

1.00 P.M.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill.

Clauses 2 to 14 were added to the Bill.

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

श्री महावीर प्रसाद : महोदय, मैं प्रस्ताव करता हूँ :

कि बिल को पारित किया जाए।

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

DISCUSSION ON STATEMENTS MADE BY THE PRIME MINISTER

Civil Nuclear Energy Cooperation With The United States of America

डा. मुरली मनोहर जोशी (उत्तर प्रदेश) : उपसभापति जी, मैं आपका बहुत आभारी हूँ कि आपने माननीय प्रधानमंत्री जी के वक्तव्य पर सारे देश को जो चिंताएं उत्पन्न हुई हैं, उस पर चर्चा प्रारंभ करने का अवसर मुझे दिया है। सबसे पहले माननीय प्रधानमंत्री जी और संयुक्त राष्ट्र अमरीका के राष्ट्राध्यक्ष जी ने 18 जुलाई, 2005 को वाशिंगटन में एक संयुक्त वक्तव्य दिया था, उसमें बहुत सी बातें कही गई थीं, लेकिन दो-तीन बातें ऐसी हैं, जिनके ऊपर सदन को और देश को, तत्काल गंभीरता से विचार करना जरूरी है। पहला तो नाभिकीय अप्रसार और सुरक्षा यानी Non-Proliferation and Security के बारे में है, फिर High technology and Space यानी उच्च-स्तरीय टेक्नोलॉजी और अंतरिक्ष है, फिर recognising

(श्री सभापति पीठासीन हुए)

इसके बारे में वहां जो चर्चाएं हुईं और उनके परिणामस्वरूप जो फैसले हुए, उन पर जरूर चर्चा करनी होगी, क्योंकि इसी में से फिर एनर्जी के नाम पर, ऊर्जा के नाम पर जो समझौता हुआ, उसने हमारी सारी नाभिकीय सुरक्षा की जो क्षमता थी, उसको भी प्रतिबंधित कर दिया है और साथ ही साथ हमारी ऊर्जा की आवश्यकताओं तथा उनकी पूर्ति के बारे में प्रश्नचिह्न लगा दिया है।

साथ-ही-साथ जिसे हमारी एनर्जी इंडिपेंडेंसी कहा जाए, ऊर्जा में हमारी अपनी स्वतंत्रता बनी रहे, उसके बारे में भी प्रश्न-चिन्ह लगा दिया है।

तीसरा, launch a US-India Knowledge Initiative on agriculture focussed on promoting teaching, research, service and commercial linkage. अभी तक यह एक ऐसा बिन्दु है, एक ऐसा पक्ष है, जिस पर देश में, सदन में बहुत कम चर्चा हुई है और यह उतना ही महत्वपूर्ण है, जितना कि यह नाभिकीय प्रश्न।

मान्यवर प्रधानमंत्री जी ने उसके बाद 29 जुलाई को इस सदन में और शायद 3 अगस्त को लोक सभा में वक्तव्य दिए। उस 29 जुलाई के वक्तव्य में उन्होंने कुछ बिन्दुओं पर बहुत ध्यान आकृष्ट किया, जो बहुत महत्वपूर्ण थे। जैसे कि यह जो कुछ समझौता होने जा रहा है, यह reciprocity पर आधारित है, परस्परता पर आधारित है, जो कुछ हम करेंगे और उसमें जो कुछ अमेरिका के दायित्व होंगे, उनको हम परस्पर पूर्ण करेंगे। ऐसा नहीं कि पहले हम कुछ कर देंगे और फिर वे हमें देखेंगे और फिर वे उस पर अपना फैसला करेंगे। ऐसा कुछ नहीं है। Reciprocity का मतलब ही यही होता है कि यहाँ और वहाँ, बिल्कुल simultaneously, एक साथ हम कर रहे हैं, वे कर रहे हैं। हम अपना काम कर रहे हैं, वे अपना काम कर रहे हैं। लेकिन ऐसा नहीं है कि हम करें, उनको दिखाएँ, उनसे approval लें और उसके बाद फिर हम उस समझौते को यह कहें कि यह reciprocal है। यह कैसे होगा, यह सवाल था।

फिर parity की बात कही गई। फिर आपने उसमें energy security की बात कही, फिर आपने न्यूक्लियर वैपन प्रोग्राम के बारे में बात कही, फिर न्यूक्लियर वैपन पॉवर के तौर पर हिन्दुस्तान की मान्यता, इसके बारे में आपने बात कही, फिर हमारे जितने भी फैसले हैं, उनमें हम सम्प्रभुतापूर्ण हैं, autonomous हैं, वे फैसले हम अपनी तरफ से लेंगे। जो कुछ करेंगे, वोल्टरी आधार पर करेंगे और जो separation भी हम करेंगे, तो वह हम अपने हिसाब से करेंगे, उसमें किसी दूसरे का कोई दखल नहीं होगा, उसकी राय भी नहीं होगी। इस तरह की बात इसमें कही गई थी। लोगों को बहुत अच्छा लगा था। लेकिन मैंने तत्पश्चात् उसके बाद एक लेख लिखा था और जो कुछ पत्रों में छपा भी था, जिसमें इसके बारे में जो शंकाएँ थीं, वे मैंने प्रस्तुत की थीं और यह भी कहा था कि यह फायदा किसे हो रहा है, जो वक्तव्य आपका आया है, जो रूपरेखा आई थी, उससे हमारे देश को कोई फायदा नहीं है। अगर फायदा है, तो वह युनाइटेड स्टेट्स ऑफ अमेरिका का है, क्योंकि उसी समय अखबारों में ये खबरें आईं, विशेषकर अमेरिका के अखबारों में कि हमने 5 बिलियन डालर के हथियार खरीदने का उनके सामने एक प्रस्ताव रख दिया है। ऐसा लगता था कि जैसे यह समझौता करने के लिए हम उनको कुछ प्रोत्साहित कर रहे हैं। जैसे डिनर में स्टार्टर होता है, तो उस तरह का एक स्टार्टर दे रहे हैं कि आप हमारे साथ यह समझौता करिए जरूर, हमको यह दीजिए, देखिए, हम शुरू में ही आपको यह 5 बिलियन डालर के ऑफर्स दे रहे हैं, हम आपसे हथियार खरीदेंगे। हमारी ये धारणाएँ और भी पुष्ट होती हैं, क्योंकि अब जिस रूप में यह समझौता आया है, उसके बाद क्या कुछ कहा गया है, उससे भी हमारी ये धारणाएँ पुष्ट होती हैं कि वहाँ पर जरूर ऐसी कुछ बात थी।

फिर कुछ दिनों तक इस विषय पर चर्चाएँ चलती रहीं, तो हमारे प्रधानमंत्री जी 27 फरवरी को फिर अपना एक वक्तव्य लेकर हमारे सामने आए। उस वक्तव्य पर चर्चा होनी जरूरी थी। लेकिन फिर 7 मार्च को आपने एक वक्तव्य दिया। अब उस 7 मार्च के वक्तव्य में और जो आपने उसमें separation plan और बाकी सारे उस समझौते के पहलू रखे हैं, उन पर हम आज चर्चा कर रहे हैं। आपने अपने इस 27 फरवरी वाले वक्तव्य में यह कहा था कि -

"The essence of what was agreed in Washington last July was a shared understanding of our growing energy needs. In recognition of our improved ties, the United States committed itself to a series of steps to enable bilateral and international cooperation in nuclear energy. These

include adjusting domestic policies, and working with allies to adjust relevant international regimes. There was also a positive mention of possible fuel supply to the first two nuclear power reactors at Tarapur."

-- Possible fuel supply -- "US support was also indicated for India's inclusion as a full partner in the International Thermonuclear Experimental Research Project and the Generation IV International Forum."

Indications, promises, assurances - उसमें कोई पक्की बात नहीं थी। फिर आपने उस संयुक्त वक्तव्य में यह भी कहा कि ...। The United States implicitly acknowledged the existence of our nuclear weapons programme. There was also public recognition that as a responsible State with advanced nuclear technologies, India should acquire the same benefits and advantages as other States which have advanced nuclear technology, such as the United States."

अब यह इम्प्रेशन बार-बार दिया जा रहा है कि हम न्यूक्लियर वीपन स्टेट हैं, और हमें वे सारे अधिकार, कर्तव्य और दायित्व निभाने होंगे जो ऐसे तमाम राष्ट्र जैसे कि यूनाइटेड स्टेट्स, निभा सकते हैं या जो उन को प्राप्त हैं। यह एक महत्वपूर्ण बात थी कि इस पर बिल्कुल पैरिटी होनी चाहिए, रेसीप्रोसिटी होनी चाहिए। आप ने फिर उस दिन दोहराया कि रेसीप्रोसिटी होनी चाहिए, लेकिन उस फरवरी, 27 के वक्तव्य में एक और बात सामने आई, जो बहुत महत्वपूर्ण थी। आप ने यह कहा कि "...and discussed implementation of the July 18 statement. In the same period, several American Congressional leaders and policy-makers have visited India in the past few months, many of whom met me. "मैंने आप का चित्र देखा बर्न्स के साथ व और लोगों के साथ बातचीत करते हुए। यह बड़े खुशी की बात है, लोग आए, आप से मिलें, लेकिन समझीते उन के स्तर पर नहीं होने चाहिए। "We have amply clarified our objective in pursuing full civil nuclear energy cooperation for our energy security and to reassure them of India's impeccable non-proliferation credentials."

यह बात बिल्कुल ठीक है, हमारे क्रेडेंसियल्स भी इस में साफ हैं, लेकिन उचित स्तर पर बात होनी चाहिए। सम्माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी की बातचीत राष्ट्रपति बुश से हो, वह समझ में आता है, यहां के किसी अधिकारी की बातचीत यहां के किसी अधिकारी को भी समझ में आता है, लेकिन हमें देखकर कभी-कभी दुख होता है कि प्रधान मंत्री जी के साथ बर्न्स की बात हो रही है, किसी छोटे अधिकारी की बात हो रही है। उस के साथ कुछ इस तरह से इम्प्रेशंस दिए जा रहे हैं कि लोगों के मन में इस तरह की धारणा बन रही है।

THE PRIME MINISTER (DR. MANMOHAN SINGH): Sir, I have had no discussion with Mr. Burns on substantive issues. He just came and paid courtesy call on me and I received him. I was not in the business of negotiating with him.

डा. मुरली मनोहर जोशी : बड़ी प्रसन्नता की बात है। जो इम्प्रेशन उन चित्रों से और समाचारों से गया, वह मैंने आप के सामने रखा। उस का उसी समय खंडन किया जाना चाहिए था।

मुझे बड़ी खुशी है, उस के बाद तत्काल हमारे दल भारतीय जनता पार्टी की तरफ से कुछ सार्वजनिक रूप में बातें कही गयीं। उस में हम ने आप के इस वक्तव्य के बारे में कुछ स्पष्टीकरण मांगे थे, जैसे उस में एक बड़ी बात थी कि यह जो आप स्ट्रेटेजिक पार्टनरशिप की बात कह रहे हैं, यह अपने बराबर की शक्तियों में ठीक होती है। एक बहुत बड़ी शक्ति और दूसरी बहुत छोटीसी शक्ति, उन के बीच में स्ट्रेटेजिक पार्टनरशिप का मतलब पिछलग्गू बन जाने की तरह हो जाता है। तो हम इस बारे में स्पष्टीकरण चाहते थे कि यह स्ट्रेटेजिक पार्टनरशिप किस स्तर पर है, क्या इस का स्तर है, क्या उस के अंदर बारीकियां हैं जिस से हम यह समझें कि हम बराबर के स्तर पर हैं या हम उनके कितने नीचे के स्तर पर हैं?

फिर फास्ट ब्रीड रिएक्टर के बारे में हम ने पूछा था। हम यह जानते हैं और दुनिया जानती है कि बेसिक साइंस के मामले में और इन ब्रीडर्स के मामले में जो टेक्नॉलोजी है, उसमें हमारे वैज्ञानिकों को हमें व सारे सदन को बधाई देनी चाहिए कि उन्होंने इस बारे में हमें दुनिया में सब से आगे किया हुआ है। जहां तक न्यूक्लियर साइंस की बेसिक साइंस है और जो यह टेक्नॉलोजी है, हम चाहते हैं कि और आगे बढ़े। विज्ञान का विद्यार्थी होने के नाते मैं जरूर चाहूंगा और सदन भी चाहेगा कि इस टेक्नॉलोजी में और इन चीजों में हमें आगे बढ़ना चाहिए, और विकास करना चाहिए न कि इस पर किसी तरह का प्रतिबंध लग जाये। अगर वह लगेगा तो हमारे लिए बहुत सी समस्याएं पैदा हो जाएंगी। हमें यह भी देखना चाहिए था कि चीन यानी पीपुल्स रिपब्लिक ऑफ चाइना, के अमेरिका के साथ संबंध तनाव के रहते हैं और प्रतिस्पर्धा के भी रहते हैं, लेकिन उस को वह सारी सिविलियन न्यूक्लियर टेक्नॉलोजी यूनाइटेड स्टेट्स से अमेरिका से बिना किसी दबाव के, बिना ऐसे समझौते के, बिना ऐसी कंडीशन के मिल रही है। तो इस का अर्थ यह है कि वह अपनी शक्ति, अपनी स्थिति में, अपनी वैज्ञानिक स्थिति में बिना समझौता किए अमेरिका से प्राप्त यह कर सकता है जबकि उनकी अमरीका से प्रतिस्पर्धा हम से कहीं ज्यादा बड़े स्तर पर मौजूद है, तो हम क्यों नहीं प्राप्त कर सकते?

यह सवाल पूछा गया था। हम यह चाहेंगे कि इसके बारे में रीयलिटी देश को बताया जाना चाहिए। हमने उस समय सरकार से यह भी पूछा था कि safeguard और perpetuity का क्या मतलब है? अगर, मान लीजिए कि हमारा कोई संयंत्र किसी एक देश से, मान लीजिए रूस से, फ्यूल खरीदता है और हमारा संयंत्र किसी दूसरे देश से आता है। तो फिर आप यह बताएं कि इसके बाद हमारा रिएक्टर सेफगार्ड में आएगा या नहीं आएगा। ये ऐसे सवाल हैं, जो जटिल तो हैं, लेकिन इनको समझना पड़ेगा और देखकर बताना पड़ेगा कि ऐसी स्थिति में क्या होगा?

यह जो perpetual safeguards हैं, इनके बारे में भी हमने पूछा था कि इस perpetual safeguard का क्या मतलब है? एक प्लांट की लाइफ तो केवल 25 साल या 30 साल है, लेकिन उससे निकला हुआ जो ईंधन है, जो फ्यूल है, उसकी लाइफ तो बहुत आगे है, तो सेफगार्ड प्लांट की लाइफ तक है या निरन्तर है। perpetual for the plant है, जो रिएक्टर लगा है, उसी तक सीमित है या उससे आगे भी है। अगर perpetual का मतलब यह

है कि उससे आगे भी है, उस फ्यूल पर भी है, तो उसका क्या होगा? उससे उन सेफगाइर्स का प्रभाव हमारे री-प्रोसेसिंग पर क्या होगा? और फिर हमें यह बताया जाए कि इससे हमारी nuclear weapon State बनने की जो क्षमता है, वह प्रतिबन्धित होगी या नहीं होगी। हमने ये सवाल पूछे थे।

फिर यह भी कहा था कि अगर हमारी और अमेरिका को वही obligations और responsibilities हैं, तो फिर आईओईओएओ में नई बात कौन सी आएगी? जो उनके हैं, वे हमारे हैं और जो हमारे हैं, वे उनके हैं। लेकिन, हमको उसके बाद आईओईओएओ से फिर एक समझौता करना है। यह भी एक अजीब बात है कि एक additional protocol करना है, जो India specific हो। ये सब बातें उस समय आपसे पूछी गई थीं। हमने अपनी ये आशंकाएँ जाहिर की थीं कि इससे हमारे देश की सारी सामरिक क्षमता पर और ऊर्जा की क्षमता पर काफी आघात पहुँच रहा है।

इंडिया स्पेसिफिक सेफगाइर्स, यानी जो क्लयंट स्टेट्स हैं, जो न्यूक्लियर स्टेट्स नहीं हैं, जिनके पास परमाणु शक्ति नहीं है, उनके लिए सेफगाइर्स हैं और जो सर्व शक्ति सम्पन्न हैं, उनके लिए कोई सेफगाइर्स नहीं हैं या जो कुछ थोड़ा-बहुत वे voluntarily करते हैं, वे हैं। यह नया सेफगार्ड बीच में कहाँ से आ गया? हम न तो न्यूक्लियर वेपन स्टेट हैं और न ही आप हमको कहते हैं कि हम नॉन-न्यूक्लियर स्टेट हैं। हम बीच में कहीं त्रिशंकु की तरह लटके हुए हैं, न वहाँ हैं और न यहाँ हैं। मैं कई बार यह सोचता हूँ कि शायद हमारी ऐसी स्थिति है कि जब न्यूक्लियर पावर के लोग बोर्ड रूम में बैठकर बहस कर रहे हों, तो हम बाहर बेंच पर बैठे हों, क्योंकि कोई तीसरा तो उस दफ्तर में घुस ही नहीं सकता। एक तो वह है, जो दफ्तर से बाहर रहेगा, बोर्ड रूम की परिधि से बाहर रहेगा। दूसरा वह है, जो बोर्ड रूम के अन्दर रहेगा, न्यूक्लियर क्लब के लोग और एक हम हैं, जो बाहर बेंच पर बैठेंगे। तो हमारी दृष्टि से यह स्थिति है, जिसके बारे में हमने पूछा था कि इसका स्पष्टीकरण होना चाहिए।

यह भी कहा गया कि जो अमेरिकन वार्ताकार थे, उन्होंने बार-बार यह कहा कि भारतवर्ष को पिछले पचास सालों में पहली बार, जब से हमारा नाभिकीय कार्यक्रम है, तब से नहीं, आज पहली बार हम ऐसे घेरे में ले आए हैं, इस प्रकार के प्रतिबंधों के अन्दर ले आए हैं, जिनको आप कहेंगे कि non-proliferation norms के अन्दर ले आए हैं, जो आज तक हम कभी नहीं ला पाए थे। यानी हमारे वैज्ञानिक जिस चीज को पिछले पचास सालों से संरक्षित रखे हुए थे और किसी को उसमें घुसने की इजाजत नहीं दी थी और काम कर रहे थे, हमने उसमें भी प्रवेश का रास्ता खोल दिया। वे बड़े खुश हैं कि जिस काम के लिए हम तीस साल से लगे हुए थे और कर नहीं सके थे, लेकिन इस समझौते के बाद हमने पूरे तौर पर उनके इस नाभिकीय कार्यक्रम के अन्दर दखलंदाजी उनसे स्वीकार करवा ली है। यह एक और पक्ष था, लेकिन उसका भी उत्तर नहीं आया।

उसके बाद माननीय प्रधानमंत्री जी ने 7 मार्च को अपना वक्तव्य भी दिया और separation plan भी रखा। अब मैं इन सब बातों को देखते हुए, जो इन तीनों वक्तव्यों में और संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ के वक्तव्य में जो विसंगतियाँ हैं, उनकी तरफ सदन का ध्यान आकृष्ट करना चाहता हूँ और माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी से भी उस सम्बन्ध में जानना चाहूँगा कि उसका क्या निदान है, हमारे देश की क्या स्थिति है, हमारे परमाणु कार्यक्रम की क्या स्थिति है और हम

किस तरह से अपनी ऊर्जा और अपनी सामरिक क्षमता को बचा के रख सकेंगे? आपने पहली बात parity के बारे में कही थी। आपने पहले कहा था कि "To acquire the same benefits and advantages as the other nuclear powers and never to accept discrimination." फिर आपने यह वचन भी दिया था कि "Predicated on our obtaining the same benefits and advantages as other nuclear powers is the understanding that we shall undertake the same responsibilities and obligations as such countries, including the United States. Concomitantly we expect the same rights and benefits." Have we received the same rights? Are we enjoying the same rights?

क्या हमें वे सारे अधिकार मिले हैं? फिर आपने लोक सभा में भी इसके बारे में कहा था। Atalji also asked this question. We have not been recognised as a nuclear weapon State. आपका जवाब है - "We have. I think, an explicit commitment from the United States that India should get the same benefit of civilian cooperation as advanced countries like the United States enjoys."

महोदय, मेरे पास एक डा. ए. गोपालाकृष्णन का लेख है, उसका हैडिंग है "Don't compromise India's dignity." मैं पूरा लेख नहीं पढ़ूंगा, थोड़ा सा इसमें से उद्धरण दूंगा - "We must recognise that it is demeaning for India to accept the US offer to join its global nuclear energy partnership as a client State. 'client State.' According to the statement of President Bush, on February 22nd, 2006, and I quote, "Under the GNAP, America will work with nations that have advanced civilian nuclear energy programmes such as Great Britain, France, Japan and Russia and to share nuclear fuel with ('client nations like India') that are developing civilian nuclear energy programmes."

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH: That particular programme has nothing got to do with the...

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: I am talking about the 'client State'...

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH: Please forgive me. That particular arrangement has nothing to do with the pact that we are discussing. So, I would like to make it quite clear there should be an informed debate. When this matter was raised with us, we said, 'we will consider joining that initiative, but only as a supplier nation.' So, these two are separate things. Please don't mix up.

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: I am saying that the status on which the President Bush keeps it and, I think,...

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH: That has nothing to do with it.

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: We don't agree to it. I am happy that you have not accepted it. But I am just bringing to the notice of the House that the mindset of the American President is not to treat us as a nuclear weapon State or as a nuclear power State, but as a client State. And, this is the statement of Dr. A. Gopalakrishnan, who was former Chairman of the Atomic Regulatory Commission. So, if the nuclear scientists receive this impression, they gather this impression and they are hurt by it and they say that, 'please don't compromise India's dignity.' It means, therefore, that the statement of the United States President that India is a client State has been noticed by all of us. I am happy if the Government and the Prime Minister refuses to join this on this term that we are a client State. I would like to have a categorical assurance on this. Either you ask the US President to clarify whether he means India is a client State or is a nuclear power State. And, if he insists on this, of course, I would be very happy if you refuse to join.

