

>

Title: Discussion regarding Indo-US Nuclear Agreement (Discussion concluded)

MR. SPEAKER: We will, of course, continue the discussion on the Supplementary Demands for Grants (General) tomorrow.

We will now take up the discussion under Rule 193 on the Indo-US Nuclear Agreement. Hon. Members, it is a very important matter and I am sure the debate will be of a very high order. I would request all the hon. Members and the Leaders to see to it that this is discussed with proper importance and dignity. I would request that Heads of foreign friendly Governments should not be referred to in the discussion.

Hon. Members, the discussion on the Indo-US Nuclear Agreement has been admitted in the names of Shri P. Karunakaran and Shri Rupchand Pal. Shri P. Karunakaran has since requested me to allow Shri Rupchand Pal to raise the discussion on his behalf. I have acceded to his request.

Now, Shri Rupchand Pal.

प्रो. विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा (दक्षिण दिल्ली): आपने जो कहा, वह बिल्कुल ठीक है, पर आपने कहा कि एग्जिमेंट हुआ था कि चर्चा नियम 193 के अन्तर्गत की जाये, हमारा इन्सिस्टेंस था कि रूल 184 में चर्चा होनी चाहिए, जिसमें वोटिंग हो...*(व्यवधान)* It is for you to decide on the issue. I thought that I can just tell this point.

MR. SPEAKER: I have already given my ruling and it was accepted by the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

SHRI MOHAN RAWALE (MUMBAI SOUTH CENTRAL): Sir, I have a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: What is your point of order?

श्री मोहन रावले : आपने रूल 253 के मुताबिक मैं पाइंट ऑफ ऑर्डर लाना चाहता हूँ। I am not going to challenge you, Sir.

अध्यक्ष महोदय : बोलिये, आपका क्या पाइंट ऑफ ऑर्डर है?

श्री मोहन रावले : अभी इसके ऊपर जो लीगल कंट्रोवर्सी टीटी में हुई है, अभी तक तो कभी भी कंट्रोवर्सी नहीं हुई थी, हमने कई देशों के साथ की। अभी ये सपोर्ट विथड्रॉ करने जा रहे थे, सरकार गिजने के लिए जा रहे थे, मेरी आपसे विनती है, I am not going to challenge you, Sir. इस पर एक लीगल ओपिनियन भी दी गई है, जो श्री पी.बी. सावंत ने दी है, "The Union Executive has no authority to enter into a bilateral treaty unless it is ratified by the Parliament."

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry. This is not a matter for a point of order. When you would be speaking, you may make the statement and speak on it.

â€¦ (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: You know that it is not a point of order.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL (HOOGLY): Sir, at long last, this august House has got an opportunity to discuss a very very important deal, the Indo-US Civil Nuclear Cooperation Deal. It has a serious bearing on the future of this country, its economy, its relationship with other countries, its nuclear programme and its energy security. It is good that we are discussing it today and we are thankful to you, Sir, the Leaders of the Government and all the concerned that this opportunity at last is given to us.

In the last Session, we have been insisting on such a discussion on this important deal but we had been denied of it because of interruptions by the main Opposition. We could well understand the reason as they continued to be confused about their stand vis-à-vis the Nuclear Deal. Firstly, it is they who had initiated it and the hon. Prime Minister had very rightly mentioned, when the delegation of the BJP met him, that it is your baby. But they want to put the ownership of the baby in a different language. What is the language going to be? We will come to know of it because different voices are being heard on it. One is by Shri L.K. Advani, the hon. Leader of the Opposition who, at a point, said, "No, no. We are in full agreement with the deal."

प्रो. विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा : आप अपना स्टैंड क्लियर करे...*(व्यवधान)*

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : Now some Opposition Leaders are writing articles and making speeches. They are speaking in different voices. According to the BJP, they have no objection to the strategic alliance with the US and 14 rounds of secret discussions have taken place.

Fourteen rounds of discussions have taken place between Shri Jaswant Singh and Mr. Strobe Talbott. Of course, they took place in different places and most of them were secret discussions. I demand from the Government what have been the issues that have come out in the latest book "Engaging India" by Mr. Strobe Talbott who tells us a lot of things that without the concurrence of the Government, without taking into account the national consensus about our foreign policy, without taking into account our national interests, certain commitments have been made. As it happened for their wrong economic policies, the claim for India shining when India was suffering, the people had put them in right place. So, also when people come to know about their position *vis-à-vis* their surrender to the US pressures people will react similarly. But we expected something different from the UPA.. When the Common Minimum Programme was being framed, at that point of time, might be that some suggestion had come about –the strategic relations with the United States and the Left had categorically stated 'no'. The Left cannot be a party to it. So, there was a demarcation of the UPA *vis-à-vis* its independent foreign policy and the policy of the previous NDA Government which had a definite tilt towards US for a strategic alliance which by now is revealed in more than one document.

Now, when the Government, the hon. Prime Minister, had come out with a joint statement on 18th of July, 2005, even at the very beginning, the Left had expressed certain apprehensions. It is not that overnight the Left woke up and said, 'no', we cannot agree to it. If you go without our consultation, and as we are a supporting partner, we cannot be a party to it. We say that we cannot be a party to it. We have serious reservations in respect of various provisions in the 123 Agreement itself. Then, on the basis of that there have been certain discussions. We have raised nine points relating to the Deal where we differ and we have serious reservations *vis-à-vis* the Draft. The hon. Prime Minister in August gave some assurances. Then in 2006, December came the Henry Hyde Act which was reconciliation between the two earlier drafts. What came out, how to give the exemption, what sort of waiver should be given in the US Atomic Energy Act, 1954 etc.

Sir, under the leadership of Henry Hyde, a Draft was prepared and after the Left came to know of the provisions in the Draft, they made it clear to the Government that there were the nine areas where the Left had objection and the nation need to be reassured by the Government on these. In August, the hon. Prime Minister came out with assurances on all those points. But to our dismay, we found that in the Hyde Act of December, 2006, most of the important assurances given by the hon. Prime Minister on the floor of the House were trampled and ignored. This was in relation to technology transfer, in relation to fuel supply, in relation to congruence of Indian foreign policy with the US foreign policy, specific reference to Iran, un-interrupted fuel supply and on very many other issues. We shall come to that one by one.

The hon. Prime Minister had categorically stated one thing - the nuclear cycle in its entirety, This is very important.[\[a39\]](#)

But we found that it was selective. It was selective even in respect of lifting of the sanctions. Transfer of sensitive technology as well as transfer of dual use technology was denied. The Government claims that from a regime of technology denial, we are entering into the mainstream global nuclear arena; we are a recognised nuclear power also. But that was not so. It is not only in respect of the technology transfer but also in the case of fuel supply, the assurance given was very vague. We have the experience of Tarapur. We found that there was no assurance regarding uninterrupted fuel supply. This was taken up again and again. The Government is trying to say:- "No. There is an assurance." Even in the case of termination, what will happen? There is a termination clause. What is the termination clause? In case the Government of India goes in for a nuclear explosion, then the termination can take place. The termination can take place for various other reasons and extraneous reasons directly unrelated to the civilian nuclear energy also. In the case of a termination of the agreement, the fuel supply, the reactors, equipment and everything will have to be returned. Although there is a clause on which the Government is trying to argue by saying: " No. In that case, the US is saying that it will help us to take corrective measures", yet you if relate the 123 Agreement to the Hyde Act. It is something else.

The relationship between these two is important. Would we find that only the US Congress can grant the permanent waiver and just condone you. The Hyde Act specifically mentions that the US will stop any other country from providing the fuel supply in such a scenario termination of the agreement. That means, you are nowhere. That is the issue that we have been making. Canards have been spread saying that we are doing it at the behest of China; we are doing it for that and we are doing it for this. So, canards have been spread. Is it not wise to ask whether our nuclear reactors will have uninterrupted fuel supply? What is the guarantee? You are going for the agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency in perpetuity. But nuclear fuel supply is not going to be in perpetuity. It is conditional. Is it not wise to ask this question? The whole gamut of the fuel issue, these extraneous issues are there. Our patriotism is being questioned. We have the past experience also.

Several times, the Communists have been charged saying that they are unpatriotic. But history says something else.

In the party there are some best men and women of the country who sacrificed most for the freedom of this land, who suffered most for 30-40 years in jail, some of whom have been Members of this House. We have made suggestions about settlement Indo-China border. We had said that it should not be resolved by an armed conflict but by dialogue. The Government is now doing it. Many others believe that this is the right way. For making our suggestion, we are accused. Today also when we are saying the right thing, we are being abused like anything. But we are not going to take it lying down. We are asking: "What about your uninterrupted fuel supply?"

Now, I am coming to all the nine points given by the hon. Prime Minister. What will happen to our strategic autonomy?[\[R40\]](#)

If we look into the speeches prior to this agreement, we do find that it had started long back during the talks between Shri Jaswant Singh and Mr. Strobe Talbott. They talked about military exchange, strategic alliance and to have a new regional architecture in Asia to contain China and very categorically in a writing very recently published it is being said by no less a person than the Chief Interlocutor Mr. Nicolas Burns that it is an age of anti-Americanism. Yes, throughout Latin America, countries like Brazil, Argentina, Mexico, Ecuador and Bolivia, Venezuela are opposing the United States of America. Look at the world, Russia is standing up against any threat which it could not do a few years back. It is a changed world. Even inside America, - I am not naming – the present President is the most hated person amongst Americans.

MR. SPEAKER: It need not be said like that.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : Sir, I have not named anybody.

MR. SPEAKER: All right, but let us discuss with dignity.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : Sir, India under NDA cooperated with them in Iraq. Some others have also done in other parts of the world. In the United Kingdom, those who have supported America have gone out of power, in Australia also they have gone out of power and in Japan also they have gone. So, this is the age of anti-Americanism. This is the admission made by Mr. Nicolas Burns and in this age, what is required? What is required, according to that article of Nicholas Burns, is that in Asia, US must have a new regional architecture, new military status, naval exercises, new friends and it is being said in the same article that "US is only just beginning to realize the benefits of this relationship for its interests in South and East Asia". So, you can well understand the situation.

Sir, why are the 'Henrys' of America losing their sleep? I am not naming anyone. Mr. Henry Hyde has done the job elsewhere and some other 'Henrys' are coming here, meeting the people in the Government, meeting the Opposition leaders and all that. Once in a millennium one benefactor has come, losing his sleep. We are questioning the Agreement and saying that we are not going to be benefited by it. They say, 'No, it is in your benefit', although we know it is in their benefit. Repeatedly it is being said that it is in their benefit for creating a new regional architecture in Asia. For a new Asian NATO, they need India. Once they wanted to balance Pakistan and India, there was talk of composite dialogue and all that, I am not going into that here. But now they want India. What do they say? The July statement says that the Indo-US Nuclear Deal is one part of it. They say there will be collaboration in the fields of agriculture, education, economy, politics, military and it is a total package and in the midst of the total package, there is one deal. In the language of Mr. Nicolas Burns, it is the centerpiece. That is not all. So, they want us to ignore our independent foreign policy. They are openly saying that non-alignment is an old thing and telling us to leave it. Again and again they are telling us not to go in support of Iran. They want us to ignore Iran and unfortunately we have been doing it. Twice India voted against Iran in the International Atomic Energy Agency.[\[R41\]](#)

[\[r42\]](#)Our Indian delegation was amazed by the directive that had come from the top quarters. How is it? Our friend is Iran. Civilisational contacts are there. On the Republic day in recent past, we had an honoured guest from Iran. We have our relationship. We depend so much on our oil supply from Iran. Why should we ignore them? But we did. In nine references, Hyde Act says, 'India, you are going to be rewarded and Iran is not behaving properly, they are going to be punished. Help us to punish Iran'. Is it the way, Indian should pursue its independent foreign policy?

Was it the legacy we had from our Freedom Struggle – a well tested Non-aligned Policy on the basis of a national consensus? It is a new multi-polar world, unilateralism is not working anymore. It has been admitted by Nicholas Burns day by day that they are getting isolated. At such a time, India should stand by America and isolate themselves, at their dictate. We should refrain from undertaking the Iran-Pakistan-India Gas project on their instance India had voted against Iran as asked by us. It is very unfortunate.

This is not simply a vision of an independent foreign policy, it affects our strategic programme also. The hon. Prime Minister's argument is that Indian economy is growing like anything, nine per cent or nine-and-a-half per cent. They can go

on saying any figure because it has nothing to do with the livelihood common people. Even his Cabinet Minister has admitted that this growth, this percentage is not reflected amongst the people. As per their own report more than 70 per cent of the people of India are living on Rs.20 a day.

In the perspective for growth, we need more energy. Who can deny it? The Left is not denying it. Have they any policy? The only policy document they have got is the Eleventh Plan Mr. Parikh Document on Integrated Energy Policy. There what they have said. Have they got any vision? They have said Nuclear Power Projections by 2020, 2030 and so many things. Have they got any national policy on the energy mix? How do you calculate this? What is the study? What is the analysis? What is the cost of imported reactor? Nothing has been done and suddenly comes the nuclear renaissance. We cannot miss the bus. Bus to which end, to what goal, whose goal?

Nuclear renaissance is a hype. In America itself, no nuclear plant has been set up for 30 years since Three Mile Island disaster. They are depending, Westinghouse GE, etc. and all other nuclear companies, on outside sales only. Even the international document says that Nuclear Power is now 16 per cent of global electricity consumption. It is an international body. If you want, I can read it. In this our Rev. Pachauri Saheb सम्मानित पचौरी साहब, जो कि नोबेल लॉरिस्ट हैं, उनकी रिपोर्ट है, स्टडी ग्रुप की रिपोर्ट है that it is only 16 per cent and with the best endeavour you can reach at 18 per cent. क्लाइमेट चेंज के आधार पर, एनर्जी सिक्योरिटी के आधार पर हमारे पास क्या नहीं है।

The people have been telling – the MP from Arunachal Pradesh is here, he has written to me and spoken to me – that there is 60,000 MW potential in hydro electricity in N.E. alone. What is the difficulty? There is no money. Only in the North-East, this potential is there, the study says that and we have not exploited it. Have you no coal reserves? Is it exhausted? Is there no clean technology available in India today? Is there no Coal Bed Methane (CBM) or no liquefied coal technology available? I would like to know whether you have any national coal use and national coal policy. There is nothing like that. In such a scenario, you are opting for the nuclear energy which is costly. According to a draft calculation in Kudankulam, it was calculated that it would be – even after Russian concessional help, and the nuclear cost would be around Rs. 4 to Rs. 5.50. It is not cheap. Now the question is that if it is not cheap, why are you going for that? If you have so much to pay – our independent foreign policy, our strategic programme, our own domestic nuclear programme, we have to go at their instance, they may use nuclear blackmail in various situations which they have done – why should you go for it? Is it to benefit them? Their ailing nuclear industry will be rejuvenated and more jobs will be created there. It is the admission of Condoleezza Rice. But it will be done at the cost of India. We have so much of unemployment. We will have no jobs. There, we will have jobs because there nuclear reactors will come to India.

We have a self-reliant domestic nuclear programme. We are not against nuclear energy. We want an appropriate, judicious, nuclear energy mix. We are being told that there is no money; resources are not available. Suddenly, we are opting for the most expensive nuclear energy at their instance. Is it going to help us? No. What I want to say is that if you go for the cost benefit, India is not benefited. It is being said that 123 Agreement is different from the Hyde Act, why we are worried about the Hyde Act. Who says this? Sir, 123 Agreement is in conformity with the Hyde Act. Wherever there is no dispute, it is okay. If there is any dispute, their national law will prevail. It is very specific. The Left had put its viewpoint on the relationship between the 123 Agreement and the Hyde Act very categorically as to what is the international position, what is the Vienna Convention about international treaties and all these things. They are saying China has done it. अरे बाबा, चाइना एक न्यूक्लियर पैपन स्टेट है। China is a party to NPT. Why are you comparing India with China? The contract between China and the United States is being guided by international law. Ours is guided by US national law. This has happened in such case, say, about the fast breeder reactor in Japan and all these things and in all such areas. What has happened in the case of Japan? By arbitration-But Indo-US nuclear deal is put on a level which is detrimental to India. They say, no, the present President has assured us in writing. What is the use of this writing? The future President will go by the American law only. In such a situation, what we have been saying is why are you so eager that we should not miss the bus, which bus I do not know, for which goal, that also I do not know. We have the experience of ENRON. Have you forgotten that? It is not only about the price; we have said so many things about it. We have said: "Do not do it." They say: "No, it is a different world." In a different world, you have gone for ENRON and Maharashtra people will tell us better as to what is the situation.

I would just like to take this opportunity to tell the Government that ultimately – the Left has told you – you can go to the international atomic energy. But, what for? We want a concrete assurance about the uninterrupted supply. That you have not done for the Russian Programme; you have not signed it. It is a different issue, I am not going into that Kudankulam issue.[\[r43\]](#)

The re-assurance from IAEA has to be according to India's specific requirement because it will be India specific safeguard. I would like to know from the hon. Prime Minister as to what the India specific safeguard is? What is the

guarantee?

You are saying that our fast breeder reactors will also be under the supervision of the international agency in perpetuity. Our nuclear scientists have said that our fast breeder reactors are superior to others in certain areas. We work on a particular nuclear cycle by which you can use the spent fuel, enrich it and go on.

Now, nuclear waste management is a big problem to the Western world. In such a situation we have certain advantages. But putting the fast breeder reactors under the supervision and under the safeguard, will it be helpful to us?

Now, I come to re-processing. It is very vague. It is notional only. Whatever assurance has been given is only notional. They say that under a dedicated arrangement, we should have this use of spent fuel and all these. What is the cost? So, it is not a simple question of a strategic alliance. It is surrendering to their pressure. As they are getting isolated, they want to get India also to be isolated. It will harm us immensely at the WTO level in our negotiations. Our friends are in G70, G77, and G90. Against whom are we fighting? China, India and Brazil are fighting against the American agricultural subsidy. They are our friends. In so many international bodies and also in the emerging bodies, we are all friends. What message will it go now? After 60 years of India's Independence, India did what India has never done. They mentioned this in their speeches.

The Congress Party people can read these aspersions about how they had been dealing with Soviet Russia and others during the time of Pandit Nehru. They had the audacity to mention that the Soviet weapons were flooding in the Indian military. We have 126, Multi Role Combat Aircraft (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Now, please conclude.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL (HOOGHLY): Please give me one minute.

Apart from that, they are saying that India should simultaneously open up banking, India should open up insurance and India should open up foreign retail. In such a scenario, we think that this Government is not applying its mind to the dangers in the Deal itself.

It is said that 90 per cent of the Indian civilian nuclear reactors would be under the supervision of IAEA. How do they calculate? That is the question I am asking. Nicholas Burns, who is the Chief Interlocutor, himself is writing that 90 per cent of the Indian civilian nuclear reactors will be under the supervision of IAEA in perpetuity. That also is in perpetuity. Then, we know their concept of democracy. They are saying that with India, they will just stabilize democracy in so many countries. What will happen to our relations with so many other countries? We know as to what sort of democracy they have. We know what happened in Iraq and what happened in Afghanistan. Now, strangely we find the change in Government voice in terms of its support to Palestine and in relation to various other Middle-East issues. It is toned down so substantially. We apprehend that the pressure has started to work on them.[\[h44\]](#) [\[h45\]](#)

Sir, I am concluding now.

He further says that 'the military co-operation is impeded by the fact that much of the Indian Military still uses a considerable amount of Soviet Union equipment. A significant Indian Defence purchase from the United States, for example, of the new Advanced Multi-role Combat Aircraft that the Indian Air Force take, would be a great leap forward.' So, 123 is not 123; 123 is also 126, that is, their aircraft.

He says about the Indian Arms Bazar, Indian Insurance Market, Indian Banking, Indian Retail and India as an ally to guard the seas and the Navy. And, they are insisting on PSI, Proliferation Security Initiatives. They are insisting on many other such Agreements, which we did not agree earlier.

We know, very recently the nuclear materials equipped ship had come. There have been Australia, Singapore, the US, Japan and India joint exercises. What signal had it sent? What was the reaction to our neighbours? What happens? It is the logistic agreement that the fuel services would be allowed and they would take the fuel here, and they would just wait in the Indian Ocean or the Bay of Bengal. They are waiting. Will not our neighbours be suspicious about us? For the fault of America, we will have to suffer, we will be punished. It had happened long back. When these people were agreeing to send the Indian troops to Iraq, the whole august House woke up and said: "No." But still they were hesitant. There was no condemnation. They used the only word 'deplorable'.

Sir, I am just concluding.

MR. SPEAKER: It should be actual concluding.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : I am concluding.

About the timetable, they are hurrying up and saying: "By January, you must have to do this; this has to go to the US Congress" as if their Parliament, their US Congress is superior to the Indian Parliament. The Indian Parliament must discuss it. Let there be a sense of this House. We know that in our Constitution, there is no provision of ratification of any International Treaty. We shall discuss it later on when the time comes.

But it is our earnest appeal. We have submitted our viewpoints. On the PM's assurances with regard to all the reservations we had made regarding the Draft Bill, most of them have been trampled down by the Hyde Act. Our apprehensions have been proved true repeatedly. Please take the sense of the House. Do not proceed further because the majority of this sovereign House is against this very, very important Deal, which has a serious bearing on the future of this country, on the future economy of this country, on our nuclear programme, on our self-reliance and on our relations with other countries in an emerging multi-polar world.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI (GANDHINAGAR): Mr. Speaker, Sir, though it is not the first time that we are discussing this particular matter, but I still believe that at this point of time, this has become a very important debate in the history of Parliament.

Just now, Shri Rupchand Pal, while concluding his speech, said that he would like a sense of the House to be taken so far as this issue is concerned. I for one see no reason why the Government should not have agreed to have this discussion under Rule 184 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business. [\[r46\]](#)

I can understand that irrespective of what the vote is, the Government may say that the Constitution does not obligate us to seek ratification for any international treaty. Therefore, you have expressed an opinion. There are occasions when the House expressed its opinion.

MR. SPEAKER: May I interrupt you for a second? When I had given my ruling on the notice under rule 184 in the last Session, I had not consulted the Government. Therefore, Government's willingness has no relevance for me. It is because you said why did the Government involve.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI : I accept it. But I think that so far as the sense of the House is concerned, it has already been expressed on several occasions. Once when we staged the walk-out against something that had been said on this particular issue from the Government side, almost all sections of the House walked out. In fact, from even the UPA, the Left Parties also walked out with us. There have been other occasions also. I am not going to go into that.

Today, the Prime Minister is here and I would like to recall that when first he met President Bush way back in the year 2005 when exactly this debate started in the country among political parties, among thinking sections of the people, a question was posed to him two days after his Joint Statement with President Bush had been issued on Nuclear Cooperation. The question posed to him at a Press Conference held in Washington on 20th July 2005 was this. "Mr. Prime Minister, do you see any resistance coming forward from your Allies--obviously, they had an inkling of what is likely to happen--and the Opposition?" So, despite what my friend Mr. Rupchand Pal may say about Strobe Talbot and all that, they knew that on this particular issue, we had certain very strong reservations. So, the question posed was: "Do you see any resistance coming forward from your Allies and the Opposition in putting the new India-US Policy to practice, and will you seek a Parliamentary consensus or approval to the new direction you seem to be taking in Foreign Policy?" So, they take it for granted that it is a new direction in Foreign Policy that this Government is taking.

The Prime Minister Dr. Manmohan Singh replied: "Well, the Parliament in our country is sovereign. It is my intention to make a Statement in Parliament when I go back home, and it goes without saying that we can move forward only on the basis of a broad national consensus." Now, my first poser to the Prime Minister is this. Do you see this broad national consensus before which you have used the word, "only if there is a broad national consensus"? In this country, we do not have any provision in the Constitution for a referendum as is there in some other countries.

But so far as Parliament is concerned, I am sure that you are aware, everyone is aware that there is no consensus on this particular deal. So, when it is obvious that there is no broad consensus on this deal, why are you so rushing into this deal? Why? I cannot understand this. Why can you not think in terms of what we have suggested all along? Think of ways of re-negotiating the deal.

Their objection is not to the deal so much. You could see it even in the first sentence itself. It is either anti-Americanism or anti-BJPism which becomes the guideline for all of them. So their very first sentence is that they are

against any kind of strategic partnership with the United States. We are not. We are not. So, when people quote me, Strobe Talbot or Jaswant Singh's book or my statement which I made, I simply emphasized this. While in the discussions in the other House, many times it may seem that the CPI(M)'s opposition and the BJP's opposition is identical. No, it is not identical. [\[m47\]](#)

The difference I wanted to stress in that particular statement which was supposed to be a shift in my stand. No, there has been no shift all along. I would like to tell you one thing. It is true that in the last Session, this issue could not be discussed as it ought to have been. Why? It was because after all, we said why we cannot have a Joint Parliamentary Committee on this. The Government did not agree and instead first said what has been done is signed and sealed and it is not negotiable and therefore, we cannot have a Joint Parliamentary Committee going into it. But it was a surprise for the country to find that instead of a Joint Parliamentary Committee in which all could have participated including the Left, you formed a Committee of the UPA and the Left. How do you explain it?

Today, my second poser to the Prime Minister and the Government is this. What has been accomplished by this joint committee of the UPA and the Left till now? From the Press all that we see is that the Committee met and decided to meet on this day again. Very often these days it appears that while the Congress is particular about the deal and says '*bachao* the deal' the Left, especially the CPI(M) suddenly says '*bachao* Bengal'. Not only that, but the kind of flip flop that you are making makes me feel that you are no longer concerned with the deal; you are more concerned with the timing of elections. You do not want an election now and therefore, you say, 'All right, you go ahead with IAEA, talk to them and we will see later'. We have a veto with us. Do not deceive yourself and do not deceive the country. *â€* (Interruptions)

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL: We are not deceiving. ... (Interruptions)

SHRI L.K. ADVANI : You are where you are, but it is certainly expected of a party which is part of a coalition, which is part of an alliance not to behave in this manner. I will see their outlook later. I will come to the deal itself.

I was surprised to find that in one of his earlier statements made in Parliament, the Prime Minister said on 13.8.07 :

"As I have said, this is an agreement for cooperation between India and the US on peaceful uses of nuclear energy. Its genesis is the shared perception between the India and the US that both our countries need to address their energy challenges ..."

I can understand that we are looking at it from the energy point of view, but I do not see how America also is looking at this deal from the point of view of energy. What is mentioned in this statement is 'its genesis is shared perception'. The US is certainly not looking for nuclear energy as a major option, leave alone the most important option to meet its energy challenges; we may be. I can say that we have our energy concern which I share, though I do not agree that this is going to be a solution to that, but the US is certainly looking at this from a strategic angle. This is the difference. They are not looking at it from the energy angle.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE): Would you just concede for a second?

If you just go to the second sentence of the 123 Agreement, which is an agreement between the India and the USA, it says:

"Recognizing the significance of civilian nuclear energy for meeting growing global energy demands in a cleaner and more efficient manner... "

This is the agreed text of an agreement. The agreement is yet to be finalised. [\[s48\]](#) Therefore, both USA and India recognise the need of sharing the common perceptions of energy.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI : Thank you, Shri Pranab Mukherjee. I can only endorse what my friend Shri Rupchand Pal just now said, namely, that there has been no nuclear reactor that has come up in America for many many years. Therefore, ... (Interruptions)

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : You just see what you said a few seconds ago, and what was my contention.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI : No, I can understand that you can have it in a format, but so far as reality is concerned, the reality comes out very clearly in other statements that they have made. I will quote them later on. ... (Interruptions)

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : You can give your own argument, and I have no problem with it.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI : It is my conviction that while our concern is energy, their concern has been all along strategic. The

strategic approach adopted by Shrimati Indira Gandhi in 1974 and pursued further by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee in 1998 is to see that it is contained. This is their principal objective, which I will prove just now.

They are not concerned too much with this as for them it is only Russia and China who have the right to build-up nuclear arsenal. So far as India is concerned, they are opposed to it irrespective of which Government is in power whether it is the Congress Government or the NDA Government. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : We are advocating universal disarmament.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI : I can quote even a recent statement that : "Our approach on the nuclear weapons is clear from the very beginning. India must not go in for weaponization in the nuclear field." This is your statement, and I can understand it. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : We are supporting universal disarmament.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI : Sir, Dr. Manmohan Singh in the famous statement made at the Tarapur Atomic Power Plant on August 31 said that : "India cannot afford to miss the nuclear bus." He said that : "There is today talk the world over of a nuclear renaissance, and we cannot afford to miss the bus or lag behind these global developments."

The UPA Chairperson, Shrimati Sonia Gandhi, went a step further while speaking at Jhajjar in Haryana when she said that : "Those who are opposed to the deal are not only enemies of the Congress, but also of India's development." I do not know why people should use words like enemy in this context meaning both the Left Party, who are allies to the Government, and the NDA, which is certainly opposed to the Government. We are political adversaries, and none of us are enemies of any other Party. But this statement mentioning 'enemies of development' is difficult to believe.

I have with me the Integrated Energy Policy Report of the Expert Committee set up by the Planning Commission. It was released in August 2006. It has taken into account all the promises made in respect of energy in the nuclear deal. The Committee was headed by Dr. Kirit S. Parikh, and Dr. Anil Kakodkar, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) was also a Member on the Committee. I would like to quote just one portion of it. The Report says that : "Even if a 20-fold increase takes place in India's nuclear power capacity by 2031-2032, the contribution of nuclear energy to India's energy mix is also, at best, expected to be 4.0-6.4 per cent." This is the total. It further says that this is an optimistic scenario, and possibilities of imports of nuclear fuel would be made possible if the Indo-US Agreement is not impaired.[\[r49\]](#) Only then, will there be this scenario – 4 to 6.5 per cent. Now, how can this be called a Deal to ensure energy security for the country? Certainly not; it is so obvious. Let us not delude ourselves.

It is true that my Party, the BJP, earlier the Jan Sangh, has been the only Party – in 1964, China had its nuclear blast at Lop Nor -- which in 1964 itself moved a Motion in the Lok Sabha, but in 1966, we formally adopted a Resolution in our Party's National Council at Varanasi that India must build up a nuclear deterrent of its own. I can tell you that in those days all other political parties criticized us, scoffed at us, and the argument was that we could not afford it; India just could not afford it because our resources were very limited. But we drew strength from the Principal Architect of India's Nuclear Programme, Dr. Homi Bhaba. He was among those who favoured India becoming a nuclear weapon State, and he said it very clearly. So much so that in one of his very significant speeches made on All India Radio on 24th October, 1964, the same year as China had its nuclear blast at Lop Nor, he said: "Atomic weapons give a State possessing them in adequate numbers a deterrent power against attack from a much stronger State." This was the statement that he made in 1964 just a few days after the Lop Nor blast, though at that time the Government's policy, the Government was headed by Pandit Nehru, was that we would develop our nuclear programme, that our nuclear energy would be used only for peaceful purposes, and that it would not be used for weaponizing the country.

Our Party became the sole Party to be an advocate of this and it is going on since then till today. So, when in 1998 Vajpayee ji became the Prime Minister, he was able to make all the other parties in the Coalition agree to this that we must develop a nuclear deterrent of our own. On the 19th of March, the NDA Government took office, and on the 11th of May, we had these Pokhran-II blasts. I can say, at that time, we were criticized within the country not only by the Left Parties, but even by the Congress Party. The present Prime Minister was Leader of the House in the other House and he criticized us. His criticism was that the consequences for our economy would not be good; it would damage our economy; economic sanctions would be imposed on us, and the consequences would be these.

Sir, I think Mrs. Gandhi did the right thing when she departed from the policy laid down by Pandit Nehru, and in 1974, shortly after the Indo-Pak War in which War, America had sent its nuclear-armed Seventh Fleet to the Bay of Bengal.

SHRI N.N. KRISHNADAS (PALGHAT): At that time, the Soviet Union protected us.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI : Therefore, if Soviet Union protects us or helps us, my Party has always been grateful to it. We were in favour of the Indo-Soviet Defence Agreement that we signed shortly after the War. We are not like you in which you have a closed mind in respect of America. You would not talk about America. So far as we are concerned, even at that time, we had favoured...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI N.N. KRISHNADAS : We are against American imperialism.

MR. SPEAKER: Advani ji, do not reply to it.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI : They are not worthy of reply.

MR. SPEAKER: But you have replied to that.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI : I concede to the Speaker's advice. He thinks that you should not be replied.

MR. SPEAKER: I said that you should not get diverted because your speech is a very important speech.

SHRI N.N. KRISHNADAS : You always take advice from the hon. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: It is better to take advice from me than anybody else, so far as the issue of running the House is concerned.

SHRI N.N. KRISHNADAS : It should always be like that.[\[r50\]](#)

15.00 hrs.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI : Therefore, my first point to the Government is, do not try to mislead the people by telling them that this is for energy purposes only and anyone who is opposing this is in a way standing in the way of India's development. I think that we need energy.

I may even mention something that relates to our period in Government. Recently, many negotiators came from America to persuade us to support this Deal. It made me feel that even more than the Government of India, it is America which is interested in this particular Deal. One of the people who met me and who has been involved in this nuclear programme of America, he originally happens to be an Indian who has lived in Mumbai, belongs originally to Goa, and has written an excellent, a very comprehensive book on India's nuclear policy and nuclear doctrine. His name is Ashley Tellis. I am not going to mention anything that he spoke to me personally. I would not mention it; it is not proper. But I have seen one of his interviews on Rediff.Com in which the question was that why no Deal was struck with the Vajpayee Government of this kind. His answer was that the Deal could not be reached because the Vajpayee Government did not offer much to the US in exchange for the Agreement. We got more from the Government of Dr. Manmohan Singh. The next question was: "What is it that you wanted from the Vajpayee Government but could not get?" The answer was: "I am afraid, I cannot answer this question." Now, this made me make some enquiries into those who were in the matter at that time. I am told that so far as negotiations with our Government are concerned, at that time, there was never even a suggestion that there would be a ban or a curb on our right to test. Secondly, we were willing to open only two reactors for inspection – two out of sixteen – by the IAEA and no more. There were other matters also on which we could not agree, but the sum and substance is that this particular statement, "that we could not get from the NDA Government what we were able to get from Dr. Manmohan Singh's", I do not know how to see it.

But what I do see is that Mrs. Gandhi went in for Pokhran-I. The other day the name that was mentioned, Mr. Paul, Henry – one Henry came to see me also (Henry Kissinger) – and I casually happened to tell him that my Party has always been in favour of India becoming a nuclear weapon State, which Pandit Nehru and subsequent Governments up to Mrs. Gandhi's, were not in favour. I even mentioned that Shri Morarji Desai was also not in favour of it, and we were in that Government. But Mrs. Gandhi, after US sent that nuclear-armed Seventh Fleet, was prompted to go in this direction. When I said to him, "Your Government", I meant the Government at that time, he smiled and his reaction was, "Well, I have been personally blamed for that." [\[r51\]](#)

Whatever that was I cannot say. But this much I can say that Mrs. Gandhi took a step in the right direction when she thought in terms of building India as a nuclear weapon State. In between there were several Governments, in one of which Shri Venkataraman was Defence Minister. He is publicly on record having complimented Vajpayeeji when a book by Vajpayeeji was being released, and saying, "While I was Defence Minister, all the things in Pokhran were ready. Everything was ready. I also went and inspected it at the last moment and I found everything in order. The scientists were there and everything was there. But we somehow failed to do it because we came under pressure. I compliment you for disregarding

all kinds of pressures and going in for Pokhran II". Shrimati Gandhi did India proud when in 1974 she conducted Pokhran I. Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee did India more proud by completing the process - that was the first step really – and conducting Pokhran II.

Mr. Prime Minister, are you determined to ensure through this deal that there will be no Pokhran III? Is that your desire? Our objection to this particular deal is principally because this deal prohibits India from making another test. Our feeling is that today India is at a stage where it is in a position to gradually build up an effective nuclear deterrent against all our hostile neighbours. I am told that we are going in for it. Well, very good. But this is also true that the 123 Agreement says that national laws will prevail. American national law will prevail on this insofar as our strategic partnership is concerned. Section 106 of the Hyde Act bans Indian testing. It also specifies the consequent punitive actions that might follow including America's right of return of nuclear reactors and other materials sold to India. The 123 Agreement upholds applicability of national laws to govern its implementation. Hence, the 123 Agreement cannot override the Hyde Act. This has to be understood.

This was very clearly explained by Nicholas Burns himself when a reporter asked him in a Press Conference. "In the Hyde Act US Congress made it quite clear that if India were to test a nuclear weapon, American cooperation with India would cease. If you are giving India assurances that there will be no interruption in its fuel supplies regardless of what happens, how does that comply with the law?" This is a very pertinent question posed by a journalist. Look at the answer that Mr. Burns has given. He states, "First of all, we were quite careful when we began this latest phase of negotiations and we reminded the Indian Government that since the President and the Prime Minister had their two agreements of July, 2005 and March, 2006, something else has happened. The United States Congress had debated over six, seven months those agreements and the Congress has now passed the Hyde Act. So, we had to make sure that everything in this US-India Civil Nuclear Agreement, the 123 Agreement was completely consistent with the Hyde Act and well within the bounds of the Hyde Act itself".

So, this kind of trying to tell us that the 123 agreement does not mention Hyde Act, the 123 agreement does not mention all these restrictions, this is misleading us. No, it is not true. [\[KMR52\]](#) The two essential parts of the clarification given by Burns are - firstly, he invited the Indian negotiating team that in terms of sequence of events, the Hyde Act comes after the two agreements between Dr. Manmohan Singh and President Bush; and secondly, we had to make sure that anything in this US-India Civil Nuclear Agreement, the 123 Agreement was completely consistent with the Hyde Act and well within the bounds of the Hyde Act itself.

Sir, in its present form, in the final form, the US legislation adopted the NSG guidelines, imposed extraneous conditions on India, this is what Dr. Manmohan Singhji said in Rajya Sabha on August 17 – if in the final form, the US legislation be adopted the NSG guidelines, impose extraneous conditions on India, the Government of India will draw the necessary conclusions consistent with the commitments I have made to Parliament." This is your own statement. Are these consistent with the assurances given in both Houses that under no circumstances, would we accept the kind of restriction on our right to - you have said in this House also - test? Though it is said that provisions have been made which call for discussion and we have to convince the American side

MR. SPEAKER: If you yield?

THE PRIME MINISTER (DR. MANMOHAN SINGH): Since you have quoted me on India's right to test- what our Government has committed on this issue of testing is no more than what your Government had done, that we are committed only to a unilateral moratorium and that if in our wisdom, if the necessity arises that this country has to have a test, there is nothing in this agreement which prevents the exercise of that sovereignty.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI : Correct. I had anticipated this comment of yours that after all, we had unilaterally decided to impose the moratorium but a country which unilaterally decides to have a moratorium on the point which we have reached, can unilaterally decided to disregard that. On both occasions – whether it was in the case of Mrs. Gandhi in 1974 or in 1998, in the case of Shri Vajpayee, America did try to penalize us. Though in 1974, the sanctions imposed on us were far severe; and secondly by 1998, India had arrived at a stage where even the severe constraints could not do us much harm so that practically they had to withdraw them. But on both occasions, the consequences followed.

Here, we are inviting consequences by signing for them this agreement that if we test, the consequences, the right on return of America. This would be something which we never agreed to. You imagine something like that happens and sometime later, some other Prime Minister has to reply in this House. What will happen? How can he defend that we have agreed to it? We have agreed that if we test, then, you have the right to take back our nuclear reactors and you have the right to take back other related necessary materials. We would have never done it.

