दबाव पर कि अब हम लोग संशंकित हैं आप एक बार दबाव में आ गए तो इस बात की क्या गारंटी है कि दोबारा दबाव में नहीं आएंगे। अभी हाल में अफगानिस्तान में अब्दुल्ला-अब्दुल्ला और इंग्लैंड में विदेश मंत्री जो आज भी हाउस ऑफ कॉमन्स के नेता जैक स्ट्रॉ हैं, उन्होंने कह दिया, एक बयान दे दिया कि ईरान पर हमला करना बुद्धिमता का काम नहीं है। मैं इसके बारे में कुछ नहीं कह रहा हूँ। 'लंदन टाइम्स' वहाँ का बहुत बड़ा अखबार है, उस 'लंदन टाइम्स' के प्रतिष्ठित लेखक विलियम रीस मौग हैं, उन्होंने लिखा है कि जिस-जिस देश के ऐसे लोग जो कि निर्णय के अधिकार पर बैठे हैं, महोदय उन्होंने अमेरिका की घोषित प्रतिपादित नीति के विरुद्ध कोई टिप्पणी की है, यह 'लंदन टाइम्स' ने लिखा

है। चाहे वे अब्दुल्ला-अब्दुल्ला हों, चाहे जैक स्ट्रॉ हों, मैं आज यहां ऐसे नाम नहीं लूंगा, जिनसे उत्तेजना की अनावश्यक सृष्टि हो।...(व्यवधान)...

श्री उपसभापति: मत लीजिए।

श्री अमर सिंह: और राजीव शुक्ल फिर पुनः अपना नम्बर बढ़ाने के लिए कुछ कर दें।
...(व्यवधान)...

श्री राजीव शुक्ल: नम्बर बढ़ाने की जरूरत क्या है?...(व्यवधान)...

श्री अमर सिंह: अमेरिकी संसद में हुए जिस प्रस्ताव पर, हमारी सरकार बड़ी हर्षित और प्रफुल्लित है, वह हमारी स्वतंत्र परमाणु नीति को कड़ाई से प्रतिबंधित करने की बात करती है। भारत और अमेरिका परमाणु 123 एग्रीमेंट की संभवतः ड्राफ्टिंग हो रही है, जिसे हम संभवतः सितम्बर में देख पाएंगे हमारे Civilian परमाणु कार्यक्रमों और उसके सहयोग हेतु US Congress फिर विचार करेगी। फिर US Congress में इस पर सीधा मतदान होगा, इसमें कोई अमेंडमेंट का अवसर नहीं मिलेगा। धारा 3(5) और (6) में अमेरिकी कांग्रेस ने Cap, roll back प्रेसी कई टर्म्स और शर्तें रखी हैं। इसमें भारत में की गई कार्यवाही अमेरिकी राष्ट्रपति के माध्यम से, प्रत्येक वर्ष अमेरिकी कांग्रेस को बताए जाने की बात कही है।

अमेरिकी राष्ट्रपति वार्षिक आधार पर हमारे मिलिट्री और सिविलियन कार्यक्रमों की जानकारी लेकर अमेरिकी संसद को अनवरत बतायेंगे कि कब तक हम अमेरिकी इशारे पर फिसाइल मेटिरियल का उत्पादन बंद करेंगे।

भारत को अमेरिका के नेतृत्व वाले कार्टेल में 18 जुलाई के Accord से परे, चाहे वह Proliferation Security Initiative हो या फिर आस्ट्रेलिया का वाजेनार अर्रेंजमेंट, सब में शामिल होना है। मैं यहां बता दूँ कि Proliferation Security Initiative अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय कानून के अनुरूप भी नहीं है।

भारत अमेरिका परमाणु समझौते में अवधारणा के अनुसार 18 जुलाई, 2005 के न्युक्लियर कोऑपरेशन एग्रीमेंट और 29 जुलाई को संसद में प्रधान मंत्री जी के बयान के बाद अमेरिका में भारत के हितों के घोषित गोलपोस्ट से विपरीत बहुत बदलाव आया है।

अमेरिका के सीनेट और हाउस ऑफ रिपजेंटेटिव में पारित कुछ प्रस्ताव गंभीर हैं, आपत्तिजनक हैं। यह सिर्फ भारत के स्वतंत्र परमाणु कार्यक्रम में हस्तक्षेप मात्र ही नहीं, अपितु हमारी स्वतंत्र विदेश नीति में भी हस्तक्षेप है। जैसे कि ईरान के बारे में हमें अमेरिकी पिछलग्गू होना पड़ेगा। मैंने आज भारत के प्रमुख वैज्ञानिक सलाहकार की चिंता को भी प्रमुख समाचारपत्रों में पढ़ा है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि भारत से अमेरिका का यह समझौता हमारे Civilian परमाणु कार्यक्रम और सामरिक परमाणु कार्यक्रमों को किस सीमा तक अमेरिकियों के सम्मुख प्रदर्शित करेगा। हमारी

विदेश नीति कैसी हो, हम ईरान के साथ कैसा व्यवहार करें, इस पर हमें अमेरिकी प्रभाव कितना बर्दाश्त करना पड़ेगा? IAEA में दस्तखत, 'Safeguard in perpetuity for the Civilian Programme', अमेरिका न्यूक्लियर को-आपरेशन एग्रीमेंट के बाद इसको करना क्या भारत की बाध्यता होगी? क्या अमेरिका भारत द्वारा IAEA Safeguard समझौते दस्तखत के पूर्व सारे प्रतिबंध, सारे बंधन वापस लेगा? यदि किसी कारणवश अमरीका fuel के लिए गारंटी न दे, क्या ठिकाना है? मैं आदरणीय प्रधान मंत्री जी को याद दिलाना चाहता हूं, आज हमारे देश के राष्ट्रपति जब वैज्ञानिक थे, अगर वे न होते, तो अमेरिका ने सुपर कम्प्यूटर देने से मना कर दिया था। सुपर कम्प्यूटर हमने यहां बनाया। आज अमरीका fuel देने की बात कर रहा है, कल न दे, तो क्या fuel की रप्लाई की निरंतरता Nuclear Supplier Group के अन्य देशों से करने का प्रावधान हम कर पाएंगे? क्या दूसरे न्यूक्लियर वैपन देशों के साथ हम राजीव गांधी प्लान और Delhi Declaration के आधार पर, परमाणु विरोधी अभियान कर पाएंगे? मूल रूप से हमारे यहां ईराक और इरान की तर्ज पर अमरीकी इंसपेक्टरों को नहीं आना था, IAEA के निरीक्षक आने वाले थे। अमरीकी बिल के ड्रॉफ्ट में अब अमरीकी इंसपेक्टरों के आने का भी प्रावधान हो गया है। हमें India-specific protocol चाहिए, न कि IAEA standard modified protocol.

हम आदरणीय प्रधानमंत्री जी से बहुत आदर से, बहुत विनम्रता से उत्तर चाहेंगे। हम यह स्पष्ट करना चाहते हैं कि हम यहां पर आपका हाथ मजबूत करने के लिए खड़े हैं, हम आपको बाध्य करने के लिए नहीं खड़े हैं। हम चाहते हैं कि अगर अमरीका में सांसद, House of Representatives और सीनेट इस प्रकार के विवादित प्रश्न उठा रहे हैं, तो आज इसे विवाद न मानें, इसे सहयोग मानें। आज अमरीका के लोगों को भी पता होना चाहिए कि भारत की संसद, मूक और बधिर नहीं है, वह भी अपने राष्ट्रीय हितों की रक्षा के लिए बिल्कुल तैयार, तत्पर और संकल्पित है। बार-बार कहा जा रहा है कि end-product का इंतजार करो, जब end-product आए, तो end-product बनाने वालों को यह पता लगना चाहिए कि भारत की संसद जागरूक है। जब भी राष्ट्रीय विपत्ति आती है, तो यहां पर "मैं-मैं" नहीं होता है, यहां पर "हम-हम" होता है, कुछ लोग "मैं-मैं" करते हैं, लेकिन अधिकांश लोग "हम" के स्वर में बात करते हैं। मिले सुर मेरा तुम्हारा, तो सुर बने हमारा, हिंदुस्तान का सुर बने। हम चाहते हैं कि हिंदुस्तान का यह सुर, प्रधानमंत्री जी के हाथ मजबूत करे, ताकि अमरीका प्रधानमंत्री जी पर दबाव न डाल पाए और हमारी परमाणु नीति और विदेश नीति स्वतंत्र रहे।

उपसभापति जी, मैं बहुत आदर के साथ कहना चाहता हूं कि वर्ल्ड बैंक से हमारा भारतीय बाज़ार, WTO से भारतीय किसान बरबादी के कगार पर हैं और अब हमारी विदेश नीति और परमाणु नीति, अमरीका के बंधक होने के कगार पर है— ऐसा लगता है। प्रधानमंत्री जी के बयान के बाद स्पष्टीकरण हो जाए, तो हो सकता है कि ऐसा न लगे। यह एक जिज्ञासु की जिज्ञासा है,

आरोप नहीं। विदेशियों का प्रभाव आर्थिक गुलामी से शुरू होकर, राजनीतिक गुलामी की तरफ ले गया। इसी भारत में ईस्ट इंडिया कंपनी आई, वह आई तो थी व्यापार करने, लेकिन बहुत दिनों तक राज करके गई। प्रधानमंत्री जी, वर्ल्ड बैंक, WTO और अब अमरीका के चक्कर में कहीं एक बार फिर हम आर्थिक और राजनीतिक गुलामी की तरफ तो नहीं बढ़ रहे हैं? कृपया हमारे संशय को देश के हित में, संवेदना से देखने की असीम अनुकंपा करें।

वामपंथी दल तो आपके अंतरंग हैं और आप दोनों की कोआर्डिनेशन कमेटी का पूर्ण समन्वय है। हम भी आपसे थोड़े दूर सही, ज्यादा दूर नहीं हैं। आप चाहें या न चाहें, हम समर्थन दे रहे हैं और आपका समर्थन भी हमें उत्तर प्रदेश में चाहे-अनचाहे मिल रहा है। न्यूक्लियर वेपन स्टेट के बारे में भारत के प्रति एक संशय है, discrimination भारत के प्रति किस सीमा तक होगा, इसके प्रति भी संशय है *perpetuity of ban for nuclear programmes with no exit clause* पर भी चर्चा हुई है, तारापुर में fuel की आपूर्ति रूस द्वारा की गई, उसका विरोध अमरीका ने किया, उससे भी संशय है। हम आपकी मदद के लिए यहां खड़े हैं, आपका विरोध करने के लिए नहीं खड़े हैं। हम यह कह रहे हैं कि हम बहुत छोटे हैं, हमारा कोई हक नहीं बनता है कि हम कोई सुझाव दें, लेकिन हमारा अधिकार बनता है कि देश के प्रश्न पर हम बात करें। हम कहते हैं कि आप समर्थन लीजिए, देश के लिए जहां से समर्थन मिले, आप लीजिए, लेकिन हमें आपके नेतृत्व में पूरा विश्वास है कि आप समर्थन तो जरूर लेंगे, लेकिन समर्पण नहीं करेंगे।

जहां तक *sense of the House* और संसद के Resolution की बात है, तो ऐसा पहले इराक के बारे में, पिछले दिनों लेबनान के बारे में, PoK के बारे में बहुत बार हो चुका है। मुझे मालूम है कि इसके पहले आप घंटी बजाएं या कोई बात कहें, मैं तो यही कहना चाहूंगा कि जो भी आपने अब तक बार-बार संसद में कहा है, जो-जो आश्वासन आपने दिए हैं, उसके परिवर्तन की सुगबुगाहट अमेरिका से, अमेरिकी सीनेट से, हाऊस ऑफ रिप्रिजेंटेटिव से आ रही है। उस सुगबुगाहट का निराकरण करने के लिए, उसे समाप्त करने के लिए, उसे विराम देने के लिए हम आपसे सादर अनुरोध करते हैं। उसके लिए अगर सेंस ऑफ हाऊस आ जाए, जिस भी प्रारूप में एक रिजोल्यूशन आ जाए या आपके बयान के माध्यम से एक-एक बिन्दु पर स्पष्टीकरण आ जाए, तो हमें कोई आपत्ति नहीं। मैं आजमगढ़ का रहने वाला हूं, मुझे कैफी साहब की एक नज्म याद आ रही है और वह नज्म कुछ इस तरह से है कि

“हमने चाहा था रहें साथ-प्रधान मंत्री जी

हमने चाहा था रहें साथ

दूर रह कर भी

वे इसे सियासत ही सियासत समझें

हमने चाहा था रहें पास
दूर रह कर भी
वे इसे कोई ताजा शरारत समझें।''

बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद।

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, at the outset, I must welcome this discussion that is taking place. Sir, I would like to compliment the Government for agreeing to have such a discussion on an important matter, and, if this be the precedent, I think, we will be setting a new trend in Indian Parliamentary democracy. I think, this ought to be the trend, and, therefore, I will begin with that acknowledgement.

But I am also rising, Sir, with a degree of anguish and a deep concern over many issues connected with the Indo-U.S. nuclear deal. Now, I have heard the spirited defence of my friend, the Minister of State for External Affairs, Mr. Anand Sharma, and the assurances that he has given that India will not compromise its sovereignty, that India will not, in any way, lower its guard, its nuclear weaponisation programme, etcetera, etcetera. We are happy, but the point that I want to state here is that if that is what the Government is agreeing to say, why can't it be part of the proceedings where this House expresses its own opinion unanimously? And that is the point we wanted to raise on those aspects. That is why, Sir, while I have this deep concern and anguish, I need to state that we are a party that is supporting this UPA Government from the outside, that we are a party which is supporting this Government on the basis of the Common Minimum Programme, that we are a party which accepted the Foreign Policy section in the Common Minimum Programme where we have repeatedly underscored that India's foreign policy shall be an independent foreign policy; while developing relations with all countries, we will not succumb to pressures from any country. Now, having stated that, if that comes under doubt, there is a question of credibility of this Government for which, as a supporting party, I am as concerned as the people are and as our nation is, and, therefore, when we raise certain concerns, often it has been dismissed as anti-imperialist rhetoric. And let me tell you that the Left's anti-imperialism is not rhetoric. We understand today's world; we understand what is happening and what imperialism is doing in the world today. We have seen, without their support, this atrocity, this

absolute inhuman atrocity in Lebanon was impossible without the U.S. support that is being given. We understand how, under globalisation, they are trying to economically—they are trying; it is not that they will succeed; hope they will not-recolonise the developing world. Now, all this is a reality, Sir. Therefore, when we express out anti-imperialistic concerns, we are expressing on behalf of the majority of the world's people that this is something that India as a country should not and cannot succumb to. And I am glad that eight of the high priests of the Indian nuclear establishment have also expressed similar concerns. After all, these are people who built our nuclear capacity. And they had built it when the United States of America opposed it tooth and nail. They have built it overcoming the sanctions. They have built, and they have created for us that self-reliant base on which we can today stand and talk about all these things. And if they raise some concerns, do not dismiss them as bickering; do not dismiss them as something that is तू-तू मैं-मैं। They are concerns which we also echoed; these are concerns which need to be address in right earnest. Therefore, Sir, I have said it earlier in this House, and I want this House to respect this aspect that do not question the integrity when the issues and concerns are raised. You can definitely question my infallibility. I may be wrong, but do not question my integrity whenever these questions have been raised, and it is on that point, Sir,—not only me but anybody else—that we are wanting this House to express its concern which, we think, will strengthen the Prime Minister and the Government's hands. And what are those concerns? On three occasions—in July, 2005, in August, 2005 and in March, 2006—the Prime Minister has, if you shortlist many of the things he said, has assured the country, in the House, that full civilian nuclear cooperation will be achieved because of this deal, that India's credible nuclear deterrents will not be lowered. That nuclear India would be treated—I am quoting, Sir—"with the same rights and benefits as the nuclear weapons States that India shall do nothing unless there is reciprocity, and, finally, that India will proceed on this only when the U.S. amends its laws." Hon. Prime Minister has stated all this. Now all that we are asking is that if these assurances, because we perceive there are shifts in the goalposts—and why we perceive, I will just come to its—are reiterated as an expression of this House's opinion, I think, this will only strengthen the Government and the Prime Minister. When President Bush can come and tell us that "What can I do? My congress and my Senate has said this "We can go back and say, "What

I can do!" This is the Indian Parliament's opinion, and beyond this, we are not going to come down. And it is with that issue in mind, Sir, that we have asked for an expression of this position. I am fully aware what Mr. Anand Sharma has said here of the constitutional arrangement that we have in India which is different from that of the United States of America. In India, the executive is answerable and accountable to the legislature, and because of this being answerable and accountable to the legislature, the framers of the constitution-I have recently gone through the debates-spent a huge amount of time on this issue, whether a parliamentary ratification of an international treaty is required or not, and, then, they came to the conclusion that it is not required because of this accountability. In the United States of America, I am fully aware, the President is not accountable to their Houses and, therefore, the ratification is required. Therefore, I am not drawing a parallel from what is happening there. In the Indian context, there is a flaw which we need to correct. And that, Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I think, involves all of us, including the Presiding Officers. In India since the executive is accountable to the legislature, and if the legislature does not agree with what the executive has done, we have the right to outvote the Government. But if the Government has already signed an international treaty, the Indian Parliament can outvote the Government, but it cannot rescind the treaty. And that is a flaw that needs to be corrected, Sir. It is that flaw that needs to be corrected, and when we asked for a sense of this House...*(Interruptions)*... Thank you; you have read it. I am very glad that Mr. Narayanasamy has read my articles, Sir! Therefore, Sir, when we ask for a sense of the House it is not borrowing phrases from America. I mean, we borrow anything good from everybody, including the USA. We borrow only when it is good, but it is not that we are borrowing the phrase; it is an expression of our concern that yes, for the Executive of the day, today, this is the denominator below which we shall not go. It is that sort of an assurance we want. That was why, Sir, we wanted to have this discussion. And I am glad that it is taking place.

Sir, coming to the deal, there are two aspects of it, which, I think, need to be considered. One is the implicit concerns; the other one is the explicit concerns. And I am more worried about the implicit concerns; let me make it very clear. I will come to the explicit concerns later. But the implicit concerns are connected with the initial concerns that I expressed regarding our country's foreign policy. Now, you may say that one senator

said this and another senator said that. But this was said by Senator Lugar who recommended to the Senate to approve this Bill. And in his opening remarks, in his recommendation, he says—I quote, Sir: "We have already seen strategic benefits from our improving relations with India. India's vote at the IAEA on the Iran issue last September, and this past February, demonstrates that New Delhi is able and willing to adjust its traditional foreign policies and play a constructive role on international issues."

Now, this is the quotation, Sir, of the Senator when he moved, and, accordingly, the Senate discussed and the U.S. lawmakers are proceeding onwards. The implicit issue is this. This nuclear deal, we see, is not only concerning the explicit issue of nuclear energy, but it has got a very implicit bearing on the strategic ties between India and the United States of America. In these strategic ties, if India is tied down to protecting and advancing US strategic interests, then, I think, we are violating the very essence of the Common Minimum Programme understanding that we shall pursue an independent foreign policy. When the americans said that our vote in Iran was because we wanted to go closer to them, we had criticised here that our own vote in Iran should actually be to oppose the US administration. We would also like to know various other developments connected with this. India had initiated it. This Government had initiated it. We had welcomed the strengthening of the ties between India, Russia and China. At the level of Foreign Ministers, I think, meetings were taking place. Now, for some time, it is not just happening, Is it also an implicit pressure that we are succumbing to?

THE PRIME MINISTER (DR. MANMOHAN SINGH) : We had a meeting of the Heads of States, Heads of Governments, in St. Petersburg. President Hu Jintao, President Putin and I took part in it. ...(*Interruptions*)....

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: Anyway, I am glad that the Prime Minister has intervened and said that he Heads of Government met. we are only urging you, let this process of Foreign Ministers meeting, the Shahghai Cooperation, etc., to go ahead. The point is that the signal that we are giving to the world is that we are not, at the present moment, today, succumbing to the pressures of the USA and its administration also. That is something very vital for us and, I think, it has got something to do with the dignity and self-respect of India as a nation. So, we don't want this deal to be used as a carrot and stick policy where we only find

the carrot dangling and the stick is being used against India to browbeat us into various positions. That is the concern and that is the fear which the Government will have to allay. That is what we are asking from this Government because we are seeing now what is happening in the world today, as I said earlier. Given this, we would like to have a categorical assurance from this Government that this can't and will not happen. This, I think, is also reflected in the nature of the deal itself. A certain degree of explanation is required, whether it is a nuclear deal or a deal concerning civilian nuclear cooperation. Then comes the question whether we are being treated as a nuclear weapon State or not being treated as a nuclear weapon State. Do we have the "same rights and benefits" as the Prime Minister has said or not? This is one side of the issue. On the question concerning nuclear issues, I would also like to know—I have raised this issue earlier when we had a debate on this—what has happened to the famous Rajiv Gandhi plan which was enunciated in the UN General Assembly. Now, are we committed to universal disarmament today or not? Where is the reiteration? What is the implication of this particular deal connected with that? Are we pursuing this entire goal of universal disarmament? That is why certain elements—I will come to that a little later—in this deal which actually to be going contrary to that. Therefore, what we are saying is that India's position of even taking a voluntary moratorium on further nuclear testing is a right which should leave for ourselves, not at the behest of anybody else. We were opposed to Pokhran II. We have said that we are still opposed to nuclear stockpiling. We are opposed to nuclear weaponisation. But we will be the first ones to defend that that right will be India's right and we will not listen to any dictates from anybody else. We will have our internal differences. That is okay. But our right cannot be infringed upon. Therefore, if this whole issue is about civilian nuclear cooperation and if it is meant to augment India's nuclear energy, then I would actually like to know whether any study has been done on the basis of which you are moving towards this option of augmenting India's nuclear energy. Has the Atomic Energy Commission ever discussed this entire issue? What is the right fuel mix that we have? What is the fuel mix that we should have? We fully understand the Prime Minister's concern. India is growing at eight per cent or plus. Very good. We wish it grows faster. It requires a tremendous energy augmentation. This energy augmentation has to come. But has there been any proper evaluation from which source, from which you will

augment this energy? Which is the best way to augment this energy? They are relying on nuclear energy. We have our apprehensions. the Atomic Energy Commission is also under the Prime Minister. At least, the country does not know and the Parliament does not know what their opinion on this entire nuclear deal is and whether such augmentation is feasible or possible. What I want to ask is: What are the facts on the basis of which you have to make this decision? In 2005, of the installed capacity that you had of electricity generation, the nuclear electricity generation was a mere 2.5 per cent, and that was, actually, 3310 MW. Now if this were to increase to 10,000 MW, which is what is being planned, by the year 2015, this would still be only 5 per cent of India's projected generation then. So, for this 5 per cent of the projected capacity generation, are we going to tie down our country's strategic interests in such a manner? And, if you look at it in another way, that is, cost-wise,— Shri Yashwant Sinha also referred to the question of the cost of nuclear production, it is the most expensive one—if you actually look at the ratio, as compared to electricity generation with coal, the ratio will be: nuclear would be 3 and coal would be 2; with gas, nuclear would be 2 and gas would be 1; and with hydro electricity, nuclear would be 5 and hydro electricity would be 3. So, on all counts, the nuclear energy production is the most expensive one. And, if by 2015, we have only 5 per cent coming in from there, and the most expensive one that we are going in for why are we doing this? Compared to this, our own National Hydro Power Corporation has estimated that India has 50,000 MW of untapped hydro potential. Add to this, the estimates that they have made for Nepal our neighbouring country, that is 83,000 MW, which is untapped there. Now our interest in tapping this untapped potential is not only in terms of energy augmentation, but it is also in terms of preventing my own people from dying every year due to floods. Taming these rivers, taming these waters, coming particularly from Nepal, apart from helping our neighbouring country, is actually vital for very existence of the millions of Indians. Now, instead of choosing that option, why are we spending our resources on a more expensive option of nuclear power generation? This is a question that needs to be answered, and I hope that this will be taken up. Now what is our apprehensive? For the last three decades, the United States of America has not installed a new nuclear reactor for electricity generation. Why? They themselves admit that it is because of its high cost and the problem of disposing of the nuclear wastes.

Therefore, they are not building nuclear power plants. In three decades, they have not built it. But they want you to enter into this deal so that we buy their reactors. We buy their reactors; spend a huge, awesome amount of money for generating 5 per cent of our electricity by 2015, and we get saddled with the problem of how to dispose of the nuclear wastes. What are we doing? Are we actually helping the American economy to survive and sustain? Or, is it in the vital interests of India? Now this is an issue which, I think, we have to consider because unless we have a serious evaluation of whether we should go into this deal for that particular aspect, we will not come to an impassioned analysis of whether this deal is really required for India's civilian energy needs, or, whether it is a part of a larger strategic concept of Indo-U.S. relations, on which we have our serious apprehension, as I said earlier. If it is the former, then, we have to answer this question as to why the most expensive option is being chosen. If it is the latter, we should reject all these things if it is going to draw us into the U.S. strategic interests in the global situation today. It is, therefore, based on this position that we have identified, and we feel that at least on nine areas, there has been a 'shifting of goal posts' done by the United States of America during the course of these discussions. And, on these issues, we would like the Prime Minister, for the interests of India and its people in the House, to give us assurances on these aspects, and that, I think, would be doing Indian polity and India's future good. I fully understand what Shri Anand Sharma said about the system of democracy that the United States of America has. You are right in that. What will now happen is that both the Houses, the Senate and the Congress, will pass this Resolution. It will then go to the Reconciliation Committee. They will have a 123 Resolution, and on the basis of this 123 Resolution, there will be a waiver given to the U.S. President to conduct negotiations for a deal with India. We all understand that. But our point is what waiver does the President of the United States get. That their Senate and Congress will decide. And if it is a conditional waiver, with all these conditions that come, is India prepared to discuss a deal under that conditional waiver? ...*(Interruptions)*... No, Not ...*(Interruptions)*... That is it. So, what the Senate and the Congress are now doing? The Senate and the Congress are precisely laying down these conditions. Now, that is where..

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: I have explained it clearly that after the waiver authority is given, then the negotiations of a bilateral agreement

will take place. India has made its position known.. ...*(Interruptions)*... And this is exactly what we reiterated that it will be within the templates of July 18, India will not accept any additional conditions or obligations. That we have made it very clear.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: Mr. Minister, the point is that if we have made it very clear that—the American law-makers are discussing these conditions, presently—if such conditions are attached to the waiver to the US President, 'we shall not enter into any deal or discussion'. If that is being done, then, these things are happening despite your saying that. Now, the fact is, this happening despite the Indian Prime Minister conveying it. That only strengthens my case. Despite the Indian Prime Minister conveying, despite the Indian Government conveying, if the US law-makers are still continuing with this, that only means that they are trying to brobeat us. And that is where this assurance and this debate in the House become important. What are these nine points? I would just like to briefly go through them. The Prime Minister has assured this House, both the Houses of Parliament and the nation that India will not compromise its strategic interests. I am just quoting from the resolution of the US Senate. It says, "such cooperation will induce the country" meaning India, "to give greater political and material support to the achievement of US global and regional non-proliferation objectives," Sir, under line the words, 'US global and regional non-proliferation objectives' "especially with respect to dissuading, isolating and, if necessary sanctioning and containing states that sponsor terrorism and terrorist groups; that are seeking to acquire a nuclear weapons capability or other weapons of mass destruction capability and the means to deliver such weapons." Then, it continues, Sir, and I quote, "secure India's full and active participation in US efforts to dissuade, isolate and if necessary, sanction and contain Iran for its efforts to acquire weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear weapons capability, etc., etc." Now, what we are being told is that this is a non-binding section of the resolution. My worry is, if it is a non-binding section, if it is not binding, why is it there at all? We have seen in the past, with some other countries; we have the experience of the famous, infamous, let us say, of the Pressler Amendments being imposed, and how it was misused in Pakistan, and how it was misused against Cuba. So, this is one area of concern, I think, where a categorical assurance will have to be made by the Prime Minister that we are not drawn into the vortex of actually advancing US strategic at the expense of India's.

2.00 P.M.

The second thing, Sir, is that the Prime Minister has said that there will be full cooperation on civilian nuclear technology, which should include the complete fuel cycle. Underline the word, 'complete'. Now, what does section 6 of the Senate Bill tell you? It prohibits the exports of equipment, materials or technology related to the enrichment of uranium, the reprocessing says that to restrict such equipment and technologies to India which means that the current sanctions on a host of technologies considered as dual use would be still under an embargo. When they say, 'they restrict such equipment and technologies to India', it means, in effect, they are arguing that the current embargo continues on these dual use technology products. Now, this is where another assurance will have to be given that this cannot be acceptable to us.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI KALRAJ MISHRA) in the Chair]

Then, on July 29, the Prime Minister himself stated, and I quote, "we committed ourselves to separating the civilian and strategic programme. However, this was to be conditional upon, and reciprocal to, the United States' fulfilling its side of the understanding...steps to be taken by India would be conditional upon and contingent on actions taken by the United States." Then, he said, "Before voluntarily placing our civilian facilities under IAEA safeguards, we will ensure that all restrictions on India have been lifted." The Minister himself said that we are already discussing with the IAEA for an India-specific protocol. You have admitted. Why discuss when they have not lifted this?

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: What I had said is that we are negotiating India-specific safeguards agreement with the IAEA. 'Negotiating' does not mean placing the facilities under the safeguards. We are very clear because the negotiations have to take place ...*(Interruptions)* We have never said that we are not going to start the negotiations ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI N. JOTHI: (Tamil Nadu): What is the necessity?

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: I am answering him. You can hear. Let me first show respect to Sitaram Yechuryji who has raised this.

Sir, I would like to assure that what is being negotiated is for the civilian nuclear facilities' India-specific safeguards, as I had mentioned, with a multi-layered assurance of fuel supplies. I had also mentioned fuel supplies for the life-time of the reactors. I had also mentioned that it is in

the phased manner, starting from 2007. So, why are we jumping to the conclusion that those facilities would be placed first under the safeguards agreement? No. What has been said will be adhered to fully, there should be no doubt.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: I will tell you why I have raised this. Because the restrictions have not been lifted yet. We have said that we will not place our facilities under the IAEA safeguards until the restrictions are lifted. But they are not lifted and we are conducting negotiations! My point is, suppose they are not lifted, why these negotiations at all? Once they are lifted, once we have an assurance that they would be lifted, yes, you talk. We are not saying no. But what I am saying is... (Interruptions)

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: On negotiations, there is no departure. You have quoted from Prime Minister's assurance and there is no departure from it.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री कलराज मिश्र): आनन्द जी, आप बैठ जाइए ... (व्यवधान)... कोई जरूरी नहीं है कि यह जो कहें, आप उससे सहमत हो जाएं ... (व्यवधान)... आनन्द जी, इस तरह से बहस नहीं हो पाएगी।

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: That is why I said, these are our apprehensions. What I am saying is, we have our experience with the United States; we have seen how they have dealt with many other countries and what they are doing.

Well, my earlier point, point number two, when we talk of the question of the complete fuel cycle, we have our apprehensions. As rightly pointed out, there is a great pride of being Indian that we have developed these technologies on our own, combating and fighting these sanctions. Our fast breeder technology, nobody in the world is working for the last two decades. You open them up now and what intellectual property we have achieved, you are handing over these technologies to the world where they have not worked, if you are opening up. You can say no, and that is the assurance I want. Why do they want to restrict us? If there is a movement towards using thorium as a fuel, where India is the country in the world where the largest thorium deposits are there, then, we will, for ever, be independent of any nuclear blandishment and blackmail when we reach that level. We apprehend that the United States of America wants us not to reach that level. And that is the assurance we want that nothing will be done to stop India from reaching that level so that we

attain our own independence from the rest of the nuclear supplier group where we start using our own thorium, we have the world's largest deposit.

The fourth point, Sir, on which we see a shift in the goalpost is that in the March agreement, it was said that the USA will take necessary steps to change its laws and also align the nuclear supplier group rules to fulfil the terms of the Indo-US nuclear deal. Now what do we see in the Senate Resolution, Sir? It says, "In addition, we require that decisions in the nuclear supplier group enabling nuclear trade with India are made by consensus and consistent with its rules." That is very clear, they are not going to seek an amendment in the nuclear suppliers' chapter at all. It has to be consistent with the nuclear supplier group's rules. Then what is the change that they are making so that our uninterrupted flow is not affected? And that is a very serious departure.

The fifth departure that we see is the original agreement talked of an additional protocol which the Prime Minister's statement made clear was an India-specific protocol, not covered under the protocol for weapon-State or a non-weapon State. That is what the Prime Minister assured us.

Then, the Congress and the Senate have suggested a more inclusive model additional protocol of the IAEA which only few countries accept in the world today and the additional protocol as a non-nuclear State. Are we accepting that status? Both the Congress and the Senate talk of an additional protocol of India with IAEA as a non-nuclear weapon State. So, that is something again which we think is not in India's interest, which has to be safeguarded. Point No.6. The assurance given by the Prime Minister on March 7, 2006 was that we are placing our facilities in perpetuity as reciprocally the USA is also guaranteeing fuel supply in perpetuity. In case, the US defaults on fuel supply agreement, as it did earlier with Tarapore, it will ensure that other members of the NSG will take over its obligations. This was the assurance we were given. Now the amendment to the Senate Bill says and I quote section 102(6), "The US should not seek to facilitate or encourage the continuation of nuclear exports to India by any other party if such exports are terminated under US law." You cannot be more explicit than this, that is, the US will decide whether the Nuclear Supply Group will continue to give India fuel or not. It is a clear-cut restriction and reneging on what the earlier understanding was. On this as assurance is required. Point No.7. In the original

agreement, India had to agree to work with the US for a Fissile Material Cut Off Treaty what is normally called the FMCT. This is now being restricted to India's fissile material stockpile. And this is in section 103 of the Declaration of Policy concerning United States India Peaceful Atomic Energy Cooperation, which states to achieve as quickly as possible a cessation of the production by India and Pakistan of all fissile materials for nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosive devices. As has been pointed out by others here, the President has to report the efforts it has made with India and Pakistan for 'disclosing, securing, capping, and reducing their fissile material stockpiles'." Is it an international multilateral agreement that we are entering into and FMCT, or is it a bilateral pressure on India that we reduce our stockpile while nothing will happen to the global stockpiles that are there? If that is the case, as I have said earlier, we are contradicting our own commitment towards universal nuclear disarmament. This needs to be clarified and an assurance has to be given that this is not going to happen. Point No.8. In the original agreement only IAEA safeguards were considered. But in section 107 of the Senate Bill, the end-use monitoring programme states, that in case IAEA is unable to fulfil its safeguard obligations the US President, "takes measures to ensure all material and its use is in conformity with its declared purposes. this includes physical verification and suitable access to be provided by India to US inspectors." Are we now going to allow a situation where we will have the US inspections taking place in our country? It is there in section 107. The final point that I have here is that the military programme had no monitoring requirement from the IAEA or the United States of America. The Minister also made it clear that it is going to be totally independent. What section 108 of the Senate Bill says is that, 'the President to report to the Congress significant changes in the production by India of nuclear weapons or in the types and amounts of fissile material produced.' Now, Sir, this, as I said, my Party had opposed Pokhran-II. We have said that India should not be stocking nuclear weapons. We stand by that. But it is part of the overall universal disarmament that we were talking about. But as I said earlier, that is a decision which is our sovereign right, India's right. We cannot do it at anybody's behest, anybody telling us. This actually here says that the President of the United States of America will keep on reporting on these matters and the type of fissile material produced. This, I think, is a severe breach of our sovereignty. Therefore, Sir, on these nine points I request the Government and the

Prime Minister that in the interest of the country, in the interest of our future to actually assure this House. If that assurance is coming and precisely that is what, I think, all of us, everybody had expressed earlier that let that be an expression of this House. Do not use the word sense. I do not want this. It is a US borrowed thing. I mean I am not particular at all on that. But some form of expression, whether it is a resolution declaration, assertion, statement, whatever it is, some form of expression from this House, is needed. Yes, this is the bottom line, beyond this India in its own sovereign right, for its own self-respect will not go. Let that message go loud and clear to the world and to the country that yes, this Government is just going to strengthen India's sovereignty, strengthen India's independence and not kow-tow to US pressures in terms of our foreign policies. That, I think, is what we owe to the country today and that is the responsibility with which I want this discussion to be taken, not in terms of *tu tu main main*, or who did what, when. I mean there are so many other things. We can talk about what happened in those six years. But right now, I do not think that is the point we have to emphasis. Let us all unanimously come to this understanding that this is in the interest of India. This is the bottomline that we define. We shall not go below that and it is in that spirit I want the Prime Minister and the Government take this entire debate and then assure all of us. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI N. JOTHI: Sir, already, Anna Dravida Mannetra Kazhagam is opposing this deal tooth and nail, with the minimum level or to the maximum level with no concession, there is no compromise in these matters. We should maintain our sovereignty in the absolute manner and to the extent possible we should never have any discussion at all on this matter, That is our view. Sir, I will illustrate the reasons why. Sir, we have had Jawaharlal Nehru as our first Prime Minister and the illustrious Prime Minister, Madam, Indira Gandhi and up to the level of Narashimha Rao also, the Congress Prime Ministers opposed NPT Agreement. They never ventured into it. They never thought of it. They were opposing it. What change has suddenly now taken place? Why has it taken place? This nation wants to know from the UPA Government. What is the possible answer which they want to give? The answer they want to give is, the fuel to our reactors is now lacking and we need reactors further more and fuel further more. For that, we should have the treaty with them. This is their answer. This is what they want to tell the world. Sir, the information from our scientists indicate, neither the fuel is lacking nor the scientists are lacking in their

attempt to have self-sufficiency in nuclear energy. What is lacking is political will. That is all. Sir, if you join the NPT, what will happen? There will be fast discrimination between nuclear weapon haves and nuclear weapon have-nots. There will be discrimination. The discrimination will lead to inroads into our sovereignty. Sir, it is a one sided treaty.