So, Sir, I was talking about parity. उसके बाद आपने पार्लियामेंट में यह भी कहा है - Yes. It is true that certain assurances in the July 18 statement remain to be fulfilled, and I seek the indulgence of this House not to divulge every single detail of the negotiations at this time. हमने आपसे उसमें पूछा है - "Are there any exit clauses in this Agreement? अगर यह एग्रीमेंट को वायलेट करें, तो क्या होगा? हम क्या कर सकेंगे, क्या नहीं कर सकेंगे? क्योंकि जो प्रारूप सामने रखा गया है, उसके बारे में हमें यह पता नहीं है कि एग्जिट क्लॉज क्या है, क्या नहीं है। हमारा पुराना तजुर्बा है कि अमेरिका ने सब कुछ लिखने के बाद तारापुर को फ्यूल देने से इंकार कर दिया था। इसलिए वह एग्जिट क्लॉज क्या है, क्या नहीं है, यह हमें जानने की जरूरत होगी। मैं समझता हूँ कि वह बात साफ होनी चाहिए। आपके इस वक्तव्य से यह बात कहीं पता नहीं चलती है।

फिर, आपके दफ्तर से जो बैकग्राउंडर इश्यू हुआ था, उसमें लिखा गया था कि "Nuclear weapons States, including the US, have the right to shift facilities from civilian category to military. And there is no reason why they should not apply to India." लेकिन समझीते के प्रारूप को देखने से तो साफ लगता है कि आप ऐसा नहीं कर सकेंगे। आज कर लें, लेकिन आज के बाद आप कर सकेंगे या नहीं, यह तो बहुत संदेह की बात है और वह देश के परमाणु कार्यक्रम के लिए और खासतौर पर हमारे न्युकलीयर-वीपन्स प्रोग्राम के लिए एक बहुत खतरे की बात होगी। आपने रेसिप्रोसिटी की बात की, सुष्मा जी ने उस दिन यह सवाल उठाया था, परन्तु आपने उस दिन उसको बहुत हल्के से लिया, ऐसे लगा कि जैसे उसमें कोई तत्व ही नहीं है। लेकिन, मैं आपको यह बताना चाहता हूँ कि 4 अगस्त को प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने लोक सभा में शायद कहा था। कि Several points have been raised here. इसी राज्य सभा में कहा था। Sushmaji referred to the statement of a particular American official, Mr. Nicholas Burns. She preferred to

believe him rather than me. Who proved right finally. आखिर बर्न्स ने वही कहा कि रैसिप्रॉसिटी नहीं है, ये उसके बयान हैं। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो बात साफ है, वह साफ होनी चाहिए और अगर गलती हुई है, रैसिप्रॉसिटी नहीं है तो बताया जाना चाहिए कि रैसिप्रॉसिटी नहीं है। Indian actions will be contingent at every stage on actions taken by the other side. यह तो कहीं पिछले सात-आठ महीनों को देखने से पता ही नहीं चलता कि हमने जो एक्शन लिया है और उन्होंने जो एक्शन लिया है, वह इंडिपेंडेंट है। वे अपना काम करें, हम अपना काम करें, वे अपने ऑब्लिगेशंस पूरे करें, हम अपने ऑब्लिगेशंस पूरे करें, यह कहीं नहीं है, बल्कि दिखाई देता है, बयानात् हैं, जो यह कह रहे हैं कि हमने और अमेरिकन्स ने मिलकर प्रोग्राम बनाया। उनके बयान हैं। एक में तो यहां तक कहा है कि हमने जो प्रस्ताव उनके सामने रखा, वह उन्हें ऐक्सेप्टेबल नहीं था और फिर उन्होंने हमें कुछ सुझाव दिए, आइडियाज दिए, जिसके बाद यह दूसरा प्रस्ताव बना है। इसका अर्थ यह है कि हम उनसे बार-बार मंजूरी ले रहे थे। हम बता रहे थे कि हम यह कर रहे हैं। यह क्या मामला है? अगर रैसिप्रॉकल है, पैरिटी है, तो वे अपना काम करते। वे यह तो बताते कि हम अपनी कांग्रेस में क्या रखना चाहते हैं, यह तो उन्होंने कभी बताया नहीं। हमको यह कहलवाया जा रहा है कि आप यह करिए, तब हम कांग्रेस में ऐसा करेंगे। तो यह रैसिप्रॉकल नहीं है, यह पैरिटी भी नहीं है। यह साफ इस बात को बताता है कि जैसा प्रोग्राम वे चाहते थे, जिस हद तक वे चाहते थे, उस हद तक आप गए। पहले आपने जो प्रस्ताव दिया, उस पर उन्होंने जवाब दे दिया कि यह बहुत कम है, हम इतना नहीं चाहते हैं, हम तो पूरा चाहते हैं। फिर उसमें से कहीं आपने समझौते का लैवल निकाल लिया, उसके क्या परिणाम हैं, वह भी मैं आगे बताऊंगा, लेकिन यह बहुत साफ है कि रैसिप्रॉसिटी नहीं है। इसमें हमने उनकी राय ही नहीं ली, बल्कि उनके सुझाव मांगे हैं और जहां तक वे हमको ले जाना चाहते हैं, वहां तक हम गए हैं क्योंकि उनके बयानात् हैं कि आज तक पिछले 30 साल में जो हम अमेरिकन नहीं करवा पाए, वह हमने करवा लिया। इसलिए, वे जहां हमें ले जाना चाहते थे, वहां हम पहुंच गए। हम उन्हें कहां ले जाना चाहते हैं, इस पर कोई ऐश्योरेंस नहीं है, क्योंकि मैं नहीं समझता कि यहां जो समझौते हुए हैं, वे आसानी से यूनाइटेड स्टेट्स की कांग्रेस में पास हो जाएंगे। आपने यह भी ऐश्योरेंस दिया था - All our commitments are reciprocal commitments. We will do nothing unless the United States honours its Commitment. हम कुछ नहीं करेंगे, जब तब कि वे अपना कमिटमेंट और अपने वायदे पूरे नहीं करेंगे। हम नहीं जानते कि उन्होंने कौन सा वायदा पूरा किया है? देश पूछना चाहता है कि कौन सा वायदा पूरा किया है और क्या वायदा ऐसा था जिसको कि हमारी तरफ से कदम उठाए बिना वे पूरा नहीं कर सकते थे? ये कुछ सवाल हैं जो आपके इस सारे प्रारूप से इकट्ठे होते हैं। फिर हम सॉवरेन डिटरमिनेशन कर रहे हैं। Separation will be decided voluntarily. यह कहा हुआ है? जो उन्होंने कहा, वह आपने माना है। होता तो यह कि आप अपना सेपरेशन प्रोग्राम करते और IAEA को बोल देते कि यह हमने कर लिया है। अमेरिकन प्रेजिडेंट के पास जाना है, अमेरिकन सरकार को दिखाना है, यह 18 तारीख के संयुक्त वक्तव्य में कहीं नहीं है। हम बाउंड नहीं थे इससे, हमारे ऊपर कोई प्रतिबंध नहीं था इस बात का, कोई हमारे ऊपर इस प्रकार की बंदिश नहीं थी कि हम अपना प्रोग्राम बनाएं और फिर उसे अमेरिकन सरकार को दिखाएं, प्रेजिडेंट को दिखाएं या उनके अधिकारियों को दिखाएं और जब पास हो जाए तो फिर उसको यहां रखें। हम अपना सेपरेशन प्लान करेंगे, फेसुड करेंगे, हम करते और उचित समय पर IAEA को दिखा देते कि यह हमने

कर लिया है, यह हमारा सिविलियन है, यह मिलिट्री है। इसमें अमेरिकन प्रेजिडेंट और अमेरिकन सरकार बीच में कहां से आ गई। वे अपना करते। अगर वे सिन्सियर हैं इस मामले में और इस मामले में वे दृढ़प्रतिज्ञ थे कि मामला ठीक होना चाहिए, तो वे भी कुछ हमें बताते कि हम यह कर रहे हैं, लेकिन उन्होंने तो कुछ बताया नहीं कि वे क्या कर रहे हैं। तो सॉवरेन डिटरमिनेशन भी इसमें नहीं हुआ।

फिर यू0एस0 एम्बेसेडर ने तो यहां तक कह दिया कि जो हमारा प्रोग्राम था, जो हमने पहले दिया था It failed to meet the US test of credibility and demanded that the great majority of nuclear sites be opened to international inspections. In February, India presented a second Separation Plan for the US approval and received US feedback on what additionally to declare civilian. As the US Security Advisory, Steel Hadley, admitted on February 24, in this latest brow round India has provided a document about a week ago. We provided some additional ideas and response.

यह अधिकृत बयान है। इसके बाद दो मार्च को बर्न्स ने फिर कहा, "India has finalised with the U.S. help, a very complex Separation Plan certified by Washington to be transparent and credible." The Prime Minister has now presented an apparent outline of this very complex separation. इस तरह इसमें रैसिप्रॉसिटी, पैरिटी, सॉवरेनिटी, ये सब कहां हैं? इसमें तो इसके एक भी सिद्धांत का पालन नहीं हुआ है। यहां पर तो सिर्फ यही एक बात समझ में आती है कि आप यह कह दें कि साहब अमेरिकन्स ने हमें कहा कि यह समझौता कर लो, तो हमने कर लिया। लेकिन एक तरफ यह कहना कि पैरिटी है, रैसिप्रॉसिटी है, सॉवरेनिटी है और दूसरी तरफ आपके समझौते की जो शब्दावली है और अमरीका के लोगों का जो बयान है, वह सर्वथा इसके विपरीत जाता है।

इसी तरह से फास्ट ब्रीडर रिएक्टर्स के लिए आपने 27 फरवरी को यह भी कहा था, "We have made it clear that we cannot accept safeguards on our indigenous Fast Breeder Programme." इसके तीन दिन के बाद ही आपने प्रैजिडेंट जॉर्ज बुश के साथ जो समझौता किया, उसमें आपने कहा, "We have agreed, however, that future civilian thermal power reactors and civilian fast breeder reactors would be placed under safeguards, but the determination of what is civilian is solely an Indian decision." लेकिन उसमें ब्रीडर तो नहीं आना था। बार-बार यह कहा जा रहा था कि उसमें ब्रीडर नहीं आएगा, लेकिन आप ब्रीडर को उसमें ले आए।

इंटरनेशनल इंस्पेक्शन्स की बात थी, उसके लिए आपने कहा था कि कोई डिस्क्रिमिनेशन नहीं होगा, लेकिन डिस्क्रिमिनेशन तो है क्योंकि वह अमरीका पर तो लागू नहीं हो रहा है, लेकिन हमारे ऊपर लागू हो रहा है। उन देशों को, जिन्हें न्यूक्लियर पावर स्टेट या न्यूक्लियर वेपन स्टेट माना जाता है, उन पर तो वह प्रतिबंध और इंस्पेक्शन के नॉर्म्स लागू नहीं हो रहे हैं, लेकिन हमारे ऊपर लागू हो रहे हैं। यह क्या बात है? इसमें वॉलंटरी कहां है? यह तो आप एक स्पेशल प्रोटोकॉल के माध्यम से उनसे नेगोशिएट करने के लिए खुद ही जा रहे हैं और वह जो एडीशनैलिटी होगी, वह इंडिया स्पेसिफिक होगी। इस तरह से इसमें वॉलंटरी कहां है?

जहां तक मुझे याद है, जहां पर सेफगाडर्स का यह एग्रीमेंट आई.ए.ई.ए. और अमरीका से होगा, उसमें आपने कहा, "because a safeguards agreement is yet to be negotiated, it will be difficult to predict its content." यह तो बहुत खतरनाक बात है। जहां पर इंडिया स्पेसिफिक प्रोटोकोल हो और उसके बारे में अभी हमें यह भी नहीं पता है कि क्या हो। मैं यह बात इसलिए कह रहा हूँ क्योंकि मुझे संदेह है कि अमरीका की तरफ से कंडीशन्स आ सकती हैं और वे कहेंगे कि नहीं आप प्रोटोकोल इस तरह से करिए।

मैंने इकोनॉमिस्ट अखबार को देखा, उसने तो यूएस कांग्रेस से यहां तक कहा कि इस डील को खत्म करो। "They have asked the U.S. Congress to kill this deal." फिर मैंने न्यूयॉर्क टाइम्स को देखा, उसके एक कॉलमिस्ट हैं, जिनका नाम है टॉमस फ्रिडमैन, बहुत ही इन्फ्लुएण्शियल कॉलमिस्ट हैं, उन्होंने ओपनली यह कहा है कि यह डील ठीक नहीं है, इसे बंद करो। इसी तरह से उनके न्यूक्लियर एक्सपर्ट्स हैं - सिडनी कॉन, जॉर्ज परकोविस्क एंड माइकल क्रेपिन, उन्होंने भी यह कहा है कि यह डील ठीक नहीं है और बुश साहब की इस बात को न माना जाए।

इसके बाद यह भी कहा जा रहा है कि अगर हिन्दुस्तान को यहां तक पहुंचाना है और उसे आप क्लाइंट स्टेट्स और न्यूक्लियर वैन स्टेट्स के बीच में कहीं पर रखना चाहते हैं तो आप, "Make Fissile Material Cut-off the precondition to India joining the nuclear deal." यह तो हमारी इस डील को भी खत्म कर देगा और हमारे कार्यक्रम को भी खत्म कर देगा। इस तरह से ये सब बातें आज अमरीका के अन्दर हो रही हैं, दुनिया इसे इस तरह से देख रही है।

ऑस्ट्रेलिया के प्राइम मिनिस्टर आए थे, वह हमें यहां तक कह गए कि अभी हम आपको ईंधन देने के लिए तैयार नहीं हैं, हम आपसे बाद में बात करेंगे। इस तरह से पूरे समझौते के बाद यह परिस्थिति सामने आती है।

इसके बाद आप कहते हैं कि हमें एनर्जी की बहुत आवश्यकता थी, 8-10 परसेंट ग्रोथ के लिए हमें क्लीन एनर्जी चाहिए। इसमें कोई एतराज की बात नहीं है, एनर्जी तो हमें जरूर चाहिए। ऊर्जा के बिना ग्रोथ नहीं हो सकती है, लेकिन उसके लिए एनर्जी की सेक्योरिटी तो अपने हाथ में होनी चाहिए। एनर्जी वह कुंजी है, जिससे समृद्धि का दरवाजा खुलता है, लेकिन ताला लगा कर चाबी हम किसी दूसरे के हाथ में दे दें, यह बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आती है। एक तरफ तो आप वहां से एक्स्पेंसिव न्यूक्लियर रिएक्टर्स इम्पोर्ट करें, उनका आयात करें और फिर फ्यूल भी उन्हीं से लें, यह एक अजीब बात है। आप अपना इंडिजिनस प्रोग्राम चालू न करें, उसे विकास की तरफ न लेकर जाएं, अपने यहां पर जो यूरेनियम की माइन्स हैं, उन्हें डेवलप न करें और फिर वहां पर उनका डेवलपमेंट होने से क्यों रुका हुआ है, उन कारणों की मीमांसा भी न करें और विदेश से आयातित रिएक्टर्स को पहले मंगाएं। पहले तो हमें देखना पड़ेगा कि कौन इसे बना रहा है, क्या चीज है, कितनी मात्रा में बनी हुई है, फिर, सिर्फ अमरीका इसे बना रहा है या उसके अन्य मित्र देश भी इसे बना रहे हैं, इस तरह से आप पहले तो वहां से हाइ प्राइस्ड रिएक्टर्स इम्पोर्ट करें, उसके बाद आप उसके लिए विदेशों से ही एनरिचड यूरेनियम लाएं और फिर उसके बाद हम यह कहें कि अब हमारे लिए ऊर्जा की सेक्योरिटी हो गई, यह बात तो मेरी समझ में नहीं आती। आज भी ऊर्जा के मामले में हम दूसरों पर डिपेंडेंट हैं।

हम अपना बाहर से हाइड्रो कार्बन मंगा रहे हैं, हम उसके अंदर सेल्फ सफिसिएंट नहीं हैं। लेकिन यह बजाए इंडिपेंडेंट होने के एक और नई डिपेंडेंसी हम अपने पर लाद रहे हैं, यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता। अच्छा यह होता कि इस मामले में अगर प्रधान मंत्री जी, हमारे देश के वैज्ञानिकों को, उद्योगपतियों को और देश की सारी राजनीतिक पार्टियों को बुलाते और मैं उनसे विनम्र आग्रह करना चाहता हूँ कि देश के लिए एक ऐसी ऊर्जा नीति बनवाइए, जो ऊर्जा के मामले में, एनर्जी की सिक्योरिटी के मामले में ही नहीं, एनर्जी इंडिपेंडेंस के मामले में देश को आगे ले जाए, हो सकता है उसमें दस साल लगें, पन्द्रह साल लगें। हमसे चूक हो गई कि हमने इस देश के लिए जहाँ उद्योग की और समृद्धि की रफ्तार तो तय की लेकिन हमने उसकी जो मुख्य कुंजी है, जो इसका सबसे बड़ा कारक है, कम्पोंनेंट है -एनर्जी, उसके बारे में कोई ध्यान नहीं दिया। ऐसा समझा जाता है कि जैसे एनर्जी हिन्दुस्तान में है ही नहीं भारत में सोलर एनर्जी है, बॉयो एनर्जी है, विंड एनर्जी है, लेकिन अगर हम सिर्फ हाइड्रो कार्बन एनर्जी के ऊपर ही डिपेंड करें और वह भी बाहर से आने में, तो यह हमारी ऊर्जा के लिए संकट पैदा करेगा। ऊर्जा के लिए हमें पूरे तौर पर स्वाधीन होना चाहिए। मैं उन लोगों में से हूँ जो यह मानते हैं और जब पहले भी बहस होती थी, तो मैंने हमेशा यही कहा है कि एनर्जी सिक्योरिटी, यह सारी सिक्योरिटी के मंत्रों में से सबसे प्रमुख मंत्र आज की दुनिया में है। यह तो आप एनर्जी की डिपेंडेंसी कर रहे हैं, यह एनर्जी की सिक्योरिटी नहीं है, यह कॉस्टली है तथा दूसरों पर निर्भर है। इसलिए मेरा आपसे अनुरोध है कि आप एनर्जी पौलिसी के बारे में सारे देश के साथ विचार करें और सारी राजनीतिक पार्टियों को इस मामले में एक नीति बनानी होगी, क्योंकि यह प्रश्न देश के भविष्य से जुड़ा हुआ है। साथ ही साथ हमारी सामरिक सिक्योरिटी -स्ट्रेटेजिक सिक्योरिटी, इससे प्रतिबंधित हो रही है। आपने सारा प्रोग्राम -दो तिहाई उनके हाथ में रख दिया, एक तिहाई अब हमारी कैपेसिटी रह गई है न्यूक्लियर वेपंस प्रोग्राम के लिए। इसलिए इसको भी देखना चाहिए कि हम किधर जा रहे हैं। हमारे ऊपर कैप लग गया है, हमारा कार्यक्रम ठक दिया गया है। इसको गहराई से सोचना चाहिए। आपने एक समझौता कर लिया और उसमें पता नहीं आपने एक्जिट क्लॉज क्या रखी है, क्या नहीं, मैं नहीं जानता, लेकिन ये खतरनाक चीजें इसमें हुई हैं, जिसकी तरफ सारे देश को गंभीरता से विचार करना है और ऊर्जा की स्वाधीनता के लिए, स्वतंत्रता के लिए प्रधान मंत्री जी, अगर आप एक कम्प्रेहेंसिव नीति लाएंगे, मैं उसका समर्थन करूंगा, लेकिन वह ऊर्जा को, देश की ऊर्जा को देश के हाथ में रखने की बात होनी चाहिए, ऊर्जा दूसरे के हाथ में गई तो आप कभी स्वाधीन नहीं रह सकते। वह आप अपने लिए गुलामी का रास्ता खोलते हैं, पिछलग्गू बनने का रास्ता खोलते हैं। आज कोई आपको गुलाम नहीं कहेगा, पर आपको क्लाइंट स्टेट कहेगा, लेकिन स्वाधीनता खतरे में पड़ जाएगी। Independence of energy is the main and the foremost component for security and independence of the country.

साइरस आपने बंद कर दिया, पता नहीं क्यों बंद कर दिया। फिर कहते हैं कि साइरस और यह अप्सरा तो जब यह आई०ए०ई०ए० नहीं थी और एन०पी०टी० भी नहीं थी उस समय से काम कर रही है और इसको बंद करके आपने यह साबित कर दिया कि जैसे कि हमारा अमी तक 1974 का भी जो विस्फोट था, वह भी It was born out of sin. हम कुछ वॉयलेशन कर रहे थे, इस वजह से वह हुआ, जी, नहीं। वह तो दोनों के दोनों प्लॉट बहुत पुराने थे। आई०ए०ई०ए० बनी भी नहीं थी तब तक एन०पी०टी० का वजूद नहीं था, तब से साइरस और अप्सरा चल रही है। इसको समाप्त करना या इसको इस ढंग से रोकना इसका

एक मैसेज यह गया है, मुझे जो कई वैज्ञानिक मिले हैं, उनका यह कहना है कि यह तो ऐसा लगता है कि जैसे कि हमने कोई अपराध किया हो। नहीं, मैं ऐसा समझता हूँ कि अपराध नहीं किया है। यह जरूरी था कि वे इस प्रोग्राम को चलाते और वैज्ञानिकों की बुद्धि को आप दाद दीजिए कि तमाम प्रतिबंधों के बावजूद वे 74 और 98 में पहुंच गए और उन्होंने देश को इतना शक्तिशाली बना दिया। अब आप आज उनके किए कराए पर पानी फेर रहे हैं, यह मैं समझता हूँ कि यह बहुत अच्छा नहीं हुआ, इस समझौते के अंदर।

अन्त में, जो आपने फूड के बारे में बातें की हैं, जो प्रोग्राम लांच किया है, उस पर मुझे बहुत चिंता है और इसलिए चिंता है कि आपने कहा है कि सेकेंड ग्रीन रिवोल्यूशन की जरूरत है। हो सकता है थर्ड की भी जरूरत पड़े, आखिर देश को खाद्यान्नों में आत्मनिर्भर होना ही है और आत्मनिर्भर ही नहीं होना है बल्कि हमें एक्सपोर्ट करने की तरफ बढ़ना चाहिए, इसमें कोई दिक्कत की बात नहीं है। पहलो जो ग्रीन रिवोल्यूशन हुआ था, वह पब्लिक डॉमेन में था। उसमें जो कुछ रिसर्च होती थी, हमारी अपनी संस्थाओं में रिसर्च होती थी। उसको जो कुछ लाभ था वह सीधे किसान को लाभ था, उसमें बिचौलिया नहीं था। हमारे विश्व विद्यालय थे, हमारे कृषि विज्ञान केन्द्र थे, उन्होंने उस तमाम जानकारी को नीचे तक पहुंचाया और उसमें किसी प्रकार की किसी आर्थिक बड़ी शक्ति की, मोनोपॉली की कोई कहीं पर दखलंदाजी नहीं थी।

वह कार्यक्रम चला, उसमें कमियां हैं या अच्छाइयां हैं, वह एक अलग बात है। कार्यक्रम को और सुधारा जा सकता था या नहीं, उस पर बहस हो सकती है, लेकिन वह जो कुछ किया जा रहा था, वह राज्यों की तरफ से किया जा रहा था और हमारे देश की वैज्ञानिक संस्थाओं की तरफ से किया जा रहा था। धीरे से पहुंचा होगा, कहीं कम पहुंचा होगा, ये सब बातें मैं मान सकता हूँ, लेकिन वह हमारे अधिकार में था। उससे हमारे किसान के हित सुरक्षित थे और हमारे जो वैज्ञानिक थे, वह उनके परिश्रम और खोज की देन थे। आज आप क्या करने जा रहे हैं? यह तो privately-owned technology की तरफ आप जा रहे हैं। आपने Monsanto और Syngenta, Bayer, DuPont, Goh, BSF Plant Sciences इन सबको इसमें शामिल कर लिया है और खासतौर पर Monsanto और Wal-mart यह तो उसके बोर्ड में रख दिये हैं। इसके बारे में मुझे बहुत चिंता हो रही है। ये क्या करेंगे? ये जो genetic food है, जो genetically-modified food है, वह इस देश में लायेंगे, जो उनके बीज हैं, वे इस देश में लायेंगे और ये बीज जब पेटेंट क्लॉज के मुताबिक आप नॉलेज सोसायटी की भी बात यहां कर रहे हैं, वह जिन पेटेंट कानूनों से प्रभावित होती हैं, उसमें हमारे किसान के लिए भारी खतरा है। वह एक बार बीज लेगा, दोबारा वह उससे काम नहीं कर सकता। अब तो terminator seeds भी आ गये हैं, जिनको sterile बीज कहते हैं, उसके बाद वह काम नहीं कर पायेगा, एक फसल पर छुट्टी, फिर खरीदो, फिर रायल्टी दो, फिर पैसा दो, महंगे बीज हैं। मैंने देखा था, जो बीटी कॉटन का बैग था, जो लोकल हमारे यहां पैदा होता है, उसमें 300 से 400 रुपये यदि दाम है सुपीरियर वैरायटी का, तो एक बैग जो Mahyco और Monsanto से बनता है, मिलता है वह 1885 रुपये में है। यह फर्क क्यों? छह गुणा है। हमारे देश के किसान के लिए यह कठिनाइयां पैदा करेगा। फिर थोड़ा सा भी सुधार हो जाने से, क्योंकि वह पुराना पेटेंट जो है नये पेटेंट के रूप में बदला जा सकता है। आजकल तो बहुत नई टेक्नालाजीज हैं, इसको करने में कोई दिक्कत नहीं होती है। यह किसान के लिए भारी खतरा है और यह जो Wal-mart और Monsanto आ गये हैं, ये तो अपने यहां एग्रीकल्चरल मार्केट में घुस गये हैं और रिटेलिंग करेंगे

एग्रीकल्चर को, हमारे एग्रीकल्चरल मार्केट के लिए भी खतरा है। आप तो पंजाब के निवासी हैं। पंजाब के किसानों की तरफ भी सोचिये कि उनकी क्या हालत होगी? मेरा अनुरोध है कि आप हिन्दुस्तान के किसानों की तरफ सोचिये। इस प्रोजेक्ट में तीन सौ, चार सौ करोड़ रुपये दिये जायेंगे। मैं जानता हूँ कि जब रिसर्च के अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय प्रोजेक्ट होते हैं, तो आने-जाने में और सम्मेलनों में ज्यादा खर्चा होता है। हमें उससे क्या मिलेगा? अगर हमारी एनर्जी सेक्योरिटी के साथ-साथ फूड सेक्योरिटी भी चली गई तब क्या होगा? अगर हम बीज के मामले में भी दूसरों पर निर्भर हो गये, एग्रीकल्चरल टेक्नालाजी के बारे में भी दूसरों पर निर्भर हो गये, तो न्यू क्लियर टेक्नालाजी का तो जो कुछ हथ्र होगा सो होगा, लेकिन इसका हथ्र तो सीधा-सीधा होगा कि हिन्दुस्तान की फूड सेक्योरिटी बहुत खतरे में पड़ेगी। फूड सेक्योरिटी उतनी ही इम्पोर्टेंट है जितनी की स्ट्रेटिजिक सेक्योरिटी। मैं बहुत विनम्रता से कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह फूड सेक्योरिटी और एनर्जी सेक्योरिटी और हमारी नाभकीय सामरिक शक्ति इन तीनों को प्रतिबंधित किया जा रहा है, तीनों पर आघात है और यह देश के भविष्य के लिए अच्छा संकेत नहीं है। मैं अनुरोध करूंगा कि आप इस मामले में, सारे देश का पहले समाधान करें कि जो कुछ किया जा रहा है, उसमें से ऐसा कुछ नहीं होगा और अगर उसमें ये खतरे हैं, तो अभी भी समय है, हम इसका सुधार कर सकते हैं, इसमें संशोधन ला सकते हैं और यह कह सकते हैं कि अगर अमेरिका के लोगों को इसे अपनी कांग्रेस से पास करवाना है, तो हमें भी अपने देश और अपनी संसद से इसको पास करवाना है, हमें भी एक पॉलिटिकल कन्सेन्सस चाहिए, हमें भी एक राजनैतिक दृष्टि से आम सहमति चाहिए, वह आप पैदा करें और उस हद तक जायें, जिस हद तक केवल, जैसे वह कहते हैं कि हमें अपने यहां एक आम सहमति चाहिए, हमें कांग्रेस की सहमति चाहिए, आप भी इस तरह से कह सकते हैं। इस तरह से जो कुछ इसमें खामियां हैं, उनको दूर करने की चेष्टा की जा सकती है। बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद।

DR. KARAN SINGH (NCT of Delhi): Mr. Chairman, Sir, we are discussing the two statements, significant statements, made by the hon. Prime Minister on the 27th of February and 7th of March in this hon. House.