Unilaterally, they are doing it and trying to penalize us is one thing, and by virtue of a pact, we do it and we agreed to it. We are opposed to this kind of infringement. I regard it as an infringement of India's sovereignty. That we will explain why a test became necessary? China did this; Pakistan did this; so and so country did this. They say, no, we are not satisfied. It is for them to be satisfied that the argument that we have for going in for a test is justifying. This is the Pact and we have agreed to. We said that if you are not satisfied, you can take back all this.

Mr. Prime Minister, the whole thing is so apparent that no self-respecting country should agree to it. I am sure that if Mrs. Gandhi were there; if Shri Vajpayee were there, they would not have agreed to this kind of encroachment of our sovereignty.

Sir, I had mentioned about Dr. Bhabha being an advocate of India becoming a nuclear weapon State. These days, while studying the whole thing, I was surprised at least I did not recall it that way but a small thing that I had thought might be worth mentioning on this occasion. [\[r53\]](#)

On 11th January 1966, just hours after he had signed the Tashkent Declaration, formalizing the end of hostilities in the war with Pakistan, the Prime Minister Shastri died of a heart attack. This is a casual mention of a fact.

Just two weeks later, on January 24, on the very day Shastri's successor Indira Gandhi was sworn in as the Prime Minister, Dr. Homi Bhabha was killed while on a trip to Europe, when the plane in which he was flying collided with Mont Blanc in France. India's impressively large nuclear establishment was suddenly left without any official plan or policy to give a direction.

Now, it makes me wonder – was it just an accident? I do not know. I have no further information than what I have come across in this. To me, it seems a mischief, that a person who was the head of our nuclear establishment and who had not kept it secret to himself and who had publicly said that India should have a nuclear weapon, died like this. And he had publicly said, in reply to a question during a Press Conference, which I had participated in, as a Journalist in those days, that if the Government of India were to give me clearance, our own atom bomb would be ready within 18 months to two years. Such a person suddenly being killed in an accident of this kind, it does make me wonder. Maybe, you have more facts about those days, but I do not have. I thought, I might put it on record, that it is, to me, an enigma and a mischief.

In the same context, I would say that today we are outside the Nuclear Weapons' Club. Why? It is only because of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. The NPT Act passed in 1967 and implemented in 1970 said that only those countries which have developed a nuclear weapon of their own before 1970, would be deemed as nuclear weapon States. I today wonder if we had not committed that mistake, in those days, in the 1960s and had gone by Dr. Homi Bhabha's advice, we would have been a part of that club.

He even requested Pandit Nehru that we should have it. But Pandit Nehru said, 'No. Not so long as I am there and I would not favour it'. If we had done it at that time, we would have been a part of this Nuclear Weapons' Club, before 1970 and all the debate that is now taking place, would not have been needed. We would not have been in this situation. We are now being pushed into the non-proliferation regime in this manner because we need nuclear energy; and therefore, they are taking advantage of it, by pushing us into the non-proliferation regime.

I must compliment Mr. Nicolas Burns, the US Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, who was one of the main negotiators and the Principal Spokesman for all that had happened. He said that this deal brings India back into the Non-Proliferation mainstream in a way, it was never before. It is true. Never before had any Prime Minister agreed to this. But we agreed to this.

He went on to say that – he did not talk about 'energy' – this deal is the centrepiece of Indo-US strategic relationship. I am not against strategic relationship; I am not against strategic partnership. But this strategic relationship and partnership is in the nature of a junior or of an unequal partner; India cannot be an unequal and a junior partner of America or of Russia or of any other country. India, this one billion strong Indians, is a proud nation, which cannot be subservient or junior to any other country.

My objection to this particular deal is principally because firstly it bars our right to test.[\[MSOffice54\]](#)

Secondly, it makes us a junior partner in this partnership with America.

Thirdly, whatever we may say, they have also said that it is not merely IAEA but even American inspectors can come and see the nuclear reactors that are opened. You assured us the other day that under no circumstances will you allow Americans to come here and see, yet it is there.

I would say that if in the sixties we had done what Dr. Homi Bhabha advised us to do, we would not have missed the nuclear weapon club or the nuclear weapon bus. We missed it. Now, let us not commit ourselves to that situation in perpetuation. This particular 123 deal says that it will last for 40 years.

One of the leading papers of Delhi, one of the leading editors who had been a Member of the Congress Party at one time, Shri M.J. Akbar wrote on that day that it is a day of dependence. After sixty years of Independence are we going to sign a deal which make us dependent for 40 years? 123 deal itself says that this will last for 40 years.

Only recently the Prime Minister went to Moscow, Russia. Among the journalists who accompanied him, one was a well known editor of *The Hindu*, Shri N. Ram. I saw an editorial in *The Hindu* after the Prime Minister's return. The editorial says: "According to Russian official sources an inter-governmental agreement, presumably on par with India's 123 Agreement with the United States, was fully prepared for signatures during the Summit but the Indian side backed out at the last moment." I do not know why. I do not know what the proposed agreement was. Why the Indian side backed out? *The Hindu* itself says that it was according to the Russian official sources. This is what he gathered. Shri N. Ram is a very responsible editor.

I would urge the Government to come to Parliament clean on this matter. What exactly happened? What was the proposal? What transpired? Why did you back out if you had agreed to it earlier? All these things must be known, otherwise, some of the complaints people have about how independent is our direction of Foreign Policy would certainly come under question mark.

I shall conclude my remarks by saying that 123 Agreement, as it stands, is unacceptable to the nation because it is deeply detrimental to India's vital and long-term interest. Let me say that hereafter if NDA gets a mandate, we will re-negotiate this deal to see that all the adverse provisions in it are either deleted or this treaty is rejected completely.

SHRI JYOTIRADITYA M. SCINDIA (GUNA): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise today in support of Indo-US nuclear deal signed by this Government. Of the numerous initiatives taken by our Government to ensure that India retains its rightful place in the global arena, none compare with the 123 Agreement signed by the US. This is a path breaking Agreement. Rupchand Palji also said that this is a historic Agreement. In one stroke, it induces the global community to accept India's nuclear weapons and strategic deterrent. With the signing of this 123 Agreement, the UPA Government has for once and for all eliminated the nuclear apartheid that had been created against India.

The 123 Deal is very clear. It keeps our military reactors outside the purview of the safeguards to be signed with the IAEA. We now have the freedom to build our nuclear deterrent without the fear of inviting sanctions and without undertaking the obligations of the NPT. India being granted a single-nation exemption to the international regime is unprecedented in the history of global diplomacy.

Members here would recall that our civilian nuclear programmes have been severely constrained due to the shortage of fuel. Our reactors today are operating at roughly 70 per cent Plant Load Factor thereby nuclear energy in our midst is only at 4000 megawatt contributing only about three and a half to four per cent of power generation capacity in our country. If India has to grow at 9 to 10 per cent and I think there is unanimity on that cause, and if that growth has to go to grass root level, we cannot ignore the civilian nuclear option. This Agreement opens the doors for that. By 2020, we should have in place close to 30,000 to 40,000 megawatt of nuclear energy in our midst. But far more important than this, the Deal also raised the stature of India. Mr. Nicholas Burns, Under Secretary of Political Affairs of US Government, in his official statement said on July 25, 2007:

"I can assure you that the United States is not going to suggest a similar deal with any other country in the world. We have always felt of India as an exception."

We have been recognized as a responsible nuclear nation that can be trusted not to proliferate weapons technology and not to illegally export any fissile material. Our record and behaviour have been praised and unlike some of our neighbours, we have been found today a responsible global player and trustworthy global player. Arguably, this definitely clears the decks for India's greater involvement in global affairs. Therefore, we must all join hands today and congratulate our Prime Minister, Dr. Manmohan Singhji and his team for achieving an outstanding accomplishment in foreign policy.

As I see it, this is a one sided balance sheet. There are only gains and no losses. Yet, we find a disturbing crescendo of criticism in our midst. Our Government is charged with bartering our sovereignty, surrendering our strategic

programme and our right to test. We are accused of becoming unquestionable camp follower of the US. It is being said that our foreign policy will now be dictated from Washington. I have great respect for our democratic traditions but we must not respect dissent when it seeks to perpetrate falsehood. We must not respect dissent when it seeks to vitiate the atmosphere by fear mongering. But before I deal with what our friends in the Opposition have said, let me, at least, recount to this House what some of our rivals in the Asian nuclear balance are saying. An official statement issued by the National Command Authority of Pakistan after assessing Indo-US deal said :

"This Agreement would enable India to produce significant quantities of fissile material and nuclear weapons from unsafeguarded nuclear reactors."

Pakistan has urged that a similar deal should be offered to them. Why would Pakistan want a deal that would barter their sovereignty; that would kill their weapons programme and take away their right to test? The truth is that it does none of that. All that it does is that it gives them the same right that it has given to India which is to continue its strategic programme.[\[R55\]](#)

The NCA of Pakistan has only reiterated the same concern with the Chinese last year. The official paper of the Chinese CCP has said:

"The Bush Administration has made a generous gift, granted India the status of a *de facto* nuclear power."

This, Mr. Speaker, Sir, is why Pakistan wants the deal.

Let me first deal with the first allegation. I will come to each of the allegations. The first allegation is that our foreign policy would now be dictated by Washington. I would like to quote the hon. Prime Minister here.

"India is too large and too important a country to have the independence of its foreign policy taken away by any power. There is independence in our thoughts and independence in our actions."

There are many areas of dissonance where we do not agree with the United States. Take the example of the WTO. Shri Rupchand Pal talked about it. We have opposed their stand tooth and nail. We have never surrendered the interest of our farmers or किसानों के हक के साथ हम कभी भी समझौता नहीं करेंगे। We stand by our democratic responsibility. We are answerable to our people. We have opposed the US on UN reforms; on the composition of the Security Council. Based on our interest in enlarging our oil security we are continuing to negotiate on the Indo-Iran gas pipeline contrary to the wishes of the US. In order to diversify our risk we are negotiating with China; we are negotiating with France; we are negotiating with Russia on nuclear power. In fact, during the last visit of the Chinese Prime Minister to India we actually talked about nuclear co-operation and they greatly evinced interest in our market, as has Australia. The hon. Prime Minister said:

"I urge those who question our commitment to an independent foreign policy to display the same degree of confidence in India as those from outside do. There is no question that we will ever compromise in any manner our independent foreign policy."

The second allegation that we are bartering our sovereignty, our right to test and what happens when the US decides to terminate. I would like to follow on what Shri Pranab Mukherjee said, the Preamble to the Agreement:

"This agreement is based on mutual respect for sovereignty, non-interference in each other's internal affairs, equality, mutual benefit and reciprocity and with due respect for each other's nuclear programmes."

It is clear that India is entering into this agreement as a sovereign nation, as an equal and not as subordinate. This agreement makes no mention whatsoever, I beg to differ with Shri Advaniji, limiting our right to test. The hon. Prime Minister said:

"A decision to undertake a future nuclear test would be our sovereign decision one that rests solely with the Government."

Standard 123 with a non-nuclear weapon States does provide that in the event of a nuclear test there will be automatic termination if there is any clause of the agreement that is violated. But this is the first time in the history of global diplomacy that this 123 agreement with India obliges the US to understand the context in which India has tested resulting from a changed security environment. In place of the earlier proposal that would have converted a unilateral moratorium into a legal obligation, this time around the 123 agreement commits the two sides to a process of consultation to take into account India's strategic compulsions.

To me it is all the more surprising to see that our principal Opposition Party, the BJP, is criticizing us on this. When

they were on this side of the Bench they nearly went ahead and signed the CTBT and I would like to quote our former Prime Minister Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee when he addressed the UN General Assembly on the 24th of September, 1998. He said:

"India announced a voluntary moratorium on further underground nuclear test explosions. We conveyed our willingness to move towards a *de jure* formalization of this obligation. In announcing the moratorium India has already accepted the basic obligations of the CTBT."[\[R56\]](#)

"India is now engaged in discussions with key interlocutors on a range of issues, including the CTBT. We are prepared to bring these discussions to a successful conclusion, so that the entry into force of the CTBT is not delayed."

The former Prime Minister, Shri Atal Behari Vajpayee echoed the same sentiment in his address to Parliament on 15th December, 1998 and the former Minister for External Affairs, Shri Jaswant Singh, expressed and echoed the same sentiments in his article in Foreign Affairs. We had opposed the CTBT then. We have not allowed it in the 123 Agreement. We are consistent. The BJP wanted the CTBT then. It is now worried that we will not be allowed to test. The BJP has always been inconsistent, hypocritical driven by their greed for momentary gain and not for national interests.

The third allegation is levelled against us all the time - The towering scepter of the Hyde Act: The Opposition's scarecrow! The Left's scarecrow! Every time the issue of the Hyde Act is raised. Let me be very clear, Sir, that India as a sovereign nation is only committed to what it has appended its signature to, which is the 123 Agreement. There is no question of us being bound by any law passed by a foreign legislature. Nowhere in the 123 Agreement does it talk about US cooperation with India being subject to an annual certification process.

President Bush, ruling on the so-called contentious clauses, while signing the Hyde Act very clearly said and I would like to quote him.

"Section 103 of the Act purports to establish US policy with respect to various international affairs matters. My approval of the Act does not constitute my adoption of the statements of policy as US foreign policy. Given the Constitution's commitment to the presidency of the authority to conduct the nation's foreign affairs, the Executive Branch shall construe such policy statements as advisory. Also, if section 104(d)(2) of the Act were construed to prohibit the Executive Branch from transferring or approving the transfer of an item to India contrary to Nuclear Suppliers Group transfer guidelines that may be in effect at the time of such future transfer, a serious question would exist as to whether the provision unconstitutionally delegated legislative power to an international body. In order to avoid this constitutional question, the Executive Branch shall also construe section 104(d)(2) as advisory."

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Glib readers of the Hyde Act, unfortunately, has lost over these very important clarifications. Clearly then these clauses are non-binding. The Hyde Act in Sections 102, 103 and 104 are not enforceable and cannot be acted upon. The Hyde Act does not have the power to determine US foreign policy.

The fourth allegation that is made about consistently is American intervention and surrendering our strategic programme. It is very clear, Sir, and I would beg to differ again with Shri Advani that we would accept only IAEA safeguards on our civilian nuclear facilities and that too post our separation plan being in place and first lifting of all international restrictions on nuclear trade. Here, I would like to quote Shri Anil Kakodkar, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. He said:

"Even if it comes to a situation where the IAEA determines that the application of safeguards is not possible, which is almost an impossibility, there will be consultation between the supplier and the recipient on verification measures. Verification measures are not the same as safeguards. Verification means you basically verify that the material that is supposed to be there is there."

Sir, this Agreement does not affect our unsafeguarded strategic nuclear facilities and our indigenous technology programme. Nicholas Burns said in his briefing on 27th July, 2007 as:

"We work with India on the civil side; that is safeguarded. What India does on the strategic side is India's business. This Agreement does not aid that programme and it does not have an effect."

Many times, Mr. Speaker Sir, parallels are consistently drawn with China-US Bilateral Agreement signed in 1985 and comparisons are consistently made with the 123 [\[MSOffice57\]](#) Agreement.

I would like to point out five important points here.

Firstly, Upfront rights to reprocess spent fuel was not granted to China. They must seek permission for that and while that permission is being given, they cannot act. In all the other 123 agreements the standard language is that no material can be reprocessed unless the US agrees. India has been given those upfront rights to reprocess.

Secondly, China's relations with Pakistan, China's non-proliferation record and China's progress on Tibet are all linked to their China-US Bilateral of 1985. There are no such linkages in India's case.

China has given Australia a role in its separation plan. India has the sole decision making authority with regard to our separation plan.

China has accepted bilateral inspections by US and Australian inspectors. Sir, I again differ with Shri L.K. Advani that India has not accepted US inspectors to be part of this transaction.

India's agreement assures uninterrupted fuel supplies and China's does not.

Therefore, Sir, clearly India though a non-NPT signatory, has achieved major distinct advantages over the China-US bilateral.

Sir, every country wants this deal. There is a dominant voice in the US that is even saying that this deal is completely in India's favour. *The New York Times* editorial dated 5th August, 2007 said:

"Bringing India in from the cold is not a bad idea. The problem is that the US got very little back. No promise to stop producing bomb-making material. No promise not to expand its arsenal. And no promise not to resume nuclear testing."

Yes, Sir, to our utter dismay, there are some of us in this House who are raising a din against this agreement. Those of us who are doing so are not only doing a disservice to the nation but also a disservice to the generations to come.

The hon. Prime Minister has upheld the commitments he made to Parliament in his last address. The coming generations will own him a debt of gratitude and he will be remembered for posterity as the visionary and enabler that ushered India to its rightful place as a global power. We must have courage and the conviction in our actions and in our dealings to stand up and be counted amongst the tallest nations in the world and this agreement will do just that!

प्रो. राम गोपाल यादव (सम्भल): श्रीमन्, जिस मुद्दे पर यह सम्मानित सदन आज बहस कर रहा है, उस पर पिछले कुछ महीनों से देश के अंदर जबर्दस्त चर्चा हो रही है। मैं समझता हूँ इस एग््रीमेंट पर जितनी बहस हुई है, समाचार पत्रों और अन्य माध्यमों में जितना लिखा गया है, उतनी दूसरे किसी मुद्दे पर चर्चा नहीं हुई। इसके पक्ष और विपक्ष में बहुत तर्कसंगत तरीके से देश के जाने-माने डिफेंस के विशेषज्ञों और अन्य लोगों ने बातें कही हैं। मैं अपनी बात दो हिस्सों में आपके सामने रखूंगा। पहले देश के सामने जो परिस्थिति है, फिर जो यह एग््रीमेंट है, उससे सम्बन्धित कुछ शंकाओं के बारे में भी कहना चाहूंगा।[\[R58\]](#)

महोदय, जहां तक हमारे देश का पूरन है, इस वक्त हमारे चारों तरफ जो भी पड़ोसी देश हैं, उनसे हमारे रिश्ते ठीक नहीं हैं। अगर हम यह कहें कि ज्यादातर पड़ोसी देश हमसे होस्टाइल हैं, तो इसमें कोई अतिशयोक्ति नहीं होगी। अंतर्राष्ट्रीय राजनीति में हमारा जो सबसे विश्वसनीय राष्ट्र सोवियत यूनियन था, वह जिस इंटीग्रेशन के बाद स्वयं संकट में फंस गया, वह किसी का संकट मोचन नहीं हो सकता है। वर्ष 1971 में पहली बार डिफेंस के मामले में बहुत महत्वपूर्ण संधि इंडो-सोवियत फ्रेंडशिप ट्रीटी हुई थी, जो श्रीमती इंदिरा जी ने की थी, उसके बाद बांग्लादेश का उदय हुआ था। अब जो दो बड़ी शक्तियां दुनिया में बची हैं वह हैं - अमरीका और हमारे पड़ोस में चाइना।

15.46 hrs.

(Dr. Laxminarayan Pandey in the Chair)

इन देशों के हमारे साथ कैसे रिश्ते रहे हैं, हमें इस बारे में भी जानना पड़ेगा। जब हमारी चीन के साथ बहुत अच्छी मित्रता थी, जब पंचशील के सिद्धांत का प्रतिपादन हुआ, जब हम "हिंदी-चीनी भाई-भाई" के नारे लगा रहे थे, तब हिंदुस्तान पर हमारे मित्र राष्ट्र ने हमला किया और लाखों वर्ग मील जमीन अब भी उसके कब्जे में है। अभी थोड़े दिनों पहले ही चीन ने कहा था कि अरुणाचल प्रदेश भी चीन का ही हिस्सा है। यह सही है कि अमरीका के रिश्ते पाकिस्तान के साथ बहुत अच्छे रहे हैं। हम पंडित नेहरू के जमाने से गुटनिरपेक्ष राष्ट्रों के तीडर रहे। अमरीका पाकिस्तान से सेंट्रल ट्रीटी आर्गेनाइजेशन, साउथ ईस्ट एशिया ट्रीटी आर्गेनाइजेशन के जरिए मिलिट्री के मामले में जुड़ा हुआ है और जब संकट में कभी वह देश आया, खास तौर से बांग्लादेश से लड़ाई के दौरान चीन और अमरीका दोनों का लगभग एक जैसा रवैया हमारी तरफ था। सैंथ पतलीट विद इट्स न्यूविलयर वैंपस कैरियर पश्चिम बंगाल की खाड़ी की तरफ चल रहा था, तब चीन ने कात्पनिक आरोप हिंदुस्तान पर लगाया था कि हिंदुस्तान ने चीन के अंदर कुछ चौकियां बना ली हैं, उन्हें 24 घंटे में डिस्मेंटल करे अन्यथा परिणाम भुगतने के लिए तैयार रहे। दोनों का एक जैसा रवैया हिंदुस्तान के प्रति था। हालांकि स्थिति ऐसी बनी कि देश इस समस्या से उभरकर सामने आया और हमारा कुछ न बिगड़ सका। अब पूरन यह है कि क्या हम आइसोलेशन की स्थिति में रहें और अगर हम किसी से रिश्ते बनाएं तो किससे बनाएं? अतीत इस बात का गवाह है कि चीन ने हमारे ऊपर आक्रमण किया और चीन का इतिहास है कि जो उसका सबसे बड़ा मित्र था, उसी के ऊपर उसने आक्रमण किया। हिंदुस्तान पर आक्रमण किया और वियतनाम

पर उस दिन आक्रमण किया जब हमारे विदेश मंत्री, श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी चाइना, बीजिंग में थे। इन परिस्थितियों में अमेरिका से एक एग्रीमेंट की बात सामने आई। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने यहां बयान भी दिया। जो टैवस्ट एग्रीमेंट का है, इंटरनेट के जरिए हमें उपलब्ध हुआ है, उसमें कई ऐसे बिंदु हैं, जिन पर तमाम तरह की शंकाएं हैं और आलोचनाएं हो रही हैं। [R59]

हमने पिछली बातें इसलिए कहीं कि अब सोवियत यूनियन जैसा मित्र देश हमारा कोई नहीं है। पड़ोस में सारे होस्टाइल कंट्रीज हैं। हम आइसोलेशन में नहीं रह सकते और जब नहीं रह सकते तो किसी से संबंध बनाने होंगे लेकिन जो अमेरिका से सिविल न्यूक्लियर कोऑपरेशन का एग्रीमेंट हो रहा है, उसमें कई ऐसी बातें हैं जिन पर शंकाएं हैं और उससे ऐसा लगता है कि हमारी कहीं संपूर्ण विदेश नीति और अन्य मसलों पर भी असर पड़ सकता है। मैं उन कुछ बिंदुओं को रखूंगा और चाहूंगा कि माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी जब जवाब दें, तो शंका का निराकरण जरूर करें क्योंकि जो शंकाएं लोगों के मन में हैं, अगर उनका निराकरण हो जाएगा तो यह देश के इंटरनेट में भी होगा और बहुत जबरदस्त विवाद पर विराम लग सकता है।

जो हेनरी हाइड एक्ट है, मैं इसके सेशन 102, सब सेशन 6 की तरफ आपका ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहूंगा। उसमें लिखा है कि -

"It is in the interest of United States to enter into agreement for nuclear cooperation arranged pursuant to Section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 with a country that has never been a State party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty."

इसके आगे लिखा है कि -

"The country has a functioning and uninterrupted democratic system of Government, has a foreign policy that is congruent to that of the United States and is working with the United States in key foreign policy initiatives related to non-proliferation."

अमेरिका की विदेश नीति के पैराल या उसके समकक्ष कॉन्ग्रेसेंट हमारी विदेश नीति हो, यह एक बिंदु इस एग्रीमेंट में है। इसका अर्थ यह हुआ कि अगर हम अमेरिका की विदेश नीति के साथ नहीं चल सकते हैं, तो इस एग्रीमेंट से दिक्कत पैदा हो सकती है।

इसी के अगले सेशन में है कि -

"With respect to South Asia, to secure India's full and active participation in United States' efforts to dissuade, isolate and, if necessary, sanction and contain Iran for its efforts to acquire weapons of mass destruction including a nuclear weapons capability."

वया इस एग्रीमेंट के बाद या इस एग्रीमेंट से हम इस बात के लिए बाध्य हैं कि जिस तरह से अमेरिका ईरान को थ्रैट कर रहा है, उस तरह से हम भी अमेरिका के साथ हां में हां मिला कर कहेंगे कि ईरान यह नहीं कर सकता, ईरान एटम बम नहीं बना सकता, वह वैपन्स ऑफ मास डिस्ट्रिब्यूशन नहीं बना सकता। अगर हम ऐसा करेंगे, तो क्या यह हमारी इंडिपेंडेंट विदेश नीति होगी? दूसरी यह आशंका थी।

तीसरा, सेशन 104 में इस बात का उल्लेख है कि -

"The President shall submit to the appropriate Congressional Committees a report including all sorts of information of nuclear activities in India, the amount of uranium mined and milled in India during the previous year."

उस यूरेनियम में से कितना यूरेनियम एटॉमिक वैपन्स के प्रयोग में यूज हुआ, यह हर साल अमेरिका का राष्ट्रपति अमेरिका की संबंधित कांग्रेसनल कमेटी को इसकी सूचना देगा। एक तरफ हम कहते हैं यह केवल सिविल न्यूक्लियर कोऑपरेशन है, वया इसका अर्थ यह हुआ कि हमारी जितनी भी एक्टिविटीज हैं, एटॉमिक वैपन्स को बनाने के लिए जो रिप्लेसमेंट हैं या न्यूक्लियर एक्टिविटीज हैं, जिनमें मिलिट्री या सैन्य न्यूक्लियर गतिविधियां हैं, अगर उन पर कोई कार्यवाही हो रही है उसकी सूचना अमेरिका को देनी होगी और अमेरिका का राष्ट्रपति सारी जानकारी अमेरिकन कांग्रेस को देगा? अगर यह चीज है तो सबसे बड़ी दिक्कत यह है। एक स्टेज ऐसी आने वाली है क्योंकि बीएआरसी में साइंटिस्ट्स काम कर रहे हैं, जो तीसरी स्टेज या थर्ड साइकल है, जिसमें थोरियम और प्लूटोनियम का यूरेनियम-233 के रूप में फिजिबल तत्व के रूप में प्रयोग किया जा सकेगा, अगर ये सारी सूचनाएं अमेरिका को देनी पड़ेंगी और अमेरिका इस बात का अहसास करेगा कि हिंदुस्तान में इस लैवल की एक्टिविटीज चल रही हैं, तो इस हाइड एक्ट या एग्रीमेंट के तहत अमेरिकन कांग्रेस या अमेरिका के राष्ट्रपति अदरवाइज व्यु अस्त्रियार करके एग्रीमेंट को खत्म भी कर सकते हैं। सब जानते हैं कि जिस दिन हिंदुस्तान इस स्थिति में हो जाएगा कि थोरियम का एज यूरेनियम-233 का प्रयोग करने लगेगा तो हमें दूसरे से इम्पोर्टेड यूरेनियम-235 की आवश्यकता नहीं पड़ेगी। असली संकट यूरेनियम-235 है, जिसकी जरूरत एटम बम और न्यूक्लियर वैपन्स बनाने के लिए पड़ती है, जितनी न्यूक्लियर सप्लाय कंट्रीज हैं, उनके माध्यम से इसकी आपूर्ति होती है। इस देश में यूरेनियम और थोरियम का इतना भंडार है, अगर थर्ड साइकल की मास्टरी हमारे साइंटिस्ट कर लेंगे और जिस दिन हिंदुस्तान आत्मनिर्भर हो जाएगा तब ये नौबत नहीं आ सकती कि हमें इस तरह से जरूरत पड़े। यहां कुछ शंकाएं हैं कि इसका असर हमारी फॉरेन इन्डिपेंडेंट पॉलिसी पर भी पड़ सकता है, हमारे साइंटिस्ट भी डिस्क्रेज हो सकते हैं, क्योंकि उन्हें ये लगेगा है कि हम जो अगली रिसर्चिंग कर रहे हैं उनका क्या होगा, कहीं उन पर पाबंदी न लग जाए।

महोदय, तीसरी चीज जो बहुत खास है और जिसे लेकर चर्चा चल रही है कि हम एनर्जी में आत्मनिर्भर होने के लिए ये सब कर रहे हैं। अभी जो देश की स्थिति है उसमें अगले पांच सालों में 2012 तक स्थापित थर्मल और हाइडल क्षमता 2,10,000 मेगावाट होगी। अब तब तक केवल एटॉमिक एनर्जी क्षमता, जो 4200 मेगावाट के आसपास है, यह अगले पांच साल में 3300 मेगावाट और बढ़ जाएगी। इस तरह से कुल एनर्जी, जो हमारे यहां अवेलेबल है, वह तीन परसेंट है, जो हम प्रोड्यूस करते हैं, उसकी एटॉमिक एनर्जी तीन या चार परसेंट है। अगर हम 2020 तक 40,000 मेगावाट भी बिजली पैदा करेंगे तो उस वक्त हाइडल या थर्मल से पैदा होने वाली बिजली बहुत ज्यादा होगी और उसका पांच, छः या सात परसेंट से ज्यादा एटॉमिक एनर्जी नहीं हो सकती। इस स्थिति में क्या सरकार ने सर्वे कराया है कि हम न्यूक्लियर रिप्लेसमेंट को लाकर कितनी एनर्जी बना सकेंगे और हमारी थर्मल और हाइडल की कैपेसिटी तब तक क्या होगी? [r60]

16.00 hrs.

दूसरी तरफ इस बात की बहुत चर्चा है और तमाम तरह के विद्वानों ने लिखा-पढ़ी भी की है, पता नहीं वे अंदाज से लिख रहे हैं या इस बात का कहीं रिकार्ड है कि जो एटोमिक एनर्जी बनेगी, उसकी कीमत थर्मल से लगभग दोगुनी होगी और जो न्यूक्लियर रिएक्टर आयेगा, वह न्यूक्लियर रिएक्टर जितनी बिजली पैदा करेगा, उस कैपेसिटी का हमारे यहां जो थर्मल पावर प्लान्ट होगा, उससे रिएक्टर की कीमत तीन गुना ज्यादा होगी। इस तरह से कुल मिलाकर कीमत में इनक्लूडिंग रिएक्टर एंड इनर्जी बोर्ड लगभग छः गुने का फर्क है। अगर यह बिजली छः गुनी महंगी होगी तो इस देश की गरीब जनता को हम इसे कैसे दे सकेंगे। यह बात पूरे देश में फैलाई गई है, बताई गई है, इसमें कितनी सत्यता है, यह मैं भी जानना चाहूंगा। ... (व्यवधान) यदि प्रधान मंत्री जी बतायेंगे, तो मैं मान लूंगा - यह मैं इसलिए कह रहा हूँ। जब मैं बोलने के लिए खड़ा हुआ, मैंने तभी कहा कि जितना विवाद, जितनी लिखा-पढ़ी और जितने आर्टिकल्स इस एग्जीमैन्ट के पक्ष और विपक्ष में आये, इतने ज्यादा पिछले बीसों सालों में मैंने कभी किसी और दूसरे मुद्दे पर नहीं देखे।

अभी हाल ही में हिंदुस्तान की रक्षा से जुड़े हुए, एटोमिक इनर्जी से जुड़े हुए, फॉरेन सर्विस से जुड़े हुए लोगों का एक संयुक्त बयान आया था, जिसमें हिंदुस्तान के भूतपूर्व एयर चीफ मार्शल, फॉरेन सैक्रेटरी, साइंटिस्ट्स, एटोमिक इनर्जी कमिशन के चेयरमैन आदि सारे लोग शामिल थे। इन सब लोगों ने कहा कि यह बहुत अच्छा एग्जीमैन्ट है। कल ही हिंदुस्तान टाइम्स में रॉ के एक रिटायर्ड सैक्रेटरी, सीनियर अफसर ने लिखा कि यह हिंदुस्तान के लिए बहुत खराब है। जब इस तरह की बयानबाजी होती है तो हमारे जैसे लोग तो लेमैन हैं, मैं कोई साइंटिस्ट नहीं हूँ, कोई एक्सपर्ट नहीं हूँ, कोई सैन्य विशेषज्ञ नहीं हूँ। लेकिन जब इस तरह की बातें होती हैं तो लोगों के मन में एक कंप्यूजन पैदा होता है और उस कंप्यूजन को दूर करना, लोगों के मन से उस आशंका को दूर करना, यह जिम्मेदारी माननीय प्रधान मंत्री और उनकी सरकार से जुड़े हुए लोगों की है। कोई प्रधान मंत्री जी की देशभक्ति पर, उनकी विद्वता पर, उनकी निष्ठा पर संदेह नहीं कर सकता। उन्होंने संसद में जो बयान दिया था, वह बहुत ही विश्वास के साथ दिया था कि हम ऐसा कोई एग्जीमैन्ट नहीं करेंगे, कोई ऐसा काम नहीं करेंगे, जो देश के इंटरैस्ट के खिलाफ हो। हम लोगों को या अन्य किसी को भी यह अंदाज नहीं था कि इस एग्जीमैन्ट पर आगे चलकर इतना विवाद होगा कि सरकार के जाने-आने और चुनाव के होने तक की नौबत आ जायेगी। प्रारम्भ में ही अगर इस तरह की चेतावनी दे दी गई होती तो हो सकता है कि आगे न बढ़ा जाता है। मैं यहां बिल्कुल ह्यूमैनिटेरियन प्वाइंट ऑफ व्यू से कह रहा हूँ, कोई पार्टी और पोलिटिक्स को बीच में नहीं ला रहा हूँ। चूंकि यदि कहीं हम एक एग्जीमैन्ट करके आ जाएं और उसके बाद यह कहा जाए कि अब आप यह समझौता नहीं कर सकते, तो जो समझौता करने वाला व्यक्ति है, उसके सामने बहुत बड़ा धर्म संकट होता है। इसमें क्रेडिबिलिटी का सवाल पैदा होता है और अगर किसी प्रधान मंत्री की क्रेडिबिलिटी को ठेस लगती है तो वह केवल प्रधान मंत्री की क्रेडिबिलिटी का मामला नहीं होता, वह पूरे देश का मामला होता है। आज यदि यह बात होती है तो कल को कोई दूसरा देश यह कह सकता है कि हिंदुस्तान का क्या ठिकाना है, आज ये लोग यहां कह जाएं और कल वहां लोग इन पर दबाव डालें, फिर यही लोग कह दें कि नहीं, हम ऐसा नहीं करेंगे - इस तरह से आने वाले दिनों में अंतर्राष्ट्रीय राजनीति में हमारी कोई बात भी नहीं सुनेगा। मैं समझता हूँ कि ऐसी स्थिति भी पैदा हो सकती है। इसलिए मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी लोगों के मन में जो शंकाएं हैं, आप उन्हें दूर करें और मैं शोर हूँ कि प्रधान मंत्री जी उन शंकाओं का निवारण करेंगे और यदि वह उन शंकाओं का निवारण करेंगे तो मुझे उम्मीद है कि सब लोग जो विरोध कर रहे हैं, देश के हित में अगर यह काम होगा, आप सारी शंकाओं का निवारण करेंगे और हमारी स्वतंत्र और सप्रभु विदेश नीति पर कोई खतरा नहीं होगा। [b61]

जहां तक न्यूक्लियर टैस्ट का सवाल है, न्यूक्लियर टैस्ट को रोकने में, क्योंकि जो करना चाहता है, उसे कोई नहीं रोक सकता है। आपको याद होगा कि जब पहली बार संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ ने डिस-आरममेंट कमिशन बनाया, उसके तुरंत बाद सोवियत संघ ने पहला विस्फोट किया। उसके बाद जब नॉन प्रॉलिफरेशन ट्रीटि पर हस्ताक्षर हुए, तो हस्ताक्षर की स्याही सूख भी नहीं पाई थी कि चीन ने अपना एटॉमिक एक्सप्लोजन कर दिया। इसके बाद भी कई ऐसी घटनाएं हुई हैं अंतर्राष्ट्रीय स्तर पर, चाहे वह सीटीबीटी की बात हो, कभी कोई की बात आई, कोई न कोई देश इसके बाद विस्फोट करता रहा है - जो विस्फोट करना चाहे। आगे अगर देश के हित में होगा तो हिंदुस्तान भी ऐसा करेगा और यह जो डील है या एग्जीमैन्ट है, यह इसे नहीं रोक सकता है। यह बात दूसरी है कि अगर उस डील में कोई ऐसी पाबन्दी है कि न्यूक्लियर रिएक्टर ही अमरीका वाले उखाड़कर ले जाएं, अगर आपने ऐसा कर दिया, इसलिए ऐसे ही कोई दस्तखत मत कर दीजिए जिसमें न्यूक्लियर रिएक्टर उखाड़ने की बात आए। मैं यही चाहूंगा कि आप सारी आशंकाओं को दूर करें, जिससे संसद और लोगों का समर्थन आपको हासिल रहे।

श्री देवेन्द्र प्रसाद यादव (झंझारपुर) : सभापति महोदय, आज भारत-अमरीका परमाणु समझौते पर चर्चा हो रही है जो न केवल राष्ट्रीय बल्कि अंतर्राष्ट्रीय महत्व का विषय है। यह विषय कोई पक्ष या विपक्ष का विषय नहीं है, यह देश के व्यापक हित से जुड़ा हुआ मामला है। जो भारत-अमरीका परमाणु समझौता है, जैसा अभी राम गोपाल जी ने भी ठीक ही कहा था कि इसमें किसी भी तरह से चर्चा में माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी की नीयत पर शंका करना उचित नहीं है। इसीलिए देश के व्यापक हित में जिस संधि पर आज चर्चा हो रही है, क्योंकि आज माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी की देश के प्रति पूरी प्रतिबद्धता है, इसीलिए प्रधान मंत्री जी की नीयत पर सवाल नहीं उठाना चाहिए। सवाल विचार का हो सकता है या मतवैय का हो सकता है, हमारा दृष्टिकोण सोचने का अलग हो सकता है लेकिन परमाणु कथार करने की जो नीयत है, इसमें कोई दो राय नहीं हो सकती है। देश के व्यापक हित को किसी भी तरह से गिरवी नहीं रखा जा सकता क्योंकि देश के सामने यह पहली संधि है। यह बात कहने में कोई अतिशयोक्ति नहीं होगी कि, यह पहली संधि है जिस पर इतनी व्यापक चर्चा हो रही है। आज तक किसी भी संधि पर इतनी व्यापक चर्चा नहीं हुई है। इसी संधि पर इतना संसद का विश्वास लेने और पूरे देश का विश्वास लेने की कोशिश की गई है। जुलाई में इस पर संयुक्त वक्तव्य हुआ ही था। इसके बाद अगस्त में दोनों सदनों में बार-बार इस बात को यानी माननीय वामपंथी मित्रों तथा अन्य दलों द्वारा जो शंकाएं उठाई गई थीं, उन शंकाओं को निर्मूल करने का भरसक प्रयास किया गया। ऐसा प्रयास इस संधि पर जिसमें लोकतांत्रिक तरीके को "एडॉप्ट" किया गया है, इसके लिए भी मैं सरकार को धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ। आपने एक अच्छा काम किया है क्योंकि आपने पारदर्शिता को स्पष्ट किया है, आपने इस देश में व्यापक रूप से चर्चा चलाई है और इसके बाद यदि कोई शंका है क्योंकि बिजली आज देश की सबसे बड़ी आवश्यकता है क्योंकि सारा बुनियादी आधारभूत ढांचा बिजली पर ही निर्भर करता है।

ऊर्जा हमारी बुनियादी आधारभूत संरचना और देश के विकास के लिए जरूरी है और देश की सामयिक आवश्यकता आज बिजली है। इस बिजली की सामयिक आवश्यकता को देखते हुए जो कथार हो रहा है, इस कथार में यद्यपि बहुत सारे मसौदों की चर्चा हो रही थी, इस देश को समृद्ध बनाने में यह नाभिकीय ऊर्जा पॉजीटिव साबित हो सकती है लेकिन हम यह कहना चाहते हैं कि इस देश में जो सवाल उठा है कि जो कथार है, या 123 जो समझौते का मसौदा है या जो हाइड एक्ट है, कई शंकाओं में मूल शंका उठ रही है कि क्या इसकी कोई वैकल्पिक व्यवस्था है या नहीं है? जो हाइड्रो-इलेक्ट्रिक पैदा करने की बात है, हाइड्रो पॉवर पैदा करने की बात है, वैकल्पिक व्यवस्था कोयले से भी हो सकती है। जो एनर्जी पैदा करने की बात है कि क्या पवन से ऊर्जा पैदा करने की कोई वैकल्पिक व्यवस्था हो सकती है?