If you go into the treaty, you will know that it is a one-sided treaty. It is something like, 'you bring your grains; I will bring my chop. We will mix it together and then we will have them equally.' It will lead to only such a situation. And, you are willingly joining in it. Sir, your basic theory that fuel is not available is not correct. Have you ever verified the data? Have you checked it with our scientists? Have you checked this with the available material in India? Sir, according to my information, Uranium, which we are using, as on today, as fuel, is available in plenty. It is available at Cuddapah in Andhra Pradesh. It is available in the North-Eastern States. It is also available in Jharkhand. This can last, at least, for another fifty years. It can also go further. In the meanwhile, we are already on research of harnessing Thorium. We are already on it. We may also achieve that in the years to come. Under these circumstances, where is the need for fuel to be borrowed or the reactors to be borrowed. I don't see any reason. What explanation do you have? Have you come to the conclusion that Uranium is not available in India? Have you come to the conclusion that our reactors cannot be fed any further with the available raw material? Have you come to that conclusion? Have you got any data for that? If so, please, explicitly show the same to the House. Please show it to the world. Please show it to the nation. Sir, Uranium is a natural ore. Our scientists have developed it and made it as a fuel. And, as on today, we are having, at least, ten reactors situated in Tarapur, Kalpakkam, Narora, Kaiga and Kakrapar. And, now, Koodankulam is in the offing. They are being run. I am sorry to say this word. I don't think you will be disagreeing with Smt. Indira Gandhi. I don't think that you will be disagreeing with Dr. Homi Bhaba. I don't think you will be disagreeing with Sarabhai. And, I don't think that you will be disagreeing with Narsimha Rao or with any other Congress Prime Minister to that extent. In such a case, why, suddenly, you want to sign the NPT? What is the reason? I don't suspect your *bona fides*. No. I am not saying that. I am not saying that you are less patriotic. I am not accusing you on that. But, I only want to know why are you suspecting our scientists? Why are you not heeding to our scientists? You are not giving audience to our scientists. When your

Prime Minister could meet vagabond politicians, comedian politicians and others, why is he not interested to meet our scientists? I am very sorry to say that. Scientists have expressed their disagreement with your Prime Minister on this issue. They want audience. You refused to give them audience. Why, Sir? Don't you like any explanation from scientists who have been working for this nation? They have been working for this nation. Still, you don't want to give any audience to them, Sir, there is something wrong with your policy. Please correct yourself. Please touch your conscience. You claim yourself that you have brought freedom for this country. You — Congress people — claim that you have brought freedom for this country and hence you have the right to rule this country. This is what quite often you proclaim. But, kindly think loudly, can you ever say this hereafter, because what would be the difference between the people who invited East India Company to India and yourself, now, when you are inclined to sign the NPT? What is the difference between you and them? I see no difference between those who invited the East India Company and those who are now speaking for the NPT. I see no difference between you both. I am sorry. And, you are justifying, whether your justification is correct or proper. Sir, according to me it is not. I will tell you. I will tell you what happens once you sign this treaty. Often, I have been hearing, both from Shri Anand Sharma and through statement of the hon. Prime Minister here, saying that we are taking care of our civilian requirements and we will not allow them to interface in our military matters. We are self-confident on that.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Just a minute, Mr. Jothi. You are talking about the NPT. We are not at all signing the NPT. We are not discussing the NPT. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI N. JOTHI: I know where it is going to lead. I know that. I know where you are going and where it is heading. Now, you are having only learner's licence. Finally, it will land there only. I know that. We know how to look at you. We know what you are doing. What is the necessity, first of all, to have linkage with America? Mr. Shivraj Patil was the Minister of Science and Technology earlier and he visited Kalpakkam several times. I know that. With all this, I would say that our scientists have harnessed nuclear energy and are running all these reactors so far. But, you have no confidence on them. I am not saying that you are going to sign. But, I am saying that the day is not far off. It is something like passing a love

letter. Thereafter you will marry. I know that. Now, you are having some looks at each other. Then, letters will be exchanged and, finally, elopement will take place and marriage will be elsewhere. This is going to end there only. We have seen the fate of so many assurances. We have seen so many tactics. And, we have also seen where you have landed finally. Sometimes ago you talked about self-sufficiency in food. Now, you are importing food. We are seeing your working system. We know that.

Sir, where does the problem arise? You all say that you will not allow our sovereignty to be interfered and you will keep them off wherever they are to be kept off. This is what you have often been telling. Mr. Anand Sharma, will you assure, will this Government assure this country that they will not have inspection rights over waste management? The waste management is the raw material for the production of atom bombs. Will you assure that they will not interfere in it? (*Interruptions*) One minute; one minute. You can assure in the end (*Interruptions*) Will you assure that they will not count on the production of your heavy water? Will you assure that they will not interfere in your heavy water production? Will you assure that they will not interfere in your fast breeder reactor research, where you are already advancing from 250 MW to 500 MW? Sir, our scientists and our military exponents have said this treaty, this further understanding with them will cap our research capabilities on military warfare. They have already been warning us. You are not interested in meeting scientists. You are not interested in meeting anybody. You suspect us saying that we are opponents; why should you respect us? That is the error of thinking that you have got. Kindly think about this nation. If it is a political decision, which you have taken, please have a referendum. If it is a scientific decision, please have a symposium with scientists on this matter. So, on both these counts, will you assure this august House? If you have taken a political decision on this matter, are you prepared for referendum in the public? If you have taken a scientific decision, are you prepared to have discussions with scientists, a fullfledged discussion? Are you prepared? Everything is under camouflage. From day and day two you are bottling our interests.

Sir, Mr. Yechury has said that old posts are being rearranged. I feel further. Not only old posts are being rearranged, the old playing fields are also being rearranged; the markings are being rearranged; the playing rules are being rearranged; and players are being rearranged. And, this

is a game that you want us to witness. No, we won't. We will take this agitation further not only here, but I appeal to all the patriotic Indians to take this agitation to the streets and to the public and tell this Government—this minority Government, this minority Congress party—that they cannot hold this country to ransom forever, especially in the sensitive matters. You have all forgotten Smt. Indira Gandhi—how indigenous she was; how great she was. You have all forgotten. We remember her. I am mentioning her name. You are mentioning only Dr. Manmohan Singh's name. You have all forgotten her name. The foreign invasion in all the matters is increasing in all the matters day-by-day. Why? Some foreign element is triggering you off. That's the reason. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: No, no. *(Interruptions)* Just to help him out. *(Interruptions)* I am asking him. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI N. JOTHI: Mr. Anand Sharma, I am not yielding. *(Interruptions)* Please do not interface. *(Interruptions)* Do you want to say Smt. Indira Gandhi was not your leader? *(Interruptions)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI KALRAJ MISHRA): Please don't disturb. *(Interruptions)* Mr. Jothi, please continue. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI N. JOTHI: Mr. Anand Sharma, I may tell you for your information that....*(Interruptions)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI KALRAJ MISHRA): Mr. Jothi, please conclude. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI N. JOTHI: Sir, our scientists developed our fast breeder reactors indigenously. We have risen to 500 MW from 250 MW. And, they are saying, "Americans have to help us now". We already know driving; we already know the cycling; we already know the swimming; we already know how to speak, but they still want to help us in all our activities. There is something wrong with these people. Somewhere something is wrong. ...*(Interruptions)*... Something is wrong. *(Time-bell)* Please, Sir, I will take five minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI KALRAJ MISHRA): Mr. Jothi, the time allotted to you is over.

DR. K. MALAISAMY (Tamil Nadu): Sir, he is talking about the interest of the nation. Give some more time to him.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI KALRAJ MISHRA): Yes.

SHRI N. JOTHI: Please allow me, Sir. This is a sensitive issue. Sir, without the help of anybody ...*(Interruptions)*... Sir, without anybody's help, we had Pokhran-I. Then the whole world got up and started looking up to us with some respect. Then, we had Pokhran-II. What have we lost due to these two? What were the sanctions? We, Indians, are not ordinary people. Our mass, 110 crore people, our intellectual level, our scientific level is much greater than anybody who can interfere in our country. Our country is supreme, that pride I am having. Sir, for your information, Mr. Minister, please check up your records and consult your scientists and you will get a positive reply. We are the first country in the world, we are the first scientists group in the world who have successfully launched GSLV in the first attempt itself. We succeeded in the first attempt. No country in the world succeeded in the first attempt. Please check up the records. Dr. Kasturirangan has done it. He succeeded in the first attempt. No country has succeeded in the first attempt including America, Canada and France. Dr. Kasturirangan is sitting quietly. The problem with our scientists is, they are quiet. They are very calm. This is the problem with our scientists. The problem with our politicians is, they are timeservers; not we, but Members on that side. For the time being they are saying, oh, this person is great; oh, this Prime Minister is great. Sir, by comparing this Prime Minister, you are denigrating Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. You are denigrating Smt. Indira Gandhiji, whom, even though we are in the Opposition, respect more. Sir, we are also patriotic, though not more, at least, equal to you. Kindly understand this. ...*(Interruptions)*... It may be more also. ...*(Interruptions)*... Sir have we not seen Kasturirangan? Have we not seen disciples of Homi Bhabha? Have we not seen disciples of Vikram Sarabhai? Have we not seen those people? Have we not consulted them? Why should this be done? Why should we kneel before Americans, Sir? I am not an anti-American. In whichever field we want help, we will take help from them. And whichever field we have to help them, we will help them. But why should we kneel down? Why should we spread a red carpet for them? It is an unnecessary field. It is a sophisticated field. You can invite your friend up to your drawing room, not to your bedroom where you have a beautiful wife....*(Interruptions)*... I am very sorry to say that.

My blood is boiling. As a citizen of this country, who has taken oath under the Constitution, and as a Member of Parliament, I feel you are all insulting the patriotic people. I feel I am insulted by this Government.

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY (Karnataka): Sir, the words, 'inviting into the bedroom' should be expunged. It is not in good sense.

SHRI N. JOTHI: That is the best example I can say on this issue. While participating in the debate, I am very thankful to the media. But for the media, the issue would not have gone this much further. Sir, I am thankful to the comrades. I am very thankful to them. They stood their ground. They insisted on their policies in this matter in opposing this Government. I hope they will continue further. Sir, in the Communist parlance, they used to call opponents as reactionaries. I feel that term will apply to them. I feel the term will apply to these people who speak for this Bill. They are the reactionaries. They do not recognise our scientists' talent. Without the help of anybody, Sir, indigenously, we are running this. Then, why should somebody come suddenly? Why should they come? What is the purpose behind it? Because they want to wage a war against Iran. They want to wage a war against Iraq people: they want to wage a war against the Gulf people, and they want to use us as a tool. They want to use India as a tool. Sir, globalisation is moving in a different direction. America alone is not the only country where you can (*Time-bell*) look to for matters. There are other countries also. Very nearby is China. Have you ever looked at China? Have you ever thought of it any time in your life? Why you just look at Americans?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI KALRAJ MISHRA): Mr. Jothi, please conclude.

SHRI N. JOTHI: Sir, I will finish in two minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI KALRAJ MISHRA): You have already taken ten minutes more.

SHRI N. JOTHI: Sir, there is Pokhran-I and Pokhran-II. Like that, I will deal with it...(*Interruptions*)... Sir, if you continue to persist with this kind of a thing and giving explanations saying that we will not give you anything, the sovereignty will be looked after, this assurance will stand, even after July 18, nothing has changed, etc.—you would like to go on like this—you will stand in trial before the public. Public is watching you. You will stand before the trial. You will stand in trial before the public.

[17 August, 2006]

RAJYA SABHA

Sir, there is some* and some kind of a * view is being developed somewhere in policy-making sector of this Government. Please find out who they are. Please find out who they are who are acting against the interests of our nation. Please weed them out. We will support you on that. Please weed them out. Sir, nobody is supporting this deal. Our scientists are opposing, public are opposing, all political parties except the Congress Party are opposing, and NRIs in the USA are opposing. Sir, who are the better people to oppose it? The NRI who live in very America are saying, "Indians, please don't do this." They are appealing to us. Please do not agree further on this matter. In spite of all that...(Interruptions)...

THE MINISTER OF OVERSEAS INDIAN AFFAIRS (SHRI VAYALAR RAVI): Sir, I am on a point of order ...(Interruptions)... Accusing the person sitting on this side of *, I think, is unparliamentary. ...(Interruptions)...

SHRI N. JOTHI: No. It is a section ...(Interruptions)... it is a section...(Interruptions)...

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: I know the law...(Interruptions)... Don't teach me Law...(Interruptions)...No Member can call any other Member...(Interruptions)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI KALRAJ MISHRA): I shall look into it.

SHRI N. JOTHI: It is not unparliamentary, Sir...(Interruptions)...

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: What do you mean by unparliamentary? ...(Interruptions)...

SHRI N. JOTHI: Sir, it is not unparliamentary...(Interruptions)...

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: Sir, you cannot accuse any Member, or any Government of a * ...(Interruptions)... * is a word ...(Interruptions)...which is very serious.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI KALRAJ MISHRA): I shall look into the record. If it is there ...(Interruptions)...

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: I am assuring you, Sir ...(Interruptions)...

*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

SHRI N. JOTHI: Sir, it is in the IPC. There is a section ...*(Interruptions)*... *(Time-bell)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI KALRAJ MISHRA): Please conclude.

SHRI N. JOTHI: Okay. Sir, the NRIs are opposing. The NRI Minister is now opposing it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: (SHRI KALRAJ MISHRA): Now, please conclude. Finish your speech.

SHRI N. JOTHI: The NRIs are opposing this and the whole world is opposing this. I don't know what makes these people to go ahead further. If you go ahead further, for the remaining few days, when you will be in the office ...*(Interruptions)*... You will be leaving an indelible mark. For that, you will be cursed for ever. Thank you.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: Sir, I withdraw my last sentence.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI KALRAJ MISHRA): Okay, thanks, Shri Mangani Lal ji.

[श्री उपसभापति पीठासीन हुए]

श्री मंगनी लाल मंडल (बिहार): माननीय उपसभापति महोदय कई माननीय सदस्यों ने इस महत्वपूर्ण विषय पर अपनी बातें कही हैं। यशवंत बाबू का सारगर्भित भाषण मैंने सुना और ज्ञान भी अर्जन किया। क्योंकि मैं वैदेशिक मामले में और वित्त के मामले में उन्हें ज्ञानी समझता हूँ, लेकिन यशवंत बाबू ने जितनी बातें कही थीं, मैं समझता हूँ कि श्री आनन्द शर्मा जी, जो विदेश राज्य मंत्री हैं और जिन्होंने हस्तक्षेप करके अपना भाषण किया है, उन्होंने सारी बातों का जवाब दे दिया कि तत्कालीन प्रधानमंत्री ने स्वयं अमरीका की संसद में जाकर कहा था कि हमारा moratorium हो गया, आगे के किसी भी परमाणु परीक्षण के लिए महोदय, कई तरह की भ्रांतियां पैदा हो गई हैं। यद्यपि प्रधानमंत्री जी ने 27 फरवरी, 7 मार्च और 29 जुलाई को इस सदन में जो वक्तव्य दिया था, उसमें बिल्कुल पारदर्शिता है। 18 जुलाई को सहमति के आधार पर अमेरिकी राष्ट्रपति और भारत के प्रधान मंत्री का जो वक्तव्य आया था और उस वक्तव्य के बाद अमेरिका के राष्ट्रपति का दिल्ली में जो ज्वायंट स्टेटमेंट आया था, उसके बाद जो वक्तव्य आया है, तो प्रधान मंत्री ने बार-बार कहा कि जो सहमति का वक्तव्य हुआ और जो समझौता हुआ है, उससे एक बिन्दु भी किसी भी सूरत में हम नहीं हटेंगे और अपनी सम्प्रभुता और सार्वभौमिकता से कोई समझौता नहीं करेंगे।

महोदय, वैज्ञानिकों के बयानों की बात हो रही है। अनिल काकोदकर जी एटोमिक एनर्जी कमीशन के अध्यक्ष हैं। स्वयं प्रधान मंत्री ने सदन में कहा है कि जो सहमति बनी है, उसमें हमने

वैज्ञानिकों का सहयोग लिया है, उनसे वार्ता की है। अभी 9 वैज्ञानिकों का जो बयान आया है, जिससे भूचाल पैदा हुआ है, भ्रान्ति पैदा हुई है, किन्तु उनके बयान में कहीं नहीं कहा गया है कि जो समझौता हुआ है वह गलत है और जिसके बारे में प्रधान मंत्री ने तीन बार सदन को विश्वास में लिया है और सदन में अपनी बातें कही हैं, वैज्ञानिकों ने उसका विरोध नहीं किया है। इसमें सिर्फ एक विवेचना की बात आई है, व्याख्या की बात आई है। जहां तक मैं समझता हूं कि अखबारों में जो समाचार छपा है कि जब महामहिम राष्ट्रपति के यहां भारतीय जनता पार्टी का प्रतिनिधिमंडल गया था, तो प्रतिनिधिमंडल के मिलने के बाद अखबारों को जो बात बताई गई, उसमें यही बात कही गई है कि एक भ्रम की स्थिति पैदा हो गई है, जिसकी विवेचना स्पष्ट रूप से होनी चाहिए। भ्रम की स्थिति क्या है, क्या विवेचना होनी चाहिए? वह यह है कि अभी हाऊस ऑफ रिप्रिजेंटेटिव की बातें हुई हैं, जो बिल वहां से पारित हुआ है और उसकी वैदेशिक अंतर्राष्ट्रीय मामलों की जो समिति है, उसमें चर्चा हुई है, उसमें कतिपय संशोधन किए गए। उस संशोधन के बाद एक भ्रान्ति पैदा की गई है। इसी पर वैज्ञानिकों ने कहा है कि इस मामले में कहीं-न-कहीं हमें ऐसा लगता है कि अनावश्यक हस्तक्षेप हो रहा है। मैं श्री आनन्द शर्मा जी को बधाई देना चाहता हूं कि इन्होंने बहुत दृढ़ता के साथ कहा कि हम एक बिन्दु इधर या उधर स्वीकार नहीं करेंगे और जो भारत की सम्प्रभुता है, उससे हम कोई समझौता नहीं करेंगे, अमेरिका के राष्ट्रपति और भारत के प्रधान मंत्री के बीच जो सहमति बनी है, जो समझौता बना है उसकी पारदर्शिता हम बनाए रखेंगे।

महोदय, यह बार-बार कहा जा रहा है कि सदन को विश्वास में लेना चाहिए। सदन को कैसे विश्वास में लेना चाहिए? प्रधान मंत्री तीन बार सदन में आए, प्रधान मंत्री ने तीन बार इस सदन में अपना वक्तव्य दिया। महोदय, मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी के एक बयान को पुनः यहां कोट करना चाहूंगा, जो उन्होंने 29 जुलाई, 2005 को दिया था और फिर 27 फरवरी, 2006 को दिया था। उन्होंने कहा, दोहराया और दृढ़ता के साथ कि “हमने अपनी ओर से नागरिक और स्ट्रेटेजिक कार्यक्रम को अलग-अलग रखने की प्रतिबद्धता जताई थी, किन्तु यह प्रतिबद्धता सशर्त और परस्पर आदान-प्रदान के आधार पर थी और इस पर तभी अमल होगा, जब अमेरिका समझौते के अपने पक्ष को पूरा करेगा।” अब इस मामले में उसका क्या संशोधन होता है, तो अभी अधर में लटका हुआ है और अभी तो इसे सीनेट में जाना है। फिर स्वयं यशवंत बाबू ने कहा है कि फिर दोनों हाऊसेज में इस पर reconciliation होना है और उसके बाद अन्तिम रूप से पारित होकर फिर भारत के सामने आएगा, उसी के अनुसार हम विचार करेंगे। इसी बात को प्रधान मंत्री ने 27 फरवरी को इस सदन में कहा था और 7 मार्च को भी कहा था। आगे प्रधान मंत्री ने फिर स्वयं कहा कि “मैंने इस बात पर जोर दिया था कि परस्पर आदान-प्रदान महत्वपूर्ण है और हमने उम्मीद जताई थी कि भारत द्वारा उठाए जाने वाले कदम सशर्त होंगे और अमेरिका द्वारा की गई कार्रवाई

पर निर्भर करेंगे", तब मैंने इसी बात पर बल दिया था और आज भी उसी बात को दोहरा रहा हूँ कि इसकी प्रक्रिया के किसी भी हिस्से का हमारे स्ट्रेटेजिक कार्यक्रम पर न तो कोई प्रभाव पड़ेगा और न ही इससे कोई समझौता किया जाएगा। यह प्रधान मंत्री ने सदन में आकर कहा है।
...(समय की घंटी)

महोदय, फिर भी यह कहा जाता है कि ईरान के मामले में हमारी वैदेशिक नीति, यहां पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू की चर्चा हुई है, उन्होंने इसकी बुनियाद रखी थी। हमारी वैदेशिक नीति हमारी संप्रभुता से जुड़ी हुई है। अब उस में ईरान का इश्यू लग जाए, लीबिया का इश्यू लग जाए तो हम ईरान का समर्थन करेंगे, हम लीबिया का समर्थन करेंगे, लेकिन हम अपने हित को ध्यान में रखकर करेंगे। लेकिन अमेरिका के साथ शत्रुता लेकर हम ईरान का समर्थन करें या अमेरिका को प्रसन्न रखकर ईरान का विरोध करें, यह हमारी वैदेशिक नीति का आधार नहीं रहा है। यह हमारी नीति की बुनियाद नहीं रही है। इसीलिए मैं समझता हूँ कि इस में पारदर्शिता बनी हुई है, सदन को विश्वास में लिया गया है और अभी अमेरिकी कांग्रेस से जो बिल पारित होना है, वह अधर में लटका हुआ है, वह आने वाला है। मैं समझता हूँ कि यशवंत जी ने बहुत विद्वतापूर्ण बातें कही हैं, आनन्द शर्मा जी ने उन का उत्तर दिया है और प्रधान मंत्री जी सदन की भावना के आधार पर उस का उत्तर देंगे। लेकिन एक बात मैं कहूंगा, यशवंत बाबू ने त्रिस्तरीय स्वरूप की चर्चा की है। इस संदर्भ में प्रधान मंत्री जी के वक्तव्य को कोट कर मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करना चाहूंगा। महोदय, प्रधान मंत्री जी ने इस सदन में 27 फरवरी को कहा था और बहुत दृढ़ता के साथ दोहराया था कि जिस पृथक्करण योजना का उल्लेख किया जा रहा है, महोदय इस बारे में चर्चा इसीलिए हुई है कि वहां संशोधन हुआ है और यहां जो उसे सेपरेशन कर के भेजा गया है, मीडिया में लगातार एक भ्रांति फैलाने का प्रयास किया जा रहा है। इसीलिए प्रधान मंत्री ने पहले ही सदन को विश्वास में लिया है और इस सदन में कहा था कि "जिस पृथक्करण योजना का उल्लेख किया जा रहा है, वह न केवल राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा की अनिवार्यता के अनुकूल है बल्कि हमारे महत्वपूर्ण अनुसंधान तथा विकास संबंधी हितों का भी बचाव करती है। हम ने यह सुनिश्चित किया है कि हमारा त्रिस्तरीय परमाणु कार्यक्रम बाहरी हस्तक्षेप से कमजोर या बाधित नहीं होगा। हम केवल उन्हीं सुविधाओं को निगरानी में रखना चाहेंगे जिन्हें हमारे निरोधक क्षमताओं को नुकसान पहुंचाए बगैर अथवा हमारे अनुसंधान एवं विकास के प्रयासों को प्रतिबंधित किए बिना अथवा किसी भी तरह से हमारे त्रिस्तरीय परमाणु कार्यक्रम के विकास की हमारी स्वायत्तता से समझौता किए बिना नाभिकीय उपयोग के रूप में निर्दिष्ट किया जाता है।" प्रधान मंत्री जी ने यह स्पष्ट रूप से कहा था। इसलिए मैं समझता हूँ कि अभी तो स्थिति स्पष्ट नहीं हुई है। भारत का पक्ष अटल है, प्रधान मंत्री जी ने तीन बार वक्तव्य दिया है, सदन को विश्वास में लिया जा चुका है और जैसे कहा गया है कि सरकार सदन के प्रति जवाबदेह है, मैं समझता हूँ कि सरकार सदन में अपना पक्ष रखेगी।

इन्हीं बातों के साथ मैं समझता हूँ कि सरकार का पक्ष बिल्कुल पारदर्शिता पर आधारित है। इसलिए मैं इस का समर्थन करता हूँ और अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ।

DR. K. KASTURIRANGAN (Nominated): Hon. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I have been listening to the extraordinary, compelling and persuasive statement made by some of the very senior hon. Members of Parliament, starting with Shri Yashwant Sinha, Shri Anand Sharma, Shri Yechury and many others. I was really debating in my mind; I was thinking, I have an end goal that is very clear, but how to reach the end goal after having heard all those compelling arguments.

Sir, I thought, first of all, I should say that over the last one-and-a-half to two years, this initiative, which has caught the attention not only of our country, not only of the United States, but also of countries across the world, is obviously a significant one. This is very clear; I don't think that we have two opinions on this. The initiative taken by Shri Vajpayee, through the Vajpayee-Bush declaration, which for the first time highlighted through two lines, one related to cooperation in atomic energy and the other related to the Space, the intent to cooperate, was left to the present Prime Minister, Dr. Manmohan Singh, to be carried forward. So, that single line became a paragraph in subsequent agreements. Later on, it became texts as we advanced more and more into the details of this agreement. Obviously, in a area like atomic energy, it is never a easy walk-through; it had to be complicated; it had to be intricate and that is reflected here. So, if one talks about the present situation, it is a natural evolution of these kinds of agreements, because these are unique agreements; there are no benchmarks for it. so, obviously, we have to accept that there could be pros and cons which one has to deal with. So, I am not surprised that, this kind of a nuclear deal—the Indo-US nuclear deal—has evoked a lot of passion in the country, this has come because of the very nature and complexity of this kind of a system which can affect not only the science and technology, the strategic capability, but can tilt the geo-politics of the entire region, and perhaps, the world. Now, that is, therefore, you can see that it is not only the political parties that has debated this, the general intelligentsia in the country has come forward to give their opinion, and we have also the scientific community who have forcefully argued their own views on this particular matter. So, this only reflects the seriousness of the situation. I don't have to say here the history of this relation with the United States in the area of atomic energy. In fact, it did start in a

cooperative framework with America. We have Tarapur. There have been the supply of fuel for Tarapur. Subsequently, of course, had the Pokhran-I which soured the relations and even though there has been some kind of a contact, but it was never the same. Then, of course, we had Pokhran-II. At the time, the geo-politics had been already changing. The end of cold war was being witnessed. But in spite of that, the Pokhran-II did leave a certain level of hostility towards India's need. But after September 11, 2001, there was a discernible shift in the attitude of the United States towards India's security needs. Obviously, the nuclear deal which we are currently negotiating with the US is the culmination of this long-drawn process of understanding each other's security concerns in the new global order. Now, what does all this mean? In the context of India going alone since the Pokhran-I—we have been going alone—over the last three decades we have conceptualised our programmes starting with Homi Bhabha, we have been developing our own directions and also we have been addressing the question of self-reliance and pragmatic considerations with regard to how do we have a sustainable programme which depends on our own abundantly available fuel, that is, thorium. So, this resulted in having a three phase programme and I don't think that I have to repeat this scientific aspect because it has already been very well articulated by Shri Anand Sharma and others. But the most important thing is that India develops its own strategy to develop nuclear power, to develop its strategic capability for national security reasons. This, of course, is very unique, and I should say that the Indian atomic scientists proved themselves to be extraordinary in trying to do this. The support has politically cut across all the party lines. I don't think that there is any question of one party or the other party. Every political system in this country has supported this programme and certainly the major milestone, of course, happened during certain leadership times. But that is a part of an overall systemic support that this programme received from the political system of this country since Independence. That is very unique. In fact, people elsewhere are envious of this character of our programme when they see that the atomic energy programme and the space programme in this country are very-well supported by the political system, without any reservation in terms of making the necessary funds available. The Atomic Energy used this opportunity to develop several kinds of technologies—they did this fuel cycling, fuel enrichment applicable for the three-phase cycle which we discussed. All of them

were the product of extremely innovative thinking within the establishment and that provided them with a global leadership in this area. In fact, the present Atomic Energy Chairman, Dr. Anil Kakodkar, was telling me that every second or third paper in the international journals that appeared in the recent year has been from India with respect to technologies related to fast breeder reactor, fuel recycling, fuel enrichment and many kinds of things. One can immediately see the level to which we have progressed in this. We are ranked right at the top in terms of our capability. So, when we talk of any kind of cooperation and collaboration with the country having this level of development and maturity, we are no longer talking as looking for a cooperation to get something. I don't think that that is the spirit in which we are really looking at the United States. We are looking to be equal partners. So, the sentiments here are more related to whether we are equal partners. Are we really equal partners or is the US only considering us as an inferior partner? What are our own compulsions? I don't think we have any compulsion to co-operate. But, I think it is our policy to co-operate because you know, any programme which we have started, we always have an international co-operation as one of the cornerstones of our programme in scientific and technological side. The reason is not for us to seek. If you want to go for development, if you want to go for understanding what the world community is doing and if you want to be a partner in that kind of an endeavour of a world community, because science and technology cuts across borders, there is an acceleration process that you get. Every country derives an acceleration benefit from such a cooperative process. And, this should not be overlooked in any scientific and technology endeavour. So, in connection with the United States, I would like to say that it is the powerhouse of science and technology, many innovations have come from that country. Obviously, India co-operating with the United States is certainly a major landmark, not so much because we are weak or we want to look at their technology, or capability, but there can be an overall synergy which can enhance the overall value and outcome of our own work and I do not see any kind of a contradiction in the current enthusiasm to collaborate with the United States and I am sure that that will be good for us. So, that part is clear.

Now, I come to the third point that I would like to make. I have, tried to make some assessment on the issues that have been raised often here and this is, of course, my own assessment. I had, of course, the

benefit of few discussions with the atomic energy establishment but not to the level that I reflect my assessment based on those discussions. I had also opportunities to discuss with my own colleagues here but ultimately, the conclusions are my own. I am only placing these conclusions in this august House just so say how I feel about this particular Agreement, not necessarily because it goes with one or the other views which have been already expressed in this particular House. One of the things, that have been addressed in great detail, has been the question of strategic autonomy of India's independent decision-making in the atomic energy. On going through all the information that is available, formal documents, those authentic documents—I am not talking about the interpretation in the Press and media on what they are—I did not find a particular specific statement that our autonomy is going to be infringed upon by this particular deal. I could not, at least, see that. But, one of the reasons, of course, is not far to see, the question of separation that we have agreed. With regard to the military facility and the civilian facility, we have agreed that there shall be a division. I think it is a right step. In fact, this was already envisaged even earlier in the programme. And, civilian and nuclear programme being separated out is not uncommon in this kind of area. If you look at DRDO working on missile and ISRO working on satellite launch vehicle, it is a classic example of what we have already done in this connection. So, it is not that we are developing a new model here. We are only facilitating a natural evolution of a system into two convenient sections so that we can independently pursue them. Why do we need to do this? We are always in international co-operation. The question of civil area is more amenable to co-operation internationally. The moment I say that I want to develop a missile, I will have a problem. But, the moment I say that I want to develop a satellite or a component of a launch vehicle, I will have less difficulty because it is civilian, it is open, it is transparent, it is more accountable to an international order, which is not so in the case of military. This is exactly the type of model that we are discussing here. So, there is nothing I can see as a contradiction in the decision to separate out providing the civilian thing with more transparency and the military part of it separated out so that we can pursue our own strategic autonomy with respect to this. But, this was envisaged. So, if you give a close reading to the United States and India Nuclear Co-operation Act of 2006, passed by the House of Representatives, it allows India to develop its nuclear arsenal within the facilities that it has declared

military. The Act does not prohibit addition to these facilities if needed at a future date. I am talking of sections 123, 128 and 129 of the US Atomic Energy Act of 1954. The deal also does not limit India's stockpiles of the fissile material until you go into the Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty. That is a multilateral issue. It has nothing to do with a bilateral agreement and this multilateral Treaty is a part of the agenda on the Conference on Disarmament. The Conference on Disarmament has been discussing this question for the last several years. No agreement has been reached. Obviously, nobody wants to put a cap. That is why you don't have an agreement. The present assessment of the experts who participated in the conference of disarmament is that it would take anywhere up to 15 years to 20 years to come to some kind of an agreement on FMCT, and, even if I put 10 years as a reasonable time, I think, by that time, we would have solved what our requirements are. So, this is not an area that we should too much worry about so long as we have planned it already. I am sure that atomic energy has already factored this aspect into their own planning so that we won't impinge on our requirements.

The other part of it is the act of the achievement of a moratorium on the production of fissile material. There have been statements with respect to India, China and all that. But it is a part of the FMCT; I don't think it is a part of trying to work out some kind of understanding and the US imposing certain types of constraints in the amount of material that we should process at this point in time.

Sir, many Members of the political and scientific community are also concerned that this deal would constrain India's options to conduct further nuclear tests. I think, this is one of the things that have been genuinely expressed by several Members here. Coming to July 18, 2005 statement and I use this statement because we should have some benchmark, which has been presented here, which has been debated here, and, in some sense, has the endorsement of the House. So, that is why, I am taking July 18, 2005. Otherwise, if we don't talk of any basis, then, we are not reaching anywhere. So, we need this kind of a thing. Our Prime Minister had mentioned, "the continuation of India's unilateral moratorium on nuclear testing". Further, India's unilateral moratorium was declared based on the opinion of nuclear scientists in the country. With regard to tests of Pokhran-II, they said, we have sufficient technical data to design, refine and develop the current generation of weapons required

for India's nuclear arsenal. This also has been mentioned. And, if there is a change in the political environment warranting further development and the refinement of these nuclear weapons or even tests, obviously, we have currently the necessary freedom to respond—currently, I mean, even when this discussion is going on and the present level of details on the deal.

If at all, there is an iota of doubt that this is likely to be constrained because of the fact that this deal somewhere innocuously brings in this question, I think, it is something which should be discussed. I don't think, anybody, any nation would say that India should not have this option, having demonstrated or having come up to a certain point. And, if that is an issue, which the House is concerned about, I think, it is a concern for all of us. I don't think that this can be left. Neither this Government nor the Prime Minister can overlook the aspect of it. But, certainly, we should make sure that we are at full liberty to continue with the development, if the geopolitical decision warrants such a requirement in the context of our declared voluntary moratorium on further tests.

The Indo-US Civil Cooperation comes in the way of relations with other countries. The type of reflection of the opinions in the Act, I could say, is one part of it. "The US shall secure India's full and active participation in the US efforts to dissuade, isolate, and, if necessary, sanction and contain Iran for its efforts to acquire WMD, including a nuclear weapons capability (including the capability to enrich or process nuclear material), and the means to deliver WMD". This is one part of it. But if one looks at the July 29 statement of the Prime Minister in this august House, it says, "The Prime Minister agreed to refraining from transfer of enrichment and reprocessing technologies to States that do not have them and supporting international effort to limit their spread and ensuring that the necessary steps have been taken to secure nuclear materials and technology through comprehensive export control legislation and through harmonisation and adherence to Missile Technology Control Regimes (MTCR) and Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG) guidelines. So, there is an alignment between that statement and this statement that has been made. I just thought that I should bring to notice this kind of a thing.

There are similar things; one is related to annual review process. There have been some discussions here. Are we reporting to the

3.00 P.M.

Congress of the United States? I think, it is simply not possible. There is a kind of system that the US has established that wherever they have concerns of a deal working with a country, they want to make sure that they are in full know of the deal because of the strategic and many other implications. They always made it mandatory for the US President to report to the Congress. This has been done when ISRO was under sanctions. The President of the United States, through the National Aeronautics and Space Administrator, used to report every year what they have cooperated with China, what they have cooperated with India. But, what is significant to note is, not even a piece of paper went from India about this part of it. So, there is no question of binding ourselves with any agreement that calls for exchange of information between the President of the United States in his attempt to get this Bill through with the US Congress. I don't think that we should be exercised beyond a point. And, I am sure, we know how to guard ourselves in terms of information, even when we discuss the Right to Information Act with regard to these kind of details. I am sure about that.

The final thing that I would like to say is this. Has the US shifted really the goalposts? A little analysis and sharing this assessment with all of you here. The commitment of the US President as reflected in the July 15 Joint Statement was that 'the President would seek agreement from Congress to adjust US laws and policies and the US will work with friends and allies to adjust international regimes to enable full civil nuclear energy cooperation and trade with India including but not limited to expeditious consideration of fuel supplies for safeguarded nuclear reactors at Tarapur. In the meantime, the US will encourage its partners to also consider this request expeditiously. India has expressed its interests in ITER, that is, the International Thermo Nuclear Energy Research Project, and the willingness to contribute.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI in the Chair]

The US will consult its partners considering India's participation. The US will consult other participants in the generation IV International forum, the new type of reactors, with a view towards India's inclusion'. Now, what has happened? The US is amending its Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to make an exception for India. By repealing Section 128 of the US Atomic Energy Act of 1954, the US recognises India as a *de facto*

nuclear weapons state. The US has also exempted India from all actions that India undertook prior to 18th July. The US has also enabled discussions with IAEA and NSG to facilitate India's participation, I am sure the Prime Minister would update us on what is the level of these discussions. And finally, India has recently become a full member of ITER. So, this is where it stands. From all these available documents, this is the kind of an assessment that, at least, I get for the overall status of this. What does it mean? It means that the deal, the present level of processing that is happening in the United States and also the discussions that are taking place here, there are no major things which one should worry about except what would happen in the future, depending on the way in which certain things have been mentioned here, which essentially means we have to be continuously alert. The concern certainly of this august House reflects that part of what could happen in the future, and if there are any such situations, that would develop either at Senate or in joining of the two versions of the Act, the Senate and the Congress and, ultimately, of course, the type of waiver that the President is endowed with. During any of these phases, certainly one can make use of this kind of concerns. At this present juncture, I should say it has gone off well. I think, it has been dealt with well. And, it is my view that at this particular point one should not be unduly concerned about the various issues. That is agreed. But, it does not mean that we should not tread a cautious path as we reach the final deal. And knowing, of course, the Government, the Parliamentary system as well as atomic energy establishment, I have no doubt we will ever overlook things which will be detrimental to the autonomy and independence of this country. After all, all of us have worked for our lifetime in this country, for this country and by people who are Indians. So, there is no question that there will be any kind of amiss on this. If there is any amiss likely to happen, I am sure, the Parliament will be alert. And if necessary one can identify a way in which the Government can facilitate the Parliament being alert in an effective way, I think, it will fulfil the concerns that have been expressed here. And, I am sure, that this sentiment also would help our Prime Minister to carry forward in his further dealing with the United States. Thank you, Sir.