Sir, the Civil Nuclear Energy Cooperation with the United States is, indeed, a landmark Agreement. Both the Prime Minister and President Bush have called it 'historic'. That is not a word that can be easily bandied about, but I do feel that, in retrospect, it will turn out that this Agreement does mark a very significant turning point in our growing stature as a global player. It involves self-confidence in the rapidly developing world scene.

Although many doubts and fears were expressed before the Agreement was signed, after the details have become public a general consensus has emerged. Despite Dr. Murli Manoharji's somewhat negative and defeatist remarks, I would like to say that a general consensus has emerged that India has not only fully safeguarded its national interests, but has, in fact, got a rather good deal.

Sir, I shall not go into the technical aspects and details, which are rather complex. Perhaps Dr. Kasturirangan is the only person in this House

who could really deal with the high-level technology that is involved. But, I would like to make five major points regarding this Agreement, which, I may add, was entered into after very careful consideration, after full consultation with the scientific community and after hard negotiations. As you know very well, whenever a major agreement is to be entered into, there is always a process of negotiation, of give and take, and it was only after that that this Agreement has emerged.

Sir, there are these five points that I would like to briefly put before the House. The first and most significant point is that our present and future security needs are fully safeguarded. This was the great fear, as to whether with this Agreement we would be compromising with our national security. That has certainly not occurred. In fact, we have ensured that our military and defence needs are going to be fully met in perpetuity. We live in a dangerous environment, with nuclear-armed neighbours. Of course, we want friendly relations with them, but nonetheless we have got to maintain our security. Our nuclear doctrine is very clear, 'no first strike, but minimum nuclear deterrent', in other words, the capacity to inflict unacceptable damage on any potential aggressor.

Sir, in this Agreement, eight thermal reactors have been kept out of the civilian safeguards and so have the fast breeding reactors. So, it is quite clear that we have, and will always have, enough fissionable material for our military needs. We are not a proliferating country. We have an impeccable record. It is not our intention to go on stockpiling nuclear weapons, but what we need for our defence requirements has been fully safeguarded. In fact, this reminds me of the six-nation- five-continent initiative for nuclear non-proliferation that the late Shri Rajiv Gandhi had put before the world. Unfortunately, it did not receive the attention it deserved, otherwise, the situation may have been different. But, the situation today is that we need enough material for our defence needs and this has been fully ensured in this Agreement. Let there be no doubt about this. Our military and scientific experts are clear that the thermal reactors that are outside the safeguards are more than adequate to meet our defence needs, either today or in the future.

Sir, we did not sign the NPT; I remember, Shrimati Indira Gandhi called it 'highly discriminatory'. But despite that, and despite what Joshi has said, it is clear that for all practical purposes, we have accepted the NPT, we have not proliferated. And, therefore, that acceptance, the stability of our politics and the democracy that we have, has made India a unique

case. जोशी जी, आपने कहा कि हम न यहां हैं, न वहां हैं। हम वाकई न यहां हैं, न वहां हैं, हम भारतवर्ष हैं। India is unique. India doesn't have to be put into any particular category. The whole contours of our economic development, our impeccable record, our scientific abilities and our technological prowess, put India in a unique, stand-alone situation. And, therefore, this question of whether we are included in this category or that category, frankly, is not relevant. That is the first point I would like to make, Sir, our security requirements are fully met.

The second point that was raised revolves around energy. Today, we are facing a major energy crunch. Our economy is growing rapidly and continues to accelerate. Sir, Joshiji talked about energy independence. Are we independent today? We are miserably dependent, woefully dependent, upon importing vast quantities of oil.

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: I agree and I said that this dependence should be removed as quickly as possible.

DR. KARAN SINGH: On OPEC countries' oil prices, we have no control. They keep spiralling. Our bill keeps going up. God forbids something happens tomorrow in Iran, the prices will go through the roof. Therefore, we have got to develop alternative sources of energy. We have fossil fuels, there is no doubt about it. But our fossil fuels have a very high ash content and are highly polluting. As you know, the Co₂ levels are going up; the global warming is proceeding apace; glaciers are receding and so on. Therefore, we need additional sources of energy, and nuclear power represents such an additional source in the long run which is non-polluting except, of course, for the management of nuclear wastes for which our fast breeder approach is a good step. Sir, in France, over 75 per cent of its power comes from nuclear energy. Our percentage today is hardly two per cent.

Therefore, what we require as an alternative source, additional source of energy, is a steady and uninterrupted supply of fissionable material for civilian use, and that has been ensured in this Agreement. The fresh India-specific agreement, which will be negotiated with International Atomic Energy Agency, will also confirm this. I submit, Sir, that this is a major step in meeting our energy requirements in the long run. We need a mix certainly - we need oil; we need solar energy; we need wind energy; we need bio-gas, but also nuclear energy and it has been proved in many European countries that nuclear energy can become a major source in the

long run. Therefore, this is a major breakthrough in our energy mix and is something that should be welcomed. That is the second point.

Sir, the third is that we are proud of the achievements of our scientists. Some of them have been represented in the House. They have done extraordinarily well. But our nuclear scientists were functioning under severe disabilities imposed by the Nuclear Suppliers' Group. This agreement will break that barrier and will help our scientific community to maximise its activities. This is a point that needs to be made. Far from capping our abilities, this will open up new vistas for our scientists, and our scientists are second to none in the world. But there was this cartel, the Nuclear Suppliers' Group which held us in its grip and this Agreement has broken that cartel and has ensured that the latest scientific technology and nuclear technology will be available to us. And not only nuclear technology, there is clean coal technology which is being talked of. We are having a High Technology Co-operation Group. There is co-operation in space exploration for peaceful purposes. There are possibilities of MoUs between ISRO and NASA. The third point is that this Agreement represents a major technological and scientific breakthrough. The first point is our national security. The second point is alternative sources of energy. The third point is that from the scientific and technological point of view, we seemed to be hemmed in; we have broken out of that, and, therefore, it will enable our scientists to really develop their prowess, their abilities, to the utmost extent.

Sir, the fourth point I would like to mention is one that Joshiji mentioned but in a somewhat negative way, and that is the second green revolution. Sir, in our lifetimes, we have seen the first Green Revolution. That was 30-35 years ago. It was an astounding event. We remember the days when Indian ships used to go virtually with begging bowls around the world to get wheat and rice. And today we have become more or less self-sufficient in foodgrains, thanks to our *kisans* and to our farmers. In 30 years, there has been a tremendous technology leap. We cannot simply live on the technology that is outmoded and outdated. Therefore, with the growing population, which is now over a billion, we do need a second Green Revolution. We need it in agriculture; we need it in horticulture; we need it in floriculture; and the knowledge initiative on agriculture and the promotion of agricultural bilateral trade will pave the way for a new flowering of our agricultural system.

I am sorry I cannot appreciate the defeatist attitude of my esteemed friend, Shri Murli Manohar Joshi where he says that our scientists will also collapse as a result of this agreement or kisans will also collapse. It is not true, Sir. On the contrary, we are getting into a new level of technology, and, certainly safeguarding our farmers, their interests and our agricultural interest will be the top priority of our Government. No Government can compromise on that. But I would suggest that the Knowledge Initiative on Agriculture is now essential because with the rate of population, unfortunately, still almost at two per cent per annum, we are adding one Australia every year to our population. So, unless there is a quantum leap in our agricultural production, we will not be able to meet our requirements. Sir, that is the fourth major point I would like to make.

Sir, my fifth point is that in addition to this particular agreement, there were several other initiatives. There was the CEOs forum. I know some friends are a little uneasy about that. The way the world markets are developing -- our CEOs, I am sure, are as patriotic as any other -- I am sure, as a result of these initiatives, there will be a substantial increase in trade and commerce with the United States and the rest of the world, and, hence, that will boost our economy.

There has been a Financial and Economic Forum, there is a Trade Policy Forum, there is a Disaster Relief Initiative, there is a HIV-AIDS Initiative, there is a Coalition Against Wildlife Trafficking, and, there is a Joint Working Group on Counter-terrorism. There are a number of other agreements, apart from the Civilian Nuclear Agreement, which have been part of this package that has been entered into after very close and careful negotiations between India and the United States, and, finally, as a result of the personal initiative of the Prime Minister Dr. Manmohan Singh and of President Bush.

So, I must say, Sir, that the totality of President Bush's visit to India has been remarkably positive. Let us not look at the whole thing through the prism of Iraq. None of us is happy with the American policy on Iraq. We made it very clear right from the beginning and we opposed the invasion of Iraq. But everything has not to be looked at through that particular prism. This is a stand alone agreement. This is an agreement between two great civilisations, two great nations and two great powers. You don't have to be in the Security Council to be a great power. India has always been a great power, a great civilisation. We must not lack the

self-confidence to enter boldly into agreements that will place ourselves in a new position *vis-a-vis* the emerging global society. And, Sir, what the Prime Minister and President have done is that they have walked that extra mile to put our bilateral relations on a new trajectory.

It is true that President Bush is under strong attack in his own country from the economists. *The Economist* wrote what I can only call a venomous editorial on this issue. Other people have attacked him because they say that he has given away too much to India. There are some Congressmen including Mr. Strobe Talbott, a good friend of the Leader of the Opposition, who are apparently opposing this agreement. But, now, it is the responsibility of President Bush -- he has put his prestige on the line -- to get this through Congress and to get Congress to change the laws. Mr. Chairman, Sir, the reciprocity involved is that America has to change its laws in order to honour this agreement. If we were asked to change our laws, we might find it difficult. They have to change their laws and that is what President Bush has said that he would do.

And, therefore, It is clear that when you have an agreement of this nature, we have our part of the agreement, they have their part of the agreement, and, it is only when this agreement goes through Congress that the agreement will be complete. That is very clear. So, the reciprocity does not have to be on each particular issue or on each particular reactor. It is the overall reciprocity of this agreement between two great nations.

Sir, the leaders of our Freedom Movement and of free India, especially, Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru, envisioned for India a radiant future. Now, the situation is changing; the world situation is never static. And, in the light of the new emerging global realities, we have got to respond creatively. We must have the confidence to be able to respond in a positive fashion, always safeguarding our sovereignty, our national interest, and our freedom of decision in the years ahead. Sir, I would simply urge, and I will even urge those who may be somewhat negative about the agreement, to realise that this, in fact, represents a major breakthrough in India's rise to a due stature in the Comity of Nations. And, I would like to congratulate the Prime Minister and his team for the sustained efforts that they have put in to get this agreement, and also congratulate our Party President for the bold and self-confident leadership that has resulted in this landmark agreement. Thank you, Sir.

2.00 P.M.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU (West Bengal): Sir, at the outset, I do not know how I am going to respond to this debate because this is perhaps my last major intervention in a debate in this House. And, such high standards have been set by Dr. Murli Manohar Joshi and then adequately followed up by Dr. Karan Singh, who have been, to me, great sources of inspiration in whatever I have learnt in my parliamentary life. Sir, it is also very fortuitous for me that we are debating today and I am having the opportunity to speak on a subject whose import is so momentous for the future of this country that you can say that this is a make-or-break debate for the entire future of this great country. Therefore, Sir, I think, there will be passion, no doubt. But, at the end of the day, we should come out of this debate with some kind of a unanimity and some kind of a consensus, because this is a debate about, I quote the Prime Minister, "enlightened national interests", and if this House does not represent 'enlightened national interests', who will? Therefore, my fervent appeal to the hon. Prime Minister, through you, Sir, is that there will be issues on which there will be contention, there will be difference and there will be disagreement, but, at the end of the day, if there is a visible and sincere effort on the part of the Government to evolve a consensus on these vital issues, I think, we can really secure our 'enlightened national interests' which will emerge with our popular interest, the interest of our billion plus people. Sir, on 7th of March, when the Prime Minister placed this statement on the floor of the House, we have pointed out that the discussion that we are going to have on this goes much beyond the nitty-gritty of the nuclear agreement. I will come to that also. But, the nature of the statement, together with the separation plan and the Joint Indo-US Statement, which was also placed on the floor of the House, actually describe a new contour, a new paradigm, in terms of our relationship with the United States. And, in a way, they influence very fundamentals to where India stands *vis-a-vis* the contemporary world.

Therefore, I think this whole question of the Agreement on Civilian Nuclear Energy Cooperation cannot be discussed in isolation with the far larger and wider ramifications that this entire set of documents has thrown up. Sir, immediately after the hon. Prime Minister spoke, I had the good fortune of getting an opportunity from the Chair to raise this question. And we said that it would be better had those documents -- regarding other aspects of the relationship with the United States which have been described in the Joint Statement -- also been made available to us. Maybe

we do not have signed agreements on them. For example, this CEO Forum. My very dear and respected colleague, Dr. Karan Singhji, has just spoken.

Now, the point is not whether it is good or bad, but whether Parliament will have a role to play. Nobody knows what is this 24-point Action Plan. Today, we see in the newspapers that the Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission has already announced that there will be 24 Working Groups to work out the specific details of actualising and putting into action each of these recommendations which has been made by the Indo-U.S. Forum. Is it correct? When we have started a momentous journey, is it correct to keep Parliament in the dark? If it is correct not to take the Parliament into confidence while finalising this, because, I think, this journey is very crucial. We will go nowhere unless we have some degree of national consensus in this House and in the other House on this question. Sir, the question is of propriety. Therefore, even at the risk of earning displeasure from my very good friend, Shri Suresh Pachouriji, the Parliamentary Affairs Minister, I raised this question and maybe I was a little bit acrimonious also.

Sir, as I spoke the other day in the farewell programme, I will keep reminded of the basic job that we, Parliament as an institution, have to do, that is, to force accountability of the Government, and to try and forge a national consensus on issues of national importance. The strength of India is in the open society that we have; the strength of India is in the unity that we have in our diversity, not only in physical terms but in terms of our thought process also. Sir, therefore, I think we would be much benefited had we been given all those documents, which are unfortunately not with us.

Sir, let me start with the Joint Statement itself. Dr. Karan Singhji has urged all of us not to see the world through Iraq prism. Sir, I quote from the Joint Statement what we will jointly do with the U.S. The sub-heading is "Deepening Democracy and Meeting International Challenges."

"(1) Recalled their joint launch of the UN Democracy Fund in September 2005 and offered the experience and expertise of both Governments for capacity building, training and exchanges to third countries that request such assistance to strengthen democratic institutions."

"(2) Welcomed the decision of India and the United States to designate a representative to the Government Advisory Board of the

International Centre for Democratic Transition (ICDT) located in Budapest to facilitate cooperative activities with ICDT."

Sir, I think, in the international politics today, everybody is aware what this International Institute is all about. We know who runs it. The Central Intelligence Agency is an entity of which we, in India, are very well aware. I think the leader of the party, to which the present Prime Minister belongs, Mrs. Gandhi spoke many a time about the role of the CIA. It is well documented.

I am talking about Indira Gandhi. What role has the CIA played in the entire process of attempt at balkanisation of India in North-East? In many other ways, they have tried to really disrupt democratic processes in different parts of the world. So, people are in the knowledge of what this institute is all about.

Now, Sir, what kind of democracy, freedom and values we share with the United States? The other day, the hon. Prime Minister was very kind enough to categorically say that our country does not agree to efforts at regime change. But, Sir, what kind of freedom, democracy the US is spreading throughout the world? President Bush used our soil, Purana Quila, to tell the whole world that we are for regime change in Iraq, Cuba, Syria, Zimbabwe and Venezuela. Now, do we share those lines? This is something more fundamental. Then, Sir, what are we celebrating about this Democracy Fund? Condoleezza Rice says to the whole world openly, "We will spend 85,000 million dollars to effect a regime change in Iraq." What do we share jointly with the American Government on this question? The Prime Minister must explain to us. I don't know. Then, the question of agriculture. Now, I think, I must thank Dr. Joshi because he has more effectively articulated the statement of the CPI (M) Polit Bureau on this question. ...*(Interruptions)*...

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: I am thankful to CPI (M) Polit Bureau.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: You deserve my appreciations, Sir. ...*(Interruptions)*... I could not have articulated ...*(Interruptions)*...

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: This saffronisation of CPI (M) Polit Bureau is highly. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Sir, we are very happy. What I am saying is, I am not repeating those points because you have articulated more effectively than perhaps I could have. ...*(Interruptions)*... Sir, the question is, we, the Communists, are not fools. We know that in this age of

scientific and technological revolution unless there is international cooperation, we can't go ahead. Sir, today no single scientist gets the Nobel Prize. It is usually a collective and joint effort on the same subject; hundreds of laboratories work jointly. But the question is: Who will control technology? That is a question which is defined by political power balance. Sir, Dr. Karan Singh was saying that all sounds very sweet in the ear. But, Sir, at the same time, practically when we are going to the WTO meetings, what is our position on agriculture, what is our position on IPRs, why do we say that developed countries are controlling technology and using it to the disadvantage of developing countries, why do we complain that our farmers can compete with the farmers of Europe and North America as it is, but for the heavy subsidy that these Governments are providing to their farmers that we cannot grow. So, Sir, I think, we cannot just buttress the point that has been made by the Prime Minister in his statement. We cannot distort the reality that the world today presents. It is a very vital question that how the research agenda will be set by all these multinationals, as has been stated by Dr. Joshi. Now, earlier, in the Green Revolution technology, the entire emphasis was on how to extend those new technologies to common farmers because the entire research was in the public domain. And today, country after country, Asia, Africa, Latin America -- why are there political changes? Because these Monsantos, these GAO Chemicals, these BSEs, these Wallmarts, they have been looting those countries, and after this kind of a policy is being pursued there, there is a backlash of the people, and you see the Governments changing, political changes taking place in the backyard of the United States. Therefore, I think, these are very serious issues. I do not want to question the competence of the Prime Minister or his Government. But, at the same time, it is not an issue which can be decided by the Government alone. These are issues where there has to be a sufficient public debate and discourse, and some kind of a national consensus has to emerge because, our position in the WTO on all these questions, the question of the kind of agreement that we had, and the kind of governing body that we have created, are at odds with each other. This has to be understood.

Sir, I must clearly demarcate from Dr. Murli Monohar Joshi, the strategic question of the stockpiling that he has raised. Sir, the issue is not that. My problem with the Prime Minister's statement is elsewhere on this nuclear question. Sir, we have heard of a new terminology that has been used by the hon. Prime Minister in his statement on 27th February, 2006 on

the eve of this Agreement with President Bush, where he has stated "in 2nd paragraph, and I quote. "The joint statement offered the possibility of decades-old restrictions being set aside, to create space for India's emergence as a full member of a new nuclear world order." What is this new nuclear world order? I do not understand because, so far, the nuclear discourse that was going on in the world, there were people who were arguing from the standpoint of non-proliferation. India was fundamentally opposed to them, talking about global nuclear disarmament. And again, Sir, I refer back to hon. Rajiv Gandhi, the illustrious predecessor of the present Prime Minister. Now, Sir, what was the problem with that global nuclear order? Essentially, that the world was divided into nuclear haves and nuclear havenots, and it is discriminatory regime, where the nuclear haves will dominate, will dictate the pace of development. Sir, I do not think the hon. Prime Minister has tried to suggest through this reference that by co-option of India in this exclusive nuclear club, the discriminatory nature of the global nuclear regime has been reversed. Sir, we are staking our claim for the membership of the United Nations' Security Council. What is our plank? Our plank is that we are a strongly emerging developing country. But, we are a country, which is more capable than anybody else to represent the interests of the 100-plus developing countries of the world today. We add to their strength, we add to their voice. Now, you tell me, Sir, if we have such a stake, if we have such a claim, will our being co-opted in the nuclear club and our legitimising that nuclear club, endear us favourably to these 100-plus developing countries of the world? Nowhere, do we find that regardless of the fact that he is so eloquent, so perfect words he chooses, especially when hemmed in by opponent forces, now when we have broken loose, we cannot stop here, our ultimate journey, our ultimate destination, is to have a nuclear free world.

There is no mention of that. However, the newly acquired status will be used to protect the monopoly of nuclear haves. You don't refer to that.