वैकल्पिक व्यवस्था के बारे में प्रो. राम गोपाल जी ने चर्चा की है। इन सब सम्भावनाओं के लिये सरकार प्रयास करे। वैकल्पिक विकास हो या न हो लेकिन यह कथार आगे की दिशा में बढ़ रहा है। हमारे वामपंथी मित्रों ने सरकार को अंतर्राष्ट्रीय ऊर्जा एजेंसी से वार्ता करने की इजाजत दी है कि सरकार वार्ता कर सकती

हैं, लेकिन उसके परिणामों पर शंका हो रही है। बिजली व्यवस्था से रोजी-रोटी का मामला और योजगार का मामला जुड़ा हुआ है। इस परिणाम से, यदि बिजली की हमारे देश को आवश्यकता है, उसे पाने के लिये कोई विकल्प है, तो उस पर ध्यान देना चाहिये। बिजली को पाने के लिये देश में कई शंकाये कई तरफ से उठायी जा रही हैं। कोई कहता है कि गृह निरोधक नीतियों का बलिदान हो जायेगा, कोई कहता है कि स्वतंत्र विदेश नीति पर कुप्राभाव पड़ेगा, यहां तक कहा जा रहा है कि देश की सार्वभौमिकता पर कुप्राभाव पड़ेगा और परमाणु परीक्षण का अधिकार छीन लिया गया है। हाईड एक्ट में जो 123 का करार है, उसका कहीं न कहीं कुप्राभाव पड़ेगा, जहां तक हाईड एक्ट का पूंन है, यह अमरीका का नेशनल लॉ है। उसका प्रभाव हमारे यहां कैसे होगा? अमरीका का कानून है, इसलिये एक तकनीकी सवाल है, इसके मसौदे की विस्तृत जानकारी श्री रूप चंद पाल ने दी है और कहा है कि 123 करार पर हाईड एक्ट का कैसा प्रभाव होगा? मैं फिर इस बात को कहता हूं कि हाईड एक्ट अमरीका का कानून है, उससे हम कभी प्रभावित नहीं हो सकते हैं, क्योंकि यह कानून उनके लिये है, हमारे लिये नहीं है। लोग शंकाये करते करते हाईड एक्ट से 123 करार पर चले गये। प्रो. राम गोपाल जी ने ठीक कहा है कि नीयत कर तो तो रिपब्लिक उखाड़कर ले जाएगा अमेरिका, रॉयल्टी ठोक देगा, उनका उपकरण है, काफी दाम होगा। वया हम उससे कम सजग हैं? यदि साम्राज्यवादी देश हमारे व्यापार की अनदेखी करेगा तो इस मसौदे में यह वलाज़ है कि हम एक वर्ष के नोटिस के आधार पर डील को खत्म कर सकते हैं, वापस कर सकते हैं, इसमें क्या बात है? हमें इस डील से अलग होने के लिये कौन रोक सकता है? अगर हमारी स्वतंत्र विदेश नीति पर आघात होगा या सार्वभौमिकता पर आघात होगा, परमाणु परीक्षण पर प्रतिबंध लगेगा तो हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी संसद में इस संबंध में कई बार स्पष्टीकरण दे चुके हैं कि परमाणु परीक्षण का हमारा अधिकार महफूज़ रहेगा। इसलिये चर्चा होने के बाद एनर्जी सिक्यूरिटी के व्यापक हित में करार होगा, विकसित देशों की श्रेणी में चीन जैसा देश इन-प्रिंसीपल इस करार के खिलाफ नहीं है।

सभापति महोदय, देश को 2012 तक एक लाख मेगावाट की अतिरिक्त विद्युत की आवश्यकता होगी, जैसा सोलर विद्युत सर्वे ने बताया है। हमारे देश में विद्युत की आवश्यकता को पूरा करने के लिये अतिरिक्त ऊर्जा स्रोतों की आवश्यकता है। इस आवश्यकता को देखते हुये हमें इस पर विचार करना चाहिये। आज हमारे देश में एक लाख 34 हजार मेगावाट बिजली का उत्पादन हो रहा है। इसमें परमाणु ऊर्जा का हिस्सा केवल 3.1 प्रतिशत है। हमारी आवश्यकता 8.0 प्रतिशत है, और हमें 5-6 प्रतिशत अतिरिक्त ऊर्जा चाहिये। हमारे देश के कृषि और औद्योगिक क्षेत्र में इनफ्रस्ट्रक्चर को विकसित करने के लिये ऊर्जा की आवश्यकता है।[s62] आने वाला समय परमाणु ऊर्जा का युग होगा, जिसमें अंतर्राष्ट्रीय सहयोग ज़रूरी है। अपने देश के हित को तिलांजलि देकर हम अंतर्राष्ट्रीय सहयोग नहीं ले सकते। इस पर भी विचार करने की ज़रूरत है। मैं इसीलिए निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि जब बार-बार माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी ने स्पष्ट कर दिया है कि भारत-अमेरिका परमाणु करार भारत के परमाणु परीक्षण के अधिकार को प्रभावित नहीं करेगा, राष्ट्रहित में परमाणु परीक्षण करने का हमारा संप्रभुतापूर्ण निर्णय रहेगा और हमारी स्वतंत्र विदेश नीति पर भी कोई आँच नहीं आएगी। आज मैं समझता हूं कि माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी या विदेश मंत्री इस बात को स्पष्ट कर दें कि इसकी वैकल्पिक व्यवस्था है या नहीं - जैसे हाइड्रो इलैक्ट्रिक पावर है। हाइडल पावर की बात शुरू होगी तो बहुगुणा जी द्वारा तुंत प्रदर्शन शुरू हो जाएगा। इसमें कई तरह की अड़चनें और कठिनाइयां हैं। इन कठिनाइयों को ध्यान में रखते हुए, मैं समझता हूं कि जो परमाणु ईंधन के रीप्रोसेसिंग का अधिकार है, वह भी स्थायी रूप से बना रहे, इस पर भी ध्यान देने की ज़रूरत है। परमाणु करार में हमारे परमाणु संयंत्रों को अमेरिका द्वारा सतत परमाणु ईंधन की आपूर्ति जारी रखने की गारंटी हो, इस पर भी माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी जब वक्तव्य दें तो स्थिति स्पष्ट करें। इससे हम सब लोगों की शंका का समाधान हो जाएगा। हम अमेरिका जैसे साम्राज्यवादी देश के सामने उनके व्यापक हित के लिए नहीं झुकेंगे। हम दोस्ती चाहते हैं लेकिन किसी भी हालत में दासता स्वीकार नहीं कर सकते, यह हमारा संकल्प है। लोकतांत्रिक तरीके से जिस तरह से माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी ने इस पर बार-बार चर्चा करने की कोशिश की है, संसदीय लोकतांत्रिक इतिहास में कभी इस तरह से किसी भी तरह की अंतर्राष्ट्रीय संधि पर चर्चा नहीं हुई थी। यह एक अच्छा प्रयास है, अच्छा तरीका है जो यूपीए सरकार ने अडॉप्ट किया है। इसके लिए माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी को बधाई दी जानी चाहिए।

मैं साफ कहना चाहता हूं कि हमारे समक्ष जो ऊर्जा का बेहतर विकल्प हो, उनकी संभावनाओं को भी खोजने का भरसक प्रयास करना चाहिए। मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूं कि यदि इसके बाद भी हमारे वामपंथी मित्रों की शंका का समाधान नहीं होता है और वलीन बिजली, स्वच्छ विद्युत उत्पादन करने का और कोई रास्ता है, तो मैं समझता हूं कि यूपीए और वाम दलों की बैठक की जा सकती है। हमारे राष्ट्रीय अध्यक्ष लालू जी भी उसमें सदस्य हैं। जब यूपीए और वामदलों की सहमति की बैठक होती है, उसमें आम सहमति बनेगी। सहमति बनाकर ही इस करार पर मुहर लगेगी। बैठक निरंतर चल रही है, सिलसिलेवार बैठकें हो रही हैं। उसमें सारे बिन्दुओं पर, तकनीकी विषयों पर और देश के व्यापक हितों पर विस्तृत चर्चा हो रही है। उस समिति द्वारा सहमति के बाद ही यह करार होगा, इसलिए शंका की कोई गुंजाइश नहीं है। पर्यावरण का मामला भी बहुत चलता है। इसलिए वलीन बिजली की भी ज़रूरत है। इन सब बातों पर ध्यान देने की ज़रूरत है। इसलिए सुलह समिति जो यूपीए और वाम दलों की है, उसमें सहमति के बाद ही इस पर विचार होगा। मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूं कि एनर्जी सिक्यूरिटी के हित में यह करार ज़रूरी है। मैं अंत में एक मिनट का और समय लूंगा कि आज जो परिस्थिति देश में बनी है, उसके संबंध में मैं कहना चाहता हूं। ...**(व्यवधान)** साम्राज्यवादी देशों से हमारा कोई समझौता नहीं हो सकता। हम लोगों ने तो लाठी लेकर प्रदर्शन करने का काम किया था जब इसका सवाल उठा था। हम अपनी संप्रभुता को किसी भी तरह से नहीं खो सकते। हम साम्राज्यवादी देश के खिलाफ हैं, लेकिन यहां संधि का सवाल है और एनर्जी सिक्यूरिटी का मामला है। सिर्फ एक मसले की बात है। आज जो वर्तमान स्थिति है, मैं उसकी चर्चा करना चाहता हूं। ...**(व्यवधान)** आडवाणी साहब की शंका है कि 90 प्रतिशत परीक्षण रिपब्लिक की जांच उनके हाथ में जाएगी...**(व्यवधान)** यह सब भ्रम है। देश के व्यापक हित के साथ किसी भी तरह से समझौता नहीं हो सकता है। देश के किसान और गरीबों को आज इसकी ज़रूरत है। [h63] इसमें देश के व्यापक हित का ध्यान रखा जाएगा, इससे कोई समझौता, साम्राज्यवादी देश से नहीं हो सकता। आज जो स्थिति है, उसके संबंध में मैं थोड़ा बोलना चाहता हूं। आज सुबह जब परमाणु पर चर्चा हो रही थी, तो मैंने एक छोटी सी कविता बनाई, उसे मैं पढ़ना चाहता हूं -

"आज हो रहा है भारत और अमेरिका के बीच परमाणु करार,

इस परमाणु करार ने देश को कर दिया है बेकरार,

यूपीए तथा प्रतिपक्ष में भी पड़ रहा है छोट-सा दरार,

यदि केन्द्र सरकार रखे अगस्त, 2007 वाला संकल्प बरकरार,

और स्वतंत्र विदेश नीति, सार्वभौमिकता व परमाणु परीक्षण का महफूज़ रहे हमारा अधिकार,

तो हो जाएगा परमाणु करार, तब नहीं रहेगा किसी दल को शंका और कोई मलाल,

देश के व्यापक हित में हो जाए यह करार, तब पट जाएगी यूपीए और प्रतिपक्ष की भी दरार,

सम्पूर्ण देश को हो जाएगा इस परमाणु करार से पूरा सरोकार,
दोस्ती बढ़ेगी अमेरिका से, नहीं होगा कोई दास्ता और वास्ता से सरोकार,
बिजली महंगी नहीं हो, इस पर भी करना है विचार,
किसी हालत में देश का व्यापक हित रहे बरकरार,
तब हो पाएगा मजबूती से यह परमाणु करार, यही है हमारा विचार।"

श्री बृजेश पाठक (उन्नाव) : माननीय सभापति महोदय, आज मैं बहुत महत्वपूर्ण विषय पर भारत-अमेरिका परमाणु समझौते पर बहुजन समाज पार्टी का पक्ष रखने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ। भारत-अमेरिका परमाणु समझौता, जिसे 123 के नाम से भी जाना जाता है, यह एक महत्वपूर्ण मुद्दा है, क्योंकि यह समझौता एक प्रकार से भारत के भविष्य से जुड़ा हुआ है।

सभापति महोदय, इस संबंध में बहुजन समाज पार्टी का मानना है कि इतने महत्वपूर्ण व दूरगामी प्रभाव वाले समझौते को अंजाम देने से पहले जनता के दिमाग में उभर रही भ्रान्तियों को केन्द्र सरकार द्वारा अवश्य दूर किया जाना चाहिए। यह ठीक है कि ऊर्जा हमारी परम आवश्यकताओं में है ताकि विकास की प्रक्रिया को तीव्र बनाया जा सके, लेकिन भारत-अमेरिका परमाणु समझौते के संबंध में सभी पार्टियों के नेताओं को विश्वास में लेकर या आमराय बना कर काम करना क्या गलत होगा? इसके अलावा भारत-अमेरिका परमाणु समझौते के प्रति जनता में ये भ्रान्तियां फैल रही हैं कि भारत अपनी अस्मिता, स्वतंत्र विदेश नीति तथा भविष्य में परमाणु स्वतंत्रता के अपने अधिकार को अमेरिका के हाथों बंधक बना कर रख देगा। जनता में फैली इन भ्रान्तियों को अवश्य दूर किया जाना चाहिए, क्योंकि हमारी पार्टी का मानना है कि ऐसे महत्वपूर्ण व संवेदनशील मामलों पर देश को एकमत रहना चाहिए। राष्ट्र की अस्मिता व सुरक्षा से संबंधित मामलों पर देश को एकजुट रखने की आवश्यकता है और यह जिम्मेदारी मुख्यतः केन्द्र सरकार की बनती है। इसके साथ-साथ हमारे परमाणु विशेषज्ञों की राय भारत-अमेरिका परमाणु समझौते के प्रति स्पष्ट तौर पर क्या है, इसका भी सही-सही खुलासा किया जाना चाहिए। साथ ही अमेरिकी मंत्रियों व अधिकारियों का यह कहना कि भारत के साथ अमेरिका का परमाणु समझौता स्वयं अमेरिका के बड़े हित में है, परन्तु भारत-अमेरिका परमाणु समझौते को अमेरिकी अधिकारी लगातार ईरान के साथ गैस पाइपलाइन से भी जोड़ रहे हैं, जिसकी तरफ केन्द्र सरकार को भी अवश्य ध्यान देने की आवश्यकता है।

सभापति महोदय, केन्द्र सरकार को चाहिए कि वह अमेरिका को एहसास दिलाए कि उसे भारत के साथ दोस्ती का और मजबूती से हाथ मिलाना है तथा उसे और मजबूत करना है। उसके अंदर इतनी इच्छाशक्ति है कि वह भारत को वास्तव में अपना सही दोस्त साबित करना चाहता है, तो वह भारत को संयुक्त राष्ट्र सुरक्षा परिषद में पहले वीटोयुक्त स्थायी सदस्य का दर्जा देकर अपनी नेकनीयती का सबूत दे और इस प्रकार भारत की जनता को भी भरोसे में ले।

सभापति महोदय, अंत में बहुजन समाज पार्टी केन्द्र सरकार को यह सुझाव देती है कि भारत-अमेरिका परमाणु समझौते पर कोई भी कदम बढ़ाने से पहले सभी पार्टियों के नेताओं को विश्वास में लेने के लिए एक सर्वदलीय बैठक बुलाए ताकि सभी दलों को यह मालूम हो सके कि इस न्यूक्लियर डील के पीछे केन्द्र सरकार की असल में नीयत क्या है और इस समझौते के नफा-नुकसान के कितने दूरगामी परिणाम हो सकते हैं तथा इस समझौते के आधार पर भारत का परमाणु भविष्य क्या है? क्योंकि अपने देश के लोग किसी भी कीमत पर परमाणु स्वतंत्रता खोना नहीं चाहते हैं। साथ ही किसी सामरिक गठबंधन का हिस्सा बनने के बजाए स्वतंत्र प्रतिरक्षा व विदेश नीति पर चलना पसन्द करते हैं, अर्थात् भारत को दुनिया के सामने अपने आप में एक मिसाल की तरह कायम करना चाहते हैं।

सभापति महोदय, इन सब बातों को मद्देनजर रखते हुए बहुजन समाज पार्टी का स्पष्ट मत है कि यदि कांग्रेस के नेतृत्व वाली यू.पी.ए. की सरकार बी.एस.पी. के इन सुझावों को नहीं मानती है तो हमारी पार्टी अपना रास्ता खुद चुनने का अधिकार सुरक्षित रखती है। [rep64] महोदय, परिस्थितियों के अनुसार कोई भी निर्णय लेने का अधिकार, हमारी बहुजन समाज पार्टी ने, बहुजन समाज पार्टी की राष्ट्रीय अध्यक्षता व उत्तर प्रदेश की मुख्य मंत्री, बहन कुमारी मायावती जी को दे रखा है। अगर देशहित के खिलाफ, परमाणु नीति के संबंध में कोई निर्णय लिया जाता है, तो बहन कुमारी मायावती जी, इस संबंध में, कभी भी कोई निर्णय ले सकती हैं। इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ, सदन और आपके प्रति आभार व्यक्त करते हुए, मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ।

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI K. VENKATAPATHY): Mr. Chairman, Sir, thank you very much for allowing me to speak on behalf of the Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam (DMK), and my hon. Leader Dr. Kalaignar on the issue of nuclear deal signed between India and the United States of America.

India is witnessing an unprecedented all-round progress over the past few years. Our economy is growing at a rate of between 8 per cent and 9 per cent per annum; our foreign exchange reserves are rising; our stock market is booming; and our export growth is experiencing a growth of 20 per cent per annum. Therefore, the world is looking at India as a favourable investment destination.

Millions of people, who have been suffering a lot, are watching with new hope and optimism. I feel that this is largely because of the macro-economic management of the UPA Government. However, not everyone is rejoicing at what we have

attained or what we have achieved so far. I need not adduce statistics, evidence or give material particulars to establish the fact that millions of our brothers and sisters are still starving; millions are still sleeping on the pavements without any shelter; millions of children are severely malnourished and remain illiterate; and millions of people are yet to get the basic amenities like drinking water, health facilities, or electricity. Therefore, this generation has to get energy at any cost.

We should maintain the growth momentum in order to give specific relief to the people, and we require among other things a conducive policy environment; infrastructural facilities and quality inputs in order to sustain the growth momentum. Uninterrupted energy supply is vital to all our economic activities, and it will be more helpful towards the development of the nation.

The per capita consumption of energy is very much necessary as it is the indicator of the level of economic development of a country. On an average, our energy consumption is only 1/20th of energy consumed by a person living in a developed nation. Despite the critical linkage between energy and development, access to energy for the poor has not received sufficient attention. Our economic development is dependent on energy because the economic development is energy intensive.

Our domestic reserves of fossil fuels are rather limited. Therefore, we have to import major proportion of gas, crude oil and petroleum products. This import incurs heavy expenditure, and that cost is putting severe strain on our economy. Therefore, augmenting and diversifying our energy resources is essential for our nation. This is important not only from the economic point of view, but also on strategic considerations.[\[r65\]](#)

We must explore all the sources of energy – whether hydel, thermal, non-conventional or nuclear. Nuclear power generating capacity should be improved because that is the only avenue available now. To meet the demands of expanding economy, this Deal is very, very important. This Deal frees our country from 33 years of unfair restrictions imposed on us following the peaceful nuclear test conducted by hon. Indira Gandhi in 1974.

I congratulate our Prime Minister and the team of negotiators for having negotiated this Deal. Our Prime Minister is a man of honesty, integrity and uprightness, and nobody can question his *bona fides*. Without compromising on India's key positions, he has clinched this Deal. It enables India to acquire civilian nuclear technology. At the same time, we are able to have access to the dual-use technologies.

This Agreement with India is unique, singular and exceptional in view of the fact that we are the only country who is a non-NPT member. Therefore, they have entered into an Agreement with a non-NPT member. It recognizes India as a responsible country with advanced nuclear technology. Therefore, this Deal is in favour of India which nobody can question. Other countries who are our neighbours are very particular to have this type of pact with the US with the same terms and conditions that have been extended to India. That itself is a proof that our Deal is in our favour.

Concerns have been expressed about the right to conduct further nuclear tests and whether we have been curbed from conducting nuclear tests in the future. So far as this issue is concerned, our concerns are misplaced. A mere reading of the text will clearly go to show that if at all there is a test, we have to explain the circumstances under which we carried out the tests. That point should be taken into account. Also, it provides for a process of consultation before terminating it.

We have got a provision for compensation also. Suppose, America decides to take back all the materials that have been furnished, we have got a provision for compensation. These things are provided for in the Deal. So far as the nuclear stockpiles are concerned, it is not good for India. We are not after waging any wars. India is a country which does not believe in wars. The military strategic argument for stockpiling arms is detrimental to the interest of any nation. We stand for peace and tranquillity. We have been fighting for that. We do not have intransigent attitude or uncompromising attitude. We have been preaching Panchasheel Policy and, therefore, India must focus on faster economic development and equitable distribution of opportunities, wealth and resources to every one of its citizens.

Certain genuine concerns have been expressed by our Left allies. They stem not only from the Agreement *per se* but also from the general direction of our foreign policy initiatives. Therefore, not only from the text, but also from the context, they are raising certain questions. Our Prime Minister has taken effective steps by issuing statements twice with regard to them. He has allayed their fears and he has also clarified the apprehensions. A mere reading of those two statements clearly establish that there is no point in having those apprehensions and that we can get on with the Deal.

Some other parties are opposing it and I do not know why they are opposing it. Without showing any reason or without knowing the reasons, they are opposing it tooth and nail. Had they continued in power, they would have clinched

this Deal and they would have claimed that they had done a wonderful job. But quite unfortunately or fortunately, they were sent out of power, and now they are opposing this Deal. Like a Chameleon, they are changing their colours. After crossing the fence, they have changed their colours. [r66] [KMR67] When they were in power they were of one opinion and they are airing a different opinion now when they are in the Opposition. They are taking a different stance now. They are famous for their doublespeak. They are determined to oppose whatever the Government does. They are ready to oppose the Government view either in the name of Ram or in the name of bomb. They are all men of diction but they tell untruth. We are fighting for power for the betterment of the public. They are fighting for power, the political power. They are men of diction but have now become men of addiction to power.

Renowned Tamil poet Thiru Valluvar said,

*"Gunam Naadi Kuttramum Naadi Avattrul
Migai Naadi Mikka Kollal"*

That means, "Weigh good and evil well. Weigh merits and demerits. Judge by virtues that prevail". Whenever we look into this agreement, there are merits and there is good. Therefore, it is the virtues that prevail. Therefore, we have to support the agreement. I welcome this agreement because it is not entered at the cost of the three important aspirations of our country – (1) autonomy of our strategic nuclear programme, (2) indigenous three-stage nuclear programme, (3) India's research and developmental activities.

I consider this agreement to be a unique and historical agreement by which India will become the only country in the world to pursue a nuclear development programme even without signing the NPT and still being allowed to conduct nuclear trade with the NSG member-countries. What else do we want? This is a win-win situation for us. I would request all our friends to have oneness of opinion, modicum of thought and perfect symphony in supporting this agreement. I hope that all of us would support this agreement. I on behalf of my DMK Party and my beloved leader Kalaignar support this agreement.

श्री मोहन रावते (मुम्बई दक्षिण-मध्य): महोदय, जो अभी एग्रीमेंट हुआ या ट्रीटी हुयी, मैं इसके बारे में कहना चाहता हूँ। आज सुबह मैं जब टीवी देख रहा था, अभी प्रियरंजन दासमुंशी जी यहाँ नहीं हैं, उन्होंने एक वक्तव्य दिया। उस वक्तव्य में उन्होंने कहा कि ट्रीटी डिस्कस होगी। उसको मान्यता नहीं है, अगर वोट होती, तो मान्यता होती। आपको मान्यता लेने में क्या ऐतराज है? पहली बार हिंदुस्तान में ऐसी ट्रीटी हुयी, जिस केस में कंटावर्सी हुयी है। इसके बारे में मैं आपको कोट करके बताना चाहता हूँ कि सुप्रीम कोर्ट के एक जज हैं, उन्होंने कहा, "Legal experts on the nuclear deal questioned the claim that the 123 agreement does not require ratification by the Indian Parliament. The Union Executive has no authority to enter into any binding treaty unless it is agreed to by the Parliament. In support of this assertion, articles 53, 73 and 253 of Indian Constitution were cited." He further said, "The nuclear deal without ratification by Parliament is not only undemocratic but is also unconstitutional. The national laws of US are already embedded in the 123 agreement. The Government cannot deny that Hyde Act will apply to the deal." यूएस के साथ जो वर्ष 2005 से प्रधानमंत्री ने प्रक्रिया शुरू की। प्रधानमंत्री और बुश के बीच करार के बारे में बातचीत हुयी। बाद में अमेरिका की सीनेट में करार के पक्ष में 85/12 वोटिंग हुयी। वहाँ वोटिंग हो सकती है, तो हमारे यहाँ वोटिंग क्यों नहीं हो सकती है? यह यूनीलेटरल है। This is not bilateral. मैं आपको बताना चाहता हूँ। मैं कोट करना चाहता हूँ। Article 253 reads, "Notwithstanding anything in the foregoing provisions of this Chapter, Parliament has power to make any law for the whole or any part of the territory of India for implementing any treaty, agreement or convention with any other country or countries or any decision made at any international conference, association or other body". हमारे यहाँ यह पास क्यों नहीं हो सकता? पहली बार इतनी कंटावर्सी हुयी है। हमारे दोस्त लोग तो सपोर्ट विदग्ध करने वाले थे। यह ट्रीटी ऐसी है, जो हिंदुस्तान को पंगु बना देगी। [p68] यह ऐसी ट्रीटी है। मैं बताना चाहता हूँ कि चीन ने 1985 में यूएस के साथ एग्रीमेंट किया था।

The China-US Agreement of 1985 states that both States would observe the principal of the international law under which neither party could invoke the domestic law to justify failure to perform the treaty. चीन कर सकता है, लेकिन चीन ने स्वीकार नहीं किया। उसने डायरेक्ट साइन नहीं किया, वह उनके सामने नहीं झुका, उसने अपना स्वाभिमान बचाया। हमारी सरकार अपना स्वाभिमान क्यों नहीं बचा रही है? हमारी सरकार अमरीका के सामने क्यों झुक जाती है?

उन्होंने अभी चीन के साथ इंटरनेशनल एग्रीमेंट किया। यह एग्रीमेंट अमरीका और इंडिया के तहत हुआ है। मान लें हमने कल 123 एग्रीमेंट तोड़ दिया, तो हम इंटरनेशनल कोर्ट में नहीं जा सकते, लेकिन चीन जा सकता है, चूंकि चीन का इंटरनेशनल एग्रीमेंट के तहत समझौता हुआ है। मुझे नहीं पता कि इन्हें क्यों इतनी जल्दी थी। चीन ने काफी साल लिए और जापान ने छः साल लिए थे, जापान और अमरीका के एग्रीमेंट में छः साल लगे। मुझे लगता है कि यह यूनीलेटरल एग्रीमेंट है बॉयलेटरल एग्रीमेंट नहीं है।

मैं न्यूयॉर्क कोऑपरेशन के बारे में बताना चाहता हूँ। हमारे पड़ोस में पाकिस्तान, चीन, मालदीव, श्रीलंका हैं और यह सारे हमारे ओशन से घिरे हुए हैं। इन सब जगहों पर चीन के मौनीटरिंग सेंटर्स हैं। श्री बुश ने कहा कि आप न्यूयॉर्क टैस्ट नहीं कर सकते। यदि अमरीका हमें अपना पार्टनर बता रहा है, तो पार्टनर का स्टेटस क्यों नहीं दे रहा है। हमें पार्टनर का स्टेटस मिलना चाहिए। हमें भी न्यूयॉर्क टैस्ट करने का मौका मिलना चाहिए।

अभी हमारे विद्वान नेता श्री लाल कृष्ण आडवाणी ने सभी तरीकों से बताया। उन्होंने डा. भाभा के बारे में बताया। हम न्यूयॉर्क वैपन के बारे में सक्षम हो

सकते थे। लेकिन दुर्भाग्य से वे मारे गए या उन्हें मार दिया गया। यदि उनका कहना मानते तो अलग बात थी।

भारत सीटीबीटी और एनपीटी में टैस्ट बैन ट्रीटी और न्यूक्लियर नॉन प्रोलिफरेशन ट्रीटी का सिग्नेटरी नहीं है। भारत सरकार ने यही स्टैंड लिया था कि इन दोनों में मसौदे का सिग्नेटरी नहीं बनेगा। पोखरण-2 के बाद एनडीए सरकार ने पांच न्यूक्लियर टैस्ट किए। उसके बाद इन्होंने सैल्फ इम्पोज मोरेटोरियम एनाउंस किया था और कहा था कि फिलहाल भारत कोई न्यूक्लियर टैस्ट नहीं करेगा। इसका मतलब यह नहीं हुआ कि भारत कोई टैस्ट नहीं करेगा। उन्होंने पाकिस्तान को सहूलियत दी हुई है, चीन को सहूलियत दी हुई है। यदि वे कभी न्यूक्लियर टैस्ट करेंगे तो क्या हम उनका मुंह देखते रहेंगे? वे हमारे यहां बम फोड़ते रहेंगे तो क्या हम मरते रहेंगे? सरकार का क्या इरादा है? सरकार का इरादा स्पष्ट होना चाहिए।

पाकिस्तान हमारा पड़ोसी देश है। कुछ दिन पहले अमरीकन सरकार ने डिवलेयर किया था कि पाकिस्तान में विकास निधि के लिए जो पैसा दिया जाता है, वह साया हिन्दुस्तान के खिलाफ आतंकवादी एक्टिविटीज के लिए इस्तेमाल किया जा रहा है। आज अमरीका ने उसे छः हजार बिलियन डालर की मदद दी है। आज पूरे हिन्दुस्तान में बम फट रहे हैं, चाहे मुम्बई हो, रेल हो, बाजार हो या कोई भी जगह हो, आज जगह-जगह पाकिस्तान की आईएसआई एजेंसी के द्वारा बम फोड़े जा रहे हैं और पाकिस्तान उसे सपोर्ट कर रहा है।

मैं बताना चाहता हूँ कि ईरान को न्यूक्लियर वैपन्स टेक्नोलॉजी ब्लैक मार्केट में मिली है। पाकिस्तान को जो न्यूक्लियर टैस्ट टेक्नोलॉजी दी गई, पाकिस्तान ने उसे लीबिया को दी है, ईरान को दी है, नार्थ कोरिया को दी है और चीन ने उनके लिए चोरी-छुपे नान-प्रॉलीफरेशन कनाइवेंस से किया है। [N69]

सभापति महोदय, मैं थोरियम के बारे में कुछ बताना चाहता हूँ। आदरणीय प्रधान मंत्री जी को मैंने इस संबंध में एक लैटर लिखा था। हमारे स्वर्गीय होमी भाभा, जो ग्रेट साइंटिस्ट थे, उन्होंने कहा था कि थोरियम का इस्तेमाल होना चाहिए। भाभा जी ने जो कहा था, उस पर हमारी सरकार ने ध्यान नहीं दिया। अगर सरकार उस पर ध्यान देती, तो आज हमें थोरियम के लिए यूरेनियम और प्लूटोनियम की आवश्यकता नहीं होती। मैं बहुत से साइंटिस्ट्स से मिल चुका हूँ। थोरियम के लिए प्लूटोनियम की आवश्यकता होती है। आज हमारे पास प्लूटोनियम काफी कम है। हम उसका केवल दो साल ही इस्तेमाल कर सकते हैं।

16.46 hrs.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

महोदय, अगर हम प्लूटोनियम रशिया से मंगाते, तो आज हम प्लूटोनियम, थोरियम के जरिये यूरेनियम जैसा मैटीरियल बना सकते हैं। इसी सदन में दो दिन पहले जब रंजन साहब ने थोरियम के बारे में वक्तेष्वन पूछा, तो माननीय पृथ्वीराज चौहान ने जवाब दिया कि हमारे पास थोरियम सफिशेंट है। हमारे यहां थोरियम का प्रोग्राम चल रहा है। लेकिन इसका इस्तेमाल होना चाहिए। आज हमारे पास 2 लाख, 90 हजार टन थोरियम है। हम पूरे वर्ल्ड को थोरियम दे सकते थे। श्री होमी भाभा ने इस बारे में कहा था लेकिन 1966 में श्री होमी भाभा की मृत्यु हो गयी। उसके बाद 41 साल गुजर गये हैं। हमने इसका टाइम बाउंड प्रोग्राम क्यों नहीं किया? मैं आपके माध्यम से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार के पास इस बारे में क्या टाइम बाउंड प्रोग्राम है? ... (व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप कृपया मुझे बोलने दीजिए। India has developed nuclear weapons, but it is not recognized as a nuclear weapons state by the five official Nuclear Weapons States – US, Russia, Britain, France and China, which had all tested their nuclear devices prior to the existence of the NPT. लेकिन वे हमें करने नहीं देते हैं। The Hyde Act calls for achieving a moratorium on the production of fissile material for explosive purposes by India, Pakistan and the People's Republic of China. It may be recalled that China has been producing fissile material for weapons purposes for a long time, while India was not allowed to do, by the NWS. The Hyde Act that President Bush signed categorically demands that India should ban all nuclear tests. हम प्रधान मंत्री जी से जानना चाहते हैं कि क्या वह हमारी प्रगति को रोकना चाहते हैं? मैं बताना चाहता हूँ कि प्रधान मंत्री जी बार-बार यह बोल रहे हैं कि इससे हमें ऊर्जा मिले जायेगी, यानी हमें 20 हजार मेगावाट इलैक्ट्रिसिटी मिल जायेगी। मैं आपको बताना चाहता हूँ कि हमें 20 हजार मेगावाट बिजली कब मिलेगी, यह वर्ष 2020 में 20 हजार मेगावाट बिजली हमें मिलेगी। इसी सदन में हमारे पावर मंत्री श्री सुशील कुमार शिंदे जी ने कहा था कि हमें दो लाख मेगावाट पावर की जरूरत है यानी 86 हजार मेगावाट बिजली की हमारे यहां कमी है। इस 86 हजार मेगावाट बिजली की हमें वर्ष 2013 तक आवश्यकता है। अभी हमारा इंडस्ट्रियल ग्रोथ 11.5 परसेंट के करीब जाने वाला है, ऐसा सरकार का कहना है। इस हिसाब से हमें वर्ष 2020 तक 4 लाख मेगावाट ऊर्जा की जरूरत है। अब आप बताइये कि 20 हजार मेगावाट ऊर्जा कहां पूरी होगी? ये लोग सिर्फ 20 हजार मेगावाट के बारे में बताना चाहते हैं, दिखाना चाहते हैं, जो सही नहीं है। यह ऊर्जा एक स्टेट के लिए भी पूरी नहीं होगी। हमें केवल 20 हजार मेगावाट ऊर्जा मिलेगी, जिसके लिए हम इतनी कोशिश कर रहे हैं। हम अपने स्वाभिमान को गिरवी रख रहे हैं। मेरे पास बोलने के लिए बहुत प्वाइंट हैं।

MR. SPEAKER: You can lay your speech.

श्री मोहन रावले : अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप हमें बोलने के लिए इजाजत दें।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : हम क्या करें। आपका पांच मिनट टाइम था लेकिन बारह मिनट हो गये हैं।

श्री मोहन रावले : इसके लिए आपका बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद। आपने हमारे ऊपर बहुत मेहरबानी की... (व्यवधान) अध्यक्ष महोदय, हम शिवसेना पार्टी की तरफ से कहना चाहते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान को पंगु बनाने वाला आपने जो एग्जिमेंट किया है, वह अनकांस्टीट्यूशनल है। आप पार्लियामेंट की मान्यता लेते नहीं हैं। इस बारे में कम्युनिस्ट लोगों ने पहले ही विरोध किया था। उन्होंने बंगाल में जाकर प्रधान मंत्री जी को ललकारा था। वे गुरसा हो गये थे। उन्होंने वहां कहा था कि आपको जो करना है, वह कर लीजिए। मेरी आपसे प्रार्थना है कि इस डिबेट के साथ इसकी निंदा होनी चाहिए।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप एक लाइन में बोल दीजिए। You can say that you reject this.

SHRI MOHAN RAWALE : Let the Government come forward. [MSOffice70] जैसा कि सुबह दासगुंशी जी ने कहा कि वर्चा हो रही है, तो इसका मतलब यह नहीं है कि इसे सभी की मान्यता मिल गयी है।

महोदय, मेरे पास कहने के लिए बहुत से प्वाइंट्स हैं, अगर आपकी इजाजत हो तो मैं अपनी स्पीच सदन के पटल पर ले करना चाहता हूँ।

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, you can lay it. I hope it deals with the Nuclear Deal.

श्री मोहन रावते : जी हाँ, न्युक्विलियर डील से ही सम्बन्धित है।

*अमरिका के साथ होने वाले परमाणु करार को लेकर काफी जदो जहद चल रही है लेकिन अध्यक्ष महाराज, इसके पीछे छिपे तथ्य को ध्यान में लेने के लिए कोई तैयार नहीं। बिजली की दिन दुनि और रात चौगुनी बढ़नेवाली मांग, इस सभी फसाद कि जड़ है। भारत अब आधुनिक जीवन के नये मार्ग पर अग्रसर हो गया है, बिजली उसके जीवन का एक अविभाज्य अंग बन चुका है। इसी कारण बिजली के मांग की आपूर्ति यह सरकार की प्रथम समस्या बन गयी है। बाष्प द्वारा निर्मित बिजली, जलस्रोतों से निर्मित बिजली और अन्य किसी भी स्रोतों से प्राप्त बिजली हमारे नैसर्गिक धरोहर को समाप्त करने में लग जाती है। केवल एक ही स्रोत ऐसा बचा है जो हमें लंबे अरसे तक बिजली मुहैया करा सकता है और वह है परमाणु शक्ति से निर्मित बिजली। इस समस्या को सुलझाने के लिए परमाणु शक्ति और परमाणु शक्ति के लिये पर्याप्त युरेनियम 233 की आवश्यकता है। इस आवश्यकता की परिपूर्ति के लिए करार करने की नौबत हमारे देश पर आई है क्योंकि युरेनियम पर्याप्त मात्रा में आज हमारे पास उपलब्ध नहीं है। हमें तो इसी सभागृह में बताया जाता है कि हमारे देश में थोरियम का भण्डार भरा है। उपलब्ध थोरियम के खजाने को बिजली के उत्पादन के वास्ते अनुकूल बनाने के कदम क्यों नहीं उठाए गए? इस अहम समस्या पर मंत्रालय क्यों सोता रहा?

*â€; * This part of the speech was laid on the Table.