श्री दिग्विजय सिंह (झारखंड): उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं शुरू में ही इस बात को कहना चाहूंगा कि जब 18 जुलाई को बेंचमार्क रखने की बात, 29 जुलाई को इस सदन में भारत के प्रधानमंत्री ने कही थी तो हम सब लोगों ने इसका विरोध किया था और हमने कहा था कि जो

काम आप करने जा रहे हैं उस काम के दूरगामी परिणाम होंगे और इस परिणाम का नतीजा यह भी निकलेगा कि एक दिन जिन लोगों को आज आपकी बात पर विश्वास हो रहा है उन्हीं लोगों को आपकी बातों पर अविश्वास का माहौल बनाने का मौका दिया जाएगा और आज वह बात करीब-करीब सही हो रही है। मैं नहीं जानता अखबारों के माध्यम से यह बात बार-बार कही गई कि अब एक लाइन खींच दी गई है 29 जुलाई के प्रधान मंत्री के बयान 18 जुलाई के बाद और उस लाइन का नाम रख दिया गया कि यह मनमोहन लाइन है और मनमोहन लाइन से नीचे भारत का कोई समझौता नहीं होने वाला है। लेकिन उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, जब आज हम आपके सामने बोलने के लिए खड़े हुए हैं तो हमने तो इतिहास के पन्नों में मेकमोहन लाइन को तो चायना को ठुकराते हुए सुना था, आज पहली बार मनमोहन लाइन को उसी की सरकार द्वारा ठुकराते हुए मैं देख रहा हूँ क्योंकि जिस तरीके के लोगों का समर्थन आपकी सरकार को हासिल है, आज वही लोग आपके सामने शक उठा रहे हैं, आज वही लोग आपके सामने अविश्वास का माहौल खड़ा कर रहे हैं। अगर यह बात आपकी समझ में आ रही हो तो मैं इतना ही कहना चाहूँगा कि अगर वक्त रहते आप चेतने का प्रयास करेंगे, तब जाकर यह बात आपकी समझ में आएगी कि जो बात हम लोग कह रहे हैं, यह ऐसी कोई बात नहीं जिस बात को हम कह रहे हैं कि हम कोई बहुत बड़े देशभक्त हैं और आपका देश से कोई प्रेम नहीं है, इस बात को समझने का प्रयास नहीं किया जाए, हमारी बातों में। हम इस सदन में जब अपनी बात कह रहे हैं और जब सदन के बाहर यह बात कहते हैं तो उसका एक ही मकसद है उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, कि भारत ने जिस सम्प्रभुता को लेकर इस देश को आजाद किया था और जिन लोगों ने अपनी गरीबी में अपनी बदनसीबी में हिन्दुस्तान की ताकत और शक्ति को दुनिया के शिखर पर पहुंचाने की हिम्मत रखी थी, आज उन लोगों को ठेस पहुंच रही है। बहुत जोरों से नाम लिया जा रहा है यहां पर उन नेताओं का, जिन नेताओं का हम सब लोग श्रद्धागुजार हैं भारत की विदेश नीति को तैयार करने का, भारत की न्यूक्लियर पॉलिसी को तैयार करने का जिससे क्या सचमुच आज हम उन कामों को कर रहे हैं। उनके बारे में हम श्रद्धा के दो शब्द भी कह सकें। पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू का बार-बार नाम लिया गया, उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस सदन में तमाम तरफ के लोगों ने, यशवंत सिन्हा से लेकर आनन्द शर्मा जी ने उनका नाम लिया, सीताराम येचुरी जी ने उनका नाम लिया। क्या मैं पूछ सकता हूँ कि जिस समय हमने अपनी आत्मनिर्भर स्वतंत्र विदेश नीति को और परमाणु नीति को तैयार किया था उस समय हमारी आर्थिक हालत क्या थी। इस देश में बियासी फीसदी लोग गरीबी रेखा के नीचे थे, अमेरिका का गेहूं हम खाते थे लेकिन फिर भी हमारे मन में हौसला था, हिम्मत थी। वह हौसला, वह हिम्मत इसलिए थी कि हमने आजादी की लड़ाई में दुनिया के लोगों से यह वायदा किया था कि अगर हिन्दुस्तान आजाद होगा तो उसकी आजादी का महत्व सिर्फ वह अपने देश तक सीमित नहीं रहेगा, बल्कि वह दुनिया के उन तमाम देशों के लिए जो देश या तो साम्राज्यवाद के खिलाफ लड़ रहे हैं या जो देश कहीं कॉलोनी बने हुए हैं, जो देश कहीं गुलामी झेल रहे हैं, हम उन सब

लोगों के लिए मिलकर लड़ाई लड़ेंगे। लेकिन क्या आज हम इस बात को कह सकते हैं? बहुत जोश-खरोश के साथ यहां पर बोला जा रहा था और एक दिन मैं इसी सदन में जब आनन्द शर्मा जी जवाब दे रहे थे तो शायद मेरा गुस्सा हो सकता है मैं कोई बदतमीजी की भाषा नहीं बोला था, मेरा गुस्सा था। जब वे बोल रहे थे तो मैंने कह दिया था कि आप झूठ बोल रहे हैं और उस झूठ बोलने के पीछे मेरी एक ही मंशा थी, क्योंकि जिस बात का वे जिक्र कर रहे थे उसके ठीक उल्टा, चूंकि प्रधान मंत्री जी ने इस बात को कहा था, प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा था कि अमेरिका की कांग्रेस में, अमेरिका की संसद में क्या हो रहा है, हम उसके लिए जिम्मेदार नहीं हैं, हम तो जिम्मेदारी लेते हैं कि हमने बुश से क्या बात की है, वहां के राष्ट्रपति से क्या बात की है, हम उसकी जिम्मेदारी लेते हैं। लेकिन प्रधान मंत्री जी और आनन्द शर्मा जी, यह बयान जिसको मैं उद्धृत करने जा रहा हूं, यह बयान न तो वहां के कांग्रेस के किसी सदस्य का है, न वहां के किसी सिनेटर या कांग्रेसमैन का है, बल्कि यह बयान वहां की विदेश मंत्री कौन्डोलीजा राइस का है। बुश प्रशासन की, बुश की विदेश मंत्री और वे कैपिटल हिल में भारतीयों को सम्बोधित कर रही थी और कैपिटल हिल में उन्होंने सम्बोधित करते हुए कहा, आनन्द शर्मा जी, मैं ज्यादा समय नहीं लूंगा केवल मैं सिर्फ उसकी एक लाइन उद्धृत करना चाहूंगा। "Let me be clear: We do not support India joining the Non-Proliferation Treaty as a nuclear weapon State. Rather, the goal of our initiative is to include India, for the first time ever, in the global non-proliferation regime." यह क्या कहता है? इस एक लाइन में कितनी बात छिपी हुई है, इसका अंदाजा आपको लग रहा है? यह तो कांग्रेस के लोग नहीं कह रहे हैं, यह तो बुश प्रशासन के विदेश मंत्री, जिसके जिम्मे यह है, जो इस काम के नायक लोग हैं, आज उनकी तरफ से यह भाषा बोली जा रही है, यह बात बोली जा रही है। क्या इससे हमारे मन में शंका पैदा नहीं होती है? आपने बार-बार कहा, हमने कोशिश की थी कि इस सदन में एक रिजोल्यूशन हो जाये और वह कोशिश किसी दलगत भावना से उठकर की थी, हमने सब लोगों को मिलाकर कोशिश की थी कि उसमें सब लोगों की भावना हो, लेकिन आपको लगा कि जैसे कोई बात हम आप पर थोप रहे हैं या आपके ऊपर हम अविश्वास कर रहे हैं। प्रधान मंत्री जी, हमारा कोई अविश्वास आप पर नहीं है। अगर अविश्वास होता, तो अविश्वास प्रस्ताव दूसरे सदन में लाया जाता। हम तो आपकी उस ताकत को बढ़ाना चाहते थे, जिसमें देश की सम्प्रभुता को बचाने की शपथ आपने राष्ट्रपति भवन में ली थी। हम तो आपकी शक्ति को बढ़ाना चाहते थे, जिसमें आप हिन्दुस्तान की न्युक्लियर पालिसी को, इंडिपेंडेंट पालिसी बनाकर, वायदा किया था सदन में। हम तो उस ताकत को बढ़ाना चाहते थे। वह बात क्यों पैदा हुई हमारे मन में? हमने यह बात नहीं कही। हम राजनीतिक लोग हो सकते हैं, हमारे मन में, आपके मन में एक-दूसरे के प्रति अविश्वास हो सकता है, लेकिन यह देश के उन लोगों ने कहा, जिन्होंने अपने कंधों पर इस देश की न्युक्लियर पालिसी को, गरीबी में ढोया, किसी के सहारे नहीं, अमेरिका के भरोसे विदेश नीति को और

न्युक्लियर पालिसी को नहीं चलाया। उन्होंने इसको गरीबी में चलाया, साधन-विहीन होने के बावजूद चलाया और चलाते-चलाते, जैसा कि श्री यशवंत सिन्हा जी ने कहा, हम कहां से कहां पहुंच गये। कहां से हमने शुरुआत की थी और कहां हम आज आकर खड़े हैं। दुनिया में न सिर्फ एक न्युक्लियर राष्ट्र के रूप में हम खड़े हैं, बल्कि हम अपनी आत्मनिर्भरता के उस मुकाम पर खड़े हैं, जिसका जिक्र उन्होंने किया था। हमारे 97-98 फीसदी वैज्ञानिक कहते हैं कि हम 97-98 फीसदी थोरियम के आधार पर अपनी न्युक्लियर पालिसी में दुनिया में स्वतंत्र हो जायेंगे। हम एक-दो परसेंट के बीच खड़े हैं और तब हम यह कहते हैं या वह वैज्ञानिक यह कहते हैं कि इस तरह के काम से तो अच्छा था कि एनपीटी पर दस्तखत कर देते, सेठना साहब कोई हमारे दल के नहीं हैं, विरोधी पक्ष के लोग नहीं हैं और ना ही सत्ता के पक्ष के लोग हैं, सेठना वह नाम है जिसको इस देश के लोग, इस देश का नागरिक अपने को गौरवान्वित महसूस करता है कि सेठना जैसा वैज्ञानिक हमारे देश में पैदा हुआ। उस परम्परा को धोया, जिस परम्परा को डा० होमी भाभा ने इस देश में स्थापित किया था। आज सेठना क्या कहते हैं कि इससे अच्छा तो एनपीटी पर दस्तखत हो जाते, इस इंडो-यूएस न्युक्लियर डील से तो अच्छा था कि हम एनपीटी पर दस्तखत कर देते, वह हमारे लिए ज्यादा अच्छा था। क्या प्रधान मंत्री जी, आप पर इन बातों का भी कोई असर नहीं है? क्या इन बातों से आपको नहीं लगता कि जिन बातों को हम कह रहे हैं, वह कोई विरोध की भाषा में नहीं कह रहे हैं, बल्कि देश के स्वाभिमान को ऊंचा करने के लिए और जो भ्रांतियां फैली हैं, आपको प्रधान मंत्री जी, पता नहीं कि इस बात की जानकारी है या नहीं, क्या आपके कानों तक आपके इंटेलेजेंस के लोग यह बात सुनाते हैं या नहीं सुनाते हैं, आपके कई मंत्रियों के बारे में कहा जाता है कि उनका विभाग इसलिए बदल दिया जाता है कि वह अमेरिका के खिलाफ हैं। हम यह बात इस देश में सुनते हैं और इसी देश में नहीं, इस देश के बाहर सुनते हैं। जब हम लोग टेलीविजन पर जाते हैं, तो पाकिस्तान के लोग हमसे यह पूछते हैं कि क्या यह बात सही है? यह भ्रांति है और इस भ्रांति को दूर करना है, आप इस देश के प्रधान मंत्री हैं यह सदन सार्वभौमिक सत्ता का केन्द्र है, इसलिए इस सदन के माध्यम से हम इस प्रस्ताव को लाना चाहते थे, अगर आप इसे स्वीकार कर लेते, तो देश की इज्जत और गरिमा के साथ-साथ आपकी इज्जत और गरिमा भी बढ़ती। आपको मालूम है, आप तो उस समय विपक्षी दल में थे, आप तो जहां पर जसवंत सिंह जी बैठे हुए हैं, वहां पर बैठे हुए थे। इराक के मसले पर एनडीए सरकार के मन में शंका थी, हमें सदस्य होने के नाते, हमें इस सदन के माध्यम से, इस तरह का कोई रिजोल्यूशन लाना चाहिए या नहीं लाना चाहिए और उस पर दो-तीन दिन तक बहस चलती रही। हम बहुमत में थे, आपके तो सहयोगी भी आपके खिलाफ हैं, आपके सहयोगी भी आपसे चाहते हैं कि आप किसी तरह से इस तरह का प्रस्ताव ले आयें, लेकिन हम तो बहुमत में थे, हमें किसी की जरूरत नहीं थी। हमारे वामपंथी दल के लोग, हमारे मित्रों ने कहा कि इससे आपकी शक्ति बढ़ेगी और जो आप चाहते हैं, वह अच्छा हो सकता है, नटवर सिंह जी वहां बैठे हुए हैं, इन्होंने अटल जी को कहा था कि इससे

आपकी शक्ति और ताकत बढ़ेगी और एक समय ऐसा आया जब अटल जी ने इस बात को स्वीकार कर लिया, एनडीए की सरकार ने स्वीकार कर लिया, कम से कम देश व्यक्ति से बड़ा होता है, व्यक्ति से बड़ा उसका सिद्धांत होता है और कभी-कभी सिद्धांत से बड़ा देश होता है। हम इतना ही, आपसे कहना चाहते हैं कि इस तरह से कोई, सदन के माध्यम से कोई प्रस्ताव पेश होता, तो आपकी ताकत और हैसियत बढ़ती, इससे घटती नहीं, अब हमको समझाया जाता है कि जो अमेरिका की कांग्रेस कर रही है, जो कांग्रेसमैन वहां कर रहे हैं, जो सीनेट करने वाली है, वह हम पर कोई बाइंडिंग नहीं होगा। क्या प्रधान मंत्री जी, आप इस बात को अच्छी तरह से नहीं जानते हैं कि अमेरिका का राष्ट्रपति कोई एक इंच भी इधर से उधर हिल सकता है, जो यूएस कांग्रेस से पास हो जाये। हमें दुख इस बात का है, हमें दुख इस बात का नहीं है कि हम आपके विरोध में हैं और आप पर हम कोई स्कोर करना चाहते हैं। हमें दुख है तो इस बात का है कि भारत के प्रधानमंत्री को ही सिर्फ मालूम होता है कि हमारी न्युक्लियर तरक्की में हम कहा-कहां और किस जगह खड़े हैं। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, बहुत सी ऐसी बातें हैं जो भारत के राष्ट्रपति और उपराष्ट्रपति को भी पता नहीं होती। हम सब लोग विदेश मंत्रालय और अलग-अलग मंत्रालय में काम किए हुए लोग हैं। हम लोगों को भी पता नहीं होता। यह ताकत और शक्ति सिर्फ भारत के प्रधानमंत्री को मालूम होती है। केवल वही जानते हैं कि कौन सी चीज़ कहां पर मौजूद है। किसी को यह पता नहीं होता है। और अब, जो यूएस कांग्रेस में फ़ैसला हो रहा है, उसके मुताबिक क्या होगा? हर साल 31 जनवरी का दिन मुकर्रर कर दिया गया है। 31 जनवरी को भारत की सरकार की तरफ से अमेरिका के राष्ट्रपति को बताया जाएगा और अमेरिका का राष्ट्रपति यूएस कांग्रेस को बताएगा। क्या हम अपने को इसके लिए शर्मिंदा महसूस न करें? जिसके मंत्री को पता नहीं है, जिसके सहयोगियों को भी पता नहीं है। सर, देश ने प्रधानमंत्री के ऊपर यह भरोसा किया है, प्रधानमंत्री को कोई अनजाने में यह शक्ति नहीं मिली है। क्योंकि हम चाहते हैं कि हमारी इन चीज़ों से, भारत की अस्मिता जुड़ी हो, भारत की इज्जत और गरिमा जुड़ी हो, उनके बारे में जो भारत का मुखिया हो, उसी को सिर्फ पता हो, किसी और व्यक्ति को पता न हो। प्रधानमंत्री जी, हम आपसे एक और बात की गुजारिश करना चाहेंगे। लोग इस पद पर आते हैं, चले जाते हैं। जब आपने यह काम किया था, तब आपके साथ आपके सहयोगी नटवर सिंह जी थे। वे आँधर थे, उन्होंने बनाया। आज नटवर सिंह जी जो विदेश मंत्री नहीं हैं। लेकिन जो करके चले गए, आने वाली पीढ़ियां उसको भोगेंगी। आप कल प्रधानमंत्री रहें य न रहें, जसवंत सिंह जी और यशवंत सिन्हा जी विदेश मंत्री थे, अब नहीं हैं, लेकिन जो कुछ करके गए, उसको तो आने वाली सरकार और आने वाली पीढ़ी स्वीकार करेगी। हमारा आपसे इतना ही कहना है कि हम आपसे जो कहना चाहते हैं या आपकी जो ताकत बढ़ाना चाहते हैं, उससे आने वाली पीढ़ियों की ताकत बढ़ेगी। आज़ादी सिर्फ खाने-पीने के लिए नहीं होती है। ग्लोबलाइज़ेशन इसलिए नहीं होता है कि दुनिया एक हो जाए और बहुत करीब हो जाए। बार-बार ईरान का जिक्र हुआ था, सब लोगों ने अपने भाषण में ईरान का जिक्र किया था। ईरान के बारे में हमारे एक सदस्य ऐसा बोल गए जिससे हमने अपने को शर्मिंदा महसूस

किया। ईरान हमारा सदियों पुराना दोस्त है, पीढ़ी-दर-पीढ़ी हमारा दोस्त है। एक बात थाद रखिएगा कि बोलने में सक्नुवाहट में लोग नहीं बोल पाते हैं लेकिन महात्मा गांधी से बड़ा देश में कोई नेता पैदा नहीं हुआ है। यह महात्मा गांधी की समझ थी कि जब अंग्रेजों के खिलाफ आजादी की लड़ाई उन्होंने प्रारम्भ की तो उस आजादी की लड़ाई से पहले महात्मा गांधी ने इस देश में खिलाफत आंदोलन शुरू किया था। क्यों किया था? उस समय तो इतना टेलीविजन भी नहीं था। उस समय में तो इतने टेलीफोन भी नहीं थे। 15-20 दिन में एक देश की खबरें दूसरे देश में आती थीं, लेकिन गांधी जी इस देश की नब्ज को समझते थे। गांधी जी का बड़प्पन इसमें छुपा हुआ था। वह जानते थे कि अगर हमें देश की आजादी की लड़ाई लड़नी है, तो देश के लोगों के विश्वास को अर्जित करना जरूरी है और इसमें सब लोग बराबर के हिस्सेदार थे। तब गांधी जी ने खिलाफत आंदोलन पहले प्रारम्भ किया, देश की आजादी की लड़ाई बाद में प्रारम्भ की—यह गांधी जी की समझ थी। और आज, ईरान के बारे में हम एक शब्द में कह देते हैं। अभी एक सदस्य बोलते हुए कह गए कि हम अमेरिका को खुश रखना चाहते हैं तो ईरान के खिलाफ तो रहना ही पड़ेगा। यह कौन सी बात है?

श्री मंगनी लाल मंडल: किसी ने यह नहीं कहा।

श्री दिग्विजय सिंह: मैं अब इस पर बहस नहीं करना चाहता। मैं सिर्फ इतना कहना चाह रहा था कि ईरान हमारा सदियों पुराना दोस्त है।...(व्यवधान)... मैं किसी का नाम नहीं ले रहा हूँ।...(व्यवधान)...

श्री मंगनी लाल मंडल: किसी ने ऐसा नहीं कहा है। मैंने चर्चा की थी...(व्यवधान)...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री दिनेश त्रिवेदी): किसी ने यदि कहा नहीं है तो उसका सवाल ही पैदा नहीं होता है।...(व्यवधान)...

श्री मंगनी लाल मंडल: अमेरिका से शत्रुता लेकर और न अमेरिका को खुश करके किया जा सकता है। हमारी वैदेशिक नीति हमारी सम्प्रभुता के अनुसार होनी चाहिए। यह मैंने कहा था। ये गलत बात कोट कर रहे हैं। ये गलत बात कर रहे हैं।...(व्यवधान)...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री दिनेश त्रिवेदी): दिग्विजय जी, आप चालू रखिए।...(व्यवधान)...

श्री मंगनी लाल मंडल: नाम आपने नहीं लिया है लेकिन आप शर्मिंदा महसूस कर रहे हैं, गलत बात पर।...(व्यवधान)... जो बात कही ही नहीं गई।...(व्यवधान)...

श्री दिग्विजय सिंह: उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, 1978 में एक ऐसा माहौल बना था। अमेरिका को यह विश्वास हो गया था—हम सब लोग सरकार के समर्थक थे, मोरारजी भाई इस देश के प्रधानमंत्री बन गए थे और अमेरिका को ऐसा लगता था जैसे उनके बारे में एक भ्रांति फैलायी गयी थी या ऐसा माहौल बनाया गया था कि वे अमेरिका के दोस्त हैं और उनके बारे में यह कहा गया

कि वे सोवियत संघ के खिलाफ हैं, कम्युनिस्टों के खिलाफ हैं इसलिए उस समय के तत्कालीन राष्ट्रपति कार्टर को ऐसा एहसास हुआ कि शायद हम अभी जाएंगे और भारत से एनपीटी पर दस्तखत करवाकर चले आएंगे। इसी उम्मीद के साथ कार्टर साहब हिन्दुस्तान आ गए। बहुत दिनों के बाद अमेरिका का कोई राष्ट्रपति हिन्दुस्तान आया था। चूंकि जब से श्रीमती गांधी और निक्सन का episode हो गया, उसके बाद से अमेरिका का कोई राष्ट्रपति हिन्दुस्तान नहीं आया। एक लंबे अरसे के बाद कार्टर इस उम्मीद से हिन्दुस्तान आए थे कि यहां आते ही वे मोरारजी भाई से अपना काम करा लेंगे, लेकिन तीन दिन रहने के बावजूद, जिसके बारे में अमेरिका को इतनी उम्मीद थी, भारत के प्रधान मंत्री ने कहा कि हम कम्युनिस्ट के पक्ष में हैं या विरोध में, यह तो बाद में तय होगा, लेकिन एक बात मैं बता दूँ कि मैं किसी भी कीमत पर एनपीटी पर दस्तखत करने की बात छोड़ दूँ, उस पर आपसे चर्चा करने के लिए भी तैयार नहीं हूँ—ऐसे लोग इस देश में पैदा हुए हैं। आज उनका नाम नहीं लिया जाता है। कांग्रेस के लोग जवाहर लाल जी का नाम नहीं लेते हैं, हम जवाहर लाल जी का नाम लेते हैं। हम श्रीमती गांधी का नाम लेते हैं, क्योंकि श्रीमती गांधी ने ही तो हम लोगों का emergency में जेल भी भेजा था। ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री रुद्रनारायण पाणि: जगजीवन राम जी का भी नाम नहीं लेते हैं।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री दिनेश त्रिवेदी): आप बैठिए।

श्री दिग्विजय सिंह: श्रीमती गांधी ने तो हम लोगों को emergency में जेल भेजा, लेकिन तब भी हम लोगों को गौरव होता है, जो बहादुरी उन्होंने दिखाई। 1971 की लड़ाई के समय जब वे अमेरिका गई थीं, प्रियरंजन दास मुंशी जी तब आप एक युवा नेता के रूप में उनको देखते होंगे, याद है वह घटना? जब श्रीमती गांधी अमेरिका गई और उन्होंने कहा कि हमारे ईस्ट पाकिस्तान से एक करोड़ लोग आ गए हैं, उनका हमारे लिए कोई इलाज कीजिए। इन रिफ्यूजियों का कोई रास्ता ढूंढिए। निक्सन साहब ने कहा कि अभी बहुत समय है, हम इसको देखेंगे, रात में खाने के समय इस पर चर्चा हो जाएगी। इस पर श्रीमती गांधी ने कहा कि हिन्दुस्तान में गरीबी जरूर है, लेकिन हम यहां आपका पुलाव और रोटी खाने नहीं आए हैं, हम एक करोड़ लोग के पुनर्वास की बात करने आए हैं। अगर आप इसका रास्ता नहीं निकालेंगे, तो युद्ध ही अवश्यभावी है और अंत में हम युद्ध में झोंक दिए गए। देश के लोग अपने बुरे समय में इतनी ताकत दिखा सकते थे, इतना गौरव दिखा सकते थे, तो आज कौन सी ऐसी कमजोरी हो गई, जिसमें पूरे न्यूक्लीयर साईंस को, हमारे वैज्ञानिकों ने अपने कंधों पर ढोकर यहां तक पहुंचाया है, आज हमारी ऐसी कौन सी जरूरत आ गई? सीताराम येचुरी जी ने बिल्कुल ठीक कहा—पूरे साठ साल में 2.5 परसेंट अपने न्यूक्लीयर एनर्जी की और आने वाले दिनों में न्यूक्लीयर साईंस के सहारे एनर्जी की ताकत और शक्ति जो आप तय करने जाएंगे, वह कितना होने वाला है? 8 परसेंट के करीब होने वाला है। जब हमारे वैज्ञानिकों से पूछते हैं, तो कहते हैं कि 2020 पर इस रफ्तार से चले और सब सहयोग मिला,

तो हम ज्यादा से ज्यादा 15 से 20 हजार मेगावॉट तक पहुंच सकते हैं और उसकी क्या कीमत देनी पड़ेगी? यशवंत सिन्हा जी ने एक बात कही, जिसको लोगों ने गंभीरता से नहीं लिया। जब ये separation हो रहा है, सिविलियन और मिलिट्री का, तो जानते हैं उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, हमें तो प्रधान मंत्री ने नहीं बताया, हम अखबारों के माध्यम से या जो वैज्ञानिकों ने हमें बताया है, उस आधार पर हम इतना ही कह सकते हैं कि वह लगभग 2 लाख हजार करोड़ रुपया खर्च होने वाला है। जिसे 40 बिलियन कहते हैं, 40 बिलियन यूएस डॉलर्स उस पर खर्चा होगा और उतने पैसे में तो हम कितनी एजर्जी बनाने को तैयार हैं। अभी भी हमारे पास जो कोल का भंडार है, जो alternative source of energy है, उसके सहारे कहां तक हम अपनी एनर्जी, ताकत को बढ़ा सकते हैं, इसका अंदाज़ा नहीं है। इसलिए प्रधान मंत्री जी, जब आप इस सदन में बोलने के लिए खड़े हों, तो हम आपसे कुछ बातों पर स्पष्टीकरण चाहेंगे और वह स्पष्टीकरण है कि आखिर यह बात तय हुई थी, आपने कहा था, आपके बयान हमारे हाथ में रखे हुए हैं, आपने कहा था कि हमारे और अमेरिका के बीच में जो भी समझौता होगा, वह बराबरी पर होगा और उसका फायदा, उसका सहयोग एक-दूसरे को मिलेगा, लेकिन क्या मैं आपसे पूछ सकता हूँ कि जिस तरह का बिल पास हुआ है, उसमें क्या यह बात सही नहीं है कि उसमें कहा गया है कि आप जिस काम को करने जा रहे हैं, उस काम में हमारी तरफ से तो पहले तय हुआ था कि जो इंसपेक्टर आएंगे—एटॉमिक एनर्जी इंसपेक्टर, वे फैसला करेंगे, लेकिन अब तय हो रहा है कि उनकी तरफ से कॉमर्स मिनिस्ट्री के लोग भी होंगे। उनकी तरफ से एटॉमिक एनर्जी रेगुलेटरी के लोग भी होंगे। ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री मंगनी लाल मंडल: यशवंत बाबू की चर्चा आपने बहुत की है और यशवंत बाबू ने स्वयं कहा है कि वह सीनेट से पास होगा। अभी तो कानून बना नहीं है, तो यशवंत बाबू की बात आप क्यों करते हैं? ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री एस्.एस्. अहलुवालिया: सबको मालूम है सबको मालूम है। ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री मंगनी लाल मंडल: सबको मालूम है तो ... (व्यवधान)...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री दिनेश त्रिवेदी): देखिए, चर्चा बहुत गंभीरता से हो रही है, आप मेहरबानी करके मत टोकिए। ... (व्यवधान) ... मिस्टर पाणि, प्लीज़ ... प्लीज़ ... Let me handle ... (व्यवधान) ... दिग्विजय जी, बोलिए। ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री रामदेव भंडारी (बिहार): सर, मेरी पार्टी का सात मिनट का टाइम था, सात मिनट होते ही घंटी बजी थी। इनकी पार्टी का चार मिनट टाइम है, अब ये कितनी देर बोलेंगे, बताइये ... (व्यवधान)...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री दिनेश त्रिवेदी): दिग्विजय जी, अब आप खत्म कीजिए। आपका समय खत्म हो चुका है। ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री रामदेव भंडारी: हमारी पार्टी का सात मिनट टाइम था, तुरंत घंटी बजाई गई और इनका चार मिनट का समय है और 15 मिनट ये बोल गए हैं। कितनी देर और बोलेंगे? ... (व्यवधान)...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री दिनेश त्रिवेदी): दिग्विजय जी, आप conclude कीजिए। देखिए, चर्चा बहुत गंभीर environment में हो रही है और मैं। आपको ...(व्यवधान)... मैं आपसे रिक्वेस्ट करूंगा ...(व्यवधान)...

प्रो० राम देव भंडारी: हमारी पार्टी का सात मिनट टाइम था, तो आपने दस मिनट में खत्म करवाया। अब इनकी पार्टी का चार मिनट का समय है और पंद्रह मिनट ये बोल गए हैं। ...(व्यवधान)...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री दिनेश त्रिवेदी): मैं आपसे रिक्वेस्ट करूंगा(व्यवधान).... मैं आपसे रिक्वेस्ट करूंगा कि मेहरबानी करके इनको खत्म करने दीजिए।(व्यवधान).... दिग्विजय जी।(व्यवधान)....

श्री एस०एस० अहलुवालिया: आपको किसी ने रोका है?(व्यवधान)....

प्रो० राम देव भंडारी: रोका गया है(व्यवधान)....

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री दिनेश त्रिवेदी): दिग्विजय सिंह जी, आप कन्क्लूड कीजिए।(व्यवधान)....

श्री एस०एस० अहलुवालिया: अब तो आपका खत्म हो गया।(व्यवधान)....

प्रो० राम देव भंडारी: मैं समझता हूँ कि(व्यवधान).... अब दिग्विजय सिंह जी को खत्म करने दीजिए, गंभीरता से चर्चा हो रही है। मैं आपसे विनती करूंगा कि आप मेहरबानी करके बैठ जाएं।(व्यवधान)....

श्री दिग्विजय सिंह: भंडारी जी, अगर आपको मेरे बोलने से(व्यवधान)....

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री दिनेश त्रिवेदी): भंडारी जी, आप मेहरबानी करें। प्लीज(व्यवधान)....

प्रो० राम देव भंडारी: महोदय, मेरी पार्टी का 7 मिनट का टाइम था, जैसे ही 7 मिनट हुए तुरंत घंटी बजी।(व्यवधान).... आपकी पार्टी का 4 मिनट का टाइम है और आप 15 मिनट से बोल रहे हैं।(व्यवधान)....

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री दिनेश त्रिवेदी): भंडारी जी, मेरे पास टाइम का रिकार्ड है।(व्यवधान)....

श्री दिग्विजय सिंह: मैं तो यह मौका इसलिए ले रहा था कि प्रधान मंत्री जी बैठे हुए हैं और हम सब लोग अपनी बात कह रहे हैं, क्योंकि इनको हमारी बातों का जवाब देने का बहुत दिनों बाद यह मौका मिला है। हम अलग-अलग तरीके से प्रयास को कर रहे थे। हमारा यह प्रयास था कि सदन में और कहीं से नहीं तो कम से कम कुर्सी की तरफ से ही यह बयान आ जाता, जो प्रधान मंत्री जी की ताकत और शक्ति को बढ़ाता। इसलिए हम चाहते थे कि यह काम होता, लेकिन दुर्भाग्य से वह काम हो नहीं पाया, जैसा कि उपसभाध्यक्ष जी ने कहा और भंडारी जी को मेरे बोलने पर दुख है,(समय की घंटी)...(व्यवधान)...

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): Nothing is going on record ...(*Interruptions*)

श्री एस०एस० अहलुवालिया: *

प्र० राम देव भंडारी: *

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री दिनेश त्रिवेदी): भंडारी जी, भंडारी जी, ... (व्यवधान)... मेहरबानी करके ... (व्यवधान)... देखिए, बड़ी ... (व्यवधान)... भंडारी जी, ... (व्यवधान), अहलुवालिया जी, ... (व्यवधान)... अहलुवालिया जी, ... (व्यवधान)... आप प्लीज़ बैठ जाइए। ... (व्यवधान)... आप प्लीज़ बैठ जाइए। ... (व्यवधान), आप प्लीज़ बैठ जाइए। ... (व्यवधान)... हम संभाल रहे हैं। ... (व्यवधान)... भंडारी जी, ... (व्यवधान)... भंडारी जी, ... (व्यवधान)... भंडारी जी मैंने आपसे पहले भी विनती की है कि बहुत अच्छे माहौल में यह चर्चा चल रही है। ... (व्यवधान)... मैं आप से मेहरबानी करने के लिए कह रहा हूँ कि दिग्विजय जी, अब खत्म कर रहे हैं। ... (व्यवधान)... प्लीज़, प्लीज़ भंडारी जी। हम न्याय कर रहे हैं, ... (व्यवधान)... समय मेरे पास है। आप मेहरबानी करके बैठ जाइए। दिग्विजय जी आपका समय खत्म हो गया है, मेहरबानी करके खत्म कीजिए। प्लीज़ कन्क्लूड।

श्री दिग्विजय सिंह: महोदय, इसलिए मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करने जा रहा हूँ और समाप्ति के दरमियान मैं फिर से प्रधानमंत्री जी से एक बात कहना चाहूंगा। प्रधानमंत्री जी, डॉ० होमी भाभा, डा० एच०एन० सेठना, डॉ० एम०आर० श्रीनिवासन और पी०के० अयंगर इन तमाम लोगों ने अपने-अपने तरीके से लेख लिखे हैं। ये सब वे लोग हैं, जो इस कमीशन के चेयरमैन रहे हैं। आपके नेतृत्व में और आप से पहले जो प्रधानमंत्री थे, उनके नेतृत्व में सभी ने काम किया है और काम करने के बाद एक प्रतिष्ठा अर्जित की है। जब मैं इस सदन में पहली बार आया था तो डा० रमन्ना साहब इस सदन में बैठते थे। वे हम लोगों को अलग से बताते थे कि किस तरह की मुसीबतों में, उन लोगों ने 1974 के दरमियान किस तरह से काम किया था, जब श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी जी के प्रधानमंत्रित्व काल में पोखरण हुआ था और बाद में फिर अटल जी के नेतृत्व में हुआ। वे बताते थे कि दोनों के समय में कितना फर्क आया था, इसलिए कि हमने तरक्की की थी। हम आज आपसे इतना ही कहना चाहते हैं कि हम आज तरक्की के रास्ते पर हैं, हम आगे बढ़े हुए हैं। अब हम किसी देश के गेहूँ के मोहताज नहीं हैं। हम अपने पैरों पर खड़े होना चाहते हैं और जिन जवाहर लाल, इंदिरा गांधी का नाम हम लोग इस सदन में ले रहे हैं, हम इतना ही चाहते हैं कि जिन आदर्शों पर उन्होंने हमें खड़ा किया है, हम उन आदर्शों को भूलने का प्रयास न करें और अगर उसे भूलने में आपको कहीं कमजोरी दिख रही हो तो हम चाहते हैं कि सदन के माध्यम से एक सर्वसम्मति का प्रस्ताव हो जाए और उस प्रस्ताव से आप देश पर जितने आगे के समय तक शासन

*Not recorded.

करना है, आप करते रहें, मेरा कोई विरोध नहीं होगा। देश में एक स्वर से एक भाषा जाए कि इस बात पर, इस सिद्धांत पर हम सब लोग एक हैं। इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): Shri C. Ramachandraiah. I just want to tell you this. I have seen that time was not curtailed by anybody here. I would only request you to discipline yourself, and within the time allotted, please conclude. As per the time allotted, you have six minutes. I will not disturb you because it is an important debate going on. But you kindly discipline yourself.

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: Sir, as far as the time-frame is concerned, on this subject, the goal posts have already been changed.

Sir, this subject is too esoteric to anybody other than the nuclear scientists, journalists or scientists. But, to my utter surprise, this particular subject has drawn the attention of the entire nation. And I am happy that everybody is now talking about it, even outside the Parliament, outside the intellectual forums. Sir, we have been in isolation of nuclear sector for five decades. Why have we chosen this time, at this juncture, to break this? I want to know whether the country's interest is being protected, or, it is detrimental to the interest of the nation. Sir, an impartial analysis has been made by certain persons. As far as my analysis goes, Sir, it seems to be a unilateral, not even bilateral. What are the reasons that have been adduced for justifying this Deal? Energy security. So very well articulated by Mr. Yechury about various options that the country has got to meet the energy requirements. About the technologies that are available, we have got solar energy, we have got biomass, we have got wind energy, apart from thermal and hydro energy. And, I don't think a cost analysis has been made. A lot of investment is needed to have the reactors, to own the reactors. A lot of fixed investment is needed for that. Ultimately, when compared to the cost of production that is being incurred to generate nuclear power, it is not at all an academically viable proposal. This is my opinion. That is one aspect of it.

Sir, the second aspect is, to what extent this will cater to our requirement? For everything, we are depending upon the articles that we read in the newspapers because we are not privy to the decisions, and decisions of the Government are not accessible to us. The generation of power from nuclear sector has got a long gestation period. So, that is

energy aspect. My opinion is, unless extraordinary benefits are being derived by the nation from this Deal, extending the reason that the energy security can be ensured is not a justifiable reason. In my opinion, it is not at all a justifiable reason.