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH: I have made that quite clear. Our destination is a nuclear weapon free world, and that I have made in my statement of July 29 itself, if you read it.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Sir, that is precisely the ground for my confusion. That concern, somehow, does not get captured in the formulation of new Nuclear World Order. That is precisely our point. Therefore, Sir, the question is that India will have a nuclear doctrine, that

India will have a minimum deterrent; that is okay. Individually, India may also be coming out of the immediate question of discrimination. But we believe that no nuclear war can be fought like this. What I mean is we fundamentally differ with Dr. Joshi. I had a discussion with Dr. Manmohan Singh on this. For constraint of time, I do not quote the debate that we had in this House immediately after Pokhran-II. We fundamentally differ that a nuclear deterrent is any deterrent. There is only one word "mutually assured destruction" the acronym of which is very significantly 'mad', which is the outcome of a nuclear confrontation. So, the whole world should, really, aim at creating a situation where nuclearisation does not take place, where the world does not lead to a nuclear confrontation. So, Sir, that is not the question. We have no discrimination, fundamentally, *per se* with the notion of the Separation Plan. ...*(Time bell)* सर, थोड़ा सा अनुरोध है, जो आप मेडन स्पीच के लिए कानून लगाते हैं, वह आखिरी स्पीच के लिए भी कर दें।

Sir, the whole question of civilian nuclear energy has the only option for our energy security; that is the thrust of the whole argument. I am feeling so ashamed to actually contradict Dr. Karan Singh because I am really a great fan of his great erudition. He always speaks with immense knowledge on any subject he is supposed to speak, and out of humility he says, "Except for Dr. Kasturirangan, nobody can enlighten this House." But, Sir, I have a small information which I want to share with you and, through you, with the House that the U.S. Energy Information Agency has come out with a report, sometime back, showing some figures about the emerging global trends, the total global energy production and the contribution of nuclear energy as a component of the total energy. He is saying that the whole world is moving towards nuclearisation. He has talked about France; France is having more than 70 per cent. Already, it has come down to 57 per cent, Sir. And what does it say?

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: Germany has decided to close its nuclear plants.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: I have no fight against nuclear energy. But what I am saying is that the unilateral, one-dimensional attention and the thrust on nuclear energy solving our energy problems, I think, is completely misplaced. Sir, what are the figures? They are saying, over the same period, that is up to 2020-2025,--the reference case which is given by the Energy Information Agency (EIA): "The global installed power will rise from 3,318 gigawatts in 2002 to 5,495 gigawatts by 2020-25.

That will be the overall production. "Over the same period, the installed nuclear capacity will rise more modestly from 361 gigawatts to 422 gigawatts, as nuclear power in total installed capacity will fall from 10.9 per cent in 2002 to 7.7 per cent by 2020-2025". Therefore, with all humility, I submit that these facts show that the contention of Dr. Karan Singh is absolutely incorrect and misplaced.

Now, the question is this. What were we doing about our nuclear energy? Didn't we spend time in really developing and generating our nuclear energy? Sir, these are figures from the Government documents. This is the break-up of the installed capacity of energy in this country as on 20.2.2005. Maybe, there are some differences here and there. Of the 1,16,245 megawatts that we generate, 2,720 megawatts come from nuclear sector. It is 2.35 per cent of the total. How is this? This was not to be. I have some papers with me. Jaswant Singhji has gone. I think, he had also some role to play in that. It was stated in the Twenty-third Report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Energy which he was chairing in 1995-96 and I quote:

"The Department of Atomic Energy, in 1984, had set for itself a target of 10,000 megawatts of nuclear power capacity at the turn of the century."

So, we had a plan for 10,000 megawatts of nuclear power by the turn of the century. Now, it is 2.6 per cent. We would have reached 10 per cent. When the whole world is still down at 7 plus percentage in 2025, we would have reached 10 per cent by the turn of the century. Why didn't it happen?

I again go back to the Report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Energy of 1999-2000. This is again a unanimous Report. This was headed by a new Chairman. What does the Report say? It says, "The Committee notes that a number of nuclear projects in the country are getting delayed primarily due to lack of funds". It is not due to lack of access to nuclear fuel. "In the present scheme of things funds are being made available to the Department only after a project is sanctioned. As a result, the Department is not able to carry out the pre-project activities prior to the sanction of a project. This, in turn, results in longer gestation period for nuclear power projects. In this context, the Committee recommends that prior to the sanction of a project, the Planning Commission and the Ministry of Finance should consider the feasibility of making a provision of

5-10 per cent of the project cost in the Budget of the Department so as to enable it to carry out pre-project activities beforehand".

In 2000-01, what were we told? Again, there is a Standing Committee Report. It says, "The exercise carried out by the Department of Atomic Energy, as part of 'Vision 2020', aims at setting up about 20,000 megawatts of nuclear power generating capacity in India by 2020". So, the target period was shifted by 20 years and the capacity was doubled.

The list is there. Sir, again, nowhere in the report do we find the mention of lack of access to nuclear fuel as the major reason for our programme getting retarded. Then we come to the Standing Committee Report of 2003-04. 'The present nuclear share of electricity production in India is to be viewed in the context of the development phase requiring significant efforts and time that the country had to go through in the nuclear power sector, despite -- I underline these words -- the technology denial regime prevalent internationally in this field. While the present share of nuclear electricity is small, nuclear energy has the potential to meet a significant part of the future needs of electricity. With the completion of the projects under construction, progressively by December, 2008, the total nuclear capacity in the country will be 6,680 megawatts. Additional projects are contemplated to be taken up in future for construction so as to reach a total nuclear power capacity of 10,000 megawatts by the end of the Eleventh Plan and about 20,000 megawatts by 2020.' It is more than average projected nuclear energy production in the global mix and this is despite the technology denial regime. Therefore, Sir, I think the Prime Minister has to give us more explanation. I think the limited time available to this House for this debate is not adequate.

Sir, I come to the separation plan. I think the Prime Minister has provided himself an escape route from the Americans. It is very clear in the separate plan. At page 8, it says, "The United States is willing to incorporate assurances regarding fuel supply in the bilateral US-India agreement on peaceful uses of nuclear energy under Section 123 of the US Atomic Energy Act. I, through you, Sir, very sincerely ask each of the hon. Members of this House, "Has anyone gone through these provisions of the US Energy Act?" Speak the truth. I have no problem if I am not telling the truth. I don't think most of my friends in this House will be able to answer affirmatively. It is not their fault. What does the US Energy Act say? Sir, I have tried to download that. There are so serious implications of this Act.

First of all, it says, "No cooperation with any nation, group of nations or regional defence organisations pursuant to Sections 53, 54 (a), 57, 64, 82, 91, 103, 104 and 144 shall be undertaken." It is the American Act. We do not know these provisions. Then Section 123 (2) says, "In the case of non-nuclear weapon States a requirement as a condition of continued United States nuclear supply under the agreement for cooperation that IAEA safeguards be maintained with respect to all nuclear materials in all peaceful nuclear activities within the territory of such State under its jurisdiction or carried out under its control anywhere." It is such an omnibus provision. I don't want to go into the nitty-gritty of this nuclear agreement.

Sir, the kind of ruckus, there was in this country, for people who were supporting this general effort of the Government to reach out to President Bush! Following the interview of Dr. Anil Kakodkar, who is the DAE Secretary, all hell broke loose. There was article after article saying, "He is a betrayer; he is not a patriot. He does not understand the great significance of this journey", so on and so forth. So I dare say this in this House, with all humility, that together we must examine these things. These are too serious to be left alone, for two Economic Editors to decide. I have my greatest regard for our nuclear scientists. There are many of them and the fact that we have developed an independent nuclear programme notwithstanding the international adverseness is in itself a great tribute to them. But is it enough? Is the issue only technical? Or, are there strategic aspects? What kind of relationship will we share with the United States. How will we pursue an independent foreign policy? The question of our energy security is involved. The question of our food security is involved. Is it a matter which can be left alone to the Government and technical experts? Therefore, I thank the hon. Prime Minister that he has left himself and all of us away. What is the way out? If we look at Page 6 of the Separation Plan, -- मेरा भाषण ज्यादा अच्छा नहीं हो रहा है, सर। इसलिए मोती लाल बोरा जी बगल में ही सो गए।... (व्यवधान)... गहरी नींद में सो गए, सर।... (व्यवधान)... When you read the last point of para 12 which is in bullets, the Separation Agreement says, "Must be acceptable to Parliament and public opinion." This is a great formulation which is made in this Separation Agreement. What we are saying is that the Americans are taking their sweet own time, and they have time and again bamboozled bilateral agreements and multilateral agreements showing the Congress and the Congressional approval. We have done this also. Dr. Joshiji, you must also understand that in Iraq, we escaped sending Army showing the Parliament and the Resolution...

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: In my speech, I have already mentioned it.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Yes; yes. That is why I think you were fighting a double battle because there is a disconnect between Jaswantji's statement and what you spoke today.

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: There is no disconnect. There is a complete continuity.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: If you are happy with that, then, I am happy with that.

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: Thank you.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Therefore, my most fervent appeal, through you, Sir, to the hon. Prime Minister is, create a special parliamentary committee where we can call everybody. This provision is there in the Agreement; so, you will not be breaching it. And that is the real reciprocity. If the American Congress can take their sweet own time to approve what you have jointly come together -- there are issues which are really of a very, very momentous nature -- we cannot take these things lightly. It is not a college debate that I take care of certain points made by Dr. Karan Singh, or, Dr. Joshiji takes care of some points that I made. It is far more serious; it is the country's future that we are dealing with. It is not a child's play. Therefore, there has to be a structured engagement across the political spectrum and across the informed and technical opinion and expertise that we have available in the country today.

Therefore, Sir, I think this debate could end in some kind of a result if that kind of an approach is taken. Otherwise, we are sorry about the way we have bound ourselves with the implications on energy security, the implications on food security, the implications on foreign policy, the way we have bound ourselves to the adventurous global military game plan of the Americans by going in for this 'democracy and freedom' business all over the world.

Sir, let us accept this. People understand these things. On the 6th of March, Iran was referred to the UN Security Council. Why? Was there any difficulty on the part of the Iranians cooperating with the IAEA? We have explained the aspersions that are being cast on the Iranians based on information which Iranians themselves shared. Sir, if you look at Director General, IAEA, Al Baradie's actual report that has been forwarded to the

United Nations Security Council, it is very, very clear that regardless of what Iran does, the UN Security Council would go in for action and that is what the Americans are urging. With Nicholas Burns I don't know what kind of discussion the hon. Prime Minister had, but he has already issued a warning that now is the testing time for our friends all over the world. Mere words would not do, they will have to materialise into action. Now, what kind of action would it be?

Sir, I cannot really displease the very respected, Dr. Karan Singh. I must not look at the world from the Iraqi prism. But I cannot share the view that the people, who are perpetrators of Abu Ghraib or Guantanamo Bay, have something common with us in the fight for freedom and democracy all over the world.

Therefore, Sir, with folded hands, I beg of the hon. Prime Minister to go in for a kind of special parliamentary committee, where everybody could express their views and we could really use the entire expertise that is available in this country. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI ARJUN KUMAR SENGUPTA (West Bengal): Mr. Chairman Sir, after these three very major statements, I rise to make a few points, which, I am afraid, have not been covered fully. Mr. Joshi is going away. I would like to begin with that.

Sir, this is an Agreement that has been reached, and which is being opposed, because the non-proliferationist Ayotullah is in the United States. They think that this Agreement has given to India something, which is much more than the Americans could provide. How could you ignore this? How could you ignore that an achievement has been made by this statement, which even several people in the United States, including *The Economist*, which is not an American journal, is opposing. The reason for that is that India seems to be in a position of getting almost all the benefits of a NPT power, a power that has 'signed' NPT, without signing NPT. This particular point needs to be clearly appreciated. I think Dr. Karan Singh has pointed out five elements. The first element is security interest. What exactly is our security interest? The time has now come for us to clearly analyse that. Is it in our interest to accumulate nuclear arsenal indefinitely? Is it in our interest to see that we engage in a competitive nuclear arms race with China or any other country? It is not. It has been stated from the very beginning, in fact, it has been stated from the first nuclear experiment that was made under Mrs. Gandhi's time that we are not going to be a first-strike power.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN) in the Chair]

We are not interested in attacking any country. All our interest is to have enough capability to inflict unacceptable damage on any kind of potential aggressor. This is the meaning of the minimum nuclear deterrent. Have we compromised with that? We have kept eight reactors out of the supervision of the IAEA. Is that not enough? This issue has to be considered very seriously. Do we need anything more? Do we have any other requirement with building up nuclear capacity? In the minimum deterrents, we need, besides some minimum nuclear arsenal, delivery capacity and also improving R&D. Both of these things have been protected. The R&D -- Mr. Kasturirangan is here -- has been completely protected, particularly by keeping the fast breeder reactors out of this. Having done that, what exactly is the way by which we can say that this has compromised our security? I want to put forward this argument because this thing must go through the US system. It is not so easy. There are plenty of Americans, American non-proliferates that they think that this is a one-sided agreement. It is one-sided because they feel that India, taking advantage of this, will build up nuclear capacity much beyond what it is necessary. I think, it is important for us to spell it out that we are not interested in this kind of a nuclear accumulation. This means, I think, Mr. Joshiji would say that we are trying to cap our capability. I don't know whether we can put the word 'cap', but this is something that we would like to do ourselves; this is something what he was referring to as a sovereign determinant. This is determined through a sovereign decision in the country. This is enough, or, this is the only way we can ensure that our basic security is safeguarded. I have a feeling, Sir, that this particular message should go to the world from us that we are not in the business of building up indefinite nuclear capacity. This is what Mr. Nilotpal Basu was saying; this is the original way in which the whole nuclear debate started. We have not given up our nuclear deterrents, and we shall not give up our nuclear deterrents. Having said that, we should be able to persuade the world that we are now playing the game properly. Almost the same way when we said that we are not going to have any further tests. We have not signed the Test Ban Treaty. But this is a moratorium that we have declared ourselves, and that is the way to assure the world that we are doing. This is exactly what is required for our interest.

Sir, I am afraid, this whole debate has been confused by bringing in 'other elements'. The 'other elements' such as energy security, scientific

capability and then this foreign policy argument. The basic achievement of this nuclear agreement is that the technology denial situation has been withdrawn. This changes our capacity to build up our productivity, and our ability to withstand the international pressure. Energy security question has been raised, and I would like to point it out, since Mr. Nilotpal Basu raised this issue, earlier than that, Dr. Murli Manohar Joshi has also raised this issue, no energy security, and for that matter, no food security, nothing of the security in a global world should be defined in terms of self-sufficiency.

It is not the case that we have to produce everything ourselves. The reason why our nuclear power has not expanded is that economically if we depend upon our domestic fuel supply, it is uneconomic, the cost is too high. The numbers have been given and I think the Government should bring out this number quite categorically. If we are allowed to import uranium, the cost of nuclear energy goes down three to four times than what it is today. We are unable to import this nuclear fuel from outside because of our present situation. Just one particular change in the situation improves our possibility of having a much better option of getting nuclear fuel from all over the world. I am mentioning this because this is something, which cannot be decided immediately. There are capital costs involved, how we are going to import the actual reactors and all these questions. It only expands the possibilities. It is still quite likely that we shall depend more on hydrocarbon, more on the conventional energy, but this particular agreement allows us to move to a new era where nuclear technology is going to be very important. Why is it going to be important, Sir? The Americans, the Europeans, the Japanese have now realised that dependence on hydrocarbon as their energy source is going to be suicidal for them. So they have gathered together. This particular global nuclear energy initiative is the result of that that they are not going to spend enormous amount of money, enormous efforts to build technology, to build new equipments so that nuclear power can be made available to countries who require energy at a reasonable cost. We are going to be a party to that agreement. There is nobody going to force us to do that. This whole assumption that as if we are getting into that at a great cost to ourselves is totally wrong. It is something that is definitely in our interest. So, what I am trying to point is that the energy security argument is an additional argument. It has been brought in; it does give us the freedom but that is not the only point for which this particular new arrangement has actually been achieved. The third question is the question of supplies. I must say that this technology agreement that we have actually arrived at

has nothing to do with this Monsanto, the agricultural technology, etc. These are separate. These will be discussed. This can be debated in the Parliament. There is no reason why we should consider that having agreed to this particular nuclear separation plan, we have also agreed to all those technological agreements. Mr. Nilotpal Basu was talking about that there should be a parliamentary debate. Of course, there should be a parliamentary debate. The Prime Minister has never said that this will not be considered in the Parliament. And that is not a part of the whole agreement either. The second Green Revolution -- Dr. Karan Singh thinks that this is going to be a very major thing that is going to happen. Probably it will. But it may not. The technology can never be predicted. We have to do ourselves and one of the things that we have learnt most is that any kind of Green Revolution requires our domestic efforts to prepare our farmers, to prepare our agricultural environment to absorb that kind of technology. So, this gives us an opportunity. But the whole discussion whether we should accept this particular separation plan, whether you accept this whole agreement between our Prime Minister and President Bush on these particular factors, is totally irrelevant. I want to say another point, which has been referred to again and again. It is unfortunate that this agreement has been mixed up with what is happening in Iran. Nothing to do with that, if nothing happened to Iran, if this issue were not here, even then this particular agreement would have been supportable. We should be able to proceed with that.

It so happens that at this particular juncture Iran has got involved. Now, I beg to submit and this is a point -- I am afraid my Left CPI (M) friends have all left -- it is juvenile to think that the Americans do not know what is our foreign policy. They know that the Prime Minister who has signed this agreement is a Prime Minister of a Government which is headed by the Indian National Congress which has categorically stated that Non-Alignment is the basic policy of a foreign policy. The Prime Minister has also said in this House that there is no reason to think that the Non-Alignment question has been given up. Now, what is Non-Alignment? It is a misunderstanding that Non-Alignment is a neutrality between the Russians and the Americans or not. It is a simple assertion of our national interest without being aligned to any country and that the United States' authorities, the United States policy makers, the United States publishers all know. On that one particular assertion that we are still Non-Aligned is sufficient to rule out the possibility that we shall join the United States in exporting

democracy or exporting freedom. It is juvenile to expect that we shall shout at every point what is said by President Bush is not what we actually mean. They know this thing. They have their own way of exploring what is their position. But I do not think anybody would have any misgiving on this point that we are giving up our basic sovereign right to have our own foreign policy. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, this gives us an opportunity and this point has been raised, I think, both by Mr. Nilotpal Basu and Dr. Karan Singh. This gives us an opportunity to play a new role in this world by presenting the interests of all the developing countries exactly the way we did during the earlier days of our Non-Alignment. Non-Alignment meant not only not allowing to any particular big power but also solidly aligned with the interests of the Third World countries, interest of the developing countries and we shall continue to do that. We do not have to go against Venezuela. We do not have to go against Cuba. We do not have to play any role which is pro-American in WTO which we actually are not doing. Even now in WTO we have played that kind of a role. I do not think anybody should be able to say that this particular agreement has an implication which will bind us, which will restrain our freedom in any of these agreements. I have to end up with one point about Iran and this is a point which, I think, everybody should realise, we are not going to support Iran if it is trying to build nuclear capacity. It is they themselves who say that they do not want to do that. All that we are trying to say is that we shall try to persuade them that have a different approach to build up their peaceful use of nuclear energy. But we must appreciate the 'hurt' of Iran. We must appreciate that we cannot take a position against Iran because it is an Islamic country. They have every reason to feel offended if there are dictations to them that you must do this or do that. We can play a major role in that. We can play a role of intermediation just as the Russians are playing there, that they are trying to understand with Iran what can be done and this is the way we can do. We can have a role to play almost as effectively as we played in the case of Iraq. Just to tell Iran that we would not allow Iran to be another Iraq. We shall protest that. This is something which they were supported. I am saying this thing because the only fallout of this whole discussion is that a possibility of our being misunderstood that we are in this game, that the United States after the 9/11 identifying any terrorism with a particular group of countries. We have suffered from terrorism for many years. We are not willing to do that and this message must go to the Third World countries, must go to Iran, must go to the Islamic world. Thank you very much.

SHRI SHAHID SIDDIQUI (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, today, we have taken up one of the most important subjects which is going to influence this country and the generations to come. I call the consensus that are emerging between the BJP, the Left, our party and most of the other parties here as an enlightened national consensus. But, I am extremely sorry to say that this debate has been taken up today at a time when $\frac{3}{4}$ th Members of this House are not present. I would like the hon. Prime Minister to be present right through this debate. This debate is extremely important, not for our generation but for the future of this country and what we are going to do. We are talking about the historic deal. We are patting our backs for what we have achieved and what we have got from the USA. I am sorry to say that we have started counting chicks before they are hatched. I am sorry to say that the deal we are so proud of is just a piece of paper. This deal has no meaning till the restrictions placed by the USA -- the Congress -- are removed. There is a wrong notion in this House that this deal has to be ratified by the Congress. No, Sir. This deal is not to be ratified by the Congress. It has to remove certain restrictions which it has imposed on nations that have gone in for nuclear experiments. The USA has placed certain restrictions on such nations and they have to be removed. What is the meaning of this deal without removal of these restrictions? We were very happy on 18th July that a wonderful deal has been signed. Again, we are patting our backs for this deal where there is no deal at all. It is only a piece of paper. And, for this piece of paper, we are paying a very, very heavy price. We are paying a price in economic, political and social terms. We were told by the hon. Prime Minister, through many statements he has made, that we will take one step and they will take another step. He said, 'for every step they take, we will take one step.' What has happened? We have taken so many steps. They have not even started moving! This was the assurance of the hon. Prime Minister to this House. But that assurance has not been kept. We were also told that we will decide the separation of nuclear plants into civilian and military installations and nobody would dictate to us as to what is to be done. But, Sir, let me say that the Americans were much more honest. When we talk to the Congressmen, when we talk to the Senators this becomes clear. I had even an opportunity to talk to Ms. Condoleezza Rice in Washington. I had also an opportunity to meet Mr. Nick Burns when he came here and, again, in Washington. He told us very clearly that this separation has to be a good separation. And, when I asked Ms. Condoleezza Rice that what is 'good?' She said, 'It has to

3.00 P.M.

be credible.' And, who will decide what is credible. She said, 'It is we; Our Congress will decide what is credible, not your Government.' So, it is not by us. We are told that we are free to decide what is credible, what is good and this decision is our own independent decision. I am sorry to say that we are independent and we have not taken this independent decision. We were told now, after 18th July, since this Agreement has been arrived at, the American administration will go to the Congress to get the restrictions removed. But the Americans are very honest. We are not. They said, 'No. We will not go to the Congress unless the separation plan is in place. It is before us.' Sir, I am sorry to say that no Minister is sitting here to note down my points.

THE MINISTER OF SMALL SCALE INDUSTRIES AND MINISTER OF AGRO AND RURAL INDUSTRIES (SHRI MAHAVIR PRASAD): Sir, I am sitting here.

SHRI SHAHID SIDDIQUI: Okay. Shri Prasad is sitting here. I am very thankful for your mercy. He is there to listen this very important debate and the points that I am making.

Sir, we were told that that they will go to the Congress. But, the fact is otherwise which they have made it very clear.

Of course, today, I read that we have opposed the Congress. But when I asked the congressman there, we were told very clearly, "Administration has not even tried to persuade us. They are not even trying to persuade us. They have not come to us with anything, with any plan." Even the Indian Congress people told us that the administration does not seem to be very serious about this deal. Sir, to me, it seems that the administration still is not very serious about this deal. We were told by the Prime Minister that India would have same powers and obligations as any nuclear power. But, Sir, we would we have the power that the nuclear-weapon-States, including the United States, have -- right to shift facilities from civilian category to military. The fact is that we do not have this power. It is for perpetuity. Once, we have made this 'separation plan', we are enslaved forever, our generations are enslaved forever. हमारे मुल्क के साइंसदानों ने अपने पेट पर पत्थर बाँध कर आज हमें यहाँ पहुँचाया था। We have reached, where we have reached after so many sacrifices. From Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru to Rajiv Gandhi we had made all these sacrifices. To what use? Today, we are giving up all these sacrifices. Today, we say that we could achieve all that in spite of restrictions, in spite of our poverty. Today, we

are saying that we cannot do anything without the help of the United States. Is it the kind of thing which our scientists, who had sacrificed so much, would like to hear?

Sir, there are so many hurdles to this deal. I see three main hurdles. The first hurdle is the Congress, of course, where the reports, which are coming from both, the Republicans and the Democrats. They are very clear that it will not be possible. Today, the Bush Administration is at the lowest ebb of its popularity. It is the most unpopular administration ever in the history of the United States. And, we are depending on that Administration to get it passed. Even the Republicans are moving away from Mr. Bush because they want to re-win elections in November, this year. Anybody, who wants to win elections in the United States, will have to distance himself from Mr. Bush. Today, the world is distancing itself from the Bush Administration. But we are going close to the Bush Administration, and saying that we are very proud of that. Sir, it is an extremely dangerous step that we are taking. So, I don't see the first hurdle being crossed. The second hurdle is the IAEA. The Prime Minister has assured us that we will have a new special protocol with the IAEA. So, some of our media people, some of our friends, here, were very happy, very proud that something special is being created for India a special seat, which is not there for anybody else. And, what is that special seat? Sir, it is the very special enslavement that we are going to have - the worst of both the worlds. And, with the IAEA, we will have to make more concessions. Let me tell you, despite whatever concessions we have made, the American Congress will be asking for more concessions; the IAEA will be asking for more concessions, which is putting more restrictions. Then, we will have to go to nuclear supplies groups. Again, a new deal has to be worked out with the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG), again concessions will have to be made, again restrictions will be placed. So, this is not going to be an easy task, but we are patting our backs; we are very happy; we are very proud; we are clapping and saying that we have achieved something great. But we have achieved nothing, not even a piece of paper is of any value. But why all this is going on? As Dr. Murli Manohar Joshi said, Nilotpaji, who made one of the best speeches, his last speech was the best speech that I have heard in this House, made this point that we are.... Last time I talked of the 'stick' and 'carrot'; the 'carrot' was the 'nuclear deal', but the 'stick' is being used again and again and again to browbeat us into signing these 'agricultural' agreements.

In buying arms at prices which we should not be paying. And the kind of arms we are buying, we do not require them. But we are going into that. We are talking about FDI in the retail sector. We want to bring in Walmart. So, what will happen after the end of a year or two, or, after the end of a year-and-a-half? We would have made all the concessions, we would have bought what we did not want to buy, and we would have bought the arms, which we do not require. But the American Congress, of course, can reject this deal and we will be nowhere. We would have given what they wanted but, we would have got nothing. And, they can, of course, say, "we are sorry, we tried our best. Bush was your best friend. Bush is your best friend and, Bush will be your best friend. But the American Congress has rejected it." So, Sir, what are we getting into, and where is our Government taking us into? I am extremely worried about what we are doing.

We are told that the whole basis of this argument is energy security. And, Shri Nilotpal Basu brought this point very clearly before the House. He said, "This is not about energy security." If it was about energy security, then, let me say, Sir, that it is very clear. The experts say that they are very clear. Today, less than 3 per cent of our power comes from the nuclear energy. I do not think in the next two decades, it will increase to more than 6,7 or 8 per cent. So, ultimately, we are going to depend on other sources of energy.

Sir, this is a very important debate. So, I am not making points for the sake of it. I am not trying to score points. I am not repeating. I had so much to say, which my friends, Dr. Joshi and Shri Nilotpal Basu have already said. I am making those points which have not been made by them.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): Yes. Please be brief. Your time is over.

SHRI SHAHID SIDDIQUI: We can debate on it for two days. This is a debate which is of such importance that time should not be a restraining factor for us. But, anyway, I would like to finish as soon as I can.

The point I am making is that our energy security does not come from nuclear energy. It will come from other sources. It will depend on hydrocarbon, whatever we may say. And, Sir, in hydrocarbon we have the freedom to buy. We have the freedom to invest, which our friend was trying. Mr. Aiyar was trying his best to make India more independent in the

field of hydrocarbons. He took very significant steps. I do not want to go into why he was shifted. That is the prerogative of the Prime Minister. But what I can say is that he was doing a wonderful job for this country. Our energy security will not come, and what we will buy? We will buy highly priced, uneconomical reactors from the Americans, and for which we will be dependent. Shri Arjun Sengupta was saying that we have to depend on this new, clean nuclear energy. Are you telling me that this fuel will be available easily at cheaper rate? No; Sir. We will be much more restricted. In the case of hydrocarbons, we have certain freedom. If the same kind of investment is made on solar energy, wind energy, and other sources, then, definitely, we will be much more free. But we are making that investment. Investment will be going for buying these uneconomical reactors from the United States. These are very dangerous points. I will just make last two points. I totally agree with Mr. Nilotpall Basu and Dr. Murli Manohar Joshi. They have made a number of points. But will just make two important points, which were not touched by them.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): Please conclude.

SHRI SHAHID SIDDIQUI: There are two very important points, Sir. The Prime Minister is not here. I wish he was here because I wanted to tell him, "Sir, the foreign policy of this country cannot be and will not be communalised." No community can dictate the foreign policy of this country. Sir, I am very afraid. I am very worried when you say that you will be inviting the Muslim leaders to discuss the Indo-U.S. Nuclear Deal after the end of this session. With folded hands, I request the Prime Minister, through you, that please do not do that.

The message you are giving is that all those who are opposed to this deal either belong to the minority or want the votes of minority. That is a very, very dangerous proposition.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): You come to the point.

SHRI SHAHID SIDDIQUI: This is very important point, Sir. This is very important point. We are opposing this deal because we believe in India.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): Your time is over...(Interruptions)...

SHRI SHAHID SIDDIQUI: I am not opposing this deal, because I belong to any community, (*Time-bell*) or, anybody who is doing that...(*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): Please conclude. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI SHAHID SIDDIQUI: If you say that, that is a very ...(*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): You are going away from the points. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI SHAHID SIDDIQUI: This deal is being opposed because. ...(*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN) : No, no. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI SHAHID SIDDIQUI: This deal is being opposed because this deal is not in the interest of the country, not because any community.....(*Interruptions*).....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): Please conclude.

SHRI SHAHID SIDDIQUI: Sir, we are being told that it is in the national self-interest. I would like to say that even in the United States, the Foreign Policy is not independent of the internal pulls and pressures. It is a reflection of the internal policies of any country. The Jewish lobby influences the American foreign policy as much as any other would. The multinationals do influence, Sir. The Walmart did influence us, the arm producers in the United States do influence the American Foreign Policy.. ...(*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): Mr. Mr. Siddiqui, please, see your party had eleven minutes...(*Interruptions*)... You have taken sixteen minutes. Please conclude....(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI SHAHID SIDDIQUI: Sir, if you can give more time to others, then, if I have eleven minutes-- others have spoken for 40 minutes-- ...(*Interruptions*)... can't I speak, at least, for fifteen, sixteen minutes?...(*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): No, your party had eleven minutes. You have taken sixteen minutes.

SHRI SHAHID SIDDIQUI: Sir, I am making the final points.
...(Interruptions)..

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): Please, there are others...(Interruptions)...

SHRI SHAHID SIDDIQUI: Sir, I am making the final point.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J.KURIAN): Mr. Manoj Bhattacharya wants to speak. He has to catch a flight at 3.30.
...(Interruptions)... Please remember that others also have to speak.

SHRI SHAHID SIDDIQUI: Sir, I would very much like to hear him. I would very much like to be enlightened by my friends here. But the final point I am trying to make is that...(Interruptions)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): You have so many final points.

SHRI SHAHID SIDDIQUI: No, Sir, I told you that I have to make two final points...(Interruptions)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF.P.J.KURIAN): No, no please conclude.

SHRI SHAHID SIDDIQUI: I don't indulge in this kind of a thing, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): Please conclude.

SHRI SHAHID SIDDIQUI: If you let me.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN) : Say your final point and conclude.

SHRI SHAHID SIDDIQUI: Sir, this is my last point. We will not decide our Foreign Policy only on the basis of cold self-interest. This country has not been known for nuclear power. It has been known for Buddha, this country has been known for Mahatma Gandhi. The foreign policy is influenced by the traditions, the history, the philosophy, the religion, the culture, the morality of the country. Are we going to give up all that to pursue a foreign policy, which is cold-blooded foreign policy pursued by the Americans? You have been asking this question for the last fifty years that why there are double standards in international politics, why there are double standards in nuclear policy. Today, because, we are being asked to sit outside the nuclear club, we are so happy to give up all those questions,

to give up all that morality for which we stood up, for which our leaders, and the leaders of the Congress Party stood up, leaders of the National Movement stood up. Sir, this is extremely dangerous. The policies which our Government is pursuing...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): Okay, that is enough.

SHRI SHAHID SIDDIQUI: ...I am afraid, I have great respect for the Prime Minister, are not in the national interest. Therefore, I would like to request this House-- because these things cannot be debated here, in detail, they have to be debated in detail-- to join me in demanding a select committee which should go into this deal and either JPC or Select Committee, whatever the Prime Minister decides,...*(Time-bell)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): Yes, please conclude. *(Time-bell)*, Shri Manoj Bhattacharya.

SHRI SHAHID SIDDIQUI: We can definitely discuss *(Time-bell)* and decide...*(Interruptions)*... what India's interest is...*(Interruptions)*... Thank you very much.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): But you made very good points.

SHRI MANOJ BHATTACHARYA (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I will try to restrict myself to the points, particularly, after hearing Dr. Murli Manohar Joshi and my friend Shri Nilotpal Basu, I need not go into elaboration. Sir, I am sure that you will agree with me, and the entire House will agree with me that yes it is a fact that the Foreign Policy is determined looking at the best national interest, whether it is enlightened national interest, or, national interest alone. I am not going into that debate. Neither, I am going to make any comments on the newly found terminology, enlightened national interest. We have been talking about our own national interest. I would just like to examine what is the national interest of the United States of America for entering into such a deal, what is being termed as a historic deal. Somebody is saying a landmark deal. Now, what is the national interest of America that is going to be served by entering into this agreement with Dr. Manmohan Singh? Sir, I must ask this explanation from the hon. Prime Minister that how he views that. What sort of national interest of America that is going to be served by espousing this sort of foreign policy? Sir, that is one thing.

The second thing is this. Of course, I am not against Americans. I will say, 'I am not against Americans at all.' But, certainly, I must confess to you and I don't have any repentance for this that I am terribly against American imperialism. I am all-out against American imperialism. I can walk thousands of miles to establish a peaceful, a world free of the terror, free of the threats, free of hegemony, hegemonic attitudes of imperialism and capitalism. But, Sir, I will say that to my mind -- it appears to me -- that most of these agreements were signed and negotiated in secrecy. So, I would like to know whether it is a fact that most of the agreements, the US President and Dr. Manmohan Singh, our very dear Prime Minister, have signed were negotiated in secrecy and without adequate discussion with the concerned Ministers' level or Ministries level. Our policy-makers, starting with Prime Minister, Dr. Manmohan Singh, demonstrated evangelical zeal in re-aligning India with the US while giving up even the pretence of independence. It is as if they lived in a fantasy or make-believe world and became blind to the character of the US as a power in the desperate search of a global Empire and to Washington's disastrous role in spreading insecurity and instability in the world. Sir, I am sure, that none of my erudite colleagues in the House will oppose me when I say that right from the days of Foster Dallas till the Bush Administration, till the days of Condoleezza Rice, the American Foreign Policy has been pursued only to subserve the interests of the big economic powers of America, the big multinational corporations of America, and whatever they do, they do only looking at the interests of the multinational corporations, the big capital of America, and only for them, they attacked Iraq. They did not hesitate to attack Iraq. For them, they don't hesitate to kill thousands of innocent people; for them, they don't hesitate to plan a war on Iran. For them, they don't hesitate to plan an attack on Syria. For them, they don't hesitate to kill thousands and thousands of innocent people. Sir, what has been the policy of America? My friend, my erudite colleague, Shri Nilotpal Basuji, has talked about the situation that is existing today in Latin America. Why are the regime changes, peaceful regime changes, taking place in Latin America? The peaceful regime changes are taking place in Latin America because they have experienced the wrath of imperialism. They have experienced that how American imperialism functions, they have experienced; through their lives they experienced. I cannot forget how the CIA has conspired against the independence movement of Bolivia in 1960s. I very fondly remember, very respectfully, I remember the role of the Ernesto Che Guevara. Very fondly I remember -- with all respect, I remember what sacrifice he made for the

emancipation of the people of Bolivia, for the emancipation of the peoples of Latin America who had been exploited, exploited ruthlessly by the American imperialism. And, what was that American imperialism? It was the United Fruits Company. It was the IBM. It was the Monsanto, it was the Exxon, it was the Mobil. And, today, this Bush-Dick Cheney clique is trying to conspire the world-over. They are only perpetuating, Sir, untold misery, I must say, untold misery on the detainees in Guantanamo Bay and Abu Ghraib prisoners also. Who doesn't know that elsewhere also, in different places, in Germany, in many European countries, they are operating to perpetuate untold misery to detainees? Sir, this is America. This is the United States of America. This is an imperialist way of functioning. Sir, what could be their interest? Sir, what could be the shared values? We do not share any values with the American imperialism. We do not share any value with the Bush Administration. We do not share any value, either moral, ethical, economical, political, linguistic; no values we share with them. But, for whatever reasons, Bush came all the way to India and signed a historical landmark agreement with our Prime Minister. My question is, is it for the benefit of the country? No. Sir, it is very interesting. I just read yesterday's *The Hindu*. Shri Anil Kakodkar, the Secretary of the DAE, is saying, "According to the Separation Agreement, between 2006 and 2014, India will place 14 out of 22 thermal power reactors, which are operational or currently under construction in the country, under International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards."

This will include four safeguarded reactors - Tarapore-I & II, Rajasthan-I & II and Koodankulam -I & II, which are under construction in Tamil Nadu. What is more interesting is that Mr. Jain, Chairman and Managing Director of the Nuclear Power Corporation of India, is saying -- Mr. Nilotpall Basu has sufficiently dealt with that and I am not going into the details -- that our own, indigenous PHWR, that is, the pressurized heavy water reactors programme, would be supplemented by importing light water reactors. Now, what are light water reactors? Kindly note that after 1973 America has stopped installing any nuclear facilities for power production in their own country. Many of the plants, many of the machines, have become obsolete; they have become redundant. And they have to sell them somewhere; they must find some place to sell them. These light water reactors are run only on enriched Uranium fuel and light water, as coolant and moderator. Now, they are trying to sell those to India and India will have to get them by paying down the nose. That is one of the reasons. I

would say that that is the American interest. That interest would be served by signing these sorts of agreements.

Secondly, Sir, today the US is engaged in an aggressive project to reshape the world. Various statements of this orientation are available in the public domain -- everybody knows this. Who doesn't know this? Anybody who is conscious of the international situation knows that US is trying to do so -- including the "National Security Strategy of the US" and "Nuclear Posture Review" of 2002, a total of 44 National Security Presidential Directives signed by Mr. Bush, "Strategic Command" documents such as "Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operation" and reports of the National Intelligence Council, including "Mapping the Global Future" (December 2004). And Sir, does the US want to establish a "full-spectrum dominance in all strategic areas and prevent the emergence of a potential rival or alternative power centre anywhere including, most importantly, Eurasia, Eurasia has become a potent enemy for the Americans even though the so-called Communism has been demolished. It is quite possible and I too accept that the so-called communism was demolished in the Soviet Union and its satellite countries. But that doesn't mean that those countries, including Russia, are enjoying the confidence of America.

Sir, my fourth question is whether it is a deal only to allow the US controlled strategic resources like oil and gas and reject any proposals for limiting consumption of those by any of the countries or their generation by any other country. Sir, is Washington eager to beat back any challenge to its economic, political and military hegemony while waging, if necessary, preventive wars, an indefinitely 'long war', as the Defence Secretary, Donald Rumsfeld, put it? Sir, Donald Rumsfeld has said this in almost unambiguous terms. I must say that in that way he was honest about it. He straightaway says that I want it and I must get it. And that is the way American imperialism functions; that is the way it operates. Now, are we being mindful of that? Are we mindful of that at all? Have we ever pondered over the matter?

Sir, I know that there is no dearth of votaries of America in India, particularly the elite of this country. Among the rich of this country there are many votaries of the American way of life. They imitate the American way of life. I know that many of them do not even listen to Indian music; they listen only to American music. They dance the American way, they socialise the American way. They even try to lead their family lives that way, although virtually there is no family life in America. They try to imitate them. Even the

values of a husband and wife relationship are being determined by the American values. Sir, I was born in India and I had no occasion of going to America. Even so, would not like to go to America. But I would say that this would be a catastrophe; this has got serious ramifications. If the elite of this country become so pro-American, if they are being so keen on emulating the American way of life blindly, I am sure, we would be moving towards a situation where we shall be perishing ourselves. I am worried about that. I am only expressing my anxiety about that. I am proud of the Indian values. I am proud of the values that we nurtured, which I have learnt from our forefathers, which I have traditionally taken from my environment. I am proud of that. I am proud of that. I am the last person to compromise on those values and I value those values as the best in this world. And, for the votaries of American values, I will say only one thing, "Down with those values." Now, Sir, I would like to ask whether this Agreement has been signed by Mr. Bush only as a manifesto of neo-conservatives. We term them as neo-conservatives today - neo-fascists or neo-conservatives. Neo-conservative is a project for the New American Century. Right from the days of Foster Dallas, they have been only looking at yellow-fever. They are finding it very difficult to exist in this world. They are trying to teach their own people that there is a yellow-fever, that socialism will grab them. Russia or USSR was the main enemy of the Americans. After the collapse of Cold War regime, they are finding it very difficult to identify some enemy. They must have some perceived enemy and they have already created that perceived enemy. Only they created Osama Bin Laden; they created Talibans, and now, they are trying to make believe their own people in whom destitution has increased to a great extent. Whoever has the knowledge of American economic situation, would know that it is a deplorable situation. Now, more than 23 lakhs of people are destitute in America itself. Sir, I must say that it is reported that the taxpayers of America are paying \$118000 per minute to keep America busy in Iraq and Afghanistan, which they have already lost; Bush Administration has already lost. Now, will India be a very close aide to America in developing a consensus in the world because India has got a different position in the world? Sir, kindly, don't ring the bell. I will just conclude. Thank you very much for accommodating me. Kindly don't ring the bell, otherwise, I will get distracted. It is a very serious matter. I must say that we should have a very long debate on this. We should not have only a debate. It is not a question of debate. It is a discussion for the national interest, for the international interest. This is a very serious discussion that we must indulge

in. Sir, I will ask whether it will serve Washington's larger strategic goals. To achieve these, the US must build a system of alliances which neutralises all rivals and dissenters and co-opts previously recalcitrant - I must underline 'recalcitrant' - States, be they are "Old Europe" (which temporarily defied the US or Iraq), or Russia and any other former communist country. Sir, has this Agreement been signed because India has enthusiastically supported Mr. Bush's "Ballistic Missile Defence ("Star Wars") Programme"? Whether it is because India has already supported the Star Wars programme of Mr. Bush. That is why, Mr. Bush is trying to oblige the Indian Government. Sir, whether this piece of agreement is an endorsement of the US position on climate change, including its latest avatar, the "Asia-Pacific Partnership", helping the US get rid of a Third World director general of the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons. Sir, I am sure that you will agree with me that India has already purchased \$990 million worth of weapons from America. Sir, you are also aware, and the entire House is aware, that American multinational corporations just thrive on weapon manufacturing. Military industry is the largest industry in America. Many of the companies, whom you know as sometimes software or hardware companies, actually their main plank of business is weapon manufacturing or armament manufacturing. They must get market to sell their products. By binding us in these sorts of agreements, they will push more of their arms, more of their weapons, to the countries like India. And, India will lose the regional balance. The regional balance will be tilted more towards the American imperialism. Sir, I shall not continue for a very long time. I know about the time constraint. Sir, I submit that I fully endorse the views expressed by my colleague, Shri Nilotpal Basu, that there must be a very careful examination of such agreements. It is not a question of winning a debate. It is not a win-win situation. Even though some of the American Nicholas Burns -- I am forgetting his name of the person who has taken over from Christina Rocca as the Under Secretary of the State for this region of ours. They are trying to manufacture consent. Even in the American Congress, they are trying to manufacture consent. They are saying that let the Republicans and Democrats not fight. Let them come closer for the best interest of America. Now, whose interest is this? Is it the best interest of American people who are paying down the nose \$118000 every minute for maintaining US forces in Iraq and Afghanistan war, or, is it in the interest of American plan to destroy the peace and stability of this world, to destroy the democracies in different countries of the world? I have umpteen

numbers of examples, if I am permitted to say, I can speak for hours that what has been the behaviour of American imperialism. Sir, we shall have to examine it very carefully. I am sure that a Joint Parliamentary Committee or a special Committee for examining this issue will be of great use and we can get rid of this problem.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): Please conclude.

SHRI MANOJ BHATTACHARYA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I had joined Dr. Manmohan Singh, the then Leader of the Opposition to move an all-Party Resolution, a unanimous Resolution, to condemn the American imperialism when they were attacking Iraq or when they had attacked Iraq. Sir, the NDA Government maintained a deafening silence. Even though we insisted a number of times, they had maintained a deafening silence till Iraq was attacked. They were not prepared to move the Resolution. We had to force them. Sir, I am grateful to Dr. Manmohan Singh, the then Leader of the Opposition, who was instrumental in forcing the Treasury Benches to move an all-Party Resolution to condemn America's role in attack on Iraq. Now, when you are in power, kindly don't change yourself, kindly don't change your world view, as you should, in respect of American imperialism for the best interest of the world, for the enlightened interest of the world.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): Please conclude. That's enough. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI MANOJ BHATTACHARYA: Sir, I request the Government, through you, to take care of the nation. ...*(Interruptions)*... Sir, we are going to face a very serious situation unless you take much-required essential steps. With these words, I thank you for having given me the opportunity to speak on this issue.

SHRI P.G. NARAYANAN (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am grateful to you for giving me the opportunity to speak on the Indo-US nuclear deal concluded recently.

Sir, there are two issues that need to be addressed in this context. One is the ever-growing need for power for sustaining our economic development, and, the other is to safeguard our country's sovereignty. Sir, it is clear that India is woefully short of power and our fossil resources are very, very limited. Sir, crude is becoming more and more dear, and, therefore, prices of petroleum products are skyrocketing. So, India has no option but to enhance its nuclear power, the cheapest energy after the hydel power.

Sir, no one would have problems in securing nuclear fuel from western countries. We should realise that western countries also have an agenda in giving this fuel to India. Sir, till the US Congress clears the proposal, it is premature to believe that India has secured the fuel. I am grateful to the hon. Prime Minister for not putting spokes on the ongoing research on fast-breeder test reactors. Sir, once this research succeeds, India can readily use thorium and need not be dependant on western sources of nuclear fuel. So, it is in the abundant national interest that the research on fast breeder reactors should succeed. Sir, I am happy that the Prime Minister has taken care to exclude fast breeder reactors from the purview of the agreement. Unfortunately, Sir, this nuclear agreement that we have signed with the United States has got mixed up with the Iran's efforts to build nuclear reactors.

Sir, we have been sucked into the confrontation between Tehran and Washington. We have already voted against Iran twice in the International Atomic Energy Agency meeting and we are going to vote against Iran for the third time also. Sir, the Defence Minister says that Iran has signed the NPT, and, therefore, obliged to international safeguards. The Prime Minister brings the issue of national security to vote against Iran. I would submit that these arguments are not tenable. We have had close relations with Iran and we should not succumb to pressures to vote against Iran. Iran has never posed a threat to India's security. Does India want one more enemy in the neighbourhood? We don't have good relations with any of our neighbours. Iran would join the other neighbouring countries who work against our interests. India should learn lessons from the way the US had treated a 40-year old strategic ally, Pakistan. No doubt, we are happy the way US is treating Pakistan. But, this could happen to us also one day or the other. Pakistan created Taliban at the instance of America and now it is fighting Taliban at the behest of the Americans. Still, the US is treating Pakistan like dirt. We should not forget that the US is using us against another major neighbouring country, China. So, in the name of getting nuclear fuel, we will have enemies all around us. Does it contribute to our national security? If it did, I have no objection in India playing second fiddle to Washington. But, that is not the case. Already substantial section of Indian population is up in arms against the Nuclear Agreement. Of course, the Varanasi blasts will bring down the temperature, but in the long term, our national security will be in peril if we have too many enemies in our neighbourhood. So, the need for power to sustain our economy needs to be balanced with the need for nuclear deterrent. So far as nuclear

agreement is concerned, it involves so many implications. So, it is better to refer this agreement, this issue, to the Select Committee or any other Committee. Thank you, Sir.

श्री मंगनी लाल मंडल (बिहार) : माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, भारत और अमेरिका के संयुक्त वक्तव्य पर माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी ने 7 मार्च को जो वक्तव्य दिया और उससे पहले 27 फरवरी को जो बयान उन्होंने सदन में दिया था, उस पर कई माननीय सदस्यों ने चर्चा की है। डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी ने बड़े विद्वतापूर्ण तरीके से अपनी बातें रखी हैं और कई माननीय सदस्यों ने इस संयुक्त वक्तव्य, जो प्रधान मंत्री जी का बयान है, पर चिंता व्यक्त की है और आशंका जाहिर की है। मेरे ख्याल से प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जो वक्तव्य दिया है, उस पर किसी प्रकार की आशंका, शंका या चिंता करने की कोई गुंजाइश नहीं है। उनका जो 7 मार्च का बयान है और 2 मार्च की इंडिया-यू.एस. की ज्वाइंट स्टेटमेंट है, उसके आधार पर, उसमें जो महत्वपूर्ण विषय है, जिस पर सहमति बनी है और संयुक्त वक्तव्य आया है। उसमें पहला है, कृषि, जिसके बारे में प्रधान मंत्री जी ने चर्चा की है। दूसरा है, आर्थिक तथा व्यापार सहयोग, तीसरा है, उर्जा सुरक्षा, चौथा है, स्वच्छ पर्यावरण, पांचवां है, ज्ञान आधारित अर्थव्यवस्था को सुदृढ़ करना, छठा है, विश्व में सुरक्षा का वातावरण तैयार करना और सातवां है, लोकतंत्र तथा लोकतांत्रिक मूल्यों को सुदृढ़ करना। इसके बाद में कई बिन्दु हैं, लेकिन मोटे तौर पर ये बिन्दु हैं। जो चर्चा अभी तक हुई है, वह सिर्फ ऊर्जा सुरक्षा के मामले में हुई है और कुछ माननीय सदस्यों ने इस संबंध में आशंका जाहिर की है। महोदय, आदरणीय डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी जी यहां मौजूद नहीं हैं और भारतीय जनता पार्टी के एक ही माननीय सदस्य हैं, एक बात का मैं जरूर उल्लेख करना चाहूंगा कि जब लोकतंत्र का खात्मा पाकिस्तान में हो गया तब सर्वप्रथम जनरल मुशर्रफ हो गए, चीफ ऐक्जीक्यूटिव। चीफ ऐक्जीक्यूटिव को रातों-रात एनडीए गवर्नमेंट ने सदर बना दिया, राष्ट्रपति बना दिया। जब हमने वार्ता के लिए आमंत्रित किया तो वे राष्ट्रपति बन गए और शेरवानी पहनकर हिन्दुस्तान चले आए। लोकतंत्र के प्रति जो हमारी आस्था थी, लोकतांत्रिक मूल्यों को अक्षुण्ण रखने का जो हमने संकल्प किया था, एनडीए सरकार ने उसकी परवाह नहीं की। लेकिन यह जो समझौता हुआ है और जो सहमति बनी है, इस आलोक में बुश साहब यहां से गए पाकिस्तान - एनडीए सरकार के समय में जिस लोकतंत्र को दफना दिया, मुशर्रफ साहब ने - किन्तु डा० मनमोहन सिंह और बुश साहब के संयुक्त वक्तव्य का यह प्रभाव पड़ा कि बुश साहब ने कहा कि लोकतंत्र पाकिस्तान में बहाल करो, पाकिस्तान में चुनाव करो, क्योंकि सहमति में, जो प्रधान मंत्री का वक्तव्य आया है, इसमें जिन चीजों के लिए सहमति बनी है, उससे लोकतंत्र और लोकतांत्रिक मूल्यों की सुरक्षा के बारे में भी संयुक्त सहमति बनी है। महोदय, एक बात और कहना चाहता हूं। यहां पर कई लोगों ने चर्चा की कि गुट निरपेक्षता का जो हमारा सिद्धांत था, वह समाप्त हो गया। यह ठीक है कि गुट निरपेक्ष आंदोलन का भारत अगुवा रहा है और भारत उसका नेता रहा है। गुट निरपेक्ष आंदोलन के दो पक्ष थे, एक ही पक्ष नहीं था। एक पक्ष यह था कि जो गरीब मुल्क थे, जो विकासशील देश थे, उनको संगठित करके, उनकी आवाज को हमने अंतर्राष्ट्रीय मंच पर पहुंचाया। दूसरा पक्ष था कि गुट निरपेक्ष आंदोलन के द्वारा हमने अमेरिका के खिलाफ अंतर्राष्ट्रीय मंच पर सारे देशों को संगठित किया। किन्तु अब परिदृश्य बदल गया है, परिस्थिति बदल गयी है। चीन से हमारी वार्ता हुई थी। एनडीए सरकार के समय में माननीय प्रधान मंत्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी ने समझौता किया और जब संयुक्त वक्तव्य आ गया तो चीन ने कहा कि सिविकम को हम मान्यता नहीं देंगे। अभी भी चीन के साथ जो हमारा रिश्ता है, उसमें

आशंका बनी हुई है, दिल से दिल नहीं मिला है। चाऊ-एन-लाई से लेकर अभी तक का जो समय था, वह बदल गया है। पाकिस्तान चीन का बगल बच्चा है। पाकिस्तान एक तरफ चीन का बगल बच्चा है, न्यूक्लीयर विस्फोट करने के लिए, एक्सप्लोजन करने के लिए तकनीकी ज्ञान से लेकर सारी चीजें चीन ने मुहैया की हैं - यह जग जाहिर है तो दूसरी तरफ पाकिस्तान अमेरिका की गोद में भी रहा है। भारत को इस स्थिति को तोड़ना है। गुटनिरपेक्ष राजनीति का इस्तेमाल भारत को अपने हित में करना है। पाकिस्तान की इस स्थिति को, डा० मनमोहन सिंह जी ने जो समझीता किया है, जो संयुक्त वक्तव्य आया है और सात मार्च को उन्होंने जो बयान दिया है, उस बयान से पाकिस्तान की वह स्थिति टूटी और पाकिस्तान आज अलग-थलग पड़ गया है। यह ठीक है कि अमेरिका में कुछ लोगों ने इसके खिलाफ वक्तव्य दिया है तो कुछ लोगों ने इसके पक्ष में बयान दिया है, जैसे यहां कुछ लोगों ने इसके खिलाफ अपनी राय दी है। सारा देश चाहता है कि अमेरिका के साथ हमारे रिश्तों में जो एक जड़ता की स्थिति कायम हो गयी थी वह खत्म हो और जो यूनीपोलर सिस्टम अस्तित्व में आया है, एक ही ध्रुव पर सारी चीजें केन्द्रित हो गयी है, उसमें, बदली हुई परिस्थिति में जब इतने ताकतवर होकर हम उभरे हैं तो अपने राष्ट्र के हित में हमारा स्वयं का निर्णय होना चाहिए। और उस निर्णय के आधार पर हमको आगे बढ़ना चाहिए। डा. मनमोहन सिंह ने ऐसा ही किया है और जो समझीता हुआ है, इतिहास की नई तारीख प्रधानमंत्री डा. मनमोहन सिंह ने लिखी है। मैं उनको बधाई देता हूं, उनकी सरकार को बधाई देता हूं।

मान्यवर, प्रधानमंत्री डा. मनमोहन सिंह जी ने जो बयान दिया, उन्होंने कुछ छिपाया नहीं है। आदरणीय जोशी जी ने उनके बयान के कई अध्याय और कई बिंदुओं का उल्लेख किया है। उन्होंने कहा है -

"भारत कलपक्कम में स्थित प्रोटोटाइप फास्ट ब्रीडर रिएक्टर (पी.एफ.बी.आर.) तथा फास्ट ब्रीडर टेस्ट रिएक्टर (एफ.बी.टी.आर.) दोनों पर निगरानी को स्वीकार नहीं करेगा।"

फिर आगे उन्होंने फिर स्पष्ट रूप से कहा -

"हम नहीं चाहते कि हमारे फास्ट ब्रीडर कार्यक्रम में कोई बाधा पैदा हो और इस बात को पृथक्करण योजना में पूर्ण रूप से सुनिश्चित किया गया है।"

माननीय सदस्यों ने बहुत वैज्ञानिकों का उल्लेख किया है, प्रधानमंत्री जी ने यह भी कहा है क्योंकि काकोदकर साहब का, जब ईरान पर वोट भारत ने किया था, तो हमने भी उनका बयान कई अखबारों में देखा और बाद में भी हमने कई वैज्ञानिकों का आलेख देखा है। उस बयान और आलेख की चर्चा कई माननीय सदस्यों ने की है, लेकिन पहले जो बयान या कोई लेख आया था अखबार में, उसकी चर्चा की है, देश के अधिकांश वैज्ञानिकों ने कहा है कि भारत और अमेरिका के बीच में जिन बिंदुओं पर सहमति बनी है और दोनों का जो संयुक्त वक्तव्य आया है, अब इससे कोई आशंका नहीं रह जाती है कि हमारा जो परमाणु कार्यक्रम है, सैन्य के लिए, सामरिक दृष्टिकोण से उस पर किसी प्रकार की बाधा उत्पन्न होगी और यही बात माननीय प्रधानमंत्री जी ने अपने बयान में 7 मार्च को कही है। उन्होंने अपने बयान में कहा है, जिसको मैं वोट करना चाहूंगा -

"हमारे स्ट्रेटेजिक कार्यक्रम के लिए इंधन चक्र से जुड़ी रिप्रोसेसिंग और एनरिचमेंट क्षमताओं तथा अन्य सुविधाओं को पृथक्करण योजना के दायरे से बाहर रखा गया है।"

यह बात उन्होंने कही प्रधानमंत्री की, तो हमारी जो वैदेशिक नीति होगी, किसी एक देश को देखकर नहीं होगी। हमारी जो वैदेशिक नीति होगी, वह हमारे राष्ट्रीय परिप्रेक्ष्य में और राष्ट्रीय हित को देखकर होगी।

(श्री उपसभापति पीठासीन हुए)

मान्यवर, प्रधानमंत्री ने जो समझौता किया है, मैं उनको बधाई देना चाहता हूँ, धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ कि डा. मनमोहन सिंह के लिए पहले यह कहा जाता था कि वे गंभीर व्यक्ति हैं, एक शांतिप्रिय व्यक्ति हैं। यह बात सही है कि वे गंभीर व्यक्ति हैं, वे शांतिप्रिय व्यक्ति हैं। उनके बारे में कहा जाता था कि वे एक विद्वान हैं, अर्थशास्त्री हैं, यह बात भी सही है कि वे अर्थशास्त्री हैं, विद्वान हैं, लेकिन उन्होंने इतिहास में इस बात को बता दिया कि कूटनीति की असीम संभावना माननीय प्रधानमंत्री डा. मनमोहन सिंह में जो छिपी हुई थी, उस आधार पर जो समय की चुनौती आने वाली है, उस चुनौती का मुकाबला करने के लिए अंतर्राष्ट्रीय मंच पर, भारत को एक निर्णायक भूमिका निभाने के लिए, उन्होंने कूटनीतिक जीत हासिल की है और उन्होंने समझौता किया है और सहमति के आधार पर संयुक्त वक्तव्य आया है।

महोदय, पुनः एक और वोट करना चाहूँगा कि जो आशंका यहां व्यक्त की गई है कि परमाणु ऊर्जा आयोग के जो पूर्व अध्यक्ष और सेक्रेटरी हैं, उनके बारे में कहा गया है। मान्यवर, प्रधानमंत्री ने अपने बयान में कहा है -

"पृथक्करण योजना में मेरे कार्यालय की देखरेख में गहन आंतरिक परामर्श प्रक्रिया के बाद बड़ी सावधानीपूर्वक तैयार की गई है। पृथक्करण योजना को तैयार करने में परमाणु ऊर्जा विभाग तथा हमारे परमाणु वैज्ञानिकों को शामिल किया गया है। परमाणु ऊर्जा आयोग के अध्यक्ष तथा भारत सरकार के प्रमुख वैज्ञानिक सलाहकार हर स्तर पर सक्रिय रूप से शामिल रहे हैं।" उन्होंने आश्वस्त करते हुए कहा -

"वार्ताओं के दौरान हमने किसी भी तरह से राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा के महत्व से जुड़ी किसी भी सूचना से समझौता करने की अनुमति नहीं दी है।"

अब कहां कोई गुंजाइश रह जाती है कि इस पर अविश्वास किया जाये अथवा आशंका व्यक्त की जाये! इसीलिए महोदय, मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करते हुए, और जब आप मुझे बैठने के लिए कहते हैं, तो मैं प्रधानमंत्री जी को धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ। मैं समझता हूँ कि इसमें किसी तरह की आशंका की गुंजाइश नहीं है। राष्ट्रीय हित में किया गया यह समझौता, समय की मांग है और हमें गुट-निरपेक्ष नीति को राष्ट्रीय हित में परिभाषित करने की आवश्यकता है, जिसको माननीय प्रधानमंत्री जी ने किया है। मैं उनको धन्यवाद देता हूँ, बधाई देता हूँ और इसका समर्थन करता हूँ।

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI ANAND SHARMA): Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir. The House is discussing a subject of great importance once. For the last few months, there has been an intense debate going on in this country, in

America, and elsewhere in the world, about the engagement between India and the United States of America, ever since the July 18th Agreement, a statement between President Bush and the Prime Minister, Dr. Manmohan Singh. That statement talked of multi-dimensional cooperation between India and America, and the significant aspects, the features, being cooperation in the civilian nuclear energy field, in science and technology, cooperation between India and the United States of America in space technology, a Knowledge Commission on Agriculture, which was referred here, and also, the CEO forum, which was set up amongst the leaders of the business community of the two countries. Sir, this debate results from the *suo motu* statements of the Prime Minister made in both the Houses of Parliament, one on the 27th of February, 2006 and the second on the 7th of March, 2006. Twenty-seventh February's statement was necessitated because, not only was there an on-going speculation, but also a lot of reactions emanating purely from speculative reports, and a campaign was on in the country, questioning the motives, questioning the intent, and also casting certain doubts, which was leading to misgivings and confusion. I must say, Sir, the statement of the Prime Minister helped in removing those misgivings, dispelled misapprehensions, if any, and this debate will help in a big way in informing our country as to what this Government is doing, and what is the importance of the initiatives taken and the agreements reached. Sir, we believe in democracy. Parliament is the highest forum of discussion and debate in a democracy, and the Prime Minister had said very categorically that everything will be done in a transparent manner, and the Parliament shall be taken into confidence. I was listening very intently to my distinguished friend, Shri Nilotpal Basu, for whom I have high regards, and I am sure, he will be joining us soon, and some of the other distinguished colleagues about a Parliamentary Committee to be formed, and this matter to be discussed. I fail to understand, Sir, after two statements in less than 10 days by the Prime Minister of the country, and in less than 10 days, after the visit of the President of the United States of America, after this Agreement has been reached, here, on Saturday, we are discussing this matter in great detail. There cannot be any other way for the Parliament and the people of this country being taken into confidence. The July 18th statement had defined the parameters of the Agreement between the two countries. Implicit in that was the recognition of India as a Nation, State, with advanced nuclear technology. A question has been raised here that we have not been given that recognition, we have not been recognised as a Nuclear State.

Sir, what does the very reference to the Separation Plan 'that there shall be a separation of the civilian nuclear facilities, the military nuclear facilities and the strategic nuclear assets' mean? That is an acceptance and acknowledgement. So, it is for all our friends to understand, very clearly, that this recognition, this acceptance was there from July 18 onwards. There were certain reciprocal steps which have been mentioned, and the Agreement which has been reached is in the spirit of that Statement, and also adhering to that reciprocity, there are certain steps which we have to take, and there are certain steps to be taken by the United States of America. If we have to determine a separation between the civilian and the strategic nuclear assets, they have to take this Agreement to the US Congress; they have to amend some laws, which, eventually, will, then, lead to change or amendments of the international laws in the international regimes, giving India access to the Nuclear Suppliers' Group, and also access to the technology and fuel. This is what India has achieved. Now, for anyone to say that there has been any compromise, any shift, would be a travesty of the truth. India did not start this journey a few months ago, or a few years ago, which has been claimed, very loudly, by our friends, especially in the BJP and the NDA, that was a journey which India began, the quest soon after India's independence. The first Prime Minister of this country, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, was a great visionary. He could clearly recognise India's future needs, India's potential, and, along with Dr. Homi Bhabha, he set this nation on that path. I was saying in the other House a few minutes ago, Sir, that it is important to realise that it was in 1948 that India enacted the Atomic Energy Act, and it has been a long journey. There have been challenges, there have been setbacks, there have been achievements, achievements which have made this country proud, achievements which are there for anyone to see, especially when we realise that our nuclear establishment, our nuclear scientists had worked in a regime which was of denial and discrimination, a regime which had isolated our nuclear establishment; yet, they worked, they mastered the nuclear fuel cycle, they made India nuclear capable, and this country is proud of them. This country acknowledges what they have achieved.

Sir, when we look at the Agreements which have been reached, we have to look at them not from the current perspective, but we have to take a long-term view and the benefits or the advantages which that will bring, especially with regard to India's energy requirements, generation of

4.00 P.M.

nuclear energy. Now, it is a debatable issue, when our friends raised, some friends including Mr. Nilotpall Basu, that, whether India does need nuclear energy and whether that is a right approach, we have failed to meet the targets which we have set for ourselves upon the completion of the Eleventh Plan and the targets which have been set for the year 2020. I would agree with you; we have not been able to achieve the targets. Figures are there for anyone to see, and that is why it is all the more reason that we access this technology, we access the fuel so that the future targets which we have set for ourselves, we will be able to achieve.

Sir, when we talk a subject of this great national import, we have to clearly realise that whatever we say should reflect the broad national interest and national consensus. We must not be swept away by partisan political considerations to level accusations or to question the *bona fides* or the sincerity of a Government and the Prime Minister in reaching certain agreements. Sir, criticism is acceptable, but motivated accusations are not. As I was referring to the journey of this country and its achievements, it was way back in 1974, when India made its first statement by that peaceful but a very loud nuclear blast, the then Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, made it clear that India was committed to peaceful use of nuclear energy. As for a Government, led by a party which has this vision and this commitment, even to insinuate that India's sovereign interests would be compromised in any manner would be unfortunate.

Sir, here, whatever is being done through this agreement, as I said, that is not only transparent but also takes care of India's national interests and security interests. The separation is India's sovereign determination. We have determined which facility is to be civilian and which facility is to be strategic asset. There was a speculation about the Fast Breeder Reactors and the Prototype Fast Breeder Reactors that all have been kept out. It is the Government of India, the nuclear establishment, which has determined which facility should go where. Yes, there is a talk: Why is there an India-specific arrangement or Safeguards Agreement to be negotiated with the IAEA? It is very clear. India falls in a different category, a unique category of its own. There are signatory countries and non-signatory countries to the NPT. There are weapon States and other signatories to the NPT. India is a non-signatory. That was a conscious decision, a principled decision taken in India's interest on merit, because India's leadership felt, and rightly so,

that the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty was discriminatory and unequal. When we negotiate we will negotiate with implicit recognition of our needs as a nuclear State which has been responsible, which has impeccable credentials that have been acknowledged on non-proliferation. There again, there is no capping. We have not agreed to cap our programme, to cap the future production of fissile material. There is no prohibition or restraint on India to build future nuclear reactor. It again will be determined by us for future reactors, which one is to be put under civilian and which one is to be put under military.

There has been talk of enlightened national interest which Nilotpal Basuji was mentioning and that it should merge with popular interest. He also commented in great detail on the other aspects of the relations, which I referred to earlier, about agriculture and the Joint Statement on Democracy Initiative Fund. I may just refer to these two aspects for the sake of record.

When we talk of Democracy Initiative it is not again that India is tilting away from its known position. Last year, it was the United Nations which have decided to set up the UN Democracy Fund. India and the United States of America are the two major contributors of that Fund. India's contribution is the same as that of the United States of America. But if you read the Agreement which has been reached and what was being referred to, there is some misunderstanding about it. That Democracy Fund is under the aegis of the United Nations.

This statement refers to if India and America were to come together to promote democracy. That is on the specific request of the concerned country. It is not that India and the United States of America will go to any country and decide what kind of regime they will have and what kind of democracy or structure they should have. The references which were there to President Bush's statement and some other US officials with regard to regime change and Iran, the Prime Minister has made it clear in this House that India does not subscribe to that. India take its own decisions; decisions which are in our sovereign interest; decisions which are in conformity with our stated policy positions; decisions which are independent and on a merit of the issue. For anybody to feel that India can be persuaded otherwise or influenced otherwise to take a position which does not take into account our own interests, our security needs and also the sovereignty of 1.1 billion people of this country, that impression is not correct. I can understand there are some deep-rooted suspicions or

viewpoints which have been there in this country. We are a democracy. In a democracy, people have every right to their perception, to their viewpoint. Differing viewpoints in a democracy through such discussions and debates, eventually, help in a better understanding and evolving a national consensus which my friend, Shri Nilotpal Basu, was referring to. Yes, his was a very scholarly presentation. He made some very pertinent points. But India has always worked for a consensus. Our presence here and discussing this matter here is indicative or confirmation of this country's commitment and this Government's commitment to this Parliamentary institution and also to what we talk of evolving a national consensus in the national interest. So, enlightened national interest does not take us away from what initiatives the Government takes and there should not be any distinction when we talk of enlightened national interest as something which is different from what India has stated throughout.

Sir, there is also a reference about disarmament; that India had made a commitment to disarmament and whether the new arrangements, the new agreements take us away from that commitment and also that India being one of the heroes of the Third World movement, one of the leaders of the Third World movement which Shri Nilotpal Basu again referred to, that the countries look up to India, the countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America, India is mindful of that. India has not done anything which raises any doubts or questions about our commitment to that concept. Yes, India stood for disarmament. It was Shri Rajiv Gandhi who had, as Prime Minister, called for universal disarmament; total disarmament and a plan of action was presented to the United Nations. We remain committed to that. But our exercising the nuclear option does not mean that we have withdrawn from disarmament commitment. With due respect to my friend, he also said that where is the need of a deterrent; that they have fundamental opposition to it. I fail to understand. This is not recognising the realities of the world in which we live. It is all right for France and the UK and Russia to have deterrents. It is perfectly legitimate for China to have a nuclear deterrent, but it is not in the interest of India to have a deterrent.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Sir, I request him to yield for a moment. I was talking of global order, and I have no problem of India coming out of the nuclear isolation. My point was, what is there to celebrate in the co-option of India in this nuclear order which, according to our perception, is something that is discriminate.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: I think this requires clarification for one reason that India has taken its own sovereign decision. It is not a question of India joining a club. It is a rightful claim of India which has been accepted; and I do remember and recall the words very clearly when he said, "You are in fundamental opposition. The nuclear order came later. The nuclear deterrent issue also came up later." I have my notes here...(Interruptions)...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: No; no; I am sorry. Sir, you can check the proceedings. I was hearing quietly; I was not objecting. But he has no business in putting words into my mouth. My point is, there is nothing to celebrate this...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sharma, please go ahead.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Mr. Basu, if you want me to yield again, you are a good friend of mine, I can yield again to you. I will only say one thing. This is exactly what I was referring to. Yes; they are entitled to their viewpoint, entitled to oppose also, but not entitled to question our *bona fides*, question our integrity, question our patriotism and, again, our commitment to India's sovereign interests. Let me make it very clear to this House, to the people of this country, that this Government and this party which leads the coalition Government is as concerned and as committed, as any patriotic Indian would be, in safeguarding India's interests and India's Independence.