अध्यक्ष महाराज सभी समस्या की जड़ यह है। क्योंकि इन लोगों ने सामान्य जनता के हित की बात कभी सोची ही नहीं। कुछ बेपरवाह राजनितिक दल तो समस्या हल करने के बजाय सरकार गिराने की कोशिश में जुट गये। मेरी समझ में नहीं आ रहा की सरकार गिराने से बिजली की आपूर्ति कैसे हो जाएगी? यहां मुझे सरकार की बकालात नहीं करनी है, बल्कि जिन गरीब मजदूरों का मजदूरी सक्षम बिजली की आपूर्ति पर निर्भर है उनका भविष्य अंधेरे में क्यों धकेला जाए? समस्या को क्यों जटील किया जाए? क्योंकि इन्हें तो समस्या का हल नहीं, इस महान सभागृह को राजनीति का अखाड़ा बनाना है। आओ यहां पर कुछ बुनियादी बातें सोचे अगर आपको अमरिका सहित किसी बाहरी देश के कारणों नहीं चाहिए तो आत्मनिर्भरता के कुछ सुझाव दो। देश की बिजली समस्या को कटीन मत बनाओ। हमें सपने में भी नहीं भुलना चाहिए की हमारी मातृभूमि भारत एक सार्वभौम (सोव्हरिन) देश है। हम नहीं चाहेंगे की लाखों स्वतंत्रता सेनानियों के खून के बदले में हमें जा आजादी मिली, वह किसी अजनबी देश के ओट भेज चला दी जाए। हम अपने असुलोपर चल रहे हैं और भविष्य में भारत एक सुपर पावर महान देश बनने वाला है।

अध्यक्ष महाराज बड़ा बनने के लिए मेहनत और लगत की जरूरत है। किसी की ईर्ष्या करने से, किसी की बुराई करने से और देशों में नफरत की खाई बढ़ाने से कोई देश बड़ा नहीं हो सकता, इसका इतिहास साक्षी है। तथाकथित मित्र कहलानेवाला देश अमरिका बड़ा उदार देश है। वह जिस प्रकार हमें मदद देता है, उसी प्रकार पाकिस्तान को भी भरसक मदद पहुंचाता है। फर्क केवल इतना है, हमें मिलने वाली मदद सही मानों में विकास कार्यों पर खर्च होती है तो हमारे प्यारे पाकिस्तान को मिलनेवाली मदद भारत के खिलाफ नफरत के दायरे बढ़ाने के वास्ते उपयोग में लायी जाती है। नहीं, नहीं एक विरोधक के नाते मैं यह बात इस महान सभागृह में प्रस्तुत नहीं कर रहा हूँ बल्कि हमारे देश के महान नेताओं ने खुलेआम कबूल किया है कि पाकिस्तान को अमरिका द्वारा की गयी मदद भारत के खिलाफ नफरत के दायरे बढ़ाने के लिए, आतंकवाद बढ़ाकर, निर्दोष नागरिकों के कत्लेआम के लिए, निजी एवं सार्वजनिक सम्पदा बाँब धमाके से उड़ा देने के लिए और जिनकी वित्त और जिवित हानी हुई है उनका दिल दहलाने वाला विलाप देखने के लिए खर्च हो रही है। अब आप ही सोचिए बहस इस पर होनी चाहिए या अमरिका से मिलने वाली धन राशी पर होना चाहिए?

अध्यक्ष महाराज उर्जा की बढ़ती मांग हमारे देश की एक अहम समस्या है क्योंकि भारत एक महान देश के रूप में उभर रहा है, बिजली की आपूर्ति सरकार को नये-नये स्रोतों पर मजबूर कर रही है ऐसे में उसे हल करना सरकार का काम है। यह काम किस प्रकार से पूरा किया जाए, इस पर सारा लक्ष्य आन पड़ा है। अब आप ही मार्ग दर्शन करें की हमें राजनीति वाली कशमकश चाहिए, या विकास का राजमार्ग चाहिए?

अध्यक्ष महाराज भारत में इस विधेयक का विरोध बिलकुल अलग मायने में किया जा रहा है। जहां तक न्युक्विलियर नॉन प्रॉलिफेरेशन करार का सवाल है, शुरू से ही यानी जब 1970 में यह करार सामने आया था, इस पर दस्तखत नहीं करने वाले देशों के श्रृंखला में भारत जुड़ गया था यह भी सभी जानते हैं की, इस करार के दायरे बाहर रहकर भी, 1974 से लेकर 1998 तक भारत ने पांच बार अणुशक्ति परीक्षण कर लिया है इसी का दुसरा अर्थ यह है कि भारत ने अपने परमाणु सामर्थ्य का प्रयोग अपनी सामरिक शक्ति बढ़ाने के वास्ते नहीं बल्कि परमाणु शक्ति का उपयोग जन सामान्य की भलाई के लिए किया है। जिस प्रकार सफल तरीके से भारत ने परमाणु परीक्षण किये हैं, वह देखते हुए उसे संसार के पांच अणुशक्तिशाली देशों के समान मान्यता मिलनी चाहिए थी लेकिन मामला आपके सामने है।

भारत में परमाणु शक्ति की एकमियत इस लिए है, के सारे संसार में जिस तेजी से परमाणु हथियारों को कारगर बनाने के लिये विकसित राष्ट्र प्रयास कर रहे हैं, उन प्रयासों को देखते हुए अगर हमने अपने देश के सुरक्षा के वास्ते, अपने प्रयास तेज कर दिये तो उसमें क्या हर्ज है? जिस हायड्रॉपॉवर पर राष्ट्रपति बुश ने दस्तखत किये हैं, उसमें स्पष्ट रूप से यह मांग की गयी है कि भारत अपने भविष्य में कोई भी अणुशक्ति परीक्षण ना करें। अब हालात ऐसे हैं की खुद अमरीका ही अपने यीलायबल रीप्लेसमेन्ट वेपन्स के विकास में जुटी है। और भविष्य में वह अणुशक्ति परीक्षण नहीं करेगी, इसकी संभावना कम ही दिखाई पड़ती है।

अध्यक्ष महाराज इस विषय पर राजनीतिक दृष्टिकोण नहीं, किसी राजकिय दल का स्वार्थ नहीं, किसी व्यक्तिगत समुह का मनाफा नहीं बल्कि हमारे राष्ट्र के नवनिर्माण में हमारी कदम अपने देश को एक कदम अग्रसर करने में कितना कारगर साबित होगा इस पर सोचने का है।

यह सभी जानते हैं कि पाकिस्तान की निर्मिती धर्म के आधार पर हुयी है। पाकिस्तान हमेशा से अपने विकास को नहीं बल्कि अपने ही देश में धर्मान्यता को बढ़ावा देने के लिए प्रयत्नशील रहा है। लेकिन इसी नीति के चलते उसने पाकिस्तान में 52 आतंकवादी ट्रेनिंग केंम्स चलाए रखे हैं जिका प्रमुख रूख हिन्दुस्तान रहा है। रेलवे, बाजार, बस, मंदिर, मस्जिद ऐसे स्थानों पर जहाँ की भी भिड़ लगती हो उसमें यह आतंकवादी बंम धमाके करके लोगों के जानोमाल को बरबादी में धकेल रहे हैं। आज जो दहशतवाद वह इस्लाम के नाम पर चल रहा है उसका फायदा पाकिस्तान के तानाशाह भरसक अठा रहा है। लेकिन भारत तो नॉन इस्लामिक राष्ट्र है। अपने विकास निधि के कारण भरत ने एक शान्तिपूर्ण राष्ट्र के नाते अपनी प्रतिमा तैयार की है। इसी कारण से अमरिका भारत से करार करना चाहता है। इस करार को अमरिका के इशारे पर नाचने के लिए नहीं अपितु अपने देश को एक सार्वभौम (सोव्हरिन) राष्ट्र बनाने के लिए इस्तेमाल करना है। विदेशों से करार

करने का अधिकार भारत सरकार को अवश्य है लेकिन इस अधिकार का प्रयोग देश की स्वतंत्रता को बिखरी रखने के लिए नहीं अपितु अपने राष्ट्र को बलवात बनाने के लिए होना चाहिए यही मेरी अपेक्षा है।

In India, the opposition to the bill is based on an entirely different perspective. India has remained a non-signatory of the Nuclear-Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) since the Treaty entered into force in 1970, following U.S. ratification. Staying outside of the NPT-regime, India has tested its nuclear devices on three occasions—once in 1974 and twice in 1998. In other words, India has developed nuclear weapons, but it is not recognized as a nuclear weapons state by the five official Nuclear Weapons States—(NWS)—United States, Russia, Britain, France, and China—which had all tested their nuclear devices prior to the existence of the NPT.

The issue of future nuclear tests is important to the opponents of the bill in India, because they consider that such tests are necessary in order to upgrade India's nuclear weapons to match nuclear developments elsewhere, and provide security to the nation. The Hyde Act that President Bush signed categorically demands that India ban all nuclear explosive tests in the future. It, however, does not address the 'fact that the United States itself is working on the design of a "Reliable Replacement Weapon" (RRW) to modernize its nuclear arsenal, and may indeed carry out a test in the future!

Moreover, in the "Definitions" section of the contested 11, it is clearly stated that the "Additional Protocol" is to be based on the Model Additional protocol of the IAEA applicable to non-nuclear-weapon states, which is highly intrusive. It is maybe pointed out that the Hyde Act makes it clear that the U.S. President has to satisfy himself that India is working actively on an early conclusion of the Fissile Material Control " regime (FMCT); that India is supporting the United States in preventing the spread of enrichment and reprocessing technologies; and that India adheres to the Missile Test Control Regime (MTCR) and NSG guidelines (without actually being invited to be a member of these bodies). These actions which India is obliged to take are not consistent with what "a strategic partner" (which Washington wishes India to be) should be taking. Neither are they consistent with what India—described as a "responsible state with advanced technology"—should be mandated to take.

What also concerns India's planners about the bill is the way it has been formulated. The Hyde Act calls for achieving a moratorium on the production of fissile material for explosive purposes by India, Pakistan, and the People's Republic of China. It may be recalled that China has been producing fissile material for weapons purposes for a long time, while India was not allowed to by the NWS. Therefore, stopping production of fissile material at the same point of time would lead to a serious imbalance. The statement of policy goes on to say that the United States shall "seek to halt the increase of nuclear weapon arsenals in South Asia and to promote their reduction and eventual elimination."

Indian scientists have made their views known about the inadequacy of the Hyde Act, citing two specific areas. First-, the bill says categorically that India cannot reprocess spent fuel from its reactors. It demands this because the United States claims that the "no reprocessing" clause would prevent from getting plutonium, which could be used later for making nuclear weapons. However, there is more to the clause than meets the eye, India atomic scientists point out.

India decided on a three-stage nuclear program back in the 1950s, when India's nuclear power generation program was set up. In the first stage, natural uranium (U-238) was used in pressurized heavy water reactors (PHWRs). In the second stage, the plutonium extracted through reprocessing from the used fuel of the PHWRs was scheduled to be used to run fast-breeder reactors (FBRs). The plutonium was used in the FBRs in 70% mixed oxide (MOX)-fuel, to breed uranium-233 in a thorium-232 blanket around the core. In the final stage, the FBRs use thorium-232 and produce uranium-233 for use in the third stage reactors.

To a certain extent, India has completed the first stage, although it has realized a dozen nuclear power plants so far. The second stage is only realized by a small experimental fast breeder reactor (13 MW), at Kalpakkam. Meanwhile, the Indian authorities have cleared the Department of Atomic Energy's proposal to set up a 500 MW prototype of the next-generation fast-breeder nuclear power, reactor at Kalpakkam, thereby setting the stage for the commercial exploitation of thorium as a fuel source.

One reason for India's commitment to switch over to thorium is its large indigenous supply. With estimated thorium reserves of some 290,000 tons, it ranks second only to Australia. Further, the nation's pursuit of thorium helps to bring independence from overseas uranium sources. Since India is a non-signatory of the NPT, its leaders foresaw that its civil nuclear-energy-generation program would be constrained in the long term by the provisions laid down by the commercial uranium suppliers. The 45-member Nuclear Suppliers Group demand that purchasers sign the NPT and thereby allow enough oversight to ensure that the fuel (or the plutonium spawned from it) is not used for making nuclear weapons. A non-signatory of the NPT is prevented from receiving any nuclear-related technology and nuclear fuel.

India already began the construction of the Advanced Heavy Water Reactor (AHWR) in 2005. The AHWR will use thorium, the "fuel of the future," to generate 300 MW of electricity—up from its original design output of 235 MW. The fuel for the AHWR will be a hybrid core, partly thorium-uranium 233 and partly thorium-plutonium.

In other words, if India cannot reprocess the spent fuel to secure plutonium for the sake of converting thorium into fuel, the thorium reactors will never take off. Separation of plutonium is essential for the eventual use of thorium as a nuclear fuel. India therefore expects that reprocessing will be an important activity of its nuclear energy program. This is what has put the Indian atomic scientists on a warpath against the Singh government's willingness to accept the bill.

Natural uranium contains about 99.3% of the isotope uranium-238 and 0.7% of the fissionable isotope uranium-235. Although uranium-235 is the rarer of the uranium isotopes, it is the one that most readily undergoes nuclear fission, and is thus the most useful for common nuclear applications. Therefore, to use uranium, the proportion of the uranium-235 isotope found in natural uranium must be increased. This process of increasing the fraction of uranium-235 in natural uranium is called enrichment. At the same time, one must note that while uranium-235 is present in natural uranium in small amounts, uranium-233 does not exist in nature. Therefore, thorium-232 must be converted to uranium-233 in order to generate nuclear power.

The second concern of the Indian scientists is the scope of "full civilian nuclear energy cooperation" (Section 123 of the U.S. Atomic Energy Act) that was promised to India in July 2005. India had assumed that this term encompassed the fuel cycle, namely enrichment of uranium and reprocessing of spent fuel. In the "discussions leading to the adoption of the Hyde Act, U.S. legislators argued that the U.S. Atomic Energy Act Of 1954 specifically forbids export of these technologies, as also heavy water production technology, to other countries. India has developed its own technologies in these three important areas.

India's top atomic scientists have spelled out some of the key points to be incorporated in the 123 agreement are:

- India should not be asked to participate in international non-proliferation efforts with a policy congruent to that of the United States.
- There should be full-scale civilian nuclear cooperation, with an assurance of constant fuel supply.
- India should be free to carry out more nuclear weapons tests.

There are four main areas of interest for the US to enter into the nuclear cooperation agreement with India. Firstly, this will generate over \$150 billion worth of business opportunities to companies producing nuclear reactors, which would in turn be financed by US based transnational banks. Secondly, the Defence Cooperation Agreement, which preceded the nuclear cooperation agreement, would pave the way for the sale of sophisticated weaponry to India creating a huge market for the military industrial complex of the US. Thirdly, this would enable the US to draw India into the National Missile Defence System, which symbolizes the hegemonic design of the US to dominate the entire world. Fourthly, the US wants India to become its strategic ally in Asia, especially in the backdrop of the ASEAN taking a position against the Iraq War and the strengthening of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization comprising of Russia, China and other Central Asian republics. The provisions in the Hyde Act clearly point towards these strategic goals of the US. Nuclear cooperation would provide the leverage to the US to make India fall in line.

Our main weakness regarding nuclear energy is a limited supply of uranium which can be expanded by more mining or going for the thorium cycle. The government without doing any of this has suddenly pushed 123 Agreement with the US, when India today is on the threshold of completing the Thorium cycle. Contrary to the assurance made by the prime minister, the nuclear deal has not assured "full" nuclear cooperation. Technology would continue to be denied to India in crucial areas.

The legal aspects of the nuclear deal question the claim that the 123 Agreement does not require ratification by the Indian Parliament. The union Executive has no authority to enter into any binding treaty unless it is ratified by parliament. In support of this assertion, three articles from the Indian constitution are sighted: Articles 53, 73 and 253 along with entry numbers 6 and 30 from the union list. On the basis of these- to go ahead with the nuclear deal without ratification of parliament is not only undemocratic but also unconstitutional. The national laws of the US are already embedded in the 123 Agreement and the government cannot deny that Hyde Act will apply to the deal.

What are India's problems that force us into needing this agreement?

First off, we need energy to sustain our growing economy. We can't depend too much on the middle-east to supply

fossil fuel for two reasons:

- 1) They are getting costlier
- 2) That region is constantly volatile. Also, we don't have quality coal available freely in India anymore. Some are hidden underneath our rainforests and we will have to destroy a bit of our ecology to plough them out.

We have very minimal uranium. We need nuclear fuel badly.

In the last 40 years, we have been zealously developing this technology all by our own, though the advanced technology that this agreement is going to bring will help.

What are we losing in this bargain?

We have to agree not to develop nuclear weapons using the fuel and the technology that the US is going to provide us. In order to do this, we have to identify a set of reactors that will use the fuel and the techie stuff comes from them. And understandably, there will be audits to ensure that we are not "sneaking" out any stuff outside to the reactors used for military purposes. These audits will be carried out by IAEA, International Atomic Energy Agency. India has identified 14 out of 22 reactors as 'civilian' and hence these will come under the IAEA surveillance.

We will also have to work with US in terms of combating other countries that are aspiring for nuclear weapons, namely Iran.

The third most important aspect is about our right to conduct further tests. Interestingly, India has voluntarily capped a moratorium on further tests but we still have the right to test a nuke or two in case the situation demands. Going back a couple of decades, all the signatories of NPT have tested nukes after that. Considering the prevailing situation, India will not want to conduct another test, unless or otherwise it sees a threat.

The legal aspects of the nuclear deal question the claim that the 123 Agreement does not require ratification by the Indian parliament. The union Executive has no authority to enter into any binding treaty unless it is ratified by parliament. In support of this assertion, three articles from the Indian constitution are sighted: Articles 53, 73 and 253 along with entry numbers 6 and 30 from the union list. On the basis of these - to go ahead with the nuclear deal without ratification of parliament is not only undemocratic but also unconstitutional. The national laws of the US are already embedded in the 123 Agreement and the government cannot deny that Hyde Act will apply to the deal.

What are India's problems that force us into needing this agreement?

First off, we need energy to sustain our growing economy. We can't depend too much on the middle-east to supply fossil fuel for two reasons*

MR. SPEAKER: Next speaker is Shri B. Mahtab. You will speak for only five minutes. I know you are very articulate.

SHRI B. MAHTAB (CUTTACK): Respected Speaker, Sir, the discussion taking place today when the Government is taken as a hostage. It is not only peculiar but also very interesting. Objections to the Agreement are basically two. One, this 123 Agreement will adversely affect India's weapons programme and India's ability to test in the future. The second objection is opposition to the Agreement because it is with the United States of America.

The debate on the Nuclear Deal in the country throws light on how poorly certain sections of our society have developed a sense of national sovereignty during the last 60 years of our Independence. Jawaharlal Nehru was criticized in harsh words when India joined Commonwealth as a Republic. His decision was denounced even in this House. When he appealed for arms aid following the Chinese aggression, he was derided. Indo-Soviet Treaty of Peace and Friendship in 1971 was severely criticized and there were predictions that India was now being made a Soviet Satellite. India recognizing the Heng Samrin regime in Cambodia was attributed wrongly. Indian stand on Soviet entry into Afghanistan was also denounced as siding with the Soviets. Such criticisms were voiced at the time of the happenings, yet critics talk nostalgically about traditional independent Foreign Policy during the last 60 years and fear that it will be compromised if the proposed Indo-US Deal goes through.

What do they worry? What they seem to worry about is that future Indian Governments would not be as strong as

the past Indian Governments in asserting Indian sovereignty. But one knows that a sovereign nation when faced with a conflict between its perceived national interests and its contractual obligation or pledged word, exercises its sovereignty to sustain its national security interests and accepts its consequences in the international system. This is what India did during the Bangladesh war. When it ignored the UN Resolution passed by 110 nations mostly our non-aligned friends asking India to stop war. India defied the entire international community when it stood alone in the United Nation General Assembly and declared that it would not sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. That was done while the United Front Coalition Government under Shri I.K. Gujral was in Office.

The nuclear tests of May 11, 1998 were exercises in assertion of our sovereignty when India defied almost the entire international community and conducted the nuclear tests. We have a record of safeguarding our national interests at a time when the United States was the dominant super power leading Western Europe, Japan and China. At that time India was weak economically, politically and militarily.[\[R71\]](#)

Today, India's strategic partnership is sought not only by the United States but also by the European Union, Japan, and China. India today – a nuclear power State, a missile and space power and IT power – is growing at nine per cent GDP. Therefore, I am puzzled why some sections are terrified of India's sovereignty being compromised by the Indo-US nuclear deal. That shows lack of adequate understanding of the current international realities and an obsession with images not the reality. This indicates a total lack of self-confidence.

MR. SPEAKER: You can lay it, if you want.

SHRI B. MAHTAB : I have certain amendments also relating to it. I would say that a debate on the Indo-US Nuclear Agreement cannot be conducted in a vacuum. This Indo-US Agreement on Civilian Nuclear Cooperation is a complex accord having few parallels in international Treaties and Agreements. It has both bilateral and international dimensions. The Agreement is on civilian nuclear cooperation but its military dimension is in a sense even more important. I believe the accord straightaway confers *de facto* nuclear weapon power status on India by-passing NPT. Encased in the 123 Agreement, this status is to be sealed by the IAEA, an institution under United Nations within the terms of India specific "safeguards" agreement that the IAEA is to work out with the Indian nuclear establishments. What are the major issues of concern? Can a strategic programme continue for a credible minimum deterrent? Are we prepared for the possible consequences should India find it necessary to test again? I am of the opinion that the Hyde Act enables the US Administration to enter into civilian nuclear cooperation agreements with India. This was earlier prohibited by US law. This law does not impact on our strategic programme nor on our vital interests or the independence of our decision making.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry your time is long exhausted.

SHRI B. MAHTAB : In article 2, paragraph 4 of 123 Agreement, it is stated that the implementation of the Agreement would neither hinder nor interfere with the military programme of either country. It is not unknown that the United States does not approve of our weapons programme and we do not approve of theirs either. India's nuclear weapon programme was the cause of 30 years embargo on dual-use high technology flows to India. The US is now bound not to hinder or interfere with our weapons programme while promoting civilian nuclear cooperation with India and this commitment will -- if this Agreement gets through -- become part of the United States law.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry to interrupt you but I cannot otherwise finish this. Please cooperate. I am very sorry to do this.

SHRI B. MAHTAB : Sir, there is no point in laying it down.

MR. SPEAKER: Why not? It will be recorded fully. It is very painful for me to do that. You always make good points but you can summarize in another one minute. The Chair does not feel happy at all to interrupt Members.

SHRI B. MAHTAB : These are certain issues which I did not speak earlier on two other occasions.[\[R72\]](#)

The issue of testing is more complex. After 1998, the then Government declared that we did not need any more explosive tests. A voluntary moratorium on testing was announced. In article V part (vi) and article 14 part (2) and (5) of the agreement it clearly states. When one reads together, these clauses have been so drafted that without mentioning the issue of testing sufficient safeguards have been put in place to protect India's interest in the event it did, for whatever reasons. What did it say? "To create the necessary conditions for India to obtain fuel access to the international fuel market including reliable and uninterrupted and continual fuel supply from firms in several nations, and towards the end in part © it says that in the light of the above and the rest". Without stating in so many words the US has agreed to treat India, as it would, a nuclear weapon State conducting tests even with additional concessionsâ€¦ (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: You may please conclude now.

SHRI B. MAHTAB: Sir, I need go to the fissile material. But I have a query to ask. The topic is on the moratorium on production of fissile material. The hon. Prime Minister on the 17th of August, 2006, in his statement in Parliament had said that we are not willing to accept moratorium on the production of fissile material. We are only committed to negotiating. That was his statement on the 17th of August, 2006. In the Hyde Act, which came later, in section 104 Â© (2) (d) it is mentioned that the President must submit to Congress a description of the steps that India is taking...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: You should be aware of our numbers and the time allotted. What can we do? I have already allowed you almost 150 per cent more than your allotted time.

SHRI BRAJA KISHORE TRIPATHY (PURI): Sir, there is no time limit for this.

MR. SPEAKER: There is time limit and there has to be a time limit. There is time limit even for the Members of the Ruling Party and the Opposition. Even then I have allowed you more than double the time allotted to you.

SHRI BRAJA KISHORE TRIPATHY : Sir, I am not challenging your decision.

MR. SPEAKER: I know the ability of Shri Mahtab. He can speak for two hours on this topic. But it cannot be helped. You can think when Shri Gurudas Dasgupta takes over. What will you do? So, please co-operate with the Chair. I am sorry about it, but please co-operate with the Chair.

â€¦ (*Interruptions*)

SHRI B. MAHTAB : Sir, give me another three to four minutes, I would conclude.

In the agreed text, "the quantity agreed in special reasonable material that may be separated may only be utilized in national facility under IAEA." On 13th of August, 2007 the hon. Prime Minister had stated that "any special reasonable material that may be separated may be utilized in national facilities under IAEA safeguards. Thus the interests of our three-stage nuclear programme have been protected." We would like from the hon. Prime Minister to understand the statement which he had made on the 17th of August, 2006 and the statement he made on the 13th of August, 2007. There is a little bit of difference and there is a little bit of confusion in this. To a great extent the nuclear deal is becoming, to many minds, very unclear also. There are other issues and there are certain amendments about which it is being discussed outside. A suggestion has been made that it is the domestic law of the US which is causing all problems and we should examine whether we can alter our law such as the Atomic Energy Act of 1962 in such a way so as to insulate...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: I have got a list another 21 Members. If I have to give 15 minutes to each one of them, then the discussion would extend up to tomorrow. I am sorry it cannot be done. [\[R73\]](#) We have agreed that we will complete it today. I have given you triple the time allotted to you.

SHRI B. MAHTAB : We should examine whether we can alter our law, that is, the Atomic Energy Act, 1962 in such a way as to insulate our strategic objectives. If that can be done, we would be strengthening our law and on the basis of those altered laws renegotiate the 123 Agreement. Though article 14 of the 123 Agreement provides effective protection for India, the Government should consider the merit of adding a further layer of insurance under our domestic statute. Let us be doubly sure of it. Specially Parliament could enact an amendment to the Atomic Energy Act of 1962 as well as a change in the Special Chemicals, Organisms, Materials, Equipments and Technology Guidelines making it illegal for nuclear materials or equipments to be transferred outside the country.

Before I conclude, I am reminded of what Jane Wells had said. She said:

"Learn the wisdom of compromise, for it is better to bend a little than to break."

Perhaps the Prime Minister was reminded of this in this autumn but at the cost of the prestige of this Cabinet. We have a super Cabinet now. That is accountable neither to the Legislature nor to the nation. This is a disquieting precedent. It may be used by future Governments and future coalitions.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I did not expect this from you.

SHRI B. MAHTAB : It can reduce almost any Treaty, any Agreement and any policy matter to a private enterprise pushing both the Executive and the Legislature to the margins of policy-making. A far better option would have been to set up a Joint Parliamentary Committee to study the deal. At least, the prestige of the Cabinet could have been

retained.

श्री सचिन पायलट (दौसा) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, आपका बहुत धन्यवाद। आज का दिन बहुत महत्वपूर्ण है और इसलिए महत्वपूर्ण है कि पिछले डेढ़-पाँचे दो साल से देश में परमाणु करार के माध्यम से जो परिस्थिति पैदा की गई, आज उसका खुलासा अंततः होने जा रहा है। आज पूरा देश, पूरा सदन, देश के मतदाता जान लेंगे कि सत्ताई क्या है, दूध का दूध और पानी का पानी हो जाएगा। न्यूक्लियर एनर्जी के बारे में मेरे पास बहुत तथ्य हैं। मुझ से पहले वक्ताओं ने आपको बहुत विस्तृत जानकारी दी है। न्यूक्लियर एनर्जी जेनरेशन के बारे में और बहुत से आंकड़े पेश किए हैं। मैं बहुत मोटे तौर पर जो सिद्धांत और प्रिंसिपल हैं, जिन मुद्दों को लेकर यह विवाद उत्पन्न हुआ है, दुर्भाग्यपूर्ण रूप से पैदा किया गया है, मैं उन पर चर्चा करना चाहता हूँ।

Sir, resurgence of nuclear energy is now a world-wide phenomenon. Japan, for example, in the early 1970s and 1980s, had 90 per cent of their energy imported and India today imports 76 per cent of all its energy and by 2015, the percentage will go upto 90 per cent. So, the need of diversifying our energy basket is very well known. The nuclear deal with the US is one step in adding a resource to our energy basket. I think, the larger issue is why are we succumbing to the US.

मुझे इस बात की बहुत खुशी है कि आज इस विषय पर चर्चा हो रही है और जिन लोगों ने, जिन दलों ने दोहरापन अपनाया, डबल स्पीक किया, आज वह स्पष्ट हो जाएगा। मैं अपने वामपंथी मित्रों की बहुत इज्जत करता हूँ। हो सकता है कि मैं इनकी आइडिऑलॉजी से पूरी तरह से सहमत न हूँ लेकिन मुझे इस बात की खुशी है कि वामपंथी भाइयों और मित्रों का एक कॉन्क्लूजन है, एक प्रिंसिपल है। The Left Parties are not in favour of developing nuclear weapons. That is their ideology. That is their mind set. I respect that. I may not agree with it. चार-पांच साल पहले भाजपा में विवाद हुआ था कि भाजपा का एक चेहरा मुखौटा है और दूसरा चेहरा असली चेहरा है, वह विवाद आज मुझे समझ में आया है कि इतने सालों से भारतीय जनता पार्टी सत्ता में रहते हुए जिन मुद्दों के बारे में बात करती थी, वे बिल्कुल अलग हैं और जब विपक्ष में होती हैं तब बिल्कुल बात अलग करती हैं।

The next step of strategic partnership with the United States was started by the NDA Government. What we have done is merely secure our right to participate in global nuclear trade. The crux of this deal is that the Americans are only helping us to facilitate the talks in the NSG because it is a 45 member group.

Sir I might remind the House that the NSG was itself created to keep India out of the nuclear trade after the 1974 test explosions. आदरणीय आडवाणी जी, जो इस वक्त सदन में मौजूद नहीं है, मुझे बड़ी खुशी है कि उन्होंने आज स्वर्गीय इंदिरा गांधी जी की बहुत बड़ाई की। Sir, just because we conducted those nuclear tests, we were excluded from the global trade of nuclear technologies, nuclear knowledge and nuclear know how. But now the time has come where the world, Europe, United States and Asia have recognised the global prominence and the geo-political role that India is going to play and is playing in world affairs. अगर कोई देश हमसे समझौता करता है तो वह हम पर कोई अहसान नहीं कर रहा है। यह सिद्धांत की बात है कि हमारे वामपंथी मित्र communism is one school of thought. It is receding. I grant that. अब सिर्फ चीन और क्यूबा में रह गया है। Communism is a school of thought. It is one school of thought. But in our country, we are so democratic that even that school of thought has five different sections. The Americans have not done us a favour. This is a deal on parity, on equity and solely to ensure that India is able to develop its nuclear assets. Nuclear energy is important to us and we will develop it and that is our right.

Sir, the NPT which India has not signed is a flawed Treaty. This is the Government's stand from day one. How can four or five countries in the world decide that 1st January, 1967 is the cut off date and beyond that no other country can have the right to possess nuclear weapons? This is precisely the reason that we did not sign the NPT and we still have not signed it. On the contrary, after the 1998 test, when respected Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee was the Prime Minister, the Government went to the United Nations and accepted the fact that we are ready to concede this self-imposed moratorium and give it a legal framework. That would have stopped the Indian nuclear strategic programme. I am happy to report that today the agreement with the United States is only for civilian and nuclear energy. Of the 14 installations that we have opened up for India-specific safeguards in the IAEA will remain just that.

Sir, L.K. Advani was speaking before us. He said that his Government was only offering two sides. First, the IAEA safeguards to be implemented and to open up for inspections. He failed to mention that his Government had agreed to cap and not build any more nuclear reactors which are of strategic purposes.

Sir, I, on behalf of the Congress Party, am proud to say that whatever nuclear facilities we have today for our strategic programme, it is our decision – how many we have today and how many we have tomorrow. Today, we have six and tomorrow we need to make 60. We deserve and we deserve the right to make those 60 strategic nuclear installations in our country.

Sir, it is our sovereign right and I think we have not compromised. The problem is that there is so much confusion created around the nuclear deal that today it is coming in the eye of the people. बहुत आर्टिकल लिखे गए, यादव जी ने कहा इतने आर्टिकल छपे हैं, बीस-बीस कॉलम छपे हैं, अखबारों, टेलीविजन और मैगजीनों में चर्चा हो रही है, टेलीविजन में डिबेट हो रही है। लेकिन जो मुख्य मुद्दा है उस पर आज हमें बोलने का मौका मिला है।[r75]

The NPT has been defined by an Argentinean President as a Treaty of disarming the disarmed. We have been

against that Treaty. Till date, our conviction and our principled stand is what it was before.

One of the things that makes me very proud as an Indian citizen is the fact that when an individual becomes a Prime Minister of this country, he could be from my party or from any other party. I have full faith in that Prime Minister. No Indian Prime Minister, who represents the 100 crore Indians, can ever take a decision which will be harming India's interests in the present or in the future. I am proud to say that. Whether it is Shri Vajpayee ji or Shri Devegowda ji or Shri Gujral ji or Dr. Manmohan Singh ji, our Indian Prime Minister, whoever he or she may be, will always take a decision in the best interests of India. फॉरेन पालिसी पर बहुत लोग बोल रहे थे, हमारे वामपंथी मित्र बोल रहे थे "you have sold out to the Americans."

यह उबल स्पीक कब तक चलेगा। बुद्धदेव बाबू यहां पर एफ.डी.आई. इनवैस्टमेंट करते हैं, अमरीकी पैसा जाता है तो कोई दिक्कत नहीं है। कैश में आता है तो कोई दिक्कत नहीं है। यहां पर अमरीकियों का पैसा बुरा नहीं है और हम लोगों ने किसी को कुछ नहीं बेचा है। अमरीकी आज हमसे बात कर रहे हैं तो इसलिए कर रहे हैं, क्योंकि हम आपस के पार्टनर बनने जा रहे हैं। हमें इस बात पर फ़ला होना चाहिए we have arrived on the global stage where we will decide what is in the best interests of India.

Now I come to the imperialist policy of the United States. बार-बार इस फ़ेज को यूज किया गया है। I beg to differ and I want to state clearly in this august House that the Indian foreign policy is mandated only after looking at what is in India's best interest. It has no influence from any country whether big or small. यह हिन्दुस्तान देश है, इसकी सौ करोड़ की आबादी है, यह कोई छोटा-मोटा टापू नहीं है, जिस पर कोई कंट्री अपना प्रभाव डालकर हमें किसी डायरेक्शन में भेज सकता है। That is why, I think it is ironical to teach a party or a Government. It is also ironical to give dictation on foreign policy to this Government.

In 1971 when Shrimati Indira Gandhi not only changed history but the geography, when India was a very vulnerable country, when we were not as economically strong as we are today, we created Bangladesh. अमरीका का सातवां बेड़ा बे ऑफ बंगाल में आ गया था। लेकिन हमने किसी की परवाह नहीं की और यह कांग्रेस पार्टी की बढौलत है। मैं एक बात और बोलना चाहता हूँ कि 1998 में जो न्यूक्लियर बम का एक्सप्लोजन किया गया था, उसमें पूरा देश साथ था, बहुत अच्छी बात है। लेकिन भाजपा के लोगों को गलतफहमी न हो कि न्यूक्लियर बम बी.जे.पी. के कार्यालय की रसोई में बनाया गया था। चार डिसेंबर तक इसे पूरी सपोर्ट कांग्रेस की सरकारों ने दी थी। यह बोलना कि हमने सत्ता में आकर न्यूक्लियर बम का एक्सप्लोजन किया। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह देश का एक्सप्लोजन है, बम किसी पार्टी का नहीं होता है। किसी पार्टी का प्रोग्राम नहीं होता है। होमी भाभा किसी पार्टी के आदमी नहीं थे, यह देश की एक धरोहर है, एक असेट है। We must treat it like that. It goes to the credit of the Indian scientists, researchers and nuclear physicists who have developed this programme for us. It is not a question of which party is in power.

जहां तक भारत की बात है। We have outrightly opposed the invasion of Iraq. India has been in the forefront of taking leadership of not just the Third-World countries or the developing countries but also, even today, be it the fight against apartheid, be it taking our own stand *vis-a-vis* many countries where perhaps the American interests are not in consonance with our interests. I want to assure this House that whatever may happen in terms of foreign policy, this House must be assured that it will be done only after look at what suits India's interest best.

भाभा साहब को बहुत बार कोट किया गया और मैं किसी मैगजीन, किसी नेता और किसी साइंटिस्ट को कोट नहीं कर रहा हूँ। लेकिन डा. भाभा ने एक बात बहुत जरूरी बोली थी। He said: "No power is more expensive than – no power." So, Sir, I think what we have achieved with the Indo-US Nuclear Agreement on Civil Cooperation will open up the doors for India to trade with every single country which has nuclear technology – of all the 45 nations including China and Russia. जहां तक एन.पी.टी. की बात है। Some countries have signed the NPT and are not abiding by the rules of international relations. चाहे वह चीन हो, जब चीन ने पाकिस्तान को टेक्नोलोजी ट्रांसफर की तो किसी ने खड़े होकर नहीं बोला कि यह गलत हो रहा है। When a country like Iran, which is a signatory to NPT, does not abide by the rules and regulations of international agreement, that is when India took a principled stand and said: "No. The Iranian Government and the Iranian establishment has done a wrong thing." The Indian people have thousands of years of association with the Iranian people. [R76]

The Indian people will stand by the Iranian people in good times and bad, but if the Government does something wrong, we must have the courage of conviction to get up and say, 'this is wrong and it must be corrected'. We are a larger country. Let us not reduce ourselves to feel that we can be overpowered by one country or another country. If we can have strategic partnership with the European Union, with the Russians, with the Chinese, with the Japanese, why can we not have a strategic partnership with the Americans and only when it suits our commercial and strategic interests?

So, I am very glad and I am very thankful to the hon. Prime Minister that he has taken this step and he has got out of these negotiations which no previous Government was able to get out. It is not a question of debating as to whether how many megawatts of electricity we would have made by hydro or by other means. Our fossil fuels are limited. India has a very concentrated programme of developing hydro energy, thermal energy, solar energy and wind energy, but nuclear energy is also an area where we have to invest. There are some technologies which are dual use technologies which are under the restrictive list of the NSG and unless the NSG in all its entirety, all 45 members, agree to trade with India, we will

never have access to those dual use technologies and those technologies are important not just for generation of nuclear power, but also for other uses like for making a super computer, for developing space technologies which we do not have and which we are deprived of. So, this nuclear apartheid has to end. I think our neighbours are very worried about India getting this deal from America. I think time will tell, our future generations will look back and history will decide whether this deal with the United States of America is something that is beneficial for our generation and the coming generations.

Sir, Shri Mohan Rawale has left the House. He also gave a very passionate speech as to why he is opposed to this deal. His party supported the Congress candidate Shrimati Pratibha Singh Patil for the post of the President in the Presidential Election in the interest of Maharashtra. Similarly, may be in the interest of India, he can speak to Bala Saheb and his party could also support what we are saying today. I do not know if it will happen.

Sir, in 1954, when the country was very weak, feeble and vulnerable, Nehruji led the entire world. He was a known statesman for the entire Asia and the Third World. He was respected for what he said because foreign policy was the forte of the Congress Party and I am very proud to report that it continues to be so. It was Shri Rajiv Gandhi, while speaking about nuclear disarmament, who told the world at the United Nations in 1987 that India will readily sign the CTBT and FMCT if all the five nuclear powers disarm and destroy all their nuclear weapons. So, this has been the ideology and the thought of the Congress Party. I think this Government has done a great service by engaging the Americans and getting what is needed for developing our nuclear energy and for our strategic purposes.