Sir, the solution lies within the country. We can solve this problem. As eminent Members have participated in the debate, I have read so many articles in the newspapers, that too from that particular sector of the eminent scientists who are responsible for keeping our head high among the comity of nations for building up the nuclear technology in this country, which state that we are not short of technology in this country. We do not need any technology, at this juncture because we are very rich in preparing uranium, which, of course, may be short. But, can you adduce the reason that for strategic purpose, we need the raw material? I don't think so because we are committed for disarmament in the long run, and we are committed to a minimum nuclear credible deterrence, for which, I have read in an article that 100 warheads will be sufficient, and for which, we require half-a-tonne of uranium. So, if such is the case, what are the factors that coerce the nation to enter into this Deal, which has become so controversial? There are so many apprehensions. After passing the Bill by the Congress, the sum and substances of the apprehensions that have been entertained, Sir, that this Deal will severely limit our sovereignty in the matters of nuclear, foreign and energy policy, our freedom to conduct nuclear research and development and the ability to sustain a credible nuclear deterrent which we have committed. We are not going to manufacture more weapons. We do not need more weapons in our arsenal. Having more nuclear weapons does not provide any nation the strength. The qualities that are required by a nation to have strength are different, which we are trying to continuously erode. We are continuously trying to erode those. So, what factors have compelled the Government to strike this deal? Of course, the Prime Minister has gone on record, and is trying to allay the apprehensions of the people. But, as a layman who is novice to this sector, my apprehensions may be untenable. But, how about the apprehensions that have been entertained by the eminent scientists in that particular sector? How do you thrash them aside? And, the provisions that have been incorporated, which we feel apprehended, which are detrimental to the interests of this country, cannot be thrown into a dustbin. We cannot extend the reason that these are all customary practices that are being

adopted in formulating the legislation of the United States of America. You bind the nation in the process. You are binding the nation for generations. It is not a momentary decision that you are taking. So, you have to ponder over this. If it were an investment decision, we can discuss. This is a decision where you are privy to the information; you are accessing the information which nobody else can have, as Mr. Digvijay Singh has pointed out. So, you are the best judge of the circumstances as to which ones are in the interest of the nation. So, I appeal to the Prime Minister to ponder over it; to go by your conscience, to look into seriously to what extent this deal is desirable and whether it is in the interest of the nation or not.

Sir, we do not need the policing of the United States which they have been doing. We know the role the United States has played in Iraq. We know the partisan role that has been played by it as far as Iran is concerned. Of course, we have given an impression to the outside world that we are subjugating ourselves to the dictates of the United States by voting against Iran. So, these all constitute the background. I cannot quote because of the constraint of time. The sum and substance of this, Sir, is that clear objectives have been laid. One of the objectives is to take our help and cooperation to contain Iran. Sir, will it good in formulating a foreign policy? Can we associate with a super power to contain the development of a nation, to formulate the foreign policy of an independent country? So, why are we trying to divert ourselves? What are the advantages we are going to get?

We do not need the help of the United States as far as the technology is concerned. As scientists are saying, we are not that poor in results also. A uranium project is being set up in my own district. The Government could locate these in so many areas. And, the technology is very sound in India. But, in spite of all these things...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): Sorry, I did not want to disturb you but I have to. You know, you have exceeded your time, at least, by five minutes. Kindly conclude.

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: Sir, the hon. Prime Minister has gone on record saying in Rajya Sabha, "Our nuclear programme is unique. It encompasses the complete range of activities that characterise an advanced nuclear power, including generation of electricity, advanced research and development, and our strategic programme. Our scientists have mastered the complete nuclear fuel cycle." This, I can infer the

meaning that our scientific community has perfected the technology of 'the full circle'. When such is the case, what is the extra advantage we are going to derive by getting the technology? Sir, the most dangerous provision, which I have seen, is the character certificate by the President of the United States whether we are following the nuclear programme as dictated by them by virtue of this deal and, he will submit his report to the Congress and the Congress has got power to annul this deal. It will have a very dangerous effect on our nuclear programme I am telling. Basing on this, we will proceed with our nuclear programme and we will be investing billions of rupees. Assuming that if we fail to implement on one pretext or the other and if they stop this deal, what will be the economic impact on this country and what will be future? (*Time-bell*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): Constraints.

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: I request the Chair to be fair to me. ...(*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): The Prime Minister has also to go. ...(*Interruptions*)... I am trying to be more than fair and that is my problem.

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: Sir, priority order has been changed.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): Please, if you could conclude in just one minute....(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: Sir, the President of America will issue the certificate to us and the Congress has got power to annul this. Why are we trying to make the United States to enter into our shoes? What are the advantages? It is a billion dollar question to which I am unable to get answer. Sir, my request is that, do not make India a client of the United States of America. If there are any strategic interests of the nation being served, you come out to the nation and take it into confidence. If it is a geo-political warranted decision or if it is an economically warranted decision Parliament has got every right to know. Mr. Yechury has rightly pointed out the structural deficiency in the Constitution itself. How can a decision be taken for entering into an international agreement with other countries without this supreme body being aware of it? Parliament has got every right to know it; Parliament has got every right to review it. Parliament should have a right to ratify or reject it. If that is not prevailing in the existing provisions of the Constitution, I appeal to the entire House

to change the Constitution itself. ...*(Interruptions)*... The future of the country cannot be kept in the hands of a particular individual. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): Thank you very much, Mr. Ramachandraiah.

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: I have not seen any merits in this deal; I have not seen any advantage to the nation except refurbishing the sagging image of Mr. Bush who has become unpopular. He has become very unpopular. It is being done to refurbish his sagging image. He has tried to use us as ...*(Interruptions)*... We have been used as scapegoat. ...*(Interruptions)*... Let us not become sacrificial goat.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): Please conclude. ...*(Interruptions)*... Thank you.

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: That was not the treatment meted out to other Members. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): You had six minutes and you have already spoken for 14 minutes. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: Sir, you compare 4 minutes with the time that has been allotted to other Members. ...*(Interruptions)*... If the Members do not want to hear me, I will sit down. ...*(Interruptions)*... Sir, in two minutes, I will conclude. ...*(Interruptions)*... in-controvertible evidence is available if you go through the documents; and that evidence is clearly available that it will be detrimental to the interests of this nation, which this House will not allow. This should not be allowed. Sir, what is happening in the WTO?

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

This is the structural defect. I am not pointing out a mistake that you have done it. Sir, I tell you, just by bashing NDA you cannot justify yourself. You can't point out the omissions that have been committed by NDA and justify your irregularities or your actions which are detrimental to the country's interest. No longer you can bash the NDA Government (*Time-bell*), which has been there for two and a half years.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ramachandraiah, kindly conclude. You have taken more than the time allotted to you.

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: Your actions are to the advantage of the country, to the welfare of the people. As Members of Parliament, we have got every right to review. That right cannot be taken by anybody just because you are sitting in the Treasury Bench. Sir, my appeal to the Government, Sir, and to the hon. Prime Minister is, I am not individually accusing anybody. It is not the time to accuse or indulge in sycophancy which I am not accustomed. But let us be fair, have a frank discussion with the scientists. Let them be taken into confidence. Let there be an exhaustive discussion. You can say that the end product is yet to come. But the end product seems to be dangerous and end product once it comes, you will be so pressurised, Sir, honestly, I am telling you, you will be so pressurised that you will be acquiesced, you will accept it. Let it not be imposed on this nation, Sir, it will be highly detrimental, anti-national. My request is to kindly ponder over and this House should not accept this deal, Sir, and we totally oppose this.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Arun Shourie.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH (Rajasthan): Sir, I wrote a letter to the Chairman saying that as a Foreign Minister of India when the Nuclear Agreement was announced in Washington D.C. on 18th July.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Natwar Singhji, I have called Mr. Arun Shourie. Your name is not there.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: He has agreed to yield...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: How can he agree?

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: No, no, wait a minute.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have called you, Mr. Arun Shourieji.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: I have not received a reply.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE (Uttar Pradesh): Just one small point, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: His party has not given the time. His name has not been given.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: I am sorry. I am very sorry, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Natwar Singhji, you are a senior Member. I...

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: That is why I am appealing to you. I was the Foreign Minister of India when this was signed. I have a right to speak.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, about that you can talk with the Chairman.

कार्मिक, लोक शिकायत और पेंशन मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री तथा संसदीय कार्य मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री सुरेश पचौरी): सर, मेरा प्वायंट ऑफ ऑर्डर है। अगर आप राज्य सभा एट वर्क के पेज 276, लिस्ट ऑफ स्पीकर्स देखें, ...(व्यवधान)... तो सदन हमेशा नियम और परम्पराओं से चलता है ...(व्यवधान)... सदन में किस पार्टी का...(व्यवधान)... कौन बोलेगा, यह निर्णय ...(व्यवधान)... किया करता है।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, it is very clear. I have given the ruling. Your party has not given your name. That is the convention we are following. Kindly take it up with the Chairman. Mr. Arun Shourie.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: I am merely pointing out to you...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no, please...

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: I have not received a reply from the Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That you can discuss with the Chairman.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: Discuss when?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Arun Shourie, are you going to speak.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Let him... (*Interruptions*)...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no, I have not allowed him. You please... (*Interruptions*)...

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (SHRI JASWANT SINGH): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the hon. Member is asserting a right as a former Minister for External Affairs of the country who he says had something to do or quite a great deal to do when this July 18th Agreement was arrived at. He wants to say something. We wish to hear him. He has a right to speak in the House. Do not deny him. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no, we are following certain procedures. Please, let us not take it as a ... (*Interruptions*)... As on today, he belongs to a political party. The convention we are following is that political parties give the names and the Chair is going by that convention. If he wants to deviate the rules let him contact the Chairman and then take a decision. (*Interruptions*) I am sorry, I will not be able to...

[17 August, 2006]

RAJYA SABHA

(Interruptions)... Mr. Jothi, ... (Interruptions)...You need not... (Interruptions)...It is the decision of the Chair. (Interruptions) No, no, you are not to direct the Chair. You have said, 'let him speak'. We have to follow certain rules. I have said, 'no'.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: My party has suspended me. I have a right to speak. (Interruptions)

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: Sir, he is a suspended Member. (Interruptions)

SHRI SHAHID SIDDIQUI (Uttar Pradesh): Conventions are not holy scriptures.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Shahid Siddiqui, no, no, (Interruptions) please, I cannot allow.

श्री खन्नारायण पाणि: महोदय, ...(व्यवधान)... यह लोकतंत्र का सवाल है ...(व्यवधान)...

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: He was... (Interruptions)...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have not been permitted. (Interruptions) Nothing goes on record... (Interruptions)...Nothing goes on record.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: *

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: *

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Chair has not called you ... (Interruptions)...I will not allow you... (Interruptions)...I will not allow you to speak... (Interruptions)...

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH:*

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI (Nominated): Sir, will you not complete one round before you go back to the BJP? ... (Interruptions)...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We will do that. I have called Mr. Arun Shourie ... (Interruptions)...

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Sir, actually, this is one of the issues which will decide the fate of the country for the next fifty years. And, the House should certainly get to know by first person—after all, only two persons were negotiating with the President Bush, the hon. Prime Minister and the then hon. Foreign Minister—and if the House in its wisdom does not

*Not recorded.

get to even hear the first person accounts of these two persons, it is being deprived of a very important information. And, I appeal to you and I also appeal to the Prime Minister—not about this particular thing—that we have seen debates...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Pondicherry): Sir, I have a point to make.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no, Mr. Narayanasamy. I have called him... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Sir, I am not on that point... (*Interruptions*)... I am only on the question of time. We have seen in this very House—I have been here for seven years and you have been here for longer—that on many issues, which were not as grave as the issue that is being discussed by the House, the debate was extended indefinitely and the Prime Minister and the other Ministers replied the next day. I remember even sometimes that the reply is much later.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Arun Shourie, the question is not about the time... (*Interruptions*)... Please give an opportunity to the Chair to speak... (*Interruptions*)... It is not the question of time; it is the question of conventions that we are following... (*Interruptions*)... Then, he should request the Chairman. Only the Chairman can decide (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: *

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Sir, I am not on Mr. Natwar Singh... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: *

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You will get the reply... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: *

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: *

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ramachandraiah, why are you getting up? ... (*Interruptions*)... Each party has its own support... (*Interruptions*)... Let us not have a debate on this... (*Interruptions*)... It is for the party to decide... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI N. JOTHI: *

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is for the party to decide ...

(Interruptions)... Don't interfere in the internal matters of other parties...(Interruptions)... It is not for you to decide...(Interruptions)... Which speaker has to speak is the decision of the party concerned. It is not your concern...(Interruptions)...

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: *

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You are going. That is why I have to interfere. Otherwise, why should I interfere? Please come to the point. Let us not waste the time.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Sir, it is one of the most important issues that this House has had the opportunity to discuss. I am and everybody here is for cooperation with all countries, including the United States. But, as the hon. Prime Minister has emphasized, as everybody has emphasized, and Digvijay was just now saying that we are for cooperation of an independent and strong India with other countries. I will seek your permission to point out that what has, actually, been done by this agreement is closed the options of India and will, ultimately, if it goes through, you will see that India will be consigned to accepting the umbrella of the United States for protection even in this region. You will please permit me to elaborate on how this is being done. All of us, who have studied strategic matters, have seen that in regard to nuclear weapons, especially in regard to India, the USA has had four objectives. The first one is that one way or the other to get India to abide by the NPT even if you cannot make it sign. And one of the architects of this agreement, an Indian, who is now an advisor on National Security Affairs to the US President and has testified to the Congress, he told the US Congress, Mr. Ashley Telles, that, actually, this time India is accepting conditions which are more harmonious than the NPT. The second point, which they have had, was that India must be made to accept safeguards as a non-nuclear weapon State. Condoleezza Rice was quoted. I will give you three other remarks of this kind in which they were absolutely candid in this regard. But the third objective of the US, you keep quoting Shri Jaswant Singh and Stuart Talbot, has been that India must abide by the CTBT conditions. Even though the CTBT is not ratified and even though the US Senate has itself thrown out the CTBT, India must be made to sign those more onerously in the sense that the CTBT, as you know, Sir, so well, and I remember Mr. Pranab Mukherjee was raising this point here, and I

*Not recorded.

was there; I answered him by reading the CTBT clause. The CTBT has a supreme national interest exit clause. Now, as I will show you, in this agreement, and what is being read into it, there is no exit clause at all. The fourth thing was that the US had aimed at what the Bill specifically uses these words—to halt, to roll back, and eventually eliminate. These are the three expressions: 'halt', 'roll back', and 'eventually eliminate' the nuclear capability of a country, like India. Now, these objectives are being achieved by this Bill. I will come to the legislative process of the USA, on which my pretty dear and close friend, Shri Anand Sharma, dwelt so much. The operational consequence of the difference in the legislative process of the US and ours is the opposite. That's why the US House so overwhelmingly voted for the Bill because it overwhelmingly support their objectives. And, you will see, Sir, Mr. Anand was saying that there is an elaborate legislative process. The other day, when Mr. Yashwant Sinha had put a question to the Prime Minister, the Prime Minister also said, "It is just a step and we shall see what the final outcome will be". The House passes, the Senate passes a Bill; then, there is a Reconciliation Committee; then, there is an agreement, this one, two, three... Now, you will see what happens. Actually it is the opposite. If it were the Indian Parliament, the Executive can enter into an international treaty and we can only discuss it. But in the American legislative process, it is the opposite. The Senate is the final authority on international treaties. The big example, as you remember, is: One of the Presidents of the US, Mr. Wilson, was also the architect of the League of Nations, and the Senate threw out that treaty. Now, in the CTBT the United States Executive was far advanced in those discussions and the US Senate threw it out. So, to tell us that actually what is happening now is only a stage, and there will be a final thing which will be different from the things that are coming up, is to give us sleeping pills, because actually speaking what will happen is that the US Administration will also be bound by it, it cannot but do anything than what has been sanctioned by the US Congress, in particular, by the US Senate. (*Interruptions*) Just a second, Mr. Anand. (*Interruptions*) Sir, because of the shortage of time, I will only take up two points which the Prime Minister has been emphasising. (*Interruptions*) in this matter again. The first has been the question of parity. You keep citing the agreement of July, 18. The July, 18, Agreement is a statement of intent. Anything can be read into it. There is not a person in this House who could have seen that one of the only two reactors, which we have, which produce weapons

4.00 P.M.

Plutonium, that is, the Cyrus, which has recently been renovated, and which the US itself has said to their Congressional Committees that it is not conclusively proved at all that India has violated any treaty in regard to the Cyrus. We have agreed to close down that within four years. That was supplying, I pronounce it openly because scientists have said it, one-third of the weapons-grade Plutonium that India would be using for its nuclear arsenal. You show me a person who can read from the July 18 Agreement that we will agree to close this Cyrus Reactor when we do not have another reactor to produce that same kind of thing. So, all sorts of things are being read into it. But what is said on the face of it? It said, "President Bush affirmed that as a responsible State with advanced nuclear technology, India should acquire the same benefits and advantages as other States." And what did Prime Minister pledge India to? He said, "India would reciprocally agree that it would be ready to assume the same responsibility and practices, and acquire the same benefits and advantages as other leading countries with advanced nuclear technology such as the United States." Now, Sir, as you see, Shri Yashwant Sinha was reminding us, immediately after this, within two days, the Prime Minister's Office issued a background. We are from the Press, so, we get the background. In five places that background said that we will acquire the same status and the safeguards as a nuclear weapons state. A principal negotiator on behalf of India, he said that our objective is to be recognised as a nuclear weapon state and the quotation is, "Nothing more, and nothing less". Now, I will come to that. Today also Shri Anand Sharma said that great play was made of the fact that safeguards will be India-specific. I will tell you whether that condition is seen at all in this case.

Secondly, we were told all along that this is an agreement about energy and that under no circumstances, does the Agreement bind India to capping the nuclear weapons programme. I will read out only one sentence from the Prime Minister's reply in the Lok Sabha on the 10th March this year. He was mentioning this. "We have not compromised our autonomy with regard to our strategic programme. We have not agreed to any formula or any proposal which would amount to a cap on our nuclear programme. I have taken full care about it. We have made sure that we have taken care of India's present requirements and future

requirements as far as possible humanly. We have not accepted a cap on the nuclear programme. There is no question of India accepting a cap on our deterrent potential." This is the understanding of the Prime Minister. Now, we just see what is the understanding of the U.S. on this. Not only understanding verbally, what is it that they have legislated by which the U.S. Executive will be bound. Now, Sir, section 2(5) of the Bill which has been passed says that the objective is to bring within the ambit of the NPT discipline countries that have not signed up. Just now, Shri Digvijay Singh was also reading out what Dr. Condoleezza Rice told the U.S. House in this. She said, "India is not, and is not going to become a Member of the NPT as a nuclear weapon state. We are simply seeking to address an untenable situation." What is that situation? India has never been a party to the NPT and this Agreement does bring India into the non-proliferation framework and thus strengthen the regime. This is their declared objective. Then, Sir, you see section 2(6)(c) of the Bill. It says that the Agreement, which both the President and the Prime Minister have signed, induces the country to refrain from actions that would further the development of its nuclear weapons programme. Section 3(b) (5) states that the policy of the U.S. in pursuing this deal is to seek, to halt the increase of nuclear weapons arsenals in South Asia and to promote their reduction and eventual elimination. And we are told this is about energy! Even Dr. Kasturirangan just now said that this FMCT is a multilateral agreement for which we have to wait. He gave us his says advice that we have ten years interval. They are saying in their legislation, in section 3(b)(7) that the U.S. aim shall be to encourage India not to increase its production of fissile material at unsafeguarded nuclear facilities pending implementation of a multilateral moratorium. So even before that moratorium comes into being, the US has clearly stated its aim. Section 3 (a) (i) specifies: " That the United States through the agreement and other devices will oppose the development of a capability ...*(Interruption)*... to produce nuclear weapons by any non-nuclear weapon State within or outside the Treaty on the Non-proliferation of nuclear weapons." In fact, the Bills of the Senate and of the House go even further," we are thinking only on the US." Dr. Kasturirangan was telling us about the time we have on multilateral things, but see what they are saying. Section 3 (a) (iii) of the Bill says:— " The United States Executive will work to strengthen the Nuclear Suppliers Group guidelines concerning consultation by Members of violations by any country of this particular agreement, and by instituting

the practice of a timely and coordinated individual NSG Members to all such Violations, including the termination of nuclear transfers to an involved recipient that discourages individual NSG Members from continuing cooperation to such recipient in any form whatsoever." So, it is not just that they are going to do it, but they are going to make sure that the entire Nuclear Suppliers Group will act as one to discipline the country, so that their objectives are going to be furthered. In section 4(2) (d) (iv), it says, "If nuclear transfers to India are restricted pursuant to his act, the President should seek to prevent the transfer to India of nuclear equipment materials or technology from other participating Governments in the NSG from any other source." So, they are saying that we are going to ensure that, and we are going to discipline you, we have a clear objective. We are going to make sure that the entire cartel of 45 countries will do this. My friend, Anand, was talking of nuclear apartheid. This is the foundation for the nuclear apartheid that will be created, and now, I will come to you with the conditions which they will say....(*Interruptions*)..

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Would you please yield for a minute, please? You are actually misleading ...(*Interruptions*)....Will you yield for a minute? You are reading something which is not material at all ...(*Interruptions*)....

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Please, just one second, Sir ...(*Interruptions*)....

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: We made it very clear what matters to us within the agreement.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Right, Sir.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: And this does not apply to us ...(*Interruptions*)....

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: We will see that ...(*Interruptions*)....

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Don't try to mislead ...(*Interruptions*)....

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: That is right. As Mr. Yashwant Sinha said, as nothing applies to some people; the other people are passing their laws. This certainly applies to the US President who is signing the agreement with the Indian Prime Minister ...(*Interruptions*)....Not only that, Dr. Kasturirangan was saying that, yes, we will negotiate an FMC Treaty. But as he knows, the US has already put in a draft in May in the Geneva Conference, and it does not have what you were saying, what others

have always been emphasizing, which has been the consistent stand, as Mr. Natwar Singh will bear out of Indian Governments for 20 years that unless there is a universal credible verification mechanism, we will not proceed. Not a word of that clause is in the draft Treaty and they have put in a clause saying that this will come into force the moment the P-5 have signed it. And, not only that, Sir, in the Bill, in section 4 (c) (2) (d), it says: "That the US has taken and will take steps to encourage India, to identify and declare a date by which India would be willing to stop the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons unilaterally." Now, we are not to wait for anybody; they are not waiting for anybody. They are saying, actually, pending that Treaty, you have to declare a date unilaterally. The US President is certainly bound to work on these guidelines, on these mandatory laws. Sir the Senate Bill is the ultimate Bill. The Senate has the power to ratify or reject treaties or agreements which the US President sign, unlike us. That Bill says in Section 103(1) that it shall be policy of the United States—the US will do what will do *vis-a-vis* India—to achieve as quickly as possible a cessation of the production by India and Pakistan of fissile materials for nuclear weapons and any other nuclear explosive devices. Section 103(9) says that "exports of nuclear fuel to India should not contribute to, or, in any way, encourage, increases in the production by India of fissile material for non-civilian purposes." This is a very important clause because they say that 'you have to do it consistently with the obligations of the US under article 1 of the NPT. Many of us would not know that article 1 of the NPT says that that country will not do anything which will directly or indirectly help the other non-nuclear weapon States to acquire nuclear weapons. Therefore, in some of the briefings, it was suggested.....(*Time-bell*) Sir, I will just take a few things.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude because I have to regulate the time.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Sir, I am only confining myself to this Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have to regulate the time.

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: Sir, we can sit for one more hour.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is all right. But since the time is fixed for it, we have to regulate the time also. Please try to confine to the time.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: I am requesting some more time from you only because... ..(Interruptions)...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have given you the maximum time. You have already taken extra time.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Sir, article 1 of the NPT says, "Neither directly nor indirectly." Now, they export uranium to us. It was suggested and implied to many persons here,—'no; no; we have a lot of uranium. So, when they give us some uranium, we can use our own uranium to produce nuclear weapons.' This is what is meant to stop, that you cannot directly or indirectly do this in any way. In fact, India and Pakistan must be disclosing, securing, capping and reducing their fissile material stockpiles, and this will be done 'pending creation of a world-wide fissile material cut-off regime. Now, Sir, these are just very few of the clauses. I can give you many such examples in which this is put out. It is made mandatory for the US President to work for these things. We are told to be 'macabres; no; no; keep waiting, something might turn up. We can't be made a nation of macabres,....(Interruptions).... end products. The end products will be macbre. We are waiting. Something will turn up.

The second point, Sir, is this. Sir, my friend Anand read about the voluntary moratorium; a moratorium with the tests at that time. Moratorium means a temporarily suspension and it was voluntary. Now, just see, Sir, what Condoleezza Rice says. The Senate clause says,—she told the House Congressional Committee—we have been very clear with the Indians that the permanence of the safeguards is the permanence of the safeguards, *without condition*.' As you know, credible minimum deterrent, which was talked of, is a function, not that I will acquire thirty pounds and keep thirty pounds in that credit.' To be credible, the deterrent has to be pegged to what your potential adversary might have. It is a changing capability and the sophistication is not just a number; It is a sophistication of your weapons. Now, Sir, that was the point. Look here. I am just giving you an example of China. The China has acquired x,y, and z capability and therefore, we must now test or do something else or increase our fissile material production. Condaleeza Rice says, "No; we have been clear; we have been very clear with the Indians that the permanence of the safeguards is the permanence of the safeguards, *without condition*; China or no China; sophistication of weapons or no sophistication of weapons.' It is said, "In fact, we reserve the right, should India test, as it

has agreed not to do, or should India in any way violate the IAEA safeguard agreement—to which I will just come—to which it would be adhering that the deal from our point of view would be at that point be off." This is not Condaleeza Rice!

Now, section 110 of the Senate Bill clearly says that any waiver under section 104, which you were talking of, saying that president is going to get that waiver, shall cease to be effective if the president determines that India has detonated a nuclear explosive device after the enactment of this Act. So, where is the option that is left with us? and, as I told you, it is more onerous than the....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please, conclude

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Sir, I shall make only one more point and then finish. There are several points to be made but I would only take up one point.

Sir, there is no option; option are being closed. A cartel is being set up to make sure that India will not budge an inch, not only *vis-a-viz* the US, but once the US determines, all the 45 countries will have to ensure it as well. and please, remember, china is one of those. Anybody trying to give a favourable interpretation to anything India does would be subject to China's veto. Why? That is because the US bill requires of the President that he must is the NSG proceed by a consensus. That is the word that they have used. So, consensus will mean that everybody there will get a veto. And you know how this world is! We keep talking of energy security. Everybody is aware of the fact that not only have the prices of Uranium gone up by 300 per cent in two years, but it is also controlled by a much stronger cartel than oil. Governments interfere with it. You may look at Australia. Australia is selling Uranium to China, but it has refused to sell it to India because it is part of an arrangement. So, that arrangement is being perfected through this legislation. And not only is the US President going to be bound by it, but the important point is, you keep hoping that the US administration will do something, but please read the statements of the US Administration after the Bill was passed by the House. They said it is a tremendous step forward. They did not object to any clause in the agreement.

Now, Sir, I come to this point that was made much of and has been made much of in the earlier statement also, that these safeguards will be

India specific. Sir, it is a fantasy. The senate Bill says in clause 113 that the agreement that India will have to enter into with the IAEA will be in accordance with the standards, principles, policies and practices of the IAEA as set out in the information Circular 540. That Circular 540 applied only to non-nuclear weapon states. There is no option. And it is probably not seen that the model agreement—some people might be innocent of these matters and they may access it from the internet—itself says that such protocols shall contain all the measures of this model protocol. There is no option! where is the option of India Specific things? It can only be ...(time bell)... Two minutes, Sir.

The impression that was given was that we would have some protocol with the IAEA, which will be minus the model protocol. Actually, it will have to be that model protocol plus some further agreement, because we would have bound ourselves in this way and the nuclear weapon states. I would only read one item to you, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have already taken a lot of time.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Sir, I shall take only a little more time.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You may take it, but I will not be able to control the time. If each individual member takes his own time, it would be very difficult for me. You must understand. You must understand the position of the Chair. If every member wants to speak earlier, every member wants to go out of his turn, it would not be possible to do it.

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: Sir, we don't want to speak earlier, we only wish to contribute.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Definitely everybody wants to contribute, But then, why do you fix the time limit"

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Sir, I shall give you an example. We have already placed two-thirds of our reactors under these safeguards. The Bush Administration has said that as all new reactors are going to be under safeguards, soon, India will be placing 90 per cent of its reactors under safeguards. Do you know what the position is with the other countries? Sir, there are 217 nuclear reactors in these P-5. Of them, only 11 are under safeguards. In the US, there are 104 nuclear reactors and only five are under safeguards and the protocol applicable to the US says that it shall be a voluntary offer agreement, and in this,

those measures will be incorporated which the Nuclear Weapons State has identified as capable of contributing to the non-proliferation and efficiency of the NPT. It is left up to them. The protocol says, "The Agency, that is, IAEA shall require only the minimum amount of information and data consistent with carrying out its responsibility." Information pertaining to the facilities of only those five out of 104 shall be the minimum necessary. All these things will need not be examined on the plans and designs, which we will have to submit to them in Vienna. They say that these will be examined only on the premises of those facilities; we will not take them out. Clause 33 specifically says, and I will end only with that single example so as not to tax you, that the agreement should provide that safeguards shall not apply thereunder to material in mining or ore processing activities. You contrast this, and I am ending with that. You contrast this and I am ending with that. There is one contrast. Section 4(0)(2)(B) of the Senate Bill says that the US President shall get from India (1) an estimate for the previous year of the amount of Uranium mined in India; (2) the amount of such uranium that has likely been used or allocated for the production of nuclear explosive devices; (3) the rate of production of (i) the fissile material for nuclear explosive devices; (ii) nuclear explosive devices; and (iii) an analyses as to whether imported uranium has affected such rate of production, etc. उनको कहा है कि आपके uranium और ores के बारे में हम कुछ नहीं करेंगे—specific prohibition! और हमारे ऊपर यह कहा जा रहा है कि नहीं, नहीं, एक-एक आउंस देखेंगे, कहाँ गया? कहाँ आपने दिया? So, this India specific myth is a complete fantasy. I don't want to use a strong word like 'fabrication'. It is a hope that the US law by which the US President appears to be bound, we are not bound too. The IAEA protocol itself leaves no option about this fanciful negotiation position that we may think of. Sir, there are many other points about energy security, about full cooperation. Shri Sitarm Yechury made a very good point on how the Bill in both the Houses prohibit on heavy water or on enrichment and even on the use of nuclear waste. You know that in Tarapore a huge problem has arisen due to nuclear waste and yet we have not been allowed to process it and the US has not exercised the option of taking it back. ...(Time-bell)...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Raashid Alvi. ... (Interruptions)...

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Therefore, for all these reasons, Sir, I feel that this particular agreement might have been well intentioned, but we have been involved in a pincer in the energy field. ... (Interruptions)...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude ... (Interruptions)...

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Last point, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have called the next speaker

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: In the energy field, we are going to be just closed in into dependence on imported reactors and imported fuel and, secondly, on the security field, we are going to become dependent on a nuclear umbrella of the US even to survive within our own region. It is not a good agreement and I would sincerely appeal to the Prime Minister, who, I know, has the interest of the country at heart, to please reconsider this issue, and as your friend and as a person who has known you for 30 years, I will plead with you and with the Government, please do not make this particular agreement a matter of personal prestige at all. Thank you.

श्री राशिद अल्वी (आंध्र प्रदेश): उपसभापति महोदय, यह एक बहुत इम्पोर्टेन्ट इश्यु है, जिस पर हम सब लोग यहां बात कर रहे हैं। मैंने बहुत गौर से सबकी बातें सुनी हैं। हिन्दुस्तान की फारेन पॉलिसी को हमेशा से पूरी दुनिया के अंदर एप्रिशिएट किया गया है। दुनिया के अंदर हम हमेशा उन मुमालिक के साथ खड़े हुए, जिन मुमालिक को मजलूम समझा जाता रहा, लेकिन हमारी फारेन पॉलिसी के अंदर अपने मुल्क का इन्टरेस्ट हमेशा हमारी फर्स्ट प्रियोरिटी रहा है। आजादी के पिछले 60 सालों के अंदर दुनिया की सियासत के अंदर कितने नशेबोफराज आए, 74 पोखरण और उसके बाद 98 पोखरण के बाद, कितने तरीके के सैंक्शन्स हमारे मुल्क पर लगे, हम परेशानियों से गुजरते चले गए। शायद अकेला फ्रांस ऐसा कंट्री था, जिसने हमारी मदद की और एशिया ने भी हमारी मदद की। आज यहां पर सब लोग जिस सेफ गार्ड की बात कर रहे हैं, 1978 से हमारे चार रिएक्टर्स सेफ गार्ड में रहे हैं। सर, किसी भी मुल्क को आगे ले जाने के लिए ऐसी लीडरशिप की जरूरत होती है, किसी थिंकर ने कहा है कि जिसके पास फोरसाइटिडनेस भी हो और थॉट भी हो, वहीं लीडर अपने मुल्क को आगे ले जा सकता है। ऐसा लीडर, जो यह देख सके कि आने वाले कल में क्या होने वाला है, ऐसा लीडर जो यह एहसास कर सके कि आने वाले कल में यह दुनिया किन हालात से गुजरेगी तो उसका फैसला वह पहले कर लेगा। मैं हिन्दुस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री डा० मनमोहन सिंह जी को उनकी फोरसाइटिडनेस के लिए और उनके थॉट के लिए मुबारकबाद देता हूँ। सर, जो 19 जुलाई का एग्रीमेंट हुआ है, हम आइसोलेशन के अंदर चले गए, हमारे पास रिएक्टर्स में फ्यूल नहीं था, हमारे बहुत से रिएक्टर्स काम नहीं कर रहे थे। सर, मैं यह

कहना चाहूंगा कि किसी भी देश को आगे ले जाने के लिए सबसे बड़ी जरूरत एनर्जी की होती है। हमारे पास जो क्रूड ऑयल के रिजर्व्स हैं, वे 22 years के लिए हैं और जितनी देश की कंजम्पशन है, अगर हम वह पूरा इस्तेमाल कर लें तो वह क्रूड ऑयल 6 साल के अंदर खत्म हो जाएगा। यहां पर कहा गया है कि हमको कोल एनर्जी से आगे चलना चाहिए। इस देश में कोल एनर्जी सिर्फ आने वाले 80 सालों के लिए है। अगर गुजरात स्टेट पेट्रोलियम कारपोरेशन नई तलाश नहीं करता तो हमारी नेचुरल गैस करीब-करीब खत्म हो चुकी होती। इन हालात के अंदर सरकार को सोचना था कि हम अपना मुस्तकबिल कैसे बना सकते हैं? हम देश को कैसे इंडिपेंडेंट कर सकते हैं, कैसे देश के अंदर एनर्जी ला सकते हैं, जबकि हमारे पास थर्मल पावर कैपेसिटी सिर्फ 19 परसेंट है। सर, यूनाइटेड स्टेट के साथ 19 जुलाई का जो एग्रीमेंट हुआ है, उसके मुताबिक यह जो 19 परसेंट थर्मल पावर कैपेसिटी है, यह 2014 तक 65 परसेंट हो जाएगी। इस पार्लियामेंट के अंदर कितनी बार हम इस एग्रीमेंट पर बहस कर चुके हैं, शायद तीन बार। हर बार प्राइम मिनिस्टर पार्लियामेंट के अंदर एश्योरेंस दे चुके हैं। मैं बहुत अदब से इस हाउस के अंदर कहना चाहता हूं कि युनाइटेड स्टेट के अंदर कोई बयान आ जाता है, कोई कुछ कह देता है तो फौरन जरूरत महसूस होती है कि हम पार्लियामेंट के अंदर बहस करें। आज कौन सी जरूरत थी कि इस पर पार्लियामेंट के अंदर बहस की जाए? सर, अभी 26 जुलाई को हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने इसी हाउस के अंदर एश्योरेंस दिया, we have made very straight representation to the US Government. Let the process be completed. अभी युनाइटेड स्टेट के अंदर प्रोसेस कम्पलीट नहीं हुआ है, अभी सीनेट के अंदर पास होना बाकी है। अभी यह House of Representatives के अंदर पास हुआ है और हम सब जानते थे कि अमरीका की कांग्रेस में पास होना इतना आसान नहीं है, कितना खतरा था कि डेमोक्रेट्स मुखालफत कर सकते थे, लेकिन कितनी बड़ी तादाद के अंदर, House of Representatives के अंदर और दोनों Foreign Committee के अंदर यह पास हुआ है, अभी सीनेट के अंदर पास होना है, उसके बाद उस बुश साहब के signatures होने हैं, उसके बाद अगर कोई बात ऐसी होती है, जो 19 जुलाई के agreement के खिलाफ होती है तब उस पर ऐतराज किया जा सकता है। प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने 26 जुलाई को इसी हाउस में कहा था कि I spoke to the President Bush himself. Now, I have an assurance that the US administration will do all it can to see that the parameters, the goal posts of July 18, are not tampered with. इसके बाद कौन सी गुंजाइश रह जाती है? बार-बार कहा जाता है कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर आएँ और यकीन दिलाएं। इस स्टेटमेंट के बाद प्राइम मिनिस्टर से कौन सी यकीनदहानी चाहिए? मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि हम लोगों को दूसरे लोगों पर ज्यादा भरोसा है, अपने प्राइम मिनिस्टर पर कम भरोसा है। यहां कहा जाता है कि सरकार को Sense of House मानना चाहिए। यहां पर कहा गया है कि इराक के मामले में, लेबनान के मामले में Sense of House

माना गया। मैं अदब से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इसका क्रेडिट किसे जाता है? लेबनान के मामले में इजराइल को कंडम करने का क्रेडिट किसे जाता है—सरकार को जाता है। वह sense हाउस के अंदर किसने पैदा किया, किसने वह Resolution पास कराया, किसने वह Resolution हाउस के अंदर रखा? इस बात का अहसास होना चाहिए।

अमरीका के साथ हमारे जो रिश्ते हैं, आज दुनिया की सियासत बदल रही है, दुनिया के अंदर ताकत बैलेंस में नहीं रही है, पावर बैलेंस में नहीं रही है। Foreign Policy वक्त के साथ-साथ बदलती है, लेकिन इसके बावजूद कि अमरीका के साथ हमारे जो रिश्ते हैं, अमरीका के साथ हमने जो agreement किया है, उसके बावजूद पूरी दुनिया ने देखा है कि हमने इजराइल को कंडम किया है, हम लेबनान के साथ खड़े हुए और हमारी Foreign Policy पर कोई फर्क नहीं पड़ा।

उपसभापति जी, यहां पर बहुत सारे ऐतराजात किए गए, बहुत सारी बातें कही गईं, यहां पर Strategic Programme के बारे में कहा गया, यहां पर इरान के बारे में कहा गया, यहां पर कहा गया कि India's fissile material production से पाबंदी लग जाएगी। अब से पहले जिन लोगों ने ये ऐतराजात किए, यशवंत सिन्हा जी Foreign Minister रहे, मैं Annual Report 1999-2000 का एक पैराग्राफ पढ़ना चाहता हूँ। उस समय NDA की सरकार थी। Annual Report 1999-2000 एक official document है, जिसमें कहा गया है अमरीका के साथ हमारी जो बातचीत हुई है उसमें किन चीजों पर बात हुई, मैं इसे पूरा नहीं पढ़ना चाहता, इसमें कहा गया है कि—These issues are CTBT, the FMCT, Export Control and other things. The talks are being conducted on the basis of comprehensive proposals that India has put forward. Sir, इसके साथ-साथ Strobe Talbot ने अपनी किताब के अंदर लिखा है CTBT के बारे में, जसवंत सिंह जी चले गए, उन्होंने लिखा है कि, "Jaswant said that India would sign the CTBT by the end of May." यशवंत सिन्हा जी यहां नहीं हैं, अरूण शौरी जी, 1999 तक CTBT पर साइन करने की बात उस सरकार ने की थी, यह जसवंत सिंह जी ने कहा था। मैं फिर आपको पढ़कर सुनाता हूँ। "Jaswant said that India would sign the CTBT by the end of May. If this were actually to happen, it would be a significant development, but it would still leave a ratification of the treaty for the indefinite future. When, I pointed out, Jaswant assured me that under the Indian system signature was tantamount to ratification which he called 'a mere formality.'" आज आप हाउस के सेंस की बात कर रहे हैं। आप कह रहे हैं कि हाउस का सेंस होना चाहिए, एक रेजोलुशन पास करनी चाहिए। मैं उस किताब का एक हिस्सा पढ़ कर बता रहा हूँ। आज आप उस एग्रीमेंट के बारे में कह रहे हैं कि जैसे हमने पूरे देश को अमेरिका के हाथों के अंदर रख दिया। आप fissile material की बात कर रहे हैं...(व्यवधान)...