Sir, I will not go into the other details about the Separation Plan which has been tabled in this House. The Separation Plan again is a document that has been worked out by the negotiators, which included representatives of the nuclear establishment. It is not for the civilians to work out what the Separation Plan was. But if it has the endorsement of the nuclear establishment, I think, we should not doubt that. They know what they are doing. It is to be done in a phased manner. And, by the time we reach that stage, India will be in a position to evaluate how the other countries have adhered to the reciprocity which has been committed to. There is no reason to doubt the complete access to the NSG, and also the technology and fuel for future. Nuclear energy is one area where differing views may be there. But this country will be required to move in that direction and also to ensure that in the 21st century, India is not left behind. By joining others, to be accepted by others as a responsible nation with advanced nuclear technology, where the scientists have not only

mastered the fuel cycle but also when we look at the on-going Stage - III, for which thorium will be used, then, one has to say that it is the new nuclear order; which means that you are accepted. Sir, we were isolated. It is not a question of celebration, as you say. But, yes; as a nation, we should feel proud that we have been acknowledged; we have been accepted, and no terms have been dictated to us. It has been our sovereign determination...(Interruptions)...

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: It has been acknowledged not because of this, but because of the scientific progress...

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: I am not saying that is because of this...(Interruptions)... That is what I am saying...

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: So it has nothing to do with the document.

श्री आनन्द शर्मा : उसमें मेरे और आपके विचार एक हैं, शायद आप यह पूरी तरह से नहीं देख पाए। मैं बार-बार कह रहा हूँ कि आपको उनकी सराहना करनी चाहिए, जो हमारे परमाणु क्षेत्र में काम करने वाले वैज्ञानिक हैं, जिन्होंने भारत को सक्षम बनाया। हम श्रेय अपने को नहीं दे रहे हैं, परन्तु यह अलग बात है कि आपके यहाँ के लोग 1998 का श्रेय लेते रहे कि जैसे उससे पहले सफर तय ही नहीं हुआ। यह भी एक त्रुटि रही है, जिसका निवारण होना आवश्यक है।...(व्यवधान)...

डा. मुरली मनोहर जोशी : इसके लिए तो 1974 में सारी पार्टियों ने तारीफ़ की थी। ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री आनन्द शर्मा : हमने वही कहा कि यह जो उपलब्धि है, यह उपलब्धि दशकों की है, यह उपलब्धि नीति और दर्शन की है, यह उपलब्धि कोई मई महीने, 1998 की नहीं है। यह भी एक त्रुटि रही है, जिसका निवारण आवश्यक है।

Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I have just one thing to say about the couple of doubts which have been expressed about the Agriculture Knowledge Commission, issue. I was looking into the papers after what Nilotpal had said on the Agriculture Commission, whether it is in the interests of the country or not and, Sir, this is an agreement only on the setting up of the Agriculture Knowledge Initiative...

श्री नीलोत्पल बसु : इसके ऊपर जोशी जी बोले हैं।...(व्यवधान)...

डा. मुरली मनोहर जोशी : उनके नॉलेज से ताल्लुक नहीं है।

श्री नीलोत्पल बसु : हमारी कोई आपत्ति नहीं है।...(व्यवधान)...

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Sir, if I may say with your permission, just before I conclude, just to refer to this, it is US-India Knowledge Initiative on agriculture, education, teaching, research, services and commercial linkages. Now, what it refers to is about education, about research, about food processing, bio-technology and water management.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Sir, I have an objection. Let him actually authenticate this document and place it on the Table of the House. This was the point I was making earlier also.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA:- No, no.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: I mean, there is a joint action plan, to which only the members of the Government are privy. *...(Interruptions)...* And I think, in that sense, it is an unfair debate.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: It is not unfair. The reference to the Knowledge Commission is very much there in the Prime Minister's statement. There is no other detail what the Knowledge Commission says, but... *...(Interruptions).....* It is very unfair. I did not expect that from you. I am just trying to be helpful in telling you...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Why are you saying this? Everybody knows that there are separate documents, maybe signed, maybe unsigned. But we are not privy to that. We are saying that on an issue of such national importance, all that material should be available to the House so that every Member could take advantage of that. *...(Interruptions)...*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Prasad, please. *...(Interruptions)...* Please conclude.

श्री नीलोत्पल बसु : बीच में आप कहां से आ गए?...*(व्यवधान)*...

श्री उपसभापति : प्रसाद जी, आप बैठिए। आप बैठिए, प्लीज। *...(व्यवधान)*...

श्रीमती सुष्मा स्वराज : तमाशा दिखाओगे, तो तमाशा लोग देखेंगे। *...(व्यवधान)*...

श्री रवि शंकर प्रसाद (बिहार) : आप चाहते हैं कि तमाशा भी न देखें। *...(व्यवधान)*...

श्री उपसभापति : आप बैठिए, प्लीज। *...(व्यवधान)*...

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Sir, I will only say one thing. *...(Interruptions)...* It is very important that on this issue there is no doubt left about this matter. We are not referring to a document. This Government does not work in an opaque manner. I am only saying that the reference to the Knowledge Commission, a detailed reference, was made in the Joint Statement of July, 18. And this reference to the Agriculture Commission

was there ...*(Interruptions)*... Sir, this was there, if you go by the records, in July, in the statement which was made earlier. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: No, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I cannot allow this to go in the House. ...*(Interruptions)*... Whatever you wanted to say, you have said it. If the Minister wants to say, let him say. There is not question of a debate here between the two of you.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Sir, there is no document with the Government which assigns...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Nilotpal Basu, you have made your point.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: But he is saying that there is no such document.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Sir, I have clarified it and whatever misgivings my friend has, those are based on unfounded speculation. It is not correct at all. But, yes, when we talk of Knowledge Commission on Agriculture, it has been...

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT (West Bengal): Sir, I need a clarification. Is the hon. Minister saying that there is no representation of Monsanto and Wallmart on the Committee which has been formed?

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: I have not heard of that, Sir.

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: Let him consult his own Agriculture Minister.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That can be a separate issue. We cannot start the debate again. Please conclude.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Sir, nothing of the sort. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Then, unfortunately, as a Minister, he should not say that we are going by speculation. This is a very serious charge.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: This is not a charge. There is no need to get worked up. You are making so many allegations ...*(Interruptions)*... I

am only saying that this is not the first time. In every statement, the reference has come. There is no further information. What my hon. friends are referring to, no such detail has come to my notice and I am not in a position to confirm what you are saying. So, what is being done...
...(Interruptions)...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Then say that. Don't say that we are speculating.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Sir, with all respect to our friends...(Interruptions)...

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: Sir, we are only observing.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: You will keep on observing.
...(Interruptions)...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Don't provoke him.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Sir, I am only saying that I am here being advised what to say and what not to say. I will say what the Government has to say, what is true, what is in the interest of this country. Finally, I am making it abundantly clear that we believe in transparency and accountability. We understand our responsibility. That is why we are having this debate; that is why we have had not one, two statements by the Prime Minister of this country. Thank you, Sir.

DR. K. KASTURIRANGAN (NOMINATED): Thank you, hon. Deputy Chairman, Sir. Of course, probably, I don't think Saturday afternoon, and that too at this hour is the right time to discuss about atoms, energy and so on. But, it is a very unique opportunity to debate on a very important issue. At the outset, of course, I follow the very eminent speakers, my colleagues here how, Dr. Joshiji, hon. Nilotpal Basuji and hon. Dr. Karan Singh who set the trend for these discussions which were of an extraordinary breadth and depth. So, all I can do at this point in time is to add a little bit in specifics regarding certain types of technologies which have implications in the context of our trying to implement this Agreement. But, before that, I would like to compliment our hon. Prime Minister, and also the entire team for this historical deal. I can say with confidence that this is, certainly, a very significant step in fostering science and technology cooperation, and that

too, with a country which has been providing path-breaking solutions in science and technology in a variety of areas.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, science and technology has never flourished in the absence of proper collaborations and cooperation. You need to bring synergy between groups. Even within the country, when one laboratory works without interaction with another laboratory, one can see the impact of this. When nations come together in the context of cooperation, certainly, the kind of results that we get are very far-reaching. And, in this context, picking up the threads of cooperation with the United States, and trying to strengthen this kind of a cooperation is a very welcome development, and, particularly, in an area where our nuclear programme has been isolated for a long, long time, nearly a few decades, three decades, probably. This isolation of our nuclear programme was for various reasons. So, from that point of view, I think, it is a very important step, and when it comes to nuclear, certainly, one starts looking at the implications of this. There have been many eminent speakers before me, who mentioned about the relevance of the nuclear energy in the present context and so on. Of course, the first thing one would immediately address is the questions of the Green House Emissions. If one looks at the Green House Emissions, today, the Chinese economic growth rate being what it is; a few years back, we thought that we ourselves and China were polluting only to the same extent, that too insignificant, compared to the United States. But, today, China has already gone up to 18 per cent, in terms of contribution to the Green House Emissions; the United States, of course, is 25 per cent; whereas India is at four per cent. At eight per cent growth rate, one is, certainly, expecting that these kinds of levels for India will not be holding, unless we have the right choice of energy system which would be less polluting. The nuclear technology, certainly, has been one of the candidate sources of energy. There has been the question whether in the 21st century the nuclear energy would be one of the important and key elements of the technology. All one has to see is some of the economically developed countries across the world, particularly, you look at the United States, 18 per cent of their total energy produced is accounted for by the nuclear energy; France, of course, is around 60 per cent; Russia is 22 per cent; Japan is about 25 per cent, and China hopes to boost its energy output from the nuclear source between 30,000 megawatts and 40,000 megawatts by 2020. We have also set a target for 2020, which is more like 20,000 megawatts. So, it is quite obvious that it is not without consideration

that one has been investing in the nuclear energy. Certainly, it has a role. The question of how far this role will be played is a matter which still is not very settled. But, certainly, the type of the countries, where the development is similar to what India is going to witness in the coming years is a good enough credential for us to have a part of our stakes put into the nuclear energy.

In that context there is certainly an urgency to boost and step up the nuclear energy production. Now, in this context one is also to see what kind of things others are doing and therefore, I would mention, Sir, the nuclear programmes elsewhere and, of course, the best way is to look at what kind of things are happening in the United States in the very recent past. If you look at it the United States produces nuclear energy which is almost equal to the total energy production in this country at this point in time. But on the other side, they have not been putting up any new reactors over the last 30 to 40 years. What they have tried to do is a very excellent arrangement between the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the industries to extend the licence of the existing reactors, suitably upgrading them and in the process they have not only extended the life of these reactors by another 20 years but also they have made sure that there is increased production of nuclear energy coming out of them.

This is one indication of what the direction could be. The second is, they also eight to ten years back took a decision through the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to provide incentives to the industry to invest in the nuclear energy programme which has also started slowly making an impact. The Nuclear Energy Initiative that the United States has recently started is primarily to ensure that they will continue the prominence in this particular area with the nuclear engineering education, stepping up the research areas and so on. One should know that this has been practically dormant over the last few decades. Now, they are trying to reopen and entrust all these institutions within the university system and research and development system to ensure that they have a vibrant research and development activity and also a nuclear engineering educational system. The fourth generation initiative that they have now recently put together and it is very interesting to see that out of the six proposals that they have come up with in the fourth generation initiative, four-and-a-half proposals are related to fast reactors, something which we have gone through historically for a very long time. So, they are recognising the importance of this -- the recycling part of it, reprocessing part of it. So, these are all being revisited, the things which were given up they were shunned long back as not

applicable and not practicable in the overall context of an energy programme involving nuclear energy, because they thought that they have abundant uranium. But now they are revisiting it. Then, they have of course, the global leadership, which they want to maintain. They are diversifying into other areas related to nuclear physics with ramifications for nuclear energy in the coming years, one of which is to participate in the super collider, the hydron collider and research, the international thermo-nuclear experimental research project into which we are also trying to make an entry. Thanks to this deal, I am sure this will be facilitated, much easier. Then, of course, a lot of research and development and particularly the basic research in this area, lastly, of course, the important area of the global nuclear research initiative. The reason why the global nuclear research initiative becomes important at this point in time is that for the first time you recognise that you cannot overlook the reprocessing of the fuel in this particular initiative. This is one thing. The second thing is that this will provide again a route, which is very closed what India has been pursuing in the context of reprocessing and close to fuel cycle for which we are well known. Against this, let us look at India's nuclear programme. We started in very a modest way in 1945. Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, we had areas like research and nuclear medicine and nuclear research applicable to agriculture, certain aspects of nuclear technology and so on and by 1955 a very significant decision was taken to set up a research nuclear reactor, APSARA and it was done in a record time of 12 months. Then, subsequently, of course, we had the 1956 and 1969 CIRRUS reactor being built along with the Canadian support and the Tarapur reactor, which was built with the United States support. If one looks at all these programmes at this particular juncture, certainly, in terms of the megawatts -- I do agree with Mr. Nilotpal Basu -- it is small in megawatts. But there have been tremendous achievements in terms of technologies and many areas of engineering which are path breaking in the global context. I can only say in this connection, of course, our thermal reactor of 500 MW systems are well known, recognition of the fast breeder reactor as a key element, ultimately to use thorium is the second part of it, our scientific work that gets published all across the world.

I think probably we are among the most advanced countries in the Fast Breeder Technology, fuel processing and so on and if one scans through the literature it is very clear that we have a very unique position in this particular thing. And ultimately, of course, our strategy of going with

the long term interest in the use of Thorium, starting with the Uranium route and then going into the plutonium through the Fast Breeder Reactor route and ultimately of course, the advanced heavy water reactor which will be the third stage. So, all these along with other areas of research, which is very similar again to the United States plans such as Accelerator Technology that is used for increasing the reaction rates in Thorium. It can be also used as an incinerator for the Spent Fuel. In fact, Dr. Karan Singh mentioned about the question of Spent Fuel and there are technologies that are being evolved using the Accelerator Technology and of course, the fast breeder reactor technology itself which could then be used for the breeding of energy and ultimately the Plutonium burning. Besides the power part of the production with the fast reactor, they also do a kind of a laundering of the contaminated plutonium. So, you have several dimensions to the type of research that this organisation has carried out. All that I can say at this particular point is that they have put us as a world leader in the area of reactor engineering and nuclear research engineering. So, when we talk with the United States, we are talking from that position of strength. I don't think that there is any tendency to be subdued by an agreement with the United States because we have in 30 years produced a system of research, a system of development and a system of capability which is of extraordinary dimension, extraordinary depth and extraordinary breadth. So, what is it that the Nuclear establishment were worried about in this deal? They were worried whether these three stage system, whether that would be maintained, the integrity of the research and development related to these three will be maintained or not. I have the confirmation on this from the top people in the Atomic Energy. In spite of reading all the papers that are being given here and elsewhere I wanted to make sure whether they are satisfied before I even make a statement here. So, I talked to them. They said that so far as three-stage programme is concerned, involving ultimately the Thorium use, they have no concern currently through this particular deed. In fact, we will certainly stand to gain out of this. The second point to the agreement was related to, of course, the fuel. Fuel certainly is in short. The Uranium, particularly, and our heavy water reactors do need Uranium in the near term and this supply will be facilitated by this deal and ultimately the Nuclear Suppliers Group will be coming into the picture. The third, of course, is the addition of more reactors for power production, increased power production. Our 20,000 MWs target for 2020 is not going to be realised purely by an internal mechanism of setting up reactors. So, obviously, we need to get reactors and this is another area.

Then, of course, there are the upgradation of technologies and also related to safety and other things where there could be a mutual sharing of the experiences. I should say that when the Tarapur was visited by the US Nuclear Regulatory Team and they found their own reactor working so efficiently that they were amazed at the way in which the reactor has been maintained, run, and continue to produce power. So there is a very interesting aspect of the type of observation they have. So, in this particular deal, at least, from the point of view of the Department of Atomic Energy and many of the scientific communities, they are strongly of the opinion that this deal will certainly foster and strengthen the internal research capability and also establishment of a higher level of nuclear power. I think, both of these are at this point urgent, timely and relevant. But, we need to do in the context of making sure that this deal succeeds not only through the amount of paper work and discussions that has gone in. First, of course, we have been taken as a partner and the United States certainly takes partners in these kinds of areas only if they think that they can play ball with us. And they also make sure that we have the necessary capabilities to work with them. Virtually, we have to run with the United States in many areas. I have found this in the Space programmes. Obviously, we need to prepare ourselves. For this, we need to have a strong R&D element, the culture of which certainly exists in the Department of Atomic Energy. But, if there is a need in terms of resource investment, infusion of more money, infusion of more manpower, I am sure that the Government will not be found lacking in making the positive decisions on this kind of a thing.

The second, of course, is the question which is related to the installation of nuclear power station itself. We need to debate whether a private participation in the nuclear power generation is also something that one should worry about, because this could also give a way to enhance the power production in which case there are questions which are related to legislation. The current legislation does not permit that kind of a thing. But, it is a question to be debated. Then, of course, there are questions related to environmental issues and also the mining issues. I don't think that we have reached a level of mining efficiency that we have exhausted all the possibilities of generating internally the ores that are needed for our nuclear programme, both uranium and other types of isotopes. I am sure, this part of stepping up the mining activity is another important thing.

Lastly, Sir, the R & D programmes of the Department of Atomic Energy, especially the critical areas, have been an in-house programmes. I

think it is time that we open it up and make sure that we have several institutions in the country which partake, not only in the regular science programmes and maths programmes, which they support very heavily. But, at the same time, also, in the area of reactor engineering and many other aspects of it, many institutions should be involved.

I can also say, at this stage, a word about space. I think, this is a significant component of the overall deal. It is good. I should say one significant aspect of the Agreement on the space is the fact that, for the first time, the USA has agreed that India can launch satellites with components which are manufactured in America. This has been a great impediment, Mr. Deputy Chairman, in trying to accept satellites from many countries. In fact, today, there is no satellite in the world which does not use one or two American components, so that comes in the way of launch of these satellites. So, I am sure, it could open up on the commercial front. So far as the use of Indian space launchers are concerned, there is a positive way of looking at it. It is a very significant thing that this has been agreed to. In overall sense, I only comment on these two aspects -- nuclear deal and space deal, I feel that this is an excellent opportunity for India to push her interest, both in space and atomic energy. This is number one. I also remember, with a lot of satisfaction, a few years back the whole thing started with Vajpayee-Bush Declaration where there has been an agreement to push programme on space and nuclear energy and then we have July 18 Agreement which really is path-breaking in terms of trying to look at the future programme in a more comprehensive way and ultimately March 2nd Agreement which is more related to the specific details. On the whole, it is an excellent opportunity for India to push ahead its long-term interest in nuclear and space programmes.

[MR. CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

I take this opportunity once more to compliment the hon. Prime Minister, Dr. Manmohan Singh and his entire team for facilitating this new development. Thank you.

श्री राजीव शुक्ल (उत्तर प्रदेश) : धन्यवाद समापति महोदय। आदरणीय डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी जी, डा० कर्ण सिंह जी, नीलोत्पल बसु जी, आनन्द शर्मा जी और डा० कस्तूरी रंगन जी के विद्वतापूर्ण भाषण के बाद इसके जितने टेक्नीकल आसपेक्ट्स हैं, वे सब आ गये हैं। अब मैं कॉमनमेन की भाषा में, यह क्या डील है, क्या अमेरिका के साथ हो रहा है, वह बात मैं जरूर रखना चाहता हूँ, क्योंकि आम आदमी को इसको समझना बहुत जरूरी है। अगर प्रधान मंत्री जी यह बात करते हैं कि हमने कुछ देश हित में किया है, तो कुछ सोच-समझकर करते होंगे। इसमें यह नहीं है कि कोई अपने देश-हितों से कम्प्रोमाइज कर ले और उन्हें अमेरिका के

हाथों में बेच दे तथा यहां प्रधान मंत्री बनकर बैठा रहे। इस तरह की धारणा, इस तरह की भावना बनाने का प्रयास, हमें लगता है कि हम सब को नहीं करना चाहिए। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री शाहिद सिद्दिकी : इस तरह की धारणा बनाने का प्रयास इस हाउस में किसी ने नहीं किया है। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री राजीव शुक्ल : देश में माहौल तो यही बनाया जा रहा है। आज ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री सभापति : जो बन रहा होगा, उसे आप यहां इंट्रोड्यूस मत करियेगा। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री राजीव शुक्ल : अगर यू0एस0 कांग्रेस में ...**(व्यवधान)**...

डा. मुरली मनोहर जोशी : आप मदद कर रहे हैं। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री राजीव शुक्ल : अगर यू0एस0 कांग्रेस में इस डील का इतना विरोध हो रहा है, अगर अमेरिकी अखबार इससे भरे पड़े हैं, अगर हैरिटेज फाउंडेशन ऑफ अमेरिकन इंटरप्राइज में बैठे थिंक टैंक इसको क्रिटिसाइज कर रहे हैं, तो कुछ न कुछ बात तो होगी। मुझे तो लग रहा है कि पहली बार भारत की विदेश नीति में ऐसा हुआ है जब भारत ने कुछ जबरदस्त अमेरिका से हासिल किया है। और अमेरिका के अंदर बुश सरकार की आलोचना इस बात के लिए हो रही है, उनके क्रिटिक्स खुलकर उनके खिलाफ बोल रहे हैं। अगर वे इस तरह की बात कह रहे हैं तो कोई न कोई बात तो होगी। मान्यवर, तीस साल में पहली बार ऐसा हुआ है कि न्यूक्लियर टेक्नोलॉजी और न्यूक्लियर फ्यूल हम लोगों को प्राप्त होने जा रहा है। इस देश की जो मोटी-मोटी समस्या है, वह सड़क, बिजली और पानी की है। आज बिजली के मामले में हमें जो निर्भरता इससे मिलेगी, बीस से पच्चीस प्रतिशत...**(व्यवधान)**... सुन तो लीजिए। मैं जोशी जी को बैठकर सुन रहा था, आप भी तो सुन लीजिए, सुषमा जी।

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज : मैं कहां बोल रही हूं?

श्री राजीव शुक्ल : बीस से पच्चीस प्रतिशत की हमारी न्यूक्लियर पॉवर की रिक्वायरमेंट है। मैं नीलोत्पल दा को सुन रहा था। उन्होंने जो बात कही कि साढ़े सात परसेंट की सिर्फ रिक्वायरमेंट देश की है - तो मैं एक ऐडिटोरियल को इसमें कोट करना चाहूंगा कि with increase in global energy needs, particularly with economic development in developing new emerging economies, there would be a question of availability of energy resources. Also, there is a question of climate change that could take place as a result of burning of fossil fuels. There is, therefore, a growing concern on the role of nuclear power in meeting future energy needs. For a country, like India, with its large energy needs, nuclear power -- even more important to meet its future energy needs -- its electricity production to grow to a level ten times higher in the next five decades to meet this level of energy needs. Share of nuclear power would, then, have to increase to, at least, around 20-22 per cent even after accounting for energy from all other resources. यह वस्तुस्थिति है, फैक्ट है जो

आपके सामने हम रखना चाहते थे। इसका मतलब यह नहीं है कि हम, जो दूसरे ऐनर्जी के रिसोर्सिज हैं, फ्यूल के, चाहे गैस हो, चाहे कोल हो, उनको हम छोड़ने जा रहे हैं। वे तो हमारी जरूरत हैं ही। प्रधान मंत्री जी ने खुद कहा है कि ईरान गैस पाइपलाइन जारी रहेगी, चाहे अमेरिका का कितना ही दबाव हो। उन्होंने स्वयं घोषणा की है कि जो ईरान-पाकिस्तान-इंडिया गैस पाइपलाइन है, उस पर हम दृढ़ हैं, अडिग हैं। जब हमारे पास गैस भी abundance में होगी, न्यूक्लियर और फ्यूल भी abundance में होगा, तब निश्चित रूप से हमारे इस देश की यह समस्या हल होने जा रही है। जब बिजली की समस्या हल होगी तब उसका सबसे बड़ा फायदा क्या होगा? आज हर घर में जेनरेटर लगा हुआ है। आप छोटे-छोटे शहरों में चले जाइए, डी-ग्रेड टाउन्स में चले जाइए, हर जगह ऐसा कोई घर नहीं है, जहां पॉल्यूशन न हो, जहां जेनरेटर न चल रहा हो। कितना डीजल और पेट्रोल बर्बाद होता है। अगर हमारे यहां बिजली पर्याप्त मात्रा में मिल गयी तो भारत की अर्थव्यवस्था की आप कल्पना कर सकते हैं। गांव-गांव विकसित हो जाएंगे, कितने उद्योग-धंधे आएंगे। लोगों को सिंचाई के लिए बिजली नहीं मिलती। अगर हमें बिजली इससे प्राप्त हो जाती है, बीस से पच्चीस प्रतिशत की कमी पूरी हो जाती है, इसके अलावा गैस हमारे पास है, कोल हमारे पास है, अगर हम बिजली के मामले में आत्मनिर्भर हो जाते हैं तो इसमें किसी को ऐतराज क्यों है?

श्री सभापति : बहुत बड़ी बात होगी।

श्री राजीव शुक्ल : मेरे ख्याल से इससे बढ़िया कोई बात नहीं हो सकती है। मान्यवर, मैं आखिर में एक बात और कहना चाहता हूं कि हम अमेरिका से इतना क्यों डरते हैं, अब कौन सा होवा है, कौन हमें गुलाम बना लेगा? हर बात में अमेरिका-अमेरिका कहा जाता है। अरे, अब कौन हमें गुलाम बनाएगा? वह दिन गए, जो तीन सौ, चार सौ साल पहले हो गए थे। डब्ल्यूटीओ में क्या हुआ? हम लोगों ने पूरी दृढ़ता से अपनी बात रखी। हम तो अमेरिका के आगे नहीं झुके। महोदय, जिस तरह की वर्किंग रिलेशन से, जिस तरह का कोऑपरेशन, अगर रूस और चाइना अमेरिका के साथ कर सकते हैं, मोस्ट फेवर्ड नेशन हो सकते हैं, तो भारत अगर एक रिश्ता रखता है तो इसमें क्या ऐतराज है? हम नहीं कहते कि आप सऊदी अरब की तरह रिश्ता रखो, बहरीन की तरह रिश्ता रखो, यूनाइटेड अरब अमीरात की तरह क्लोज हो जाओ, इजीप्ट की तरह क्लोज हो जाओ, लेकिन कम से कम जिस तरह के रूस और चीन अमेरिका के साथ रिश्ते रखते हैं, अगर वैसे रिश्ते हम रखें, अगर सहयोग का रिश्ता रखें, तो उसमें क्या बुराई है? सर, पुराने किले पर मैं भी भाषण सुनने के लिए गया था। अगर देखा जाए तो 90 प्रतिशत भाषण भारत की तारीफ में था। अगर अमेरिका का राष्ट्रपति हमारी धरती पर आकर भारत के गुणगान करता है, तो इसमें क्या ऐतराज होना चाहिए, किसी को क्या आपत्ति होनी चाहिए? वह अपनी एक-आध बात कह रहे हैं तो उससे हम सहमत थोड़े ही न हैं। प्रधान मंत्री ने स्वयं कहा है कि हम रिजीम चेंज के लिए बिल्कुल तैयार नहीं हैं। इसलिए जब सारे स्पष्ट आश्वासन हैं, हम कोई अमेरिका से गाइडिड नहीं होने जा रहे हैं। जिन टर्म्स पर, जिन फायदों के लिए रूस और चीन अमेरिका के साथ सहयोग करते हैं, अगर हम वैसे रिश्ते रखते हैं, सहयोग करते हैं तो इसमें क्या गलत है? यही बात मैं आपके माध्यम से रखना चाहता था। धन्यवाद।

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am very grateful to all the hon. Members who have participated in this debate, which deals with a very important issue, and which will have a profound bearing on the

course of economic and social evolution of our country. Sir, our Government believes in fullest possible transparency in the conduct of public policies and that is why. I have come to this House three times explaining what we have done with the United States in matters relating to subjects covered in the Joint Statement that I and President Bush signed earlier this month. I assure you, Sir, and through you, the country at large, that what we have done is in the best possible interest of our country. I have always believed that the primary purpose of our foreign policy must be to widen the development options that we have in this country, to tackle the formidable problems of mass poverty, mass ignorance, and mass disease which afflict millions and millions of our citizens even today.

I have also believed, simultaneously, that in the final analysis there are no international solutions to India's problems. The bulk of the resources for India's development have always been and will always be mobilised internally. We have to take hard decisions to make the future happy in our lifetime. But who can deny that in an increasingly interdependent world that we live in, the international environment does matter. We need an international trading environment which allows our country to take full advantage of the opportunities offered by international division of labour. We want an international environment which will encourage the flow of capital to our country so that we can accelerate the pace of our development beyond the level determined by our own domestic savings rate. We need an international environment, which would enable us to have access to the top class technologies so that we can upgrade the quality of our production processes, be they in agriculture, be they in industry, and services. The United States is a pre-eminent global power. It has worldwide responsibilities. It has worldwide interests. And it is not always that our interests coincide with that of the United States. Where we differ from them, we have and we will continue to restate our position unambiguously. The House knows, for example, what happened in this very House when the war in Iraq was being discussed. And, I think, that is the tradition of this House. India has always stood by the oppressed people and there can be no compromise on that basic orientation of our common policy bequeathed to us by the founding fathers of our Republic. But, Sir, we live in a world of unequal power. We want the world to become a multi-polar world in which we would have greater elbowroom, but we have also to make concession to realities. And it is my sincere conviction that wherever opportunities arise, it is in our national interest to widen and

deepen our contacts with the United States because of the pre-eminent role that the United States plays in the world economy. That does not mean that we are in any way surrendering the independence of our foreign policy or the independence of our thinking.

And, Sir, I would like to mention to this House that while we have sought to upgrade our relations with the United States qualitatively, we have also been at work in strengthening our relations with Russia. Our relations with Russia are stronger. They were never as strong as they are now. We have reached out to China. We had the privilege of welcoming Premier Wen Jiabao here last year.

Contacts have been established, and, even today while the House is meeting, the Special Representatives of our two countries are discussing the border issue that divided our countries in the past. In the same way, our relations with France have never been as good as they are today. We have reached out to the West Asian countries. We had the unique privilege of welcoming His Majesty, the King of Saudi Arabia in our midst, as our guest in the Republic Day. On the East side, on South East Asia, we have come closer to the ASEAN countries. We are now a part of the East Asian community.

So, the House can judge by our performance in matters relating to foreign policy, and, I think, the judgement must be that we have not surrendered independence of judgement. Wherever opportunities exist to cooperate with other countries, to widen our development options, I think, it is my duty as Prime Minister, it is our duty as a Government that has responsibility for the well being of a billion people, to take full advantage of those opportunities, and that is precisely what we have done when it comes to dealing with the United States.

President Bush and I have met three or four times, and, invariably, the discussion turned around India's democracy, India's development prospect, and it is out of that conversation I think last year, emerged this idea of strengthened cooperation in the supply of nuclear energy. The President asked me how are you going to deal with the problems of energy supply? I did mention to him that we are heavily dependent on imported hydro carbons from the Middle East, and that there are uncertainties of supplies, there are uncertainties of prices; and therefore, to that extent, even if we can save and invest more to raise our development prospects, there are limitations arising on account of our inability to secure our energy

supplies. I also mentioned to him that we have plentiful reserves of coal. There are prospects now on the horizon of using clean coal technologies, but who can deny that even in countries like China and others, increased use of coal has given rise to carbon dioxide emissions, global warming concerns; and, therefore, if we can, we should avoid excessive dependence on coal. Dr. Joshi mentioned that why should we talk only about nuclear energy? I agree with him. There are, I think, prospects of use of solar energy, wind energy, geothermal power, and even hydrogen, etc. We must toss all the balls, because, as I see it, if Indian economy is to grow at the rate of ten per cent per annum, the Indian energy sector must also grow at the annual rate of about ten per cent. And, that would require our increased use of all sorts of energy. Where the nuclear power comes in, it is at the margin; it increases greater manoeuvrability in ensuring the energy security of our country. If you look at the prices of energy, the proportion of energy generated in the use of gas or petrol, or hydro carbons, the share of gas and petroleum in the total cost of production of energy is much higher than the cost of raw materials, say, like Uranium in the generation of nuclear power. So, there are certain advantages if we have increased access to nuclear energy, and it is in that context I mentioned to President Bush that we do need the world to end this system of nuclear apartheid, and I said to him, Mr. President, rightly or wrongly, the thinking people of our country, our scientists, our technologists have nursed thus grievance against the United States, that the United States has been the leader of a group of countries which have ganged up together to prevent India's march into the brave new world. If you really feel that the United States has a change of heart, this would be one single act which would have maximum possible appeal in India that the United States has a change of heart.

President said to me that "Well, what you state is, I think, eminently sensible, but you cannot expect us, I think, to help you to build atomic bombs. Now, therefore, we must find ways and means in which we can co-operate in promoting the civilian-nuclear industry as a part of your energy security strategy without my getting into difficulty with my own Congress that we are helping India to build atomic weapon." I felt that was a reasonable proposition, and out of that came the July 18 Statement, in which we agreed to separate our programme in a phased manner and to be determined by us, what is military, what is civilian. This is the background of the nuclear agreement that is now enshrined in the Joint Statement, which was issued earlier this month.

5.00 P.M.

Dr. Joshi and Nilotpal Basu are right that this statement is not only about nuclear power; it is also about cooperation in the field of research and development activities, having a bearing on agricultural productivity in our country. Who can deny that the first Green Revolution in our country largely came from the work done by the American scientists like Dr. Norman Borlaug in the early 60s. Those miracle seeds became available and, in fact, I think the first experiment with these miracle seeds were made in the house which is now occupied by former Prime Minister Vajpayee. At one time, Dr. C. Subramaniam as Food and Agriculture Minister lived there, and the first, I think, trials about the efficacy of those miracle seeds were in that house. So, therefore, I think, there was very substantial cooperation between American Land-Grant Colleges, American universities and our agricultural universities, which facilitated the Green Revolution. We ceased to live from ship to mouth, as Dr. Karan Singh so aptly put it. But we all know that for the last seven or eight years, the pace of agricultural activity in our country has reached a plateau. Our plans talk of a four per cent growth rate in agriculture. Year after year, We have to be content with less than two per cent growth. And, I do believe that we need a second Green Revolution, particularly when it comes to improving the technology of dry-land agriculture. Our Green Revolution has essentially concentrated on irrigated areas, with the result that the hard core of poverty lies in agriculture which is dependent on rainfed agriculture. It is there we feel that there is need for new technologies, and if cooperation with the American scientists, with American institutions can help us improve the productivity of our agriculture, I don't think there is anything wrong with that.

Now, there are fears about cooperation in the field of biotechnology. We have instruments in our country to make up our mind independently whether a particular technology is good for us. If it has side-effect, if it will hurt the interest of our farmers, I have full confidence in the ability of our scientists and the mechanisms that are in place to ensure that they will be able to sift good from bad technology, but we do not have to wait. We are afraid of improved technology simply because they originate in the United States of America.

In the same way, when it comes to the development prospects, when we were discussing development issues, President Bush said to me, "Dr. Singh, I don't believe in the philosophy of large-scale aid. We are not

in the business of giving aid. But I do believe that if the United States Government has any role in inducing more American capital to go to India, you tell me what we can do and we will be very happy to play a supportive role."

It is out of that conversation that this idea of the Group of CEOs was born. He said - "you set up a group of five people on your side and I will put five of my friends. Let them work together and produce a plan. I shall bless it and let us see what happens." Now, the CEOs have produced a report. Shri Nilotpall Basu is right that it is not on the Table of the House. But I have no hesitation in laying it on the Table of the House. There is nothing confidential about that. That report is now under examination and I can assure the hon. House that nothing will be done in violation of the existing rules and procedures, and affecting the existing legal requirements.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU : Sir, if you could yield for a minute. Our contention was not a technological cooperation in the field of agriculture. But the prognosis that you have made just now does not match even the findings of the National Commission for Farmers which has recently submitted the report.

Sir, there is a serious crisis of public investment in the field of agriculture. Now, this one-sided emphasis on technology cooperation and that too in the private space as against the public space earlier, during the Green Revolution, is something, which I think, you should really clarify in the House.

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH : Well, I agree with you. I have no hesitation in saying that the decline in public investment in agriculture is a major problem. The fact that we are not investing in irrigation as much as we ought to be investing is a major problem. This was not to say that these issues do not merit attention. All I am saying is that among other things, agricultural productivity could also be improved by using more modern technologies and wherever these possibilities exist, I submit, it is in the interest of our country to use them.

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI : Just a minute, Sir. About the productivity issue, have you got any idea what was the productivity per hectare when there was no modern technology, before the advent of Britishers and Mughals in this country? There are records which say that there were productivity records of 20 tonnes per hectare and that was in a

dry land area in the southern parts of this country, especially the district of Tanjore. These are written records, found and discovered by various scholars. There are records that even in 1757, the productivity was 7.57 tonnes per hectare near Ghazipur. Now, these are records of periods when there was no modern technology, or the so-called Green Revolution. Therefore, I would say that before jumping on to any modern technology, let us try to recognise and realise what were the standards of productivity and what were the technologies used by this very country under conditions that were much worse than they are today. That is the point I am making about these agreements. We shouldn't be enamoured by what is happening in America, thinking that that is the only solution to the problems of this country. We have seen the results of the First Green Revolution in the country. They are not very encouraging now; they were very encouraging in the beginning. But, today even the productivity in Punjab is going down. That is my point.

Therefore, Sir, just like in the field of energy, in the area of agricultural productivity too, there must be a general debate in the country and we should look at what kind of agricultural technology would be useful for this country. That is the point that I had raised.

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH : Sir, I am not as learned as Dr. Joshi is. I don't have to disagree with him that there are instances of high productivity even under traditional systems and that this country must make full use of this traditional wisdom and traditional knowledge. I am not questioning the logic of what he has said. But I do agree that India in at least the short and medium terms, does require technologies which have made their impact elsewhere. It is, of course, not my case, that all new technologies are going to make the same impact. But possibilities do exist and we should not shy away from using those possibilities. That is the logic behind this knowledge initiative.

That is also the logic behind the new initiative that President Bush and I have agreed upon and which is mentioned in the joint statement about HIV. Now, we know that five million of our citizens are afflicted by HIV. We also know that it is going to become a major pandemic and if it affects the working population of our country, as we fear, I think it could have a disastrous effect. Therefore, whatever cooperation we can get, whether it be through the Bill Gates Foundation or cooperation with the US agencies, I believe it is in our national interest to stem the smooth of this

dreadful disease. That is why all these things are mentioned in the Joint Statement.

They do not, in any way, imply any surrender of our autonomy, any surrender of our independence. I do believe, if used intelligently, they will widen our development options.

Sir, I now come to issues arising out of the civil nuclear energy. Dr. Joshi referred to some \$ 5 billion worth of weapons being used as an inducement. There never was any such discussion. There was no such temptation that was offered. This is a stand-alone deal and therefore no negotiations were undertaken by me or my colleagues during President Bush's visit or on the occasion of my visit to Washington. So, I would like to state that categorically.

Sir, there have been several questions about specific aspects of the Agreement on Civil Nuclear Energy and you will forgive me, because of the technical nature of these issues, I will have to read out.

Sir, questions have been raised as to whether we have accepted a cap on our strategic programme. Dr. Joshi also referred to it. We have been asked if we have ensured availability of sufficient fissile material and other inputs for our strategic programme. Let me reassure this House that the Separation Plan has been drawn up in such a manner that it will not adversely affect our strategic programme. Sir, Dr. Joshi and Shri Shahid Siddiqui spoke about reciprocity. They said that we have taken action, but the U.S. is yet to act. Let me clarify that the actual implementation of the agreed Separation Plan will be conditional upon U.S. Legislation amending existing laws and upon our negotiating with the International Atomic Energy Agency on safeguards. Until these arrangements are in place, there is no question of our implementing our separation programme. In that sense, there is, I think, full reciprocity. I should also like to emphasise, Sir, that there is no question of India accepting a cap on our deterrence potential. Based on assessments of threat scenarios, the Government has ensured that there would be adequate availability of fissile material and other inputs to meet current and future requirements of our strategic programme. The Separation Plan does not in any way undermine the integrity of our Nuclear Doctrine. I have had the fullest possible consultations with our nuclear scientists, with our Defence Forces and supervised by my Office and I have been assured by them that our deterrence requirements, both current requirements and future requirements, are not compromised by the

Separation Plan. The Separation Plan does not, in any way, undermine the integrity of our Nuclear Doctrine. This Doctrine stipulates a credible minimum deterrent based on a policy of no-first-use and the assured capability of inflicting unacceptable damage or an adversary indulging in a nuclear first strike. The Separation Plan will not limit our option, either now or in future, to address evolving threat scenarios with appropriate responses consistent with our nuclear policy of restraint and responsibility.

Sir, a question has been asked regarding safeguards in perpetuity. Under the July Statement, India agreed to identify and separate civilian and military facilities and put civilian nuclear facilities under safeguards. The Separation Plan provides for an India-specific Safeguards Agreement to be negotiated with the International Atomic Energy Agency. Questions have been raised, why an India-specific safeguards? Because in the terminology of the NPT, there are the Nuclear Weapon States. There is one set of safeguards applicable to them.

Then, there is a comprehensive safeguard applicable to the non-nuclear weapon States. We are not in this latter category. Therefore, we insisted that whatever safeguard agreement we sign, it must be India-specific, and that is why, at our instance. We have not said that we will sign the additional protocol. We have said that we will sign an additional India-specific Safeguards Agreement to protect our status of what we are.

Sir, I should like to mention that India will not accept a Safeguards Agreement signed by non-nuclear weapon States under the NPT, otherwise called comprehensive safeguards. This is precisely because our military facilities will remain outside the purview of safeguards like those of other nuclear weapon States. Each of the nuclear weapon States has concluded separate Safeguards Agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency listing specific facilities offered for safeguards. Similarly, we too will include in an India-specific Safeguards Agreement, the list of facilities offered for International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards.

Sir, since such an India-specific Safeguards Agreement is yet to be negotiated, it will be difficult to predict its content in detail. However, it will contain protection against withdrawal of safeguarded nuclear material from civilian use at any time. It will be negotiated so that India will be permitted to take corrective measures to ensure uninterrupted operation of our civilian nuclear reactors in the event of disruption of foreign fuel supplies.

Sir, on the subject of fuel supplies, I must underline that the United States has provided a number of assurances of uninterrupted supplies of fuel. These must be read with the assurance of India's right to take corrective measures in the event fuel supplies are interrupted. Even after these assurances, if all measures fail and supplies to our safeguarded reactors are disrupted, India retains the sovereign right to take all appropriate measures to fully safeguard its interest. Thus, safeguards in perpetuity must be seen in this overall context.

Sir, the third set of issues relates to measures announced by the Government with regard to the Cirus and Apsara research reactors, both of which are located at BARC. As I explained in my last *suo-moto* statement, we have decided to permanently shut down the Cirus reactor in 2010 and to shift the foreign sourced fuel core of the Apsara reactor outside BARC. The fuel core will then be available for safeguards in 2010. Let me clarify that only the fuel core will be shifted, and not the reactor. We have decided to take these steps because the BARC complex is of high national security importance and we will not allow any international inspectors in this area. While the Cirus reactor was refurbished recently, the associated costs will be more than recovered by the isotopes produced and the research that will be conducted before its closure. Both Cirus and Apsara are not related to our strategic programme, and therefore our scientists have assured me that these steps announced in the separation Plan will have no impact on the strategic programme.

Sir, some members have also expressed concerns whether these steps will hinder ongoing research and development. Dr. Kasturirangan has eloquently spoken on this subject, and I don't have to repeat what he has said. But I would like to assure this august House, in particular, the scientific community, that we will take adequate steps to ensure that there is no adverse fall out on research and development. Our scientists will have state-of-the-art facilities to expand the frontiers of knowledge. One of the main criteria motivating us in drawing up the separation plan has been our determination to safeguard the autonomy of our research and development programmes including the fast breeder programme.

This will be ensured in full measure. Finally, Sir, some hon. Members have expressed concern whether the confidentiality of the strategic programme was fully preserved during the negotiations with the United States. Sir, I can assure the hon. Members that our discussions with the United States pertained only to those facilities that are being offered for

safeguards between 2006-2014. The discussions did not cover our strategic programme. Confidential information on our national security and the strategic programme has been and will remain fully protected.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I believe, that it is the sentiment of the House that the decisions we have taken will lead to welcome resumption of international cooperation in a very important area of science and technological research. Our understanding will open the door for cooperation in the development of our civilian nuclear energy sector, not only with the United States, but also with other international partners like Russia, the United Kingdom and France. At the same time, we will also be able to internationally share our recognised capabilities in the field of civilian nuclear technology.

Sir, in this context, some hon. Members have spoken of the Global Nuclear Energy partnership, and Dr. Joshi also referred to it, which, as I said earlier, is a separate issue from our bilateral discussions with the United States on civil nuclear cooperation. Our comprehensive capabilities across the spectrum and mastery over all aspects of the nuclear fuel cycle are well-established and widely-recognised. Therefore, our possible association with any such international initiative can only be on the basis of participation by India as an equal partner with other founding Members and as a supplier nation. We will not forgo the three stage programme which will enable us to utilise our vast thorium reserves in future.

Sir, Shri Nilotpall Basu asked about the ultimate destination of our nuclear policy. I had in my statement in July last year clearly stated that India remains committed to pursuit of universal nuclear disarmament and there is no change in that matter. I had mentioned this in my statement of July 29, 2005, and I have no hesitation in reiterating that the Government remains committed to this principled policy: that is, one of unwavering support for the global elimination of nuclear weapons and all Weapons of Mass Destruction as well as complete nuclear disarmament. This has been our consistent position at the United Nations and at the Conference on Disarmament. We are the only nuclear weapon State to support the complete elimination of nuclear weapons in a time-bound manner.

I believe, Sir, I have answered most of the questions that were raised.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU : Sir, we must express our sense of disappointment with this reply because it really does not address any of the

serious concerns that we have expressed, and it is for the people of the country to decide ultimately how they take this down.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Let the people decide.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU : Sir, he has also not replied on that Committee for which he has left himself a route in the agreement itself.

SHRI SHAHID SIDDIQUI : Sir, while appreciating the Prime Minister, I would like to ask a very specific question ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Message from Lok Sabha. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI SHAHID SIDDIQUI : Sir, the Prime Minister said*(Interruptions)*.....

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU : Sir, the APSARA was*(Interruptions)*.....

MR. CHAIRMAN : Message from Lok Sabha. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MESSAGES FROM LOK SABHA - *Contd.*

The Appropriation (Railways) No.3 Bill, 2006

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

"In accordance with the provisions of rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose the Appropriation (Railways) No.3 Bill, 2006, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 11th March, 2006."

"The Speaker has certified that this Bill is a Money Bill within the meaning of article 110 of the Constitution of India."

Sir, I lay a copy of the Bill on the Table.

श्री सभापति : सदन की कार्यवाही सोमवार, दिनांक 13.03.2006 को प्रातः 11:00 बजे तक के लिए स्थगित की जाती है।

The House then adjourned at twenty minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Monday, the 13th March 2006.