I would like to say a few words about the very important aspect of testing. As far as testing is concerned, no matter which country at any time will conduct a nuclear test, there will be repercussions for it. In 1974, when the Buddha smiled for the first time, Shrimati Indira Gandhi knew what is going to happen. She had the courage because our farmers were working hard, our scientists were working hard and our young people were working hard to manage those circumstances. In 1998, when we tested again, we had sanctions and our country was strong enough, we endured the pains and we came out on top.

Today, India is the fifth largest producer of electricity in the world, we are the world's largest producer of milk and milk products, we are the second largest in the production of fresh fruits and vegetables and we are the third largest producer of food grains in the world. We are a country on the move. Today, I think, no amount of animosity by any other country will derail our progress and our GDP growth.

Sir, there were some comments made about our GDP growth being 6 per cent or 8 per cent or 10 per cent. These are not mere numbers, they are important because this growth will percolate down to those 6,40,000 villages where India lives. How will they get re-employment? How will they move from agriculture to tertiary services? This growth rate will improve their lot and not let these people to lag behind.

Sir, in conclusion, I hope better sense will prevail on our Opposition parties and I think they will look at India's national interest much more magnanimously and leave their narrow political self-interest, stop doing flip-flop on the nuclear testing issue and the nuclear negotiations with the Americans and finally come out of their hoodwinked foreign policy and support the Government when it does best because, I think, this Government has done a landmark deal and I think the hon. Prime Minister must be congratulated for this.

SHRI C.K. CHANDRAPPAN (TRICHUR): Sir, the Left Parties made their position very clear that we are opposed to this Treaty, the Indo-US Civil Nuclear Agreement, because it is an unequal treaty. Secondly, it has been told that it opens up a renaissance and it will meet our energy needs.

A lot of things have been told here, but what is the fact about it. I think, the hon. Prime Minister, in his previous statement, has said that at present India's nuclear share in India's energy generation is three per cent. In 2020, with Indo-US Nuclear Agreement, it would become seven per cent. I do not think, it is going to make a very substantial difference by jumping from three per cent to seven per cent. At that time, our requirement will be much more.

Sir, then comes the price at which we are getting it. It has not been officially calculated. It has not been told what is the calculation about it. But it has been calculated by various experts and in any case, it will be more than ten trillion rupees that we will have to spend for producing these nuclear plants and nuclear energy.

It is also said that when we produce energy, it would be so costly that it would not help the common people or even our industries to utilize it in an economic manner. When we say renaissance, we use all kinds of words, but the fact of the

matter is that for too little advantage that we are getting, we are paying too much in terms of money, in terms of political concessions. These are some of the disagreements that we have.

Another thing is that the hon. Prime Minister said that it will be our own decision that we will do the nuclear test or not. It is good. But after making that statement in the Parliament last time, the US Ambassador to India came public and said that if you do the nuclear test, that is the end of it. They take a different perception about it. We have said that we can take our own decision at the time which is suitable to us.

Now, to spend these huge resources for producing a small percentage of increase in nuclear energy, whether we are going to abandon our programmes of economic development? When you talk in Parliament about the Government's flagship programmes being implemented, whether it is a question of Employment Guarantee Scheme or for bringing a legislation for unorganized workers, it is always said that there are serious economic constraints. [r77] When there are economic constraints to bring about the programmes which will affect the large masses of Indian people, who are common people, here we are spending enormous money to produce a little bit of energy.

MR. SPEAKER: You can speak for one more minute. Every Party cannot have 15-20 minutes. It is not possible. Then you would have agreed for two days' discussion. Nobody suggested that there should be two days' discussion.

SHRI C.K. CHANDRAPPAN : Mr. Speaker, Sir, you should treat our Party in the same manner as you are treating the other Parties.

MR. SPEAKER: If somebody is not listening to the Chair, if everybody defies the Chair, that cannot be an ideal situation. Now you may kindly speak. I have given you one minute. Another one minute will be the final one. That is what I expect from you as a disciplined Party.

SHRI C.K. CHANDRAPPAN : I do not know what I would say in one minute. As a disciplined soldier of the Party, I may have to forgo.

MR. SPEAKER: Good.

SHRI C.K. CHANDRAPPAN : I will not take much of the time.

MR. SPEAKER: I know that you will not take much time. You are very articulate; I know that. Please understand that the Chair is very unhappy to ring the bell; but I – whoever sits here – have a duty to perform.

SHRI C.K. CHANDRAPPAN : Sir, I have also a duty to perform.

MR. SPEAKER: I know that. I wish I had your ability to perform the duty!

SHRI C.K. CHANDRAPPAN : I will not take much of the time; I will obey the Chair. I will speak one or two things and then conclude.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

SHRI C.K. CHANDRAPPAN : I have a feeling that in the course of doing this, we will do away with our self-reliant policy. We have various other sources of energy. I would not like to go into the details. It has been pointed out that there is tremendous capacity; there is hydro-electric power generation possibility. We have hydel power; we have wind energy and all kinds of things. We have also huge deposits, perhaps world's biggest deposits, of thorium. We were trying to utilize all these. In the name of this Indo-US nuclear energy deal, I have my own doubts whether we are we going to abandon all these or whether we are giving less priority to all these.

Sir, due to time constraint, I may not be able to say anything more.

MR. SPEAKER: If you have some more points, you can lay it.

SHRI C.K. CHANDRAPPAN : I have no points to lay.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you very much; I am very sorry.

Shri Uday Singh, I would like to make one thing clear. Your Party has another 12 minutes left. I will give five minutes to each Member; three Members' names are there.

SHRI UDAY SINGH (PURNEA): I would try to finish it within the allotted time.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. I deeply appreciate your kind cooperation.

SHRI UDAY SINGH : Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Sir, for giving me time to speak on this important matter.

It is really unfortunate that an Agreement so important that will have an impact on the country for a long number of decades has got caught up in unfortunate controversies. We have heard and read more about this Agreement than we have about any other Agreement in the recent memory.

Before I speak of the deal itself, I would like to draw the attention of this House to something as important as, or perhaps more important than, the deal itself. During the last Session, a lot of heat was generated on whether this debate should be held under Rule 184 which entails voting or Rule 193 which does not require voting. I think that you were absolutely correct in ruling that under the present laws, international treaties do not require Parliamentary sanction. The Government of the day has the sole prerogative to enter into such agreements. Therefore, voting was neither required nor was it necessary. It brings me to the point that I want to emphasise on. Look at the absurdity of the situation. The change in retirement age of a Director in a medical institute requires Parliamentary sanction; disinvestment of Tyre Corporation requires Parliamentary approval; but an international treaty whereby territory can be ceded to another country does not require Parliamentary involvement. I think that we are making Parliament more and more irrelevant. [r78]

Therefore, I earnestly urge all the Members and especially to the Government that the laws must be changed. When our Constitution was written, a political milieu like this was probably unforeseen. India has changed. Indian politics has changed. Indeed, the world has changed. Therefore, there is an urgent need for the Government to give a serious consideration to the aspect that the laws must be amended. In fact, this whole controversy of a deal for an agreement which even we in the BJP agree is required, maybe not an agreement which is a *fait accompli*, which we believe is an unequal deal where India is at a disadvantage but we do recognise the fact that an agreement with the United States is required, it has got caught up in all kinds of controversies for the simple reason that the Government did not require Parliamentary sanction, did not require Parliament's approval, did not require Parliamentary involvement, and went ahead and did things where we have serious objections to various things that were done. So, my request to you, Sir, is that you must use your influence to see that these laws which need to be changed are changed.

Sir, coming back to the debate, as I said, the BJP indeed feels that there is a need for an agreement but the agreement is structured differently. Giving due respect and considerations to the sensitivities of the various political Parties present here, we do not deny that there is a need. Therefore, Mr. Prime Minister, Sir, since you are here, what you needed today and perhaps what you missed today is a political consensus. That is what is lacking.

I will refrain from going into the specifics of the deal firstly because the time is short and secondly because the other eminent Members have already done so and I am sure the other Members to follow would also go into the merits of the deal. But what I would like to say is, what you miss today is the political consensus, and the responsibility for getting that political consensus was yours. It was not the BJP's. Granted that you have the legal sanction to go into this deal on your own but it is also of the moral and political sanction. You did not. Your Government should have tried to build that political consensus.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, if a bi-partisan support in the Indian context was ever required, it was required for a deal such as this because I cannot overemphasize that this agreement is an important agreement. We are in complete agreement of the need for an agreement and, therefore, there must have been a greater effort on the part of the Government to have built that political consensus, which the Government failed to do unfortunately. Mr. Prime Minister, your Ministers and sometimes you yourself – (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Please conclude.

SHRI UDAY SINGH : Sir, I will take just two or three minutes more.

Your condescending attitude towards the BJP does not help in building the political consensus. The language used by your Party spokespersons, whom I am convinced – have red chillies for breakfast – does not open the way for any meaningful political dialogue to take place.

There is a demand in my constituency and I am sure there is a similar demand in other places that the two national parties must come together on national issues. But clearly it is for you to realize that the BJP Members are here because they were elected and sent here by the same people who elected your Members. We did not break open the doors of the

Lok Sabha and came and occupied the benches here. I do not know whether I should be saying this here. In the last Session, I almost staked my personal reputation to see that the logjam gets broken and I was in touch with the senior members of your Cabinet to try and work out a system whereby the two parties would come into a dialogue. I was given to understand that it was acceptable to you and then I was suddenly told that it was not. When things like this happen, it makes life very difficult.

Now, let me make the BJP's stand on the nuclear agreement clear. We have been told that we do 'double-speak', 'treble-speak' or whatever. We do not suffer from the Left's encumbrances of not doing business with the United States. [h79] For us, agreement with the US is as welcome as agreements with other countries just as long as those agreements are good for India. My young friend, Mr. Sachin Pilot was referring to the NSSP and we have no hesitation in saying that the genesisâ€¦!

MR. SPEAKER: If you are taking the time of the other speaker in your party, I cannot help it. You can go on for another five minutes, which your party has.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN (BALASORE): Sir, if you feel that nobody needs to listen to our views, it is all right, we need not speak!

MR. SPEAKER: Why are you saying all those things? Do not impute anything to the Chair. Mr. Swain, I will call you to speak depending on the availability of the time.

â€¦! (*Interruptions*)

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : Yesterday, right up to 6.30 p.m., the Government wanted the debate to continue...(*Interruptions*) You may ask the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Uday Singh, you please continue.

â€¦! (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Whatever names are given, I would continue to do it. I am not going to be guided by you.

â€¦! (*Interruptions*)

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : If you do not want this debate to take place, we are agreed for that...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: You are always lecturing to the Chair.

Mr. Uday Singh, please continue.

SHRI UDAY SINGH : Sir, I would try and get out of this. I am trying to finish my speech in just another minute.

After Pokhran-II, which itself was an act of great political courage, there were sanctions. The NDA Government showed tremendous diplomatic and political finesse. It not only got out of the sanctions, it actually improved our relations globally, and we took our understanding with the United States and many other countries to a higher level, which culminated probably in the NSSP, which was being referred to just now. The NSSP would have formed a tremendous foundation for an honourable Deal, had this Deal not been done in such great hurry and bolstered in the manner that it has.

So, where do we go from here now, Mr. Prime Minister? We are unable to appreciate the argument that this is a 'now or never Deal'. This is a Deal between India and the United States. We appreciate your efforts that have gone into it. But we cannot appreciate the fact that this is a Deal between Dr. Manmohan Singh and Mr. George Bush only. It is not a Deal between two individuals. If it is, then I am sorry to say that one of you is trying to hoodwink the other; and India does not hoodwink other countries into signing agreements. Now, if it is a deal between the two countries -- India and the United States -- whether we sign the Deal in a hurry now or we sign the Deal after due deliberations with all political parties, build a consensus and then sign it, it does not make a difference.

Therefore, Mr. Prime Minister, my request to you would be to take Parliamentary sanction, to be candid with the US Administration; they should go to the US Congress, say that this is the request that has come from one democracy to another, make necessary changes, if required, and then go ahead with the Deal. We will applaud for you, we will applaud for India. We have no hesitation whatsoever in supporting you just as long as India's strategic interests, India's Foreign

Policy interests are safeguarded.

Thank you very much *Adhyakshji*.

MR. SPEAKER: Now, Shri Rajiv Ranjan Singh. Your party's time is three minutes. However, I would allow you five minutes. If you have anything, in writing, you may lay it also.

SHRI RAJIV RANJAN SINGH 'LALAN' (BEGUSARAI): No, Sir, I have nothing to lay, in writing.

अध्यक्ष महोदय, अमरीका के साथ हमारे देश का जो परमाणु समझौता हुआ, उसने लोक सभा के पिछले सत्र यानी मॉनसून सेशन से पूरे देश को आन्दोलित करने का काम किया है। हर गांव और हर घर में यह चर्चा पटुंती है कि आखिर इस समझौते से कहीं देश की संप्रभुता पर तो खतरा नहीं है? इस देश की पं. जवाहर लाल नेहरू के समय से आज तक जो तटस्थ विदेश नीति चली आ रही है, वह विदेश नीति तो कहीं प्रभावित नहीं हो रही है, कहीं हम इस समझौते के माध्यम से अमरीका के पिछलग्गू तो नहीं हो रहे हैं, क्योंकि इसका इतिहास है? अफगानिस्तान और ईराक का नाश हुआ। वह सब अमरीका की कृपा से हुआ और अब कहीं हिन्दुस्तान भी, उसी रास्ते पर आने तो नहीं बढ़ रहा है? यह सारे देश के मन में शंका हुई।

महोदय, पिछले सत्र के दौरान जब यह चर्चा सदन में आई, तो यह सवाल आया कि जो विदेश के साथ समझौता होता है, उस पर संसदीय सहमति की आवश्यकता नहीं होती है। यह ठीक बात है कि विदेशों के साथ हुए समझौतों पर संसदीय सहमति की आवश्यकता नहीं होती है, लेकिन जब इतना बड़ा समझौता आप करने जा रहे हैं, जिससे पूरा देश आन्दोलित है, पूरे देश के सामने एक पूरा चिह्न खड़ा हुआ है। [180] तो आप कानून को रास्ते में लाकर उस समझौते पर चर्चा करने से भी उस समय घबरा रहे थे और संसद की सहमति लेने से आप घबरा रहे थे। ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिए, क्योंकि लोकतंत्र लोक-लाज से चलता है, सिर्फ कायदे-कानून और नीति से लोकतंत्र नहीं चलता है, लोकतंत्र लोक-लाज से भी चलता है। लोक-लाज यही कहती थी कि इस समझौते पर संसद की भी सहमति लें, क्योंकि संसद का और इस सदन का बहुमत इस समझौते के खिलाफ था, यानि देश का बहुमत इस समझौते के खिलाफ था, इसलिए इसकी आवश्यकता थी। हम इस पर ज्यादा चर्चा करना नहीं चाहते, क्योंकि समझौते में कई ऐसी शर्तें हैं और समझौते में यह बात साफ है, प्रधान मंत्री कह रहे हैं या सरकार के कई मंत्री कह रहे हैं कि इस समझौते से हमारी संप्रभुता या हमारी विदेश नीति पर कोई प्रभाव नहीं पड़ रहा है। उसके विपरीत अमेरिका के विदेश विभाग के अधिकारी कह रहे हैं, अमेरिका के एम्बेसडर कह रहे हैं, ये सारे लोग जो कह रहे हैं तो इसमें विरोधाभास है, इसलिए यह बात तो साफ है और कई माननीय सदस्यों ने भी इस बात की चर्चा की है कि इस शर्त के साथ इस समझौते के तहत अगर हमने भविष्य में कोई परीक्षण किया तो हमें जो भी सहयोग अमेरिका से प्राप्त हुआ है, वह वापस ले लिया जायेगा। इसमें इस देश को भी कहीं कोई संदेह नहीं है और इस सदन को भी संदेह नहीं है, सरकार चाहे जितनी बात कहे। लेकिन हम एक बात कहना चाहते हैं कि सरकार ने जो तर्क रखा है कि इस समझौते में हम 2020 तक 20 हजार मैगावाट परमाणु ऊर्जा से बिजली का उत्पादन कर लेंगे। हम अपने देश की तकनीक को छोड़कर विदेशी अमेरिकन तकनीक पर क्यों जाना चाहते हैं?

ये इस समझौते के तहत दो लाख करोड़ रुपये परमाणु ऊर्जा के संयंत्रों को लगाने के लिए, बिजली के उत्पादन के लिए खर्च करेंगे। आज हमारा देश की जो हाइड्रिल की, पनबिजली की जो योजना है, हम अगर उतना पैसा उस पर खर्च करें तो आज नेपाल से जो नदियां निकल रही हैं, नोर्थ ईस्ट से जो नदियां निकल रही हैं, उन पर अगर हम पनबिजली की योजनाएं लगायें तो लगभग एक लाख मैगावाट बिजली का उत्पादन हम कर सकते हैं। हम उस पर क्यों नहीं केन्द्रित हो रहे हैं, हम उसकी ओर क्या ध्यान नहीं दे रहे हैं, जो हम अमेरिका के पिछलग्गू बने हुए हैं। इसके अतिरिक्त मैं यह बताना चाहता हूँ कि आज आप अमेरिका से परमाणु ऊर्जा समझौते के बाद जो बिजली का उत्पादन आप करने जा रहे हैं, उस बिजली के उत्पादन की कीमत कितनी पड़ेगी, प्रोडक्शन कास्ट कितनी पड़ेगी। उसकी कास्ट नौ रुपये से दस रुपये प्रति यूनिट पड़ेगी। आज जो हम थर्मल से बिजली का उत्पादन कर रहे हैं, उसकी कीमत ढाई रुपये प्रति यूनिट पड़ रही है। आज जो हम हाइड्रिल से उत्पादन कर रहे हैं, उसकी कीमत डेढ़ से पौने दो रुपये प्रति यूनिट पड़ रही है तो हम क्यों 10 रुपये खर्च करके उस पर जाना चाहते हैं? हम क्यों इस तकनीकी की ओर जाना चाहते हैं? हम क्यों देश के सामने यह पूरा खड़ा करना चाहते हैं। सबसे बड़े आश्चर्य की बात तो यह है कि जिस परमाणु ऊर्जा की तकनीक हम अमेरिका से ले रहे हैं, जिसके लिए हम देश को अमेरिका के हवाले कर रहे हैं, हम अमेरिका के पिछलग्गू हो रहे हैं, वही अमेरिका अपने देश में परमाणु से मात्र 19.4 परसेंट बिजली का प्रोडक्शन कर रहा है। यह इस बात का प्रमाण है कि अमेरिका खुद अपने संयंत्रों के माध्यम से परमाणु ऊर्जा का उत्पादन नहीं कर रहे हैं, लेकिन हमारे देश पर यह थोप रहा है।

आप अटल जी की बात करते हैं, पुरानी सरकारों की बात करते हैं, अभी कांग्रेस के साथी बोल रहे थे, 1974 की कांग्रेस में और आज की कांग्रेस में जमीन आसमान का अन्तर है। उस समय अगर स्वर्गीय श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी इस देश की प्रधानमंत्री थीं, उन्होंने अमेरिका के सैंवशंस को स्वीकार किया, उस चुनौती को स्वीकार किया। एन.डी.ए. की सरकार थी, अटल जी ने अमेरिका के सैंवशंस को स्वीकार किया, उनकी चुनौतियों को स्वीकार किया, इसलिए आज आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि हम उस परमाणु समझौते पर जाने से पहले पूरे सदन को कॉन्फिडेंस में लें। आप एक जोइंट पार्लियामेंटरी कमेटी बनाइये, जोइंट पार्लियामेंटरी कमेटी में आपकी एक-एक शर्त, जिन शर्तों पर आपने समझौता किया है और हाइड एक्ट, उसमें हर शर्त की समीक्षा हो और समीक्षा के बाद सदन के सामने सारे तथ्य आयें, तब सरकार इस पर आने बढ़ने का काम करे।

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you very much.

Prof. M. Ramadass. Your party has got three minutes, but you may speak for five minutes.

PROF. M. RAMADASS (PONDICHERRY): Sir, I am the only speaker from my party.

MR. SPEAKER: Therefore, you will get five minutes instead of three minutes.

PROF. M. RAMADASS : Sir, I am very happy that the Indian Parliament today is discussing a very significant deal which will have far-reaching implications on the Indian economy and the Indian country. We are grateful to the hon. Prime Minister for

enabling a discussion in this House. Sir, I would like to remind the hon. Members of the House that this is not the first time that the Prime Minister has come to this House to explain the intricacies of this Agreement; this is the third time. We have never seen a Prime Minister who is so transparent in his approach towards Parliament. An hon. Member said that Parliament has become irrelevant as far as this Agreement is concerned. We are discussing this Agreement for the third time. He is not shying away from the Parliament in explaining the rationale of this Agreement. Therefore, at the outset, I should compliment and congratulate the hon. Prime Minister for effecting this deal.

On behalf of our party, PMK, we deem it a pleasure to extend full and wholehearted support to this Agreement which contemplates a cordial cooperation between India and US on the use of nuclear energy for civil purposes or peaceful purposes. We consider this Agreement as one more innovative initiative of the UPA Government towards faster, quicker and stable economic growth of this country.

We know that in the last three and a half years, the UPA Government under the leadership of Dr. Manmohan Singh and Madam Sonia Gandhi has implemented a large number of programmes designed to promote growth and social justice in this country. A mention may be made to NREGP and Bharat Nirman while several other monumental schemes have also been implemented. In our view, this Indo-US nuclear deal is also a part of the larger programme of the Government of India to develop India's progress.

I thought that the Members who are discussing this deal must have read this deal line by line and article by article, but unfortunately most of the people who have levelled allegations seem to have not read the Agreement in full and that is why, they have said that India has become an unequal partner, India has surrendered its sovereignty, India has different perceptions with regard to use of nuclear energy and the Hyde Act will override 123 Agreement. All these statements at best are hypothetical statements or statements which are in the form of guess work as well as hunches, which cannot be substantiated from the text of the Agreement. At least I have gone through this Agreement. There is a preamble to the text and it is spread in 22 pages and 17 articles.

A careful perusal of this document would make any objective reader realise that this Agreement or deal is in tune with our contemporary needs of energy requirement, which is *sine qua non* for India's development. Therefore, today even the Leader of the Opposition said that energy is important and without energy, progress of Indian economy either at 8 per cent or 9 per cent growth rate is not possible. All macro economic models worked out at the Indian universities have revealed that the energy is the most significant factor among all the factors which are contributing to the growth of the economy. Therefore, this deal will add to the growth of this economy by contributing to the supply of energy. A speaker said that this deal would help us to get only four per cent of energy requirement of India, but I would feel that something is better than nothing.

Not only that, after this deal, we will be able to import nuclear fuel supply from 45 countries and all the sanctions will be removed. Therefore, we can expect a quantum jump in the supply of nuclear fuel. USA has pledged support and help to India in the matter of revising the rules of Nuclear Suppliers Group to favour India. Once the NSG amends its guidelines, India becomes open for nuclear commerce for rest of the world. At that time, what happens in Washington should not really matter as we will be free to source our fuel from other countries. If the American Congress shoots down the 123 Agreement, the biggest losers would be American companies. In the above context, trade with Russia will be especially important. Russia has already expressed interest in this regard. Importantly, unlike the US, they do not have laws which make it mandatory for them to stop supplying nuclear fuel to the country in case of a nuclear test.[\[s81\]](#) On the contrary, they view India as having a history of responsible behaviour in terms of non-proliferation.

Australia -- with its rich Uranium reserves -- too has already expressed willingness to cooperate with Indian needs in the NSG, so that its guidelines can be amended for the supply of knowhow and equipment to India in the civil atomic energy sector.

The deal does not cap India's nuclear weapons programme in any way, and if it comes through, then India can use its scarce indigenous Uranium exclusively for weapons while importing Uranium for power reactors.â€ (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: If the Congress Party wants, then I can give him time from the Congress Party's time. There is some time left of the Congress Party.

â€ (Interruptions)

PROF. M. RAMADASS : This provides for exchange of information on research in controlled thermonuclear explosives, and the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor Project, in which India recently became a participant.

India is working on new ways to use Thorium as a nuclear fuel. Therefore, India's dependence on imported Uranium is for a comparatively short-term, and the Agreement could ensure this supply.

MR. SPEAKER: You can also lay it on the Table of the House.

PROF. M. RAMADASS : No, Sir. On the positive side, the Agreement has tremendous advantages for India's development. It is not only from the energy's point of view, but in terms of other inputs that we require. Therefore, we support this deal wholeheartedly.

On behalf of our Party, we once again congratulate and compliment the hon. Prime Minister who is bent upon taking India on the higher growth trajectory path.

MR. SPEAKER: Shri L. Ganesan, I am allowing you to speak on this issue for four minutes. You had two minutes with you, and I am giving you double the time to speak on this issue.

SHRI L. GANESAN (TIRUCHIRAPPALLI): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I thank you very much for having given me this opportunity to participate in this discussion on the Indo-US Agreement.

At the very outset, I want to congratulate our beloved Prime Minister wholeheartedly, and also commend him profusely for having clinched this Agreement and for having concluded this Agreement. There were several hurdles, several obstacles, and several barriers in it, but our hon. Prime Minister deftly, skilfully and in his own style has surmounted all the obstacles and concluded this Agreement. It is a splendid achievement by which our beloved Prime Minister has added a golden chapter to the history of our glorious nation. (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Ganesan, why do not you lay it on the Table of the House, and every sentence will be recorded.

SHRI L. GANESAN : Sir, I am not going through it.

MR. SPEAKER: All right, then you can have the entire statement recorded.

SHRI L. GANESAN : I strongly support this Agreement because this is an historical achievement; I strongly support this Agreement because India gets due recognition as a nuclear club member; I strongly support this Agreement because this Agreement takes our nation one step forward in our endeavour to become a world power; I strongly support this Agreement because we do not surrender our sovereign right to conduct nuclear test; and I strongly support this Agreement because we have not surrendered our sovereignty in our foreign policy.

I do not claim that I know all the intricacies and certainties of the Agreement. Therefore, it would be better if I quote the opinion of eminent persons and scientists instead of waxing eloquent on the merits of this Agreement. I am saying this because that will be more appropriate on this occasion. Shri R. Chidambaram, the Principal Scientific Advisor to the Government of India and the former Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission from 1993 to 2000 has said that : "For nuclear renaissance the world needs India." He has also said that : "From the outset there are three boundary conditions. There will be no effect on the strategic programme."

Many other experts have given their views, but since time is very short I wish to take up the objection raised by the Opposition Parties. First of all I wish to dismiss the shrill cry of somebody who does not even have a single Member in the Lok Sabha describing this Agreement as a Master-Slave charter. I simply ignored this because I thought that it might have reminded that somebody's earlier stages in an earlier life. Therefore, I do not want to reply to it.[\[r82\]](#)

18.00 hrs.

As far as BJP is concerned, I have great respect for Vajpayee ji, the former Prime Minister. They have already stated that a Joint Parliamentary Committee should be appointed, which should give its own report and on which Parliamentary approval should be given. The Constitution is the bedrock of our political set up, and all that is required is the Cabinet's approval. What were they doing while they were in power?

Lastly, I wish to inform the hon. Prime Minister that the nation as a whole is with you; the UPA is with you; the Chairperson of the UPA is with you; above all, the Democratic Progressive Alliance is with you; and Dr. Kalaignar, rank one strategist, rank one diplomat and a statesman is with you. Everybody is with you. Therefore, please go ahead undaunted and bring greater glory to this glorious nation.

With these words and because of the intervention of the Speaker, Sir, I lay rest of my speech.

*Sir, I don't want to dismiss the criticism of the Left parties so lightly. I share with them their concerns and apprehensions. We cannot take US at its face value. We cannot and we should not ignore the foul play of the US in international politics. We cannot easily forget its foul play in Vietnam, in Cuba, in Iran and in Iraq. No doubt, we should be vigilant and watchful as far as the US is concerned.

Mr. R. Chidambaram the Principal Scientific Advisor to the Government of India and the former Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission from 1993 to 2000 has said, "there will be no deceleration in our three-stage Nuclear Power Programme which has been the foundation on which we have built our entire Programme (Agreement) and there will be no effect on our Advanced R&D Programme. These boundary conditions have always been with us as we have gone through this. So, there will be no effect on our Strategic Programme".

"But as far as 123 agreement goes, there is nothing in the Agreement which prevents us from testing if the government decides to test for whatever reason". This is quoted from his exclusive interview he had given to The Hindu dated 10th August 2007.

Let me quote 'Indian Express' dated 25-7-07. Former Chairman of the Indian Space Research Organisation (ISRO) K.Kasturirangan says, "If for some naive and sentimental reasons, Indian decision makers say 'no' to the Agreement, then they must also decide how they will produce 20,000 MW of nuclear power by the year 2020 as envisaged by the current plans of the Department of Atomic Energy. With the 123 Agreement, however, it is possible

â€| This part of the speech was laid on the Table.

that the share of nuclear power in the energy mix can comfortably reach 20,000 MW by 2020. With wise planning and enabling legislation this target can also be easily exceeded. There is no doubt that saying 'yes' to the deal is important for the future of the Indian Nuclear Power Industry".

No doubt this Agreement is not without inadequacies, shortcomings and pitfalls. But they could be set right and corrected when we work at it and implement it.

"It is a sound and honourable Agreement and the assurances provided to Parliament by Prime Minister Manmohan Singh in 2006 have been fulfilled in their entirety".*

MR. SPEAKER: It is always the fate of the Speaker. हमारे पास तो केवल यही बोलने का मौका है कि please sit down. हमें तो कुछ भी बोलने का मौका नहीं मिलता।

â€| (ब्यवधान)

MR. SPEAKER: The time of the House may be extended till 7 p.m. Notices given today on matters of urgent public importance shall be valid for tomorrow, except matters which would come as Calling Attention will be taken up on Monday.

18.03 hrs.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Swain, your Party has got two minutes, but I will give you five minutes to speak.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : Sir, give those five minutes time to any other speaker, thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well, I will give you six minutes time. Please start your speech now. You are a senior Member. Please start your speech, and the very important points will be noted by them. What can I do? Your hon. Leader spoke for 46 minutes.

â€| (Interruptions)

अध्यक्ष महोदय: ठीक है, आप पांच मिनट में अपनी बात कहने की कोशिश कीजिए। Do not deny the Parliament of your wisdom.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : I am not that wise enough, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Please go ahead.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN (BALASORE): Sir, I repeat what has already been told by the hon. Leader of the Opposition that like the Left, we are not paranoid and we do not suffer from any American phobia. Our only objection to this nuclear Treaty is that this Treaty is going to prevent us from conducting any future nuclear tests and it is preventing us from developing our nuclear deterrent against our hostile neighbours. That is the only point on which we have just got the objection.

Sir, a very pertinent point was raised when the hon. Prime Minister made an intervention. The hon. Leader of the Opposition made a point, and the point was that if we defy the 123 Treaty and go for a nuclear test, we will invite sanctions. Okay, we will invite sanctions from the West -- from America and its allies. Now, the hon. Prime Minister said that there is nothing in this Treaty which prevents us from conducting any test. I also agree with him. But I will like to know, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition said, that getting a sanction from them on their own and inviting it through a pact, whether there is no distinction between these two. Two of the hon. Members from the Congress Party came prepared, but they did not listen to what the hon. Leader of Opposition said and they did not give any answer. I will ask the hon. External Affairs Minister or the hon. Prime Minister that if they at all answer, then they will have to answer the question: "Is there any distinction between America imposing sanctions on us on its own and we inviting it ourselves?" Is there any distinction between these two or not?[\[r83\]](#)

The second point is, when the hon. Leader of Opposition said that we would be allowing the American inspectors to roam around in our nuclear facilities, it was said by the Ruling Party, the Congress Party, that there was no provision like that in the Agreement. I am just coming to that provision in the 123 agreement. Yet the Government has accepted US end use monitoring in the 123 agreement. This is reflected in Article 12(3) which reads, "When execution of an agreement or a contract pursuant to this agreement between India and the United States and organisations require exchange of experts, the parties shall facilitate entry of the experts to their territories and their stay therein consistent with national laws, regulation and practices." What is this? If it is not allowing the American inspectors into our nuclear facilities, then what is this? Let the hon. Prime Minister or the hon. External Affairs Minister, during their reply, say that this is wrong and what we said is wrong.

The momentum that India has gathered with regard to getting approval from the NSG has slowed down considerably. The European Union now is a divided house on supporting exemptions for India. Australia was a good friend of ours. After the change of its Prime Minister, now Australia is probably going for a course correction. Countries like Ireland, Sweden and New Zealand criticised it earlier. Other countries like Belgium, Netherlands, Denmark, Finland and Austria are very strong proponents of the non-proliferation regime. China is making supporting noises. Only the small countries are going to oppose it.

The moot point is all of them have now the gravest doubt as to whether New Delhi will be able to take the next step towards the deal. They do not believe us now. Sir, through you I ask the hon. Prime Minister who is present here, Mr. Prime Minister, Sir, why did you not build a consensus among your own supporting parties when you tried to enter into this type of an agreement? Do you feel that your allies and your supporting parties are supporting you? Did you see when your members were speaking only your Congress party people were thumping the desks and all others were sitting quietly? You just see now also as to what is their attitude towards this treaty. So, it is only the Congress party which is supporting this deal and almost all other parties are opposing it.â€ (Interruptions)

SHRI RAM KRIPAL YADAV (PATNA): All parties in the UPA coalition are supporting it. â€ (Interruptions)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : ठीक है। Please conclude now.

श्री राम कृपाल यादव : महोदय, देश को बिजली चाहिए या नहीं?...[\(व्यवधान\)](#)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : ठीक है।

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : Mr. Prime Minister, Sir, if you ultimately fail to operationalise the deal, will you not bring ridicule to this country? Is India not going to lose its credibility in the comity of nations? Why did you do this? If you did not have the capacity, why did you try to enter into this type of activity? Mr. Prime Minister, Sir, by acting in this fashion you have painted the character of the country as a country confused, irresponsible and doubtful.

Let me tell you lastly, Mr. Prime Minister, if we come to power in future ...[\(Interruptions\)](#)

SHRI RAM KRIPAL YADAV : No chance. You can only dream of it. ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Why not? He has a right to express his hope.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : When we come to power in future, in the firmest possible way we will try to bring back the lost credibility of this country by renegotiating the deal and getting it operationalised after removing the clauses which go against the interest of the nation.

SHRI D.K. AUDIKESAVULU (CHITTOOR) : Sir, I would like to draw the attention of the House towards the utmost issue of signing the Indo-US nuclear deal on July 18, 2005, Hon'ble Prime Minister has repeatedly slipped on promises to the nation. Every time he has unable to keep an assurance, he has sought to devise a revised gauge to maintain the semblance of an unbroken word. The 123 Agreement has no provision for an arbitral tribunal, despite India's bitter experience over an earlier 123 accord with the US signed in 1963. The 1963 agreement was not only more protective of Indian interests, but also free of any Hyde Act-style overarching legal framework. Yet 15 years later, the US effectively gutted the accord by retroactively rewriting its terms through a new domestic law.

In the latest 123 Agreement, India has gained the right to be merely consulted but has granted United States the right to take all final decisions. Contrast this with the Japan-US 123 Agreement in which Tokyo's interests are protected through Article 14.

After more than two years, the deal has completed two of the five obligatory stages. But now, through the 123 Agreement, a sixth stage has been added - a separate section 131 agreement on reprocessing. Furthermore, the sequencing of the next steps has now been changed to India's disadvantage. As the July 27, 2007, separate Indian and US fact-sheets revealed, India has agreed to first conclude an IAEA safeguards agreement before the Nuclear Suppliers Group even attempts to carve out an India exemption form its 1992 export guidelines.

Our Party also decided to press for a debate and division in Parliament under Rule 184 on the bilateral 123 agreement that seeks to operationalise the India-US nuclear deal. The idea is that the country should know who is on which side. 123 agreement was the single-most dangerous issue as it impinges on national sovereignty. The UNPA, popularly known as the third front, has made its

* The speech was laid on the Table.

opposition to the Indo-US nuclear deal known and alleged that the government has mortgaged the country's sovereignty.

TDP supremo N. Chandrababu Naidu said, "It marks the total surrender to the US. There is no vestige of foreign policy left in the country as, henceforth, the government would be dictated to by a foreign power on whom to support and whom to oppose."

DR. C. KRISHNAN (POLLACHI) : I am speaking on behalf of Marumalarchi dravida Munnetra Kazhagam headed by Thiru. VAIKO Leader of the Tamilian's. We wish to state that the Indo – US Nuclear agreement in the present form is not for the betterment and progress of our Country.

Article 5.2 spells out restrictions as regards transfer of technology and equipment relating to reprocessing, enrichment and heavy water production, normally referred to in U.S. regulations as sensitive nuclear technologies (SNTs). Interestingly, however, in the present 123 Agreement, heavy water technology and equipment have been separated and SNT refers only to reprocessing and enrichment technologies. This, according to informed sources, was to facilitate the possibility of accessing equipment and critical components for heavy water production in which India's pre-eminence is well demonstrated, if not for reprocessing. But, in any case, and envisaged transfer SNTs heavy water technology and equipment cannot be automatic, and according to Article 5.2, "may be transferred only pursuant to an amendment to this agreement". This implies a Congressional approval and, therefore, a hurdle.

How much is the capital cost of imported reactor-based nuclear plants?

When we build a plant, we put in some money, called equity and borrow the rest. This is called the debt equity ratio

according to Central Electricity Regulatory Commission's (CERC) norms, the debt equity ratio for thermal plants is 70:30 we need to put in 30 percent of the total capital cost as equity and are allowed to borrow the rest. As per CERC guidelines, the return on equity allowed which comes out of the tariff the consumer pays is 14 percent. The loans carry interests, and the interest charges also come out of the tariff. Lastly, there is plant depreciation, which is computed at 3.6 percent of plant cost. All these have to be included in calculating the tariff, if we take only these components into account and the cost of the plant as Rs. 9 crore per MW (around \$20000 per KW) and the

* The speech was laid on the Table.

accumulated interests during construction, in which period obviously there is no sale of electricity, the total capital cost including this interest is Rs 11.2 crore per MW. The cost of electricity using just the capital cost of the plant alone for imported reactors would be Rs 365 per unit as against the cost per unit from coal including the fuel and all other operating costs of Rs 2.20-2.60 depending on their distance from the coal mines.

In the case of Kaiga, the operating cost including fuel, heavy water and other operating cost was computed by Nuclear Power Corporation to be 1.48. If we add that to the cost of capital, the cost of electricity becomes Rs 5.13 !. This is more than twice that from coal fired plants.

To find coal reserves or mine more efficiently, requires far less money than buying expensive reactors from Westinghouse.

Article 5.6 (b) (ii-v) on fuel supply assurances, to keep the U.S. – supplied reactors operating but because the fuel is used in U.S. equipment, it is obligated to the U.S. and there is no longer any consent to reprocess spent fuel thus obligated. That is, spent fuel from a non – U.S. source used in U.S. reactors can't no longer be reprocessed in the event of the termination of the agreement. This is another issue that needs sorting out with the U.S.

If we take indigenous reactors, the capital cost of nuclear plants would be about two thirds of imported reactor based plants. Nuclear power from Indian reactors would therefore cost quite less than that from imported reactors. Even then, it will be somewhat more expensive than that of coal-fired plant.

Hence on behalf of Marumalarchi Dravida Munnetra Kazhgam headed by Thiru. Vaiko the Leader of Tamilians I wish to state that the Indo-U.S. Nuclear agreement in the present form is not for the betterment and progress of our Country.