डा० फारूख अब्दुल्ला (जम्मू और कश्मीर): यह जसवंत सिंह की किताब है या टॉलबोट की किताब है?

श्री राशिद अल्वी: नहीं। जसवंत जी की किताब पहले आ चुकी है, वह आप पढ़ चुके हैं।

डा० फारूख अब्दुल्ला: यह टॉलबोट की किताब है।

श्री राशिद अल्वी: जी हां, आगे उन्होंने कहा, "The second adjustment in the Indian position was a statement that they might join the long sought illusive moratorium on the production of the fissile material." जसवंत सिंह जी यहां थे, वे चले गए। यह fissile material के बारे में कहा है—"But only on the condition that the other six countries, P-5 and Pakistan, they both sign." अगर वे साइन कर देंगे, तो हम भी साइन कर देंगे। किस तरीके से आज आप उंगली उठाने का काम कर रहे हैं? जो 19 जुलाई का एग्रीमेंट हुआ है, पाकिस्तान उसी एग्रीमेंट को करना चाहता था। प्रेसिडेंट बुश जब यहां से पाकिस्तान गए, सारे पाकिस्तान की सरकार लगी रही कि वह एग्रीमेंट, जो हिन्दुस्तान के साथ हुआ है, वह गवर्नमेंट ऑफ पाकिस्तान के साथ हो जाए। रूस ने उस एग्रीमेंट को appreciate किया, जो हमारा यूनाइटेड स्टेट्स के साथ हुआ है। यह कोई मामूली बात नहीं है।

यूनाइटेड नेशंस के अंदर उस वक्त के प्रधान मंत्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जी की स्पीच का एक हिस्सा आनंद शर्मा जी ने सुनाया था, उसका अगला हिस्सा मैं आपको सुनाता हूं। उन्होंने कहा, "We conveyed our willingness to move towards a *de jure* formalisation of the obligation. In announcing a moratorium, India has already accepted the basic obligation of the CTBT."— आप मंजूर कर चुके हैं —We are prepared to bring this discussion to a successful conclusion so that the anti force of the CTBT is not delayed beyond September, 1999." आपसे सितम्बर, 1999 की हद लगा दी थी और आपने कह दिया था कि उससे पहले सीटीबीटी के ऊपर हम सिग्नेचर करने के लिए तैयार हैं।

सर, आज बिल्कुल ऐसा महसूस होता है कि 19 जुलाई का जो एग्रीमेंट है, वह कोई anti-national काम सरकार ने कर दिया है। सर, प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने specific तरीके से हाउस में कई बार कहा, यह 7 मार्च को प्राइम मिनिस्टर की पार्लियामेंट की स्पीच का एक हिस्सा है, "We will not accept any proviso that goes beyond the parameters of July 19, 2005 Statement and the Separation Plan agreed between India and the USA on March 2."

सर, यहां कहा गया कि कोई दूसरा न्यूक्लियर टेस्ट नहीं किया जा सकता। 19 जुलाई के एग्रीमेंट के अन्दर अगर इस तरीके के हालात होते हैं, दुनिया के अन्दर इस तरीके के हालात होते हैं कि अगर हमें जरूरत होती है कि हम यह टेस्ट करें, हमें जरूरत पड़ती है कि हम आगे जाएं, तो इंडिया टेस्ट कर सकता है, even, according to the agreement of 19th July. यूनाइटेड स्टेट्स कह सकता है कि जो nuclear fuel supply है, उसे हम बन्द कर सकते हैं। हम यह कह सकते हैं कि इन हालात के अन्दर, दुनिया में जो हालात हैं, हमारे पड़ोस के अन्दर जो कुछ हो रहा है, हम इसके लिए मजबूर हैं। ज्यादा-से-ज्यादा यूनाइटेड स्टेट्स उस एग्रीमेंट को तोड़ सकता है, वह जो fuel हमें देगा, उसे बन्द कर सकता है। लेकिन इसके साथ-साथ हम आईएईए के साथ इसीलिए negotiate कर रहे हैं कि अगर यूनाइटेड स्टेट्स fuel supply बन्द कर देगा, तो third countries, दूसरी countries हमें fuel देना जारी रखेंगी। It is not an ordinary thing.

सर, यहां पर चर्चा की गई कि हम ईरान के cause पर समझौता कर रहे हैं। अगर तारीख का एक पन्ना उलट कर देखें, तो ईरान ने हमेशा अपना interest देखा है बहुत से issues पर ईरान ने हमारा साथ नहीं दिया। यह जरूरी नहीं है कि हम यूनाइटेड नेशंस के अंदर ईरान के खिलाफ वोट करें। एक मिनट के लिए अगर इस एग्रीमेंट को नजरअंदाज़ कर दिया जाए और यह फैसला कर लिया जाए कि अमेरिका के साथ हमारा कोई एग्रीमेंट नहीं होना है, मैं इस हाउस से पूछना चाहता हूं कि क्या यह हाउस चाहेगा कि ईरान एटॉमिक/न्यूक्लियर पावर बन जाए? क्या यह इस देश के हित में रहेगा कि ईरान एक बड़ी ताकत बन जाए? क्या यह इस देश के हित में रहेगा कि पाकिस्तान, जिस के साइंटिस्ट्स ने ईरान को वे तमाम फार्मूले दिए, पाकिस्तान और ईरान एक साथ मिल जाएं और ईरान एक बड़ी ताकत बन जाए?

DR. FAROOQ ABDULLAH: Sir, I would like to inform the hon. Member that in Geneva when Pakistan was going to bring a Resolution against India, the country that supported us—because I was also there—was Iran. It was Iran at that time that supported us. I would like to inform him. Mr. Rao was the Prime Minister. At that time, it was only because Iran told Pakistan that it was not going to support Pakistan, Pakistan withdrew that Resolution. It wanted a face-saving, on which India made a statement then and there, and Pakistan withdrew that Resolution. Iran has supported us even being an Islamic country next to Pakistan. It has supported us. That should be corrected.

श्री राशिद अल्वी: मैं फारूख अब्दुला साहब को बता दूं कि ईरान ने हमारा साथ भी दिया है और ईरान ने हमारी मुखालफत भी की है। यूनाइटेड नेशंस के अंदर ह्यूमन राइट्स को लेकर आप के कश्मीर के इश्यू पर ईरान ने हमारी मुखालफत की है। ... (व्यवधान)...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I will not allow. (*Interruptions*) That is his point of view. (*Interruptions*)

डा० फारूख अब्दुल्ला: जनेवा में जब convention हुई थी, जो कि दुनिया में 10-12 साल के बाद होती है, वहां पर अमेरिका ने हमारे ह्यूमन राइट्स पर जबर्दस्त अटैक किया था। मैं वहां था और मैंने ह्यूमन राइट्स को डिफेंड किया था। मैं यहां उन बड़े हिंदुस्तानियों का नाम नहीं ले सकता हूं, क्योंकि वह अच्छा नहीं होगा। They cannot defend themselves. जनाब प्राइम मिनिस्टर मेरे पास आए थे और उन्होंने कहा कि कैसे डिफेंड कर रहे हो? ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री उपसभापति: आप अपनी बात कीजिए। You address me. ... (*Interruptions*)

श्री राशिद अल्वी: सर, ईरान से हमारी पुरानी दोस्ती है, मैं इस बात से इंकार कर रहा हूं, लेकिन मेरी बात समझने की कोशिश कीजिए। ईरान ने हमेशा अपने इंटरेस्ट को पहली प्रायोरिटी दी है, हिंदुस्तान को भी अपने इंटरेस्ट को पहली प्रायोरिटी देनी चाहिए। मैं यही कह रहा हूं। बहुत सारे वक्त में, ईरान को ऐसा लगा और वह हमारे साथ नहीं आया। बहुत सारे वक्त ऐसा हो सकता है हम ईरान के साथ न जाएं, लेकिन, इस का यह मतलब हरगिज नहीं है कि हम ईरान की मुखालफत कर रहे हैं या किसी दूसरे मुल्क के दबाव में कोई काम कर रहे हैं। ईरान ने कभी नहीं चाहा कि हमारी nuclear ambitions पूरी हों। मैं आप सभी से पूछता हूं कि ईरान से हमारी कितनी ही दोस्ती क्यों न हो, क्या आप चाहेंगे कि ईरान एक न्यूक्लियर ताकत बन जाए? आप अमेरिका को छोड़ दीजिए, अमेरिका के साथ हमारे क्या रिश्ते हैं, क्या नहीं हैं, उन को नजरअंदाज कर के बात को सोचने की कोशिश कीजिए कि क्या हिंदुस्तान की बका के लिए, हिंदुस्तान की सलामती के लिए क्या यह पार्लियामेंट चाहेगी कि ऐसा हो जाए ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री शाहिद सिद्दीकी (उत्तर प्रदेश): इस का न्यूक्लियर डील से क्या ताल्लुक है?

† [شری شاہد صدیقی : اس کا نیوکلیئر ڈیل سے کیا تعلق ہے؟]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is his opinion. ... (*Interruptions*) No. It is his opinion. ... (*Interruptions*) You give your opinion. ... (*Interruptions*) He is giving his opinion. Why are you objecting? ... (*Interruptions*) आप बोलिए, वह उनका opinion है, हम क्या करेंगे? What can the Chair do?

श्री राशिद अल्वी : सर, हिंदुस्तान ने सिर्फ दो बार वोट दिया है- एक बार सितंबर में पिछले साल और एक बार फरवरी में इस साल। पिछली बार जब ईरान को वोट दिया तो 22 वोट ईरान के खिलाफ थे और एक वोट शायद उस की हिमायत में था। इस साल जब वोट दिया तो 27 वोट खिलाफ थे और 3 वोट हिमायत में थे। सर, जिन लोगों ने मुखालफत की थी, उनमें ईजिप्ट शामिल था, जिन लोगों ने मुखालफत की थी उनमें यमन शामिल था। जिन लोगों ने

† [] Transliteration of Urdu Script.

मुखालफत की थी, उसमें इंडोनेशिया शामिल था, जिन लोगों ने मुखालफत की थी, उसमें ब्राजील भी शामिल था। ये तमाम कंट्रीज थे। इनमें अकेला हिन्दुस्तान नहीं था। लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि ईरान की बात बार-बार की जाती है, लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान का इंटेरेस्ट हमारी फर्स्ट प्रायोरिटी होनी चाहिए।

जब एन०पी०एन० की सरकार थी, इराक के मामले में मैं ज्यादा बहस करना नहीं चाहता हूँ, लेकिन उस वक्त की सरकार इराक में फौजें भेजने के लिए तैयार थी यशवंत सिन्हा साहब का स्टेटमेंट मेरे पास मौजूद है। मैं उसे पढ़ कर सुना सकता हूँ, जिसमें उन्होंने कहा था कि "अभी हमने फैसला नहीं किया", इसका मतलब कि अंडर कंसिडरेशन था। उस वक्त भी कांग्रेस की अध्यक्ष सोनिया गांधी जी ने 4 जून को चिट्ठी लिखी थी कि अगर आप इराक के अन्दर आर्मी भेजेंगे, तो हम इसकी मुखालफत करेंगे। आफिशियल चिट्ठी लिखी थी।

सर, कांग्रेस का किरदार हमेशा से साफ रहा है और क्लियर रहा है। यहाँ कहा गया कि हमें न्यूक्लियर पावर स्टेट्स नहीं मिलेगा। सर, ये फॉरेन मिनिस्टर रहे, मैं तो कभी फॉरेन मिनिस्टर नहीं रहा हूँ। लेकिन सर, मुझे अदब के साथ कहना पड़ता है...(व्यवधान)...

श्री रवि शंकर प्रसाद (बिहार): कोशिश जारी रखिए।...(व्यवधान)...

श्री राशिद अल्वी : सर, न्यूक्लियर पावर स्टेट बनने के लिए दो शर्तें सबसे ज्यादा जरूरी हैं। एक शर्त है कि एन०पी०एन० के तमाम सिग्नेटरीज़, सिग्नेचर वाले, 150 या 151 मुल्क हैं, उसको सपोर्ट करें। दूसरी शर्त है कि आपने 1967 से पहले न्यूक्लियर टेस्ट कर लिया। इन दोनों शर्तों के अन्दर इंडिया नहीं आता। अगर यूनाइटेड स्टेट चाहे भी कि हमको वह एन०पी०एन० का दर्जा दे दे, तो यूनाइटेड स्टेट नहीं दे सकता। लेकिन इसके साथ-साथ प्रेसिडेंट बुश का यह स्टेटमेंट कि वे तमाम फैसिलिटीज़, वे तमाम राइट्स जो न्यूक्लियर वेपन स्टेट्स को होंगे, वे इंडिया को होंगे। यह स्टेटमेंट है। वे तमाम राइट्स और सारी फैसिलिटीज़ इंडिया को मिलेंगी।...(व्यवधान)...

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी : किस तारीख को कहा है और कहाँ कहा है, जरा वह फरमा दीजिए...(व्यवधान)...

श्री उपसभापति : आप बोलिए...(व्यवधान).... आप बोलिए।...(व्यवधान)...

SHRI RAASHID ALVI: "The offshoot of this is that India could shop anywhere for new reactors and nuclear fuel sources." यह मैं प्रेसिडेंट बुश का स्टेटमेंट पढ़ रहा हूँ। "In the meantime, the United States will encourage its partners to also consider the request to supply nuclear fuel to India." जोशी जी, यह प्रेसिडेंट बुश का ही स्टेटमेंट है, जो मैं आपको पढ़ कर सुना रहा हूँ।

सर, मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि मैं अपनी बात लम्बी करना नहीं चाहता। लेकिन मैं बहुत अदब के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ कि जिस तरीके का propaganda इस देश के अन्दर कुछ लोग कर रहे हैं, वह बेबुनियाद है। जो फैसला किया गया है, वह देश के हित के अन्दर किया गया है। मैं इसके लिए प्राइम मिनिस्टर को congratulate करता हूँ। Thank you very much.

DR. P.C. ALEXANDER (Maharashtra): Thank you, Sir. I should start by saying that I deeply regret the Government's decision not to go in for a sense of the House Resolution. All sorts of arguments have been put forward in support of this decision. Someone said that there is no constitutional provision for a sense of the House Resolution. Mr. Anand Sharma said this morning that that is a US practice and we should follow our own traditions. These are all arguments which are put forward just for argument's sake. Why do I say that a subject like this requires a consensus backing the Prime Minister? It is because this is too serious a matter for the House to get divided on party lines or on any other line. The Prime Minister's position in his further negotiations which are to follow would have been considerably strengthened if the world knew that we, as Members of Parliament, had laid down certain benchmarks which would reflect the consensus of the Parliament, as a whole. Those who say that there are no precedents or constitutional provisions, forget that our predecessors in the Parliament in 1962 thought it necessary to have such a resolution faced with the invasion of our country by China. I am not saying that we are facing such a situation today, but this issue has all the potential of not only accepting things which we may regret later, of legislating not only for the present generation but even legislating for the future, if not, in perpetuity. Therefore, I felt very strongly that the House, as a whole, should lay down the minimum points on which there is an agreement. I am sure, that such an agreement is there, but I am very sorry to say that the Prime Minister seems to think that if such a resolution is passed in the House, it may be misunderstood by people outside our country as reflecting want of trust in his leadership. The entire House would have given him strength by passing a resolution which he could fall back upon when he is to negotiate this matter further. I would not have put so much of strength behind the plea for having a sense of the House resolution I write a piece on this in the "Asian Age" today but for one particular incident. A few days ago, a visiting American diplomat known as a great friend of our country, met some of us informally. And he was holding forth explaining the great benefits that India was expected to get

as a result of this agreement and was expressing his great optimism that the Bill, as passed by the House of Representatives would further strengthen Indo-US friendship and cooperation. I kept quiet listening to him. I was very close to him when he was working here. But when he said that the Bill, as approved by the House of Representatives, had been very well received in India, I intervened. I asked him, "who told you this? Who gave you this brief? This is something which we in India do not know." On the other hand, I said, "People like me would have gone the whole mile along with the Prime Minister's stand on the agreement if the Bill had not suffered the setback it has now received in the House of Representatives." It was a shock to him. He said, "I never knew that public opinion is against the Bill as passed by the House of Representatives." And I asked, "Who could have given you a wrong impression?" He said, without batting an eyelid, "I was briefed so by your Mission in Washington." Then, I realised the magnitude of the confusion as to what we are seeking to achieve and what we have received against what we had hoped for. There is confusion not only among people in the country and among scientists, not only among the representatives of the media and among the Members of Parliament, but even among the members of our own Missions abroad. I thought it was necessary that I should come forward boldly of supporting Yechuryji and the BJP that the House should forget party differences, arrive at a benchmark and tell the whole world that we are with the Prime Minister so long as he adheres to the benchmark. And this would have helped him a lot in his further negotiations. Sir, I wish to say why this confusion has arisen. There are four main areas of confusion about the nuclear cooperation proposal. One is about the objective. What is it that we are going to achieve through this cooperation agreement? The Prime Minister's 29 July, 2005 statement before this House makes the position very clear, in very unambiguous terms. I quote:

"The central element of my interaction with President Bush was the resumption of bilateral civilian cooperation between India and the US which has been frozen for a decade. President Bush and I agreed that we would work towards promoting nuclear energy as a means for India to achieve security."

In a sense of the House resolution, I would have put this statement of the Prime Minister prominently through a set of words declaring that

the whole House agrees with him on that. But what did the House of Representatives do? I don't want to quote the exact sentences, because Shri Yashwant Sinha and Shri Arun Shourie have already done it before the House. Their statements clearly show that their objective is very different from the Prime Minister's objective. They have not exhibited any doubts or misgivings about it. They have clearly stated that their policy is to achieve, at the earliest possible date, a treaty banning the production of missile materials for nuclear weapons to which India and the US would be parties. While proceeding to define the policy of the US Government in this, they clearly say that they oppose the development of a capacity to produce nuclear weapons by any non-nuclear weapon State within or outside the NPT. So, there is a world of difference between what we want to achieve through this cooperation and what they are aiming at. I am not talking about the other parts of the joint statement. There are so many good things in the joint statement. I am only taking this particular part on the nuclear cooperation. Our Prime Minister had one objective and he is trying to get the US assistance in realising that particular objective, whereas the House of Representatives had a totally different objective. May I remind Shri Anand Sharma that no amount of his argument will convince anybody in this House, including those who are sitting on that side, that what the House of Representatives says in these words are not binding on India. It is convenient to say that what they write in their law is not binding on us. It may not be binding on us. But it is binding on the President of the United States. When it is binding on the President of the United States who is to give that annual certificate before the 31st of January every year, it affects us. It is all right theoretically to say that it is not binding on us. It is certainly binding on us because of what I have just now said. So, let us not take it lightly. We have to make our position clear as to where we stand and what we do not stand for. That is my first point. The second point is the confusion about India and the US having a "congruent foreign policy". A new phrase is being sold. In other words, they will consider extending certain benefits to non-NPT countries like India, provided the country has a foreign policy that is congruent to that of the US. During the 59 years of independence, no responsible politician, whatever may be his political party, whether Congress, Communist, Socialist or the BJP had ever said that our foreign policy should be aligned with that of the United States. On the other hand, we had taken a firm stand, even when we were weak, even when we

5.00 P.M.

were down in the dumps as a third world country economically, and had shown the courage and determination in telling the whole world that we will decide our own foreign policy. The question of a congruent foreign policy, that has been stealthily brought into the House of Representatives Agreement, has thrown a lot to confusion. Later on it is followed by a specific provision about Iran, which has been referred to by the previous speakers, something to which we will never subscribe. We will decide what policy we should have with Iran. Nobody should tell us what policy we should have even with Pakistan because we are mature enough, strong enough, wise enough to know what policy we should have with these countries in our immediate neighbourhood. We are more concerned about these countries than others are because we all know that most of our neighbours are, what they call, failed States. We are living in the midst of failed States. We have to handle them with delicacy and with care. I am not proceeding further about Iran because enough has been said about it already today.

The third issue is the Presidential certificate. I think my good friend from the Teluge Desam Party referred to it as a good conduct certificate, a character certificate. This is not there is the joint statement signed by the Prime Minister. It is not there in the 29th July, 2005 statement of the Prime Minister in this House. It is not there in the 27th February, 2006, statement or in the 7th March, 2006 statement of the Prime Minister in this House. We follow every word of what he tells this House because he is making a statement solemnly before the people of the country, through us. He never said that we have agreed to a good conduct certificate to be given by the President of America so that we will become eligible to the concessions that are now being given. I was very happy that Mr. Anand Sharma had said in the morning speech that we are not going to agree to that. Well and good. We would have brought that point into our sense of the House statement because when the Minister of the State said it in the presence of the Prime Minister, he must have had the authority of the Prime Minister to say that. I am sure the Prime Minister would never agree to that. Therefore, that was another point which we could have been brought into the sense of the House Resolution. But we missed that opportunity as well.

Sir, my fourth point is the confusion about the words 'a responsible State with an advanced nuclear technology'. A person, like me, who is familiar with the transaction of agreements, treaties, etc., with foreign

countries, fails to understand what is sought to be conveyed by this set of words. Why can't we say, "nuclear weapon State" plainly? Why can't they plainly accept India as a nuclear weapon State? Instead they have used the words "a responsible State with advanced nuclear technology" for which some concessions can be given. And what concessions? Nothing will follow without that certificate.

Finally, Sir, when we say that the President of the United States will be able to get over these difficulties when the reconciling proceedings are initiated between the House of Representatives and the Senate, when we say that the President, who signed this Statement along with the Prime Minister, will be able to deliver on the promises he had made to our Prime Minister, we are ignoring the realities of politics in the United States. Mr. Arun Shourie has mentioned about what happened to President Wilson? And, we know what happened to President Clinton, a man who arm-twisted the Heads of Governments in dozens of States and made them sign the CTBT! For three years he waited for the Senate to agree to America becoming a Member of the CTBT. But he could not do anything about it. Every President had to suffer humiliation in the recent past in his dealings with the Congress President Bush, who will very soon become a lame duck in his own country—election campaigns have already started and they know that he has only so many months left—will not be able to change what the Congress has already decided upon. Therefore, let us not put all our hope on the capacity of the United States President to direct the Congress towards the Agreement that he had signed with the Prime Minister. Confusion all around has been created by the US Congress Bill. Before that, I was very clear in my mind because listening to the three statements before the House, I knew that the country's interests were safe in his hands. He had articulated them boldly before us, we all agreed with that something is being done, and he has safeguarded our interests. Now, I fear that he may not be able to safeguard these interests; President Bush will not be able to safeguard our interests. New negotiations may have to take place, and therefore, I thought, we should strengthen his hands through a resolution which would enable him to make sure that things do not go beyond the line endorsed by the Parliament. Thank you very much, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, Shri Shahid Siddiqui. You have only five minutes.

श्री शाहिद सिद्दिकी: सर, बहुत धन्यवाद। आज शायद चौथी बार हम इण्डो-यूएस डील

पर यहां बात कर रहे हैं। इससे जाहिर होता है कि मुल्क में भी कंप्यूजन है इस डील के बारे में, इस हाउस में भी कंप्यूजन है। हालांकि प्राइम मिनिस्टर की इंटेंशन पर कहीं किसी को कोई डाउट नहीं है और प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने बार-बार इस हाउस में बात को बहुत साफ तरीके से रखा है, उसके बावजूद हम में से कोई मुतमइन होने को तैयार नहीं। बार-बार यह बात उठाई जा रही है, जैसा कि अलेक्जेंडर साहब ने कहा और बताया कि यहां पर क्या कंप्यूजन है और मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब 18 जुलाई के बाद मुझे बोलने का मौका मिला था, उस वक्त यहां पर मैंने यह बात बहुत स्पष्ट रूप से कही थी कि यह जो स्टेटमेंट था, एग्रीमेंट था, फ्रेमवर्क था, आज तक यही साफ नहीं हुआ, अभी उससे बहुत लम्बे रास्ते पर हमें जाना है, हमें हाउस के साथ, कांग्रेस के साथ जो एग्रीमेंट होगा वह एग्रीमेंट होना है, उसमें हमें रिनैगोशिएट करना होगा और आज रिनैगोशिएट हो रहा है। हमें एन०एस०जी० के साथ रिनैगोशिएट करना होगा, हमें आई०ए०ई०ए० के साथ रिनैगोशिएट करना होगा, ये सारी चीजें हमारे सामने आ रही हैं। उस वक्त यह कहा गया था कि नहीं, आप लोग नहीं समझते हो। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ आज 13 महीने हो गए, बहुत पानी बह गया उस वक्त से अब तक गंगा नदी में, उस वक्त एक बात कही गई, प्राइम मिनिस्टर सितम्बर में फिर यूनाइटेड स्टेट गए और कहा गया हिस्टोरिक एग्रीमेंट सितम्बर में फिर हुआ, 18 जुलाई को हुआ, उसके बाद सितम्बर में हुआ। फिर बुश साहब यहां पर आए। फिर हमारी पीठ थपथपाई गई। एक हिस्टोरिक एग्रीमेंट हुआ यहां पर इस देश के साथ। बार-बार हिस्टोरिक एग्रीमेंट होते रहे, कहीं कोई सिग्नेचर नहीं हुआ, क्योंकि सिग्नेचर नहीं हो सकता था जब तक अमेरिकन कांग्रेस रेस्ट्रिक्शन नहीं हटा दे। सर, जो रेस्ट्रिक्शन हटाने की बात हो रही है, मुझे नजर नहीं आता कि वह रेस्ट्रिक्शन पूरी तरह हटने वाले हैं। लेकिन मैं उस बहस में नहीं जाऊंगा, क्योंकि यहां पर टेक्निकल डिटेल्स में बहुत बातें हो चुकी हैं और मेरे पास समय बहुत कम है। मैं तो सिर्फ इस सरकार से इतना जानना चाहूंगा कि आनन्द शर्मा जी बोले थे, सरकार बार-बार बोलती रही है, मैं अभी तक यह नहीं समझ पाया हूँ कि इस एग्रीमेंट से इतना कुछ देने के बाद इतना कुछ सेकरीफाईस करने के बाद हमें मिलने वाला क्या है? क्योंकि एक बात जो कही गई पहले दिन से कि हमें एनर्जी सिक्योरिटी मिलने वाली है। वह बहुत साफ हो गया है, इस मुल्क के साइंटिस्ट्स ने साफ कर दिया है, इस मुल्क के जो एक्सपर्ट हैं, इकॉनामी एक्सपर्ट हैं, एनर्जी एक्सपर्ट हैं, सब ने साफ कर दिया है कि एनर्जी सिक्योरिटी हमें कम से कम इस एग्रीमेंट से नहीं मिलने वाली है। तो फिर क्या मिलने वाला है, किसलिए हम इस एग्रीमेंट की तरफ जा रहे हैं, यह मैं सरकार से साफ रूप से जानना चाहूंगा? अभी हमारे कांग्रेस के साथी ने कहा था कि पाकिस्तान के साथ हमें कोई एक बरतरी मिल गई है, पाकिस्तान भी यह एग्रीमेंट चाहता था। लेकिन मेरे सामने जो बात आ रही है, 18 जुलाई को यकीनन पैरिटी की बात नहीं थी पाकिस्तान के साथ। कहा जा रहा था हिन्दुस्तान बड़ा रेस्पॉसिबल स्टेट है, हमारी पीठ थपथपाई जा रही थी, बड़ी शाबासी दी जा रही थी, हम बड़े खुश थे कि अमेरिका ने हमारे को शाबासी दे दी कि हमारा सर बड़ा ऊंचा हो रहा था, इस देश में। लेकिन आज जो सीनेट में, कांग्रेस में जो बिल

पास हुआ है, उसमें जो बात सामने आ रही है, वह यह है, मैं कोट कर रहा हूँ: "To achieve a moratorium on the production of fissile material for nuclear explosive purposes by India, Pakistan and the Peoples' Republic of China at the earliest possible date." और फिर कहा जाता है, "To achieve as quickly as possible a cessation of the production by India and Pakistan a fissile material for the nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosive devices."... In the July agreement, India undertook to join in good faith negotiations on a Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty to be universal in nature.

सर, यह बात कही जा रही है कि पाकिस्तान को इससे नुकसान होने वाला है, मुझे तो इसमें बड़ा खतरा नजर आ रहा है। पाकिस्तान के ऊपर कोई पाबंदी नहीं लग रही है, उसको अपने न्युक्लियर जो installations हैं, उनको आईईए के हवाले नहीं करना पड़ रहा है, उसको सिविल और मिलिट्री में बांटना नहीं पड़ रहा है। हम यह साब कुछ करने वाले हैं, लेकिन उसके साथ-साथ पाकिस्तान को बड़े पैमाने पर आर्म्स मिल रहे हैं, बड़े पैमाने पर आर्म्स दिए जा रहे हैं, उसके ऊपर कोई रेस्ट्रिक्शन्स नहीं हैं, हमारे ऊपर रेस्ट्रिक्शन्स हैं, आने वाले वक्त में, उसको आज़ादी होगी न्युक्लियर टैस्ट करने की, हमारे ऊपर हमेशा-हमेशा के लिए self-perpetuity, हम अपने न्युक्लियर हथियारों को आगे नहीं बढ़ा सकते, हम उस पर आगे नहीं जा सकते, यह हमारे सामने एक बहुत ही अहम सवाल है। हम आने वाली दस जेनरेशन्स को अमेरिका के हवाले कर रहे हैं और इस एग्रीमेंट के, हमारे इस मुल्क के साइंसदानों ने, हमारे मुल्क के न्युक्लियर साइंटिस्ट्स ने पेट पर पत्थर बांधकर काम किया है और तब हम यहां पहुंचे हैं। मुझे याद है, मैं 1987 में राजीव जी के साथ अमेरिका गया था और उस वक्त वहां पर रीगन साहब प्रेसिडेंट थे। हम रीगन साहब से सुपर कम्प्युटर चाहते थे, लेकिन उनके द्वारा सुपर कम्प्युटर की हमारी मांग को ठुकरा दिया गया। हमने क्या किया, इस मुल्क में वापिस आकर के, इस मुल्क के साइंटिस्टों ने सारा जोर लगाया और आज हम एक कम्प्युटर सुपरपावर, आईटी सुपरपावर हैं। ..(समय की घंटी)..क्यों, क्योंकि हमें सुपर कम्प्युटर दिया नहीं गया था, इसलिए हमने दुगुनी मेहनत की। हमारे न्युक्लियर के रास्ते पर रुकावटें डाली गईं, हमने चार गुणा मेहनत की, तब हिन्दुस्तान आज यहां पर पहुंचा है और जब यहां पहुंच गया है, जब हमारे पास सब कुछ है, जब आज हम कहते हैं कि हम इकोनामिक पावर हैं, जब आज हमारे देश का पेट भरा हुआ है, उस वक्त आप इनके सामने घुटने टेक रहे हैं, आज हम उस हालत में आ गए हैं। सर, आज यह बहुत बड़ा इश्यु है। सवाल खाली इस एग्रीमेंट का नहीं है, हम अमेरिका के साथ स्ट्रेटिजिकली कहां जाना चाहते हैं, कहां खड़े हो रहे हैं, यह बुनियादी सवाल है। हमने इराक का हथ्र देखा है। इराक के साथ कोई एग्रीमेंट नहीं था, ईरान के साथ कोई एग्रीमेंट नहीं है, लेकिन इराक के ऊपर असत्य इल्जाम लगाए गए कि कांगों से उन्होंने यूरेनियम हासिल किया है। यह बाद में साबित हुआ। खुद अमेरिकियों ने बताया

कि वे असत्य इल्जामात थे, वह सारा असत्य था। उसके बावजूद उसको बुनियाद बनाकर, इराक का जो हथ्र हुआ, वह हमारे सामने है। आज हम यह एग्रीमेंट करेंगे, आज हम सिग्नेचर करेंगे, आज से दस साल बाद, आज से बीस साल बाद, हमारे साथ क्या हो सकता है, हमारी क्या मांगे हो सकती हैं, उसके बारे में, हमें और इस हाउस को सोचना होगा। सर, अगर यह हाउस इस पर सोचकर नहीं चलेगा, तो फिर, आने वाली नस्लें हमसे सवाल करेंगी कि किस तरह से जो हमने हासिल किया था, जो देश की आज़ादी हासिल की थी, क्योंकि आज आपके पास न्युक्लियर पावर के बिना वह सोवरेनिटी नहीं है, जो सोवरेनिटी 1947-48 से पहले, न्युक्लियर बम बनने से पहले होती थी। आज सावरेनिटी का मतलब यह है कि आप न्युक्लियर स्टेट होने चाहिए। आज कोरिया में और ईरान में यह फर्क है—एक वक्त था जब अमेरिका ने कोरिया पर हमला किया था, आज अमेरिका की हिम्मत नहीं है कोरिया के अंदर दाखिल होने की। आज कोरिया खुलेआम धमकी दे रहा है, लेकिन अमेरिका उसकी तरफ नहीं बढ़ सकता, क्योंकि वह न्युक्लियर स्टेट है। आने वाले वक्त में, क्या हम इस रास्ते पर चलेंगे? ... (समय की घंटी)... सर, इसलिए मैं आपसे दरखास्त करता हूँ कि सैंस ऑफ द हाउस का रिजोल्यूशन आप अब भी पास कर सकते हैं, अब भी ला सकते हैं, आप उसको लाइये, वह आपके हित में है, वह देश के हित में है। प्रधान मंत्री जी, आपके ऊपर बड़ी भारी जिम्मेदारी है, आपके कंधों पर बड़ी भारी जिम्मेदारी है और इस जिम्मेदारी को निभाने के लिए, आपको इस हाउस के पूरे समर्थन की आवश्यकता है, पूरा हाउस एक होकर, एक आवाज से आपके पीछे खड़ा होना चाहिए और उसका नतीजा यह होगा कि आप जिस ताकत के साथ आंख में आंख डालकर बात कर सकेंगे, प्रेसिडेंट बुश के साथ, अमेरिका के साथ, पूरी दुनिया के साथ, वह ताकत आपको वैसे नहीं मिलने वाली है। आज जब यह बंट रहा हाउस है, यानी बंट रहा देश है, तो बंटे हुए देश के साथ, अगर आप जाते हैं, तो आपकी ताकत कमजोर होती है, आप उनके सामने कह नहीं सकते कि आप गलत कह रहे हैं, आपकी बात हम रद्द करते हैं, क्योंकि आज आप रद्द करने की पोजिशन में भी नहीं हैं। आप यह कहें कि साहब फाइनल जो आयेगा, हम उसको देखकर रिजेक्ट कर देंगे, आप रिजेक्ट नहीं कर पायेंगे। अगर आप रिजेक्ट करेंगे, तो उसकी कीमत हिन्दुस्तान को चुकानी होगी, आपको जो भी रिजेक्ट करना है, वह आज कीजिए। जो भी फ्रेम वर्क बनाना है कि उस फ्रेम वर्क के अंदर हमें एक्सेप्ट करना है, इस फ्रेम वर्क के अंदर हमें रिजेक्ट करना है। ... (व्यवधान) ..