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Swain, just see how good points you have made in the short time given to you. Thank you.

â€¦ (Interruptions)

प्रो. विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा : यह बहस तो दो दिन चलनी थी।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप माने नहीं, एक दिन माने थे।

प्रो. विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा : जवाब कब होगा?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आधे घंटे के बाद होगा।

प्रो. विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा : लेकिन हमें साढ़े आठ बजे बताया गया था।

18.11 hrs.

(Mr. Deputy-Speaker in the Chair)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Nikhil Kumar – only five minutes. What I have said is according to the time allotted.

SHRI NIKHIL KUMAR (AURANGABAD, BIHAR): I begin with two statementsâ€¦. ... (Interruptions)

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI): Hon. Speaker of Lok Sabha had a prior commitment of meeting a distinguished delegation from Bahrain from 7 to 8.15 p.m. Therefore, we requested the hon. Speaker to come back to the House by 8.30 p.m. and the reply would be given at that time. Meanwhile, speakers who are listed they can take as much as was allotted. Within the

time, we can discuss. We do not mind. The Government would hear and respond. (Interruptions)

प्रो. विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा : यह बात आप पहले बताते।

श्री स्वारबेल स्वाई : आप पहले बताते, हम लोग तो बार-बार कोआपरेट कर रहे हैं। हम जब बोलने के लिए खड़े हुए तो कहा गया कि सिर्फ दो मिनट में अपनी बात समाप्त करें।

श्री प्रियरंजन दासमुंशी: बड़ी पार्टियों का समय समाप्त हो रहा है। बहुत से निर्दलीय सदस्य हैं, उन्हें भी बोलना है।...(व्यवधान) आप पूरी बात नहीं सुनते, यही एक प्रॉब्लम है। पहले मेरी बात सुन लें।...(व्यवधान)

श्री स्वारबेल स्वाई : मुझे कहा गया कि जल्दी समाप्त करें।...(व्यवधान)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Nothing will be recorded.

*(Interruptions)**

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI: No we are not continuing tomorrow. ...*(Interruptions)* We have agreed in the BAC...*(Interruptions)* There is no compulsion that it should be finished at 8.30 p.m. ...*(Interruptions)* You are mistaken. I again repeat. Please understand that it is not the Government which insisted. We got the message from the hon. Speaker that he has a prior commitment with the Bahrain Delegation at 7 p.m. At that time, the hon. Deputy-Speaker or somebody else can sit in the chair. Secondly, time is allocated for each party. If the allotted time to the parties are exhausted, if any Independent Members or other hon. Members express the desire to speak, they would be given two or three minutes. Our Prime Minister is ready to reply the moment the hon. Deputy-Speaker direct him to do so. We have no problem. It is not that the hon. Speaker would give the ruling by 8.30 p.m. and he has to reply. ...*(Interruptions)*

SOME HON. MEMBERS : It is a serious discussion.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI : Serious discussion should be discussed seriously, not lightly. ...*(Interruptions)*

We have decided in the BAC that no business would be taken up today except the Nuke Deal. So, we cannot take it up tomorrow.

प्रो. विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा : हमारे सदस्य कम बोले हैं। उन्हें पांच मिनट भी नहीं दिए गए।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Nikhil Kumar, only for five minutes please.

(Interruptions)

* Not recorded

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : आपके सदस्य अब बोल चुके हैं।

प्रो. विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा : फिर साढ़े आठ बजे तक क्या करेंगे?

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : जरूरी नहीं है कि साढ़े आठ बजे तक ही यह विषय चलेगा।

श्री निखिल कुमार, आप केवल पांच मिनट में अपनी बात कहें।

श्री निखिल कुमार : पांच मिनट तो बहुत कम हैं।

I was about to say that I will make two statements only. One is that the address by the Leader of the Opposition was disappointing. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You are wasting the time. आपने पांच मिनट में समाप्त करना है और आप ऐसे ही समय व्यतीत कर रहे हैं।

SHRI NIKHIL KUMAR : I have begun, Sir. What I am saying is that I will make two statements. First is that this address by our hon. Leader of the Opposition was extremely disappointing. The second statement is that we owe to our hon. Prime Minister a great big vote of thanks and appreciation for this wonderful illustration of the UPA Government's determination and courage of conviction to reach this agreement with the United States on Nuclear Civil Cooperation. [r84]

Hon. Leader of the Opposition mentioned that Dr. Bhabha had wanted that India should test the bomb and that if it had been done, India would have become a NWS. If it was not done, it was because of this. If you will recall, I wish to recall for the sake of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, that it was the time when the Government of India was very keen on pursuing its policy towards disarmament, that was the time when India, headed by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, persuaded the non-aligned nations, to do whatever they could, to bring about disarmament, and that was not the time, when India wanted to go in for a nuclear test.

It came about only when it became clear that disarmament had no future at that time and the security environment in this country and near-about dictated to us, the need for testing our nuclear weapon. And that is why, in 1974, we had the Pokhran-I. This is something that needs to be brought to the notice of the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

The second thing that he mentioned was that there has been a misleading declaration by the UPA Government about the deal – that it is only for civilian nuclear energy. What I am trying to say is that there was no misleading declaration. This deal is as much for our strategic use of nuclear power as for civilian purposes. This is borne out by the fact that there has been a separation plan; and this separation plan was brought about after much discussion with the US people and it is clear that a certain number of reactors will be allocated for strategic purposes and above all – what is important to note is this – none of these reactors will be subject to an inspection by the IAEA. To that extent, it is a tremendous achievement on our part, on the part of the negotiators and on the part of the Government officials who represented India in these negotiations; and I wish to compliment them. This was possible only because of the leadership provided to them by our Prime Minister and our External Affairs Minister. This must go on record that there has been no misleading declaration as was alleged by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. The separation plan is very clear on the matter and there is absolutely no chance of any doubt about it. Therefore, this is a wonderful achievement; and the UPA Government needs to be complimented for this.

The other very important thing is that this opens, to us, access to higher technology. Nuclear deal is not only about nuclear weapons. Nuclear deal also has some impact on our space programme, for instance. I will cite to you the instance of the cryogenic engines. It took us 13 years to perfect it and bring it out into the open. Had we had access to higher technology, it would have been possible for us to get the cryogenic engine much earlier.

We hope that our negotiations with the NSG will be successful; we will be able to persuade them and they will be able to amend their guidelines. Once they amend their guidelines, it would be possible for us to access higher technology.

The other day, I read in the papers – there was a news item – that our friend from the Left has put a question to our hon. Prime Minister, as to why no such agreement has been signed with Russia about reactors. It is not possible until such time the NSG amends its guidelines because Russia is as much part of the NSG as any of the other 44-45 nations. So, it is still another reason why there should be a successful negotiation with the NSG. [\[MSOffice85\]](#) All this is possibly only if the Indo-US Nuclear Deal goes through. That is in some way a key to our future development, future prosperity.

The most important thing is about which a reference has been made and I am simply rushing through because of shortage of time. This country needs power. This country needs '*bijli*'. People seated here are perhaps not aware, certainly not some of the friends across the Table here. They have mentioned that we are only following the United States and nothing more. They must realise that this country needs electricity. This electricity which we are supposed to get because of nuclear power will lead to so much development. It will be possible for agriculture to benefit from it. Today, the farmer is hard placed for irrigation because he does not have either Government-sponsored irrigation plans or canals. He has to depend on his tubewells but he cannot operate tubewells because he has no power. Not all the farmers are in a position to afford diesel power to work their tubewells. If agriculturists have power, they will be benefited.

Same is the case with the industry be it medium, large or small. No industry can be set up without power. I am citing two instances of my own State. If it is backward, especially after the creation of Jharkhand and it has become largely agri-centric it is because there is no industry there. Industry cannot come about unless there is availability of power. As it is, Bihar is terribly deficient in respect of power. If it is possible to provide power to Bihar through nuclear power generation it will be a totally different picture. At the same time, kindly imagine what will happen to our people in the villages who will find their homes lit up with electricity. Above all, they will be able to cook not on cow dung cakes, not on even LPG cylinders, which many cannot afford even.

It is a question of power being given to the last village in this country, the house of every person dalit or otherwise. It is this '*bijli*' which people are hankering for and it is this '*bijli*' which the UPA Government is committed to make available to every house in the country whether it is in the urban, semi-urban or far flung villages.

So, Sir, this Bill is not only for strategic purposes, it is about providing development to this country and unless we are able to strike this deal with the United States, it will be a serious road block to our progress. I would personally recommend to this House that it should adopt this. Instead of quibbling over little details there is no question of any kind of bar on us to conduct tests. There is no question of ours being secondary power to the United States.

Before I sit down, Sir, once again I pay my most sincere compliments to the UPA Government for fashioning this Nuclear Deal and I commend it to the House to support it.

SHRI M.SHIVANNA (CHAMARAJANAGAR) : Thank you Sir, the Indo-US agreement for civilian nuclear co-operation has generated huge controversy in the India and also abroad.

Sir, we have been spending crores and crores of rupees every year to generate nuclear power by using domestic uranium. If Indo-US nuclear deal materializes, India would be getting uranium at a very cheap rate. To this extent we can agree to this nuclear deal provided our sovereignty is not at stake.

Sir, during the last 60 years of Indian independence there is no evidence of India having compromised on its foreign policy. Therefore, I would like to suggest that the civil nuclear co-operation agreement should protect the nation's self respect. We may get uranium at cheaper rate. but we should not yield to the dictates of any foreign country. Our great nation can not surrender to anyone just for the sake of uranium. It is important to remind ourselves that Nation's interest and Nation's pride can not be compromised. We are the largest democracy on the globe. Therefore I urge upon the Government of India to up hold our independent foreign policy and protect the unity and integrity of the country taking all parties in to confidence. While negotiating with US on nuclear deal all these factors should be considered. With these words let me I conclude my speech.

*English translation of the speech originally delivered in Kanada

श्री लक्ष्मण सिंह (राजगढ़) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इस अनवलीयर न्यूक्लियर डील का समर्थन भी करता हूँ और विरोध भी करता हूँ। अनविलियर इसलिए कि हमें प्रधान मंत्री जी से अपेक्षा नहीं थी कि वह सदन को गुमराह करेंगे, अमेरिका में जाकर वक्तव्य दें कि हमें न्यूक्लियर समझौते पर हस्ताक्षर करने चाहिए।[\[a86\]](#)

मैं माननीय प्रधानमंत्री जी का बहुत आदर करता हूँ लेकिन उनके इस वक्तव्य से देश में और सारी दुनिया में बहुत अनिश्चितता का वातावरण बना, फिर मीडिया के माध्यम से नई तरह की खबरें छपीं, कभी इसे न्यूक्लियर एग्जिमेंट कहा गया, कभी इसे न्यूक्लियर डील कहा गया और कभी इसे न्यूक्लियर कॉमर्स कहा गया। डील का अर्थ कुछ और होता है, मैं कांग्रेस में रहा हूँ मुझे मालूम है। अनिश्चितता का वातावरण न रहे और स्पष्ट वातावरण बने, मैं अपेक्षा करता हूँ कि माननीय प्रधानमंत्री जी अपने भाषण में इसका उद्घोषण करेंगे। आज न्यूक्लियर पावर का जनरेशन तीन प्रतिशत होता है, 2020 तक आप सात प्रतिशत करने वाले हैं यानी 13 साल में चार प्रतिशत न्यूक्लियर पावर जनरेशन के लिए इतना बड़ा बखेड़ा खड़ा किया। यह क्यों किया - इसे आप जानें और इसका उत्तर दें। डा. ए.एन. प्रसाद, जो भाभा एटॉमिक रिसर्च सेंटर के भूतपूर्व डायरेक्टर रहे हैं, उनका वक्तव्य है -

"India will be slowly forced to become dependent on imports with practically the entire gamut of activities coming under safeguards and inspections with a miniscule of activities left under the strategic category."

This is what he said. Now, what does Mr. Brahmachalani, who is another expert on the subject, says? He says:

"Legislation had little to do with energy and everything to do with NPT. The Government should also be more transparent to the people of India regarding prevention of radio active accidents, disposal of nuclear waste and the vulnerability of the nuclear plants to terrorist attacks. Unfortunately, it is not so. I would like to urge the Government to look into these issues and have a full-fledged discussion on this very important issue."

कांग्रेस की तरफ से जो वक्ता बोले, मैंने उन्हें बहुत ध्यान से सुना, लेकिन न्यूक्लियर वेस्ट डिस्पोजल के बारे में बहुत से सदस्य नहीं बोले। उधर से ज्योतिरादित्य जी ने अच्छी शुरुआत की, अच्छा बोले, बच्चा अच्छा बोला, लेकिन हमें यह नहीं भूलना चाहिए कि विश्व में ऐसी बहुत सी घटनाएं हो चुकी हैं, जैसे 1986 में रूस के चेर्नोबिल में रेडियो एक्टिव मैटेरियल लीक हुआ और उसका परिणाम यह निकला कि वहां तरह-तरह के कैंसर फैले और लगभग ढाई लाख गर्भवती महिलाएं प्रभावित हुईं। यूएस में 1989 में क्या हुआ, श्री माइल आइलैंड में रेडियो एक्टिव मैटेरियल लीक हुआ, वहां ईश्वर की बहुत कृपा रही कि बहुत बड़ा हादसा नहीं हुआ। रूस में 1957 में यूरोल माउंटेन में न्यूक्लियर वेस्ट का डिस्पोजल किया गया, पहाड़ के ऊपर गड़ढा खोदा और न्यूक्लियर वेस्ट का डिस्पोजल किया जिससे वहां बहुत बड़ा विस्फोट हुआ। विस्फोट क्यों हुआ, कोई असावधानी बरती गई होगी तभी वहां इतना बड़ा विस्फोट हुआ जिसमें हजारों लोग हताहत हुए, प्रभावित हुए। मैं मानता हूँ और मुझे अपने वैज्ञानिकों पर गर्व है, न्यूक्लियर पावर कॉरपोरेशन ऑफ इंडिया पर गर्व है कि उनके पास न्यूक्लियर वेस्ट डिस्पोजल की तकनीक है।[\[r87\]](#)

गारबेज वेस्ट डिस्पोजल की तकनीकी हमारे पास है, लेकिन क्या लातफिताशाही के कारण गारबेज डिस्पोजल हो रहा है - नहीं हो रहा है। इलेक्ट्रॉनिक वेस्ट डिस्पोजल की तकनीकी हमारे पास है, लेकिन क्या इलेक्ट्रॉनिक वेस्ट का डिस्पोजल उस तरह से हो रहा है, जिस तरह से होना चाहिए - नहीं हो रहा है। फिर से लातफिताशाही इसमें आड़े आ गई। हमें यह आशंका है कि न्यूक्लियर वेस्ट के डिस्पोजल पर भी अगर लातफिताशाही लगाई गई, तो कहीं कोई दुर्घटना न घट जाए।

इसलिए उपाध्यक्ष जी मैं आपके माध्यम से प्रधान मंत्री जी से निवेदन करूंगा कि वर्तमान में जो हमारे न्यूक्लियर संस्थान हैं और जो लगने वाले हैं तथा जो लोग इन्हें चला रहे हैं, आप उन्हें स्वायत्तता दीजिए, उन्हें ऑटोनोमी दीजिए और उन पर छोड़िये - तभी हम न्यूक्लियर वेस्ट के डिस्पोजल...(व्यवधान)

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : आपको पांच मिनट हो गये हैं।

श्री लक्ष्मण सिंह : पांच मिनट कहां हो गये हैं।...(व्यवधान)

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : बहुत लोग बोलने वाले हैं।

श्री लक्ष्मण सिंह : यूनाइटेड स्टेट्स में 1974 से कोई न्यूक्लियर पावर प्लान्ट नहीं लगाया गया है। यह सोचने वाली बात है कि जो देश 1974 से आज तक न्यूक्लियर पावर प्लान्ट नहीं लगा रहा है...(व्यवधान)

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : आप भी बोलने वाले हैं, आपकी बारी भी आने वाली है। अगर आप इन्हें डिस्टर्ब करेंगे तो वह भी आपको डिस्टर्ब करेंगे।

श्री लक्ष्मण सिंह : वह हमें न्यूक्लियर पावर प्लान्ट लगाने के लिए क्यों उत्साहित कर रहा है। इसका क्या कारण है? जो देश अपने यहां न्यूक्लियर पावर प्लान्ट नहीं लगा रहा है, वह हमसे कह रहा है कि आप लगाइये। 15 वर्ष के अंदर उन्होंने कई न्यूक्लियर पावर प्लान्ट्स और रिएक्टर्स बंद कर दिये हैं। ऐसा उन्होंने क्यों किया, क्योंकि वहां के मीडिया और जनता का उन पर दबाव है। अब अपनी जनता और मीडिया के दबाव से अमरीका अपने यहां न्यूक्लियर पावर प्लान्ट्स नहीं लगाता है, लेकिन हमारे ऊपर भले ही मीडिया और जनता का दबाव हो, लेकिन हमसे कहता है कि हम लगाएं। यह दोहरी नीति समझ में नहीं आई। इसका एक कारण और है कि 1990 के दशक से लेकर आज तक एशियाई देशों में लगभग 64 प्रतिशत न्यूक्लियर पावर जनरेशन बढ़ी है। यह उनके लिए चिंता का विषय है कि कहीं एशिया के देश सुपर पावर न बन जाएं। क्योंकि सुपर पावर केवल अमरीका या रूस हो सकता है, जिनके पास पचास हजार न्यूक्लियर हथियार हैं। लेकिन हमारे पास अभी वर्तमान में 18-20 न्यूक्लियर हथियार हैं और आगे हम इन्हें बनाने की बात करते हैं, तो हम पर बंदिश लगाई जाती है - यह दोहरी नीति है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, 123 एग््रीमेंट की बहुत सारी बातें हैं। अब इस 123 एग््रीमेंट में जो आर्टिकल 14.2 है, वह क्या कहता है -

"The agreement however offers immediate bilateral consultations in the event of an Indian test and commits the two sides to take into account whether the circumstances that may lead to termination or cessation resulting from the Party's serious concern about changed security environment or as a response to a similar action by other States which could impact national security."

चलिये हम इस बात को मानते हैं, लेकिन क्या हम अपने परमाणु हथियार इसलिए नहीं बनायें क्योंकि यू.एस. ऐसा चाहता है। लेकिन अगर हम पर हमला हो जायेगा तो क्या तब नेशनल सिविलियरिटी की बात उठेगी। जो हमारे राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा सलाहकार हैं, मैं उनका बहुत आदर करता हूँ, लेकिन मुझे बड़ा दुःख हुआ जब उन्होंने सुरक्षा के मामले में पत्रकारों के सामने जाकर जिस तरह की सफाई, जिस तरह का स्पष्टीकरण देना चाहिए था, वह नहीं दिया और उसकी वजह से बहुत सारे सवाल खड़े हो गये।

महोदय, अगर हम इसे गहराई से देखें तो परमाणु परीक्षण की राजनीति भी हुई है और अभी भी हो रही है। सबसे पहले परमाणु परीक्षण किसने किया? सबसे पहले परमाणु हथियार किसने बनाया? परमाणु हथियार यदि सबसे पहले किसी ने बनाया तो वह यूनाइटेड स्टेट्स ऑफ अमेरिका ने बनाया। परमाणु हथियार का परीक्षण यदि किसी ने किया तो यूनाइटेड स्टेट्स ऑफ अमेरिका ने जापान के हिरोशिमा में किया और उसके बाद रूस ने किया। रूस जबकि वाइसा पैवट का अध्यक्ष था, ईस्टर्न यूरोपियन कंट्रीज के साथ जो वाइसा पैवट हुआ था, रूस उसका अध्यक्ष था [b88]। उसके बाद भी उन्होंने परीक्षण किया और न्यूक्लियर हथियार बनाए। इसलिए हम अगर न्यूक्लियर हथियार बनाते हैं और सुपर पावर कहलाने के लिए प्रयास करते हैं, तो किस तरह से हमें दोष दिया जा सकता है?

एनर्जी के लिए आप कह रहे हैं कि सरकार न्यूक्लियर एग््रीमेंट करने जा रही है। बहुत अच्छी बात है - करिए, लेकिन क्या हम एनर्जी के जो अन्य सोर्सेज हैं, क्या उनको नहीं ले सकते? सौर ऊर्जा की हमारे पास अपार संभावनाएं हैं। हमारे पास टैक्नोलॉजी मौजूद है। हम टैक्नोलॉजी और विकसित कर सकते हैं? हम टैक्नोलॉजी दूसरे देशों को दे सकते हैं? क्यों न हम प्रयास करें कि हम सोलर सुपर पावर बनकर दिखाएं - इसमें क्या बुराई है?

आज ग्लोबल वार्मिंग के कारण यू.एस., यूरोप और यू.के. में गर्मी बढ़ रही है। हम अपनी सोलर पावर टैक्नोलॉजी विकसित करें, हम अपनी सोलर पावर की टैक्नोलॉजी इन देशों को बेचें, यह एक बहुत बड़ा मार्केट है, सारी दुनिया हमारे लिए एक मार्केट है। वहां अगर हम बेचें तो बहुत अच्छी बात होगी।

विंड पावर, यानी पवन ऊर्जा की आज 13 राज्यों में 45,000 मेगावाट के उत्पादन की क्षमता है।...(व्यवधान) हमने कितना उत्पादन किया है? उसकी तुलना में बहुत कम है। बायोमॉस का उत्पादन भी हम कर सकते हैं। यह कृषि प्रधान देश है। बायोमॉस का उत्पादन भी यहां जितना होना चाहिए, उतना नहीं हो रहा है।

अंत में मैं आपके माध्यम से यही कहूंगा कि माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी, आप इस डील में जितनी पारदर्शिता ला सकते हैं, लाएं। जो हमारे परमाणु के संस्थान हैं, उनकी सुरक्षा बढ़ाई जाएं और जो संस्थान चला रहे हैं, उनको स्वायत्तता दी जाए और भविष्य में यह देखा जाए कि हमारा परमाणु उत्पादन बढ़े, हम एक सुपर पावर बनकर उभरें, लेकिन हमारे देश में परमाणु संस्थानों के कारण कोई ऐसी दुर्घटना न हो, जो और देशों में हुई है।

SHRI TARIT BARAN TOPDAR (BARRACKPORE): Sir, thank you very much for giving me this opportunity.

Sir, I would like to supplement what Shri Rupchand Pal has said and endorsing what has been spoken by Prof. Ram Gopal Yadav, I would like to place a few points in this august House.

यहां बहुत सी बातें कही गई हैं। उनका निचोड़ यह है कि डिस्कशन से पहले बाहर जो पोलिटिकल बहस हुई, उसमें लोगों को गुमराह करने की चेष्टा हुई थी, दोनों तरफ से हुई थी। चाइना की बात कही गई। आज जब चाइना की बात ठोस करके रखने का मौका आया, तो सही बात बतायी गई।

China is a member of the nuclear club and India is not. Somebody was speaking from that side that we will be given the club membership. Let them give the club membership. Then, we will come here to discuss the terms and conditions of the agreement. So why should we be hypothetical that it would be given and all those things? ये सारी बातें गुमराह करने वाली हैं, दूसरी बात आई कि इसे अभी करना होगा, जल्दी करना होगा, अभी नहीं करने से बुश साहब चले जाएंगे, तो कल क्या होगा? This is not an agreement between Mr. Bush and our hon. Prime Minister, Dr. Manmohan Singh. This is an agreement between the two countries. जल्दबाजी की क्या बात थी? कोई बात नहीं थी। फिर भी जल्दबाजी की गई और अब आईएलए का अधिकारी इंडिया विजिट करने आया तो बता दिया कि जल्दबाजी की कोई बात नहीं है, आप बाद में कभी आइए - यानी भंडाफोड़ हो गया। अमेरिकन अधिकारी ने भी भंडाफोड़ कर दिया कि टाइम की कोई बात नहीं है। So, these are the things. गुमराह करने का और दूसरा तरीका लिया गया। वह अपना कानून चलाएंगे, हम अपना कानून चलाएंगे। सही बात है। हम क्यों अमेरिकन कानून को मान्यता देंगे और अमरीका क्यों हमारे कानून को मान्यता देगा, लेकिन अमरीका तो अमेरिकन कानून मानेगा। The American President will abide by the American law. He will have to submit an Annual Report on the accounts of our nuclear material[\[a89\]](#).

In short, I do not want to lose time in giving an account of whatever nuclear materials that have been incorporated in the agreement. इसके लिये अकाउंट देना पड़ेगा। वह कुछ भी कहेगा और इसके लिये बैड सर्टिफिकेट दे देंगे। एग््रीमेंट यहां नहीं, उधर है। अगर बैड सर्टिफिकेट दे दिया, तो क्या होगा? इससे तलाक होगा। तलाक में भी एग््रीमेंट होता है, एक तरफ से तलाक चल सकता है। इधर से किसी मैम्बर ने बताया है कि हम भी तलाक दे सकते हैं, एक एग््रीमेंट हो रहा है - हाथी और चूहे में। We have been treated as a junior partner. We are not the members of the Nuclear Club. Please mind it. हाईड एक्ट लागू नहीं होगा? हमारे ऊपर लागू नहीं होगा, उनके ऊपर लागू होगा और अगर लागू होगा तो वह तलाक देगा, तलाक का क्या मतलब होता है? जो दहेज दिया, वह विदड़ करना पड़ेगा, सब चीज वापस करना पड़ेगा और जो जहां है, वैसा ही रहेगा - इस सब का क्या मतलब है? After the bombardment of the nuclear material by Alpha, Beta and Gama rays and subsequent fissions, the fissile material that will be produced as an end product will also have to be given which is the raw-material for making atom bombs. You will do the thing and they will get the raw-material for the atom bombs. In course of time वह कहेगा कि आपने छुपाया हुआ है, क्यों छुपाया? उसके लिये अपने इंस्पैक्टर्स भेजेगा, आप कैसे चेक करेंगे? This is the most dangerous part of the agreement. In any way, that cannot be agreed to. कैसे गुमराह करने के लिये ये सारी बातें कही गई हैं? अगर यहां आये हैं तो हमारे होंगे। हमारा 1964 का न्युक्लीयर एक्ट है, जिसे वेंज करना पड़ेगा। We have to agree. Everybody here has to agree to it. Otherwise that cannot be operationalised. एनर्जी सिक्यूरिटी की बात की जा रही है। न्युक्लीयर एनर्जी में फिशन निकलता है। हमें अटॉमिक एनर्जी चाहिये, इसका क्या मतलब है? You have the energy basket comprising energy coming out of different sources. इसमें जल्दबाजी की क्या जरूरत है? हमारी पार्टी ने 1994 में पॉलिसी डिस्मिशन लिया था कि हमारे देश के लिये न्युक्लीयर एनर्जी नहीं चाहिये। हम उसके खिलाफ नहीं हैं लेकिन न्युक्लीयर एनर्जी के अलग पैर नहीं होते हैं। जो थर्मल एनर्जी वे से जाता है, न्युक्लीयर एनर्जी वे से जाता है, You will get only 7 to 9 per cent. For that 7 to 9 per cent, what are you going to stake?

Now, I come to technology. आज दुनिया में कोई पागल नहीं है जो यह कहेगा कि हम अपनी टैक्नोलॉजी देंगे। हम न अपनी टैक्नोलॉजी देंगे और न ही लेंगे। यह उधर वैस्टर्न कंट्रीज में हो सकता है। Can this be called security when it is dependent on foreign supply? विदेशों पर निर्भर होकर आप सिक्यूरिटी की बात कहते हैं। यह शब्द हटा दीजिये। Security and dependence on foreign countries are two contradictory terms. They cannot go together. थोरियम टैक्नोलॉजी के बारे में क्या है? The Department of Atomic Energy should be pulled up. What are they doing with the Budget that they are given? What is the stage that we have attained in Thorium Technology? As far as I know, Thorium Technology has developed to a great extent.[\[R90\]](#)

जो तीन सूत्री कार्यक्रम कहा जाता है, वे उससे बहुत दूर निकल चुके हैं। This agreement will deter the advancement of thorium technology and I would like to explain that. First of all, we have to understand what are the ramifications of this agreement on our foreign policy and also on our defence. There is talk of strategic partnership. Strategic partnership has got its own meaning. What is strategy? It means different angles of vision. डिफरेंट एंगल ऑफ विज़न से डिफरेंट कही जाएगी। आपके दृष्टिकोण में स्ट्रैटेजी का मतलब एक है, अमेरिकन एंगल ऑफ विज़न से दूसरा है, चाइनीज़ एंगल से तीसरा है, रशियन एंगल से चौथा है।

Therefore, we have understood that the Hyde Act is an India specific Act which enables the American President to enter into agreement with a country which is not a member of the nuclear club. This is the sole purpose of the Hyde Act. It is an enabling Act. यह एनेबल करता है कि अमेरिकन प्रेज़िडेंट जो कर नहीं सकते हैं, कानून नहीं होगा तो अमेरिकन प्रेज़िडेंट इंडिया के साथ एग््रीमेंट नहीं कर सकता है। इंडिया क्या, किसी भी देश के साथ नहीं कर सकता। उसमें क्या है? उसमें कम से कम सौ बार लिखा हुआ है जिसका मतलब है कि India will be NPT compliant.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please conclude.

SHRI TARIT BARAN TOPDAR : I am just finishing. What is meant by NPT compliance? आपने एनपीटी में सही नहीं किया है लेकिन कह रहे हैं कि एनपीटी कंप्लायेंस एनवारनमेंट और अच्छा करेगा।

Sir, India has been cherishing the independent foreign policy. अगर किसी के पास एटम बम नहीं होगा तो हमारा भी नहीं होगा। अगर किसी का होगा तो हमारा भी अधिकार होगा, भले ही हम चाहते हों या नहीं चाहते हों, लेकिन एटम बम बनाने का हमें अधिकार है। हम लोग बता सकते हैं कि अभी मत बनाओ या कभी न बनाओ लेकिन वह हमारा अधिकार है, वह हम नहीं छोड़ सकते हैं। टोटल डिस्आर्ममेंट होगा। We are in favour of complete and total disarmament, not partial disarmament and that is why एनपीटी कंप्लायेंस एनवारनमेंट बनाने का वायदा अगर प्रधान मंत्री जी ने किया है

तो बहुत गलत काम किया है। इतना कहकर मैं अपना वक्तव्य समाप्त करता हूँ।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Before I request the next hon. Member to speak, I would like to inform that those hon. Members who would like to lay their written statements can lay them on the Table of the House. That will form part of the proceedings of the House.

Now, Shri Subrato Bose will speak. Mr. Bose, you may please speak only for five minutes.

SHRI NAVEEN JINDAL (KURUKSHETRA) : Sir, I rise to support the Indo-US Civil Nuclear Cooperation Agreement and thank you for giving me an opportunity to speak.

I wish this debate had started soon after the PM's statement on 13th August, 2007 so that the Government could have explained its stand after listening to all the Parties and clarified all the doubts. Unfortunately, the whole issue was stuck in the quagmire of political controversies. I am happy that today this August House has got the opportunity to discuss the issue which should help in clearing the air on several aspects of the Agreement.

I have heard the speeches from the opposition benches with rapt attention. I have tried to understand the grounds on which the Indo-US agreement is being opposed. The main grounds seem to be that the agreement will compromise our national security; it will barter away our nuclear autonomy and it will subordinate our foreign policy to the dictates of the U.S.A.

Sir, permit me to say that all these grounds are based on ill founded fears and presumptions germinating in minds conditioned by the past. They are far-fetched contentions, which ignore the fact that the world is fast changing and a new balance of power is emerging not only in Asia but on global scale, with India occupying a very vital position. I feel that some parties are opposing the Agreement due to political opportunism and their propensity to oppose everything. Some others are opposing because they have been suspicious of US intentions. I am happy that China has stated that it has no objection to the Agreement as reported by the media. I am also happy that the Left parties who have been opposing the Agreement have now agreed to go ahead with discussion with IAEA.

* The speech was laid on the Table.

It is puerile to think that in the present scenario where everything is open to public gaze, any Government could compromise the national security. As regards our foreign policy, right from the days of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru who was instrumental in formulating this policy, India has always remained neutral despite several pulls and pressures. There is no question of deviating even a bit from this path. This has been made clear by our Government from time to time. In fact all the Governments in the past have stuck to this policy despite our differences on other issues. This policy has stood the test of time. It is therefore a figment of imagination for anyone to say that we are subordinating our foreign policy to the USA or any other country. Let me say firmly that our resolve to stay non-aligned has become stronger and stronger with every passing year and it will ever remain so. The country has full faith in our Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs.

Sir, the Agreement which the House is discussing has not emerged overnight. For a long time it has remained under public and media scanning. At the outset, I would like to submit that this Agreement is for civil nuclear co-operation for peaceful purposes. It started taking shape as a part of the joint statement issued by our Hon'ble Prime Minister Dr. Manmohan Singh and US President George Bush on 18th July, 2005. Perhaps for the first time India was officially recognized as a responsible advanced nuclear technology country with which USA wanted to have civil nuclear energy co-operation. It is something all Indians should be proud of and compliment the great work done by our scientists.

The next important step was taken in March 2006 when President Bush visited India. An agreement was reached on India's separation plan. It identified nuclear facilities to be placed voluntarily by India under safeguards in a phased manner. It was clarified by no less a person than our Prime Minister that the choice of nuclear reactors and the phases in which they would be placed under safeguards shall be decided by India. Moreover, India would be free to build future nuclear facilities, whether civilian or military, in accordance with our national needs. USA supported the Indian plea of a strategic reserve of nuclear fuel and ensured perpetual supply to India's reactors. In case of any problem in the proposed fuel reserve, USA will make arrangements with other friendly countries like France, Russia, U.K. etc. These steps put together should help India to fulfill its energy requirements in the years to come and put an end to its nuclear isolation.

While this long process of negotiations continued, our Prime Minister kept the Parliament informed. He has made suo moto statements on 29th July, 2005, 27th February 2006, 7th March 2006, 17th August 2006 in Rajya Sabha and latest on 13th August, 2007. In addition, the Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs have been briefing the leaders of various

political parties from time to time. I am mentioning all this to emphasize that our leaders and Government have shared everything with other leaders and Parliament and, through them, with the people of this country. This is a glowing example of transparency which ultimately will be appreciated by one and all.

Here I would like to add that our Government have at all stages taken into account the views and reservations expressed by our scientists, technologists, experts and the media. Based on these views from all quarters, our negotiators have been having very prolonged and perhaps the most difficult negotiations with their U.S. counterparts.

Sir, I would like to mention with a sense of pride that with this well thought out Agreement, India has finally come out of a long period of nuclear arm-twisting and apartheid. I was a young student at that time when I used to read that a few countries called super powers used to stockpile nuclear arsenals but would not allow others to do the same in order to perpetuate their nuclear hegemony. For years, they put pressure on us to sign the non proliferation treaty of 1967 - NPT as it is called. We withstood our ground. We continued our efforts to acquire nuclear energy, thanks to our brilliant scientists like Dr. Homi Bhabha, Dr. Vikram Sarabhai, Dr. Chidambaram and our former President Dr. APJ Abdul Kalam. USA and other countries applied several sanctions to twist our arms so as to surrender whatever nuclear arsenal we had and give up further efforts in this direction. We did not succumb. On the other hand we intensified our efforts. Several tests were carried in 1974 when Smt. Indira Gandhi was the Prime Minister. In 1998, we reached another milestone when our scientists undertook the first nuclear explosion in Pokharan.

Sir, I take this opportunity to salute our leaders and scientists for laying the foundations of a strong nuclear India in the face of resistance from other nuclear powers.

Seen against this backdrop, the present Agreement is a landmark in the history of our nuclear progress. Let us take it as tribute to the vision of our leaders like Smt. Indira Gandhi and to the persuasiveness of our Prime Minister Dr. Manmohan Singh, to the untiring efforts of our nuclear scientists and, last but not the least, to the tenacity of our negotiators. As a sum up of all this, this Agreement enables India to have a viable civilian nuclear programme and maintain its defence arsenal. It also ensures that bilateral nuclear cooperation will not interfere in each other's military nuclear activities.

Sir, some time ago there were reports quoting US State Department that the Agreement may be terminated if India would test a nuclear device. I am happy that Hon. Minister of External Affairs and Leader of the House Shri Pranab Mukherjee has made it abundantly clear that to test a nuclear device in our national interest is purely our decision. The Government has categorically stated that " We have the right to test. They have the right to react." That should remove any doubts on this score. Moreover, our past is a guarantee that we have never succumbed to any pressure in such matters.

The agreement has emerged after the toughest ever negotiations. All our apprehensions have been taken care of during the negotiations. It is very clear that the Agreement will in no way impact our strategic nuclear programme or weapons. The strategic nuclear programme remains completely insulated from our civilian programmes.

The agreement also lays down that if at any stage USA is compelled to break the agreement for any reason, including India's decision to carry out a nuclear test, other countries can continue to supply atomic fuel and technology to India. The right to reprocess spent fuel has also been conceded. This was a major bone of contention between the two countries but the adroitness and flexibility of negotiators on both sides have got it out of the way.

Sir, I would like to point out that this Agreement will help India in the power sector in a major way,. During the Chief Ministers' conference on Power Sector in May, 2007 held in New Delhi and addressed by the Hon. Prime Minister, it was emphasized that top priority has to be given to augment our power potential. In this context, America's readiness to give us the necessary wherewithal of nuclear energy is very welcome. It will enable us to gear up our power production for civilian use thereby reducing our dependence on conventional fossil fuels and bring down the pollution levels.

I would like to remind the House that the growth of power sector in India was retarded due to the nuclear discrimination against India exercised by several nuclear powers. They came in the way of the expansion of our nuclear energy sector.

Now things have changed dramatically. The same powers have recognized our nuclear worth. In the International arena strength respects strength. Countries like France, Russia, Australia, UK and other members of the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG) are keen to have nuclear trade with India. The agreement with USA will open the doors to such trade and boost our civil nuclear power programme enormously.

India will now have full access to the latest nuclear power technology, which is needed to meet our constantly growing energy demand and to achieve and sustain 8 to 10 % economic growth. So far, India has largely depended on hydel and thermal power. The power so generated is not yet enough to meet our domestic, agricultural, industrial and other requirements. We have yet to make any mark in wind and solar energy. The burning of coal and oil for power generation has added to pollution and global warming.

In this context, we have to go in for nuclear energy in a big way to meet the ever-growing demand for power. A visionary like Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru had anticipated in the beginning itself that India will have to depend on and develop nuclear technology for economic progress.

At present, only 3% of India's power requirement is met through nuclear sources. Our target is that by 2020 we shall generate 20,000 MW nuclear energy. Today we are in a position to generate only 3700 MW. We have a very long way to go. The Indo-US Agreement will help us to achieve our target. The more we move towards nuclear energy, the more it will reduce our dependence on fossil fuels, the more it will reduce the carbon emission, the more it will reduce the level of pollution and, finally, the more it will reduce global warming.

In this context I would like to quote the following from The Tribune dated 4 August, 2007 for the information of the House, particularly those Members who are opposing the Agreement.

Sir, I quote :

"The deal means that Indian nuclear trade will skyrocket and the bigwigs of the world's nuclear industry will make a beeline to India for the \$ 100 billion market it is likely to throw open for five years after its operationalisation. This will significantly boost the share of nuclear power in Indian energy mix in the coming years. In this context, work on the four nuclear reactors that Russia recently pledged to construct in India will start soon; coupled with this is the recent declaration of intent by Australia, which holds the world's largest uranium reserves, to sell uranium to India."