श्री उपसभापति: आप खत्म कीजिए।

श्री शाहिद सिद्दिकी: तो इस हाउस को आज फार्मुलेट कर लेना चाहिए। अगर हाउस फार्मुलेट करेगा, तो वह हिन्दुस्तान का फार्मुलेशन होगा और इससे आपको बहुत बड़ी ताकत मिलेगी। बहुत-बहुत शुक्रिया।

† [شری شاہد صدیقی "انر پروٹیسٹ": سر، بہت دھندلاد۔ آج شاید چوٹی بار ہم انڈو-یو ایس ڈیل پر

یہاں بات کر رہے ہیں۔ اس سے ظاہر ہوتا ہے کہ ملک میں بھی کنفیوژن ہے اس ڈیل کے بارے میں، اس ہاؤس میں بھی کنفیوژن ہے۔ حالانکہ پرائم منسٹر کی انٹینشن پر کہیں کسی کو کوئی ڈاؤٹ نہیں ہے اور پرائم منسٹر نے بار بار اس ہاؤس میں بات کو بہت صاف طریقے سے رکھا ہے، اس کے باوجود ہم میں سے کوئی مطمئن ہونے کو تیار نہیں۔ بار بار یہ بات اٹھائی جا رہی ہے، جیسا کہ الیکوینڈر صاحب نے کہا اور بتایا کہ یہاں پر کیا کنفیوژن ہے اور میں کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ جب ۱۸ جولائی کے بعد مجھے موقع ملا تھا بولنے کا، اس وقت یہاں پر میں نے یہ بات بہت اچھا روپ سے کہی تھی کہ یہ جو اسٹیٹ منسٹ تھا، انگری منسٹ تھا، فریم ورک تھا آج تک یہی صاف نہیں ہوا، ابھی اس سے بہت لمبے راستے پر ہمیں جانا ہے، ہمیں ہاؤس کے ساتھ، کانگریس کے ساتھ جو انگری منسٹ ہو گا وہ انگری منسٹ ہونا ہے اس میں ہمیں ری نیگوشیٹ کرنا ہو گا اور آج ری نیگوشیٹ ہو رہا ہے۔ ہمیں این ایس جی کے ساتھ ری نیگوشیٹ کرنا ہو گا، ہمیں آئی اے اے کے ساتھ ری نیگوشیٹ کرنا ہو گا، یہ ساری چیزیں ہمارے سامنے آ رہی ہیں۔ اس وقت یہ کہا گیا تھا کہ نہیں، آپ لوگ نہیں سمجھتے ہو۔ میں جانتا چاہتا ہوں آج ۱۳ مہینے ہو گئے، بہت پانی بہہ گیا اس وقت سے اب تک گنگا ندی میں، اس وقت ایک بات کہی گئی، پرائم منسٹر تبیر میں پھر یونائیٹڈ اسٹیٹ گئے اور کہا گیا مسٹر ورک انگری منسٹ ممبر میں پھر ہوا، ۱۸ جولائی کو ہوا، اس کے بعد تبیر میں ہوا، پھر بس صاحب یہاں پر آئے، پھر ہماری پیٹھ تھپتھپائی گئی، ایک مسٹر ورک انگری منسٹ ہوا یہاں پر اس ویش کے ساتھ۔ بار بار مسٹر ورک انگری منسٹ ہوتے رہے، کہیں کوئی سگنچر نہیں ہوا، کیوں کہ سگنچر نہیں ہو سکتا تھا جب تک امریکن کانگریس ریٹشرکشن نہیں ہٹا دے۔ سر، جو ریٹشرکشن ہٹانے کی بات ہو رہی ہے، مجھے نظر نہیں آتا کہ وہ ریٹشرکشن پوری طرح ہٹنے والے ہیں۔ لیکن میں اس بحث میں نہیں جاؤ گا، کیوں کہ یہاں پر ٹیکنیکل ڈیٹیل میں بہت باتیں ہو چکی ہیں اور میرے پاس سمجھنے بہت کم ہے، میں تو صرف اوسرکار سے اتنا جانتا چاہوں گا کہ آئندہ شراباجی بولے تھے، سرکار بار بار بولتی رہی ہے، میں ابھی تک یہ نہیں سمجھ پایا ہوں کہ اس انگری منسٹ سے اتنا کچھ دینے کے بعد اتنا کچھ سکریفائس کرنے کے بعد ہمیں ملنے والا کیا ہے؟ کیوں کہ ایک بات جو کہی گئی پہلے دن سے کہ ہمیں ایگزیکٹو سیکورٹی ملنے والی ہے۔

وہ بہت صاف ہو گیا ہے، اس ملک کے سائنسٹس نے صاف کر دیا ہے، اس ملک کے جو ایکسپلرٹ ہیں، اکانومی ایکسپلرٹ ہیں، انرجی ایکسپلرٹ ہیں سب نے صاف کر دیا ہے کہ انرجی سیکورٹی ہمیں کم سے کم اس ایگریمنٹ سے نہیں ملنے والی ہے۔ تو پھر کیا ملنے والا ہے کس لئے ہم اس ایگریمنٹ کی طرف جارہے ہیں، یہ میں سرکار سے صاف روپ سے جاننا چاہوں گا۔ ابھی ہمارے کانگریس کے ساتھی نے کہا تھا کہ پاکستان کے ساتھ ہمیں کوئی ایک برتری مل گئی ہے، پاکستان بھی یہ ایگریمنٹ چاہتا تھا۔ لیکن میرے سامنے جو بات آرہی ہے، ۱۸ جولائی کو یقیناً پیرٹی کی بات نہیں تھی پاکستان کے ساتھ۔ کہا جا رہا تھا ہندوستان بڑا ریپبلک اسٹیٹ ہے، ہماری پیپل تھیں چٹائی جا رہی تھی، بڑی شاہی دی جا رہی تھی، ہم بڑے خوش تھے کہ امریکانے ہمارے کوشا باش دے دی کہ ہمارا سربڑا اونچا ہو رہا تھا اس دیش میں۔ لیکن آج جو سیٹیٹ میں، کانگریس میں جو بل پاس ہوا ہے اس میں جو بات سامنے آرہی ہے، ہو یہ ہے، میں کوٹ کر رہا ہوں :

"To achieve a moratorium on the production of fissile material for nuclear explosive purposes by India, Pakistan and the People's Republic of China at the earliest possible date." اور پھر کہا جاتا ہے،

"To achieve as quickly as possible a cessation of the production by India and Pakistan a fissile material for the nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosive devices." ... In the July agreement, India undertook to join in good faith negotiations on a Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty to be universal in nature.

سر، یہ بات کبھی جا رہی ہے کہ پاکستان کو اس سے نقصان ہونے والا ہے، مجھے تو اس میں بڑا خطرہ نظر آ رہا ہے۔ پاکستان کے اوپر کوئی پابندی نہیں لگ رہی ہے، اس کو اپنے نیوکلیئر جو installations ہیں، ان کو آئی اے ای اے کے حوالے نہیں کرنا پڑ رہا ہے، اس کو بول اور ملٹری میں بائٹا نہیں پڑ رہا ہے۔ ہم یہ سب کچھ کرنے والے ہیں، لیکن اس کے ساتھ ساتھ پاکستان کو بڑے پیمانے پر آرمس مل رہے ہیں، بڑے پیمانے پر آرمس دئے جا رہے ہیں، اس کے اوپر کوئی ریٹریکشن نہیں ہیں، ہمارے اوپر ریٹریکشن ہیں، آنے والے وقت میں، اس کو آزادی ہوگی نیوکلیئر ٹیسٹ کرنے کی، ہمارے اوپر ہمیشہ ہمیشہ کے لئے

self-perpetuity، ہم اپنے نیوکلیئر ہتھیاروں کو آگے نہیں بڑھا سکتے، ہم اس پر آگے نہیں جاسکتے، یہ ہمارے سامنے ایک بہت ہی اہم سوال ہے۔ ہم آنے والی دس جنریشن کو امریکہ کے حوالے کر رہے ہیں اور اس ایگریمنٹ کے، ہمارے اس ملک کے سائنسدانوں نے، ہمارے ملک کے نیوکلیئر سائنسٹ نے پیت پر ہتھ باندھ کر کام کیا ہے اور تب ہم یہاں پہنچے ہیں۔ مجھے یاد ہے، میں ۱۹۸۷ میں راجیو جی کے ساتھ امریکہ گیا تھا اور اس وقت وہاں پریگن صاحب پریزیڈنٹ تھے۔ ہم ریگن صاحب سے سیرکپیوٹر چاہتے تھے، لیکن ان کے ذریعہ سیرکپیوٹر کی ہماری مانگ کو ٹھکرا دیا گیا۔ ہم نے کیا کیا، اس ملک میں واپس آ کر کے، اس ملک کے سائنسٹوں نے سارا زور لگایا اور آج ہم ایک کپیوٹر سپر پاور، آئی ٹی سپر پاور ہیں۔..... (وقت کی گھنٹی)..... کیوں، کیوں کہ ہمیں سیرکپیوٹر دیا نہیں گیا تھا، اس لئے ہم نے دو گنی محنت کی۔ ہمارے نیوکلیئر کے راستے پر کاؤٹ ڈالی گئیں، ہم نے چار گنا محنت کی، تب ہندوستان آج یہاں پر پہنچا ہے اور جب یہاں پہنچ گیا ہے، جب ہمارے پاس سب کچھ ہے، جب آج ہم کہتے ہیں کہ ہم اکانومی پاور ہیں، جب آج ہمارے دیش کا پیٹ بھرا ہوا ہے، اس وقت آپ ان کے سامنے گھٹنے ٹیک رہے ہیں، آج ہم اس حالت میں آگئے ہیں۔ سر، آج یہ بہت بڑا ایٹھ ہے، سوال خالی اس ایگریمنٹ کا نہیں ہے، ہم امریکہ کے ساتھ اسٹریٹیجیکل کہاں جانا چاہتے ہیں۔ کہاں کھڑے ہو رہے ہیں، یہ بنیادی سوال ہے۔ ہم نے عراق کا حشر دیکھا، عراق کے ساتھ کوئی ایگریمنٹ نہیں تھا، ایران کے ساتھ کوئی ایگریمنٹ نہیں ہے، لیکن عراق کے اوپر غلط الزام لگائے گئے کہ کاکو سے انہوں نے یورینیم حاصل کیا ہے، یہ بعد میں ثابت ہوا، خود امریکیوں نے بتایا کہ وہ جھوٹے الزامات تھے، وہ سارا جھوٹ تھا۔ اس کے باوجود اس کو بنیاد بنا کر، عراق کا جو حشر ہوا، وہ ہمارے سامنے ہے۔ آج ہم یہ ایگریمنٹ کریں گے، آج ہم سکینچ کریں گے، آج سے دس سال بعد، آج سے بیس سال بعد، ہمارے ساتھ کیا ہو سکتا ہے، ہماری کیا مانگیں ہو سکتی ہیں، اس کے بارے میں، ہمیں اور اس ہاؤس کو سوچنا ہوگا۔ سر، اگر یہ ہاؤس اس پروسچ کر نہیں چلے گا، تو پھر آنے والی نسلیں ہم سے سوال کریں گی کہ کس طرح سے جو ہم نے حاصل کیا تھا، جو دیش کی آزادی حاصل کی تھی، کیوں کہ آج آپ کے پاس نیوکلیئر پاور کے بغیر وہ سوورینٹی نہیں ہے جو سوورینٹی ۱۹۴۷-۴۸ سے پہلے، نیوکلیئر بم بننے سے پہلے

ہوتی تھی۔ آج سوورنئی کا مطلب یہ ہے کہ آپ نیوکلیئر اسٹیٹ ہونے چاہئیں۔ آج کوریا میں اور ایران میں یہ فرق ہے۔ ایک وقت تھا جب امریکہ نے کوریا پر حملہ کیا تھا، آج امریکہ کی ہمت نہیں ہے کوریا کے اندر داخل ہونے کی۔ آج کوریا کھلے عام دھمکی دے رہا ہے، لیکن امریکہ اس کی طرف نہیں بڑھ سکتا، کیونکہ وہ نیوکلیئر اسٹیٹ ہے۔ آنے والے وقت میں کیا ہم اس راستے پر چلیں گے؟ (وقت کی گھنٹی).....

سر، اس لئے میں آپ سے درخواست کرتا ہوں کہ سٹینس آف دی ہاؤس کاریزولیوشن آپ اب بھی پاس کر سکتے ہیں، اب بھی لاسکتے ہیں، آپ اس کو لائیے وہ آپ کے ہت میں ہے، وہ دلش کے ہت میں ہے۔ پردھان منتری جی آپ کے اوپر بڑی بھاری ذمہ داری ہے آپ کے کانڈھوں پر بڑی بھاری ذمہ داری ہے اور اس ذمہ داری کو نبھانے کے لئے آپ کو اس ہاؤس کے پورے سرٹھن کی ضرورت ہے، پورا ہاؤس ایک ہو کر، ایک آواز سے آپ کے پیچھے کھڑا ہونا چاہئے، اور اس کا نتیجہ یہ ہوگا کہ آپ جس طاقت کے ساتھ آنکھ میں آنکھ ڈال کر بات کر سکیں گے، پریزیڈنٹ بش کے ساتھ، امریکہ کے ساتھ، پوری دنیا کے ساتھ وہ طاقت آپ کو ویسے نہیں ملے والی ہے۔ آج جب یہ بٹا ہوا ہاؤس ہے، یعنی بٹا ہوا دلش ہے تو بٹے ہوئے دلش کے ساتھ اگر آپ جاتے ہیں تو آپ کی طاقت کمزور ہوتی ہے آپ ان کے سامنے کہہ نہیں سکتے کہ آپ غلط کہہ رہے ہیں، آپ کی بات ہم رد کرتے ہیں، کیونکہ آج آپ رد کرنے کی پوزیشن میں نہیں ہیں۔ آپ یہ کہیں کہ صاحب فائل جو آئے گا، ہم اس کو دیکھ کر رجیکٹ کر دیں گے، آپ رجیکٹ نہیں کر پائیں گے۔ اگر آپ رجیکٹ کریں گے تو اس کی قیمت ہندستان کو چکانی ہوگی، آپ کو جو بھی رجیکٹ کرنا ہے، وہ آج کیجئے، جو بھی فریم ورک بنانا ہے کہ اس ہاؤس فریم ورک کے اندر ہمیں ایکسپٹ کرنا ہے، اس فریم ورک کے اندر ہمیں رجیکٹ کرنا ہے..... مداخلت.....

شری آپ سہایتی: آپ ختم کیجئے۔

شری شاہد صدیقی: تو اس ہاؤس کو آج فارمولٹ کر لینا چاہئے۔ اگر ہاؤس فارمولٹ کریگا، تو وہ ہندستان کا فارمولٹیشن ہوگا اور اس سے آپ کو بہت بڑی طاقت ملے گی۔ بہت بہت شکریہ۔

SHRIMATI SHOBHANA BHARTIA (Nominated): Thank you, Sir. Sir, for the past 40 years ever since the emergence of the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty, NPT, the United States has steadily increased its pressure on India's nuclear programmes both civil and military. In fact, even countries that were hitherto willing to bend rules such as Russia, which was supplying us fuel for the Tarapore Power Plant, expressed their inability to deal with India on nuclear issues. Through legislations, Sir, both domestic and multilateral, India has been debarred from the use of foreign nuclear technology and in fact, even the dual use technology that may have spill over effect to nuclear use has been kept away from India thereby depriving us of high end acquisition. In the document tabled in Parliament on 7th of March on the Separation Plan, there is a very interesting table listing the most common reactors found in various countries. It can be seen from this document that the average size of Indian reactors is 220 MW whereas the average size of the reactors in most of the other countries is 1000 MW. It is shocking to see that our installed nuclear capacity today is even less than the wind energy capacity that we have in this country. If we are to achieve the Tenth Plan which talks about scaling up our nuclear power requirement to 50,000 MW by 2030, there has to be a huge incremental increase and this can only be achieved if we end our nuclear isolation from the world of R&D and the nuclear market. Many of my colleagues have been arguing and saying that we have coal energy that is sufficient. Which country want to depend entirely on one source of energy? There is also something called clean energy and judicious mix of energy. We do not want to be dependent only on one form. Therefore, we have to make that investment today if we have to move ahead. On July 18, in a historic agreement with India the US turned its nuclear policy on its head. In a grand bargain it agreed to recognise our nuclear weapon status in exchange for India putting under perennial IAEA safeguards all its nuclear installations and reactors that were civilian in nature, in any case. Since then both the countries are trying to work out arrangements to operationalise this agreement. Several steps have been taken in this regard. But ultimately it is going to be an enabling agreement, which is also popularly known as one-two-three agreement that will direct the course of this understanding with India. It will not be the legislation, Sir, and the one-two-three enabling agreement will be keeping with the July 18 understanding, keeping with what the legislation has said in the United States and the commitments made by

India in our Separation Plan. There seems to be a deliberate attempt to misinterpret the legislative process in the United States. As we know, Sir, the US House of Representatives and the Senate pass separate legislations. Thereafter they are reconciled and only then this final legislation is actually formed. People are picking on individual legislations saying that these are the conditions being sought to be imposed on India. That is not correct because the final outcome of this process is not yet over. In all democracies there is free debate on this issue and legislatures express their views either verbally or through amendments both substantive and declaratory in nature but the final outcome is yet to come. The Prime Minister has assured us that we will be keeping to the July 18 understanding and the President Bush too has said so in so many terms and to the Congress as well. Sir, there also seems to be an unnecessary requirement in the call to our Parliament to approve of this Bill. The US presidential system is very different from our system of Parliamentary democracy. In our system, the Government comes from the legislature and it is answerable to the legislature as opposed to the US where there is separation of power. To say that we will take one amendment from there, we will use it in our own and we will move a Constitutional amendment, to my mind, makes just no sense. Sir, I think the Prime Minister and his colleagues deserve to be congratulated for what they have achieved so far. They have persuaded the US to stand the policy on its head. In the amendments so far, the amendments seem to have empowered the President to have the ability to waive the clause that debars Indo-US nuclear cooperation. Sir, let it be quite clear that the rest of the world will also align their civil nuclear policy with India on the basis of the policy that we achieve with the United States. Countries like France, Japan, U.K. have all said that they will align their civil nuclear policies on the same basis as the agreement that we arrive at with the United States. Sir, moreover, this has also ended India's nuclear isolation. Our scientists and our nuclear scientists have worked against great odds during this period. Now that we are getting a chance to remedy that and come out of this isolation, I think, we should try and grab it with both hands. On December, 7th, Sir, India was invited to become a Member of the International Thermo Nuclear Experimental Reactor Project which is a very prestigious Membership. This would allow us to work alongside EU, Russia, Korea, Japan to explore cutting edge nuclear technology. This too has been an outcome of the July 18th Agreement. Moreover, contrary

to what some critics have been saying, this will also allow us to import Plutonium, which is much needed for our Thorium-Uranium reactors. If you were to depend on our internal resources, Sir, looking at our ambitious plan we have to have a very long wait. Having said this, there are certain redlines which are areas of concern which, if crossed, could potentially be deal breakers and, I am sure, that the Prime Minister and the Government could, perhaps, certainly look at those before they sign any formal agreement. So, for instance, if there are efforts to narrowly define which particular technologies the US could import to India or if their efforts to push India into formal commitment, not to test again or equally if there is a requirement of an annual declaration of our fissile material stock, these could be potential redlines which I do not think we should cross. Sir having said this there is nothing so far that would be at tandem or would deter India's nuclear status. We have eight reactors. We have the prototype fast breeder reactor and with Kalpakkam and Trombay, all being kept out of the civil list, I think, we are more than secure in our nuclear deterrent. Sir, there have been several calls, Sir, for the sense of the House Resolution. I don't know what sort of a purpose this is going to serve. We had one in 1962 with China. We had another one in 1994 on the issue of Kashmir but they seem to be borne more out of emotions than out of legislative commonsense. I would just like to urge the House, Sir, on a last note that in relation to our policy with foreign countries, we should see them in a non-partisan manner, through the cold calculus of national interest and not through sentiment. Thank you.

DR. BARUN MUKHERJEE (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, it is a matter of great concern for India that even after issuing a joint statement with India on 18th July, 2005, the United States is now seeking to make significant changes in the terms and conditions agreed upon in the US Nuclear Deal; and obviously, these changes are detrimental to the national interest of our country. That is the reason for which we want the Government's categorical declaration that India is, in no way, prepared to deviate from the original agreement. It is now widely apprehended that with the proposed changes in agreement, the US intends to bind India on nuclear issues, and at the same time, seeks to influence our independent foreign policy to tilt in their favour particularly, to manipulate India's support to their aggressive moves to contain Iran. It is a dangerous proposition to accept the changed provisions of the agreement as re-framed by the

US Agreement, particularly, because those newly framed provisions infringe on our indigenous research and development in the field of nuclear technology. We must have our own right and scope to develop with our Thorium reserves. Incidentally, it may be mentioned that recently quite a few leading nuclear scientists have appealed to the Parliament to take a unanimous decision to reject any restraint in perpetuity on the country's freedom of action or research capabilities in the nuclear field. Eight leading scientists, including three former Chairmen of the Atomic Energy Commission, have signed the aforesaid statement.

Sir, on behalf of our party, All India Forward Block, we strongly put forward our demand that the Government of India must not deviate from any of the terms and conditions of the original Indo-US nuclear deal. When the US House of Representatives can elaborately debate and impose many new restrictive conditions on the Indo-US nuclear deal, as agreed upon and declared by the President Bush, our Parliament should have the right, at least, to adopt a resolution highlighting India's concerns about the reframed deal. We request the hon. Prime Minister to make an affirmative statement in this respect, honouring the sense of Parliament. We reiterate our demand that India must not bow-down to any US pressure in whatsoever way that may come. Thank you.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I have always proclaimed that I am 75 per cent Communist and 25 per cent non-Communist.

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT (West Bengal): Whether today you are speaking within that 25 per cent or 75 per cent?

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: It is only to keep her at peace, I want to make it clear that today happens to be one of those occasions which fall within that 25 per cent.

Sir, I hear my friend, Yashwant's speech with great attention. The trouble with him was that whenever he came to the crucial point and I thought that he is about now to clinch the issue, he said, 'but to save time, I am leaving it to my friend, Arun Shourie.' Ultimately, his whole speech makes me no wiser. Then, I waited for my friend, Arun Shourie. I am afraid, Arun has given up his usual job of a very, very experienced and talented journalist and has taken to construction of documents and activity with which he is totally, totally unfamiliar. His reading of those documents is bad.

Today, we are really discussing a very important issue. So much so that my friend, Arun, said that this will affect the destiny of this nation for the next fifty years. I do not believe so. But, I will take him at his word. If it is that important, I thought, we must first establish some criteria by which you evaluate an international deal like this. I suggest that there are only three criteria. The first one is: what was the state of affairs before the deal, who wanted a change in the *status quo* which had existing until the negotiations for the deal or the deal itself came into existence. The second one is what has the deal achieved for us. And, third one is, have we paid any unfair price for that deal. I believe that the nation has not been told honestly and accurately about what this deal has achieved, what this deal has rescued us from. I thought it was the first duty of the critics of this deal to tell this House: Did we want a change in the existing *status quo*, or, did the Americans want a change in this *status quo*. Sir, I do not have too much time. But I have been assured that today is a day when nobody will be interrupted not even by your bell. (*interruptions*) So, Sir, just to save time, let me say that before this deal we were suffering from what a very respectable newspaper has called 'a uranium squeeze'. We are short of both kinds of uranium—the higher and rich Uranium and the lower and rich Uranium. The second one we use for the production of energy, and the first one we use for the production of nuclear weapons. We went round the country, my Prime Minister went round the country to persuade those who were responsible for that squeeze, to put an end to that squeeze. Sir, my experiences as a lawyer tells me that truth has a inconvenient habit of leaking out even from reluctant mouths. My friend, Yashwant, did say that they faced, what they called, 'a state of seize', but, he said that they bravely survived that. Bravo! But there was a state of seize. An honest witness should have told the nation that the Prime Minister of this country has put an end to the state of seize without paying the price for it.

Mr friend, Mr. Alvi, called it, "परेशानी की नौबत बनी हुई थी". Sir, It was परेशानी। Unfortunately, those who represent the Government and holders of office are reluctant to even speak the whole truth today on this delicate issue. We don't expose our weaknesses on the floor of Parliament. The truth is—I don't know how much of it the Prime Minister wishes to share with the nation—that our nuclear units, our energy units are terribly starved. Some of them are having outdated, antiquated technology. They are short of new technology. Some are short of raw material for use. And, some of

them are in the danger of being imminently closed down. I don't know why somebody has brought out that we have made some kind of commitment that things will close down within four years. Maybe, I don't know the details. And, I am not supposed to know the details. It must be an official secret. But, I have no doubt at all that some units of ours are imminently in danger of being closed. And, that's the present *status quo*, which has changed. If this was the squeeze that we were facing, did we want to persist with that squeeze and do nothing about it? Or, should we enter into some kind of a deal by which those who are responsible for that squeeze change their policies. Sir, I believe—and I am not a flatterer, I have nothing to get from the Prime Minister of this country or from this Government—that what the Prime Minister has succeeded in achieving for this country from July, last year, is an achievement for which the whole Indian nation has to be grateful to him and his Government. God will give him long life. But I wish that some day when he is gathered to his forefathers, a grateful nation will build a monument to perpetuate his memory. This is the achievement of this deal. The achievement of this deal is that those who do not want India to become strong are, today, agitated by that achievement. Has not China disapproved of this deal? Has not Pakistan disapproved of this deal? If I did not know that my friend, Shri Yashwant Sinha, and my friend, Shri Arun Shourie are both patriots. I would have accused them that they have the same motivation as China and Pakistan have. But, sir, they are misguided patriots. Patriots they are. They are, certainly, different from many people outside whom I consider as malefic critic of this country because they do not want this country to become strong. This deal will make this country strong. Sir, it is not that the cartel has been created before. We are proud of our sovereignty, but, equally, other nations are sovereign. Those sovereign nations, in the exercise of their own sovereignty, have decided that those who do not accord with their notions of correct international behaviour, namely, signing what they consider, from their point of view they consider it good, that states; as many states as possible should sign the NPT. and those who do not fall in line will suffer from some disabilities and from some inconveniences. And they have passed legislations in their own country imposing severe restrictions on export of this kind of a material to those Governments and those countries which have not signed the NPT. Sir, it is we who wanted those legislations to be repealed. And, my Prime Minister has succeeded in persuading the major country, the United

States to repeal that legislation. And, therefore, Sir, let us look at it. Let us look at it from the point of view of President Bush's critics. What are his American critics today vociferously attacking President Bush for? Sir, let us see one by one. His American critics are attacking him for having created an international evil precedent. Sir, I just again, to save time. I don't want to tell you the names of those distinguished critics who have accused President Bush that he is creating an evil precedent which is not good for the United States and for the world. What they say is that the entire non-proliferation system is already under attack. It is under attack from North Korea. It is under attack from Iran. And some countries have already been persuaded to reverse their course like South Africa. And, yet, Mr. Bush, why this special treatment for India? What has India done to you that you are creating this exception and are taking the Congress to pass legislation creating an exception only for the benefit of India? Sir, what is the reply of the American President? The President's reply is that India is a civilized and a responsible nation whose word is as good as a bond and whose bond is as good as a bank note. We don't insist on any written commitments from them, their record shows that they have behaved like a civilised and a very disciplined nuclear power. In spite of the fact that they have nuclear weapon, they have never used them, they have never threatened to use them. And, Sir, this is the reply which President Bush gives to those critics who have said, to use the exact words, that Mr. Bush you are making a big hole in the United State's laws creating strict export restrictions for countries which do not sign the NPT. The second line of criticism of these critics is that India has not given even an oral promise not to make more bombs. Sir, has my Prime Minister or the Foreign Ministry signed any agreement under which they have said that we are going to make no more bombs? It is not the Manmohan Government which has given any undertaking that we will have some kind of a moratorium. It is not done now. It is not done after the 18th of July. There is already a moratorium in existence, which at least creates a moral obligation to continue it. But this Government has not been compelled to give that kind of an undertaking, and in spite of the fact that we have told the United States Government, we have told the world, we have told every supplier that we shall continue to make bombs and we shall make such number of bombs as we can make; there is no cap imposed on us. The cap is imposed by our own economic conditions. Sir, let us not forget all the hullabaloo that is being made about our nuclear

weapons and all that. Some time ago, they were all talking about total disarmament. After all, we were not opposed to Non-Proliferation Treaty. We are opposed to it on the ground that it is unequal. Some States have weapons; they are not subject to its obligations, and we are being subjected to that obligation. In principle, we have not been opposed to non-proliferation. Sir, what is all this we are talking about? When it comes to a push, do you think that this poor country can ever afford to meet the combined nuclear might of Pakistan and China? Sir, this is precisely what happened to the Russians. The Russians went into a race with the Americans. The result of it was that after many, many years of lying, they discovered that the nation has been bankrupted. It was bankrupted. They gave up that race, and ultimately what happened was that the cold war ended when the Russians realised that the arms race is bankrupting their whole nation and the Berlin wall came down, and a new world was born in the year 1989. So, Sir, by all this hype that India is giving up its nuclear weapons programme, I mean, we are creating some kind of a false bogey before the nation as if our whole defence depends upon the possession of a few nuclear bombs that we have manufactured and which Pakistan has also manufactured again. Let us not forget Mr. Yashwant Sinha, today, told us that we have already made three resolutions: that we shall not be guilty on the first strike; we shall not strike against non-nuclear powers and the third one is, we will inflict unacceptable damage upon our adversaries. Sir, the Pentagon conducted a survey as far back as 1956. Their official scientists' report was that if the Russians engage themselves in the first strike upon the United States, 65 per cent of the American nation will be totally destroyed. Sir, what is this kind of few nuclear bombs that you have kept; you will not use them in any event. They are lying useless. They have only absorbed our money and our scientific skills. They are totally useless. We will have to wait for a first strike which will destroy 65 per cent of our country, then, with the remaining 35—I don't think, Sir, Mr. Yashwant will survive—he will inflict unacceptable damage upon his adversaries. Sir, all this is baloney. I have never heard such baloney ...*(Interruptions)*.... Sir, then, Bush's critics are telling him that you have now become a broker for India. Because he has to go around, suggest to those other 45 suppliers that please relax your restrictions; we are relaxing them, you also relax. Now, let us all start supplying things to India. So, Sir, they are asking him that Mr. Bush what has happened to you? Are you their agent, their sub-agent, broker, *waqil*, advocate, or

what? You have destroyed American's sovereignty and you have destroyed America's dignity that you are now becoming an advocate of the interests of India. What does President Bush tell them? Bush tells them that Indians today are our partners in the war against terror. And, I give credit to Atalji for his achievements. I give him credit. But I give greater credit to Dr. Manmohan Singh because when he went there, he expanded the scope of that partnership. Atalji's partnership was confined only to the war on terror, and, today, the Government is now a partner, India has become a partner in that partnership, the objective of which is the ramification and the spread of democracy and giving the democratic spirit and sustenance to those who are willing to imbibe the democratic spirit. Of course, Sir, I understand Mr. Manmohan has got his old hangovers; he will not always, always speak with the tenor with which I speak, but subject to those hangovers, for the first time, he has effected a very subtle and a great, great important change in the foreign policy of this country. Let us be clear about it and I compliment him for that. Today, it is for the first time that he has brought India's foreign policy in line with Article 51 of the Constitution of India. Article 51 of the Constitution of India, as I have always written, is a teaching, is a lesson by the forefathers of our Constitution to posterity, to succeeding Governments in this country how to conduct foreign policy. Such an article doesn't exist in any other Constitution of the world. That article says that 'India shall always, shall always, enforce treaty obligations and shall enforce international law.' This is only one thing.

And, Sir, we have never hurt the interests of Iran. We have never gone against the Iranian people. The Iranian people are our friends, and when their Governments were good, we were always good to them. every when they are bad, we only hurt the Governments; we don't hurt the Iranian people who will continue to be our friends and brothers. Sir, what has happened today? Sir, I am sorry, I am digressing for half a minute. They have now elected a President, a new President who first made a statement that 'I will see to it that another member of the United Nations, whom we have recognised, who is our friend, who has been our supplier in the Kargil War shall be wiped; it will be wiped off the map of the world.' Sir, that country does not deserve our vote. That country deserves to be voted against, and I am very happy that the Government of India, for the first time, has shown moral courage, international courage

and voted against Iran. I can't understand any President of any country, civilised country, publicly saying that 'I am going to wipe off another country from the map of the world'. And, Sir, what is more, I wish to tell those people who have been making this Iran argument that we have voted against Iran on its merits. The merit was that in 2003, the Iranian Government signed the additional protocol to the NPT, which allows snap inspections of nuclear sites in a country which has signed the NPT. And, Sir, not only they signed it, they allowed those inspections, and for full two-and-a-half years, until this new President came, they have been faithfully observing the terms of the NPT. There was peace all round; Iran was getting its full supplies. But this new President, threatening to wipe out another country, is also saying, 'he has repudiated the protocol which his country has signed.' We have not signed any protocol; but Iran has. And Iran having signed that protocol has, in February, 2006, said that it was repudiating that protocol. And, they say, 'we shall now continue to enrich uranium'—an undertaking which they had given in 2003 that they will not do this enrichment. They are guilty of breach of treaty obligation; they are guilty of breach of international law. And, if this Government, which Gandhiji said will reflect the conscience of humanity, does not vote against Iran, I would have attacked this Government, and I would have attacked it as vigorously as I am today supporting this nuclear deal. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI SHAHID SIDDIQUI: Was his conscience sleeping when people died in Lebanon?...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Kindly have another discussion on Lebanon. I am prepared to join with you on Lebanon as well. We shall discuss Lebanon separately. But you are a friend; you may come and discuss that with me in my drawing room!...*(Interruptions)*...(Time-bell).. Sir, I shall take five more minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Five minutes is too much...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Sir, my friend, Dr. P.C. Alexander, knows how much respect I have for him. But, Sir, he said he is afraid of policy congruence.

Sir, I have always been of one opinion and my whole political career depends upon that one principle, and that is that the democracies of the world must learn to sink or swim together. Today, there is a respectable

body of writings; please, go into academics and have a look at the literature that is being produced in international circles. The literature that is being produced says, end this United Nations; create another United Nations in which only truly democratic countries would become members, those countries which practice secular democracy, which practice human rights, which respect women and treat them as equals, as I do...

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: America doesn't ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: If they don't, democracies have an in-built mechanism for improvement, which other Governments do not have.

Sir, now, a word about the scientists, and that is one thing that has been going round and round. My friend, Mr. Jothi, made a huge song and dance about these scientists. He said they are tongue-tied. Now, first of all, a very distinguished scientist got up here and made a speech, so that that takes care of his main argument. For twenty minutes he kept saying that scientists have opposed it! Scientists have not opposed it. Here is a distinguished scientist who has supported the deal! Now, what about the other scientists? Again, Sir, I speak with great respect for the integrity of Mr. Yashwant Sinha, who quoted Dr. Gopal Krishnan's article which he seems to have written only yesterday! Is that right? I have read that article. What does he say? Please, don't misquote; half quotation is more dangerous than a complete lie. What he says is...(*Interruptions*)..

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: This article was not written yesterday; it was written a week ago.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Anyway, I hope this article of yesterday is a repetition by some people who want to make some...(*Interruptions*)..

Now, see what Dr. Gopal Krishnan says. I presume he is one of those scientists who form a part of this club! Sir, what he says is, every country must exploit its own indigenous resource for creating energy. Now, nobody can quarrel with that. Shri Yashwant Sinha is right that he quoted this part of it. But what he didn't quote was that he says that our major indigenous source is coal and coal is to be found in abundance in the East of India and some southern parts of India. But he says that our coal is so much laden with Ash that it is incapable of producing energy and no technology can really gasify that coal. Sir, therefore, we have to run to alternative sources available.

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: Well, sorry to interrupt you, but this is not absolutely correct.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: I know that you are also a scientist...*(Interruptions)*... but that much science even I know...*(Interruptions)*...

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: You know about a Science that is completely outdated...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Sir, the scientists have not opposed the deal. The scientists have advised—see to it, Mr. Prime Minister, that you don't give up your sovereignty and that you don't give up the autonomy of your research. Sir, this is the advice, which they have given. The autonomy of research has not been given up. On the contrary, we have preserved intact every single weapon that we have. We have preserved intact our complete liberty of producing more weapons; the only cap is our own economic ability to produce those weapons. And so far as the other part, the autonomy of research, is concerned, nobody has told us that under this, you cannot carry on with your research. You may carry on with as much research as you want. I would be very happy if you give more and more crores to the scientists to carry on research.* But, Sir, I can...*(Interruptions)*..

SHRI AMAR SINGH: This is not acceptable. ...*(Interruptions)*..

SHRI N. JOTHI: It is very, very unfair. ...*(Interruptions)*..

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is withdrawn. ...*(Interruptions)*.. He has withdrawn it. ...*(Interruptions)*..

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: He is the top most lawyer of this country. I respect him. But...*(Interruptions)*..

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Joshiji, he has withdrawn it. ...*(Interruptions)*... आप बैठ जाइए। ...*(व्यवधान)*.. I don't allow any argument. ...*(Interruptions)*.. Nothing will go on record. ...*(Interruptions)*..

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA:*

श्री उपसभापति: हो गया न, उन्होंने विद्वत्ता कर लिया है। ...*(व्यवधान)*.. What else you want? ...*(Interruptions)*..

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA:*

*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He has withdrawn. *..(Interruptions)..*
Please sit down. *..(Interruptions)..*

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA:*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He has withdrawn. Please sit down.
..(Interruptions).. Hon. Member has withdrawn. So, I don't allow any other
discussion. *..(Interruptions)..*

SHRI N. JOTHI:*

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Sir, It is an absolute misunderstanding.
..(Interruptions)..

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA:*

श्री उपसभापति: उन्होंने विदड़ा कर लिया है, आप बैठिए। *..(व्यवधान)..*

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI:*

SHRI N. JOTHI:*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Jothi, please sit down. I am on my
legs. *..(Interruptions)..*

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA:*

श्री उपसभापति: अहलुवालिया जी, आप बैठिए, मैं खड़ा हूँ। *..(व्यवधान)..* यह क्या बात
कर रहे हैं आप। *..(व्यवधान)..* आप बैठिए। I am on my legs. *..(Interruptions)..*
Nothing is going on record. *..(Interruptions)..* I am on my legs.
..(Interruptions)..

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH:*

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Will you kindly allow me to finish now?
..(Interruptions)..

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA:*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Ahluwaliaji, please sit down.
..(Interruptions).. The debate is a serious debate. He has withdrawn the
words. We have to complete the debate. It is an important
debate...*..(Interruptions)..* Jethmalaniji, please conclude.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: I said that I consider scientists as Gods.

*Not recorded.

[17 August, 2006]

RAJYA SABHA

6.00 P.M.

But, I said, by all means...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, don't repeat that.... (*Interruptions*).

Don't trouble me.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI:*

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Do whatever you want. This is too much... (*Interruptions*). Do whatever you want to do.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Sir, I am amending my sentence. I want to put...(*Interruptions*).

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please, conclude. श्री जेठमलानी जी, आप कंकलूड कीजिए ... (व्यवधान)

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Sir, you cannot surrender to this chaos....(*Interruptions*).. On the contrary, I want to put the apprehensions expressed by the scientist...(*Interruptions*).

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Nothing will go on record. Please, conclude.

श्री एस०एस० अहलुवालिया:**

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी:**

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज:**

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: All that I want to mention is that you accept the statement what the young Minister of State has made this morning that no nuclear installation are subject to any safeguards and scrutiny. And, second, all indigenous units shall be totally free from international inspections...(*Interruptions*).

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Next speaker, Shri Arjun Kumar Sengupta.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: And, Sir, this is ...(*Interruptions*).

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, You have concluded.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: All the scientists, they will all support the deal and not beyond their right.

*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

**Not recorded

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी: आप क्या इस हाउस में वैज्ञानिकों का अपमान करवा रहे हैं ... (व्यवधान)

श्री यशवंत सिन्हा: क्या हम इस हाउस में वैज्ञानिकों के अपमान को बर्दाश्त करेंगे ... (व्यवधान) पूरे देश ने इसे देखा है ... (व्यवधान)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sengupta (Interruptions).

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: Sir, is this debate to denigrate the scientist community?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I cannot understand what exactly do you want? आप बताइए, मैं क्या करूँ? ... (व्यवधान) I have been telling that he has withdrawn those words ... (Interruptions). अब मैं उसके बाद क्या कर सकता हूँ ... (व्यवधान) नहीं आप बताइए ... (व्यवधान)

श्री यशवंत सिन्हा: इन्होंने कहने के लिए क्या छोड़ा है सारी बात तो कह दी इन्होंने।

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी: वैज्ञानिकों का इस प्रकार से अपमान हो रहा है, क्या यह संसद के लिए उचित है ... (व्यवधान)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have deleted it and he withdrew it. I said that it should not go on record and I have deleted it ... (Interruptions).

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी: लेकिन सबको आप यह तो सूचित करें कि इस प्रकार से वैज्ञानिकों का कोई भी अपमान न करें ... (व्यवधान)।

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: Why don't you expunge those remarks?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have expunged it.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: Sir, the whole world is watching ... (Interruptions).

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: Because the whole House ... (Interruptions). Nobody, in the House, will agree to discredit the scientists. ... (Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Don't shout. Mr. Jothi, if you speak coolly, I can understand. If you shout, I can't understand ... (Interruptions). What can I do? ... (Interruptions). I have expunged those remarks ... (Interruptions). I have expunged it.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: On behalf of the whole House, I would like to say that we hold our scientists in high esteem.

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी: आज वैज्ञानिक हमारे देश के सबसे बड़े ... (व्यवधान)। अगर इस देश को आगे बढ़ना है तो बिना वैज्ञानिकों की सहायता के हम आगे नहीं बढ़ सकते हैं ... (व्यवधान) हम जहां पर आज खड़े हैं, वैज्ञानिकों की वजह से खड़े हैं ... (व्यवधान)। एग्रीकल्चर में आज हम खड़े हैं तो वैज्ञानिकों की वजह से खड़े हुए हैं और आज इस तरह की बात कही जा रही है ... (व्यवधान)

श्री उपसभापति: इस तरह से सारा समय बर्बाद हो रहा है। I have expunged it.

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी: यह कभी नहीं चलेगा, यह बिल्कुल गलत बात है ... (व्यवधान) हम वैज्ञानिकों के संबंध में इस तरह की बात बिल्कुल नहीं सुनेंगे ... (व्यवधान)।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have expunged it ... (Interruptions). If there is anything in the rules, you show it ... (Interruptions).

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: It has been telecast live ... (Interruptions).

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: It has been telecast. Sir, what is the use of expunging? It has been already telecasted. ... (Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have no answer for this. Mr. Ramachandraiah, there is no answer for this. ... (Interruptions). I cannot give you any answer. ... (Interruptions). It is telecasted. If you want, I will stop the telecast. ... (Interruptions).

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: Sir, I have a suggestion. Why don't you, on behalf of the Chair, say that this House holds the entire scientific community in high respect. ... (Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We hold the scientific community in great respect. Their contribution is accepted, and, they have participated in building the nation. Nobody can denigrate them. ... (Interruptions).

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: And that the House does not approve any remark against the prestige ... (Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sengupta, please continue.

SHRI ARJUN KUMAR SENGUPTA (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I thank you for giving me the opportunity to participate in this important discussion. Sir, I would like Dr. Joshi and Mr. Yashwant Sinha to listen to me because while speaking, most of my observations will be addressed to them. So, I would very much appreciate if they listen to me. Sir, this is the fag end of the whole debate. Lot of things have been

said. I don't want to go over the whole subject. But, Sir, let me point out two things. Mr. Yashwant Sinha said that we have had tremendous achievements by our scientists on nuclear development. There is absolutely no doubt about it. But had there been an international cooperation in technology, these scientists would have done much better, would have gone far ahead and this is the reason since Mrs. Indira Gandhi time, after the first Pokhran, we have been trying to get an understanding with the United States on nuclear technology cooperation. This is not new. It started in 1980s when Mrs. Gandhi went and talked to the American Government about the blue-ribbon technology to get the dual-use technology, which was also followed by Rajivji. Then, it was carried on by your Government during your tenure; nuclear cooperation was something that you all desired, and, which all the Government desired. The question that is raised is what did we get, or, what are we getting out of it. It is precisely this. Now, the time has come when the American Government has agreed that we have reached a position where they must have nuclear cooperation with India, and, this is an opportunity we must not allow to be missed. I will come to the point in details but before I would urge all of you who have been associated with international diplomacy that when a treaty is being negotiated, when an agreement is being negotiated, you do not tie down the hands of the negotiator. I am afraid, and this is somewhere I disagree with the formulation of the team of the Prime Minister. Even the July 18 document is nothing but a general framework. We should not tell the Prime Minister or anybody that he is bound by the words, the sentences, the phrases, talks about goal posts the sequences. These are all totally irrelevant. He must have the full freedom to change the goal post; he must have the full freedom to change the word, to change the sequencing, whatever that is necessary, provided the ultimate aim is secured. The whole purpose is to get this agreement.

Sir, I have great respect for Dr. Alexander who was my boss. Sir, I want to put forward one thing, and it is not a question of the sentiments of the House. The sentiments of the House are quite clear. There is one sentiment expressed by Shri Ram Jethmalaniji who just pointed out certain views with which I have absolutely no agreement. Now, if you talk about the sense of the House, you will be in a great difficulty in reconciling all the views. The whole world is watching. The whole world knows what the country feels. We don't have to have a resolution. This particular debate is announced all over the world. The United States has a very

powerful diplomatic mission here. They are reporting to their Government what is the sense of the country. There is nothing more that a resolution can do except to tie his hands, and, that is not acceptable when you are going for a major diplomatic initiative to sign treaties. So, I would submit that we should not talk about any of these kinds of obligations. He is absolutely free to choose the sequencing, to choose the words, to choose the phrases, whichever way he wants to do, provided we get what we are actually trying to get.

What are we trying to get? I would like to point out, this is for the Prime Minister, we note as he is present, here, I have gone through all the documents; I have gone through the CPM's nine points; I have gone through the scientist's arguments, and of course, all the newspapers' arguments, including Gopal Krishna's papers which I have read through and through. The reference to those papers is quite wrong. I can talk about that within a minute. But, the main issues can be summed up in five points that are coming out of this debate and the Prime Minister is aware of this. Let us not criticise the Prime Minister or talk about what he has not said. A lot of time has not said. A lot of time has been spent on these issues by Mr. Arun Shourie. What the Americans are doing or saying? Prime Minister is not responsible for that; we are not responsible for that. The American Senators have their own constituencies. They are trying to put forward their points of view. Why should we consider these views as if that is what is going to bind us? What is going to bind us is what Prime Minister is going to sign; what is going to bind us is what is the agreement that we are going to reach. And, he is telling you again and again that he is not going to be guided by these views. There is another fact, let me point out, and Mr. Yashwant Sinha knows it even President Bush has written to them that some of these conditionalities that they have given are non-binding. Somebody says that they are all binding on the United States. They are not binding even to them. President Bush has written to them that if you insist on these conditons, he will not be able to push forward this particular agreement. So, this is their problem. Why should we get involved in this? I was listening to this debate. Most of the criticism is what the Americans are trying to do; what the Americans are imposing on us. These are irrelevant points. They are making their own arguments. The certification that they are taking about, they do that every time. How can you oppose their Congress telling the President that

this is what you should do? That does not bind us. That is their procedure. So, the whole argument, I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, is complete non-starter. We are talking about debate in their Congress over which we have no control, and we do not want to have any control. The only thing is that we want to tell the Prime Minister, and all of us are telling, what we feel is in our interest. I have summarised these issues in five points and I would like to point out to you, it is not the sense of the House, but this, I believe, sums up all the main arguments for or against this particular Bill.

The first point, if we agree to the IAEA safeguards and sign the bilateral agreement of separation, if we agree, then, we expect five things, of which the first is uninterrupted fuel imports. Now, Yashwant Sinhaji, this is the most important thing that Gopal Krishna himself has said that what is absolutely important for a nuclear power regime in our country is that we must be able to import fuel from abroad, for a very simple reason. The reason is that the uranium that we have as natural uranium, the enriched uranium goes to Tarapore, the other thing goes to the heavy water plants. Their supply is very limited. They cannot even give you the 10,000 megawatt that has been planned by the DAE. I think, Mr. Yechury was talking about whether they have any plans. Of course, they have a plan. The DAE has a plan of nuclear power generation, 10,000 megawatt by 2010. This cannot be reached with the kind of uranium that we have. Eighteen of our heavy water plants are now in a very difficult situation. They are not closing down but they are reducing their output because there is no uranium. And, we have to have uranium imports. And, even more important thing is—this is the point Mr. Yashwant Sinha knows, but he did not say—the imported uranium is one-fifth the cost of the domestic uranium. The moment we have a nuclear power station with imported uranium, the cost of generation comes down to two to three rupees per unit. It is a major point. And, if that particular power is generated with new technology, new capital invested, then, the efficiency of the plant would be much higher. Mr. Jethmalani pointed it out—which is a fact,—Most of our nuclear power equipments are poor. We have to replace them. And if we replace them with new ones, the efficiency goes up. You mentioned the cost of Rs. 10 or 11 for per unit nuclear power. This is true only if we are sticking to the old technology, old fuel, and old plants. The moment we change them, the cost comes down very drastically. This, of course, depends upon certain factors. I think Mr. Bajaj is not in that game, but if you talk to Mr. Tata or you talk to Dr. Kasturirangan, they will give you an

estimate which will come to about Rs. 3 or Rs. 4 per unit cost as maximum. Now, I am not saying that you should go the whole hog for nuclear power. Mr. Yechury is right. It requires lots of foreign investment; it requires lots of investment to go for that. Probably, if we have this, lots of foreign investment will come. Mr. Gopal Krishna is saying that as a result of this Agreement, we shall have a substantial inflow of foreign capital in our clear power stations. Now, if this happens, then we have a major new area of power supply. I am putting it in this way, as I am not saying that this should be the only basket. But we must have the freedom. It is a fact that we are going to face severe shortage of power if we do not look for alternative to hydrocarbons. This has been analysed and this has been stated by different expert groups. We must go through different kinds of methods. One of the methods is conservation. In fact, if we can reduce our consumption that will have the maximum effect. But, in this whole scenario, nuclear power is a major new source of energy security. We cannot give it up. This is a major achievement of this particular treaty. (*Time-bell*). This is my first point. We should have uninterrupted fuel import. Whatever condition they put, we should see that we have uninterrupted fuel import either from the United States or from elsewhere and we can build up the buffer stock. We can build up the stock within the country. This point was mentioned by Mr. Anand Sharma that we have the freedom to build up stock. That is the first point that must be ensured.

The second point that must be ensured is uninterrupted access to nuclear technology and high technology cooperation. This would allow our scientists—who have already done a tremendous job without any kind of cooperation, who have made great achievements in the nuclear technology improvements—to go very far. If you ask me, the United States is very much interested in joining hands with us on that, because they have realised our importance. I think Mr. Arun Shourie said that there were no investments now in atomic projects. That situation is changing. The United States is moving towards new power stations; England is moving towards new power stations; France and Belgium are based on nuclear power facilities. They are actually going to expand it. All of them are realising that this power expansion is very important, and for them, cooperation with India is a great thing that they are looking for. This is a major support that they are actually looking for. One of the reasons why they are moving in that direction is this. (*Time-bell*)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please, conclude.

SHRI ARJUN KUMAR SENGUPTA: These are the two points.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Still you have three points!

SHRI ARJUN KUMAR SENGUPTA: There is another major thing. Mr. Sitaram Yechury is here. Question comes about our strategic programme. Scientists have said that we must not compromise on our strategic programme. Exactly, we should not compromise on our strategic programme. But what is the strategic programme? Mr. Yashwant Sinha made two points. One 'Minimum credible deterrence'. Two, 'No first strike'. I would like Mr. Yashwant Sinha to contradict me. This implies that we are not madly going in for expanding our nuclear facilities. The total number of nuclear weapons that we have today is enough. I make this point quite openly here. I know that Mr. Yashwant Sinha knows it. I know the scientists know it that the total number of nuclear weapons that we have today is enough, to put forward as a minimum credible deterrence. What we need is delivery equipment; what we need is missile; what we need is submarines and airport facilities, but not too much of this nuclear weapon. Now, I mentioned this because there is a tendency here—and I am glad that Mr. Yechury is not a part of that—that this agreement is putting a cap on our nuclear ability. No, it is not putting any cap on our strategic requirements of deterrence. It has all the deterrence facilities that you need.

श्री उपसभापति: सेनगुप्त जी, आप conclude कीजिए। I have to conclude the debate by 6.30 p.m. There are four more speakers. Other speakers take objection. Please conclude.

SHRI ARJUN KUMAR SENGUPTA: Sir, I have two more points. There is no restriction on research and development. This point has been mentioned and this point has been repeated by the Prime Minister. This has been repeated, again and again, that no such restrictions would be put on research and development and that position should be maintained. Finally, there should be no change in the Foreign Policy. I must mention this that in the initial period, on Foreign Policy, there was a fear, especially when President Bush came here and talked about regime changes. In this House, the Prime Minister got up and said that he does not believe in this regime change. He is not in that picture. (*Time-bell*) Then, when the Lebanon question came, he again resorted to the same approach which

clearly established that the Prime Minister is not going to be tied down by this kind of changing Foreign Policy regime. Now, I am putting forward these arguments because this has been mentioned by some friends that there is a possibility of a change in the Foreign Policy. We are going to be a clan State of the United States...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Next, Shri Abani Roy.

SHRI ARJUN KUMAR SENGUPTA: This is not true. It cannot be true and the Prime Minister has asserted the point again and again. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI TAPAN KUMAR SEN (West Bengal): Why are you opening a new vista of what is possible and what is not possible? *(Interruptions)*

SHRI ARJUN KUMAR SENGUPTA: All I am saying is...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sengupta, please, you have taken 20 minutes. No, no, please.

SHRI ABANI ROY (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, it is a very serious issue that we have taken up today. Nobody is talking as to whether we require the nuclear energy or not. We require nuclear energy; we want it. There is no doubt about it. Why we are questioning the Prime Minister is that we are getting news after news from various places, whether from internet, website, media or print media and these things are confusing us. The matter was discussed inside the Parliament three times. There is no doubt. Now, we are talking about shifting of the goal post. How it has come? Nobody is thinking about what they are discussing, what they are talking and what arguments are going on there is their Parliament. We are very much concerned about India. We are very much for India. We are not for the Americans—what they are giving; what they are doing; why they are interested; why they are going to give you uranium. What you have said just now, pleading this and that, that technology will come from there, machinery will come from there and money will come from there, we know all these things. So, don't try to plead in that sense. The point is, on the question, there is confusion. Let me read one thing. The President has given a speech the day before yesterday on nuclear fuel. He said, "With cooperation of certain States, the country should aim to mine enough uranium. The vast thorium resources of the nation should be harnessed by our scientists and technologists. With cooperation from all other sectors of science, technology and industry in India. I am confident

that we have the capability to bring our own thorium-based reactors. This will enable us to be self-reliant, secure and independent on nuclear energy." This is the speech given by the President on the eve of the Independence Day. So, we are not concerned alone. I have quoted what the President has said. We have given nine points to the Prime Minister. It is not that because of that, you have to come out of this. We are all nationalists; we are all thinking about it. It is not for the Press alone to show patriotic feelings. I do have that in my mind. But that is not the point here. So, we are cautioning him that this is the thing that America is doing. Why? Sometimes, it is said outside that Lefts are 'anti-American'. We are not 'anti-American'. But we are against the American imperialism; mind it. Before that, the British imperialism was there. That was of one pattern. Today, the American imperialism is of another pattern. Everything is in their hands; money, in the name of World Bank, is in their hands; all the treaties, in the name of WTO; all other things, whether nuclear or thorium, are in their hands. By so many tentacles, they want to grab the others. This is another type of imperialism. That is why, we are cautioning the Government of India that we should take care while negotiating with them. The position that the Americans have got today should not be held by them. That is the main point. That is why, we are making a demand; that is why, we are talking so much. It is unfortunate to say or I regret to say that those who have participated in the discussion from the Congress side were attacking the BJP! Yes, we know what they have done. Is it time to attack anybody or is it time to take serious note of it? Have the consensus of the House. That is the thing we have to talk about now. So, this is my request to the Prime Minister that whatever points we have made here or whatever points we have given on behalf of the Left, as Mr. Sitaram Yechury was mentioning, or to whatever conclusion we have come after having the discussion, take the sense of the House; have the consensus of the House so that nobody could blame others. We have taken a decision inside the House to build India into another form. So I request the Prime Minister to have the sense of House and, keeping that in view, take a decision. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI B.J. PANDA (Orissa): Sir, I wish, the House should function more often like this on other issues, on other days. Every Member, whether he has spoken for or against the deal, has kept national interest above other considerations. Sir, from my perspective of national interest, I am willing to go a long way towards supporting the July 18 framework for a

nuclear agreement with America. But, Sir, I will have certain important caveats and qualifications which I will come to. There are, indeed, a lot of confusing statements and developments, and it is important for the Government to clarify this to earn support of even those of us, in the Opposition, who are willing to support the July 18 Resolution. Sir, it is not enough to say that we must wait for the final version of the agreement to be signed. It is time now for the Government to take a stand on certain critical issues. Indeed, one such stand has been taken today itself when Shri Anand Sharma pointed out that we would not accept, even in the non-binding portion, a reporting requirement. But there are other such issues which need to be addressed by the Government and need to be addressed today.

Sir, much has been said as to whether this is a deal about non-proliferation or energy. Of course, the fact is that it is about both. It is an unfortunate fact that in 1967 an arbitrary line was drawn in the sand which debarred India from becoming an officially recognised nuclear State because we had not tested by then. But the harsh fact today is that it is impossible for the world to accept another official nuclear weapon State. There is no question of blaming America for this. There are more than 100 other countries which will oppose us in getting this status. It is time for us to recognise the realities and to get the most that we can get in our national interest as per today's realities.

Sir, an argument has been made that this deal is almost as good as being recognised as an official nuclear weapon State. It is possible to make that argument, but to do that one has to read between the lines and one also has to have clarity on certain issues. One has to read between the lines as to what are the mandatory requirements of us in any future agreement and what are only declarations of intent which are not binding. I am prepared, on my part, to read between the lines. But the onus is on the Government to bring forward clarity on some of these issues which could become deal-breakers for our country. I am assuaged by most of the international viewpoints that I have come across. In America, the vast majority of the opinion is that India has hoodwinked that country. As has already been pointed out by certain other Members, countries like Pakistan and China have virtually made no secret of their frenetic lobbying to stop this deal. I am assuaged by these things because there must be something good in it for us for those countries to oppose us.

As far as energy is concerned, it is a fact that only less than three per cent of our energy comes from nuclear. But that should not be the limiting factor for our forward vision. The fact is that countries like France have about eighty per cent of their energy coming from nuclear power generation and, though we should not and can't aspire for those levels, we should and can aspire for a much larger chunk of our energy coming from nuclear.

Sir, much has been said about our scientists' contribution. I am one who firmly believes that our scientists have contributed immensely to reach the position that we have reached today. But the fact remains that our uranium position does not allow us to base our uranium-based energy production as the linchpin of our policy. The fact remains that the most optimistic published figures of our uranium reserves, say, about 10,000 megawatts, can be supported for about 30 years. That is simply not enough in the larger picture. Some critics of this deal say that we must make more efforts on exploring uranium. Of course, we must. But, once again, that can't be the linchpin of our reliance on nuclear energy.

Sir, issues have been made about costs. Of course, this is costly. But our requirement of energy is so vast that we can't switch off any avenues of energy, neither hydel, nor wind, nor coal and certainly not nuclear. If the scale of our energy requirements is implemented properly, then economies of scale can come through where nuclear energy costs can drop in future. But the important issue is: Is our thorium technology enough? Are our thorium reserves enough? Are there any fetters being put on our thorium technology because that is going to be a critical turning point?

Sir, I will quickly mention only two or three key issues and then I will raise those caveats that I want the Government to answer. The first one is the scientists' viewpoints. Much has been said about it. I have done my share of reading. In this article, which has been subscribed to by all the major scientists in this arena—Dr. Sethna, Dr. Srinivasan, Dr. Iyengar and Dr. Gopalakrishnan—I find that none of them actually fundamentally objected to the 18th July framework. Therefore, neither do I. But there are concerns and those concerns must be addressed. Let me read from this article and I quote:

"We find that the Indo-US deal in the form approved by the US House of Representatives infringes on our independence for carrying out indigenous research and development."

This must be addressed. I am somewhat assuaged by Dr. Kasturirangan's statement today that he does not buy this and he believes that we will still have enough freedom for our nuclear R&D. But this issue needs to be addressed in detail, and the Prime Minister must do that. Sir, when it comes to stopping proliferation, again much has been said about Iran. So, I will not even touch upon that. But I wish to make a point that we ourselves have, in our national interest, a very strong stake in non-proliferation. It has nothing to do with going along with America; it has nothing to do with Iran really. But it has to do with asking ourselves: Are we not interested in stopping nuclear proliferation of the kind which Mr. A.Q. Khan was doing from Pakistan, with support from North Korea, with support from China? The fact that, in recent times, the media has reported that Pakistan and China want to enter into a similar agreement simply makes it clear that they want to bring what used to be an underhand above the din. We have ourselves noticed ships that have been carrying illicit cargo of nuclear materials. So we should have no hesitation, as a country, in our national interest, to happily go along with movements like the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI) which will stop proliferation not only in our neighbourhood but also around the world.

Sir, another issue is sequencing. Much has been made of sequencing. But again, I will read from the newspapers what all these important scientists have talked about, and their statement is "The sequence of actions to implement the co-operation could be left for discussion between the two Governments." If the scientists have no concern about the change in sequencing, I would say that it is not worth splitting hairs over the sequencing issue. But much has also been made about another issue that we are going to be equal partners with America. Let us not be under any illusion. Shri Arun Shourie has pointed out in great detail that we are not going to be equal partners with America. But I do not want to hang my support to the July 18 Framework on whether we are considered equal to America or not. I want to hand my support for the July 18 Framework on whether it is in India's national interests or not.

Again, on separation, Dr. Kasturirangan pointed out that is a natural progression was going to happen. It is not a bad thing for us to have a separation. We are today not a fledgling democracy; we are today not a fledgling economy. We, certainly, in our own interests, should have separation for two reasons. It will free up the civilian part of our nuclear

sector for development by both the public and the private sector while putting a much sharper grip of security on the defence sector. There are articles today that certain terrorist supporters have infiltrated even into the PMO. In that kind of a scenario, I can only support any kind of extra securities placed on our military operations.

In conclusion, I would just say that for the time being, I am willing to accept at face value certain assertions made by the Government, but with a caveat that they need to answer. I am willing to accept for the time being that the House Bill in the U.S. is not definitive, that the final Agreement, that we will have to sign, will be as per our requirements. I am happy, as I have already pointed out, about Shri Anand Sharma's statement, and I was even willing to buy Dr. Kasturirangan's statement that it does not matter to us what their internal requirement is as long as we are not bound by that. Sir, the Government has asserted that there will be no fissile material gap. I am willing to accept that, for the time being. But again, I will come to the caveat. I am willing to accept for the time being that the test ban will continue to be unilateral, that it will not be mandated in the Agreement.

Sir, finally, to conclude, my caveats must be answered for me to continue this support. We must have an answer as to what could trigger an U.S. cancellation of any deal and what could be the implications for India. Sir, I am not asking the hon. Prime Minister to speculate. I am asking for a considered analysis because, for sure, if we have a need in future to have another test, then, it will lead to the cancellation of that deal. We need to know what other situations could lead to that situation and what implications are there for India. For example, as for the future fuel supply, is it in perpetuity or not? Is our agreement to have the IAEA safeguards linked to fuel supply, or, is it not? We need a clear stand taken, as was taken on the issue of reporting on these two or three issues, and we need a clear answer as to whether there will be any kind to restrictions on our development of thorium technology, or, there will not be. When I have said that there are conflicting views on this, while eminent scientists, eminent Members of Parliament, have said that there will not be, other eminent scientists have said that there might be. So we need a clear answer on this. Sir, because of paucity of time, I am not going to take further time of the House. I will conclude and thank you.

SHRI SYED AZEEZ PASHA (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI B.J. PANDA: I have raised many of the issues that my neighbours have raised ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI SYED AZEEZ PASHA: Sir, in regard to the Indo-US nuclear deal several apprehensions have been raised in the House by several Members. Sir, outside the House also, some eminent scientists like Shri H.N. Sethna and others have raised certain apprehensions. But, we are just brushing it aside by saying that they are free to have their own observations. I think, it is not a proper response which we have to give. Mr. Sethana and others have raised a point that the safeguards are understandable where external assistance in developing nuclear technology is involved. But, here, we have developed our own nuclear technology indigenously with our own help. So, secondly, as my learned friend has already pointed out how the United States House of Representatives has infringed on our independence for carrying out research and development. They have pointed out that no external supervision is essential to hamper our research work. My learned friend has already pointed it out, but, I am giving another quotation which Dr. A. Gopalakrishnan in his website has pointed out. It states, "In connection with the legislation passed on July 26th, some in the Indian media have gone overboard in their enthusiasm to proclaim that a few 'killer amendments', which could otherwise have been 'deal-breakers' have been defeated in the process. This spreads the false and comfortable feeling that the legislation, as it stands today, is benign to India, and all the negative clauses which the Indian critics of the deal have worried about have been eliminated. The truth is far from it! It is only few of the additional amendments brought forth in the last few days, to further tighten the noose around India's neck, which have been defeated." This is the opinion expressed by the former Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, Dr. A., Gopalakrishnan.

Sir, I want to put a straight question here. What are the compulsions to enter into a deal with the United States? Is it economic compulsion or political compulsion? If it is an economic compulsion, I am afraid, it is uneconomical, and it is bad economics. Because for generating one unit of hydro electric power, we have to spend only 21 paise, but here we are looking for such a source of energy where we have to spend 20-times

more to generate one unit of energy. So, why should we spend on such a huge capital-intensive thing which we cannot afford?

Sir, then, I feel that when we are having a good neighbour like Iran who is ready to provide gas at a very cheaper rate, unfortunately, we are antagonizing our good neighbour. So, I feel that it is not economics but it is more political because you want to be more closer to America, who, in the past 59 years, have never come to the rescue of India, and the people of India knows about their so-called friendship with India. So, it is nothing but a negation of our independent foreign policy.

Lastly, before concluding my speech, I would like to request the Prime Minister to please take into consideration all the apprehensions which were expressed by the Left Parties and try to clarify them and take the whole House and the nation into confidence. Thank you.

श्री तारिक अनवर (महाराष्ट्र): उपसभापति महोदय, इतिहास साक्षी है कि हमारी विदेश नीति हमेशा स्वतंत्र रही है। अभी इस बात की चर्चा इस सदन में दोनों पक्ष के लोगों ने की कि हमारे देश में आजादी के बाद पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू से लेकर अब तक जो भी प्रधान मंत्री बने या जो भी सरकारें बनीं, उन्होंने हमारी विदेश नीति का, राष्ट्रीय हितों का, राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा का हमेशा ध्यान रखा है। हमने जब भी अपनी विदेश नीति बनाई है, तो अपने राष्ट्रीय हितों का ध्यान रखा है। इसलिए आज जब हम अमेरिका के साथ कोई समझौता करने जा रहे हैं, तो उसमें हमारा राष्ट्रीय हित छुपा हुआ है। ठीक उसी तरह से, जब पिछले दिनों सोवियत रशिया हुआ करता था, उस समय हमने उनके साथ डिफेंस ट्रीटी की थी, हमने उनके साथ बहुत सारी ट्रीटीज़ की थी तो उस समय हमें यह कहा जाता था कि हम रशियन ब्लॉक में हैं, जो सच्चाई नहीं थी, जो हकीकत नहीं थी, बल्कि उस समय की हमारी जरूरत थी। हमारे राष्ट्र के हितों की रक्षा इस बात में थी कि हम उस समय सोवियत रशिया के साथ अपने सम्बन्ध ठीक करें। ठीक उसी तरह से आज जो दुनिया के हालात बदले हैं, उसमें हमको यह देखना होगा कि हम जो आज आर्थिक विकास की लड़ाई लड़ रहे हैं और हम इस बात की कोशिश में हैं कि कैसे हम आर्थिक रूप से मजबूत हों, उसमें किस तरह से किन देशों के साथ सम्बन्ध जोड़ने से, उनके साथ ताल्लुक बनाने से, हमारा आर्थिक विकास हो सकता है।

उपसभापति महोदय, मैं समझता हूँ कि प्रधान मंत्री जी ने बहुत सोच समझ कर अमेरिका के साथ यह जो नागरिक परमाणु ऊर्जा सहयोग की बात की है, मैं समझता हूँ कि उन्होंने इस बात को स्पष्ट किया है। उन्होंने 27 फरवरी को अपने वक्तव्य में इस बात को कहा है कि हमारी जी०डी०पी०, जो आज 7 से 8 प्रतिशत है, उसको हमें 10 प्रतिशत पर ले जाना है। उसके लिए हमें ऊर्जा की आवश्यकता है। बिना ऊर्जा के हमारे देश का विकास, हमारे देश की जो उन्नति है, वह

कभी आगे नहीं बढ़ सकती है। उन्होंने उसी उद्देश्य से इस काम को किया है। उन्होंने इस बात को हमेशा स्पष्ट किया है।

अभी आनन्द शर्मा जी ने भी स्पष्ट किया कि उनके साथ हमारा जो समझौता होने जा रहा है, उसमें किसी भी तरह से, जो बातें हमारे प्रधान मंत्री डा० मनमोहन सिंह जी और प्रेसिडेंट बुश के बीच में 18 जुलाई को तय हुई है, उसी परिधि में सारी बातें तय होंगी। उससे कहीं भी हटकर कोई बात नहीं होगी। यहां जो इतनी बहस हो रही है, मेरी समझ में नहीं आ रहा है कि इस बात के स्पष्टीकरण के बाद, सरकार के, प्रधानमंत्री के, सभी लोगों के स्पष्टीकरण के बाद, यह बार-बार गलतफहमी पैदा करने की जो कोशिश की जा रही है, मैं समझता हूँ कि यह उचित नहीं है। इसको उस नुक्ते नज़र से देखना चाहिए कि उसमें राष्ट्रीय हित है या नहीं है। यह तो उसी तरह की बात है, जो हमारे यहां बिहार में एक कहावत है कि कौआ कान ले जा रहा है, तो लोग कौए के पीछे भाग रहे हैं, कान नहीं देख रहे हैं। ठीक उसी तरह से आज मुझे यह महसूस हो रहा है कि जो बहस यहां हो रही है कि सारे शक-ओ-शुबहा, सारी बातें कही जा रही हैं कि ऐसा होगा, अगर यह हुआ तो यह होगा। लेकिन जब प्रधान मंत्री स्वयं इस बात को कह रहे हैं कि 18 जुलाई को हमारी और प्रेसिडेंट बुश के बीच जो बात हुई है, उसी परिधि में ही बात होगी, उस फ्रेम वर्क में ही सब कुछ तय होगा, तो फिर यह सवाल, यह प्रश्न क्यों उठया जा रहा है? हमारे यहां थोरियम साधनों की बात कही गई। इस बारे में भी प्रधान मंत्री जी ने अपने वक्तव्य में स्पष्ट किया था कि भारत अपने विशाल थोरियम साधनों का इस्तेमाल करके एक त्रिस्तरीय परमाणु कार्यक्रम बनाएगा और पूर्ण परमाणु ईंधन चक्र की अधिक जटिल प्रक्रिया में विशिष्टता हासिल करेगा। इसके परिणामस्वरूप हमारे नागरिक और स्ट्रेटीजिक कार्यक्रम, परमाणु ईंधन चक्र के विस्तार के साथ परस्पर जुड़े हुए हैं। इस तरह यह बात स्पष्ट की गई है कि जो हमारा परमाणु कार्यक्रम चल रहा है, उसमें किसी भी तरह से कहीं कोई रुकावट नहीं आएगी। दूसरा, यह जो न्युक्लीयर स्पलायर्स ग्रुप था, जिसके सदस्य 45 देश थे और जिसमें अमरीका, रूस, फ्रांस शामिल थे, इसमें भारत को अनौपचारिक व्यवस्था से दूर रखा गया था, लेकिन अब इस समझौते के बाद इस बात की उम्मीद है, आशा है कि हमको उन देशों से समर्थन और सहयोग मिलेगा।

महोदय दूसरी बात नागरिक और स्ट्रेटीजिक कार्यक्रम को अलग-अलग करने की प्रतिबद्धता हमारे प्रधानमंत्री जी ने जताई है और हमेशा इस बात को कहा है कि हम राष्ट्रीय हितों से कभी समझौता नहीं करेंगे, नेशनल इंटेरेस्ट्स की हमने हमेशा रक्षा की है। यह यूपीए सरकार, हम तो यह कहते हैं कि कोई भी सरकार हो, वह हमेशा इस बात का ध्यान रखती है कि किसी भी कीमत पर राष्ट्रीय हितों का कहीं भी कोई अहित न हो और इस बात का ध्यान हम हमेशा रखते हैं।

महोदय, हम लोग जो आज यहां बहस कर रहे हैं, इसमें मैं अपने दूसरे साथी वक्ताओं के साथ अपनी भावनाओं को जोड़ते हुए कहता हूँ कि हमें प्रधानमंत्री जी को बधाई देनी चाहिए,

क्योंकि उन्होंने भारत के विकास का ध्यान में रखकर, भारत की आर्थिक उन्नति को ध्यान में रखकर यह एक समझौता करने का प्रयास किया है और इसमें भारत की जनता और सदन उनके साथ हैं, इस बात का विश्वास हमें उनको दिलाना चाहिए। धन्यवाद।

DR. FAROOQ ABDULLAH: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I heard this debate with great interest. We do not want to weaken the Prime Minister or the Government of India. We have never had that feeling. I sit in the Opposition but we all in the Opposition think of one thing, that is, nation. If nation does not survive, none of us will survive, those in the Opposition or in the Government. But let us not forget the past. Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru, the first Prime Minister of this country, was a great friend of panchsheel. And I have also been one of those students with the flag *Hindi-Chini bhai bhai*. Did we not have an understanding with Chinese that we were their friends, yet they marched on our borders, and they could have taken India over within very short time? We were not ready. Our factories were making percolators rather than guns. We thought that diplomacy would work. Did it work?

[MR. CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I remember when Blackwell, the famous Ambassador came to my house before attacking Iraq with all his colleagues in the embassy of importance. I begged of him with folded hands, I said, "Do not attack Iraq. Whatever Saddam Hussain may be, there is a problem of those people. Do not do it, for one the Muslims of the world would feel it is the fight of the Christians against Islam and it is the old fight that has been going on. Do not do it. You will upset the world order." Today where is Iraq? Instead of one country, it is divided into Islam's three sections, Shiaism area, Sunnism area, and then Khurdish area—one nation divided into three. I do not want India to become a stooge of any country. I would rather die than become subservient to anyone. but one thing is absolutely right that we are not wrong here. What we say, 'please look into it'. We are not binding your hands. At no stage are we interested in binding the hands of the Prime Minister. But, we warn him that these are our difficulties, the way we understand, that this is where we have pitfalls. Look into that. If the Resolution had come, as one Member from there said that Resolution binds the Prime Minister's hands, it is incorrect. The Resolution really strengthens the Prime Minister's hands that tomorrow he can stand and say, "I stand for

India and India stands behind me." We are not binding his hands. We are strengthening his hands. If tomorrow Bush tells him, "my Congress and my Senate is pushing me in this direction", he says, "Please forgive me." My House also tells me that this is where we hold and that is why we want to do. We want to strengthen his hands. I am not going to go into the nitty gritty of what my friends here or my friends there said. But I would like to say; you have yourself said you are not going to bend in front of anyone. No country can defeat you. No man is born who can show India the door. But I also say, when Mrs. Indira Gandhi's first Pokharan test took place, the very next morning I was in Islamabad and the first question the journalist asked me, "Is this to beat Pakistan"? I said, "No, India believes in friendship, but not friendship of being cowed down. It has the nuclear weapon to show that, 'look, this is a deterrent. We are not weak. It is with strength that we speak and it is with strength we want friendship.' I remember the words of our Prime Minister, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, when at the borders of Pakistan in my State, he said, "We can change friends, we cannot change neighbours and if we live with them with peace we will both develop". And I say, "Congratulations to this Government." That was the past and congratulations to you for having carried friendship forward with all countries, with all nations and even America." I may have hundred differences on certain issues but India has to be friend of everyone for its own good. But we say, 'please look into the points that we have raised.' I would have loved to listen to you, the ex-Foreign Minister, Mr. Natwar Singh. Unfortunately, we did not have that chance. I think, in a democracy we should have allowed him, really allowed him. I would have felt proud that my India is so big that it has got a big heart and that it can listen to a person who may even oppose. But that is my India, My India has the guts to speak.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: I did not oppose.

DR. FARROOQ ABDULLAH: Whether you opposed or not, I don't know because you didn't speak. I would have loved to hear you but you will not be cowed down. I hope that you will stand on your feet for you represent a big party. You represent Congress, and to the dying day, you will die as a Congressman. Those who think on this side that you will ever change, you will die but you will not change. Therefore, I say to you, I would have loved to listen to you. but to the Prime Minister I will say, 'don't take our comments as something that are binding you, that are

7.00 P.M.

pushing you. But they are only to strengthen your hands for the future of this nation.' But those of us who have lived a major part of their lives want to leave this world with a hope that our nation will never be cowed down and that we will not become poodles of any country and neither do we want those countries to be our poodles. Thank you.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, now, it has been for me, personally, one of the most interesting and one of the most well informed debates that we have had in a very long time. I have greatly benefited from it. I wish to add no points to the discussion that has already taken place. I am aware of the sense of the House. I do, however, wish to add, Sir, in just a few sentences, an appeal to the hon. Prime Minister. The substance of the appeal from all sections of this House and all political parties, whether it is the Left or the Samajwadi Party or the TDP, or the AIADMK, the BJP, is let there be a 'Sense of the House'. You can call it by whatever term you like. You can call it the sense of the House. You can call it the will of the House. You can call it a statement from the Chair or whatever it be. If there be a distillate of the House's views, it can only strengthen the Government's position. I appeal, therefore, to the Government and to the hon. Prime Minister, even at this stage, to consider this as an appeal to the Treasury Bench and to the Government. Please accede to this request. It can only strengthen the hands of whoever is to talk, to whomsoever in the world, including the Prime Minister. Thank you.