In the final analysis, this 123 Agreement should be judged by our scientists who understand its implications and intricacies better than others. Dr. Abdul Kalam in a recent interview has said that what Dr. Manmohan Singh has done to come to this agreement is "Unique". When asked whether the Agreement was about energy or about strategic interests, he said, "I feel it is about energy. After all, our nuclear scientists have a vision. Every year, they want to add about 1000 MW. So by 2020, they want to have 20,000 MW. They want to graduate to India having 20,000 MW by adding 1000 MW every year."

In a joint statement, former scientists of the Bhabha Atomic Research Centre have stated, "With the country's ever increasing energy needs and with a view to ending the 33 year long nuclear isolation, the importance of the deal has to be understood by the people of India and should not be hijacked by the Opposition and the parties supporting the Government."

Sir, I would like to conclude by joining my voice with the voice of Hon'ble Prime Minister by fully endorsing what he said in para 24 of his suo moto statement in the House :

I quote :

"Our negotiators deserve credit for delivering to the nation an Agreement which can potentially transform the economic prospects of our country. It is an Agreement that will enable us to meet the twin challenge of energy security and environmental sustainability and remove the technology denial regimes that have, for decades, been a major constraint on our development. At the same time, it will bring India the recognition it deserves thanks to the outstanding achievements of our scientists in nuclear and space sciences as well as other high technology areas."

This sums up the soul and substance of the entire Agreement. I am sure that in the times to come, the House and the country will be proud of the achievement of the Hon'ble Prime Minister and his team as a result of which India is today poised to take its rightful place among the nuclear powers of the world.

With these words, I support the Indo-US Nuclear deal.

SHRI SUBRATA BOSE (BARASAT): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I thank you for giving me an opportunity to speak on the Indo-US Nuclear Deal. When you were telling me that the time available is only five minutes, my momentary reaction was that I should opt out from speaking because on an important subject like this, if one cannot express his views to a little detail, it

is, perhaps, inappropriate, but I thought once again that this, perhaps, may be interpreted as showing disrespect to the Chair and so I shall abide by your decision and speak.[\[R91\]](#)

While initiating the debate, Shri Rupchand Pal spoke at some length on why we have very strong reservations on the Indo-US Nuclear Deal. He was not speaking only on behalf of his Party, the CPI(M), but I think, he was speaking on behalf of all the Left Parties and my Party, All India Forward Block, being a constituent of the Left, certainly endorse all that is said and also endorse and support the contention made by Shri Chandrappan and Shri Tarit Baran Topdar, who spoke although very briefly on this issue.

I will only point out two points so that I can finish within the time limit set by you, Sir. Shri Scindia, while speaking on behalf of the Congress Party was mentioning about the Hyde Act saying that this is not an Indian Act. It is a law of America. Yes, normally, the laws and Acts of other countries do not affect us, but as Shri Topdar has already mentioned the reason why this Hyde Act was brought or was made in USA is because of the Indo-US Nuclear Agreement, where two countries are involved and surely the US will be influenced by the Hyde Act. If that is so, this Agreement will be in jeopardy and as Shri Rupchand Pal has said that that will in effect means that there is no guarantee in uninterrupted supply of fuel and also it does not end with that that we shall be committed to return the nuclear reactors which the US is going to send to us and also the unused fuel at that time would have to be returned.

While the Government's spokesman says that our sovereignty is not affected, I am sorry, I cannot accept that statement. I think, our freedom of action is certainly affected and that is one of the causes for our strong reservation on this Deal.

Shri Nikhil Kumar, while speaking subsequently was saying how this Deal will help the energy production. I think, he has not even read the views of the experts on this who have said that in 2020 even if the nuclear energy that we shall be able to produce will be plus-minus seven per cent only of our requirement. He was saying that this Nuclear Deal will take electrification to our villages and every village will be lit up. He does not remember the cost. Even presently, with the thermal electricity or the hydro electricity if a village is electrified, all the inhabitants are unable to bring electricity to their homes due to financial constraints. The cost of nuclear energy is bound to be even more than the thermal energy or the hydro electric energy.

I will conclude with one point, I have heard the bell, that it is correct that there is no constitutional position for getting an international agreement sanctioned by the Parliament. But we are a parliamentary democracy and I think, the Parliament must be given the honour and the sanctity that this Constitution provides.[\[r93\]](#)

I think, the Executive actions are accountable to the Parliament. Although we cannot vote on this matter, the decision of the hon. Speaker is absolutely correct. As per the present position, we cannot. I only hope that the Government will have this attitude and approach to take note of the sense of the majority of the House and refrain from executing the Agreement till the Parliament, more or less, I think, approves with amendment this international Agreement.

SHRI FRANCIS FANTHOM (NOMINATED) : Sir, The Indo-US Civilian Nuclear Agreement is one of the most important development in modern times. It is a unique and singular development that will be the vehicle that will enable the country to leap frog its aspiration to address poverty through partnership and resources to meet this challenge.

Sir, the World today is not about blocks but of mutuality and interdependence be it the nuclear program, climate change, pollution or receding non-renewable resources that the global community as a whole is involved with. What affects one directly affects all indirectly. Hence, the world community is today watching us as we take on the issues related to this debate. Are we able to address our desired goals rising above political affiliations and considerations? Do we stand by together in national interest and development considerations or cling to pull at each other like crabs to score points that reduce the efficiency of the development processes of the national as a whole?

The world knows and the common people too, that the Indo-US civilian nuclear agreement will enhance the much needed energy requirement to meet our development targets as well as generate more jobs by opening up avenues that have remained restrained due to lack of energy required.

Sir, whatsoever may be said to negate this agreement we as a country need to examine its validity in terms of the benefit it will bring to the common people and the avenues it opens up to enable the nation to fast-track its developmental goals.

Sir, this agreement may be examined on the following aspects:

Hyde Act and 123 Agreement:

We have the solemn undertaking given by our Hon. Prime Minister that the 123 agreement transactions have an effective domain that will not be influenced by the Hyde Act and an implementation domain that requires the

* The speech was laid on the Table.

American President to keep the House of Representatives informed of developments and seek appropriate approvals in their national interest. The Hon'ble Prime Minister has assured the nation that this is a routine requirement and will not affect national interest in any manner. We need to reassure the Prime Minister of our solidarity with him on this matter and the operational difficulties will not hinder the progress in implementation.

It is legitimate for supporting parties of diverse political interest to address their concerns and it is the responsibility of the leader of the coalition to provide adequate and reasoned answers and if necessary exhibit transparency in connection with the concerns expressed.

The second concern is related to the 'energy' platform. This is coupled with the Thoreum vs Uranium debate because of Thoreum reserves and the nation's technology adequacy in Thoreum utilization as an when that is possible due to time taken to convert Thoreum to Plutonium and fissionable Uranium.

There is no doubt or debate that one of the modes to meet energy requirements is the nuclear mode. Whether this should be through the U.S. Agreement mechanism or self-reliance? While there is no doubt that the autonomy route is more desirable, it needs to be appreciated that the pace at which we need to bridge the energy deficiency gap requires pragmatism coupled with realism to use the best mode that is presently on offer. The US and the Nuclear Suppliers Group within the structure of the 123 agreement with the U.S. has a platform to partially meet a solution to bridge the energy deficit. The members who oppose this agreement have not suggested or indicated any other solution platform. Therefore, their opposition lacks operation reasonableness.

As the nation needs to move ahead the Prime Minister has explored the only option presently there and we need to augment his efforts.

The third sphere deals with perceived shift in foreign policy consequent to the agreement with U.S. and the NSG. Sir, the P.M. has made it abundantly clear that presently we do not have any cooperation with nations having nuclear capability to acquire nuclear fuel or technology to integrate the country with the world community and consequent benefits.

In national interest this integration is not only desirable but necessary due to the precarious energy deficiency that the country is likely to face, in and after 2020. Far from meeting the nation's aspiration to emerge as a developed nation over the next decade, the nation will face unprecedented energy shortage.

Raising the bogey of shift in group alignment is most unreasonable. The nation has always operated in self-interest and will always continue to do so. India is a nation whose mind has never been captured or cultivated down the ages. Perception of alignment may be a delusion never a practicing reality. India has followed an independent foreign policy and will continue to do so.

Some members are of the view that this agreement will shift the nation's alignment from the socialist block towards a political alignment addressing U.S. concerns. This to me is unfounded as 'agreements' are not foreign policy statements but independently articulated intent and practices. Our concerns will continue to address global issues related to the oppressed and subjugated, those deprived of basic human freedoms and those fighting tyranny or economic exploitation; in national interest.

Some members of the House have given extremely cogent and articulated reasoning to oppose this agreement. The question that they need to address is : Who benefits most if we do not sign this agreement? Our economic and military competitors benefit the most-as they desire to readily take on what we are hesitant to align with. All our neighbours know that India with the US Civilian nuclear agreement will emerge as a major economic power in the next two decades giving the country unprecedented vigour and vitality.

The fourth issue is the bogey that the strategic nuclear programme will be hindered due to this agreement.

It is abundantly clear that the national research and development of its strategic requirements is no way connected to the civil agreement. If we are to trust our scientists the nuclear deterrent capacity is in no way being hampered due to this agreement. If at all, it will be augmented in a diversity of ways which I do not wish to speculate about at this stage as this debate is on the 'Civil' component alone.

Sir, the fifth issue is the political alignment consideration as opposed to national need to meet its development goals.

Sir, this is not a China vs. India political interest conversation. China has been a friendly nation not only sharing borders but also cultural affinity. Political ideologies do influence spheres of thrusts that different platforms enable. The urge to bring in greater ideological influence motivates a section of those opposing this agreement. I am sure that they will appreciate that 'Rastra Dharma' is the supreme cause which this august assembly addresses and no consideration of political nature should override our national concern.

Sir, I would like to thank you for allowing me to speak on this vital debate, unique, as it will alter the course of the nation's 'destiny' which the first Prime Minister Pt. Nehru pledged to the county on 15 August, 1947.

SHRI SANAT KUMAR MANDAL (JOYNAGAR): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, it is very necessary to take a wider look at the implications of this Agreement. This is only one part of the wide-ranging alliance forged with the United States. It covers political, economic, military and nuclear cooperation. It is to facilitate large-scale investment by the US and a strategic military collaboration. Apart from the sale of nuclear reactors, the US will mount pressure on India for military contracts to purchase their fighter planes and other artilleries.

The major reason being put forth is that it would help India meet its energy needs; ignoring the fact that the nuclear power would have a very limited contribution, if we compare our overall energy generation. So, making India's foreign policy and strategic autonomy hostage to the potential benefits of nuclear energy is not wise.

Outside the sphere of nuclear cooperation, the Hyde Act contains directions on India's foreign policy and other security related matters. Going ahead with the Agreement, with the existing provisions therein, will bind India to the US. It would seriously impair an independent foreign policy and our strategic autonomy.

It is the responsibility of the Government to clarify all the doubts and the implications of the Hyde Act. However, the Government is taking steps to negotiate with IAEA safeguards, which is ongoing now. But it is conditional. There should not be any accord between IAEA and the Indian Government. The draft Agreement should be brought for the consideration and approval of the Parliament on the Nuclear Deal set up.

With these words, I conclude.

SHRIMATI JHANSI LAKSHMI BOTCHA (BOBBILI): Sir, 123- agreement is a pact between India and United states on cooperation in the field of peaceful applications of Nuclear energy and Technology.

> Though the scope of cooperation covers ten aspects emphasis is on nuclear trade.

Under this agreement U.S exports nuclear reactors, fuel and other related equipment ending nuclear isolation of our country imposed on us since 1974 after the pokhran nuclear test.

Article 5 -r- (6) states that interalia "As part of the implementation of the July 18, 2005, joint statement the U.S. is committed to seeking agreement from the U.S. Congress to amend its domestic laws and to work with friends and allies to adjust the practices of the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG) to create the necessary conditions for India to obtain full access to the international fuel market, including reliable, uninterrupted and continual access to fuel supplies from firms in several nations".

Thus this agreement paves the way for resuming nuclear commerce not only with U.S but also with other NSG countries. NSG countries like Russia, Australia, have already responded enthusiastically in favor of this agreement.

To sustain our around 9% GDP growth rate, we have to make use of all options available in the energy sector.

It reduces our dependence on coal and hydrocarbon fuels and forms a part of our Prime Minister's plan of 'de-

carbonizing' economy.

This deal helps us to double our target of nuclear power production of 20,000MW by 2020 to 40,000MW. (At present it is only 4120 MW)

It doesn't in any way hamper our indigenous 3-stage nuclear power programme but only augments it.

There is a nuclear renaissance in the world in general and as our prime minister pointed out we should not be left out of this.

No way will it compromise our strategic interests. We can continue our weapons research programme.

We can classify our reactor facilities as civil and military and later are kept out of IAEA (International Atomic Energy Agency) safeguards.

Article 2 -(4) states that: The parties affirm that the purpose of this agreement is to provide for peaceful nuclear cooperation and not to affect the unsafe guarded nuclear activities of either Party. Agreement shall be implemented in a manner so as not to hinder or otherwise interfere with any other activities involving the use of nuclear material, non-nuclear material, equipment, components, information or technology and military nuclear facilities produced, acquired or developed by them independent of this agreement for their own purposes.

We are given the right to reprocess the fuel, which is very important for our 3-stage nuclear power programme. An agreement for transfer of technology on this aspect will be worked out within 18 months.

The conditions regarding termination and cessation of the agreement are also very reasonable.

One-year notice should be given followed by consultations to see whether violations have occurred if so whether the security situation warranted that.

If the violation is regarding IAEA safeguards it is IAEA board of governors and not the U.S. that decides whether the violation occurred or not.

Multi-Layered protection is provided to ensure uninterrupted fuel supply for the entire lifetime of the imported reactors even in the worst case of termination of the agreement.

Article 5-6(b-iv) states that: U.S. promises to maintain a reserve of fuel for this purpose and also work along with India to persuade the friendly countries like Russia, UK and France to restore fuel supply to India.

Though the U.S Hyde Act provides for return of nuclear reactors imported from America, in case of a violation, it is very difficult to exercise this provision, as the U.S has to pay compensation to India at the market prices.

The very fact that many politicians and analysts criticized U.S. government for entering into an agreement, which is very favorable to India, shows that our negotiators did the best job under the given circumstances.

DR. ARUN KUMAR SARMA (LAKHIMPUR): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, sir, I thank you for giving me this opportunity. First of all, I thank the hon. Prime Minister for bringing this issue to be debated in this House to get the mandate of this House.

I would like to just emphasize on one issue. Our country has been recognized as a strong nation, when we had nuclear test during the NDA regime. The world has also started recognizing India as a future economic power because of the economic reforms which were initiated by Dr. Manmohan Singh ji when he was the Finance Minister. Sir, for any development, we have to take risk.[\[r94\]](#)

19.00 hrs.

But, Sir, the risk should not be at the cost of our sovereignty because still there is a long way to go for establishing ourselves as self-reliant in some of the important sectors like energy, food and defence products.

Sir, the nuclear deal with the United States of America is not the only solution for India's energy security for future because it is very expensive and we are deficient in technology and also in fuel. It will not cover even 10 per cent of our energy requirement. There is always a risk factor when we depend on other countries for fuel.

Sir, another issue is that there is a suspicion in the mind of the common people about the role of the United States in respect of India because the United States is a country which will not take any agreement when it is not a comparative advantage for them. Sir, we would like to know what comparative advantage of the United States in this agreement is. Otherwise, if we have comparative advantage, then our country should know that. We would like to have a specific answer or clarification from the Government on this issue.

Sir, I am from a smaller State and a smaller Party, Asom Gana Parishad. I would like to know from the Government whether the benefit of this deal will go to every nook and corner of India or the benefit of this deal will go only to the privileged class or privileged areas.

When we have shown extreme urgency on signing the agreement on nuclear issue, whether we had shown enough priority to tap the solar energy, which will be the only available source of energy in India in the event of the predictions made by the Inter-Governmental Panel on Climate Change of the United Nations. About 2,500 scientists made a research and it was headed by Dr. Rajendra Pachauri who had been recently awarded the nobel prize. The important prediction of this IPCC is that there will be no hydro power in India by 2030 since all the major rivers like Brahmaputra and Ganga will dry up due to total melting of the Himalayan Glaciers and half of the world population will die due to scarcity of water and rise of sea level. Sir, in such a situation, the nuclear power will not save us. Will the hon. Prime Minister convince us as to how our country is preparing to face that situation after 23 years?

What is our agenda for alternate power and fuel except solar energy? I hope, these questions will be answered before going ahead any sorts of an agreement like the nuclear deal with the United States.

Sir, I associate with the other Members that we should change our policy that for signing an agreement with other countries on sensitive issues which concerns our sovereignty, the Government should get the mandate of the House.

I would also like to make a request that we should start shifting some of the strategic establishments which are close to the coastal areas to some other place because those places are vulnerable by 2030 as has been predicted.

Lastly, I would like to make a request, through you, Sir, that we have to invite Dr. Rajendra Pachauri to deliver a speech on the issue of global warming in a Joint Session of Parliament. It will be very good for our country, and our country should know as to what the impact of global warming will be.

With these words, I conclude my speech.

DR. SEBASTIAN PAUL (ERNAKULAM): Sir, we are having this interesting debate here, which is to gauge the sense of the House on a matter of great public importance. But I regret to note that that sense, however clearly and visibly expressed, will be of no effect as the Government is not bound by the sense expressed by Parliament. During the course of the debate, many hon. Members have expressed the that we need a Constitutional Amendment.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Dr. Paul, wait for just a second.

अगर हाउस के माननीय सदस्य चाहें, तो इसका समय डिबेट के खत्म होने तक बढ़ा दिया जाए।

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes, Sir,

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: All right. The time of the House is extended.

प्रो. विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा : कितना समय बढ़ाया है?

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : थोड़ा समय और लगेगा।

प्रो. विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा : लगभग कितना समय लगेगा?

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : लगभग आधा घंटा।

DR. SEBASTIAN PAUL : Sir, during the course of the debate, many hon. Members have expressed the view that we need a Constitutional amendment. Yes, we need a Constitutional amendment to make all international treaties and agreements entered into by the Government subject to Parliamentary approval.

In the United States, they have the Presidential form of Government. But even there, the US Congress is supreme,

the Presidential actions are subject to ratification by the US Congress. Here, we have the Parliamentary system and our Parliament is supreme. So, this Constitutional change has become absolutely necessary for making all the Governmental actions regarding international treaties and agreements subject to Parliamentary approval and control.

Sir, many hon. Members on the other side very categorically described the necessity and vital importance of entering into an agreement with the United States known as the Nuclear Deal. If it is so important, it can be done but the agreement on Civil Nuclear Cooperation with the United States can be based only on the assurances given by the hon. Prime Minister in his August 17 Statement made in Parliament and not by accepting those provisions of the Hyde Act, which are contrary to India's interests.

Sir, 123 Agreement in the present circumstances has to be perceived as a Trojan Horse for the clandestine import of dangerous provisions contained in the Hyde Act. This debate has proved to be very effective and shed light on many important points. The grave consequences to our sovereignty and autonomy posed by the Hyde Act, and 123 Agreement have been elaborated by other hon. Members. I expect the hon. Prime Minister will clear the doubts expressed by the hon. Members in this regard.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, Shir Asaduddin Owaisi. केवल तीन मिनट में अपनी बात समाप्त करिए।

श्री असादुद्दीन ओवेसी (हैदराबाद) : महोदय, जब आप चेयर पर हैं, तो कम से कम पांच मिनट का समय दीजिए।

Sir, I vividly remember my childhood images of seeing the late Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi being warmly greeted in the Non-Aligned Summit, which was held in New Delhi. I very vividly remember the speech of the late Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi, which he delivered at the Jawaharlal Centenary Memorial on 13th November, 1989 wherein he quoted Pandit Nehru by saying that 'the way shown by Jawaharlal Nehru continues to be our way for democracy, secularism, socialism and Non-Alignment, which constitutes the pillars of our nationhood.'

The Non-Aligned Movement according to Condoleezza Rice, Secretary of State, has no relevance as of now. I would like to know whether this Government has any relevance for non-alignment or not in the light of what Pandit Nehru had said, and which was quoted by the late Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi on 13th of November, 1989,.

The third point, which I would like to bring to the notice of this august House is about the Muslims' stance. Unfortunately, a canard has been spread that because of the Indo-US Nuclear Deal, the Muslims will be against it.[\[r95\]](#)

I would like to say it in a clear way that if anything is done for the nation, it is good for the Muslims also. Now, unfortunately, this canard was spread by none other than those Parties which have adopted a very hardened stance on this issue. Now, if the Government is taking a decision, for that matter if any Government is taking a decision, if it is good for the nation, then it is good for the Muslims also. We are part and parcel of this nation. My request to the Government is that they should issue a White Paper on the energy requirements of this country whether there will be nuclear energy, solar energy, thermal energy, hydel energy or non-conventional energy. What are the energy requirements in the light of huge reserves of Thorium being found in Ladakh.

With this particular agreement for 16,000 MW of energy, 150 billion is going to be spent. I am not an economist. But the Government has renowned economists sitting over there. Let them understand whether this is good economics or bad economics.

Then, there is Foreign Policy apprehension about the USA in the light of what happened in Afghanistan. Who propped up Taliban? Who supported Bin Laden? Who propped up Khmer Rouge? Who created this bogey of weapons of mass destruction which led to the killing of half a million children in Iraq? Who is responsible for the death of three million people in the US occupation of Iraq? Who is responsible for this? Why does this Government not remember the strong statement given by the then Prime Minister when the US invaded Vietnam? Have you forgotten the statement of the Prime Minister?

This is another point which I would like to bring to your notice. Is it right for the Government to be visibly pro-America? I am basing this because you have supported twice America against Iran in IAEA. Iran is a member of NPT. It has all the right to go for civilian nuclear energy. If tomorrow, if India does the same thing, the apprehension which we have is that US might say, no, you cannot do it because that is the same policy adopted towards Iran. The reason I am saying is this. Why are we participating in the West Asia Peace Conference when Hamas has not been invited? Why did this

Government not invite Ismail Haniya who was the elected President of Palestinians? So, there are so many questions that can be put over here to quantify, to corroborate what I am saying over here.

Another last point is that US has a trade deficit with all the countries of nearly 800 billion dollars. We are against this strategic partnership. We are against this paradigm shift. We are for friendly and cordial relations with the US. We want nuclear energy but not at the cost of all these things for which India stands proudly.

I am concluding, Sir. Yes, India has to take its place. We will get our place in all the countries. Without even the USA also, India is going to go there. *Inshallah*, nobody can stop it. I would like to conclude by saying that if we believe in this strategic relationship किसी शासक ने अमरीका की दोस्ती के बारे में बहुत अच्छा कहा - कि तुम जिसके दोस्त हुए दुश्मन आसमां क्यों हो।

I would like to conclude by saying that this Government should adopt this attitude that what a poet has said:

ह्यात् लेकर चलो, कायनात लेकर चलो

चलो तो सारे ज़माने को साथ लेकर चलो।

Lastly, I have one piece of advice to those Parties who have adopted such a hardened stance. You have love for the Muslims of Iraq. You have love for the Muslims of Palestine. But for God's sake, kindly have or create love for the Muslims of West Bengal in the light of Sachar Committee.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, Mr. P.C. Thomas, you only speak for four to five minutes.

श्री गणेश सिंह (सतना) : महोदय, माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी ने देश को विश्वास में लिए बगैर यह समझौता किया है। प्रधान मंत्री जी को चाहिए था कि समझौते के पूर्व संसद को तथा अपने सहयोगी दलों को विश्वास में लेना चाहिए था। 15 अगस्त, 2007 को प्रधान मंत्री जी लालकिले से देश को जब सम्बोधित कर रहे थे तब उन्होंने अमेरिका के साथ हुए परमाणु समझौते का जिक्र नहीं करने का क्या कारण था। क्या उन्हें स्वयं लग रहा था कि देश का मजबूत समर्थन इस मुद्दे में यूपीए सरकार को नहीं मिलेगा। आखिरकार समझौते में इतनी जल्दबाजी क्यों की गई यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि इतनी जल्दी का कोई महत्वपूर्ण कारण था, स्वयं प्रधानमंत्री जी अमेरिका में जा कर बिना सोचे समझे 123 स्यूट्रीय समझौता पत्र में हस्ताक्षर कर दिया।

परमाणु ऊर्जा की जरूरत के महत्व को समझा जा सकता है लेकिन देश में अभी मात्र परमाणु ऊर्जा का प्रतिशत मात्र 3 प्रतिशत है। इस समझौते के बाद 7 प्रतिशत परमाणु ऊर्जा का उत्पादन और बढ़ेगा, देश में बिजली का संकट गहराता जा रहा है। हमारे पास पानी की बिजली, सौर ऊर्जा, पवन ऊर्जा की अत्यंत संभावना है। हम विद्युत में आत्म निर्भर बन सकते हैं।

अमेरिका का इतिहास रहा है कि सुपर पॉवर बनने के लिए वह सब कुछ कर सकता है। खाड़ी देशों में तेल पर कब्जा करने के लिए अपने समझौते को स्वयं तोड़ा। आज अमेरिका उपभोग की सारी सामग्री बना रहा है, उसे हिन्दुस्तान से बढ़िया बाजार और कहीं नहीं मिल सकती, इसीलिए वह यूपीए सरकार को लॉलीपाप देकर अपने जाल में देश को फंसाना चाहता है। परमाणु ऊर्जा तो एक बहाना है।

दुनिया में हमारे देश की एक अलग पहचान है। पड़ोसी देशों का खतरा अपने ऊपर लगातार बना हुआ है। ऐसी स्थिति में अमेरिका जैसे देश से किसी भी मामले में समझौता करने से पूर्व देश की संप्रभुता पर अवश्य विचार करना चाहिए। हमारी सैन्य ताकत तथा हमारे जो परमाणु के अड्डे हैं जिनके गोपनीयता के बारे में हमें सदैव सतर्क रहने की आवश्यकता है। परमाणु परीक्षण करके पूर्व प्रधानमंत्री श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जी ने एक मजबूत उदाहरण दिया था। उससे हमारा कोई नुकसान नहीं हुआ बल्कि हमारी ताकत का दुनिया के लोगों ने एहसास किया। परन्तु, आज इस समझौते से कई तरह के संदेह पैदा हो गये हैं। अतः सरकार को इस समझौते पर पुनः समीक्षा करनी चाहिए। अमेरिका की नजर हमारे थोरियम के भंडार पर भी है ताकि वह आणविक शक्ति का अकेला मालिक बन सके।

* The speech was laid on the Table.

देश के आम आदमी का भले इस समझौते से कोई लेना देना न हो फिर भी देश के भविष्य को ध्यान में रखकर यूपीए सरकार को कार्य करना चाहिए।

मेरी मांग है कि 123 मुद्दे जो समझौते के हैं उन सभी एक एक बिन्दुओं का पूरी तरह खुलासा सरकार को करना चाहिए ताकि जो भ्रम की स्थिति है वह खत्म हो सके।

SHRI P.C. THOMAS (MUVAATTUPUZHA): Sir, I will be very, very short in my speech.

Sir, assurances have been given by the hon. Prime Minister on 29th of July, 2005, 27th February, 2006, 7th March, 2006 and also thereafter in the debate which ensued. Those assurances were to the effect that this deal would give full access to the civilian nuclear technology, lift all sanctions for not signing the NPT and not limit India's strategic nuclear

programme. But when the legislations which were drafted, which have been passed and which have come through the Committees as well as the legislative bodies in the US, we find that there have been some differences. India has to separate its civilian nuclear facilities from the military once, meaning that the separation would be purely on India's own decision. But the terms of the legislations there would tend to have serious doubts on these assurances.[\[m96\]](#)

For example, it contains some provisions which clearly deviate from this understanding and also tend to lock India's foreign policy to US requirements and subject our scientific R&D capacities and capabilities to intrusive inspections by IAEA and other American inspectors. Any displeasure to US in this regard is also a serious concern.

If the US suspends its supplies to India, what will happen? Can we take our own action? But the terms would tend to show that for any reason, it must then push for NSG and it is not that India can turn to any other vendor of her choice. It is a serious lock on our interest. It is also a matter of concern as to whether the sanctions on India on fuel processing, on enrichment of uranium, on production of heavy water would continue for equipment and technologies. The only relaxation is on non-proliferation barriers limited to nuclear fuel reactors. The real concern is that there is one clause which prohibits exports of equipments, materials or technology related to the enrichment of uranium, the reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel and production of heavy water. These are some of the serious concerns.

I would also, at this juncture, put very simple point whether the Government will be able to say at what cost can electricity or power be given for domestic use and other uses for Indians as a whole. This is also a matter to be considered while considering the expenditure which has to be incurred, which has been highlighted.

I would humbly submit that these points may also be clarified. I hope that the Government, which will very seriously look into these aspects, will see that the prime aspects of India's security as well as India's foreign policy are taken care of.

SHRI S.K. KHARVENTHAN (PALANI) : I am thanking the chair for giving me this opportunity to support the Indo-US Nuclear Deal.

Agreement of Co-operation between the Government of India and Government of the United States of America concerning peaceful uses of Nuclear energy and it is called as 123 agreement. It is for the period of 40 years. This agreement relates to the peaceful uses of Nuclear Energy by the two countries without having any linkage with non-peaceful act. Though the deal is for civil nuclear Co-operation our Government has taken all possible security situations into consideration. This agreement is a satisfactory agreement which will enable an international civilian nuclear Co-operation. Our concerns have been adequately addressed in the agreement. This agreement favours for India in 2 reasons. One it allows India to participate in Global nuclear commerce and another is that there is no bar on India's strategic Programmes.

We have to appreciate and congratulate our Honourable Prime Minister Dr. Manmohan Singh Ji for negotiating 123 agreement that is indisputably to the advantage of India's Nuclear Programme and energy sector. For the past 2 years our Government underwent number of meetings with American counterpart and finalised this agreement. Now BJP and his allies are opposing this agreement as if America is an untouchable country. During the year 2001 then Prime Minister Honourable Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee and President Bush is a joint statement and expressed the intention to Co-operate in areas of energy and space. Our Honourable Prime Minister and president Bush issued Joint statement on 18-06-2005 and the deal was progressed after number of elaborate discussions.

The Two line statement by Vajpayee and Bush in 2001 had to be converted into a full-fledged technically, politically, and legally binding 123 agreement. In the final agreement India's right to test nuclear weapons, guarantee of lifetime fuel supply and India's right to reprocess the spend fuel have all been protected.

* The speech was laid on the Table.

India has been one of the pioneering Countries in applications of nuclear Technology for power production. Amongst the 30 countries in the world that are using nuclear power India is in the lowest 27th rank. India's economic growth is at the rate of 9% in GDP but were lacking in power production. Through this Historic agreement India's power problem and shortage of uranium are solved. We are in shortage 10,000/- M. Watt Power. Through this agreement and through nuclear energy we can produce 20,000/- M. Watt by the year 2020.

Throughout country our scientists are welcoming this agreement Japan, China and may other countries have entered into similar 123 agreement with US. On any way our military nuclear facilities will not be interfered on hindered since a non-hindrance clause is inserted in the agreement. This agreement is a practical solution to meet all our requirements. This agreement is an achievement of the UPA Government led by Dr. Manmohan Singh Ji.

I am supporting and welcoming this agreement.

श्री रामदास आठवले (पंढरपुर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज हम यहां इंडो-यूएस न्यूक्लियर डील पर बहुत गंभीरता से चर्चा कर रहे हैं। ...**(व्यवधान)** मैं वामपंथी दलों का हार्दिक आभार इसलिए व्यक्त करना चाहता हूँ क्योंकि जब 13 अगस्त को डा. मनमोहन सिंह जी ने यहां इंडो-यूएस न्यूक्लियर एग्रीमेंट के बारे में निवेदन किया तब से लगातार तीन-चार महीने तक हम बहुत टैशन में थे कि पार्लियामेंट कब डिजॉल्व होगी और कब इलैक्शन होगा। लेकिन आज वामपंथी दलों ने इस पर चर्चा का मौका दिया है। हमारे सामने वाले यानी एनडीए चाहता था कि यूपीए और वामपंथियों में काफी झगड़ा हो और यह चर्चा नियम 184 के अन्तर्गत होनी चाहिए थी ताकि वोटिंग हो। ये लोग ऐसा देख रहे थे कि हमारी सरकार जाये। लेकिन मल्होत्रा जी, हम इतने कच्चे पॉलिटिशियन नहीं हैं। स्पीकर साहब ने यह चर्चा नियम 193 के अन्तर्गत ली है, इसलिए हर पार्टी को अपनी बात रखने का यहां पूरा अधिकार है। यह जो 123 एग्रीमेंट है, वह अपने देश के विकास के लिए किया गया है। जब तक पावर बढ़ती नहीं है, आपको भी मालूम है क्योंकि आप छः साल तक पावर में थे। जब आप पावर में थे तब क्या होता है, यह आपको मालूम है। इसलिए अपने देश के कल्याण के लिए पावर की आवश्यकता है, एनर्जी की आवश्यकता है, इसलिए यह एग्रीमेंट बहुत जरूरी है। आप जानते हैं कि अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जी जब 9 नवम्बर, 2001 में प्रधान मंत्री बने तब वे भी अमेरिका गये थे। पहले आपके संबंध भी अमेरिका के साथ बहुत अच्छे रहे हैं।**[MSOffice97]** अभी जब हम अच्छे सम्बन्ध बनाना चाहते हैं तो आप कहते हैं कि यह सम्बन्ध तोड़ना चाहिए, लेकिन हम अमेरिका से सम्बन्ध नहीं तोड़ सकते हैं, रशिया और चाइना के साथ हम सम्बन्ध अच्छा करना चाहते हैं, जापान के साथ अपने सम्बन्धों को आगे बढ़ाना चाहते हैं, सभी लोगों के साथ हम अपने सम्बन्धों को अच्छा बनाना चाहते हैं, लेकिन एनडीए के साथ हमारे सम्बन्ध अच्छे नहीं हो सकते हैं।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Athawale, please conclude your speech.

â€! (Interruptions)

श्री रामदास आठवले : इसलिए यह एग्रीमेंट बहुत महत्वपूर्ण है और इसलिए विपक्ष ने जो जेपीसी की मांग की थी वह ठीक नहीं थी क्योंकि उसमें ये लोग गड़बड़ी करने वाले थे। यह जो यूपीए और लेफ्ट की कमेटी बनी है, वह अच्छा काम कर रही है। यह एग्रीमेंट बहुत महत्वपूर्ण है, लेकिन सत्ताधारी पार्टी को कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के विचार को भी सुनना चाहिए क्योंकि अगर उनका सपोर्ट नहीं रहेगा तो न आपकी सरकार रहेगी, न हम रहेंगे।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The next speaker is Shri Tathagata Satpathy. I would be able to give you only two minutes to speak on this issue.

श्री रामदास आठवले : आडवाणी जी भी सदन में आ गए हैं। मैं बताना चाहता हूँ कि

डा० मनमोहन सिंह जी ने किया इण्डो-यूएस न्यूक्लियर डील,

संसद को किया जा रहा था किल,

लेफ्टिस्ट्स को हो गया था बहुत ज्यादा फील,

एनडीए वाले हो गए थे ज़ील।

इसलिए मेरा कहना है कि यह डील बहुत अच्छी है।...**(व्यवधान)**

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Nothing more should be recorded. Shri Athawale, please sit down.

(Interruptions)* â€!

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Athawale, please sit down as nothing is going on record.

â€! (Interruptions)

* Not recorded

SHRI TATHAGATA SATPATHY (DHENKANAL): Hon. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I would like to simply accept a fact that India does not need a lot of energy, and there is no doubt about it. But, unfortunately, this country never believes in perfection, and this Government is an epitome of it.

This is a situation where the so called national media and all major Parties -- this side and that side -- are in cahoots

to do what America wants to do. Therefore, we are unable to even give the countrymen an exact clear picture of what our energy needs will be 50 years hence. The Government is not able to tell the countrymen what our energy requirement will be 50 years hence. In such a situation, I do not wish to quote any expert as it is not necessary. Many hon. Members have already spoken and quoted many national and international experts. But I wish to remind the people about a thing called Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD). The US could invade and destroy a country like Iraq with a vast history, and destroy a culture without remorse under the pretext of these three letters, namely, WMD. Many countries that backed the US then have backed out of that invasion today because they have realized that it is an insane and a mad country. We have crossed all Party barriers, etc. in our quest to be loved by America, and we are falling head over heels to tell everybody that we support them, but we do not know what we support. We do not know how much power we require, and how much energy we require in the future.

With our little sense, we should ask this to ourselves. Why is a country like Germany that had 19 power plants shut down two of them, and come down to 17 power plants today? Why is France, which used nearly 87 per cent of its power from nuclear energy, planning to scale down their nuclear power plants?^[r98]

We are not able to question as to why has the US Secretary in the Department of Energy categorically stated, which is there on their website, that by 2020, all radioactive solid and liquid waste shall be cleared from the US mainland. Where will that waste go? Those wastes which will be re-processable will come to countries like India because we believe that we have to be American.

We are not investing in a simple thing. Today, the average national waste or national loss through energy transmission in India is 35 per cent. In my State of Orissa, it is 52 per cent. In developed States like Maharashtra, the average waste is 34 per cent to 35 per cent. If you ask any engineer in any State Electricity Board, he will tell you that the waste or loss at international level is three to four per cent, if we take the loss to be around ten per cent, if we can bring it down by 25 per cent, we will be able to electrify all connected villages in India by providing for 24 hours non-stop electricity. Are we willing to think of that? Are we willing to invest in that? We are not willing to invest in that. Today, in the North-East, a single State like Arunachal Pradesh has the potential to produce 65,000 megawatt of hydel energy. Are we willing to invest there? No, we are not willing to invest there.

This is a situation where we do not know where we will land ourselves, when the whole world is worried about how to dispose of radioactive waste. Earlier, they used to dump into the ocean and they used to dig deep into the earth, but they found that radioactive waste lasts for more than 700 years. When they want to clear off their mess, we are getting all their dirt.

We are all today turning into ex-World Bank employees. The media, the Parliament and the whole Government today has one mindset. Nobody is willing to oppose this move on a ground of logic, on a ground of ethics. We are all dying to be Americans. It is a shame, and the future generations of India will curse us for what we are doing to the country today.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The last speaker is Mr. Ram Kripal Yadav. You should complete your speech within two or three minutes.

श्री राम कृपाल यादव (पटना): उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज हम सदन में एक महत्वपूर्ण विषय पर चर्चा कर रहे हैं। अमेरिका के साथ हमारे देश की सरकार ने परमाणु डील देश हित में करने का निर्णय लिया है। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस विषय पर कई शंकाएं उत्पन्न हुई हैं और यह देश में एक विवाद का विषय बन गया। इस समझौते का मूल रूप से उद्देश्य यह है कि हम अपने देश में बिजली की आपूर्ति कर सकें। देश का विकास तब तक नहीं हो सकता, जब तक पर्याप्त मात्रा में बिजली नहीं आती। इसलिए इस समझौते का यही उद्देश्य है। इस समझौते को करने से पहले सरकार द्वारा यह भी देखा गया कि हमारी विदेश नीति पर कोई कुलराघात न हो। इसलिए हम देश को गिरवी नहीं रखने जा रहे हैं और न ही इसकी स्वतंत्रता पर बाह्य नियंत्रण जैसा कोई कार्य कर रहे हैं। देश में इस तरह की आशंकाएं पैदा की गईं और यह विषय देश में चर्चा का विषय बन गया।

सरकार की मंशा है कि देश में बिजली की कमी को पूरा किया जाए। हजारों गांवों में बिजली की दिक्कत है और कई कल-कारखाने भी इस वजह से बंद हो रहे हैं। अगर देश में विकास चाहिए तो वह बिना बिजली के कभी नहीं हो सकता। आम लोगों की गरीबी दूर करने के लिए, उन्हें रोजी-रोटी मुहैया कराने के लिए और कृषि के लिए भी बिजली की आवश्यकता है। देश की आजादी को 60 बरस हो गए हैं, लेकिन अब भी हम देश में बिजली की पर्याप्त आपूर्ति नहीं कर पा रहे हैं। यही मूल रूप से इस एग्रीमेंट की सोच है। इसी के तहत यह समझौता किया गया है।

इस समझौते को लेकर हमारे वामपंथी साथियों ने कुछ आशंकाएं व्यक्त करने का काम किया है। प्रतिपक्ष ने भी कई आशंकाएं व्यक्त की हैं। प्रधान मंत्री जी ने पूर्व में सदन में और बाहर भी स्पष्ट रूप से कहा है कि हम किसी के साथ ऐसा कोई समझौता नहीं करेंगे, जिससे देश हित पर आंव आए। हमारे देश का इतिहास रहा है कि हमने कभी भी देशदितों की अनदेखी करके कोई एग्रीमेंट नहीं करने का काम किया है। ^[R99]

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे विश्वास है कि माननीय प्रधानमंत्री जी जिस विश्वास के साथ इस एग्रीमेंट को आगे बढ़ा रहे हैं, वे देश के हितों की रक्षा करेंगे, जैसा

कि प्रधानमंत्री जी ने अपनी स्टेटमेंट में कहा है कि वे ऐसा कोई काम नहीं करेंगे, जिससे देश पर कोई आंच आए।...(व्यवधान) महोदय, मैं अपनी बात समाप्त कर रहा हूँ। पता नहीं क्यों आपने मुझे सबसे कम समय बोलने के लिए दिया है। हाईटेक 123 समझौते के लिए कहा गया है, यह तो अमरीका का अपना कानून है और यह हमारे देश पर लादा जाएगा, ऐसा कुछ नहीं है। निश्चित तौर पर यह बात साफ है कि अमरीका का कानून भारत पर लागू हो ही नहीं सकता है। यह नियामक आशंका है। मैं चाहूंगा कि जब प्रधानमंत्री जी भाषण दें, तो इन आशंकाओं को जरूर दूर करें।

हमारी पार्टी अमरीका के साम्राज्यवाद के पूरी तरह से खिलाफ है। हम एक बार नहीं अनेकों बार, आज की तिथि में ही नहीं भविष्य में भी अमरीका की दादागिरी और साम्राज्यवादी आतंक के विरुद्ध ही रहेंगे और हमने पूर्वर्ण भी किए हैं तथा आज भी देश के हित की रक्षा के लिए अमरीका का साम्राज्यवाद यहां नहीं चलेगा, इस विश्वास में हैं। आपकी तरह दो रंगी नीति नहीं होनी चाहिए।...(व्यवधान)

श्री उदय सिंह (पूर्णिमा) : आप अपने बारे में बात कीजिए।

श्री राम कृपाल यादव : आप हमें बोलने दीजिए। आप चिंता क्यों कर रहे हैं। दोहरी राजनीति नहीं चलेगी। जब आप सत्ता में थे, तो आप अमरीका के साथ घुटने टेक करके उनसे आशीर्वाद प्राप्त करने जाते थे। आज जब सत्ता से बाहर हैं, तो उनके खिलाफ बोल रहे हैं। आप वतीयर कट बोलिए, अगर अमरीका के खिलाफ हैं, तो हैं।...(व्यवधान) श्री आडवाणी जी ने संसद के अंदर कुछ स्टेटमेंट दी और बाहर कुछ और स्टेटमेंट दी। कभी परमाणु समझौते के पक्ष में स्टेटमेंट देते हैं और कभी परमाणु समझौते के खिलाफ स्टेटमेंट देते हैं। आप अपनी नीतियों पर स्पष्ट रहिए। देश के हितों की रक्षा के लिए यह परमाणु करार लाया गया है। वामपंथी साथियों की जो आशंकाएं हैं, उन्हें दूर किया जाएगा। आने वाले दिनों में देश के हितों की रक्षा यूपीए सरकार करेगी, प्रधानमंत्री जी करेंगे।...(व्यवधान) महोदय, मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करने जा रहा हूँ। गरीबों की रोजी रोटी के लिए यह परमाणु करार किया गया है। भारतीय जनता पार्टी तो पूर्ण रूप से अमरीका के पक्ष में है, पूरे तौर पर अमरीका के पक्ष में खड़ी है।

श्री उदय सिंह : अमरीका के पक्ष में हम हैं और समझौता आप कर रहे हैं।

श्री राम कृपाल यादव : महोदय, मैं स्पष्ट तौर पर कहना चाहता हूँ कि यूपीए की मंशा साफ है और नीतियां भी स्पष्ट रही हैं कि देश की आजादी बाद और आज की तारीख तक देश के हितों के खिलाफ कोई काम नहीं किया है।...(व्यवधान)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, nothing will go on record.

(Interruptions) â€!*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, I would request the hon. Minister to reply to the debate.

(Interruptions) â€!*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Nothing is going on record. Please sit down, Shri Ram Kripal Yadav.

(Interruptions) â€!*

प्रो. विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, जब यह बहस शुरू हुई थी, तब बहस को स्थगित किया गया और यह कहा गया कि प्रधानमंत्री जी विदेश में हैं इसलिए जब वे भारत लौट आएंगे, तब बहस की जाएगी तथा प्रधानमंत्री जी उत्तर देंगे। हम पूणब जी का बहुत सम्मान करते हैं और उनका भाषण सुनने में हमें बहुत खुशी होगी, लेकिन यह अंतर्राष्ट्रीय समझौता है और इसे प्रधानमंत्री जी ने किया है, संयुक्त वक्तव्य दिया है। अगर प्रधानमंत्री जी नहीं बोलेंगे, तो यह संसद का अपमान है, सदन का अपमान है। हम चाहेंगे कि प्रधानमंत्री जी इस विषय पर अपना वक्तव्य दें। [\[R100\]](#)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Please sit down.

â€! (Interruptions)

PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA (SOUTH DELHI): We would not like to speak. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI: I want to make the position of the Government clear. At no point of time, there was any commitment from the Government that the Prime Minister would reply. ...*(Interruptions)* Since they have no points for argumentsâ€! ...*(Interruptions)*

* Not recorded

SHRI L.K. ADVANI : In fairness to the House, in all fairness to the country, it is an important debate – after all, you have been dealing with the matter since 2005. I have great respect for hon. Pranab. He has been entrusted with the responsibility only now. You have listened to the whole debate. I do not see why you should reply to the debate. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI: Our Prime Minister has spoken four times. These talks have never been reported to Parliament. Not even once. Therefore, I would say that we made no commitment in the BAC. The Government has only said that both the Ministers would be abroad. Let them come and choose the time. ...(*Interruptions*) Today, we have selected the time only because the Leader of the Opposition was not available yesterday. ...(*Interruptions*) We would also like to make this. ...(*Interruptions*)

रेल मंत्री (श्री लालू प्रसाद) : महोदय, इनको जवाब सुनने की हिम्मत रखनी चाहिए। ...(*व्यवधान*) ये पलायन करना चाहते हैं। ...(*व्यवधान*)

प्रो. विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा : इस डिबेट का प्रधानमंत्री जी उत्तर दें। ...(*व्यवधान*) हम सदन का अपमान सहन नहीं कर सकते। अतः हम इसके विरोध में वाकआउट करते हैं। ...(*व्यवधान*)

19.32 hrs.

(At this stage, Shri L.K. Advani and some other

hon. Members left the House.)

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I would like to express my gratitude to all the hon. Members who have participated in this discussion from 2 o' clock in the afternoon till now. Twenty-nine hon. Members have made their contribution. I expected that the principal Opposition party, the Leader of the Opposition would remain to listen to the reply to the points, which he raised but after all we are living in a world where all the parliamentary norms, etiquettes and courtesies are thrown to the wind. Therefore, I am not surprised to know the behaviour of the BJP and other NDA partners are not unexpected to do this. I am a small fry. But for the first time in the history of this country, the hon. Prime Minister of the country was not allowed to speak on August 13, 2007 when at the earliest opportunity, in deference to the parliamentary customs, etiquettes and systems, he took the opportunity to explain to the House the agreed text of the 123 Agreement. I would say, in the course of my observation, I would try to cover the various points which the hon. Members have made but even the beginning has a beginning. This 123 Agreement, this discussion is practically the continuation of the discussion which should have taken place in the Monsoon Session. Shri Rupchand Pal has correctly pointed out while raising the discussion that because of the obstruction of the principal Opposition party, it could not take place. Nonetheless, I am happy that we have the opportunity to clarify a large number of issues which have been raised by the hon. Members. [\[r101\]](#)

Sir, the Prime Minister has articulated his views on this important arrangement which is proposed to be entered with the USA. First of all I would like to clarify one point which the Prime Minister also mentioned on a number of occasions. This 123 Agreement with the USA is with the completion of this process, which has three stages – one stage, an agreed text between USA and India has been worked out, which has been frozen; the second stage, to enter into an India-specific safeguard arrangements with IAEA, which is the supreme international body to supervise all matters related to international atomic energy. India is one of the founders of this body in the early 1950s and has contributed in its own way in strengthening this most important and vital regulatory body of the international atomic energy. We are neither a stranger nor a new comer to IAEA; like many other international bodies, India is one of the founders of IAEA.

The short point which I wanted to flag at the initial stage is that this agreement will provide us the passport to enter into agreement on nuclear trade with a host of other countries. The fact is that after the first explosion of 1974 and also after the second Pokhran Test in 1998, there had been sanctions.

The Leader of the Opposition, while making his observations, boasted that his Government had been able to persuade USA to remove all sanctions. Most respectfully, I would like to submit that it was not. A number of Indian entities are still not allowed to participate in many international events related to the nuclear matters. I would not use the word 'apartheid'. But the hard, cold fact is that despite having the talent, our experts, our engineers and our scientists had been denied access to many areas.

One of the Government owned organizations is included in the entity list which is a very important defence organization and some of their activities come under the scanner of USA, as per their own domestic laws. We may like it or we may not like it, but this is the reality. Therefore, an attempt was made to cross the hurdle; once we cross this hurdle, it would be possible. But for crossing this hurdle, the support of 45 countries including USA, Russia, France, China in the NSG and about 30 plus countries in the IAEA group, is needed and this is to remove the restrictions of having access to the nuclear trade, having access to the nuclear technology, to come at par and remove the constraints which are prevailing today.

A major part of the speech of the Leader of the Opposition was devoted to boasting, that they have done a great job, by having the second Pokhran test. He told the Prime Minister – that was the burden of his song – that India has sacrificed the right to test, of which he is very proud of. [\[MSOffice102\]](#) In his observations he himself stated that his Party came to power on 19th of March, 1998 and they conducted the test on 11th of May, 1998 in less than 30 days. Not even a child will believe that a nuclear test can be conducted in less than 30 days. Everything was ready.

Here I would most respectfully like to remind the hon. Members that we had a policy from day one and the policy was enunciated by no less a person than the Father of Nation Mahatma Gandhi supported by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. We are a strong believer in total nuclear disarmament. We did not sign NPT, not because we wanted nuclear weaponisation but because we considered it as a fraud treaty. It is discriminatory. It is creating nuclear haves and nuclear have nots. We did not want to participate in this discriminatory fraud Treaty where two classes of nuclear haves and nuclear have nots are created.

He lamented that he could have entered into the nuclear club if Mr. Nehru did not commit that mistake. Pandit ji did not commit any mistake. He saved the world from impending Third World War but for his policy of non-alignment, taking strong position on various international issues starting from the peace initiative in Korea to condemning the nationalisation of Suez Canal in 1956, attack on Egypt on the issue of nationalisation of Suez Canal in 1956 and preventing the total assault on Egypt through persuasive. World was saved from a catastrophe.

When in 1974 Shrimati Indira Gandhi went for the nuclear explosions, it was not for indulging in weaponisation. Those speeches were made on the floor of this and the other House. They are on record of this and the other House. She categorically mentioned: 'I wanted to have the technology. I wanted to test the competence of the Indian scientists, Indian technicians and Indian engineers'. The purpose was the peaceful use of the civilian nuclear programmes. It was not war-mongeringism.

It was taken further in the 3rd Nuclear Disarmament Conference by young Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi. He told the whole world: 'I am ready. My engineers, my scientists and my technologists are ready. We are just screw drive away from the weaponisation programme. We can do it. We can do it right now. But I want to assure the international community that I will not cross the threshold level.'

We used to have a pledge from 1974 till 1998, almost quarter of a century that we shall keep our options open. We did not fore-close the option. That was the message which Shri Rajiv Gandhi conveyed to the world community: 'I want universal, non-discriminatory, verifiable disarmament where both horizontal and vertical proliferations would be stopped and if the international community agree I will not graduate myself from the threshold level to the nuclear weapon states.'[\[R103\]](#)

That is the philosophy. Perhaps, it is beyond the comprehension of the Leader of the Opposition and his Party, that is why, he found fault with it. I cannot contradict what he said because it is unfair. Unnecessarily he has brought the name of a distinguished son of this country, the former President of India. But the fact of the matter is that Mr. Venkataraman was the Defence Minister during the Prime Ministership of Shrimati Indira Gandhi and not during the Janata Party and not even after that. Therefore, it is totally unacceptable. This is the factual position. The Leader of the Opposition could have made his homework that Mr. R. Venkataraman was the Defence Minister from 15th January, 1982 till the day he was elected as the Vice President of India in July 1984. At that point of time, the Prime Minister was Shrimati Indira Gandhi. Who will believe in this House and in the whole country that Mrs. Indira Gandhi abandoned the nuclear testing programme under pressure from the United States of America. He started by saying – which I have to contradict and the Prime Minister also had to contradict – that the USA is not interested in the energy programme. The very second sentence of the 123 Agreement starts with the energy programme.

He asked why did we not go to the Joint Parliamentary Committee. I explained it on the floor of this House itself. I explained that the Constitution was made by the mighty minds of the then India who devoted their lives to the service of this great nation. In the debates of the Constituent Assembly I found that this issue was debated and the constitutional position was made quite clear. Subsequently, the Supreme Court has also made it quite clear. I would just like to quote one judgement of the Supreme Court in the case of Union of India and another versus Azadi Bachao Andolan and another. In paragraph 18 of the judgement of case No.2004/10 SCC, the Supreme Court said:

"The power of entering into a Treaty is an inherent part of the sovereign power of the State by article 73. Subject to the provision of the Constitution, the executive power of the Union extends to the matters with respect to which Parliament has power to make laws. Our Constitution makes no provision making legislation a condition for the entry into an international treaty in times either of war or of peace."

That is the constitutional position. That is the latest interpretation of the Supreme Court of India. But any international treaty is not *ipso facto* operationalised if it requires any legislative backing. Then the appropriate legislature and in this case, the Central Parliament, will make the legislation under Entries 10 and 14 of the List I of the Seventh Schedule. It is this House itself. That is not so remote memory. In 1994, when we signed the WTO Agreement, an international treaty, and accepted the Intellectual Property Rights to execute that and to put into effect that obligation, we had to amend the Patents Act of 1973.[\[R104\]](#)

That was to provide the product patent which was not available in respect of three items, namely, pharmaceutical, agricultural and food items. That was done by making an enactment in the Parliament. Never has the hon. Prime Minister said that he will not come to Parliament. The statement which Shri Advani quoted, it clearly says so and that is why when the joint statement was issued after 18th July, 2005 we debated it in Parliament. After the Separation Plan, March 2006 we debated it in Parliament. We debated it in Parliament on 6th August, 2006 and again we debated it in Parliament in 2006 when the Hyde Act was passed and at the earliest opportunity the agreement was signed in August. I think, it was sometimes on 1st August, 2004 and the hon. Prime Minister came to Parliament on the 13th of August. My colleague, the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs assured the BAC that look on the basis of the Prime Minister's statement we will take it up on the next day. Where have we said that we do not want to carry the people with us?

Somebody from that side suggested that there should be a political consensus. The hon. Prime Minister should take the initiative. He took the initiative and to my mind, excuse me for saying this, he took extra initiative, which was perhaps not necessary, several times as soon as it was signed and the Leaders of the principal Opposition parties, and the NDA leaders were invited. What was their initial reaction? Their initial reaction was that they congratulated the negotiators and they came out and told the waiting media persons outside. After that suddenly they discovered that this agreement cannot be accepted. Shri Advani also pointed out that there will be no tests. Do you not want Programme III? Whether one wants Programme III or not is a different matter. But I myself on the floor of this House in August last stated that yes we will not hesitate to conduct the test if it is necessary for the country to have this nuclear test keeping in view our security requirement. A question was asked, what is the guarantee that we can go for test? What is the guarantee that we will have it? If one would have read the text -- it is not a very big text, there are only 17 clauses and it does not run into hundreds of pages -- then one would have found out article 5(vi) (b) assures continuous fuel supply and article 14.8 suggests that it will not affect the military programme. I am reading the first portion of the article. [\[R105\]](#)

20.00 hrs.

"The parties affirm that the purpose of this agreement is to provide for peaceful nuclear cooperation and not to affect the un-safeguarded nuclear activities of either party."

Our strategic programme is un-safeguarded. We have not given it to them. He claimed because somebody gave some interview that what he could not get from Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee, we got from the Government of Dr. Manmohan Singh. He gave an example that we gave only two reactors of existing reactors to be under safeguarded. But all future reactors were to be brought under safeguard arrangement and that was the conclusion which the NDA Government did with the USA. What did we do you will find in the text. We said that these six reactors we are giving for safeguard. In future, what the reactors will provide for safeguard, it will be decided by us and not by you. In the text of the agreement, we have one word that our military programme will not be affected. I do not know, if they do not believe the Prime Minister of India, Minister of External Affairs of India, the commitment which we have made in this language of the 123 agreement, when the Prime Minister gave assurances to our Left friends in respect of nine points which were raised. Our job was to ensure that in this 123 agreement, all these nine points are protected.

Sir, just for the recapitulation of the hon. Members, I would like to explain what are these nine points – Full Civilian Nuclear Cooperation; Principle of Reciprocity; Permanent waiver – not temporary, not annual certification; recognition of India as a State possessing advanced nuclear technology; acceptance only of IAEA safeguards not any bilateral safeguards; Safeguarding the integrity and reliability of our strategic programme; rejection of any moratorium on production of fissile material. So, like a responsible sovereign entity, we have said that we will enter into negotiations. There, our position is very clear. It must be non-discriminatory, it must be verifiable and it must be equal. Nothing short of that is acceptable to us and we will not enter into this arrangement and safeguarding our legal right to carry out a nuclear test if that is deemed to be necessary in the national interest. That means, if you want at some point of time that a test is necessary, we will do it. But I reject the concept of Shri L.K. Advani and his Party that India should not carry on universal, non-discriminatory disarmament which is our ultimate goal and even in this session of the United Nations General Assembly, we have tabled a

resolution backed by almost 27 countries and we will continue to do so.

The question was raised that why we entered into an arrangement among the UPA and Left Parties. This is not a Parliamentary Committee. This Committee is not appointed by the Prime Minister. This Committee is appointed by the Chairperson of the UPA. [a106] It does not consist only of the Members of Parliament. There are three non-parliamentarian members of that Group. This is an informal group to work out the differences between our supporters and ourselves. So, what has the Parliament to do with it? In Parliament, when we are debating it on the floor of the House, when we are discussing it, I do not have any objection if they say: "We will like to support our party." We will, of course, have to take the approval of the Congress President. I cannot decide it. But they have never expressed their intention that they will like to support the UPA. Let them change their policy. Therefore, this is absolutely an unacceptable position.

So far as safeguard is concerned, we have assured you what is the outcome of it. The outcome of it is that we are going for the India-specific safeguard arrangements. Negotiation will take time. It is a technical negotiation. In that technical negotiation, we will continue and we will like to say three important points which our Left Front repeatedly argued in our Group. When we are insisting that we will like to ensure in the India-specific safeguard arrangements with the IAEA assurance of fuel supply, right of India to have clear strategic reserves to meet the situation in the case of uninterrupted fuel supply, if it is interrupted, if there is a breakdown to meet that situation, there should be a strategic reserve for the fuel and the recognition of our strategic programme by accepting the separation plan which this Parliament is aware of, which has been placed on the Table of this Parliament and which the United States Administration has accepted.

Now, I understand there is an issue about the Hyde Act. If you want to interpret everything with the Hyde Act, I cannot help it. Nobody can help it. The Hyde Act, as Shri Tarit Baran Topdar has correctly pointed out, is a legislation enabling the US Administration, the US President to have a waiver to enter into a civilian nuclear programme with India, which is a non-NPT country, which is a nuclear-weapon country not recognised but a nuclear weapon-country which is having strategic programmes. As per the 1954 Act, the USA cannot cooperate with that country. Therefore, in that Act, they require a waiver. That waiver has been provided by the Hyde Act. While providing the Hyde Act, one thing has been pointed out. Who is to interpret the Hyde Act? I have myself stated that there are many prescriptive and extraneous issues in the Hyde Act which are not binding on us. How can it be binding on us? As a law passed by the Indian Parliament is not binding the US Congressmen, similarly a law passed by the US Congressmen may be binding on the US Administration but not on India. The only binding agreement on India is the 123 Agreement. I will most respectfully submit to the hon. Members to show me one clause. Yes, I know that somebody will get up and say that the question of the national law is there. Yes, that is the standard practice of all international agreements. It is equally true that in Clause 14, there are references to the Vienna Convention and references to the international laws in case of disputes. That was the mandate which we gave to the negotiators to enter into negotiation with their American interlocutors. We told them quite clearly, I myself at one point of time when I had to intervene, told: "Look, this is unacceptable." [R107]

I told them that the nine points which the Prime Minister specifically referred on the floor of Parliament and gave his commitment are to be preserved in the text and there will be no reference to the Hyde Act. Most respectfully, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, sir, I can claim that we have done it. What did President Bush say? He is the Chief Executive of America? How is he interpreting the Hyde Act? Mr. Advani is depending on the interpretation of some Under Secretary – I would not mention his name – but I am quoting from the statement of the President of the United States of America, not the statement of any Under Secretary. I do not make any reflection on the Under Secretary or their officers. But the Chief Executive of the United States of America said:

"Today I have signed into law HR 5682, an Act containing Henry J. Hyde US-India Peaceful Atomic Energy Cooperation Act of 2006. The Act will strengthen the strategic relationship between the United States and India and deliver valuable benefits to both nations. Section 103 of the Act purports to establish US policy with respect to various international affairs matters. My approval of the Act does not constitute my adoption of the statement of policy as US foreign policy. Given the Constitution's commitment to the Presidency of the authority to conduct the nation's foreign affairs, the executive branch shall construe such policy statements as advices."

This is the comment of the President of the United States of America and my young friend Mr. Jyodiraditya Scindia very aptly explained it while participating in the debate.

So, my most respectful submission would be that we are accepting the obligations under Section 123 of the US Atomic Energy Act of 1954, not under the Hyde Act. The Hyde Act is an enabling provision. That is for the US Administration to deal with it and they have assured us that it would not stand in their way of implementing the

commitment which they made in the Joint Statement of July, 2005 and in the Separation Plan of March, 2006. Therefore, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I would like to, most respectfully, submit that let us look into the 123 Agreement.

I am not going into the larger aspects of foreign policy debate, but I would like to emphasize a couple of points. Much has been said about the voting in the International Atomic Energy Commission Board. I think we have explained about it several times here. There had been two occasions where we did it and we explained why we did it. It was because at that point of time we were given to understand that if we accept the amendment of the European countries, then the matter will be within the Board of IAEA and it will not be referred to the UN Security Council because if it is referred to the UN Security Council, then they will issue sanction as they have issued two sanctions on Iran. But in the last one in February, 2006, the position and the voting pattern which we had was that a large number of countries including the Non-Aligned countries like Russia and China and we were together. In my intervention in the conference of 45 countries of Europe and Russia, while stating India's position on Iran when I was asked to state our position, I made it quite clear that Iran is an old civilized country and a very proud nation.[\[R108\]](#)

[\[r109\]](#)I do not feel that issuing sanction after sanction is going to resolve the problem. Iran will have to be engaged in the dialogue process and the most appropriate forum is IAEA. The latest voting which has taken place there – no voting, where it has been again decided -- along with China, Russia, Malaysia and large number of other countries, non-aligned countries, we have decided that yes, diplomacy is to be given a chance. This is a complicated issue. It will take time.

Why should we be scared of any country? Yes, we have strategic relationship. What is wrong with it? Most respectfully I would like to submit that it is not alone USA, I have strategic relationship with Russia, with China, with Indonesia, with Japan, with Singapore, with France, with Germany, with European Union. I have strategic relationship with ten countries.

MD. SALIM (CALCUTTA – NORTH EAST): All encompassing!

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: No, not all encompassing. It is depending on the nature of relationship which we want to have. There has been substantial improvement in the relationship with China.

During the visit of Chairperson of UPA, the type of warmth she felt at the top most premiership of People's Republic of China is envy of anybody, any world's statesman and that is the meeting of her after the election. She was the first person from outside to visit People's Republic of China. In a short span of last nine months, I had four interactions with the Chinese Foreign Minister and the Prime Minister's visit is to come very shortly.

I have no doubt that in between they are saying the discussions which we had with President Hu Jintao at Heiligendamm at the margin of G-8 and G-5 countries and with Premier Wen Jiabao in Singapore speaks of the best relationship between our two countries. It is not possible for me to disclose everything what transpired between Premier of China and our Prime Minister. But I am quite confident that so many people are saying so many things about their cooperation even in the area of civilian nuclear programme. I am quite confident that if we cross the hurdles which we are having we will be able to have that.

Questions have been raised why Prime Minister did not sign the agreement with Russia. We have explained it. He explained it when the occasion arose and the reason was very simple. We are waiting, because after all these arrangements are to be made and to be operationalised; and for operationalisation, we shall have to go with IAEA India-specific Agreement. We will have to arrange the NSG guidelines and when we are in this process, Memorandum of Understanding with Russia about four reactors and Kudankulam and as soon as the process is ready, we will be able to enter into that agreement. That is the reason I was saying that this is some sort of a passport. Once I have the international passport visiting all countries, I have the option to choose which country I will visit. It is not necessary that I may take passport in the name of visiting one country, but it is not necessary that I shall confine myself only to that.[\[r110\]](#)

It will be open. Surely, we want interaction. Lot of violations etc. has been called. The initiator of the discussion, Rup Chand *babu*, said that it is only 15 per cent of the world energy requirement. It is correct. Today I have 1,28,000 megawatt power generation capacity; nuclear energy is only 3,900 megawatt. We are not talking of today; we have to talk of future.

Today our import of oil is 100 million tonnes. If we are importing these 100 million tonnes at the cost of \$ 100 per barrel, and if the entire thing was passed on to the consumer, one can easily understand what could have been the cost of energy. But simply because it is absorbed by somebody in the form of subsidy does not mean that the cost of the energy is

getting less here. Coking coal also we are importing. It is not that we are just depending on them. The Prime Minister has emphasized that we want energy; we want access to the technology on thorium, the three-tier. Even in the text of the Agreement itself, you will find that our three-staged civil and nuclear programme, which was the dream child of Homi Bhabha, the architect of Indian nuclear programme, has not been diluted at all. If we have just thorium; I am told by some reports that I have received where I find on plutonium the experts are telling that the nuclear power generation capacity can be raised from 10,000 megawatt to around 500 thousand megawatt exclusively using the contents from spent fuel discharged from PHWRs following the Plutonium 239, Uranium 238, fuel cycle in FBIs. Surely, it is not of today. It is of tomorrow. But we shall have to think of tomorrow.

Mr. Rajiv Gandhi thought in the mid-eighties of the revolution in Information Technology. Many of us did not believe in it. Today, India is on the top of Information Technology (IT). Many of us opposed computerization. Today, we are going for that.

श्री बालू प्रसाद : हमने भी किया था।

श्री प्रणव मुखर्जी : आप तो अभी मदद कर रहे हैं। ... (व्यवधान)

Therefore, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I would not like to take more of your time. I have covered some areas. Yes, there will be discussions; we are having discussions. As I mentioned, we have a mechanism with the Left, UPA. Lalu ji, Sharad ji, and Baalu ji are the Members there; I am also there. We are discussing among ourselves and we are trying to resolve it. The Leader of the Opposition has assured us, and it has been echoed by some of his followers, that if they have the mandate they will renegotiate it.

I will just conclude my observations by narrating one incident. It happened not in this House but it happened in the other House. I was a Member of that House at that point of time. It is being told today that sovereignty has been mortgaged. Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, fortunately or unfortunately, whatever it may be, I am in the Government of several Congress Prime Ministers from the seventies. At least, I have been accused not less than three times of mortgaging India's sovereignty. Once I mortgaged India's 'sovereignty' when I entered into an extended funding facility with IMF by borrowing five billion SDRs! [r111] When we returned the last installment of 1.2 billion SDRs, I told in one of my speech: "Many of you told me, like self-styled Cassandra prophecy that I will come out of the IMF building on a stretcher. I have come out of the IMF building with my head on my shoulder and on my foot, and not on the stretcher."

Similarly, again when we signed the WTO Agreement, they said that 'sovereignty' had been mortgaged and it went to such an extent. I can understand that. The Left opposed then and the Left opposed now.

Now, as I mentioned, the Indian Patent Act, 1973 was to be amended as per the International Agreement of IPR. Twice that Bill was rejected in the Rajya Sabha under the command of a great Member of the BJP who later on became the Minister in the NDA regime. ... (Interruptions) I will not take the name of the Member of the other House. But the funny part is this. After some time when the table was turned, when they were in the Government, twice India lost in the international dispute settlement mechanism of WTO. Then, the same Party came to us – I was sitting in the Opposition and Dr. Sahib was the Leader of the Opposition – and said: "If you support, we will like to amend the Indian Patent Act." It was sometime in 2000. I talked to the Congress President. She said: "If you consider that the Bill is good and in the national interest, simply by accident of changing the seat need not necessarily change the policy." So, with our support, the Bill was passed, and the only change was made. The Member-in-charge of the 1994 Bill was Pranab Mukherjee as the Commerce Minister and in 2000 the Member-in-charge was Shri Murasoli Maran, and except the year no further change was brought, which was rejected by them, and they had to plead to the Congress Party to support the Bill. Therefore, let us not be... (Interruptions)

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI: That is why they left the House without listening your speech. ... (Interruptions)

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Therefore, let us not be carried by the emotions. Yes, let us calculate, let us debate, let us discuss and let us try to find out how the issues could be resolved.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, as the hon. Prime Minister has assured the hon. Members umpteen number of times, I would like to submit most respectfully that the process is not yet complete. Whenever any major step in the process had been taken, we came to Parliament. After the Joint Statement, we came to Parliament. After the Separation Plan we came to Parliament. Again we came to Parliament. After the Hyde Act we came to Parliament. After agreeing the Agreed Text on freezing it, we have come to Parliament. Again we will come to Parliament.

With these words, I thank you, Sir, for giving me this opportunity.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : Sir, I had made several important points but the hon. External Affairs Minister has not covered them in his elaborate reply. One is about the relationship between 123 Agreement and the Hyde Act. There are public comments by important USA administrative people about the relationship. I am not going into that. I want to know whether the 123 Agreement will override the Hyde Act or the Hyde Act will override the 123 Agreement while making a reference to the international practice and all these things.

I had asked whether the fast breeder reactors are also being put under safeguards. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: The answer is 'no'. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : Okay. Now, our Indian negotiator is in the process of negotiating about India's requirement, that is, India's specific safeguard. I would like to know whether the Government has anything in mind as to what may be the requirement because this is a grey area. In re-processing, there is a notional idea given and nothing concrete. I would like to know how India is going to be benefited.

We find that they are telling that these are the benefits, namely, jobs would be created, their ailing nuclear industry would be rejuvenated, they would have something of a new architecture in Asia and all these things. But what is the benefit that we are going to derive has not been clearly stated in the long reply of the hon. Minister.

Then, things in regard to selective transfer of technology, in regard to nuclear reactor, and in regard to dual use have not been cleared by the hon. Minister of External Affairs. Similarly, about the energy mix, whether the nuclear energy at any point of time is going to help us in a big way ignoring our coal sector, ignoring our hydel sector, ignoring our renewable energy sector!

Sir, I am really disappointed that the hon. Minister did not cover all these important points.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Most respectfully, I would like to submit that if the hon. Member was a little careful, I mentioned about what I require from the IAEA. I mentioned three specific areas. It is not for the first time that India is going to have a safeguard arrangement with the IAEA. Whenever we buy a reactor from outside, we have to make it with the IAEA. There is a standard format. But what is India specific? About the India specific, I referred to these three areas in details. They are assurance of the fuel supply, right to create the strategic fuel reserves, and recognition of the separation plan, in other words, recognition of the strategic programmes. We should expect to have them. For that, the negotiations are going on. These are highly technical details, which are being worked out by the experts. I am not an expert. I am a layman like you. Therefore, here, we are normally guided by them. We are quite confident that they will protect our interests.

So far as the energy mix is concerned, I started my observations by saying that we are not looking at only today, we are also looking at tomorrow. Now, everybody is talking about the climate change. We cannot keep it under the carpet. About the cost of the technology, which the Prime Minister is meeting, and which will be again strongly advocated in the Bali Conference that as the developing countries cannot sacrifice their development, therefore, they will have to be compensated by giving adequate access to the clean energy technology at an affordable cost. The whole world, especially the advanced countries are looking at the markets of China and India. I think, they have made some calculations that 50 per cent of a few trillions dollar worth trade will be only between our two countries.

Therefore, these are the areas, where we are concentrating on, and the Planning Commission is working on it.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA : Sir, taking into account the views expressed by the majority of this House, I want a categorical assurance from the hon. Prime Minister that the Government will not proceed further. This should be treated as a sense of the House. I want this assurance from the hon. Prime Minister.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Most respectfully, I would like to submit that I started my observations by saying that the debate, which could not take place in the Monsoon Session is now taking place. It is just a small step towards the process. Unless the process is complete, where is the question of taking the sense of the House? Let the process be completed. I also assured that at the end of every stage, I will come to the Parliament and I will discuss with you.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Thank you. The House stands adjourned to meet again tomorrow, that is, 29th November, 2007 at 11 a.m.

20.34 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock
on [\[r112\]](#) November 29, 2007/Agrahayana 8, 1929(Saka).

Fd. by b1 [\[r1\]](#)

cd. by c1 [\[h2\]](#)

Three pages of written answer to be inserted here [\[r3\]](#)

Contd by d1.e [\[r4\]](#)

Fd. By e1 [\[m6\]](#)

[\[R6\]](#) fld. by f1.h

q.182 cd. [\[R7\]](#)

Q 183 cd.. & cd.. by g1 [\[r8\]](#)

Dr. Anbumani ramadoss - Cd [\[r9\]](#)

[\[r10\]](#)G3/G4: written reply to the question

Fd by h1.e [\[r11\]](#)

Fd by j1.e [\[r12\]](#)

[\[KMR13\]](#)Two pages

K1 cd [\[r14\]](#)

cd by l1.e

[\[r15\]](#)

[\[MSOffice16\]](#)Fld M

[\[R17\]](#)fd

cd. by o

[\[s18\]](#)

V k malhotra cd

[\[h19\]](#)

[\[R20\]](#)Fld by p1.e

Fd. By q [\[MSOffice21\]](#)

[\[MSOffice22\]](#)cd. by r1

[\[p23\]](#)Fld by u1

[\[r24\]](#)fld by w

cd. by x1 [\[r25\]](#)

Shri K.S. Rao – cd. [\[h26\]](#)

cd. by y1 [\[h27\]](#)

Contd by z1.e

Ctd by a2

[\[s30\]](#)contd by B2

cd.. by c2 [\[r31\]](#)

Cd by d2.e [\[r32\]](#)

Ctd by e2

[\[r33\]](#)

cd. by f2

[\[s34\]](#)

[\[h35\]](#)Fd by g2

cd. by 'h2' [\[R36\]](#)

cd. by j2 [\[R37\]](#)

cd. by l2 [\[MSOffice38\]](#)

cd. b [\[a39\]](#)y m2.e

Cd by n2 [\[R40\]](#)

[\[R41\]](#)(Cd. by o2)

[\[r42\]](#)pal ctd

cd. [\[r43\]](#)by q2

[\[h44\]](#)

cd. by r2 [\[h45\]](#)

By s2.e

Ctd. By t2 [\[m47\]](#)

[\[s48\]](#)contd by U2

cd.. by w2 [\[r49\]](#)

Fd by x2.e [\[r50\]](#)

Cd by y2.e [\[r51\]](#)

Cd by z2 [\[KMF52\]](#)

Cd by a3 [\[r53\]](#)

[\[MSOffice54\]](#)cd B3

cd. by d3 [\[R55\]](#)

Contd. By e3.e [\[R56\]](#)

cd. by f3 [\[MSOffice57\]](#)

cd. by g3 [\[R58\]](#)

Cd by h3.h [\[R59\]](#)

Cd by k3 [\[r60\]](#)

(cd. by l3) [\[b61\]](#)

[\[s62\]](#)cd. by n3

Cd by o3

[\[h63\]](#)

[\[rep64\]](#)P3cd

cd.. by q3

Cd by r3.e

K venkatapathy cd [\[KMR67\]](#)

Cont by s3.h [\[p68\]](#)

[\[N69\]](#)Cd by t3

Fd by u3 [\[MSOffice70\]](#)

cd. by 'w3' [\[R71\]](#)

cd. by x3 [\[R72\]](#)

Contd. By y3.e [\[R73\]](#)

cd. by z3 [\[MSOffice74\]](#)

Cd by a4 [\[r75\]](#)

Cd by b4 [\[R76\]](#)

[\[r77\]](#)ctd by d4

[\[r78\]](#)cd. by e4

cd. by f4 [\[h79\]](#)

[\[r80\]](#)(Cd.by g4)

[\[s81\]](#)contd by G4

cd.. by k4 [\[r82\]](#)

[\[r83\]](#)Cd by l4.e

Cd by n4 [\[r84\]](#)

[\[MSOffice85\]](#)Cd O4

Cd by p4 [\[a86\]](#)

Cd by q4 [\[r87\]](#)

(cd. by r4) [\[b88\]](#)

cd. by s4.e [\[a89\]](#)

Cd by t4 [\[R90\]](#)

[\[R91\]](#)(Cd. by u4)

[\[r92\]](#)bose ctd

[\[r93\]](#)ctd by w

cd. by x4 [\[r94\]](#)

Contd by z4.e [\[r95\]](#)

Ctd. By a5 [\[m96\]](#)

Cd by b5 [\[MSOffice97\]](#)

cd.. by c5 [\[r98\]](#)

cd. by d5 [\[R99\]](#)

[\[R100\]](#)fld by e5

Cd by f5 [\[r101\]](#)

Cd g5 [\[MSOffice102\]](#)

cd. by 'h5' [\[R103\]](#)

cd. by j5 [\[R104\]](#)

Contd. By k5.e [\[R105\]](#)

cd. by l5.e [\[a106\]](#)

Cd by m5 [\[R107\]](#)

[\[R108\]](#)(Cd. by n5)

[\[r109\]](#)pranab ctd

[\[r110\]](#)ctd by o5

cd. by p5 [\[r111\]](#)

[\[r112\]](#) Friday, March 10, 2000/Phalguna 20, 1921 (Saka).