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH: Mr. Chairman, Sir, as I stand before this august House, I would like to share with you and the hon. Members the vision that inspires us and that vision is bequeathed to us by no less a person than Jawaharlal Nehru, when, on the eve of our Independence he said, "Our task will not be complete so long as we cannot get rid of chronic mass poverty, ignorance and disease which still afflict millions and millions of our country men and country women." In the last sixty years, a great deal has been done to soften the harsh edges of extreme poverty. But, who can deny that we have to do a lot more to reach our cherished goal. Sir, Panditji said in 1947 that it has been the dream of the greatest man of our age, referring to Mahatma Gandhi, to wipe out every tear from every eye and he then said that may be a tall order for us, but, that is the inspiration which has to inspire Governments in a country as poor, as under-developed as we are.

Sir, it is my solid conviction that mass poverty can be removed only if we have a fast expanding economy. Even though, I recognise that a fast expanding economy is by itself not a sufficient condition for getting rid of poverty. We need institutional mechanisms to focus, particularly on the needs of the under privileged sections of our society. If India has to grow at the rate of 8 per cent to 10 per cent and, maybe, more, India needs rising amounts of energy. A question has been asked, 'Have I calculated what type of energy mix this country needs and have I worked out the costs of that?' Mr. Chairman, I had some experience of that. Soon after the Pokhran Tests in 1974, I became the Member for finance of the Atomic Energy Commission and, along with colleagues like Dr. Ramanna, Dr. Sethana, Dr. Iyengar, we worked out the role of nuclear energy in meeting the deficit of our energy requirements. In this context, we must never forget that the primary motivation for India's nuclear programme was the production of energy, defence came much later. And, where are we? After sixty years, our total production of nuclear power is no more than 3,000 MW. People say that we can use coal. We have plenty of coal. Often low-grade coal with high ash content. If you use increased quantities of coal you run into environmental hazards, like, the CO₂ and other gas emissions. As for hydrocarbons, you know there is a great insecurity of supplies. We know that the price of hydrocarbons, oil and gas, can go, in a very short period, to hundred dollars a barrel. Therefore, in this environment, prudence demands that we must widen our energy options. I am not saying that nuclear energy will provide the final answer. All I am saying is, as I understand, all development is about widening human choices. And, when it comes to energy security, widening our choices means that we should be able to make effective use of nuclear power. If the need arises, if the economic calculus demands that nuclear energy is the most cost-effective means—it is my belief that the nuclear order that has prevailed in the world for thirty odd years, which has imposed restrictions on nuclear trade with India—if this nuclear order is not changed, India's development options, particularly its quest for energy security will face, to put it mildly, a great degree of uncertainty.

Mr. Arun Shourie asked me what calculations have I seen. I have seen many calculations in the Department of Atomic Energy. In the eighties when Shri K.C. Pant was the Chairman of the Energy Policy Committee, a detailed study was done and it was shown that if you were talking of generating power and reaching it to place 700 kms away from coal pithead,

then nuclear energy is the right economic answer. Things can change. And, I think, the Planning Commission have done recent work, and they have also come to the conclusion that having the nuclear option is something which will give us greater degree of security on the energy front. That's the vision that inspires our quest for changing the nuclear order. We have, of course, security concerns. International security concerns, in our neighbourhood, is something which worries us and, therefore, it is quite clear that while we are committed to our civilizational heritage of working untiringly for universal disarmament, we have to recognise that we are living in a world, where this is not going to happen today, tomorrow, or day after tomorrow. In this uncertain world, the unpredictable world that we live in, we have legitimate security concerns. The nuclear weapon programme, its 'autonomy, its independence, dependent solely on our own assessment, must therefore remain a cardinal principle of our nuclear policy.

Sir, I do recognize, if you are trying to move away from the *status quo*, you do run risks. Change is very disruptive. It upsets existing institutions; existing ways of thinking, and *status quo* has the satisfaction of being rooted in reality. If you are planning for a future and the future is inherently uncertain, you run the risk that you may go wrong. But we live in a world, where the only constant thing, is 'change' itself. And, this country, therefore, has to be prepared to think big about its future and if that is the vision, that is the mission, then, I sincerely believe the path that we have identified is the right path. I am not saying that I know whether we will succeed or not. In fact, if I had been allowed to initiate this debate, I would have outlined the risks that we face and, maybe, at the end of it the whole House would have said that this is the way things should be and this is what our approach should be. I was not given that opportunity even though I offered, in both the Houses, that I was willing to make a *suo motu* statement setting out our vision, goals, risks and uncertainties. And, Sir, this is not the first time it has happened to me. My thoughts go back to the year 1991. Shri Yashwant Sinha handed me a bankrupt economy with foreign exchange reserves of no more than two weeks. I had to improvise within one week a programme to rescue this economy. Within one month I had to come with a Budget which required far-reaching changes in the way we were taught to think about our economic problems. On that occasion also, in 1992, when I rose to present my second Budget, all Opposition, the Right and Left, rose and said that I should be impeached

because I had prepared this budget in consultation with Washington and that I was an American agent. I have lived with that sort of things. And, therefore, it does not surprise me. Today all sorts of adjectives were used. I am strong or weak, history will determine that. But, I do wish to share with this House that I do recognise the risks that reform undertakings run into in all modern societies. And I was reading Machiavelli recently in 'The Prince' and I should like to quote that paragraph. And I quote: "It must be considered that there is nothing more difficult to carry out, nor more doubtful of success, nor more dangerous to handle, than to initiate a new order of things. For the reformer has enemies in all those who profit by the old order, and only lukewarm defenders in all those who would profit from the new order this lukewarmness arising partly from the fear of their adversaries, who have the laws in their favour; and partly from the incredulity of mankind, who do not truly believe in anything new until they have the experience of it. Thus it arises that on every opportunity for attacking the reformer, his opponents do so with the zeal of partisans, the others only defend him half-heartedly, so that between them he runs a great danger." Therefore, I am aware of the risks that I do incur. Mr. T.T. Krishnamachari once said that there are tigers on the prowl on the streets of Delhi. I am aware of the risks but for India's sake, I am willing to take those risks.

Mr. Chairman, you forgive me if I become a little sentimental on this occasion. I was born in a very poor family on the other side of Punjab. I was the first one in the family who went to High School. My father left his class in the eighth standard and became a freedom fighter by participating in Nabha and Jaito *morchas* that were launched at that time. I may not have been in politics, but I have in my blood the feelings of a freedom fighter's family. I may be a late comer into politics, but I have the privilege of belonging to a Party which fought for India's freedom, the Party which produced great leaders like Mahatma Gandhi, Jawaharlal Negru, Indira Gandhi, Sardar Patel, Maulana Abdul Kalam Azad, Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan, Rajiv Gandhi, etc. That is the heritage of which any Party must be proud. When I stand before this House, I can say in all faithfulness that in these two years and three months that this nation has entrusted me with the job of the Prime Minister—I did not seek it; it came my way—it has been my effort to do my very best to serve the vital interests of this nation. This commitment I made in 1991 when in my first Budget Speech I said, "No power on earth can stop an idea whose time has come". I had

then said, "The emergence of India, as a major pole of the global economy is one such idea whose time has come." And, I said: "I will dedicate myself to that task." I was criticised by the Right, by the Left, names were used, epithets, 15 years down the lane who will today say that what I did then was wrong. This Nation stands tall, proud, fast-growing and if India had not launched, if we had not launched the programmes of reforms, I shudder to think, how India would have faced the Asian crisis of the mid 90's. So, Sir I speak with some experience, even though, I may be a novice in politics. I do not have the skills of Jaswant Singhji, Yashwant Sinha, or, Arun Shourieji, but I do wish to say to our countrymen that the service of India, as Jawahar Lal Nehru used to say, means service of the teeming millions who suffer day and night and that is the vision, that is the mission which inspires me and will guide me for whatever is left of my life. No power on earth can take away that privilege from me. I will discharge my duties to this country, to the last ounce of my blood.

Sir, I now come to the subject matter of discussion today. At the outset, I would like to convey my gratitude to all the hon. Members who have participated in this debate. I am grateful for the opportunity to clarify some of the issues arising from the discussion. I am being truthful, I will do so in a non-partisan spirit and I have every reason to believe that when I have finished I will carry the entire House with me. Our Government has never shied away from a full discussion in Parliament on this very important issue. On three previous occasions, on July 29, 2005, February 27, 2006 and March 7, 2006, I had made detailed statements and discussed this important subject in this august House. Once again, several issues have been raised during the current discussions, and I wish to take this opportunity to respond to them. I also intend to cover developments since my *suo motu* statement of March 7 this year to bring the story upto date.

Two types of comments have been made during the discussion in this House. The first set of issues pertains to the basic orientation of our foreign policy. Some hon. Members have alleged that by engaging in discussions with, and allegedly acquiescing in the demands made by the United States, we have compromised the independent nature of our foreign policy.

The second set of issues pertains to deviations from the July 18 Joint Statement and the March 2 Separation Plan. Many of the points

raised by the hon. Members have also been aired outside Parliament, notably also by some senior members of the scientific establishment. Overall, a listing of the important concerns includes the following : that the India-US nuclear initiative and, more particularly, the content of the proposed legislation in the US Congress, could undermine the autonomy of our decision-making; limit the options or compromise the integrity of our strategic programme; and adversely affect the future of our scientific research and development. To sum up, the critics would suggest that India's strategic nuclear autonomy is being compromised, and India is allowing itself to be pressurised into accepting new and unacceptable conditions that are deviations from the commitments made by me to Parliament in July, 2005, and in February and March this year.

Sir, I recognise that many of these concerns are borne out of genuine conviction. I have always believed that in public life, it never pays to question the motives of those who differ with you, and, therefore, I respect those who differ with me, from what I have done or what I have to say. I recognise, therefore, that many of these concerns are borne out of genuine conviction that nothing should be done that would undermine long-standing policies that have a bearing on India's vital national security interests. Let me say, at the very beginning, I fully share and subscribe to these sentiments.

I would like to assure the hon. members that negotiations with the United States regarding the civilian nuclear deal have not led to any change in the basic orientations of our policies, or affected our independent judgement of issues of national interests.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, last year when I was in the United States, at the National Press Club, in the full glare of the media of the United States, I was asked this question, 'Mr. Prime Minister, what do you think of United States' intervention in Iraq?' And, I said, in full public glare, 'that was a mistake.' I said the same thing to President Bush. President Bush came here. We had a very long discussion about the shape of things to come and questions cropped up about regime change, and I did make quite clear to President Bush that regime change is something which does not find favour with our way of things. I can assure you, Sir, that when it comes to India's essential national interest, the only guide for me and for my Government would be what is in our enlightened national interest. No power on earth can influence that sense of independence of our judgement in this regard.

Sir, the trust of our foreign policy remains the promotion of our national interest. We are unswerving in our commitment to an independent foreign policy. We do recognize the complexities present in an increasingly inter-dependent and multi-polar world. I don't apologise for my conviction that having good relations with the United States is in our national interest. I do recognize that the United States is a pre-eminent power; good relations with the United States are in our national interest. But that is not, and should not, in any way, cloud our judgement in international affairs. There are many areas of agreement with the United States, but, at the same time, there are a number of areas in which we have differences; we differed with them on what has happened in Iraq and we have not shied away from making these concerns known to the United States, as also expressing them in public.

Currently, we are engaged not only with the United States, but also other global powers like Russia, China, the EU, the UK, France and Japan. We are also focussing on ASEAN as well as countries in West Asia, Africa and Latin America. More importantly, we are devoting proportionately larger time and effort in bridging relations with countries in our immediate neighbourhood like Nepal, Bhutan, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, Myanmar and Pakistan. Our relations with all these countries are determined by the dictates of our national interest and we have not allowed any other country, including the United States, to influence our policy; and this will not change as long as I happen to be the Prime Minister.

Sir, I would hence, reiterate, in view of the apprehensions that have been expressed in this House, that the proposed US legislation on nuclear cooperation with India will not be allowed to become an instrument to compromise India's sovereignty. Our foreign policy is determined solely by our national interest. No legislation enacted in a foreign country, howsoever powerful that country may be, can take away from us that sovereign right. Thus, there is no question of India being bound by a law passed by a foreign legislature. Our sole guiding principle in regard to our foreign policy, whether it is on Iran, or any other country, will be dictated entirely by considerations of our national interest.

Sir, let me now turn to some of the concerns that have been expressed on the second set of issues regarding possible deviations from assurances given by me in this august House on the July 18, 2005 Joint Statement and the March 2, 2006 Separation Plan. I would like to

state categorically that there have neither been, nor will there be, any compromise on this score and the Government will not allow such compromises to occur in the future as well.

Sir, hon. Members would recall that during President Bush's visit to India in March this year, agreement was reached between India and the United States on a Separation Plan in implementation of the Indo-US Joint Statement of July 18, 2005. This Separation Plan had identified the nuclear facilities that India was willing to offer in a phased manner for IAEA safeguards contingent on reciprocal actions taken by the US. For its part the United States Administration was required to approach the US Congress for amending its laws and the Nuclear Suppliers' Group for adapting its guidelines to enable full Civilian Nuclear Cooperation between Indian and the international community. The US Administration had thereafter approached the US Congress to amend certain provisions of the United States Atomic Energy Act, 1954 which currently prohibit Civil Nuclear Cooperation with India. The US House of Representatives International Relations Committee passed the Bill on the subject on 27th June, 2006. The House of Representatives passed the Bill as approved by the international Relations Committee on July 27. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee passed its version of the Bill on June 29, 2006. The US Senate is now expected to vote on this version of the Bill sometime in September. We have concerns over both the House and Senate versions of the Bills. Since the two Bills are somewhat different in content, according to US practice they will need to be reconciled to produce a single piece of legislation. After adoption by both the House and the Senate, this would become law when the US President accords his approval. The final shape of the legislation would, therefore, be apparent only when the House and the Senate complete the second stage of assent or adoption. Sir, meanwhile the US Government had approached the Nuclear Suppliers' Group to adapt its guidelines to enable full Civil Nuclear Cooperation between India and the international community. In March this year, the Nuclear Suppliers' Group at its preliminary meeting in Brazil held a preliminary discussion on this issue. The matter will be further discussed by the Nuclear Suppliers' Group later this year. On our part, we have separately raised this issue with several countries and urged them to lift the existing restrictions on nuclear supplies to India. I myself have raised this issue with the Heads of State or Government of Russia, France, UK, Japan, Germany, Brazil, Norway, Iceland and Cyprus among others. Sir,

in view of the concerns voiced by the hon. Members, I shall try to discuss each of these concerns in some detail. I shall, however, begin by affirming that our approach is guided by the understandings contained in the July, 2005 Joint Statement and the March, 2006 Separation Plan. What we can agree with the United States to enable nuclear cooperation must be strictly within these parameters. Sir, the key provisions to which references have been made in this august House and outside are the following:

First, there is this question of full Civil Nuclear Cooperation. Hon. Members have asked what is my understanding of that. I would like to share what our approach is and what our understanding is of the meaning of full Civil Nuclear Cooperation. The central imperative in our discussion with the United States on Civil Nuclear Cooperation is to ensure the complete and irreversible removal of existing restrictions imposed on India through iniquitous restrictive trading regimes for the past three decades. We seek the removal of restrictions on all aspects of cooperation and technology transfers pertaining to civil nuclear energy that is ranging from nuclear fuel, nuclear reactors to reprocessing spent fuel, that is, all aspects of a complete nuclear fuel cycle. It is our belief that this will be the surest guarantee of India's acceptance as a full and equal partner of the international nuclear community even while preserving the integrity of our three-stage nuclear programme and protecting the autonomy of our scientific research and development. The House has my assurance, nothing, in our thinking, will allow us to compromise on the autonomy of decision-making in matters relating to research and development. We will not agree to any dilution that would prevent us from securing the benefits of full civil nuclear co-operation as I have amplified a moment ago.

The second question that was raised was about this concern with reciprocity, whether reciprocity is not being compromised under pressure from the United States. Let me candidly state what our position is. I had earlier assured the House that reciprocity is the key to the implementation of our understanding contained in the July, 2005 Statement. I stand by that commitment. When we put forward the Separation Plan, we again made it clear to the United States that India could not be expected to take on obligations such as placing its nuclear facilities under safeguards in anticipation of future lifting of restrictions. India and the United States have held one round of discussions on a proposed bilateral co-operation

agreement. India and the International Atomic Energy Agency have held preliminary technical discussion regarding an India-specific safeguards agreement. Further discussions are required on both these documents. While these parallel efforts are underway, our position is that we will accept only International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards on the nuclear facilities in a phased manner and as identified for that purpose in the Separation Plan, but only when all nuclear restrictions on India have been lifted. So, there has not been any dilution of our pledge to this House as far as I am concerned. On July 29 last year, I had stated that before voluntarily placing our civil nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards, we would ensure that all restrictions on India have been lifted. There has been no shift in our position on this point.

The third issue of certification, the annual certification, has been raised. Let me clarify the position on where we stand. The draft Senate Bill requires the US President to make an annual report to the Congress that includes certification that India is in full compliance of its non-proliferation and other commitments. We have made it clear to the United States our opposition to these provisions, even if they are projected as non-binding on India, as being contrary to the letter and spirit of the July Statement. We have told the United States Administration that the effect of such certification will be to diminish a permanent waiver authority into an annual one. We have also indicated that this would introduce an element of uncertainty regarding future co-operation and is, therefore, not acceptable to us.

Sir, another issue has been India's acceptance as a nuclear weapon State or the phrase that is used in the July Statement as a State possessing advanced nuclear technology. Let me clarify where we stand. Hon. Members may recall that the July Statement had acknowledged that India should be regarded as a State with advanced nuclear technology enjoying the rights and the benefits as other States with advanced nuclear technology such as the United States. The July statement did not refer to India as a nuclear weapon State because that has a particular connotation in the NPT. Since the NPT could not be amended, we could not claim that we will get the formal status of the Nuclear Weapon State. But the July statement explicitly recognizes the existence of India's military nuclear facilities. It also meant that India would not attract full scope safeguards such as those applied to non-nuclear weapon States that are signatories

to the NPT, and, there would be no curbs on continuation of India's nuclear weapon related activities.

In these important respects, India would be very much on par with five nuclear weapon States who are signatories to the NPT. Similarly, the Separation Plan provided for an India-specific safeguards agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency with assurances of uninterrupted supply of fuel to reactors together with India's right to take corrective measures in the event that fuel supplies are interrupted. We have made clear to the United States that India's strategic programme is totally outside the purview of the July statement and we oppose any legislative provision that mandates scrutiny of either our nuclear weapons programme or our unsafeguarded nuclear facilities.

Sir, questions have been raised about the safeguards agreement and the fuel assurances. What do they mean? Let me set out what my understanding is. In this respect also, Sir, it is worth emphasizing that the March, 2006 Separation Plan provides for an India-specific safeguards agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency, with assurances of uninterrupted supply of fuel to reactors that would be placed under IAEA safeguards together with India's right to take corrective measures in the event fuel supplies are interrupted. We, of course, have the sovereign right to take all appropriate measures to fully safeguard our interest in unforeseen contingencies. An important assurance is the commitment of support for India's right to build up strategic reserves of nuclear fuel over the lifetime of India's reactors. We have initiated technical discussions at the expert level with the International Atomic Energy Agency on an India-specific safeguard agreement. Both the Bilateral Nuclear Cooperation Agreement with the United States and the India-specific Safeguards Agreement with the IAEA would be only within the parameters of the July statement and the March Separation Plan. There is no question of India signing either a safeguards agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency or an Additional Protocol of a type, which is concluded by non-nuclear weapons States, who have signed the NPT. We will not accept any verification measures regarding our safeguarded nuclear facilities beyond those contained in an India-specific safeguards agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency. Therefore, there is no question of allowing American inspectors to roam around our nuclear installations.

Sir, concern has been expressed about the integrity and reliability of our strategic programme, the autonomy of decision making and future scientific research and development prospects. Sir, in my statement of March 7, 2006, I had assured the Parliament that the Separation Plan would not adversely affect our strategic programme in any way. I reiterate that commitment today. The Separation Plan has been so designed as to ensure adequacy of fissile material and other inputs for our strategic programme based on our own current and assessed future needs. The integrity of the three-stages nuclear programme will not be affected. The autonomy of our research and development activity, the development of the fast breeder and thorium technology in the nuclear field will remain unaffected. We will not accept interference by other countries vis-a-vis the development of our strategic programme. We will not allow external scrutiny of our strategic programme in any manner, much less, allow it to be a condition for future nuclear cooperation between India and the international community.

Sir, I should say a few words about this whole issue of the moratorium on production of fissile material. Some hon. Members have raised this issue and I should like to state what our position is. Our position on this matter is also unambiguous. We are not willing to accept a moratorium on the production of fissile material. We are only committed to negotiate a Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty in the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva, a Commitment which was undertaken by the previous Government. India is willing to join only a non-discriminatory multilaterally negotiated and internationally verifiable FMCT as and when it is concluded in the Conference on Disarmament, again provided our security interests are fully addressed.

Sir, some hon. Members have raised issues about the universal nuclear disarmament in the Rajiv Gandhi Action Plan. Let me say where we stand. Our commitments towards non-discriminatory global nuclear disarmament remains unwavering, in line with the Rajiv Gandhi Action Plan. There is no dilution on this count. We do not accept proposals put forward from time to time for regional non-proliferation or regional disarmament. Pending global nuclear disarmament, there is no question of India joining the NPT as a non-nuclear weapon state or accepting full scope safeguards as a requirement for nuclear supplies to India, now or in the future.

contained in the July 2005 Joint Statement and the March 2006 Separation Plan. A White House Statement of Administration Policy of July 26th 2006 recognises some, though not all, of India's concerns, and conveyed that the administration has voiced them with the Congress. Mr. Chairman, Sir, I can assure you that there is no ambiguity in our position insofar as it has been conveyed to the US. The US is aware of our position that the only way forward is strict adherence to the July Statement and the March Separation Plan. I am hopeful that the bilateral India-US Civil Nuclear Cooperation Agreement, when concluded, will take into account the issues raised here. However, I must be very honest and frank, I cannot predict with certainty the final form of the US legislation or the outcome of the process with the Nuclear Suppliers' Group, which consists of 45 countries with divergent interests. I am hopeful that this will lead in a direction wherein our interests are fully protected and that there is a complete lifting of restrictions of India that have existed for three decades. Such an outcome, if it materialises, will contribute to our long-term energy security by enabling a rapid increase in nuclear power. It would lead to the dismantling of the technology denial regimes that have hampered our development, particularly in hi-tech sectors. I will have wide consultations including with the members of the Atomic Energy Commission, the nuclear and scientific communities, and others to develop a broad-based national consensus on this important matter. Sir, I would like to inform the House that I have called the members of the Atomic Energy Commission to meet me on the 26th of this month. I have also invited the distinguished group of scientists who have issued a statement the same evening to come and have a discussion with me, so that we can exchange views, and it will be my effort to evolve a broad-based national consensus on this issue.

Sir, I would only like to state that in keeping with our commitments to Parliament and the nation, we will not accept any conditions that go beyond the parameters of the July 18, 2005 Joint Statement and the March, 2006 Separation Plan, agreed to between India and the United States. If in their final form, the US legislation or the adapted NSG guidelines impose extraneous conditions on India, you have my assurance, the Government will drawn the necessary conclusions,

[17 August, 2006]

RAJYA SABHA

consistent with the commitments I have made to Parliament. Sir, our friends of the Left have valid concerns and I thought I owe it to them that I should reflect and state where I stand with regard to all those concerns. Therefore, the various points which have been raised today or elsewhere in the press, I have tried my very best to give as honest an answer as I can.

The first issue raised by Shri Prakash Karat and others is, whether the deal will give 'full' civilian nuclear technology and lift all existing sanctions on dual use technology imposed on India for not signing the NPT. What is my response? The response is, the objective of full civil nuclear cooperation is enshrined in the July Statement. This objective can be realised when current restrictions on nuclear trade with India are fully lifted. In accordance with the July Statement, the US has initiated steps to amend its legislation and to approach the Nuclear Supplier Group to adapt its guidelines. We seek removal of restriction on all aspects of cooperation and technology transfers pertaining to civil nuclear energy—ranging from supply of nuclear fuel, nuclear reactors, reprocessing spent fuel, that is, all aspects of complete nuclear fuel supply. Only such cooperation would be in keeping with the July Joint Statement.

The second issue that is being raised, is, we cannot accept restrictions on Indian Foreign Policy to be imposed such as on Iran, irrespective of whether it is in the policy section or in the sense of the House section of the legislation. To this, my response is, our Government is clear that our commitments are only those that are contained in the July Joint Statement and in the Separation Plan. We cannot accept introduction of extraneous issues in Foreign Policy. Any prescriptive suggestions in this regard are not acceptable to us. Our Foreign Policy is and will be solely determined by our national interests. No legislation enacted in a foreign country can take away from us this sovereign right.

The third issue raised by our colleagues in the Left is, the signing of the IAEA safeguards in perpetuity for the civilian programme to take place after the US Congress had approved the 123 Nuclear Cooperation Agreement. All restrictions on India to be lifted before we sign the

8.00 P.M.

International Atomic Energy Commission safeguards. My response is, I had conveyed to Parliament on July 29, 2005 on my return from Washington that before placing any of our nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards, we will ensure that all restrictions on India have been lifted. Under the Separation Plan agreed to with the United States, India has offered to place under IAEA safeguards fourteen of its reactors presently operating or under construction between 2006 and 2014. The nuclear facilities listed in the Separation Plan will be offered for safeguards only after all nuclear restrictions have been lifted on India. This will include suitable amendments to the US legislation to allow for such cooperation, the passing of the bilateral agreement with India and the adaptation of the NSG guidelines. It is, therefore, clear that India cannot be expected to take safeguard obligations on its nuclear facilities in anticipation of future lifting of restrictions.

The fourth issue which is raised is regarding the guarantees on fuel as agreed in the March, 2006 Statement. In case the US reneges on supply of fuel, will they ensure continuity through other members of the Nuclear Suppliers Group? Our response is Separation Plan includes elaborate fuel supply assurances given by the United States. Understandings in this Separation Plan also provide for contingency of disruption of fuel supplies to India. In such a case, the United States and India would jointly convene a group of friendly supplier countries (Russia, France and the United Kingdom) aimed at restoring fuel supplies to India. An important assurance is the commitment of support for India's right to build strategic reserves of fuel over the lifetime of its nuclear reactors. In the event of disruption of fuel supplies, despite these assurances, India will have a right to take coorrective action to ensure the operation of its nuclear reactors.

The fifth issue is, India will work for an FMCT and for nuclear disarmament with all nuclear weapon States, in line with the Rajiv Gandhi Plan or Delhi Declaration in tandem. Is it true or not? What is our response?

Our response is, our support for global nuclear disarmament remains unwavering. Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi had put forward an Action Plan in the 1988 U.N. General Assembly Special Session on Disarmament. We remain committed to the central goal of that Action

Plan, i.e., complete elimination of nuclear weapons leading to global nuclear disarmament in a time-bound framework. India has agreed to negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva for a multilateral Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty. There has been no change in our position on this matter.

The sixth issue is, in the original deal, there is no provision for US inspectors, only provisions for IAEA inspectors. The draft US Bill contains such provisions for inspectors. What is our response?

My response is, in the Separation Plan, we have agreed to offer for IAEA safeguard nuclear facilities specified in the Separation Plan for that purpose. The nature of safeguards will be determined by an India specific safeguards agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency. This will be applied to the safeguarded nuclear facilities in India. Therefore, there is no question of accepting other verification measures or third country inspectors to visit our nuclear facilities, outside the framework of the India-specific safeguards agreement.

The seventh issue is concerning an India-specific protocol, and not the additional Protocol as per IAEA Standard Modified Protocol.

Our response is, in the Separation Plan, we have agreed to conclude an India-specific safeguards agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency. The question of an Additional Protocol will arise only after the India-specific safeguards agreement is in place. As a country with nuclear weapons, there is no question of India agreeing to a Safeguards Agreement or an Additional protocol applicable to non-nuclear weapon States of the NPT.

The eighth point is, with reference to Iran in the House Bill, what is our response?

My response is, we reject the linkage of any extraneous issues to the nuclear understanding. India's foreign policy will be decided on the basis of India national interests only.

The ninth issue is, the reference to Proliferation Security Initiative in the House and Senate Bill. What is our response? Our response is, the Proliferation Security Initiative is an extraneous issue as it is outside the framework of the July 18 Joint Statement. Therefore, we cannot accept it as a condition for implementing the July Statement. Separately, the Government has examined the PSI. We have certain concerns regarding

its legal implications and its linkages with the NPT. We also have concerns with amendments to the suppression of Unlawful Activities at Sea Treaty under the International Maritime Organisation. The tenth issue is that the Jackson-Vanik Amendment linking the granting of MFN status to USSR to Jewish emigration is an example relevant to the current debate. What is our stand?

Sir, our response is that we have studied the proposed US legislation very carefully, including the so-called binding and non-binding provisions. The non-binding provisions do not require mandatory action, but at the same time, have a certain weight in the implementation of the legislation as a whole. We have conveyed our concerns to the US Administration in this respect. Jackson-Vanik Amendment was binding on the Administration and cannot be cited as a precedent for non-binding references in the current bills. A more accurate example than the Jackson-Vanik Amendment is the set of provisions accompanying the renewal of MFN status to China, that included reference to China's human rights, China's political and religious prisoners, protection of Tibetan heritage and freedom of political expression.

The final point is, Sir, the role of Parliament in approving foreign policy. My humble response is that India follows the Parliamentary model, as specified in our Constitution, wherein treaty-making powers rest with the Executive. However, we have kept Parliament fully in the picture regarding various stages of our negotiations with the United States. Broad-based domestic consensus cutting across all sections in Parliament and outside will be necessary. We have a long journey ahead of us. There will be many opportunities for me to keep this House and the other House informed as the situation evolves. We will work towards, therefore, that objective by addressing various concerns as fully as possible. These were the concerns expressed by our left colleagues.

Sir, I think, a reference has been made in this debate to the statements of some distinguished scientists. I have had the privilege of working with some of them as a Member of the Atomic Energy Commission. Dr. Sethna is a very dear old friend of mine and, therefore, I take very seriously what the members of our scientific community says.

Broadly, as I see, there are four concerns that they have raised. They have welcomed the July 18th statement as a historic document. So, as far as that is concerned, I think they don't endorse the BJP line of

thinking which rejects the July 18th statement as the basis for cooperation with the United States.

Sir, the first issue raised by the nuclear scientists group—I should read out—is, "India should continue to be able to hold on to her nuclear option as a strategic requirement in the real world that we live in, and in the ever-changing complexity of the international political system. This means that we can't accede to any restraint in perpetuity on our freedom of action. We have not done this for the last 40 years after the Non-Proliferation Treaty came into being, and there is no reasons why we should succumb to this now. Universal nuclear disarmament must be our ultimate aim, and until we see the light the end of the tunnel on this important issue, we can't accept any agreement in perpetuity."

Sir, my response is that we are very firm in our determination that agreement with the United States on Civil Nuclear Energy in no way affects the requirements of our strategic programme. We are fully conscious of the changing complexity of the international political system. Nuclear weapons are an integral part of our national security and will remain so, pending the global elimination of all nuclear weapons and universal non-discriminatory nuclear disarmament. Our freedom of action with regard to our strategic programmes remains unrestricted.

The nuclear agreement will not be allowed to be used as a backdoor method of introducing NPT type restrictions on India. Our offer to put nuclear facilities under safeguards in perpetuity is conditional upon these facilities securing fuel from international sources for their life time. If the fuel supply assurances as enumerated in Separation Plan are disrupted, then India will have the right to take corrective measures to ensure the continued operation of these reactors. The second issue that the distinguished scientists have raised, and I read out: "After 1974, when the major powers discontinued cooperation with us, we have built up our capability in many sensitive technological areas, which need not and should not now be subjected to external control. Safeguards are understandable where external assistance for nuclear materials or technologies are involved. We have agreed to this before, and we can continue to agree to this in the future too, but strictly restricted to those facilities and materials imported from external sources." My response is this. Sensitive nuclear technology facilities have not been covered in the Separation Plan. Therefore, there is no question of putting them under

safeguards or under external control. Even with regard to nuclear facilities that have been included in the Separation Plan, safeguards will be applied in phases between 2006 and 2014. These safeguarded facilities will be eligible for and will receive fuel materials and technology from international sources. If such supplies cease, then, India will be free to protect its interests through corrective measures. That will be spelt out clearly in the India specific safeguards agreement.

The third issue which the scientists have raised, and I quote: "We find that the Indo-U.S. deal, in the form approved by the U.S. House of Representatives, infringes on our independence for carrying out indigenous research and development in nuclear science and technology. Our R&D should not be hampered by external supervision or control, or, by the need to satisfy an international body. Research and technology development are the sovereign rights of any nation. This is especially true when they concern strategic national defence and energy self-sufficiency." Our response is that our independence for carrying out independent research and development in nuclear science and technology will remain unaffected. There will be no external supervision of our R&D since none of the sensitive R&D facilities, which handle nuclear material, have been included in the Separation Plan. Nothing in the Separation Plan infringes on our sovereign right to conduct research and technology development concerning our national defence and energy self-sufficiency. The Government is committed to preserve the integrity of the three-stage nuclear power programme, including utilization of our vast thorium resources. Certain nuclear facilities including Centres such as the Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Variable Energy Cyclotron Centre, Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics, etc. have been designated as civilian in the Separation Plan. As these facilities will not handle nuclear material, there is no question of safeguards being applied to them. We expect these Centres to participate as full partners in international collaboration projects.

The fourth issue raised by the scientists is this. "While the sequence of actions to implement the cooperation could be left for discussion between the two Governments, the basic principles on which such actions will rest is the right of Parliament and the people to decide. The Prime Minister has already taken up with President Bush the issue of the new clauses recommended by the U.S. House of Representatives. If the U.S.

Congress, in its wisdom, passes the Bill in its present form, the 'product' will become unacceptable to India, and diplomatically, it will be very difficult to change it later. Hence, it is important for our Parliament to work out, and insist on the ground rules for the nuclear deal at this stage itself." My answer to that is this. I had taken up with President Bush our concerns regarding provisions in the two Bills. It is clear that if the final product is in its current form, India will have grave difficulties in accepting these Bills. The US has been left in no doubt as to our position. The ground rules for our discussion are clear. These are the parameters of the July Statement and the March Separation Plan, and commitments given by me to Parliament in the three *suo motu* Statements and my reply to today's discussion will be the guiding principles of our position. The Parliament has been kept fully informed at every stage of the discussion. In their final form, if the US legislation or the NSG guidelines impose extraneous conditions on India, the Government, as I stated earlier, will draw the necessary conclusions consistent with my commitments to Parliament.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have tried to be as exhaustive as I could. I have set out the framework which will guide our negotiations with the US. I believe, I have tried faithfully to reflect the concerns of all sections of the House. I invite this House to unanimously endorse the stand that I have outlined.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Prime Minister.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: Sir, just a minute. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: Sir ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let Mr. Yashwant Sinha speak first ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: Sir, the Prime Minister has once again given assurances to this House, as he had done in the past. I will not repeat the point that there is a complete divergence between what he has said here today and what the American position is. But, that is up to him to tackle. Sir, there are a number of points which have not been replied to by the Prime Minister. I had, Sir, in my initial, first speech talked about the shift which has already taken place from the July 18, 2005 Agreement, which has not been replied to, Sir. I had asked the question whether the Americans actually opposed the fuel supply to Tarapore. That question has been ducked. I had asked the question, why was...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please be short.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: Yes, Sir, I will be very short. Why was

Cirus included in the Separation Plan? That has not been replied to. Sir, I had said that the Fast Breeder Programme, according to the Separation Plan, is going to be included, according to the statement signed, under the Safeguard Agreement. I would like to have a categorical assurance from the Prime Minister that our Fast Breeder Programme will not be included and that...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री सभापति: आप बोलिए, बोलिए। ...*(व्यवधान)*...

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: I know who are the *leaders.

श्री सभापति: होने दीजिए, कोई दिक्कत नहीं है। बैठिए, बैठिए...*(व्यवधान)*...

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: I know who are the *leaders.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That word is expunged. ...*(Interruptions)*... That word* is expunged: Please take your seats. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: They only know two things. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seats. ...*(Interruptions)*.... This is enough now. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: Sir, we had said that every nuclear weapon State has the right in the Safeguard Agreement with the IAEA to have interchangeability between civilian and military facilities. This is a right which is not being given to India. I would like the Prime Minister to assure the House that this right will be given to India in the Safeguard Agreement that we will negotiate. ...*(Interruptions)*...

Finally, Sir, an entirely unnecessary and irrelevant remark was made by the Prime Minister when he said that he inherited a bankrupt economy from me. I would like to say....*(Interruptions)*....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat. ...*(Interruptions)*....

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA. ...it was Rajiv Gandhi who bankrupted this economy, and not Yashwant Sinha. ...*(Interruptions)*....

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: Sir, I would like to thank the Prime Minister, through you, for a very exhaustive reply. I had raised only nine queries in my intervention.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All have been replied to now.

*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: No, no, Sir. I had asked nine, but the Prime Minister chose to reply to 12 of them, I am very happy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then, you should be grateful to the Prime Minister.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: Sir, I am grateful for that. Sir, this being the case, there are certain valid apprehensions that we have. The Prime Minister has stated very clearly that if in the final version the US Bills are not in consonance with the July agreement and the March Separation Plan, then, India will draw its own conclusions. If that is right, Sir, I apprehend that at this particular moment, as many of these issues that have been raised, on them I have been assured by the Prime Minister. The first point I would like to suggest is that at this present point of time let us all accept these assurances as the sense of this House. ...*(Interruptions)*.... And Let that be approved as safeguards at the moment. ...*(Interruptions)*. ...Okay, that is my proposal. The second thing why I am saying, 'at the moment' is that as the Prime Minister himself in the reply has stated that we do not really know what will come finally and how it will come, so at a later stage whenever such issues come up, we would only request the Prime Minister to give an assurance that he will come back to us before any such type of thing happens....*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: He has already given that. ...*(Interruptions)*....

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: There is no harm in my seeking reassurance. ...*(Interruptions)*. I understand your anxiety in saying that the Prime Minister has already assured. You understand our anxiety in getting a reassurance on that assurance. ...*(Interruptions)*.... So, that I would request the Prime Minister on these two points is to clarify, then, I think we can all accept all these conditions as the sense of this House.

MESSAGES FROM LOK SABHA

Motion regarding Appointment of A Joint Committee to Examine the Constitutional and Legal Position relating to Office of Profit

SECRETARY-GENERAL: Sir, I have to report to the House the following message received from the Lok Sabha, signed by Secretary-General, Lok Sabha: