

LOK SABHA DEBATES

(English Version)

Seventh Session
(Fourteenth Lok Sabha)



(Vol. XVIII contains Nos. 11 to 20)

Gazettes & Debates Unit
Parliament Library Building
Room No. P-025
Block 'G'

Acc. No.....

Dated.....

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

Price : Rs. 80.00

EDITORIAL BOARD

P.D.T. Achary
Secretary-General
Lok Sabha

P.K. Grover
Joint Secretary

Kiran Sahni
Principal Chief Editor

Hamam Dass Takker
Chief Editor

Parmesh Kumar Sharma
Senior Editor

Ajit Singh Yadav
Editor

[ORIGINAL ENGLISH PROCEEDINGS INCLUDED IN ENGLISH VERSION AND ORIGINAL HINDI PROCEEDINGS INCLUDED IN HINDI VERSION WILL BE TREATED AS AUTHORITATIVE AND NOT THE TRANSLATION THEREOF.]

CONTENTS

[Fourteenth Series, Vol. XVIII, Seventh Session, 2006/1927 (Saka)]

No. 18, Saturday, March 11, 2006/Phalgun 20, 1927 (Saka)

SUBJECT	COLUMNS
PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE	1-4, 8-9
BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE	5-7, 149-150
MOTION RE: TWENTY-FOURTH REPORT OF BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE	7-8
MOTION RE: SUSPENSION OF RULE 331G	16-17
OBSERVATION BY THE SPEAKER	17
RAILWAY BUDGET, 2006-2007	
DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (RAILWAYS) 2006-07	18-20
CUT MOTIONS	19-55
APPROPRIATION (RAILWAYS) NO. 3 BILL	55-56
Motion to Consider	55
Shri Lalu Prasad	55
Clauses 2, 3 and 1	56
Motion to Pass	56
DISCUSSION UNDER RULE 193	
Civil Nuclear Energy Cooperation with the United States	57-147
Shri C.K. Chandrappan	57-65
Shri Kharabela Swain	65-75
Shri Kapil Sibal	76-86
Shri Rupchand Pal	86-95
Shri Ravi Prakash Verma	95-99
Shri Devendra Prasad Yadav	99-105
Shri Braja Kishore Tripathy	105-109
Shri Uday Singh	109-114
Shri Nikhil Kumar	114-119
Ms. Mehbooba Mufti	119-121
Shri Tapir Gao	121-122
Shri Vijayendra Pal Singh	122-124
Shri Anand Sharma	124-129
Shri B. Mahtab	129-130
Shrimati Tejaswini Seeramesh	130-133
Shri Francis Fanthome	133-134
Md. Salim	134-138
Dr. Manmohan Singh	139-147

OFFICERS OF LOK SABHA

THE SPEAKER

Shri Somnath Chatterjee

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER

Shri Charanjit Singh Atwal

PANEL OF CHAIRMEN

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal

Shri Giridhar Gamang

Shrimati Sumitra Mahajan

Shri Ajay Maken

Dr. Laxminarayan Pandey

Shri Balasaheb Vikhe Patil

Shri Varkala Radhakrishnan

Shri Arjun Sethi

Lt. Col. (Retd.) Manabendra Shah

Shri Devendra Prasad Yadav

SECRETARY GENERAL

Shri P.D.T. Achary

LOK SABHA DEBATES

LOK SABHA

Saturday, March 11, 2006/Phalgun 20, 1927 (Saka)

The Lok Sabha met at Eleven of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: Papers to be laid on the Table. Item No. 1.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI): Sir, on behalf of Shri Arjun Singh, I beg to lay on the table—

- (1) A copy of the Detailed Demands for Grants (Hindi and English versions) of the Ministry of Human Resource Development for the year 2006-2007.

[Placed in Library, *See* No. LT 3856/06]

- (2) A copy of the Outcome Budget (Hindi and English versions) of the Department of Elementary Education and Literacy, Ministry of Human Resource Development for the year 2006-2007.

[Placed in Library, *See* No. LT 3857/06]

- (3) A copy of the Outcome Budget (Hindi and English versions) of the Department of Secondary and Higher Education, Ministry of Human Resource Development for the year 2006-2007.

[Placed in Library, *See* No. LT 3858/06]

- (4) A copy of the Performance Budget (Hindi and English versions) of the Department of Elementary Education and Literacy, Ministry of Human Resource Development for the year 2005-2006.

[Placed in Library, *See* No. LT 3859/06]

- (5) A copy of the Performance Budget (Hindi and English versions) of the Department of Secondary and Higher Education, Ministry of Human Resource Development for the year 2005-2006.

[Placed in Library, *See* No. LT 3860/06]

MR. SPEAKER: You know that there is no hour called 'Zero Hour'. It is an hour after the 'Question Hour'. Item No. 2, Dr. Akhilesh Prasad Singh.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS, FOOD AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION (DR. AKHILESH PRASAD SINGH): On behalf of Shri Sharad Pawar, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Detailed Demands for Grants (Hindi and English versions) of the Ministry of Consumer Affairs, Food and Public Distribution for the year 2006-2007.

[Placed in Library, *See* No. LT 3861/06]

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI S.S. PALANIMANICKAM): On behalf of Shri P. Chidambaram, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Detailed Demands for Grants (Hindi and English versions) of the Ministry of Finance for the year 2006-2007.

[Placed in Library, *See* No. LT 3862/06]

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE (SHRIMATI PANABAKA LAKSHMI): On behalf of Shri Mahavir Prasad, I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following Detailed Demands for Grants (Hindi and English versions):—

- (1) Ministry of Small Scale Industries for the year 2006-2007.

[Placed in Library, *See* No. LT 3863/06]

- (2) Ministry of Agro and Rural Industries for the year 2006-2007.

[Placed in Library, *See* No. LT 3864/06]

THE MINISTER OF TRIBAL AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF DEVELOPMENT OF NORTH EASTERN REGION (SHRI P.R. KYNDIAH): I beg to lay on the

Table a copy of the Detailed Demands for Grants (Hindi and English versions) of the Ministry of Development of North Eastern Region for the year 2006-2007.

[Placed in Library, *See* No. LT 3865/06]

THE MINISTER OF SHIPPING, ROAD TRANSPORT AND HIGHWAYS (SHRI T.R. BAALU): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Detailed Demands for Grants (Hindi and English versions) of the Ministry of Shipping, Road Transport and Highways for the year 2006-2007.

[Placed in Library, *See* No. LT 3866/06]

THE MINISTER OF WATER RESOURCES (PROF. SAIFUDDIN SOZ): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Detailed Demands for Grants (Hindi and English versions) of the Ministry of Water Resources for the year 2006-2007.

[Placed in Library, *See* No. LT 3867/06]

[Translation]

THE MINISTER OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT (DR. RAGHUVANSH PRASAD SINGH): Sir I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Detailed Demands for Grants (Hindi and English versions) of the Ministry of Rural Development for the year 2006-2007.

[Placed in Library, *See* No. LT 3868/06]

[English]

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Detailed Demands for Grants (Hindi and English versions) of the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting for the year 2006-2007.

[Placed in Library, *See* No. LT 3869/06]

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE (SHRIMATI PANABAKA LAKSHMI): On behalf of Dr. Anbumani Ramadoss, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Detailed Demands for Grants (Hindi and English versions) of the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare for the year 2006-2007.

[Placed in Library, *See* No. LT 3870/06]

THE MINISTER OF COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI PREM CHAND GUPTA): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Detailed Demands for Grants (Hindi and English versions) of the Ministry of Company Affairs for the year 2006-2007.

[Placed in Library, *See* No. LT 3871/06]

MR. SPEAKER: Item 12, Shrimati Renuka Chowdhury—not present.

Item 13, Shrimati Panabaka Lakshmi.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE (SHRIMATI PANABAKA LAKSHMI): I beg to lay on the Table—

- (1)
 - (i) A copy of the Annual Report (Hindi and English versions) of the Cancer Institute, Chennai, for the year 2004-2005, alongwith Audited Accounts.
 - (ii) A copy of the Review (Hindi and English versions) by the Government of the working of the Cancer Institute, Chennai, for the year 2004-2005.
- (2) Statement (Hindi and English versions) showing reasons for delay in laying the papers mentioned at (1) above.

[Placed in Library, *See* No. LT 3875/06]

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI): On behalf of Shri M.V. Rajasekharan, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Detailed Demands for Grants (Hindi and English versions) of the Ministry of Planning for the year 2006-2007.

[Placed in Library, *See* No. LT 3876/06]

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Members, this year, because of the reasons you know, our Session has been now rescheduled. I would request all the hon. Chairmen of different Standing Committees to please study usually as you do, scrutinise the Demands for Grants. I am sure, you will take the trouble of holding meetings and submitting the Reports. I expect that will be done; may

not be discussed further but I am sure all the hon. Chairmen will kindly arrange for scrutiny and submission of Reports.

[Translation]

PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA (South Delhi): Mr. Speaker, Sir, along with the study of the report, discussion should also be held on the specific points of the report and it should be introduced as

[English]

Demands for Grants will be passed here. There is no idea of ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: We are discussing the Demands for Grants of three Ministries.

PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA: They should meet and discuss. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Certainly. As you know, I have directed that every Minister has to give responses on the Committee's Reports. I am sure, all the hon. Chairmen will kindly take the trouble and I am sure of their full cooperation.

11.05 hrs.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI): Sir, with your permission I rise to announce that Government Business during the week commencing Monday, the 13th of March, 2006 will consist of:—

1. Consideration of any item of Government Business carried over from today's Order Paper.
2. Discussion and voting on the Demands for Grants for 2006-07 under the control of the Ministry of:—
 - (a) Home Affairs
 - (b) Agriculture
 - (c) Rural Development
3. Submission to the vote of the House outstanding Demands for Grants in respect of Budget

(General) for 2006-07 at 6.00 p.m. on Friday, the 17th of March, 2006.

4. Introduction, consideration and passing of the Appropriation (No. 3) Bill, 2006.
5. Consideration and passing of the Finance Bill, 2006.

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Avinash Rai Khanna—not present.

Shri Dhirendra Agarwal—not present.

Shri Mansukhbhai D. Vasava—not present.

Shri Tukaram Ganpat Rao Renge Patil—not present.

Dr. (Col.) D.R. Shandil

DR. COL. (RETD.) DHANI RAM SHANDIL (Shimla): Sir, the following subjects may be included in the next week's List of Business:

1. Apple Crop in the State of Himachal is prone to various types of diseases and the vagaries of weather like hailstorm, drought etc. It should be covered under the National Crop Insurance under the Agricultural Policy of the Union Government.
2. The existing State Highway roads between Nahan—Kumharhatti; and Nalagarh—Shimla should be upgraded and brought at par with the National Highway Standards, in the larger public interest as also due to strategic reasons.

SHRI VARKALA RADHAKRISHNAN (Chirayinkil): Sir, the following items may be included in the next week's Agenda:

1. The long-standing demand of the Kerala Legislative Assembly to establish a bench of Kerala High Court at Trivandrum, the State capital is not implemented so far. This matter may be discussed.
2. The demand of the Kerala Government to raise the century old Engineering College at Trivandrum as a Centre for Excellence and the same should be converted as IIT. This matter may be discussed.

[Translation]

SHRI HARIKEWAL PRASAD (Salempur): Sir, following items of public interest may be included in the next week's agenda:

- (1) Providing stoppage of Durg Express train at Belthara road and Salempur railway stations and of Varanasi-Gorakhpur inter-city train at Kokidihirapur station.
- (2) Beautification of Bhatparrani railway station under the North Eastern Railway.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Prof. Mahadeorao Shiwankar—not present.

Dr. Karan Singh Yadav.

DR. KARAN SINGH YADAV (Alwar): Sir, the following topics may kindly be included in the next week's List of Business.

1. To discuss the need to make a mandatory provision to include a member from OBC in all Selection Committees like UPSC and State Services Commissions.
2. To discuss the need to constitute a Parliamentary Committee to look after the welfare of OBC affairs.

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Sunil Kumar Mahato—not present.

11.08 hrs.

MOTION RE: TWENTY-FOURTH REPORT OF BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

[English]

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI): Sir, with your permission I beg to move the following:—

"That this House do agree with the Twenty-fourth Report of the Business Advisory Committee presented to the House on the 10th March, 2006."

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That this House do agree with the Twenty-fourth Report of the Business Advisory Committee presented to the House on the 10th March, 2006."

The motion was adopted.

11.09 hrs.

PAPER LAID ON THE TABLE—contd.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Now, Shrimati Renuka Chowdhury.

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF WOMEN AND CHILD DEVELOPMENT (SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table.
...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: You have to preface it with your apology. You have to apologize first.

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: Sir, I do apologize. I have also given it in writing.

MR. SPEAKER: Writing would not do. It will have to be on the record as well.

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: Yes, Sir. I sincerely apologize for having come late.

I beg to lay on the Table—

- (1) A copy of the Detailed Demands for Grants (Hindi and English versions) of the Ministry of Women and Child Development for the year 2006-2007.

[Placed in Library, *See* No. LT 3872/06]

- (2) A copy of the Outcome Budget (Hindi and English versions) of the Ministry of Women and Child Development for the year 2006-2007.

[Placed in Library, *See* No. LT 3873/06]

- (3) A copy of the Performance Budget (Hindi and English versions) of the Ministry of Women and Child Development for the year 2006-2007.

[Placed in Library, *See* No. LT 3874/06]

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry that I have to insist on this but there can be nothing more important than this House.

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: Sir, I am sorry for coming late. I was late.

MR. SPEAKER: I know that it is not deliberate. If it was deliberate, then some other action will follow.

[Translation]

SHRIMATI SUMITRA MAHAJAN (Indore): Mr. Speaker, Sir, while, on the one hand, Madhya Pradesh is a backward area and on the other hand, there is untimely rainfall occurring in the region. Heavy rainfall and hailstorm have created havoc this year especially in Madhya Pradesh. The entire Mahakaushal region of Madhya Pradesh has been devastated. At several places, reaped crops lying in the field have been completely damaged. At several places standing crops have fallen flat. Fruit laden trees have been damaged due to severe hailstorm. Chhindwara, Katni, Jabalpur, Mahakaushal and Malwa area of the State have been affected on account of this. Properties amounting to nearly more than one thousand crore rupees have been destroyed in the entire Madhya Pradesh. 29 persons have been killed in this devastation. At several places, the entire families have been ruined. Our youthful Chief Minister is paying visit to various villages. The State Government on its behalf is providing financial assistance at the rate of Rs. 2 thousand per hectare to the marginal farmers and a maximum of Rs. 12 thousand to the big farmers. Earlier Rs. 200 were paid to those farmers whose fruit laden trees were destroyed, however, this time the State Government have increased it to Rs. 250. The Madhya Pradesh government is making efforts on its own, however, as I said in the very beginning that Madhya Pradesh is a poor State. I would like to request the Central Government that it should provide full assistance to the State Government and the State Government should get special relief in this regard. ...*(Interruptions)*

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: All right, the issue was raised.

...*(Interruptions)*

[Translation]

SHRIMATI SUMITRA MAHAJAN: Sir, recently the decision regarding the recovery of loans has been taken

and the Government proposes to provide 2 percent rebate to the people. However, I would like to request the Government that it should defer the recovery and instead a special relief amount be granted as compensation to the affected families under a special package of the Central Government to the Madhya Pradesh Government. I would like to urge upon Government to sympathetically ponder over it.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Now Shri Krishna Murari Moghe will associate with this. Please associate with this. Please associate.

[Translation]

SHRI KRISHNA MURARI MOGHE (Khargone): Sir, some specific things have been left out that I would like to point out. ...*(Interruptions)*

[English]

SHRI VIJAY KUMAR KHANDELWAL (Betul): Sir, I associate with this matter.

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER: Yesterday too it was raised and today also it is being raised.

...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI VIJAY KUMAR KHANDELWAL: Sir, it is increasing day by day. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: All right, but you please mention one by one.

SHRI KRISHNA MURARI MOGHE: Sir, I would like to raise only specific points. Keeping in view the extent of damage occurred over there, the Central Government should send a study group to that area. The recovery of loan should be deferred and the amount of interest on loan should be waived off. 70 persons have been killed and more than one thousand persons have got injured there. The situation is very pathetic there. So I would like to request that the Central Government should send a study group there and relief should be provided to the people from the Relief Fund at the earliest.

Sir, this issue was raised earlier also, however, no announcement has been made by the Government. Through you, I would like to request the Government that an announcement in this regard be made at the earliest.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Now, Shri Vijay Kumar Khandelwal.

...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I have called Shri Vijay Kumar Khandelwal and not Prof. Vijay Kumar Malhotra. Do you want to monopolize all Vijay Kumars here?

SHRI VIJAY KUMAR KHANDELWAL: All are for victories.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the situation in my parliamentary constituency Betul has further deteriorated. Many people have lost their lives and the crops have been destroyed. This has resulted in the worsening of the financial position of the farmers. I would like to mention in a nutshell that relief should be provided from the Central Disaster Fund and a Central team should be sent over there.

SHRIMATI SUMITRA MAHAJAN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs should assure that he would talk to the hon'ble Minister. We need some assurance, as the extent of loss is very high.
...(Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: They are here. Responsible Ministers are here. They have listened to you. For every matter, they cannot respond in this House. It is not good.

...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I have allowed three hon. Members.

Shri Sita Ram Singh—Not present.

[Translation]

SHRIMATI SUMITRA MAHAJAN: Sir, we need at least some response. We need assistance from the Central Government and so the Government should respond on its own. ... (Interruptions)

DR. SATYANARAYAN JATIYA (Ujjain): The crisis is so intense. The Government should at least give some reply in this regard. ... (Interruptions)

SHRI CHHATTAR SINGH DARBAR (Dhar): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to associate myself with this subject.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: The very fact that it has been allowed to be raised in the House shows its importance, and I am sure the concerned Ministers will take notice of this.

Now Shri B. Mahtab.

SHRI B. MAHTAB (Cuttack): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Sir.

When parts of the country is being faced with unprecedented rain, Orissa is under severe heat wave the temperature has risen up to 40 degree Celsius in places like Jharsuguda, Rourkela and Talcher.

The cities of Bhubaneswar and Cuttack, which invariably in the month of March have a temperate climate also, have seen temperature rising above 35 to 38 degrees Celsius. This reminds us of 1999 when Orissa faced an unprecedented heatwave and scores of people had expired because of sunstroke.

So, my request to the Government here is that to tide over the situation, adequate health support system should be energised and support should be given to respective medical units where sunstroke affected people can get immediate relief and at the same time the families of the victims also should be given support and compensation. It should be treated as a natural calamity of high severity so that the victims' families can get the support.

MR. SPEAKER: Shri S.S. Kharventhan.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI S.K. KHARVENTHAN (Palani): Sir, let me go to my seat. ... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Are you hoping to be something?

...(Interruptions)

SHRI S.K. KHARVENTHAN: Sir, I would like to raise a very important matter concerning my State. In the month of November 2005 due to heavy rain and floods in Tamil Nadu, the farmers and others were badly affected. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: This is a country of diversity—hailstorm, heatwave, floods etc.

...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI S.K. KHARVENTHAN: Minor tanks, canals, wells and agricultural lands were washed away. The Central Government had already allocated the Calamity Relief Fund of Rs. 209.08 crore and National Calamity Contingency Fund of Rs. 1,000 per hectare.

Now as per norms of Calamity Relief Fund and National Calamity Contingency Fund, Rs. 1,000/- per hectare for rainfed areas and Rs. 2,500 per hectare for irrigated areas—agriculture, horticulture and annual plantation and Rs. 4,000 per hectare for perennial crops are to be given. But Tamil Nadu Government, till date, has not allocated the fund for the affected farmers and poor people.

Hence, I urge upon this Government to take necessary action and direct the authorities to disperse the amount to the flood victims of Tamil Nadu. It is already delayed. This is my humble submission.

[Translation]

PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA (South Delhi): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to draw your attention and the attention of the House towards Shri Sarabjeet Singh whose mercy petition has been rejected by the Supreme Court of Pakistan. Sixteen year back Shri Sarabjeet Singh had strayed into the Pakistani territory. Thereafter he was tried there under the name of Manjeet Singh and the punishment was awarded to him on a mistaken identity. Meanwhile, when General Musharraf came to India he had also assured that he would consider over the matter to ensure that an innocent person is not hanged. ...*(Interruptions)*

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: It is a matter for another country.

...*(Interruptions)*

PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA: Yes, Sir. I know it. I am only saying that the hon. Prime Minister should take it up with General Musharraf,

[Translation]

because there are many witnesses who have also testified that he is innocent. I feel that the House too have the same sentiments. I would like to submit that the hon'ble Prime Minister should talk to General Musharraf in this regard and should make efforts to save an innocent person from the gallows. ...*(Interruptions)*

SARDAR SUKHDEV SINGH LIBRA (Ropar): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would also like to associate myself with this.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

SHRI VARKALA RADHAKRISHNAN (Chirayinkil): Sir, there is a longstanding demand of the State of Kerala and the people of Kerala towards the establishment of a railway zone for Kerala. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: We had a full discussion on Railways, but again and again you are raising the same matter.

...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI VARKALA RADHAKRISHNAN: The development is very much hampered. Even the hon. Minister could not accede to our demands due to some other reason. But we have faith in the hon. Minister. But, at the same time, the permanent solution is towards the establishment of a separate zone. So, would I request the hon. Minister as well as the Government of India to take immediate steps towards the establishment of a separate zone for Kerala which is very essential in the context of coming elections. All of us will face the difficulty. So, I would request, once again, to have the declaration immediately after the elections.

Sir, I would request the hon. Minister once again that immediately after the election he should take steps for declaration of this new zone in Kerala. I do not think it can be done before the elections. So, immediately after the elections the Government should take steps towards establishment of a separate zone in Kerala. Thank you. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: You need not repeat it.

...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: If all demands are accepted, then nothing will be there for the Ministry to do.

...(Interruptions)

[Translation]

DR. KARAN SINGH YADAV (Alwar): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I had submitted to the hon'ble Minister of Food earlier also regarding the procurement of mustard in Rajasthan last year at the support price which is still lying in the godowns. It is on account of the faulty import policy of the Government that sufficient quantity of mustard is not being consumed. So, mustard is not being procured this year. This apprehension was expressed in the House earlier also. The hon'ble Minister of Agriculture had informed Rajasthan that the procurement of mustard would commence from 1st of March. However, I am very sorry to say that till today i.e. till March 11, mustard is being procured only in the Kota division of Rajasthan. This division is the home district of the Chief Minister of Rajasthan and the Cooperative Minister of the State. That is why mustard is being procured only in that division. Alwar, Bharatpur, Sawai Madhopur and Karauli area of Rajasthan are having bumper crop of mustard. Daily Lakhs of tons of mustard comes in the market there. The farmers of that area are forced to sell their mustard in throughway prices. I would like to request the Central Government to interfere in this regard and get the procurement of mustard commenced all over Rajasthan.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Do not refer to State matter.

[Translation]

SHRI BHANWAR SINGH DANGAWAS (Nagaur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would also like to associate myself with this matter.

MR. SPEAKER: All right.

SHRI PRABHUNATH SINGH (Maharajganj, Bihar): Mr. Speaker, Sir, through you, I would like to draw the attention of the House towards the Gramin Banks serving

the rural areas. The need of the Gramin Banks was felt in the country when it seemed that the farmers of villages were not getting proper loan and other facilities from the commercial banks. Gramin banks were set up in the country for a specific purpose. As on date, nearly 14 thousand Gramin Banks are operating in almost 500 districts of the country. Agricultural and other types of loans are provided to the village farmers through the Gramin Banks. The Gramin Bank branches have been already set up at the district level. I would like to submit that today every thing is being involved in competition. Gramin Banks are being set up in parts in one State with a regional basis and they are made to remain under the sponsorship of State Bank, Central Bank or other Banks while each bank is having its own set of rules. In this situation, the farmers in the rural areas will not get benefit. They all will remain deprived of the benefit. Through you, I would like to request the Government that the Gramin Banks should be setup through the NABARD in the interest of farmers by way of considering it as a unit at least in a State so that the farmers in the villages may get its benefit. I believe that the Government will appreciate this suggestions and keeping in view its relevance the Government will set up it.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: The other matters will be taken up at the end of the day.

Now item no. 17.

11.23 hrs.

MOTION RE: SUSPENSION OF RULE 331G

[English]

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI): I beg to move:

"That Rule 331G of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha in its application to the discussion and voting on the Demands for Grants (Railways) for 2006-2007 and the Demands for Grants of the Central Government (excluding Railways) for 2006-2007 be suspended."

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

11.25¹/₂ hrs.

"That Rule 331G of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha in its application to the discussion and voting on the Demands for Grants (Railways) for 2006-2007 and the Demands for Grants of the Central Government (excluding Railways) for 2006-2007 be suspended."

**RAILWAY BUDGET, 2006-07
DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (RAILWAYS),
2006-07***

[*English*]

The motion was adopted.

11.25 hrs.

OBSERVATION BY THE SPEAKER

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Members, as you are aware, due to rescheduling of the Financial Business, the House would consider and vote the Demands for Grants (Railways) and the Demands for Grants (General) for the year 2006-2007 before it adjourns for recess. Although, Rule 331G of the Rules of Procedure has been suspended to enable this House to pass the Demands for Grants without being referred to the concerned Departmentally-Related Standing Committees, the Committees may examine the Demands for Grants of the concerned Ministries during the recess period and make reports.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Members, it has been agreed to by the hon. Leaders that the Demands for Grants (Railways) for the year 2006-07 may be considered and voted by the House without discussion. As sufficient time for moving cut motions is not available, I think, all the cut motions, for which notices have been given and which have been circulated, may be treated as moved.

Motion moved:

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts shown in the fourth column of the Order Paper be granted to the President of India out of the Consolidated Fund of India, to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 2007, in respect of the heads of Demands entered in the second column thereof against Demand Nos. 1 to 16."

*Moved with the recommendation of the President.

LOK SABHA

Demands for Grants (Railways) for 2006-07 submitted to the Vote of Lok Sabha

No. of Demand	Name of Demand	Amount of Demand for Grants on Account voted by the House on 3.3.2006 (Rs.)	Amount of Demand for Grants submitted to the Vote of the House (Rs.)
1	2	3	4
1.	Railway Board	14,16,73,000	70,83,67,000
2.	Miscellaneous Expenditure (General)	46,59,27,000	232,96,33,000
3.	General Superintendence and Services on Railways	359,62,02,000	1798,10,10,000
4.	Repairs and Maintenance of Permanent Way and Works	659,72,21,000	3298,61,05,000

1	2	3	4
5.	Repairs and Maintenance of Motive Power	355,94,07,000	1779,70,37,000
6.	Repairs and Maintenance of Carriages and Wagons	717,86,62,000	3589,33,07,000
7.	Repairs and Maintenance of Plant and Equipment	386,15,41,000	1930,77,07,000
8.	Operating Expenses—Rolling Stock and Equipment	529,09,58,000	2645,47,87,000
9.	Operating Expenses—Traffic	1778,54,77,000	4492,93,73,000
10.	Operating Expenses—Fuel	1812,59,70,000	9082,98,51,000
11.	Staff Welfare and Amenities	289,92,42,000	1449,62,07,000
12.	Miscellaneous Working Expenses	309,30,53,000	1546,52,64,000
13.	Provident Fund, Pension and other Retirement Benefits	1325,96,98,000	6629,84,87,000
14.	Appropriation to Funds	3208,32,33,000	16041,61,67,000
15.	Dividend to General Revenues, Repayment of loans taken from General Revenues and Amortization of Over-Capitalisation	4,28,12,000	3866,44,88,000
16.	Assets—Acquisition, Construction and Replacement		
	<i>Revenue</i>	8,33,33,000	41,66,67,000
	Other Expenditure		
	Capital	3926,07,57,000	19630,37,84,000
	Railway Funds	2411,44,00,000	8616,96,00,000
	Railway Safety Fund	118,47,00,000	592,35,00,000
	Special Railway Safety Fund	391,66,17,000	1958,30,83,000
	Total	18654,08,83,000	89275,44,24,000

The motion was adopted.

*CUT MOTIONS

[English]

SHRI B. MAHTAB (Cuttack): I beg to move:

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD RAILWAY BOARD (PAGES 01.01.501—01.02.01) BE REDUCED TO RE. 1

1. Failure to keep State control over railway property by privatising it.

2. Failure to recruit youths from Orissa in Railways.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD ASSETS—ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND REPLACEMENT (PAGES 16.01.01—16.04.03) BE REDUCED TO RE. 1.

14. Failure to double the Khurdha Road—Puri rail line.

15. Failure to complete the work of gauge conversion of Baripada—Bangiriposi railway line.

*Treated as moved.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD ASSETS—ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND REPLACEMENT (PAGES 16.01.01—16.04.03) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100

17. Need to lay new lines between Bhadrak and Damra.
18. Need to lay new lines between Talcher and Gopalpur via Narasinghpur, Khandapada.
19. Need to construct new rail line between Haridaspur and Paradeep.
20. Need to construct second rail bridge over river Kathajodi and Kuakhai.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD RAILWAY BOARD (PAGES 01.01.01—01.02.01) BE REDUCED BY Rs. 100.

199. Need to start a new passenger train from Cuttack to Bhadrak in the morning.
200. Need to run a passenger express train from Cuttack to Sambalpur in the evening.
201. Need to improve conditions of railway track from Cuttack to Bhadrak.
202. Need to reschedule timing of Jagannath Express to leave Bhubaneswar at 2100 hrs.
203. Need to arrange for stoppage of inter-city express at Cuttack.
204. Need to run passenger train from Cuttack to Bhadrak in East-Coast Zone.
205. Need to start a direct train from Cuttack to Mumbai via Sambalpur.
206. Need to provide additional coaches in Konark Express.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE (GENERAL) (PAGES 02.01.01—02.02.01) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

218. Need to conduct survey for laying new rail lines from Bhadrak to Dhamva.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD ASSETS—ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND REPLACEMENT (PAGES 16.01.01—16.04.03) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100

219. Need to extend rail line from Keonjhar—Jajpur road to Jajpur town.
220. Need to man all unmanned railway crossing in East-Coast Railway Zone.
221. Need to construct level crossing at Rajahansa in Cuttack—Paradeep line.
222. Need to extend the railway platform of Cuttack railway station towards north.
223. Need to improve the Cuttack railway station in East-Coast Zone.
224. Need to replace old sleeper coaches attached to Puri-Howrah Express.
225. Need to provide more funds for providing more passenger amenities in East-Coast Railway Zone.
226. Need to construct rail overbridge at Sikharpur in Cuttack city.
227. Need to construct overbridge at Raj-Athagarh rail station.
228. Need to provide more passenger amenities at Naraj-Marhapur station.
229. Need to lay rail lines between Haridaspur and Paradeep.
230. Need to carry out laying of new line from Talcher to Gopalpur.

SHRI KASHIRAM RANA (Surat): I beg to move:

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD RAILWAY BOARD (PAGES 01.01.01—01.02.01) BE REDUCED TO RE. 1.

3. Failure to shift the headquarters of Western Railway from Mumbai to Ahmedabad or Surat.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD RAILWAY BOARD (PAGES 01.01.01—01.02.01) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

4. Need to beautify and keeping clean the Surat Railway station.
5. Need to provide stoppage to Trivandrum—New Delhi Rajdhani at Surat.

[Shri Kashiram Rana]

6. Need to provide stoppage to all mail/express South bound trains at Navsari.
7. Need to restore and increase emergency quotas for Surat.
8. Need to introduce emergency quotas in Baroda-Jodhpur Express (Train No. 4848) Kota-Nimach Express (Train No. 9020), Vadodra-Mumbai Central Express (Train No. 2928), Mumbai-Ahmedabad Shatabadi Express (Train No. 2009) and Nimach-Kota Express (Train No. 9019).
9. Need to introduce new trains from Surat to New Delhi, Surat-Vijaywada, Ahmedabad-Nanded and Surat-Rojkot routes.
10. Need to introduce a new train for Surat-Palampur at 8 or 9 o'clock in the morning.
11. Need to run Surat-Patna and Tapti-Ganga Express as daily trains.
12. Need to extend Bharuch shuttle upto to Valsad-Vapi.
13. Need to introduce new train between Surat-Ratnagiri.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD ASSETS—ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND REPLACEMENT (PAGES 16.01.01—16.04.03) BE REDUCED TO RE. 1.

16. Failure to construct the third track between Ahmedabad-Mumbai.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD ASSETS—ACQUISITION CONSTRUCTION AND REPLACEMENT (PAGES 16.01.01—16.04.03) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

21. Need to lay track between Udhna-Jalgaon station.
22. Need to shift old Lalgate rail reservation centre in Surat to a well-equipped spacious building.
23. Need to construct new railway station building at Navsari because of outdated and very old building.
24. Need to develop Udhna railway station as satellite model railway station.
25. Need to provide amenities like escalator, more ticket windows, etc. at Surat and Navsari railway stations.

[Translation]

SHRI BRAJESH PATHAK (Unnao): I beg to move:

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD RAILWAY BOARD (PAGES 01.01.01—01.02.01) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

26. Need to solve the problem of water logging at railway stations in Uttar Pradesh.
27. Need to reduce passenger fares and freight charges for essential goods.
28. Need to provide more passenger coaches and engines to various railway zones in Uttar Pradesh for smooth running of trains.
29. Need to provide full rake loading facilities at railway stations under various railway zones in Uttar Pradesh.
30. Need to run more passenger trains under various railway zones in Uttar Pradesh.
31. Need to run Delhi-Raebareilly special train via Aligarh, Kanpur, Unnao, Bighapur and Lalganj.
32. Need to make Baiswara railway station a halt station.
33. Need to restore the status of Ganjmuradabad railway station.
34. Need to restart the Gauri halt located between Mallavaganj-Muradabad stations at Kanpur-Balamau division.
35. Need to provide railway halt at Hafizabad, a prominent commercial centre, on Kanpur-Balmau section.
36. Need to provide "A category" status to Unnao railway station which earns a revenue of around rupees twelve crore.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD REPAIRS AND MAINTENANCE OF PERMANENT WAY AND WORKS (PAGES 04.01.01—04.03.01) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

37. Need for repair and continuous maintenance of approach roads of all the railway stations particularly those located in Unnao Parliamentary Constituency in Uttar Pradesh.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD REPAIRS AND MAINTENANCE OF PLANT AND EQUIPMENT (PAGES 07.01.01—07.03.01) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

38. Need to save passenger coach and wagon manufacturing units of the country from incurring losses by avoiding their import.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD ASSETS—ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND REPLACEMENT (PAGES 16.01.01—16.04.03) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

39. Need to ensure proper supply of electricity at all the railway stations under various zones in Uttar Pradesh in order to avoid frequent congestion of traffic.
40. Need to construct metalled roads under the railway bridges.
41. Need to raise the height of platform No. 4 and 5 to the appropriate level at Unnao railway station.
42. Need to raise increase the length of platform Nos. 2 and 3 at Unnao Railway station by 58 meters and to extend the shed accordingly.
43. Need to make arrangement for drainage for water between platform Nos. 2 and 3 at Unnao railway station.
44. Need to modernise the announcement system at Unnao railway station.
45. Need to renovate the waiting hall at Unnao railway station.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD RAILWAY BOARD (PAGES 01.01.01—01.02.01) BE REDUCED BY RE. 1.

46. Failure to formulate a concrete and clear cut policy for utilising the vacant railway land.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD RAILWAY BOARD (PAGES 01.01.01—01.02.01) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

47. Need to provide stoppages for Express trains at all the railway stations located at district headquarters, especially at Unnao railway station, in Uttar Pradesh.

48. Need to provide stoppage to Gomti Express at Unnao Railway station in Uttar Pradesh.
49. Need to provide stoppage to Pushpak Express at Unnao Railway station in Uttar Pradesh.
50. Need to provide stoppage to Vaishali Express at Unnao Railway station in Uttar Pradesh.
51. Need to provide stoppage to Marudhar Express at Unnao Railway station in Uttar Pradesh.
52. Need to provide stoppage to Lucknow-Bhopal Express at Unnao Railway station in Uttar Pradesh.
53. Need to provide stoppage to Chennai Express at Unnao Railway station in Uttar Pradesh.
54. Need to open the Sehani-Devara crossing between Kinara and Magarwara stations on Kanpur-Lucknow rail route in Uttar Pradesh round the clock to avoid traffic jam.
55. Need to open the closed railway crossing under the overbridge near the railway station in Unnao on Lucknow-Kanpur rail route in Uttar Pradesh round the clock to avoid traffic jam.
56. Need to provide stoppage to Rajdhani and Poorva Express at Mirzapur railway station.
57. Need to start Raibareilly-Lalganj shuttle train via Daimau.
58. Need to restore the status of Achalganj station.
59. Need to add more second class coaches in Lucknow mail running between New Delhi and Lucknow.
60. Need to add one AC-3 tier, one AC-2 tier and one AC-1 tier coach in Lucknow mail running between New Delhi and Lucknow.
61. Need to start a new superfast train from New Delhi to Lucknow.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE (GENERAL) (PAGES 02.01.01—02.02.01) BE REDUCED TO RE. 1.

62. Failure to grant appropriate overtime allowance to railway employee.

[Shri Brajesh Pathak]

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD REPAIRS AND MAINTENANCE OF PERMANENT WAY AND WORKS (PAGES 04.01.01—04.03.01) BE REDUCED TO RE. 1.

63. Failure to complete the renovation work of railway tracks all over the country in a time bound manner.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD ASSET—ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND REPLACEMENT (PAGES 16.01.01—16.04.03) BE REDUCED TO RE. 1.

64. Failure of the Government to construct rail overbridges/underbridges in Uttar Pradesh in time.
65. Failure of the Government to complete doubling of rail lines in Uttar Pradesh on time.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD RAILWAY BOARD (PAGES 01.01.01—01.02.01) BE REDUCED TO RE. 1.

66. Failure to formulate any scheme for use of railway land on both sides of railway lines.
67. Failure to reduce freight on salt and other essential materials.
68. Failure to reduce monthly ticket charges.
69. Failure to replace old coaches.
70. Failure to check inordinate delay in running the trains.
71. Failure to check rail accidents.
72. Failure to prescribe affordable fare for rail journey.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD RAILWAY BOARD (PAGES 01.01.01—01.02.01) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

73. Need to rename the Kinara Railway Station in Shuklaganj as Shuklaganj Railway Station.
74. Need to restore rail services at Achalganj station.
75. Need to increase the speed of the Kanpur and Baramau Passenger train.
76. Need to issue rail passes to Government employees and officers who are recipient of President Award.

77. Need to increase reservation quota in trains originating from Lucknow.

78. Need to ensure adequate recruitment especially of Group 'C' and 'D' employees on posts vacant due to retirement.

79. Need to start a new superfast train on priority basis between Lucknow and Delhi.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD REPAIRS AND MAINTENANCE OF CARRIAGES AND WAGONS (PAGES 07.01.01—07.03.01) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

80. Need to set up a railway spare parts manufacturing unit in Unnao.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD MISCELLANEOUS WORKING EXPENSES (PAGES 12.01.01—12.03.01) BE REDUCED TO RE. 1.

81. Failure to ensure safety of rail passengers.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD ASSETS—ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND REPLACEMENT (PAGES 16.01.01—16.04.03) BE REDUCED TO RE. 1.

82. Failure to formulate and implement any scheme to link all tourist spots with rail network in Uttar Pradesh State.
83. Failure to give more attention to Uttar Pradesh in extending rail and passenger facilities in the State.
84. Failure to start a "Palace-on-Wheels" like train in the State of Uttar Pradesh.
85. Failure to provide sufficient number of trains running through Uttar Pradesh.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD ASSETS—ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND REPLACEMENT (PAGES 16.01.01—16.04.03) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

86. Need to start an express train between Kanpur and Baramau.
87. Need to ensure cleanliness in trains and better travelling facilities for passengers.
88. Need to construct more platforms at Unnao and Lucknow railway stations.

89. Need to allocate more funds for the survey work being conducted for various railway lines in Uttar Pradesh.
90. Need to modernize railway stations under Lucknow Division.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD RAILWAY BOARD (PAGES 01.01.01—01.02.01) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

91. Need to check rampant corruption in railways.
92. Need to fill up all the vacancies in railways through Railway Recruitment Board on priority basis.
93. Need to use gainfully the vacant land of railways.
94. Need to achieve operational targets fixed by various zonal railways during the current financial year.
95. Need to check pilferage of railway property.
96. Need to fill up the vacant posts of SCs/STs and OBCs in Railway.
97. Need to have all the railway crossings manned.
98. Need to issue monthly concessional tickets to the persons living below poverty line.
99. Need to develop railway stations located at the District Headquarters of Uttar Pradesh particularly Unnao Railway station as Model Railway Stations.
100. Need to run EMU trains on time under various Railway Zones of Uttar Pradesh.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD REPAIRS AND MAINTENANCE OF PERMANENT WAY AND WORKS (PAGES 04.01.04—04.03.01) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

101. Need to make arrangements for proper maintenance of all the Railway Stations in Uttar Pradesh.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD OPERATING EXPENSES—TRAFFIC (PAGES 09.01.01—09.03.01) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

102. Need to strengthen the security arrangements to check thefts in trains.

103. Need to ensure early transit of perishable items like fruit and vegetables at cheaper rates.
104. Need to check increasing rail accidents in the country.
105. Need to make proper arrangements for regulating heavy rail traffic at certain section falling under various Railway Zones in Uttar Pradesh.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD MISCELLANEOUS WORKING EXPENSES (PAGES 12.01.01—12.03.01) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

106. Need to ensure adequate security for passengers in trains.
107. Need to improve the catering services in railways.
108. Need to allot "Canteen and bookstalls" on priority basis to the educated unemployed youth belonging to poor families at all stations in the country.
109. Need to issue licenses to the railway hawkers across the country.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD ASSETS—ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND REPLACEMENT (PAGES 16.01.01—16.04.03) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

110. Need to modernise railway workshops in the country.
111. Need to consider commercial aspects while proposing laying of new railway lines.
112. Need for procurement of more electric engines by the railways.
113. Need to depute doctors in the long distance express and mail trains.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD RAILWAY BOARD (PAGES 01.01.01—01.02.01) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

114. Need to demolish the unauthorised construction on railway land at rest camp colony near Charbagh, Lucknow railway station.
115. Need to construct upper class and second class waiting rooms at all railway stations in Uttar Pradesh.

[Shri Brajesh Pathak]

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD REPAIRS AND MAINTENANCE OF PERMANENT WAY AND WORKS (PAGES 04.01.01—04.03.01) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

- 116. Need to renovate the buildings of railway stations in Uttar Pradesh.
- 117. Need to provide proper drinking water, refreshment centres and maintain cleanliness at all the railway stations of Uttar Pradesh.
- 118. Need to modernise Unnao Railway station.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD ASSETS—ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND REPLACEMENT (PAGES 16.01.01—16.04.03) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

- 119. Need to provide sufficient covered parking and other facilities for the benefit of passengers at all the railway stations in Uttar Pradesh.
- 120. Need to man all the unmanned railway level crossings in Uttar Pradesh.
- 121. Need to speed up the work of laying of new railway lines in Uttar Pradesh.
- 122. Need to provide computerised reservation facility at all the railway stations under Lucknow division.
- 123. Need to replace old sleeper coaches with new ones in Lucknow mail running between Lucknow and New Delhi.
- 124. Need to improve passenger amenities at all railway stations in Uttar Pradesh.
- 125. Need to set up computerised reservation centre at all the railway stations in Uttar Pradesh.
- 126. Need to convert all narrow gauge lines into broad gauge lines in Uttar Pradesh.
- 127. Need to improve catering and bedding facilities in trains.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD RAILWAY BOARD (PAGES 01.01.01—01.02.01) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

- 128. Need to introduce more super fast trains in Uttar Pradesh.
- 129. Need to reduce the freight for coal.

- 130. Need to reduce the freight for salt.
- 131. Need to reduce second class passenger fares.
- 132. Need to achieve the target fixed for the procurement of wagons during the current financial year by railways.
- 133. Need to provide more coaches as per the demand in EMU trains operative in Uttar Pradesh.
- 134. Need to set up a new railway zone in the state of Uttar Pradesh.
- 135. Need to ensure proper functioning of computers and depute adequate number of enquiry clerk at important railway stations in Uttar Pradesh.
- 136. Need to discourage extravagance in the department of railways.
- 137. Need to timely complete pending rail projects in the state of Uttar Pradesh.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD STAFF WELFARE AND AMENITIES (PAGES 11.01.01—11.03.01) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

- 138. Need to allot land for construction of school building for the children of railway employees in the State of Uttar Pradesh.
- 139. Need to open a well equipped railway hospital at Lucknow having facilities for kidney transplantation, heart surgery and special facility for investigation and treatment of cancer.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD ASSETS—ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND REPLACEMENT (PAGES 16.01.01—16.04.01) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

- 140. Need to undertake electrification of important railway sections in Uttar Pradesh.
- 141. Need to construct overbridges on heavy traffic railway crossings in Uttar Pradesh.
- 142. Need to provide water coolers at all the railway stations in Uttar Pradesh.
- 143. Need to provide adequate sitting arrangements in all railways stations in Uttar Pradesh.

144. Need to improve Public Address System at important railway stations in Uttar Pradesh especially under Unnao Parliamentary Constituency.
145. Need to provide ATM facility at important railway stations in Uttar Pradesh.
146. Need to provide banking facilities at important railway stations in Uttar Pradesh.
147. Need to provide adequate wagons to meet required demand for transportation of foodgrains in Uttar Pradesh.
148. Need to construct Rail Yatri Niwas at railway stations of all the important pilgrims places of Uttar Pradesh.
149. Need to construct more rest houses for passengers and tourists at all the important railway stations of Uttar Pradesh.
150. Need to ensure smooth functioning PCO's installed at the platforms in Uttar Pradesh.
151. Need to accord sanctions to the railway projects proposed by the State Government of Uttar Pradesh for laying new rail lines.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE (GENERAL) (PAGES 02.01.01—02.02.01) BE REDUCED BY RE. 1.

152. Failure to complete the survey work of the proposed new rail lines in the State of Uttar Pradesh.
153. Failure to conduct a survey of the backward areas of the State of Uttar Pradesh to lay new rail lines.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD REPAIRS AND MAINTENANCE OF PERMANENT WAY AND WORKS (PAGES 04.01.01—04.03.01) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

154. Need to provide adequate potable water at railway stations.
155. Need to improve sanitation arrangements at all the railway stations.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD REPAIRS AND MAINTENANCE OF MOTIVE POWER (PAGES 05.01.01—05.03.01) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

156. Need to set up a workshop at Unnao for maintenance of rail engines.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD REPAIRS AND MAINTENANCE OF CARRIAGES AND WAGONS (PAGES 06.01.01—06.03.01) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

157. Need to set up a workshop at Unnao for repairing of wagons.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD STAFF WELFARE AND AMENITIES (PAGES 11.01.01—11.03.01) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

158. Need to improve educational facilities for the children of staff of various railway zones of Uttar Pradesh.
159. Need to provide adequate emergency medical facilities to the passengers at all railway stations of various railway zones of Uttar Pradesh.
160. Need to provide more incentives to the outstanding sports persons working in railways.
161. Need to set up a 50 bed railway hospital at Unnao for the welfare of railway employees.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD MISCELLANEOUS WORKING EXPENSES (PAGES 12.01.01—12.03.01) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

162. Need to take effective steps to ensure the safety of passengers in trains.
163. Need to check the irregularities in catering services at railway stations of various railway zones in Uttar Pradesh.
164. Need to employ more personnel in railway security forces for the proper safety of railway assets.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD PROVIDENT FUND, PENSION AND OTHER RETIREMENT BENEFITS (PAGES 13.01.01—13.02.03) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

165. Need to redress the grievances of railway pensioners.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD ASSETS—ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND REPLACEMENT (PAGES 16.01.01—16.04.03) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

166. Need to expand existing second class waiting halls at railway stations under Lucknow division.

167. Need to provide accommodation to the employees of various railway zones of Uttar Pradesh near their respective railway stations.

DR. LAXMINARAYAN PANDEY (Mandsaur): I beg to move:

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD RAILWAY BOARD (PAGES 01.01.01—01.02.01) BE REDUCED TO RE. 1.

168. Failure to start new recruitments inspite of increasing load of work on Group 'D' staff and stenographers.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD RAILWAY BOARD (PAGES 01.01.01—01.02.01) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

169. Need to increase the strength of members of Railway Board in view of their increasing responsibilities.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD STAFF WELFARE AND AMENITIES (PAGES 11.01.01—11.03.01) BE REDUCED BY RE. 1.

193. Failure to modernise the existing medical facilities and formulate a comprehensive policy to provide medical assistance to railway employees and their families.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD MISCELLANEOUS WORKING EXPENSES (PAGES 12.01.01—12.03.01) BE REDUCED TO RE. 1.

194. Failure to formulate a clearcut policy with regard to the functioning of the Director General, Railway Protection Force.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD RAILWAY BOARD (PAGES 01.01.01—01.02.01) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

237. Need to fill up posts of different grades lying vacant for the smooth functioning of the Railways.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD REPAIRS AND MAINTENANCE OF PERMANENT WAY AND WORKS (PAGES 04.01.01—04.03.01) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

238. Need to repair the access road falling within the railway territory at Chittor-Nimach-Ratlam section of Western Railway.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD OPERATING EXPENSES—TRAFFIC (PAGES 09.01.01—09.03.01) BE REDUCED TO RE. 1.

239. Failure to reduce the workload of existing overburdened TTEs by filling up the vacant posts of in various divisions of the Railways.

240. Failure to fill up the posts of drivers, co-drivers and guards which are lying vacant for a long time.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD STAFF WELFARE AND AMENITIES (PAGES 11.01.01—11.03.01) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

241. Need to provide proper medical facilities (during emergency at various important stations of Western Railway i.e. Ahmedabad, Vadodara, Ratlam, Shamgarh etc.

242. Need to upgrade and expand the Railway Hospital located in Ratlam (Western Railway) for better medical facilities to Railway employees.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD ASSETS—ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND REPLACEMENT (PAGES 16.01.01—16.04.03) BE REDUCED TO RE. 1.

243. Failure to ameliorate the problem of passengers due to lack of adequate facilities even after constitution of various new railway zones.

244. Failure to avoid delay in ensuring the work of gauge conversion on priority basis to achieve the target of 'Unigauge' in the country for smooth operation and functioning of Railways.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD ASSETS—ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND REPLACEMENT (PAGES 16.01.01—16.04.03) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

245. Need to construct an overbridge at level crossing near Jaora station on the Ratlam-Nimach section of Western Railway.

246. Need to provide proper power supply to the Suwasra, Shamgarh, Garot stations on the Ratlam-Kota section of Western Railway.
247. Need to extend the sheds on main railway stations of the Western Railway including Nimach, Mandsaur, Jaora and Namli.
248. Need to extend the platforms of railway stations of the Western Railway for the convenience of the passengers embarking or disembarking from trains having 22 or more coaches.
249. Need to construct a railway overbridge near the railway crossing at Mandsaur and Nimach Railway stations in Ratlam-Chittor section of the Western Railway.
250. Need to provide accommodation facilities to Group III and IV employees and Gangman.

SHRIMATI NEETA PATERIYA (Seoni): I beg to move:

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD RAILWAY BOARD (PAGES 01.01.01—01.02.01) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

170. Need to provide stoppage to 2161 Jabalpur-Nagpur Superfast Express at Shridham.
171. Need to provide stoppage to 2062 Jabalpur-Habibganj Express at Shridham.
172. Need to provide computerized reservation at Shridham.
173. Need to provide railway gate near Kevlari block colony in Seoni district.
174. Need to provide railway gate at Binaiki Marg in Seoni district.
175. Need to provide railway gate at Chhinga Marg in Seoni district.
176. Need to provide railway gate at Sunehara Marg in Seoni district.
177. Need to provide stoppage of 8233 Narmada Express at Bhitauni station.
178. Need to start shuttle train from Seoni to Jabalpur and Nainpur.

179. Need to run a superfast train from Jabalpur to Gondia.
180. Need to start Mahakaushal Express from Narsinghpur.
181. Need to run 2411/2412 Gondwana Express from Jabalpur to New Delhi with full rack.
182. Need to provide a full 1st class AC coach in 2411/2412 Gondwana Express.
183. Need to extend Jabalpur-Bhopal overnight Express upto Indore.
184. Need to run Hazrat Nizamuddin-Jabalpur Sampark Kranti Express from Delhi on Friday.
185. Need to reduce the fare of Bina-Itarsi Vindhyanal Express as it stops at every station.
186. Need to run a new train from Jabalpur to Mumbai.
187. Need to restore the VIP quota of 8233/8234 in Jabalpur.
188. Need to provide a switch board for mobile laptop in AC coaches.
189. Need to provide TV sets in Shatabdi Express trains.
190. Need to provide stoppage of all Sampark Kranti Express trains at every junction.
191. Need to run Raipur-Delhi Rajdhani Express via Katni-Bina.
192. Need to write the name of every railway station in three languages, viz., Hindi, English and regional language.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD ASSET-ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND REPLACEMENT (PAGES 16.01.01-16.04.03) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

195. Need to extend new broad gauge railway line from Goregaon to Ramtek *via* Seoni.
196. Need to construct new railway line for Jabalpur-Katangi-Damoh-Lalitpur route.
197. Need to expedite broad gauge conversion work of Jabalpur-Gondia rail line.
198. Need to construct Seoni-Chhindwada-Nainpur broad gauge rail line.

[Shrimati Neeta Pateriya]

[English]

SHRI BRAJA KISHORE TRIPATHY (Puri): I beg to move:

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD RAILWAY BOARD (PAGES 01.01.01—01.02.01) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

207. Need to reschedule timing of Utkal express so that it reaches Delhi in the morning.
208. Need to upgrade and modernise Puri and Cuttack railway stations.
209. Need to provide stoppage to all express trains at Naraj-Marthapur railway station.
210. Need to attach more coaches to Tapashivi Express.
211. Need to start a local train from Talcher to Bhubaneswar via Cuttack.
212. Need to modernise the platform of Dhenkanal railway station.
213. Need to start a direct train between Puri and Bilaspur.
214. Need to increase reservation quota in the trains originating from Puri.
215. Need to modernise the platform of Anugul railway station.
216. Need to run a new superfast Shatabdi train between Bhubaneswar and Howrah.
217. Need to start EMU train from Puri to Paradeep railway station.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD ASSETS—ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND REPLACEMENT (PAGES 16.01.01—16.04.03) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

231. Need to provide computerised reservation facility at all railway stations under Khurda Road division.
232. Need to provide sufficient funds for early completion of second line from Khurda road to Puri.

233. Need to set up a railway spare parts manufacturing unit in Orissa.

234. Need to improve the condition of railway track from Cuttack to Bhubaneswar.

235. Need to carry out protective work in river Mahanadi near Jagatpur—Kendrapada road station.

236. Need to improve condition of platform at Puri and Cuttack railway station.

[Translation]

SHRI HANSRAJ G. AHIR (Chandrapur): I beg to move:

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD RAILWAY BOARD (PAGES 01.01.01—01.02.01) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

251. Need to introduce a new shuttle train between Chandrapur and Ghugus in Maharashtra.
252. Need to increase number of sleeper class bogies in trains running between Balharshah-Nagpur-Dadar.
253. Need to provide halt to Bilaspur-Yashwantpur Express train at Ramgundam railway station.
254. Need to introduce a 'Vanrani Heritage Train' between Nagpur and Nagbhind area.
255. Need to provide adequate vehicle parking facility for the passengers at Chandrapur, Chanda Fort and Balharshah railway stations at Maharashtra.
256. Need to introduce an intercity express train from Balharshah railway station to Bilaspur in Maharashtra.
257. Need to extend the proposed Rajgarh-Godiya Janshatabdi Express upto Balharshah railway station in Maharashtra.
258. Need to increase the number of passenger coaches in Balharshah-Wardha-Bhusawal passenger train.
259. Need to provide halt to Rajdhani Express at Chandrapur railway station in Maharashtra.
260. Need to ensure speedy disposal of various cases pending against the railway employees under

the Nagpur and Sikandrabad division of Maharashtra.

261. Need to give incentives to the employees working at railway stations situated in naxal affected areas.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD REPAIRS AND MAINTENANCE OF PERMANENT WAY AND WORKS (PAGES 04.01.01—04.03.01) BE REDUCED TO RE. 1.

262. Failure to provide terminal and maintenance facility at Chandrapur and Balharshah railway station in Maharashtra.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD REPAIRS AND MAINTENANCE OF PERMANENT WAY AND WORKS (PAGES 04.01.01—04.03.01) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

263. Need to provide adequate facility of potable water at Chanda Fort railway station.
264. Need to repair and maintain the railway stations, waiting rooms and platforms of the rural areas of all the railway zones of Maharashtra.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD OPERATING EXPENSES—TRAFFIC (PAGES 09.01.01—09.03.01) BE REDUCED TO RE. 1.

265. Failure to check the corruption among ticket collectors/conductors who allegedly provide seats or berths to passengers of waiting lists in running trains in violation of rules.
266. Failure to provide latest position regarding reservation status and waiting list status to passengers in running trains by Train Ticket Examiners.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD STAFF WELFARE AND AMENITIES (PAGES 11.01.01—11.03.01) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

267. Need to renovate the Warora railway hospital under Nagpur railway division of Maharashtra.
268. Need to renovate the railway hospital at Nagpur.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD MISCELLANEOUS WORKING EXPENSES (PAGES 12.01.01—12.03.01) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

269. Need to increase the amount of compensation given to passengers killed in rail accidents.

270. Need to ensure adequate security arrangements at crowded railway stations for protecting lives and property of passengers.

271. Need to provide adequate funds for laying railway line on Wadsa-Aamori-Gadchiroli railway route in Maharashtra.

272. Need to provide facility of pantry car in Vanganga Express running between Yashwant and Bilaspur.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD ASSETS—ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND REPLACEMENT (PAGES 16.01.01—16.04.01) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

273. Need to expand the waiting room at Balharshah railway station in Maharashtra to facilitate passengers.

274. Need to lay a new railway line between Balharshah and Allapalli via Surjagarh rail route in Maharashtra.

275. Need to construct road overbridge at level crossing No. 31(a) and 32 at Majari junction in Maharashtra.

276. Need to provide funds to accelerate the pace of construction of road overbridge at level crossing No. 43 at Babupeth in Chandrapur city of Maharashtra.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD RAILWAY BOARD (PAGES 01.01.01—01.02.01) BE REDUCED TO RE. 1.

277. Failure to formulate a policy to rehabilitate poor slum dwellers living on railway land.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD RAILWAY BOARD (PAGES 01.01.01—01.02.01) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

278. Need to add more coaches and to increase the speed of DMU trains running between Chanda Fort and Gondia.

279. Need to introduce a new train between Hyderabad and Howrah station via Chanda Fort-Gondia.

[Shri Hansraj G. Ahir]

280. Need to introduce a new train between Hyderabad and Varanasi via Chandra Fort station.
281. Need to add reserved coaches in Balharshah-Bhusawal 1396 passenger train.
282. Need to introduce new passenger train between Balharshah and Nasik railway station in Maharashtra.
283. Need to add AC three tier coaches to Maharashtra Express and Sewagram Express from Balharshah station of Maharashtra.
284. Need to start a new train between Balharshah and Mumbai via Nagpur.
285. Need to connect 1335, Nagpur-Bhusawal passenger with 1337 Bhusawal-Vardha passenger at Wardha railway station in Maharashtra.
286. Need to extend train No. 7233/7234 Bhagyanagri Express upto Balharshah railway station in Maharashtra.
287. Need to make available tickets for Balharshah railway station from Hyderabad on Andhra Pradesh Express train.
288. Need to introduce a shuttle train between Balharshah railway station and industrial town Gadchandire in Maharashtra.
289. Need to run Bilaspur-Trivandrum-Bilaspur Express train via Chanda Fort-Gondia.
290. Need to provide stoppage to train No. 2625 Kerala Express at Chandrapur railway station.
291. Need to start a shuttle train on the Nagpur-Wardha-Hingonghat-Chandrapur-Balharshah rail route in Maharashtra.
292. Need to extend Kazipet-Balharshah-Bhadrachalam-Singroni Express to Chanda Fort station.
293. Need to provide a stoppage to all the Express trains passing through Chandrapur in Maharashtra.
294. Need to introduce a new train between Shirdi and Tirupati.
295. Need to start a new train from Tirupati to Howrah via Chanda Fort railway station in Maharashtra.
296. Need to provide stoppage to all Express trains at Bhadravati railway station in Maharashtra.
297. Need to add more general coaches to all Express and Mail trains.
298. Need to introduce new train on the Nagpur-Vani-Adilabad rail section of Maharashtra.
299. Need to run Yashwantpur-Bilaspur Express on daily basis.
300. Need to provide reservation quota for Chanda Fort railway station in Yashwantpur-Bilaspur Express.
301. Need to give concession in fares in reserved classes to people visiting pilgrim places of India.
302. Need to give concession to unemployed youth of the country for travelling any place of the country for a limited period once in a year.
303. Need to give concession to women entrepreneurs for vocational training and marketing.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE (GENERAL) (PAGES 02.01.01—02.02.01) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

304. Need to conduct a survey for laying a new railway line from Balharshah to Alapalli-Surajgarh in Maharashtra.
305. Need to conduct a survey for laying a new railway lines from Surajgarh to Balladila in Maharashtra.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD REPAIRS AND MAINTENANCE OF PERMANENT WAY AND WORKS (PAGES 04.01.01—04.03.01) BE REDUCED TO RE. 1.

306. Failure to maintain and repair all railway bridges under Nagpur railway division of Maharashtra.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD REPAIRS AND MAINTENANCE OF PERMANENT WAY AND WORKS (PAGES 04.01.01—04.03.01) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

307. Need to ensure uninterrupted supply of potable water at all the railway stations of Maharashtra.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD MISCELLANEOUS AND WORKING EXPENSES (PAGES 12.01.01—12.03.01) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

308. Need to ensure the facility of pantry car in all the Express and long distance passenger trains of the country.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD ASSETS—ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND REPLACEMENT (PAGES 16.01.01—16.04.03) BE REDUCED TO RE. 1.

309. Failure to introduce new trains, doubling of existing tracks and electrification of new railway lines of Maharashtra especially in the Vidarbha region.

310. Failure to construct railway bridges at Rajura, Varora and Babupeth of Maharashtra.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD ASSETS—ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND REPLACEMENT (PAGES 16.01.01—16.04.03) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

311. Need to provide PNR and Voice Response System (VRS) enquiry facilities at all stations from Wardha to Balharshah in Maharashtra.

312. Need to set up a consultative committee to monitor the passengers amenities at all the railway stations of Maharashtra.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD RAILWAY BOARD (PAGES 01.01.01—01.02.01) BE REDUCED BY RE. 1.

313. Failure to provide jobs to local unemployed people in catering services, bookstalls, parking contracts at all railway stations under the Nagpur Railway Division in Maharashtra.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD RAILWAY BOARD (PAGES 01.01.01—01.02.01) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

314. Need to allot PCOs to the handicapped and blind persons at all the railway stations in Maharashtra.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE (GENERAL) (PAGES 02.01.01—02.02.01) BE REDUCED TO RE. 1.

315. Failure to conduct survey for laying new rail lines in tribal dominated areas in Maharashtra.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD OPERATING EXPENSES—TRAFFIC (PAGES 09.01.01—09.03.01) BE REDUCED TO RE. 1.

316. Failure to provide storage facilities including cold storage at all the stations in Maharashtra to ensure transportation of agricultural produce.

317. Failure to check corruption prevalent in various station yards in transportation of coal in Valkoli in Maharashtra.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD STAFF WELFARE AND AMENITIES (PAGES 11.01.01—11.03.01) BE REDUCED TO RE. 1.

318. Failure to modernize the railway hospitals situated in the Nagpur Division of Maharashtra.

319. Failure to provide adequate health care facilities to the patients admitted in the railway hospital situated in Varora in Maharashtra.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD MISCELLANEOUS WORKING EXPENSES (PAGES 12.01.01—12.03.01) BE REDUCED TO RE. 1.

320. Failure in adopting remedial measures to check the increasing cases of crimes against women in trains.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD MISCELLANEOUS WORKING EXPENSES (PAGES 02.01.01—02.02.01) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

321. Need to ensure the sale of eatables on prescribed price by the vendors at all the railway stations in Maharashtra.

322. Need to start catering service in unreserved coaches for the benefit of the common passenger.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD ASSETS—ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND REPLACEMENT (PAGES 16.01.01—16.04.03) BE REDUCED TO RE. 1.

323. Failure to provide funds for laying railway line on already surveyed Wadsa-Armori-Garhchiroli rail route in tribal dominated areas of Maharashtra.

[Shri Hansraj G. Ahir]

324. Failure of the Government in laying railway line between Chandrapur-Garhchiroli in Maharashtra for providing transport facilities for tourists visiting Tadoba sanctuary and Andhari, Chaprala Tiger Project.
325. Failure in accelerating the gauge conversions work in stipulated time period in Maharashtra.
326. Failure to provide computerised reservation facility at all railway stations of Maharashtra.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD ASSETS—ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND REPLACEMENT (PAGES 16.01.01—16.04.03) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

327. Need to replace old sleeper coaches with new ones in Sewagram Express.
328. Need to construct sheds at all platforms of Ballarpur railway station.
329. Need to construct sheds at all the platforms at Chanda Fort railway station in Maharashtra.
330. Need to ensure utilisation of Sulabh Souchalayas at Balharshah railway station in Maharashtra for facilitating passengers.
331. Need to construct a culvert for going towards Basti at Balharshah railway station in Nagpur Railway Division.
332. Need to open a reservation counter at outer side of Basti gate at Balharshah railway station under Nagpur Railway Division.
333. Need to provide computerised reservation facility at Virur railway station in Chandrapur district of Maharashtra.
334. Need to provide computerised reservation system in Bhandak, Varora, Chandra Fort and Manikgarh railway stations of Maharashtra.
335. Need to provide computerised reservation facility at district headquarters of Garhchiroli and Rajura in Maharashtra.
336. Need to provide more computerised reservation counters at Balharshah railway station in Maharashtra in view of increasing number of passengers.
337. Need to set up railway cement slipyard at cement producing Chandrapur district in Maharashtra.

SHRI RAKESH SINGH (Jabalpur): I beg to move:

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD RAILWAY BOARD (PAGES 01.01.01—01.02.01) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100

338. Need to run the proposed Rajdhani Express from Raipur to Delhi *via* Jabalpur-Katni.
339. Need to extend the Jabalpur-Bhopal Super Express upto Indore.
340. Need to revamp platform No. 3 of Madan Mahal station, Jabalpur.
341. Need to provide stoppage to Bilaspur-Indore-Bilaspur train at Madhavnagar railway station in Katni.
342. Need to start a new fast train between Jabalpur and Mumbai.
343. Need to start a new fast train between Jabalpur and Bangalore.
344. Need to start a local train (DMU) between Narsinghpur-Jabalpur-Katni with stoppage at the well known tourist spot Bheraghat, Ranjhi and Khamaria.
345. Need to undertake beautification and upgradation of Bheraghat station—a tourist spot famous for its marble rocks.
346. Need to modernise Kachhpur—a station at Jabalpur on the lines of Habibganj Railway Station (Bhopal).
347. Need to provide 2 to 5 minutes stoppage for Chitrakut Express, Gondwana Express, Rajkot Express and Revanchal Mahanagri Express for large scale transportation of water chestnut and 'Bidi' from Sihora at Jabalpur.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD REPAIRS AND MAINTENANCE OF PERMANENT WAY AND WORKS (PAGES 04.01.01—04.03.01) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100

348. Need to revamp the Katni station in order to make it capable of accommodating trains having 24-coaches.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD ASSETS—
ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND REPLACEMENT
(PAGES 16.01.01—16.04.03) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100

349. Need to link Kundalpur—the Jain pilgrimage place, with railway route.
350. Need for early completion of gauge conversion work of Jabalpur Gondia track.
351. Need to electrify the rail route between Katni and Itarsi.
352. Need to undertake electrification work alongwith gauge conversion between Gondia and Jabalpur.
353. Need to construct the Jabalpur to Vilaspur (*via* Mandla) rail route for which survey work has already been completed.
354. Need to lay a new rail line between Jabalpur and Damoh, thereby reducing the distance by approximately 100 KM.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD RAILWAY
BOARD (PAGES 01.01.01—01.02.01) BE REDUCED BY
RS. 100

355. Need to run Madhya Pradesh Sampark Kranti Express from Jabalpur to Delhi on daily basis.
356. Need to provide stoppage to all trains passing through Deori railway station.
357. Need to open railway crossing permanently at Gram Panchayat Badkhera in the Development block Panagar.
358. Need to provide stoppage to Chitrakut, Mahakaushal, Vindhyachal and Janta Express trains at Sleemanabad Road railway station.
359. Need to provide stoppage to Bilaspur-Bhopal-Bilaspur train No. 8235 and 8236 at Patoha station.
360. Need to provide stoppage to all Express trains passing through Sleemanabad railway road station.
361. Need to extend Chirmiri-Katni train upto Jabalpur.
362. Need to open the railway crossing gate permanently at Katni Mission Chowk on Sagar railway bridge.

363. Need to provide stoppage at Kota-Jabalpur train at Rithi railway station.

364. Need to provide stoppage to Kurla-Benaras (Kamayani Express), Kurla Express and Chirmiri trains at Salaia station.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD ASSETS—
ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND REPLACEMENT
(PAGES 16.01.01-16.04.03) BE REDUCED TO RE. 1.

365. Failure of the South-Eastern-Central Railway zone to complete the Jabalpur-Gondia gauge conversion work expeditiously.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD ASSETS—
ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND REPLACEMENT
(PAGES 16.01.01—16.04.03) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100

366. Need to construct a Platform shed, an over bridge and a parcel office at Salaia railway station.
367. Need to give priority to the proposed leveling work of the approach road from bridge No. 1 to Burn Company in Jabalpur.
368. Need to construct a side bridge upto Bhatta Mohalla at the under construction Mudwara railway station in Katni.
369. Need to construct a shed towards the upside at Sihora Road railway station.
370. Need to construct shed at Rithi Railway station in Katni-Beena railway division..
371. Need to provide adequate passenger amenities at Salaia station.
372. Need to construct a foot over-bridge at under construction Mudwara railway station in Katni covering the entire railway lines.
373. Need to computerise the Sihora station.
374. Need to set-up a factory for the printing of stationery items related to the commercial, engineering and Signal and Telecommunications Departments in Jabalpur.
375. Need to set-up a factory in Jabalpur for the maintenance of trains and repair of coaches originating from Jabalpur.

SHRI BACHI SINGH RAWAT 'BACHDA' (Almora): I beg to move:

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD RAILWAY
BOARD (PAGES 01.01.01—01.02.01) BE REDUCED BY
RS. 100

[Shri Bachi Singh Rawat 'Bachda']

376. Need to run Shatabdi Express from New Delhi to Ramnagar and New Delhi to Kathgodam on daily basis.
377. Need to run a daily Express train between Kathgodam and Jammu Tawi via Ambala.
378. Need to run Kathgodam-Dehradun Express daily instead of three days in a week.
379. Need to run a direct daily train from Lucknow to Kathgodam via Bareilly-Rampur.
380. Need to run a daily Express train from Kathgodam to Mumbai.
381. Need to run a direct Express train from Kathgodam to Ahmedabad.
382. Need to run a direct train from Kathgodam to Jagannath Puri and Kanyakumari.
383. Need to introduce a direct train from Kathgodam to Dwarka.
384. Need to extend Allahabad-Bareilly Express upto Kathgodam.
385. Need to extend the Kanpur-Bareilly Express upto Kathgodam.
386. Need to introduce a new train from Jaipur to Kathgodam.
387. Need to operate Bagh Express running between Kathgodam and Howrah as per schedule.
388. Need to attach one additional track in trains from Madhya Pradesh to Rudrapur keeping in view the heavy shortage of cement in Uttaranchal.
389. Need to start daily non-stop train from Delhi to Kathgodam and Delhi to Dehradun at the speed of 150 km/hour.
390. Need to introduce a separate daily train from Delhi to Ramnagar.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD GENERAL SUPERINTENDENCE AND SERVICES ON RAILWAYS (PAGES 03.01.01—03.03.01) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

391. Need to transfer Ramnagar railway station and surrounding areas to Northern Railway, Izzatnagar, Bareilly from the jurisdiction of North-Eastern Railway Moradabad.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD OPERATING EXPENSES—TRAFFIC (PAGES 09.01.01—09.03.01) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

392. Need to ensure the availability of TTE in every AC two tier coach and to ensure the safety of passengers.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD STAFF WELFARE AND AMENITIES (PAGES 11.01.01—11.03.01) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

393. Need to construct quarters for railway employees at Kathgodam, Ramnagar and Tanakpur.
394. Need to set up sports stadiums at Kathgodam, Ramnagar, Tanakpur, Lalkuan, Rudrapur and Kashipur for the families of railway employees.
395. Need to construct community centres for the welfare of railway employees at Ramnagar, Tanakpur and Kathgodam.

THAT THE DEMAND UNDER THE HEAD ASSETS—ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND REPLACEMENT (PAGES 16.01.01—16.04.03) BE REDUCED BY RS. 100.

396. Need to provide computerised reservation facility at all railway stations of Uttaranchal.
397. Need to provide proper potable water lavatory and refreshment centre at all railway stations of Uttaranchal and maintain cleanliness.
398. Need to set up computerised reservation system at Gangolihat, Berinag, Dedihat, Dharuchula, Munayari, Salu, Syale, Bhikiyasain, Kasauli, Kapkote, Barkot Tehsil headquarters of Kumaon division in Uttaranchal.
399. Need to convert all narrow gauge and meter gauge lines into broad gauge lines in the state of Uttaranchal.
400. Need to expedite the construction work at Kashipur-Jaspur-Dhampur railway lines after the completion of survey work.
401. Need to construct additional railway platforms at Ramnagar and Kathgodam.
402. Need to construct additional sheds for the stoppage of trains at Ramnagar and Kathgodam.

403. Need to lay new railway lines from Ramnagar to Chaukhutia, from Ramnagar to Bagvalipokhar and from Tanakpur to Jauljivi.
404. Need to expedite the laying of new railway lines connecting Dehradun to Tanakpur, Kathgodam, Ramnagar, Kotdwar and Haridwar.
405. Need to construct overbridges at Rudrapur, Kashipur, Bajpur and Kichha on Khatima-Panipat rail route for smooth traffic on National Highway No. 74.
406. Need for doubling of Kathgodam-Moradabad, Ramnagar-Moradabad and Kashipur-Lalkuan rail lines.
407. Need to convert meter gauge line from Pilibhit to Bareilly into broad gauge line.
408. Need to convert meter gauge line from Bareilly to Tanakpur into broad gauge line.
409. Need to lay a new rail line from Tanakpur to Purnagiri pilgrim centre.
410. Need to lay railway tracks in the hilly areas of the country especially in Uttaranchal on the line of Jammi-Srinagar rail link through tunnels and overbridges.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI PRABHUNATH SINGH (Maharajganj, Bihar): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to submit to you. ...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: What has happened now?

...(Interruptions)

SHRIMATI SUMITRA MAHAJAN (Indore): Mr. Speaker, Sir, you do not even give us a time to speak.

~ ...(Interruptions)

SHRI PRABHUNATH SINGH: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I agree with all the decisions taken by you. ...(Interruptions) I personally met the hon'ble Minister of Railways and had given him in writing also that the railway line between Maharajganj and Mashraikh was approved at the time, when Shri Nitish Kumar was holding the portfolio of the Minister of Railways and its survey was completed and pillars were also erected over there. But the Ministry of Railways has not issued orders with regard to Land acquisition. ...(Interruptions) Therefore, I want that the

Minister of Railways should issue orders for land acquisition. ...(Interruptions) Alongwith it, I would also like to speak about the railway line going from Masraikh via Patna that. ...(Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: May I request that all these suggestions may be sent to the Railway Minister?

...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: They will be sent to him.

...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: That will be known to them.

...(Interruptions)

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER: Prabhunath Singhji, it is enough please cooperate. Sumitra Mahajan ji, you always cooperate.

...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: You may please send them.

PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA (South Delhi): You can send them, but he is not accessible. ...(Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: I cannot force him.

[Translation]

THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS (SHRI LALU PRASAD): Sir, I am available all the time. Nobody is more accessible than me.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: I shall now put all the cut motions, which have been treated as moved, to the vote of the House.

The cut motions were put and negatived.

...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: All 'ayes' are not good!

...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I shall now put the Demands for Grants (Railways) for 2006-2007 to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts shown in the fourth column of the Order Paper be granted to the President of India out of the Consolidated Fund of India, to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 2007, in respect of the heads of Demands entered in the second column thereof against Demand Nos. 1 to 16."

The motion was adopted.

11.27 hrs.

APPROPRIATION (RAILWAYS) NO. 3 BILL, 2006*

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Now we will take up item no. 19.

[Translation]

THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS (SHRI LALU PRASAD): Sir, I beg to move that leave be granted to introduce a Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the services of the financial year 2006-07 for the purposes of Railways.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the services of the financial year 2006-07 for the purposes of Railways."

The motion was adopted

[Translation]

SHRI LALU PRASAD: Sir, I introduce** the bill.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Now, we take up item no. 20.

[Translation]

SHRI LALU PRASAD: Sir, I beg to move that the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the services of the financial year 2006-07 for the purposes of Railways to be taken into consideration.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain sums from and out of the Considered Fund of India for the services of the financial year 2006-07 for the purposes of Railways, be taken into considered."

The motion was adopted.

MR. SPEAKER: The House will now take up clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill.

The question is:

"That clauses 2 and 3 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 2 and 3 were added to the Bill.

The Schedule was added to the Bill.

The Schedule was added to the Bill.

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

[Translation]

SHRI LALU PRASAD: Sir, I beg to move:

"That the bill be passed."

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

**Introduced with the recommendation of the President.

*Published in the Gazette of India, Extraordinary Part-II, Section 2 dated 11.03.2006

11.30 hrs.

DISCUSSION UNDER RULE 193

Civil Nuclear Energy Cooperation with the United States

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Now, we will take up item No. 21, namely, discussion under Rule 193. Shri Gurudas Dasgupta.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI): Sir, I would like to make a submission before the discussion starts on this issue. Today, this discussion is taking place in response to the desire of a section of the House under an appropriate motion, and our hon. Prime Minister is also very keen to reply to the same. But today is Saturday, and we have to accommodate the hon. Prime Minister to reply in this House as well as in the Rajya Sabha. Therefore, I will request the House to conclude the discussion by 5 o'clock in order to allow me to bring the hon. Prime Minister to this House at 5 o'clock to respond to the debate. I am saying this because he has to go to the Rajya Sabha also. Sir, we should try to do it.

MR. SPEAKER: Do you want the reply of the hon. Prime Minister at 5 o'clock?

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI: Yes, Sir, at 5 o'clock today.

MR. SPEAKER: All right, we shall try to adjust accordingly to start the reply at 5 o'clock.

Shri Gurudas Dasgupta—not present

Shri C.K. Chandrappan to initiate the discussion on this issue.

SHRI C.K. CHANDRAPPAN (Trichur): Sir, I stand to raise a discussion on the Statement made by the hon. Prime Minister on 7.3.2006 regarding the civil nuclear energy cooperation with the United States in the context of the recent visit of the President of the USA.

Sir, in the statement, the hon. Prime Minister has explained about the various decisions taken by the two

Governments during the course of the discussions. It was a nuclear energy agreement, and there were also certain agreements regarding agriculture, knowledge economy, trade and business between the two countries, and arms deal too. These are the main items, which the hon. Prime Minister had included in the course of discussions, and on which the hon. Prime Minister had included in the course of discussions, and on which they had come to an agreement. It was agreed upon that the civil and other reactors will be separated, and separation was successfully done according to India's choice. This is what the hon. Prime Minister had stated.

Now, the last part of the statement described the two countries as 'democracies in the world' which will strive to achieve the common cause of fighting against terrorism, and preserving democracy and democratic institutions in the world.

Sir, these agreements apparently look very good, and they got such a big publicity that they were termed as historic, unprecedented, etc. I would like to say that there is conspicuous silence in the statement about one issue. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Please maintain silence in the House.

SHRI C.K. CHANDRAPPAN: A point was always raised in the recent past with the Heads of visiting States or Government—during discussions with the hon. Prime Minister or other important Ministers—about India's claim to have a seat in the United Nations Security Council (UNSC). I do not know whether the Government has raised this issue with the hon. President of the USA as there is a conspicuous silence on this issue. Probably, it was not raised or if it was raised, then probably, they did not agree to it. I feel that it is a serious omission with regard to India's own interest, and its legitimate claim to have a place in the comity of nations. The Congress benches very eloquently spoke about this during the debate on Motion of Thanks on the President's Address, namely, that this is one issue on which we would approach the nations of the world for support.

Probably, your Government did not approach on this issue to have an opinion from the United States of America. Whatever it is, the Joint Communique is silent about it.

About all the other things spoken in the joint Statement, I have certain things to say. When you look

[Shri C.K. Chandrappan]

at it historically, it may be very good to speak in terms of civility or talking things in nice terms so that the President of the United States or his supporters might feel very happy about what the Indian Parliament discusses. But I would like to remind you that Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, I hope, the Congress benches are still proud of Pandit ji, refused to shake hands with Mussolini when he came to receive Pandit ji at the Airport in Rome. It was a very surprising thing. But Pandit ji told that he would not shake hands with a Fascist. He did uphold the great Indian tradition of our Freedom Movement, and the values it cherished.

Here, such fanfare was made when Bush came. In this world, as it is today, which is described as a unipolar, he is the President of the mightiest of the mighty States, I do not mind that we spread red carpet to receive him. I must say that he gave a parting kick when he made his speech in Purana Qila, which is after the agreement was signed, everything was spoken nicely, everything was done nicely, and after so much of toast being raised. The last part of the Joint Communiqué says:

"We should stand together to fight against terrorism, protect democracy."

What Bush said, I am quoting from his speech.

"India's leadership is needed in a world that is hungry for freedom. Men and women from North Korea to Rome to Syria to Zimbabwe to Cuba yearn for their liberty. In Iran the proud people is held hostage by a small clerical elite that denies basic liberties, sponsors terrorism and pursues nuclear weapons. Our nations must not pretend that the people of these countries prefer their own enslavement. We must stand with reformers and dissidents, I underline the word 'dissidents', and civil society organisations and hasten the day when the people of this nation can determine their own future and choose their own leaders. These people may not gain their liberty overnight, but history is on our side."

Sir, this speech was made not in Washington, this speech was made not in New York, this speech was made where he was the Chief Guest in Purana Qila where when pleasantries were said, he said, "I am coming here as a friend. Martin Luther King said that he would come to India as a pilgrim. I am coming here as a friend." And the friend said this!

Mr. E. Ahamed, the Minister of External Affairs was in Iran. He was in Iran embracing the leaders of that State and came and reported back, when we were discussing Iran issue in Parliament, that the Iranian leaders are happy about the position India takes.

Now, here is our guest President Bush, utilising the opportunity we provided to him here, stating that in Iran a minority clerical sect is administering. He called upon India to stand with them to liberate those people. He wanted India to rally with the dissident. Do we agree with this? A feeble statement was made by the Ministry of External Affairs after he left for Pakistan—I should not say that I have not seen that—that we do not agree with that. That shows the unequal nature of the friendship you are creating today. You are creating a new friendship with a nation which wants to be the Chief International Police today, arrogates itself to positions where it decides which is a rogue country and which is a good country, where democracy is there and where democracy is not there, where regimes have to be destabilised and where army has to be sent for destabilisation.

They decided to send army to Iraq despite the fact that the United Nations did not agree to that. This House condemned in unequivocal terms sending of army and stationing of army in Iraq. But the USA did it and it did it with the help of NATO. Their missiles flew over India from that far off island in Indian Ocean the Diego Garcia where they have their military base. Their missiles flew from Europe. One of the ancient civilisations was bombed to rubbles. That civilisation that was there, probably during the period of our Gangetic civilisation, on the banks of the Euphrates and Tigris was bombed to rubbles. There was no sanction of the United Nations.

What was the reason they gave? The reason they gave was that there were weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. Who said that? CIA did and nobody else said that. The United Nations Inspectors did not say that. They repeatedly said that they could not find any weapons of mass destruction. There is a Chinese proverb which says that if you want to kill a dog, call it a mad dog and beat and kill it. On the same lines, the CIA said that weapons of mass destruction were there in Iraq and you have beaten and killed Iraq.

Saddam Hussain is in prison. I am no fan of Saddam Hussain. But he was the elected leader of that country. You may not like the elected leaders of many countries, that is a different matter. But in a democratic world, you

have to have elements of tolerance and a democratic sense which our new friend President Bush and for that matter the United States do not have. That is my complaint. There my right doubt also as to what extent they would respect the commitments they have made to this country. They may not honour them. Somebody said, "Oh! President of the USA. They will not honour". Yes, that is their tradition. I can cite any number of examples about the agreements that they dishonoured, international agreements. I can cite any number of destabilisations they made in the world during half a century. The destabilisation was made everywhere with a purpose.

This has a purpose behind unseating a Government that was progressive. That necessarily should not be that of the Communists. In the Fifties, just after the Second World War, when new nations were coming up with new aspirations like India, what happened to the Prime Minister of Iran, Mohd. Mossaddeq, who nationalised the British oilfields? I think, you remember that. What happened to him? The Anglo-British combine unseated him using the military power. Sir, two years later, in the backyards of the United States in Guatemala, a new Government was elected by the people and that Government was not liked by the multi-national companies selling fruits. They are called the United Fruit Company, a multinational company. They did not like the Government and they wanted the Government to be overthrown. Then came the United States and bombarded that country and that Government was unseated. That was in the Fifties.

Now, we are discussing this in March, 2005. On 16th February, there was an election in Haiti, a small island in the Caribbean. In Haiti, the Government of Aristide was overthrown last year by the United States. His own man with massive majority, inspired the forces of democracy and got elected on 16th February. Thus, probably again facing another destabilisation.

We received Mr. Fidel Castro. He was made the President of NAM in Delhi. Indira Gandhi handed over the Presidentship to Mr. Fidel Castro. Mr. Fidel Castro, from day one onwards when he came to power in 1959 till today, he is under US blockade. His life is threatened and he is threatened with war. What right the United States has got to do all these things? Is it not well known that in the Seventies, the CIA instigated and directly intervened and upset the whole political system of Chile and unseated Mr. Allende, President of Chile. Not only that, he was killed. That is the history of the United States. I do not want to narrate further.

In the last century, more than 100 destabilisation acts have been done in their own backyards of South America. Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia are located 3,000 kilometres away from the United States, which fought for their freedom. You know that probably more than a million US army men were sent there and for years they remained there. They had used all kinds of weapons, probably, except the nuclear weapons. What for they were there? Explanation was given that these countries were hampering the security interests of the United States.

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Chandrappan, I do not wish to interrupt you. But the discussion is on civil nuclear energy cooperation. You have taken 20 minutes.

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

I am saying that this is a nuclear treaty we have entered into with a friend whose tradition is such that they never honour. They never give respect to their partners—big and small. We may be thinking that we are a big country but they care too hoots for all that. That is the history of that country. That is why I say that whatever good things are said, they may not come true.

Secondly, when the President of the United States landed in Delhi, Press lauded his magnanimity. He came and quietly went to sleep. Everything was left to Condoleezza Rice saying that no hitch should be there tomorrow morning. He work up and asked whether there was any hitch. Probably there was no hitch or whatever hitch was found, was removed and the Agreement signed. What a wonderful person he is! What a wonderful Agreement it is! The treasury Benches were in ecstasy but unwillingly India was made to become part of the global strategy of geo-politics that the United States wants to have. They want an alliance desperately. I am not saying this. Their senior leaders including President Bush said it, to contain China. They say, after the collapse of the Soviet Union, after the cold war, they do not want another contender in the world and so, they want to contain China. They want also to see—Russia is not doing well—that Soviet Union is no more there. They want new friends in Asia. They have Pakistan with them. But Pakistan was always with them. But, they want India to be with them. When, our friends from the BJP, sitting here, were in power, they were trying to take India to the United States' table. They did not succeed. Now, to my great surprise, this Government have done that. They have taken India to the stable of the United Nations

[Shri C.K. Chandrappan]

global strategy of containing China, containing Russia and to have an upper hand in politics in this Asiatic region. That is a danger that we see in the Joint Statement. They have bartered their independent foreign policy. That is our complaint. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: For records sake, 'you' will mean, 'the Speaker'.

SHRI C.K. CHANDRAPPAN: I do not mean you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The say, 'the Treasury Benches'.

...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI C.K. CHANDRAPPAN: Sir, the Government has bartered the independent foreign policy, that has been continuing for decades since the time of Independence. This foreign policy of peace, solidarity and the policy of disarmament, that stood against the arms race, has been bartered for a little nuclear energy and arms which they are sending to us and probably will instigate arms race in this part of the world.

My third point is this that we have bartered our independent policy of non-alignment, peace and disarmament. We have seen that. When I quoted President Bush, I must say that it is his audacity that after such a grand reception, the nice words and everything, it is almost like a kick on our face. He said that he was inviting us to come with him and stand in the fight against countries who have regimes that he did not like. They did not like their destabilisation. They want an ally in India. Therefore, my contention is that the Statement speaks good things, but the Statement is silent about India's place in the Security Council.

There is another aspect also in the Asiatic region. Our Prime Minister spoke about our extended neighbourhood. He speaks about our enlightened national interest. There is Israel in the extended neighbourhood. Just after Iran and Syria, one comes across Israel and just on the borders of Israel, recently a very important development took place. Hamas has been elected to office in Palestine.

What did Israel say? The Ministers must have read it. All of them must have read it. Israel told the Hamas Prime Minister; "You might have been elected but our sharp shooters will shoot you down." It was said about the head of a State. Will, we will not feel so surprised

because Yasser Arafat was one of the world leaders we honoured. He came to the Central Hall and spoke to this Parliament. He was given a red carpet welcome. It is all right.

In Ramallah in his last days he told that 'probably he was not a person shedding tears.' But he said this in such a manner that how the Head of a State was treated by Israel with their tanks surrounding his palace and made him a virtual prisoner. Israel has stockpile of nuclear arms. They are threatening Iran by saying: "If you go ahead with your nuclear programme, we may strike the manner the pre-emptive strike we have done in case of Iraq." But our Government said nothing about it. Their Joint Statement did not utter a single word of concern about that development in this part of the extended neighbourhood. So, it is the extended neighbourhood where freedom is being attacked; destabilisation effort is being done all with the support of the USA. Without the support of USA, Israel cannot exist. It is a surrogate country existing with the support of the USA. Is it that we are not concerned about it.

When the BJP people were in power, they tried to take the policy a little forward India-Israel Axis. It had all the support of the USA. Mr. Brajesh Mishra went to Washington to negotiate that. But somehow time was not in their favour. But I would like to know from the Government whether they are also going to do that after this. I think, it is a dangerous thing and we cannot ignore it. We may get nuclear power generation facility. I do not know whether we will have facilities for re-processing the nuclear wastes. That depends. We have kept our fingers crossed. The US Congress is not like our Parliament. It is all powerful, constitutionally so.

MR. SPEAKER: We are also powerful.

SHRI C.K. CHANDRAPPAN: We are not so powerful, Sir, I am sorry; because our Constitution does not say that a Treaty has to be ratified by Parliament.

MR. SPEAKER: Our Constitution makers did not make that.

SHRI C.K. CHANDRAPPAN: We can make it.

MR. SPEAKER: But that does not mean that we are not powerful.

SHRI C.K. CHANDRAPPAN: So, I have moved an amendment to the Constitution. If you kindly permit, we can discuss it.

Sir, if their Parliament, the US Congress does not approve, everything falls through. It has happened in the history. About agreement of any country with USA, when the US Congress disapproves that or refuses to ratify, it falls through.

MR. SPEAKER: All Constitutions are different. Our Constitution is different. But that does not mean that our Parliament has no power.

SHRI C.K. CHANDRAPPA: We have this power that we can discuss it and talk it out. But their Parliament can decide 'yes' or 'no'.

MR. SPEAKER: Then, do you want to follow that?

SHRI C.K. CHANDRAPPA: No. I think, in this regard specially after certain experiences, I would like our Parliament to have such powers so that behind the back of this country things should not happen as the WTO Agreement was signed. The peasants are perishing. We can only discuss it but there is no ratification. Now, behind our back, the US Accord is being signed. We can only discuss it.

So, I would say that with crossed fingers probably, you are praying that wisdom should dawn on the US Congress so that nothing untoward happens to the Treaty. With these words, I express these apprehensions about the unequal nature of the Treaty. They want a partner who always refuses whatever they do not like: and now dangerously so, they are calling us to go forward with them to fight for destabilisation of the regimes they do not like. These are our serious apprehensions. This is why this discussion was raised.

Thank you very much for your patient hearing.

12.00 hrs.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN (Balasore): Sir, the BJP as the initiator of the process of strategic cooperation with the United States of America, whom the then Prime Minister Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee had termed as India's natural ally, is gratified by the development. This joint statement is an explicit confirmation by the present UPA Government of the continuing validity of BJP, NDA Government's strategic initiative of deepening, broadening and strengthening relations with the United States of America. This is the direction in which the BJP-NDA Government has set the entire policy. The joint

announcement of 2nd March reaffirms the centrality of that policy. But, Sir, the only yardstick of objectively assessing, evaluating and commenting on this important announcement is India's national interest, very purposively explained by the hon. Prime Minister, the enlightened national interest. Based on this, it is our view that the Government has surrendered on many counts and these are the concerns, though we support this Agreement, which I shall basically express.

The Prime Minister rests his argument on two bases; availability of nuclear energy and the energy security of this country. What are his arguments? His arguments are; coal-base thermal energy is a polluter, gas is more costly but nuclear energy is clean. These are the three basic points on which he established all his arguments. Let us see what is the position of nuclear power in India now.

The nuclear power energy in India constitutes less than three per cent of the energy basket of this country. Let us go to the Annual Report of 2004-05, of the Department of Atomic Energy. It says that the Nuclear Power Corporation of India operates 14 reactors; two boiling water reactors and 12 pressurised heavy water reactors. What is the total capacity of these 14 reactors? It is 2,770 megawatt. In addition to that, India is also going to be engaged in the construction of eight nuclear power reactors with a total capacity of 3,960 megawatts. So, altogether there are 22 reactors and their total capacity is going to be 6,730 megawatt. The Government has set to achieve a target of 10,000 megawatt of power generation by 2010 and thereafter to achieve setting up of a few more reactors of 5,40 megawatts each like TAPP III and IV. These TAPP-III and IV projects are the largest indigenously designed and built nuclear power reactors of this country. According to the Annual Report of the Department of Atomic Energy, the gestation period of these reactors is about 50 months and they are one of the bests in the world.

This is the strength of our nuclear scientists and the technologists. It has happened because of the capability of our nuclear scientists. It is because of them that we have today been described as a responsible State with advanced nuclear technology. But my point here is that even if we achieve 10,000 megawatt of nuclear energy by 2010 or 20,000 megawatt of nuclear energy by 2020, it will at best be a small contribution to the total energy need of India. It will be not more than 10 per cent of the total need. Our potential for hydro electricity is huge.

[Shri Kharabela Swain]

There is also the possibility of having non-conventional energy like wind energy. So, it is a very wrong premise to say that it is only the nuclear energy which can sort out the problem of India in the next two decades. We do not believe in this.

Now another point on which the hon. Prime Minister's speech rests is that the nuclear energy is clean energy. It is not like coal. The United States is the biggest polluter on this planet. It has not signed the Kyoto Protocol. Our emission of green house gases is 0.05 per cent of the total US emission. So we have to think of this. Who is polluting this world? It is not us. It is the United States of America. The clean coal technology is available elsewhere in the world. We can adopt it. It is available in South Africa. The environmental issue could be taken care of by thermal and also by clean coal technology. So to say that the clean energy is only available out of the nuclear technology or nuclear power, for me, it is not true.

The next point is that we will have nuclear power but at what cost. What is its cost? For a target of 40,000 megawatt of installed capacity by 2020, the total additional investment required would be Rs. 2,40,000 crore. Is it a very small sum? We want electricity but at what cost? This is a stupendous cost. This is only the installation cost of the reactor. What about the cost of the uranium? Nobody knows what would be the cost of the uranium. What we have heard is that the cost of uranium has gone up by three times. So, the capital cost involved in a nuclear project is very high and the fuel cost is also equally high. As per the Annual Report of the Department of Nuclear Energy, we have not exploited our uranium mining capacity. There is only one mine in Jadugoda in Jharkhand from where we have our uranium and elsewhere we have never tried.

As regards thorium. It can also work as fuel for the nuclear reactor. The two-third of the world's thorium deposits are available in India. It is a chance given to the scientists of India to become self-sufficient. If you utilise the thorium deposits that are available with us and if you utilise the uranium then I think India will be self-sufficient in this field and India will not be critically dependent on any of these nations of the world for its nuclear fuel and energy.

As per this Agreement, neither India is having energy security nor it is going to be self-reliant in the energy security. It is basically a programme of imported fuel and imported reactors.

This is exactly what is going to happen. How can India, on one hand, be perpetually dependent—that is another problem—on imported reactors and fuel and also, on the other hand, talk about energy security and self-reliance in this regard? These are two contradictory things. I would like to appeal to the hon. Prime Minister to reply to this point when he replies to the debate. What has been our experience in the past? All of a sudden, just like as it happened in the case of Tarapur power plant of stopping fuel supply, it can happen again in future. This is my apprehension and also the concern of my Party. The hon. Prime Minister should reply to this.

The next point is, what is India's standing in the nuclear field? We agree that there are three phases of India's nuclear development programme. Initially, pre-1974, it was an independent era. We did not have any restrictions on us. We developed our nuclear energy programme independently. We, with the help of other countries, developed it. We had the Apsara reactor with the help of Canada; we had our reactor in Tarapur with the help of USA and we had our reactors in Kundukulam with the help of the then USSR. That was the first phase.

Now, second phase started when tests for the first time was conducted in 1974 in Rajasthan. The second phase was the era of sanctions. That was the noon of a nuclear winter. That was the time when India was being described as an international pariah. This happened during that time. That was the second phase. But this was also the time when nuclear technology blossomed. The scientists who were denied access to nuclear technology mastered this art of nuclear technology in all fields and we were even using our indigenous nuclear technology for strategic purposes. That was the second phase. The regime of international denial became a source of great strength for India. We became self-reliant and our scientists brought this glory to this nation. I could say that this was the best period with regard to nuclear technology that India had.

The third phase started post-Pokhran in 1998. We became practically a *de-facto* nuclear weapon state in 1998. There were more sanctions, more denials, but we faced them. Our situation did not deteriorate. Within two years of this nuclear denial, the then President of the United States of America, Mr. Bill Clinton, after imposing economic and technological sanctions on India, visited India. It so happened because we stood our ground. We gained from our strength and from our foreign policy to have the minimum strategic deterrence.

Sir, with regard to NPT, I would like to submit that we have not signed the NPT because we thought that it was discriminatory and so we did not sign that. Taken this example. It was signed in 1971, some 34 to 35 years back. It recognised two categories of State, one is the nuclear weapon States and the other category of States that it recognised was the non-nuclear weapon States.

In 1998, we declared that we are also a Nuclear Weapon State. Even though we have proved ourselves to be a Nuclear Weapon State, we have not still joined the non-proliferation regime. Our Prime Minister declared that India is a responsible nuclear power. I have already mentioned that NPT has divided the world into two categories, namely, Nuclear Weapon States and non-Nuclear Weapon States. But after we tested our device in 1998, we became the third category. The world saw the third category State emerging. This is a non-signatory State to NPT but a Nuclear Weapon State. By 1998, all the five countries having nuclear weapons were signatories to the NPT. In 1998, we became the sixth State having nuclear weapons almost officially but we are non-signatory to NPT. By signing the present agreement, we are doing so without being recognised as a Nuclear Weapon State. That is our objection. We are actually a *de facto* Nuclear Weapon State but in this agreement, we have not been accepted as such. That is our objection. We are actually being given a second class status in this agreement. We have been treated as a poor cousin of the United States of America. Why do I say this? It is because now we will have to sign the India Specific Agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency. We have to sign one India Specific Agreement with the IAEA. India Specific talks are to be negotiated with the IAEA because we are not a nuclear weapon State. We will have to sign an agreement which no other five countries having nuclear weapons have done. They do not have an agreement like this. They have no agreement with the IAEA like the India Specific Agreement.

Now, as per this agreement, what are we going to do? We have to voluntarily place our civilian nuclear facilities under the IAEA safeguards. In future, we have to sign and adhere to an additional protocol with regard to the civilian nuclear facilities. These are the two things to be considered here. We will have to sign one India Specific Agreement and voluntarily, we have to separate civilian and military nuclear facilities and we also will have to sign one additional protocol in future with the IAEA.

Sir, my basic point and the point of my Party is that when there should be an agreement with any other country, it should rest under reciprocity. This should rest on parity. It cannot be an agreement with unequals. It should be an agreement with the equals only. Now, what happened in this agreement? In future, we are volunteering to place our civilian nuclear facilities and programmes in a phased manner under the safeguards of the IAEA.

My question here is this. Has the US made such a separation between its civilian and military nuclear facilities? Has it done that? They are also Nuclear Weapon States and we are also a Nuclear Weapon State. Why should we do something which they have not done? Has the US brought into force the additional protocol signed with the IAEA? Has it done that? It has merely signed it but has not implemented it. No nuclear power has separated the military and civilian nuclear facilities in actual practice including the USA. They have merely signed it. The five countries, namely USA, Russia, China, France and UK have signed additional protocols with the IAEA. I agree with this. But neither Russia which has signed it on the 22nd March, 2000 nor the USA which signed it on the 22nd September, 1998 have brought this into force.

Even while signing the Additional Protocol, the United States of America, consistent with the rights of a Nuclear Weapon State, has chosen to limit or deny access to IAEA safeguards. I would like to emphasise this point. The United States of America has got the right to deny access or include or exclude any inspection activities on the basis of its national security exclusions. They have signed this Additional Protocol with the IAEA. The United States of America says that it has got the right to deny access to any international inspection in future. But what will we have to do? We will have to voluntarily place them under the international inspection, that too perpetually, for all the times to come. Is it based on parity? Is it based on the policy of reciprocity? The USA, in particular, will not provide the IAEA information which are of direct national security significance to it; it can deny access to activities and locations which are of direct national security significance to it; and it can exclude inspection activities that are inconsistent with the national security exclusions. The USA has already told that whenever we think that it is against our national interest, we will refuse it. They can very well say that the IAEA cannot come and inspect it.

[Shri Kharabela Swain]

The IAEA now applies safeguards at only four US facilities out of the 250 civil nuclear facilities that the US has made eligible for the IAEA safeguards under its Voluntary Offer Agreement with the IAEA. The US is having 250 nuclear facilities. It has declared that they are all civilians. But it has allowed inspections only at four facilities. So, for them it is good. But for India it has to be in perpetuity. This is what the present position is.

In more than two decades, the IAEA has conducted inspection only at 17 of these facilities in all these five Nuclear Weapon States combined together. The IAEA has conducted inspections only in 17 of these facilities. But in our case it is intrusive, that is, the inspection can be conducted at any time, anywhere. Whenever they want to conduct an inspection, they can do so.

The IAEA inspection is very nominal in the case of the USA, Russia, China, UK and France because they are Nuclear Weapon States and are recognised as such under the NPT. Will India get the same treatment as a nuclear Weapon State from the IAEA?

I am very happy that the hon. Prime Minister is present here. I would expect that a clarification will come when he replies to it at the end. I hope he will address our concerns. It clearly shows that it is a discrimination against India.

There is one more point which I would like to point out. Nuclear Weapon States can declare one facility as civilian and in future can change it to military. They can declare one nuclear facility as civilian and if it does not suit them they can change it to military. For example, the USA can declare one facility as civilian and if it does not suit that country they can change it to military and thereby exclude it from international safeguards. Can we do so? We have said that we will leave it for inspection in perpetuity.

My another point is that there is a fixed life for a reactor. USA has also agreed that it will supply nuclear fuel to these reactors in perpetuity. But there lies the catch, because every reactor has got a fixed life, around 25 years. So, when it will cease to function after 25 years, since we have placed it under perpetual international safeguards, the IAEA will have the right to intrude and to inspect it even after 25 years. Spent fuel in a nuclear reactor is a precious thing. So, the safeguards will continue even after the longevity, with the afterlife of spent fuel. That is what I explained.

Now, I would come to the most important point about this deal, where we have a very strong objection also. This deal effectively caps our nuclear weapons capability because out of 22 nuclear facilities, we are handing over 14 as civilian for international safeguards to the IAEA for any intrusive inspection, at any time. In perpetuity, the fissile material available for our strategic work will not be available. This is where our objection is.

We have already decided that we will close down the CIRUS reactor by 2010. But, we have not declared that we are going to replace it by anything. We are not bringing in any replacement. Nuclear reactors cannot be built overnight. So, we should have come up with another new reactor in place of CIRUS reactor, which we are going to close down by 2010.

Now, Sir, six reactors are going to be imported. But they will also remain under perpetual safeguards. So, that is capping our strategic programme; it is going to be restricted. Depending upon our threat perception, we cannot have the independence of determining our minimum credible deterrence. That is our most important point, and objection too here, that in future we will not be in a position to determine what minimum requirement, strategic requirement, with regard to the nuclear weapons we must have.

Now, India will have India-specific commitment with IAEA, which is a multilateral body. Yes, we are having an agreement with the United States of America, but that is a bilateral agreement. But when we enter into an agreement with IAEA, it is going to be a multilateral one. My point is that if something wrong happens in future, we have said that we can walk out of the agreement with the United States of America because it is a bilateral agreement. Can we do so by walking out of IAEA which is a multilateral agreement? Will it be possible? I would like a clarification from the hon. Prime Minister on this.

Sir, I have already told that the main deal rests on reciprocity, on parity. The hon. Prime Minister said that our separation would be voluntary. We can dare say from our party side that we do not think that the separation was voluntary. It was forced on us because they have already discussed with the United States of America. First, it was discussed with the United States of America and then only we declared that this is our Separation Plan. So, it is discriminatory because it does not recognize India as a nuclear weapons State. Our demand is that no restriction should be put on our nuclear

weapons programme. We very strongly feel and say that in future no restriction should be put.

But, I am very sorry to say you, Sir, the United States of America is trying to impress upon their own Congressmen that they have succeeded in limiting our nuclear capability.

They are selling this argument to their Congress. They are saying: "Even though India is not a signatory to the NPT, we have been able to limit their nuclear weapons capability." That is the story they are selling to their countrymen to get it passed through their Congress. That is one of the most frustrating things for India as far as our party is concerned.

I mean to say that there should be friendship with equality. There should be no subordination or superior relationship. Friendship should be on equal terms. We should not cap our nuclear programme. I would accuse that this UPA Government has gone out of its way to befriend the United States of America which we would not have done. The NDA, the BJP Government would not have done that. We would have agreed to place only three facilities under the international safeguards. We would never have gone beyond this which this Government has done. I will take three or four minutes. I will complete my speech. From our Party only two Members are there to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: I did not say anything.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN: That is what we would have done. Our point is that it has gone out of its way to appease the United States of America. Take the example of China. Why I am saying is that we must have a credible nuclear deterrence. You take the example of China. We are nowhere near China in missile technology. India's foreign policy is not Pakistan-centric. We do not simply depend upon what Pakistan does. We have to see somewhere else also. The Europe has already lost the momentum. So, it is China, India and the United States of America which are going to compete in this century to become the world leaders. As I said, already, the Europe has lost the momentum. It is far behind. So, we should get ready for that eventuality.

I will now just make the last two points. With regard to NPT, it says that all Nuclear Weapon States should destroy their stockpiles; they should go for total disarmament. It was first signed in 1970. But thirty years

have passed. There has been no movement in this regard. So, India is a responsible Nuclear Weapon State. We have already declared that we will have no first use of it; we will have no use of it against any non Nuclear Weapon Country. So, I would appeal to this Government that India should take the lead for the disarmament of the world. A nuclear weapon free world is what we actually required. So, India should take the lead. Please take the examples of Japan and Germany. Without even having the nuclear weapon, they have attained greatness and prosperity. So, Sir, I appeal to this Government that it should also take the lead and see that India becomes a leader of disarmament.

I now come to my last point. I am very much surprised that this Government says—just like our Government said—that it is a historic occasion by just inviting Mr. George Bush. It is very much surprising that their own allies, the Leftists were having an agitation. They were having an agitation all over this country. They say that they are supporting this Government but they are just opposing it. I was very much surprised when I saw a photograph which appeared in the newspapers that in Mumbai, when the Leftists were having a rally, there was a banner which said: "We will become the suicide bombers." ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI: Are you opposing or supporting it? I am a little bit confused. I can understand what they say ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN: That is what I want to know.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI: If you yield for a moment, I will put a question. Did you advise your concept of nuclear weapons free State in 1998 to the then Prime Minister Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee? ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: No, it is for him to reply.

...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN: Sir, I have. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI VIJAYENDRA PAL SINGH (Bhilwara): Is it right for the Minister to intervene like that? ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: It is because he yielded.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN: It is a very good thing, Sir. ...*(Interruptions)*

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER: You Speak.

[English]

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN: No, I would complete because I have nothing more to say. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: No, I am not stopping you.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN: My point is this. I do not know whether he was present at the time when I just commenced my speech. I said that the BJP as the initiator of the process of strategic cooperation with the United States of America, whom the then Prime Minister Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee had termed as India's natural ally, is gratified by the development. This is the first sentence I said, Sir.

THE MINISTER OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY AND MINISTER OF OCEAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRI KAPIL SIBAL): Are you supporting?

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN: But, I said that we have our concerns as an Opposition Party. As the principal Opposition Party, these are our concerns because we feel that India has surrendered to United States of America on many counts. I would like a clarification from the hon. Prime Minister.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI: Sir, I would like to appeal through you to the House that this short duration discussion began at 11.30 am and it will be nice if the House agrees, through you, that we skip the lunch hour so that the harmony of the debate continues. They can conclude by 3.30 pm or 3.45 pm so that the hon. Prime Minister, as I have said has to reply at 5 p.m., can postpone his reply. I have seen the list of the speakers.

[Translation]

PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA (South Delhi): At what time reply would be given.

[English]

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI: After 3.30 p.m.

PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA: Any time? Fix a time.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI: Exact 3.30 pm or after that because five or six minutes might be here and there. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Not many speakers are there so it maybe early also.

THE MINISTER OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY AND MINISTER OF OCEAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRI KAPIL SIBAL): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was listening with rapt attention to both Mr. Chandrappan and Mr. Kharabela Swain. As far as my good friend Shri Chandrappan is concerned, I thought that the debate was on the statement of the Prime Minister on the 27th of February and the 7th of March in respect of the civil nuclear energy cooperation with the United States of America. Instead we got a conspectus of US foreign policy over the last 55 years. As that is not the ambit of this debate, I will choose not to respond to all the Statements made by my learned colleague except to say that the Congress Party has always learnt from history and in the dynamics of the present situation, wishes to protect the future of our country. I was also a bit confused by Mr. Swain's very valuable contribution this morning because I do not know really where his party stood. I think it is important for the country to know really where his party stood. I think it is important for the country to know where the BJP stands. Where the NDA stands? Are you for the deal or are you against the deal? I think it is important for them to have made that clear at the initial intervention that they made.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I just wish to go back in history because I do not think we can understand the entire conspectus of this deal without going back a few years. I go back to the time when we attained independence. At that point of time, we were the ones who talked about nuclear non-proliferation. We were, in fact, the initiators of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) in 1954 itself. It is because we realised what devastation Hiroshima and Nagasaki caused to the world. So, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru as leader, at that point of time, called upon all countries to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

Unfortunately, that never happened and the United States, after Hiroshima and Nagasaki, had a programme called 'Atoms for Peace'. They wanted to project to the world that nuclear energy can be used for peaceful

purposes also. In that context through the 'Atoms for Peace' programme, they wanted to extend support to the less-developed world and gave us \$80 million on soft terms to set up a nuclear reactor at Tarapur, constructed by General Electric.

Then, we signed and we were the first country to sign the Partial Test Ban Treaty of 1963. Thereafter, things changed and the reason why things changed was on account of three events. Unfortunately Pandit Nehru passed away. He was a firm believer in non-proliferation. Second, in 1962 we were involved in a conflict with a neighbouring country. In 1964, which is a very important date, China conducted nuclear tests and we realised that our security was in danger. Though we were great believers in non-proliferation, we were also great believers in ensuring that nothing should happen which can impact adversely on the security of our country. Therefore, in terms of the Tarapur project, which was a project for peaceful purposes, for civil nuclear energy, we set up a Reprocessing Plant at Tarapur as also the Cirus Research Reactor at Tarapur which enabled us to use reprocessing facilities for the purposes of our security concerns. That was the beginning of a weapons programme for India.

Then came the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty in 1967 and, as everybody knows, the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty created a regime of nuclear apartheid. You have the 5 nuclear States and the rest of the world as non-nuclear States. The 5 nuclear States perpetuated their nuclear power and I dare say that after 1967 till 1995, 35,000 nuclear tests were conducted by various nuclear powers. That is the extent to which the nuclear powers were, in fact, amassing nuclear weapons.

In the context of what had happened in 1964 and 1962, we realised that we were at the receiving end of the nuclear apartheid regime and we could not expose our security to a neighbour with nuclear weapons. Therefore, we decided to move forward not to become a nuclear weapon State, but to have the capacity to produce nuclear weapons. I am giving this background because that is the background in which we must understand the 1974 tests.

We demonstrated to the world that we were not going nuclear because they were referred to as 'nuclear tests for peaceful purposes.' If you remember, those were the very significant words used by Mrs. Indira Gandhi. She said: "These are nuclear tests for peaceful purposes." Therefore, we wanted to tell the world that we have the

capacity, but we did not want to become a nuclear weapon State because we were firmly committed to a weapons-free world, we were firmly committed to a non-nuclear world regime. That happened in 1974 and the only consequence of that was that after the 1989 Tarapur Agreement with the United States and Canada, we did not get any fuel supply till the Agreement ended in 1993.

We realised that we needed to actually be prepared to protect our security at any given point in time. So, I give credit to the scientific community of this country, who despite the gravest of odds, prepared our country to have the capability to meet any challenge that came from this part of the world. I want to stand here today to congratulate the scientific community for having enabled us to do so.

Mr. Speaker Sir, it is important to remember that despite the nuclear test for peaceful purposes in 1974, India was ready to embrace the nuclear non-proliferation regime. I would like at this point to comment and to quote what Rajiv Ji said way back on June 9, 1988 at a special session on Disarmament in the United Nations. That was a very historic speech and this is what he said:

"We are approaching the close of the Twentieth Century. It has been the most bloodstained century in history. Fifty-eight million perished in two World Wars, 40 million more have died in other conflicts. In the last nine decades, the ravenous machines of war have devoured nearly one hundred million people. The appetite of this monstrous machines grows on what they feed. Nuclear war will not remain the death of a 100 million people or even a 1000 million people. It will mean the extinction of 4,000 million. The end of life, as we know it on our planet Earth, we come to the United Nations to seek your support. We seek your support to put a stop to this madness."

I say this because even after the nuclear tests, Rajiv Gandhi was wedded to a non-proliferation regime.

Let me tell you a very interesting thing, which he said and which really is the heart of the matter that differentiates us and the BJP. In that very Address to the United Nations, he said:

"Corresponding to such commitment by the nuclear weapon States, those nations—and he was referring to India—which are capable of crossing the nuclear

[Shri Kapil Sibal]

weapon threshold must solemnly undertake to restrain themselves. This must be accompanied by strict measures to end all covert and overt assistance to those seeking to acquire nuclear weapons."

There was a dual message in this. The message was that we are at the threshold, we know how to produce nuclear weapons, but we are exercising a policy of self-restraint. But let this not allow other nations to assist some nations in acquiring nuclear weapons. It was a message to the world that our policy was a policy of restraint and that we still believed in non-proliferation.

All that changed in 1998. The difference between them and us is that we believed in non-proliferation, we still believe in non-proliferation. But they changed the whole paradigm of India's nuclear policy without understanding the import of the restraint reflected in the words of Rajiv Gandhi. That is where you brought upon India and brought upon the people of India, the sanctions which were the consequence of your act in 1998.

But much happened after 1998. In 1995, unfortunately, the 1967 Treaty was extended without any limit.

So, the nuclear apartheid regime was made limitless, was granted unlimited extension and we realised that India was not in a position to secure its concerns unless India was able to manufacture nuclear weapons. I remember that on the 11th of May 1998 the kudos that the then NDA Government and the BJP showered on itself as to how they were the ones who were able to actually cross the Rubicon by pushing the button. I have to say that you may have pushed the button, but everything till the button stage was done by us. You should have given us credit and given the credit to the scientists of this country for what they did and the leadership of this country for what they did. You never did so. That is why, today, for the first time I am placing before this House the historical context in which this agreement has been entered into with the United States of America.

What was the nature of the sanctions regime and what did we have to go through, I think it is important for us to remember that. You should realise that we were denied cryogenic engines. I just want to explain as to what is a cryogenic engine. It is the use of liquid oxygen and liquid nitrogen to provide greater lift when you launch a spacecraft. This denial had a great negative

impact on our space programme which is put to multifarious civilian uses. Today, our space programme through remote sensing can locate water catchments. Our space programme through remote sensing can tell us the extent of forest cover. Our space programme is the basis of the communications system that we have in this country. But we were denied the cryogenic engines because of the policies that you entered into. Though cryogenic engines are not used for launching of missiles because liquid nitrogen is not used for the launch of missiles, yet we were denied this technology. There were export controls imposed upon us. Today as the world moves along, huge technological developments are taking place because of high computing capacities of super computers. We were denied all the super computers because of the decision that you took. Today, the capacity of super computers is in teraflops. We could not even get into this country, import into this country a low capacity cray's computer, super computer. If you look at all the hardware, you look at all the bio-tech sector in this country, the information technology sector in this country, all the hardware is based on super computing. We could not import any of these into our country. Not just that, Sir, we could not use these technologies, and many of these are health-related technologies which allow the use of radiation to detect many things. We could not import PET scans and TEM scans. These are all nuclear laser technologies which could be put to dual use. In the area of food processing and agriculture, for safety and security, we could not use these technologies to increase the self life of our agricultural produce. You know that large quantities of agricultural produce go waste. We could not use spectroscopic techniques for security. What is it that I am trying to say? It is because of your decision in 1998, not after 1974, after 1998, that we were subjected to all these restrictions.

SHRI VIJAYENDRA PAL SINGH (Bhilwara): May I ask you one question?

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: No. I am not yielding.

MR. SPEAKER: He is not yielding.

...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: No. Sorry.

...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: It will not be recorded.

...(Interruptions)*

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: I am not yielding.
...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Vijayendra Pal Singh, he has not yielded. Sorry. Please cooperate.

...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Please do not record anything. Nothing will be recorded.

...(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: He must yield. You know that.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN: It is not a High Court or Supreme Court. ...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Please do not record anything.

...(Interruptions)*

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: I never interrupted you.
...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Will you please take your seat? This is not the way. A very important discussion is going on. He has made a very good speech. Do not spoil his speech.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Sir, this is one aspect of the matter that we were denied civilian use of technologies over the years, which could have had a very positive impact on the developmental needs of our country. But there was another imperative that was facing us. Let me tell you about that imperative. The other imperative that faces us is this. I want to give the figures now. The fact of the matter is that our energy needs by the year 2025 are going to grow exponentially. At the moment we produce about 1,30,000 megawatt of electricity, if you include captive consumption. But by the year 2025 we will probably need three to four times that capacity. Where are we going to get that capacity from? It is very important to understand this issue.

As far as the oil producing countries are concerned, I may mention to you, Sir, that five oil producing countries in the world produce 64 per cent of all the oil in the world. Twenty-five per cent of that 64 per cent is produced by Saudi Arabia alone. Iraq produces 10 per cent. UAE produces 9.3 per cent. Kuwait produces 9.2 per cent. Iran produces 8.6 per cent. The total is 64 per cent. This is a limited resource. Other countries in the world whether it is South America or the Nordic countries or in Siberia, they produce a very small quantity. This is a limited resource.

As China and India grow in prosperity and as the bludgeoning middle class increases in numbers, we are going to need more and more energy. Where are we going to get this energy from? It is not going to be provided by the oil producing countries because their production levels are going to go down and the consumption levels will far outreach the supply levels. So, we will have to look for alternative sources of energy.

If you look at the United States today, if you look at their energy consumption levels, they are also increasing exponentially. So, their demand will be on the rise. We will all be competing for the same energy resources in the Middle-East, which, as you know, today is in the midst of all kinds of conflicts and controversies. So, we cannot get an assured supply of energy. If we cannot get an assured supply of energy, the people of this country cannot progress. So, energy is at the heart of development.

The 1998, 11th May nuclear blasts did not enable us to secure the energy resources that were necessary. So, we need to actually secure those resources. But at the same time, as we secure those resources we need to protect ourselves because there is a security threat that we see around us. So, we cannot give up our military programme and we must compromise on the civilian programme for larger uses of energy. It is a simple equation. The imperatives of our national interest demand it. I think, at this point, ...(Interruptions)

Shri Swain, why do you insist? I will explain. If you listen quietly, you will understand what I am saying. If you interrupt, you may not understand and sometimes, you know, it is difficult. Get your mind cleared of the cobwebs and you will understand.

*Not recorded.

[Shri Kapil Sibal]

13.00 hrs.

I have great respect and I give great kudos to both the Prime Minister of India and the Head of the UPA, Mrs. Sonia Gandhi for taking this momentous decision. I believe that the ultimate measure of the maturity of a political party is not where it stands in moments of comfort but where it stands in times of challenge and controversy. These are challenging times. These are controversial times. Our Party stands steadfastly for the future of India and for the future of our people, and I congratulate the Prime Minister and Mrs. Sonia Gandhi for that.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is in this context that we must analyse the agreement that has been entered into, our security needs, our civil nuclear energy needs, the future of this country and how we can reach development at their doorsteps of the common man. Now, what have we done in the separation plan? What we have done is the following. Mr. Kharabela Swain was wrong when he said that he would have given only three nuclear facilities for safeguards. He probably does not know that, as I talk, before this agreement, four nuclear facilities are already under safeguards.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN: I know that, I have said it also.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: You did not say this. But anyway I am glad you know it.

MR. SPEAKER: Yours is such a scientific speech. We could not follow it.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: You would have given three more or three less. But anyway, that is neither here nor there.

What have we done? Of the 22 facilities, we say that 14 of them will be allowed to be put under the civilian nuclear safeguards. ...*(Interruptions)* Yes, it is for perpetuity. Do you know what is perpetuity? The nuclear reactor has a limited life. So, perpetuity in this context means the life of the nuclear reactor. If you say I will live in perpetuity, it means till I die.

MR. SPEAKER: You address the Chair.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: So, perpetuity, in this context means the life of the nuclear reactor. I think you should understand that. Under this agreement, what am I entitled to have? I am entitled to have as much stockpile of

uranium that I want for the life of the reactor. I can buy as much uranium from anywhere in the world. There is no bar on me. There is no bar on India.

Secondly, I will have a bilateral agreement with the United States to ensure stockpile of supplies of uranium for the reactors which are put under safeguards. That is number two. If there is any interrupted supply in respect of those stockpiles, I have an assurance in a multilateral agreement with the IAEA that they will arrange for them. Even if that fails, there is going to be a 'Friends of India' agreement in terms of which Russia and other countries will ensure that there is no interruption of supplies. Even if that fails, the Prime Minister in his statement has said that we have the sovereign right to do the best that we can for our country. What is it that we have compromised on?

Now, see the positive side of it. What is the impact of this on our energy requirements? We have a continuous stockpile of uranium. May I just mention that in this country we have 95,000 tonnes of uranium? If you use up all the uranium, 95,000 tonnes, we will be able to produce energy of a total of 12,000 megawatt. That is all. If we use up all our uranium resources, we can produce 12,000 megawatts of energy.

Now, what are our energy requirements? At the moment, if you include captive consumption, we have 1,30,000 MW. By 2025, it will be 3-4 times of that capacity. The nuclear energy only comprises 2.7 per cent of the total production of energy. Once we get a continuous supply of nuclear fuel, we will be able to use that nuclear fuel for continuous supply.

We can build many more reactors, put them in the civil-nuclear field and get more resources. I was very happy to note that John Howard, the hon. Prime Minister of Australia before he departed from Australia, made a particular statement saying that it was not willing to supply. But when he was in India I saw a very distinct change from the statement that he had made before he departed from Australia. The Western world is fully cognisant of the importance of this agreement. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: How long would you take?

...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Sir, I will conclude within ten minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: There are another five speakers from your party.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: I will conclude within ten minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: So, you can continue.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Sir, I will conclude soon. So, we will have continuous supply of energy. What is it on the military side? What is that we have done on the military side? That is very important and I think we must explain that. On the military side, it is our prerogative not to include certain facilities in the civil-nuclear energy programme. So, we can continue our research and development in the manner that we want. We can continue without capping. We are not testing any more, but we can continue to use the nuclear fuels that we have for our weapons programme without carrying on any nuclear tests. The United States does not carry on nuclear tests, but they are carrying on with their weapons' programme. For any future facilities it is our decision whether we want to put them under the civil-nuclear energy regime or under the military programme. That is our choice. So, the future is protected.

Sir, more important than that and this is heart of the matter that we have a three-stage nuclear energy programme. First is the use of pressurised Heavy Water Reactors by using uranium. Now, what is this pressurised Heavy Water Reactor and I want to explain this. They are fuelled by natural uranium and they generate electricity and the spent fuel is rich in Plutonium. That is the first phase of our nuclear energy programme. In the second phase, this plutonium is used as fuel in Fast Breeder Reactors to breed U-233 from thorium. In other words, the Fast Breeder Reactors use thorium and if you take the fuel which is rich in plutonium and Fast Breeder reactors, it produces U-233 which is fissile material, which is the second stage of our programme.

As you know, the Fast Breeder Reactors are outside the civil-nuclear energy regime. They are outside safeguards. We will make sure about that. Then, the third stage of our programme is with the use of Advanced Heavy Water Reactors. We burn U-233 with thorium and extract—and that is most important—about 75 per cent of the power from thorium, instead of the less than one per cent of the power extracted from U-235 in Light Water Reactors. In other words, the quantity of power produced

In the third phase would be 75 times more which will take care of our energy needs not of today, not 50 years hence, not 100 years hence, but for a long long time to come for future generations. Why? It is because we have 3,00,000 tonnes of thorium in this country which is one-third of the total supplies in the world; the largest supply is in Australia, the second is in India. So, what is it that we are doing? We have protected our civil-nuclear energy programme, we have protected our weapons programme and we are protecting the future generations of this country. What more do the people of this country want and what more do political parties opposing us want? We would not want to be slaves of the past, nor do we want to be slaves of the ideologies of the past and we do not want to be slaves of political opportunism, as we see across us. We want that this country moves forward. We want that the common man in this country gets what he needs for his daily living. We will use all our might, all the technologies in the world to reach him.

Sir, just a few words and I have done.

The civil nuclear energy deal is just a part of what technologies can bring us and the advantages that we can give to our people. It opens up—and I do not say open *sim sim*—it opens up huge possibilities of transfer of technologies in the field of agriculture, in the field of health, in the industrial field and in the sphere of environment.

Another agreement that we have entered into is with the Generation-4 Programme and the Next-Gen programme. What that means is—zero emission if you use coal. I congratulate the hon. Minister of Finance that he has already set apart 20 billion tonnes of coal for the purposes of using technologies of this nature to have zero emission through the use of these technologies. It is not just a civil nuclear energy deal. The possibility of transfer of technologies opening up for use of the common man will become a reality.

Sir, I want to end by quoting the words of Talleyrand. He said: "The art of statesmanship is the foresee the inevitable and to expedite its occurrence." We are seeing the inevitable in front of us, the inevitability of making this country a great nation. We want to expedite its occurrence.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL (Hooghly): Mr. Speaker, Sir, my eminent colleague Shri Kapil Sibal, towards the end of his speech, mentioned that it was not a simple case

[Shri Rupchand Pal]

of civil nuclear technology deal but a gamut of issues relating to agriculture, research in biotechnology and many more areas as has been mentioned in the hon. Prime Minister's statement. Our discussions cover the expansion of our in the field of agriculture, economic and trade cooperation, energy security and clean environment, strengthening innovation and the knowledge economy, issues to global safety and security and on deepening democracy.

There are so many areas. Firstly, let me start with the other areas before I come to the civil nuclear energy deal. As per the discussions that have taken place and in the meetings of the CEOs you find that there are reports about cooperation. The CEO of Walmart, the CEO of Monsanto have been present and some reports have been prepared. It is more or less a roadmap to the future of our agriculture, our agricultural research and how we should move. The apprehension is that agricultural research for a country like India may be moved from the public domain to the private sector. It will be dominated by the multinationals.

The hon. Prime Minister owes an explanation to this House because no report with regard to the knowledge initiative in respect of agriculture has been placed on the Table of the House. In the meanwhile the Government has started acting. That is the most unfortunate part. Even before the other important part of the negotiations have proceeded, we find that 24 Committees have already been set up at the instance of the hon. Prime Minister by the Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission.

Instead of calibrating the developments taking place in the US, we find that we have already started acting, and this House is quite in the dark. The Prime Minister owes an explanation to this House. What is actually the deliberation with regard agricultural research? What could be the outcome of deliberations with the Monsanto Chief, the Wal-Mart Chief and other good number of CEOs of multinational companies on the basis of which the Deputy-Chairman of the Planning Commission has already set up 24 committees?

There have been some other deals also with regard to our Defence. It is a follow up of the June, 2005 Indo-US Defence Co-operation Agreement. In the meanwhile, there have been joint-exercises, maritime understanding and all these things. We find reports in the papers. I do not know how far they are credible. After so many years, they have agreed to sell F-16 and F-18 fighter aircraft to

India, which we have always been denied for the last several decades. Will it not create a new situation? Will it not create an arms race because immediately after visiting India, the US President visited Pakistan? We know their track record and how even conventional weapons were denied to India. They have been strengthening and providing the latest sophisticated weapons to Pakistan. In such a situation, an arms race may build up. The Prime Minister has not spoken about these things, about the knowledge initiative and about the deals.

The most important part of it is that with regard to democracy, there is a mention in the statement that "..... the Government relating to global security and safety and on deepening democracy...." Only yesterday Nicholas Burns has said in a note given to 14 American Congressmen that if required, as it happened in the case of Iraq, their allies must join with them for just implanting the American brand of democracy. At Purana Qila also, the US President had named certain countries and spoken about regime change. The nation wants to be assured about what this means. Nicholas Burns was openly saying only yesterday and you just relate this with the American President's famous observation 'with us or against us'. When Pentagon has made full preparation for military operation in Iran, with the sort of scenario emerging, confrontation is there.

The Russian proposal or diplomatic initiative was nipped in the bud. We have to also see how the NPT is gradually being interpreted according to the whims of the US. Earlier, NPT was discriminatory between the nuclear weapon States and non-nuclear weapon States. Then, the non-nuclear weapon States were again divided with right for full cycle and right for truncated cycle. Then, again, after the Russian proposal in the case of Iran, it is being said that even more dose of uranium enrichment for research purposes under the inspection and supervision of IAEA is not permitted. There is a confrontation.

In such a confrontation, we remember that in the case of Iraq, there had been request for sending troops. There have been denials of the UN and Nicholas Burns has already said that beyond the letter and spirit of the resolution of UN, our allies must go along with us. What does it mean? It is the same roadmap. We are dragging ourselves into the global game-plan of the US. What will happen to the strategic trilateral alliance among China, Russia and India? What will happen to the confidence-building measures we have already initiated and

proceeded with Pakistan, with SAARC countries, our small neighbours, our distant neighbours and BIMSTAC.

What will happen to us? Will the philosophy of 'with us or against us' not create suspicion even among our friends that India has aligned totally with the US brand of democracy initiatives?

13.20 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

I am saying this because India has agreed to join the International Centre for Democratic Transition. We are also aware that Ms. Condoleezza Rice has taken huge amount of funds for change of regime in Iran in the name of restoring democracy. We know that they have particular brand of democracy. They accept if it is military dictatorship, and they accept if it is Shah's monarchy in Iran. But if it is a democracy, which is a reflection of the wishes of the masses of that country, then it is not considered to be a democracy. We know all that happened with respect to Cuba, Venezuela, Brazil, Argentina, etc.

Some people have been criticising us during Mr. Bush's visit to India stating that he is a respected guest of this country, but the left is demonstrating throughout the country. It is no demonstrating or protest against any individual. We neither have any particular liking or any disliking for the individual. We are doing it for the very philosophy; for the hegemonistic design; for the imperialist measures that they are adopting to subjugate the country with an eye to the oil resources and with an eye to other natural resources. If you are with us, then it is all right. Otherwise, you are against us, and you are my enemy. This is their philosophy. There was a mention about the regime change even while he was speaking at the *Purana Qila*. Therefore, the hon. Prime Minister owes an explanation to the nation. Does he conform to the views of the US President? I am asking this because India has already agreed to join the democracy initiative, defence deal purchase, etc.

I was wondering about the main reason for the US going out of the way for agreeing to lift the sanctions, which were prevailing for the last three decades. What could be the reason for it? Firstly, I thought that this strategic alliance is to have a country like India—on the side of the US—as the frontal political country to contain China. The word is there that the moment the President

had gone, some dignitaries of China have come, and very soon the Chinese leadership will be visiting India. It is high time, after six decades of endeavour that the relationship is normalised. Is it the price that we should pay for an unstable assurance? Though I shall come to this issue later on.

The outcome of this strategic alliance is not only underlining the UPA Government's departure from the commitment to the nation regarding independent foreign policy, which was so long based on national consensus, but it is also isolating it. We were isolated in Vienna when Malaysia presided and underscored about the role of the non-aligned countries. We did not perform as we should have done. What will happen to our neighbourhood, namely, the SAARC, China, etc.? This is the question, which the hon. Prime Minister owes to explain in this House. He should assure the august House that this is not going to be the price for the same.

We are very categorical in our relationships, which we have already established with countries like China, the China-Russia-India trilateral, and all the Confidence Building Measures (CBM) that we have started with our neighbouring countries.

Now, this Agreement on Civilian Nuclear Energy will have to be seen in this perspective. On our strategic alliance, the Defence deal, the deal with regard to the agricultural research, science and technology, infrastructure, have we acted in national interest? We do not think so. We have compromised in respect of our foreign policy independence. We have compromised in respect of our nuclear strategic sovereign programme. We need a full-fledged discussion on the agreement that might have been entered into in respect of agriculture, biotechnology and in all such areas.

Coming to energy security, I do not agree with the undue importance given to nuclear energy security. Till today, the country does not have any nuclear energy security policy. From the website, I was trying to find out whether Government has any. I found very recently an integrated energy security policy has been put there for discussion. Even without any discussion about our energy needs—how much of hydro we require, how much of thermal we require, about our coal reserves, our non-conventional energy, and from 2.7, how much we can raise in the near future and the distant future—the Prime Minister is going on saying, 'energy policy, energy policy'. They have woken up to energy security suddenly. We do

[Shri Rupchand Pal]

not oppose that there should be energy security. India should have its own energy security policy. We do not have any disagreement with the policy. This sudden undue importance to nuclear energy raises many questions.

Now, after this 18th July Agreement, joint Statement, the Left Parties had cautioned this Government that it should be careful, that India has a sovereign nuclear programme, and our strategic programme should never be opened up for inspections. The Left Parties' apprehensions and caution was further strengthened by the caution by the scientific community, even the former Chief of the Atomic Energy Commission, Diplomats and many others who were associated with a whole sort of negotiations in different fora. After that, what has happened because of this caution, pressure and apprehensions were expressed nation-wide? The Government could withstand the pressures of the US with regard to two areas. Out of 22, 14 have been opened up, I shall come to that in a while, and 8 have been kept in the strategic sector, for example, the Fast Breeder Reactor in Kalpakkam. They have also agreed for CIRUS and Apsara to be removed from the BARC arrangement. It raises two or three things. What is the cost involved in the separation because nowhere in the world we have heard that such separation is an easy thing. What is the cost? Who will pay the cost? Then, there will be difficulties with regard to the movement of our scientists from the strategic programme to the civilian programme because nowhere there is any such separation. The Prime Minister can apprise us about the past experience of the countries about this nuclear separation from the civilian programme and from the strategic nuclear programme.

We had just recently refurbished the Cyrus. How much would it cost to shift Apsara and Cyrus from the BARC arrangements?

News has come that just yesterday the Separation Plan has been referred to the US Congress. A list has been prepared. Fourteen representatives belonging to both the Senate and the House of Representatives have been apprised of the details of the Separation Plan and how the US Government look at the agreement. But we do find that articles have already come in *The Economist* and *The New York Times* questioning as to how India-specific arrangements can be made. They say that India-specific arrangements cannot be made going by the spirit, if not letter, of NPT, until all such facilities are brought under the safeguards. It is a dangerous game we have entered into.

Coming to fuel supply, yes, it is reciprocal. We have the experience of Tarapur. What will happen? The previous speaker, Kapil Sibalji, was saying that we can go to Russia, we can go to France, then we can do that if that is not done, etc. I would say that the American President has the authority to declare the agreement null and void. Can the Government of India withdraw from it as in the case of NPT. Can we say, 'This far and no further?' We are having difficulties. We have entered into safeguards of perpetuity.

This House has to be convinced about what will happen in the future. We are putting everything in the basket of the US President. We know about the declining popularity of US President. We know what may happen in the US Congress. We have, only two days back, the Dubai World Court's decision. We have the knowledge of China going to buy shares in a multinational oil company. We know that whenever their own interest comes they will jettison other's interests. We want to be informed as to what will happen if this list which has been submitted indicates 'beyond such and such thing'. Such change of goalpost is already there.

Changing the goalpost is very much in their philosophy. It happened in the case of Iraq. It is happening in the case of Iran. One after another they will come out with new arguments and new logic. After that, till you are a client State, they will go on giving you new conditions continuously.

I am just asking as to what will happen? The US President has said that by May you do it and they say, it is never possible. We can take more time'. Let them take more time. Then the energy groups are there. Do you think everyone will listen and make it India-specific and do everything? They have their own reading of the situation.

China is observing. You are deliberately and intentionally distancing yourself and aligning with the USA, in the game plan in Asia, to contain China. What will happen? It would cause further isolation from us, isolation from other countries. These suspicions are there and already there are statements. It is being said that it is a win-win situation. Fast Breeder Reactors and the strategic programme in regard to 14 are subject to safeguards and they are India-specific. What is it? I do not know what is it. How can it be? But still we say that at the wishes of the US President, it will be like that. All the 45 NSG countries will accept that; the US Congress will

accept that; and the Committee of Senate and the House of Representatives Committee on the subject would accept that. Even then, what would happen at the IAEA? It would come to the 30-Member Committee, which is an autonomous body. In the case of Iran, instead of consensus you go for voting. If you go for voting in such a situation and because of the whims of the American President, we are putting everything in a single basket. We are paying such a heavy price. We are going away from our independent foreign policy.

I am happy that hon. Kapil Sibal was making a reference to the historic speech of Rajiv Gandhi on disarmament in the United Nations. We are rest assured that we have the capability. I was happy because at least some sections of the Congress remember their own legacy but India should have proceeded on the lines and philosophy of total disarmament plan set by Pandit Nehruji and Rajiv Gandhi ji and was enunciated in the United Nations speech. He was making a reference to that. It is an upward down position. Well, some people say that Iran has done. We are holding no brief for Iran. It is a question of sovereignty. We are in favour of total disarmament. Hence, we criticized them in 1998, now, as has been criticized by Shri Kapil Sibal ji.

Our nuclear policy was built on national consensus. Our foreign policy was built on national consensus and now India is aligning itself with the nuclear diplomacy of the USA—minimum credible deterrent. What is this 'minimum' he has asked? But now America is stating as to what is the 'minimum'. By setting the trap, America is saying that this is the 'minimum'.

Today, I was reading about 'proliferation' and that India has a great record in the NPT. Yes, today only the report has come that the UK Government has provided the technology of nuclear weapons to Israel. Violation is taking place, and imposition of conditions on the non-nuclear States is taking place. That is the problem. Now, India is going apart from its own philosophy, its own legacy.

It is being said that in the Atomic Energy Act, 1954, as amended in 1974, Sections 1 to 3, 1 to 8 and 1 to 9 prohibit sale of nuclear technology to countries, which have not signed the NPT. What will happen when these countries refuse to allow full scope safeguards and develop nuclear weapons in defiance? In this full scope, we have already given the list of eight research bodies which will be under the safeguards.

The technical difficulties are imposed on the cost involved for separation. Apart from that, we are making ourselves dependent, totally dependent on them. What they will do or what they will not do is a different thing. We have to go for the additional protocol. And the Government thinks that it can go on like that. India is also working with US for conclusion of a Multilateral Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty. It is true? It has come out in certain sections of the American Press that India is supporting to prevent the spread of enrichment and re-processing technique regime and control of nuclear supply guidelines. Along with this, this Multilateral Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty is coming. We do not know anything about it. Nothing is mentioned about it in the Statement. What I want to know is that the Prime Minister must assure this House that no further steps would be taken. We must calibrate ourselves to the developments taking place. We must observe what happens in the Congress. We must take note of what happens in the NSG meeting. We must observe how the International Atomic Energy Body is reacting to the proposals of India-specific safeguards. We have said that no step should be taken.

The Prime Minister owes an explanation as to how the development of our research can be protected from the inspection through IAEA power centre. How can it protect. We do not need to give details of integrity. We want to be assured of it. It can be done. We are a buyer of nuclear weapons. Another partnership is growing and it is being said that nuclear fuel will be shared amongst 11 countries including US, UK, France, Japan and Russia. What will happen to this? What will be the cost of the fuel? And I would like to know whether along with the nuclear reactor, used fuel will be given to us with new type of reactors for which they want to enter into commercial deal. These are very important questions. Our scientists are on the verge of achieving certain very significant thing. In such a situation, I would like to know whether this deal is going to affect our strategic nuclear programme or not.

Lastly, President Bush has said that India is a wealth-creating democracy and 300 million middle class are eager to buy their washing machine. In such a situation, there eyes are on the Indian market for their military, industrial complex, for producing nuclear reactor companies. Even in the Purana Quila speech, President Bush has made it clear that the Indian market should be opened up for the FDI in the retail market, in insurance and financial sector. Strangely, instead of waiting for this House to discuss it, some of the steps being taken by this Government will

[Shri Rupchand Pal]

be disastrous. It will affect our self-reliance. It will affect our dignity. It will affect our foreign policy. Do they trust that? Our scientists are seeking visa in response to the invitation from a US university. They are being asked whether they are terrorists. One such scientist is Shri G. Mehta. Our dignitaries including even the Indian Union Minister entering US, have to pass through all sorts of similar humiliation. ...*(Interruptions)*

That is a humiliation for the signatories. Our scientists are suffering when they are seeking visas. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Your party's time was only 20 minutes and you have already taken more than 30 minutes.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL: They are the worst violators of Human Rights. In such a situation, to depend too much on US, to trust too much US and to following a country like India with their strategic alliance, there is a conspiracy in Asia to contain China and destabilise these countries for hegemonic change. I think the Prime Minister owes an explanation. In our system, there is no opportunity for the MPs to discuss important matters. I demand that there should be a Parliamentary Committee going to the nitty-gritty of the discussions of the Agreement including the civilian deal.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Do you think that this is not the discussion?

...*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: What do you mean by an elaborate discussion. Could there be more elaborate discussion than this ongoing discussion? It is a full-fledged discussion.

[Translation]

SHRI RAVI PRAKASH VERMA (Kheri): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, today, you have given me an opportunity to take part in a very important discussion. I would like to thank you for this. A lot of deliberations are going on in the country and it appears that we are standing on the crossroads. The Government has taken a shift from our tradition to tread the path of self reliance which has been our legacy for the last 50-55 years. We had maintained our identity with regard to keeping India aloof from the power blocks of the world and in its endeavour to become self-reliant on the basis of our non-aligned

policy, our great scientists and democracy, but an effort has been made to change it.

Sir, I just listened to the views of the Minister of Science and Technology, Shri Kapil Sibal on the US-India agreement with regard to using atomic energy for power-generation with rapt attention. He tried to justify it in many ways that India is making progress at a very fast pace, and energy needs of India are also increasing and in order to meet these needs, they have signed Atomic Energy Agreement. It was urgent. He has given great emphasis on its urgency, because there was no other way. I would like to submit that the details given by him can be understood, but newspapers have reported something else. I would like to state with your permission that a Bill opposing the treaty with our country has been introduced in the American Parliament. Edward Mark, an MP of the Democratic Party from Mesachuset and Fredeption an MP from Missigun of the Republic Party have introduced this Bill in the American Parliament for cancelling the treaty with our country. In this situation, what is the sanctity of all the exercise that has been undertaken? It is being written in the newspapers that a great effort has been made, a great incident has taken place, a very big development has occurred and new horizons have emerged—is it not likely that all that may turn out to be castles in the air? Our entire efforts have been put into it, our dignity, identity and whole legacy has been kept at stake.

President Bush signed agreement over here and afterwards it came to light that the approval of the US Parliament is mandatory. It is not necessary that the approval would be granted. In these circumstances, what will happen to our dreams, to our energy needs, and to the new way we have taken and what will happen to the path we have been treading all along? The speaker before me was saying that this treaty has given rise to an atmosphere of suspicion in South East Asia. It has created an atmosphere of suspicion in the relations emerging between the two super-powers of Asia, India and China, what will happen to that?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I have got a clipping of the daily, 'Rashtriya Sahara'. With your permission, I would like to quote from it which reads as follows—"America ne Bharat Ko Dhamkaya, Iran ke Khailaf vote do, Varna Parmanu Sandhi Khatam". This is the bitter truth. One may not be able to understand the views expressed over here, but it becomes very clear from the news item published in this newspaper. India has been pressurized

to vote in this way. Iran is our old friend. It is a socialist country. India succumb to the US pressure keeping aside all its traditions. India voted because it was in need of an energy security? Whether India is in need of energy security in real terms? I have the statement of the hon. Prime Minister with me. In its last paragraph it has been said—the main agenda of our international cooperation should keep in view the needs of our people. This has created a peculiar situation over here. What are our needs? Whether Iran was not fulfilling our energy requirements? Shri Kapil Sibalji informed that through atomic power we generate only 2.75 megawatt of energy. The hon'ble Prime Minister had stated in his last statement that 40 thousand megawatt power would be available as a result of this agreement. I want to submit that this much energy can be produced by Bihar alone through thermal power. This much energy can be produced by Himachal Pradesh, Uttaranchal, Jammu and Kashmir and other States through hydropower. This matter is not only related to energy security. It seems to me that the discussion being held in the House are also going on in the entire country as to whether India has changed its path. America has become our friend in the absence of unanimity in the country. There is a saying that there are certain people with whom if friendship is cultivated then there is no requirement of enemies.

Sir, I have read in history that whenever, South East Asia has witnessed political destabilisation, it has been due to American vested interest in some way. WE have to pay attention towards this fact that the Indian Ocean Zone has been a very big conflict zone. The American diplomatic interests have remained active here since very long.

*There are hidden American diplomatic interests behind it, a major component of US policy is to destabilize the South East. Today, those very people are becoming friends of India. ...(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The names of all those persons who are not present in the House should be deleted from the records.

[*Translation*]

SHRI RAVI PRAKASH VERMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, an agreement in the name of energy security has been signed with India. What is the hidden agenda behind

this agreement should also be pondered over. Alright, it may accrue some benefit, but the issue is, as the Member who spoke before me was saying that many people from the business community of that country also accompanied President Bush because India alongwith South-East Asia is an emerging market. India has a market potential of 80-90 thousand crore rupees and is growing at the rate of 13 percent and it is a centre of attraction for multinational marts like Wall mart etc.

I want to caution the Government of India that all the MNCs do outsourcing of goods from Latin American countries whether it is of textile or edible items. If multinational corporations come to India and open their markets over here, what is the guarantee that they will not start outsourcing of all the goods produced by the 2 lakh 36 thousand villages of the country. At present, you are just dreaming, but reality is very bitter and chances of realizing these dreams are very remote. US has extended the hand of friendship to India only to set a balance with China, as China and India are the two greatest emerging economies of Asia and it has tried to express that the US is a friend of India, but in reality it is not so.

Through you, I would like to inform the House and the Government about this fact. We keep on reading in the newspapers that America is creating an individual trade zone. At the time of discussion on the WTO, these facts had come to light and had been reported by the newspapers also that America wants to rise above the World Trade System and slogans in this regard were also given over there. As per their diplomacy, American Trade Block is being developed in the entire world. Will India become the colony of America? We are facing this question and it is very necessary to give reply in this regard to the House because all of us have witnessed the plight of Iran, Iraq and Afghanistan and other Western Asian countries as to how America has forcibly taken hold of the oil business over there. It is apprehended that American diplomacy is compelling the Government of India to compromise with its basic principles and is going to enter into the American trade block by changing its way. ...(*Interruptions*) Today, such a big deal has been signed. I have heard that deals are made between the equals. ...(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please conclude now. You have given your name individually your name has not come from your party.

SHRI RAVI PRAKASH VERMA: Sir, I am the only Speaker from my party.

[Translation]

Whether India has entered into this agreement with the US on the basis of its strength or has made compromises for the sake of its needs. The geo-strategic location of India above the Indian Ocean is our strength and also it is the biggest emerging market of the world. Had all the powerful nations competed to enter into agreement with India then we would have benefited a lot. But today such circumstances have been created that as stated by the Prime Minister, India is making an agreement with America to meet its needs, such needs for which alternative is already present with us, and we have been compelled to sign such an agreement, future of which is undecided and we have started preparation for that. Whether America will support our claim for membership of the Security Council on the basis of this friendship is an important question today. Whether we would be able to redress through this friendship. Our permanent problems like the ongoing struggle with Pakistan, or problem being faced by us because of other countries? Whether we will get any mileage for taking this path—these are some important issues about which we are being apprehensive and we want to see them in context of this treaty. Through you, I would like to inform the House and would like to tell the Government to move cautiously. This deal will prove very costly for the self reliance of the country. If America betrayed us in future, as it has done in the Middle-East, then what would be our stand, what strategy we would adopt and what would be our position in the South-East Asia where we have got a prominent position.

14.00 hrs.

[English]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Shri Devendra Prasad Yadav, I would like to inform you that only 11 minutes have been allotted to your party. I think, you would certainly end your speech within 11 minutes.

[Translation]

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV (Jhanjharpur): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I will try my best to follow your order.

Today after a long meeting between both the sides, India and America have reached a consensus on Nuclear agreement which gives a stamp of approval for the implementation of the nuclear agreement dated 18 July, 2005 which was the basis of this agreement. George W. Bush has now declared that he would see to it that the separate civilian nuclear plant scheme gets the nod of American Congress. According to the Joint Committee on Nuclear energy, out of 22 Indian Nuclear Plants, 8 would be earmarked as belonging to the strategic class. None of the Fast breeder reactors will be put under monitoring. We were also successful in making the Americans agree to the condition that if any reactor is built in Future, the sole right for determining its nature i.e. whether it is civilian or strategic, lies entirely with India. Apart from this historic agreement, many agreements were signed concerning various fields. Mid-term and long-term initiatives were taken for ensuring cooperation in the fields of agricultural science, technology, space security, health etc. Giving due regard to the report of the group of CEOs of the both sides, a statement has been issued in order to increase the bilateral cooperation in business areas in which as part of the separation plan as I had already stated out of the 22 plants, 14 have been classified as the civilians ones and the remaining 8 have been put under the strategic category. Under this agreement, no fast breeder reactor has been put under the Civilian plant category. It is also added that fuel supply will continue even during monitoring.

Deputy Speaker, sir, Now I want to throw some light on the major hurdles concerning this agreement. Out of the issues which have been sorted out, two points were highly significant which were full of hurdles and impediments. One was the issue of separation of civilian Plants and their monitoring. If in future, a reactor is built in India, then who will have the right of separation? Regarding the issue of importing a reactor, no one will be willing to give the reactor unless we accept the condition of the safeguards. The second issue was about the future fuel supply for the civilian nuclear plants which come under the monitoring. We have the example of Tarapur Plant from the past. These apprehensions were raised during the discussions by both sides. I feel that this apprehension is still valid because there is no guarantee of uninterrupted Fuel Supply being maintained always, who will give this guarantee? For this purpose they were of the opinion that till the time supply goes on, India would have to accept the restriction of monitoring. The right of fuel supply is scrapped by NSG.

By taking a remedial measure it extricated this plant from monitoring. During the bilateral negotiations, the American side resorted to various new terminologies for the assurance of fuel supply. They spun a vast web of words. These words lead to various kind of apprehensions because India was not ready for an iota of doubt in this matter.

I would like to speak about some obstacles. We faced some obstacles in the agreement which was in the making. That's why I made a mention about it. Then it was stated and there was a consensus that if such a situation arises, India will have the right of rectification of errors. After using such brilliant terminology, a few words were coated with fresh paints. Therefore, I would like to say this. If such situation arises, the monitoring of the plants can be separated from the boundaries i.e. it will not be confined to the limits and in order to improve that terminology, it was expanded a little more. Sentence structure was improved upon and with great emphasis and firmness it was stated that a joint campaign would be carried out against the scourge of global terrorism. There was even some mention of the increasing participation in International trade and India's democratic system was also referred to. While on one side during a press conference glowing tributes to India were paid by the President George Bush and on the other hand they kept mum on India's aspirations for the permanent membership of the Security Council. On the one side, a pat on the back and later on the question of India's claim for permanent membership of the Security Council they maintained silence deliberately. ...*(Interruptions)*

During the press conference President Bush made it clear that the bilateral relation with India is not only in the interest of India, but it also looks after the interests of America. It was widely reported in the newspapers across the country. But people of America believe that the friendship with India serves their interests and if it is in their interest. I would like to add that if it is in India's greater interests then I have to admit that our learned friend Kapil Saheb has presented this matter in a very efficient way. Regarding the nuclear deal hon'ble Rupchand Pal ji and hon'ble Member Varma ji have raised some questions in this esteemed House. Some doubts were created among the members of the House. I would like to give an advice to the Government that they should not take any steps till this deal gets clearance from the American Congress. The past experiences show that the America has a history of backtracking. They make promises and then backtrack on them. Agreements are

made, but they act to establish their one upmanship over the global world, because the imperialistic nations have a tendency to exert pressure on other nations and this mentality came to the fore in various incidents. We can cite the example of Iraq in this regard. You can see so many such instances everywhere. They had prepared a strategy without a resolution from the UNO and when Iraq was attacked a motion was also passed in this House. They act according to their whims and fancies, i.e. they never heed other's point of view.

So I request that there is no need for India to take any action in haste regarding the Nuclear deal with America. Here George Bush had stated in no uncertain terms that at first he would get it cleared in the American Congress. So let him fulfil his promise of approval from the American Congress, then India can initiate action towards that direction. They have a reputation of going back on their words all over the world. So how can we repose our faith in them? Be it the issue of nuclear technology or the issue of uninterrupted supply of energy to India how can we take quick and rapid actions for making progress without the clearance of American Congress? There should be guarantee for this also. America will accept our hand of friendship but they can also pressurize us from behind. That's why I am expressing my doubts. Whatever India has left aside, there is no need to expand it till this agreement gets approval from the American Congress.

Regarding agriculture, I would like to state that in this agreement, it is stated that WTO had defined it and the terminology used in it for our MSP is 'Distorting Support Price'. This is the same MSP which was instrumental in sending thousands of farmers on the verge of suicide because if the Farmers are not getting remunerative prices they have no other options left. Take the example of Andhra Pradesh where farmers are committing suicide in large numbers. Farmers should get remunerative price. If MSP is defined in the agreement of WTO, then I would say that we should have comprehensive discussions regarding this matter. Our subsidy, the MSP for the farmers are called the Trade Distorting Price and it is labelled as a hurdle to the trade and they are saying that we should abolish it. What they mean is we should scrap the MSP of the farmers little by little, that we should reduce MSP. If MSP is abolished then what will become of the Farmers? India will become a dumping ground for the foreign agriculture produce. This is my doubt. At least we should not allow ourselves to become a dumping ground for foreign agriculture produce.

[Shri Devendra Prasad Yadav]

The second issue is related to science. It is related to the multinational company 'Monsanto' and it is also related to seeds. Monsanto is involved with the technology and research concerning the agricultural field. We are going to strike a deal with them. It is a Government to Government level agreement. Have we made the deal to help the private sector, with the intention of prospering the markets of the multinationals? This is not our interest. We are not entering into this agreement with the aim of helping WTO in the fields of agriculture, science and research. We are not interested in helping neither the multinationals nor assisting them in expanding their markets. That's why I made the submission. Multinational agenda will fix this matter. This doubt should be rooted out completely from our mind.

[English]

Focus from public domain, signs to the private sector.

[Translation]

Will the multinational's agenda decide it? Who will take the final call in this matter? This doubt should be removed completely.

America is acting according to its perceptions and we should also act according to our perceptions. Our Foreign policy is very independent because we are bound by the Common Minimum Programme of the UPA Government. So for further development and progress to get rid of pollution, to stop global terrorism, in order to make progress in the fields of science, energy and nuclear sector we should enter into an agreement with America. For this purpose, everyone would agree. But there should be a national consensus regarding this matter. National consensus is more important than the voices raised in the House. I would like to add that our national consensus is much more significant than the consent of America. Our national consensus is not less significant. We should speak in one voice in the House. Regarding this issue there should not be two different voices. We are perfectly in sync with Kapil Saheb's views that regarding the field of development we should act cutting across the party lines. We agree to this point of view. However, we will request that there is a need to reach a national consensus on this issue which is more important than reaching a consensus with the Americans. Regarding the question raised by my friend from the other side, I desired not to raise that question because ours is a country of 100 crore people and the consent of over 100 crore people

will be regarded as the national consensus. It will be significant for us. During the regime of the then Prime Minister Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee who is adorning the opposition benches, the bedrock for the agreement between India and America was formed. This cannot be denied. That is why my friends in BJP feel that the foundation stone of this deal was laid very much earlier. That's why I spoke about the national consensus because laying the foundation does not mean that you should follow their footsteps. This turned out to be the reason for their defeat. Though they had prepared the plan, they failed to carry it out. Now Kapil Sibal Sir and our hon'ble Prime Minister is trying to give it a final shape.
...(Interruptions)

[English]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Shri Yadav, you are going beyond your limits.

[Translation]

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV: The culture of this country has always inclined towards democracy.

[English]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Shri Yadav, again you are going beyond your limits. You have to address the Chair and not the individual members.

[Translation]

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV: I was speaking about the culture prevalent here. You please abstain from giving encouragement to the imperialistic practices and their mentality. Imperialistic nation acts according to its interests but we have to act taking into account the larger interests of our nation. We should not compromise on our interests at any cost and we will support such agreements which will work towards this direction. That's why the situation is ideal for such an agreement to come into place. Along with this, due emphasis should also be given to the issue of our claim for permanent membership of the Security Council. Third World Countries, be it Venezuela or any other third world country, all of them are supporting us in this behalf, but the USA is maintaining a studied silence whenever this issue crops up. That's why I am saying that we should tread cautiously towards this new found friendship.

[English]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You have to address the Chair. Please conclude.

[Translation]

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV: Sir, we should make a solemn pledge not to deviate from our independent foreign policy of our country.

[English]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Now, I would like to request Shri Braja Kishore Tripathy to speak.

...(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Nothing should be recorded except Shri Tripathy's speech. Shri Tripathy, your party's time is only five minutes. Please be brief.

...(Interruptions)*

SHRI BRAJA KISHORE TRIPATHY (Puri): Sir, I will try to limit myself to the time limit though a lot of things are there.

Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, we are discussing the statement made by the hon. Prime Minister on 7th March, 2006 regarding civil nuclear energy cooperation with the United States of America. The hon. Prime Minister's Statement is quite disappointing. It creates suspicion in the minds of the people. The hon. Prime Minister lays stress on energy security. Yes, the country needs energy security but it should not be at the cost of national security. Now, the suspicion is that the Government is compromising with the national security. That is the suspicion in the minds of the people.

What is the hidden agenda behind this? The country wants to know about it. We trust our hon. Prime Minister but we must be clarified regarding the real position. To become a nuclear power, the people of this country have sacrificed their lot. They are now suffering from hunger, unemployment and poverty. We have neglected the social sector and development. Our compulsion was to spend more money on Defence because of the threat perception from our neighbours. We have also been compelled to spend a major chunk of money from our Budget on Defence. The people have sacrificed their lot. But what are they getting?

*Not recorded.

I just want to take this House to the background of the nuclear policy. On 1st July, 1968, the five Permanent Members of the United Nations Security Council formalised a system of nuclear apartheid by opening for signature the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), restricted possession of nuclear weapons to the Permanent Five Members.

It gave signatories the rights of the peaceful use of nuclear technology. The Treaty recognised the P-5, the Permanent Five, as permanent nuclear weapons States and did not provide adequate security guarantees to other countries. That is the reason, India did not signed this NPT. This is the background why we have not signed the NPT because there was no security for other countries, those who were not capable of nuclear power or nuclear weapons. Of course, it has brought many difficulties to the nation. Since 4 decades, no Indian Government has deviated from that line and maintained distance from NPT. In 1974, India conducted first nuclear test with peaceful nuclear explosion. It took India another 24 years to try and force another entry. This time it was more bold and persistent with serial nuclear tests in 1998 when Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayeeji was the Prime Minister. We had witnessed the outrage of the US and other countries. Even then US had been compelled to accept us as a nuclear power. It had recognised India's indigenous nuclear capability. But in India, the nuclear market was not opened up. So, this is the hidden agenda to open up the Indian nuclear market. Everything was opened up in this country except the Defence and nuclear market. Everything was opened up in this country except the Defence and nuclear market. This is the hidden agenda to open the nuclear market and now the US, France and other countries are sure to rush. Now, we have the greatest market of the world for the nuclear materials. Hence, this is definitely a big deal for the interested parties. Now, India would open up 14 of its 24 nuclear reactors to IAEA safeguards. The Nuclear Supplier Group (NSG) will now deal with India. NSG comprising of 45 nuclear supplier States including US have an agreement to coordinate its export control governing transfer of civil and nuclear materials and nuclear related equipments and technology to non-Nuclear Weapon States. So, when in 1998 the world has accepted us as a nuclear power, with this agreement we have converted ourselves to a non-Nuclear Weapon State. Otherwise, there will be no agreement. These 45 countries, NSG and US, will not supply any material to us. We have no hope but take dreams to be secured in energy though

[Shri Braja Kishore Tripathy]

we will not get supplies. We shall have to convert ourselves to a non-Nuclear Weapon State. Hence, India will now convert to a position of a non-Nuclear Weapon country and we shall have to accept this position. What have we achieved during the past years, will go away due to lack of foresight of this UPA Government. The key objectives of this agreement, stated in the statement of the hon. Prime Minister, are to separate India's military and civilian nuclear installations so that it would be opened for international inspections. But, this separation is difficult for India. Other Members have already stated that the same reactors produce electricity as well as fissile material for the weapon's programme. So, now from where will we get money for this separation of civilian and military installations and are our scientists equipped with all these things? Now, the Prime Minister stated that it will be effected after 10 years. In 2014, it will come into effect.

But within these 10 years, what amount of money that will be required for this separation? Where will the money come from? This has not been elaborately clarified in the Prime Minister's statement made to this House.

Sir, our future programme is more important. I would like to know whether our country has the right to have more reactors in future or will continue with these reactors. This has also not been clarified. Rather, the Prime Minister stated in his statement:

"India has decided to place under safeguards all future civilian thermal power reactors and civilian breeder reactors."

So, we are also not hopeful for our future programme. He has also stated:

"We have agreed, however, that the future civilian thermal power reactors and civilian fast breeder reactors would be placed under safeguards..."

So, the entire civilian programme for energy purpose and for military purposes will remain under safeguards. That is what the hon. Prime Minister has stated in his statement.

Sir, I would like to make another very important point about fast breeder reactors. The scientists of our country are mostly worried about the opening up of these reactors for inspection which will affect our indigenous programme. What will be the result of this agreement? Our scientists are very much in a suspicious mood about this agreement.

Whatever we have achieved indigenously for the last so many years will go away now. The Prime Minister should clarify this when he replies to this debate.

Sir, our foreign policy is independent and there is a national consensus on it. When the Prime Minister discussed this matter with the United States of America in July last year, he had not taken the Opposition into confidence and he had never discussed this matter with the Opposition. Even before this agreement was signed, the Opposition was not consulted. So, whatever we have achieved on the basis of national consensus on our foreign policy will now go away. This Government is unilaterally deciding everything without consulting the Opposition or without taking the Opposition into confidence. This is not good both for our foreign policy and nuclear policy. In both the matters, the Opposition is not consulted and the Opposition is not taken into confidence. When the Prime Minister replies to this debate, he should also reply as to why the Opposition was not consulted on this matter.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please conclude.

SHRI BRAJA KISHORE TRIPATHY: Sir, I will conclude in one minute.

Sir, we are self-reliant so far as nuclear weapons are concerned. We have achieved this with a lot of effort, with a lot of labour. I must congratulate our scientists for this because it is due to their effort and the sacrifice of our people, we have achieved this position. Now, after this agreement, our self-reliance will go away. We will be completely dependent on other countries for fuel, uranium and other things and we will be critically dependent on others because there is no guarantee that we would get all these things in future. So, for all times to come, we will be critically dependent on others for fuel, uranium and other things. How can India be perpetually dependent on others for fuel and uranium? The Prime Minister should reply as to whether our self-reliance will go away due to this agreement. This is a departure from our independent foreign policy and also from our nuclear policy which is based on national consensus. This Government is unilaterally deciding everything without consulting anybody and without taking people into confidence.

When the hon. Prime Minister replies to all these things, he should also tell the country what is the real hidden agenda about this Agreement. I would like to know whether we can sacrifice our national security for the

sake of energy security. We are self-sufficient. Our natural resources are sufficient. We have not tapped hydro energy and even we have not tapped our carbon energy to the full extent so far. India is sufficient in its natural resources and we can tap them. Nobody can preach us in this regard, by raising environmental matters and other issues and ask us to divert to atomic energy. This way, we will depart from our natural resources and depart from the generation of our natural source of energy. So, let us tap our resources first.

At the moment, we are getting only three per cent from Atomic Energy Sources. We can go beyond that, if you want to tap the atomic energy and create more energy from the atomic resources. As far as uranium is concerned, we have not got sufficient deposits. But as far as thorium is concerned, we have got one-third of the world's deposits. We have not exploited that and we have not taken steps to exploit thorium. That is why, we must first try, see and explore all these things. Then we can go beyond all these things. We should not be dependent on anybody. That is why, my request to the Government is that they should first tap our natural resources, try our own deposits of thorium and then we can go beyond that.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No other hon. Member from your Party will be given the chance to speak on this debate.

SHRI UDAY SINGH (Purnea): Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker Sir, for giving me this opportunity to speak. I could not hear the speech of hon. Shri Kapil Sibal and all I can say is that his tenor and his convoluted logic precludes any possibility of a bi-partisan cooperation in this important agreement.

They are the people who cannot take the Parliament together. They are the people who cannot keep their own allies together and then to come here and start blaming the principal Opposition Party for all that has gone wrong, I think is very wrong. For him to have said that because of 1998 Pokhran Blast India lost, I think, Shri Sibal is displaying zero understanding of what that one blast did for India in getting for the stature that India today has globally. Therefore, Shri Kapil Sibal needs to be censured on trying to say this.

I was quite surprised to hear from hon. Shri Priya Ranjan Dasmunsi when he asked my party colleague whether he was with the agreement or against the

agreement. Shri Dasmunsi is too experienced to understand that this is a very important and complicated agreement and there is no way that a person can either be for it or against it. It is not a clear cut black and grey.

We agree, the NDA agrees, the BJP agrees that it initiated this cooperation with the United States. We agree that there is need for an agreement. But we have certain difficulties with this agreement. I think, it should have been the UPA Government's responsibility to have taken the entire Parliament into confidence, to have worked with its allies, to have worked with the principal Opposition Party, with the other Opposition Parties and tried to get a unanimous resolution of Parliament backing the Government's move for the agreement as important as this.

I am surprised that legal conventions or legalities are quoted that the Government is not obliged to come to Parliament for an approval. I think, it is wrong. I think, we must have legislation in place. Very important agreements like this, especially, of a nature which will have a long-term impact on India's national security, on India's energy security, on India's economic security that the issue must be debated threadbare in Parliament and the voice of the Parliament taken before the Government can move ahead and enter into agreements like this.

Coming to the Agreement itself, who has trivialized this agreement? The motivated leagues by the Government about how the Prime Minister spoke to Condoleezza Rice, how the Prime Minister was steadfast, how the President Bush whispered what into the ears of his own Secretary of State, what the President of the United States whispered into the ears of our Prime Minister, this is all trivializing this very important Agreement. We are seeing another dangerous trend that has emerged. We are seeing for the first time that diplomacy is being communalised. There is no other explanation that we have for the Alliance partners of the UPA holding a demonstration when a guest of the Government, of the people of India was here. The composition of the entire demonstrators was made up in a manner to convey a particular message. And then comes the Prime Minister's reported statement that after the Parliament Session he will speak to the Muslim leaders. Is it an agreement concerning the Muslims, or is it an agreement concerning India's energy needs? India's agreement with USA has ramifications beyond just the energy needs. So, we do not understand why pathological

[Shri Uday Singh]

weakness for playing the minority card shows up in everything. In an agreement with the United States, the Prime Minister has to speak to the Muslim leaders! Then we will insist that he speaks to the Hindu leaders as well. The only leaders he needs to speak to were the leaders present in the Parliament and that he refused to do. That he did only by way of two *suo motu* statements. Parliament is not a rubber stamp. Parliament is not a place which just needs to be informed. Parliament is a place which needs to deliberate on these issues before the Government arrives at a decision. Post-decision, informing parliament is no big deal. We would have otherwise read in the newspapers. We would have otherwise collected information from various national and internal media. So, this *suo motu* statement of the Prime Minister is in bad taste. The Prime Minister must in his reply mention that in future when the Government decides to undertake such important agreements, Parliament will be taken into account, taken into confidence before the decisions have been arrived at. This is imperative. Otherwise India will move into dangerous zones where it will be difficult for us to extricate ourselves. I am glad that Shri Kapil Sibal is back here. I would say that if there is any bipartisan cooperation. *...(Interruptions)* Do you want me to yield? Sure.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI: My distinguished colleague was talking about accountability part. I can cite several examples of the past, previous Lok Sabhas since 1971 when I joined this House. The Prime Minister of India, Dr. Manmohan Singh, has many times appeared before both the Houses of Parliament through statements, through discussions and through replies. It is unprecedented in the records of the Parliament.

SHRI UDAY SINGH: I accept what the hon. Minister has said. I did not have the privilege to have been a Member of the time that he is referring to. But I would say that if something wrong has been done in the past it need not be taken into future. Important agreements must come to Parliament. The Parliament must discuss it. The Parliament must tell the Government what it thinks on a particular agreement, before the Government goes through. I know that there are no legal provisions for us but we have what the US negotiators are saying. The US negotiators are saying that they will take it to the Congress; they will take it to all the influential groups in the United States before they move the resolution in the

Congress. I do not know why our Parliament should be treated indifferently. *...(Interruptions)* It is extremely sorry that Members of Parliament themselves want to dilute your own powers. I am not saying something for myself. It does not affect me alone; it affects the whole House. All that I am saying is that this is not the only Government that is going to say, there will be other Governments. There have been other Governments.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Uday Singh, address the Chair.

SHRIMATI TEJASWINI SEERAMESH (Kanakapura): Did Shrimati Gandhi yield to any power in the world when she first tested the nuclear weapons?

SHRI UDAY SINGH: Sir, do you want me to respond to that or you want me to go on?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Nothing is going on record.

*...(Interruptions)**

SHRI UDAY SINGH: We have two basic problems. Our first problem is that there are too many nuclear plants that have been put under perpetual safeguards. This is a question to which there can be no clear-cut answers. The BJP Government say six were enough; the UPA Government will say, no, 14 were required. This is exactly what I mean that this should have been discussed threadbare in Parliament before the separation plan was drawn up.

Sir, discussing it now and voicing reservations, I know, is not going to have any meaning. They cannot go back to the United States and say: "14 is not acceptable. Now we make it 12." This should have been done before the Agreement was entered into.

Our second problem is that India has not been given a Nuclear Weapons State category because in a Nuclear Weapons State category, all safeguards are voluntary. They are not put under safeguard in perpetuity.

I am thankful to Shri Kapil Sibal for having educated us that 'in perpetuity' means for the life of the nuclear reactor. We knew that but we are thankful to him all the same. To put something in perpetuity, in safeguards, I

*Not recorded.

think, is not serving the national interests and not serving the national interests well at all.

Secondly, the over-dependence on nuclear energy is without any basis. We have the world's largest reserves of coal. We have excellent sites which can yield tremendous amounts of thermal coal. Why are we not wanting to exploit all those? Why are we wanting to depend on something where we will never be self-reliant? Even with the separation plan in operation, even with the nuclear energy co-operation with the US in operation, we will always be dependent on fuel from abroad. We will always be dependent on other countries wanting to give us that fuel. So, we would like to know why this over-dependence on nuclear energy. The Government should come forward with a reply.

We heard about how many megawatts, how many kilowatts of electricity would be required. We understand that. The other forms of energy are available here and without depending either on fossil fuel or on nuclear fuel we can generate that kind of electricity. So, the Government must come out clean as to the need for entering into this Agreement.

[Translation]

There is a saying that you will be forced to link one with other if you resort to lying.

[English]

I think, the Government has been caught up in this. We needed to remove our outcaste status which is what the NDA had been saying, had initiated and was propagating. To that extent we are supporting the Agreement and say: "Yes, it will rid India of its outcaste status, it will open up for India other avenues with the West, with the US, with the western world and with the other countries of the world.

To say that this particular Agreement, the way it has been cast is a national interest is not correct. Therefore, we would like the Government to reconsider how our doubts can be assuaged, how they can discuss with us, how they can tell us that the doubts that we have are not well-founded and that there are enough escape routes for India to get out of a locked in situation and that India's long-term national security interests will not be compromised.

This is all that I have to say.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Now, Shri Nikhil Kumar.

[Translation]

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI: After the turn of Mr. Uday Singh of BJP, his own brother-in-law will speak from our side.

[English]

SHRI UDAY SINGH: This is a good strategy. I cannot oppose what he is saying. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Hopefully it is the most temperate language befitting the status of this House. ...*(Interruptions)*

[Translation]

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI SHRIPRAKASH JAISWAL): You have selected the members judiciously.

[English]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Shri Nikhil Kumar, please speak only for seven minutes.

[Translation]

SHRI NIKHIL KUMAR (Aurangabad, Bihar): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, before I say anything, gross injustice has been done to me by the hon'ble Minister's words as I know that the entire world is on one side and how I can compete with that gentleman who is sitting on the other side?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is necessary to hear his point of view also.

[English]

SHRI NIKHIL KUMAR: Sir, there are leaders and there are statesmen. Statesmen have a sense of history. They are in a position to know what are the factors operating in history. It is statesmen who realise that there is a tide in the affairs of men which taken at the flood leads on to greatness. It was just such a tide, Sir, when the Congress Government took office in 1991 that the then Finance Minister took us to greatness by his economic policies.

[Shri Nikhil Kumar]

It was his laid down Economic Policy that has been followed by the Governments that have succeeded thereafter. It is only to show that when there is a statesman, he forgets what happened in the antiquated past because the critics of that policy said that this policy would sell out India. They forgot that India is progressing, that India will progress and that India will enter the new millennium. Doctrines of the Eighteenth Century were outdated and antiquated. We have to move with the times and in moving with the times, we have entered the information age. Nobody can deny this.

It was because of the farsightedness of the statesmen like the Finance Minister in the Government from 1991 to 1996, that he could liberate the Indian economy. He abolished the licence and control *raj* and took us into a totally new atmosphere, a new environment and it is because of that that today India is being seen as an emerging global power. When the President of the United States was here last week, he described India as a global power. Not only he, but the entire world today is seized of the fact that India is taking rapid strides and it is fast emerging as a global power. Once again, therefore, this tide came to us last week and our leaders seized it. It was seized by our Prime Minister. It was seized by the Chairperson of the UPA and it led to the signing of the Indo-US Agreement which seeks to expand our co-operation in various fields, co-operation between them and us in economic fields, in security, in defence and what not.

But the most important thing was the separation plan that was signed between them and us. It is this separation plan that was the subject of the Prime Minister's *suo motu* statement and that is now under discussion today. This separation plan, for the first time, separates civilian nuclear facilities from military nuclear facilities and to that extent. This is a major achievement. It is for the first time after the Pokhran-I in 1974 under the valiant leadership of Indiraji when we had then given notice to the entire world that we are emerging as a nuclear power. Let this House understand this and accept it. The policies laid down by Indiraji in the 60s', about which the hon. Minister, Shri Kapil Sibal gave an excellent presentation which was actually an education for all of us, were considered to be in national interest and which have been followed by the succeeding Governments, whether they belong to the Congress Party or to any other Party. It is these policies which have been the cornerstones of not only India's internal policy but also the foreign policy. It

is in pursuance of that, this tide came to us last week and we then signed this separation plan.

Sir, I would just read out to you some salient features of the plan. It will answer many of the questions that our friends from the other side have raised. I am not going into the details of the entire plan. Sir, you have given me only seven or eight minutes' time, and I do not intend to exceed the time. But it is important that I read out to you from this separation plan some salient features. It says:

"To further guard against any disruption of fuel supply, the United States is prepared to take the following additional steps:—

The US is willing to incorporate assurances regarding fuel supply in the bilateral US-India Agreement on peaceful uses of nuclear energy under their own law"—and that would be submitted, of course, to the US Congress. "It will join India in seeking to negotiate with the IAEA"—kindly note this—"an India-Specific Fuel Supply Agreement."

What more can anyone ask for than an-India specific fuel supply agreement?

(iii) The United States will support an Indian effort to develop a strategic reserve of nuclear fuel to guard against any disruption of supply over the lifetime of India's reactors.

Against this background, if you are giving, it was giving away a lifetime safeguard to the IAEA. What is wrong with it? There is nothing wrong. It is in our own interest.

(iv) If despite these arrangements, a disruption of fuel supplies to India occurs, the United States and India would jointly convene a group of friendly supplier countries to include countries such as Russia, France and the United Kingdom to pursue such measures as would restore fuel supply to India.

In the light of the above understandings with the United States—again, kindly note—an India-specific safeguards agreement will be negotiated between India and the IAEA providing for safeguards to guard against withdrawal of safeguarded nuclear material from civilian use. Please note that there is no mention here of the strategic reactors. The mention is only of the civilian-nuclear facilities and, therefore, there could not have been

a more self-respecting agreement than this that was signed between India and the United States last week. There should have been no question or any squabbling over it. There should have been no question of any kind of apprehension over this.

This is for the first time in the history, at least, of the 20th Century that a Nation has stood up to a Super Power and who incidentally happens to be the sole super power. When there is an agreement signed with a Super Power, the general impression is that the other signatory will cow down to the Super Power, will do what the Super Power says and carry out its little bidding. This did not happen in this case. As to why it has not happened is because India has been emerging as a global power. Its emerging economic might is known to all. The President of United States made a reference to it, not only during his visit to India but also in the United States and to the United States media. It confirms that India is emerging as a global power. And there is a saying, if you cannot beat them, join them.

The United States for many years now has been having a rather unfriendly attitude towards India. It saw that it is no use now persisting with that. That is why, it has made an exception in this world of nuclear non-proliferation. India is the only one country which has not signed the NPT and still it has been signalled out for this singular agreement with the United States. It is because the United States has seen the writing on the wall. It knows that this is history. The dynamics of time, the change in perspective and the change in, above all, of India's economic prospects cannot be taken lightly. It has to be given its due place in the world's scheme of things. That is why, the United States has agreed to sign this agreement. It is an agreement which is on equal terms; it is totally on the same footing and the United States realises that it will not do to ignore India and the amount of the safeguards that I just read out are indication of plenty that the United States has acknowledged the fact that India is going to be a super power and therefore, it is good to be on its side.
...(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Sir, you have taken 12 minutes.

...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI NIKHIL KUMAR: Sir, there is one more point. There was a reference to the power position in India. It

was said that the nuclear power today, which is used to generate electricity, is just under three per cent of total India's requirement. The total nuclear capacity is 1,16,000 megawatt, against that we are turning out only 2600 megawatt. Can you imagine that by 2010, in another four years, this will rise to 10,000 megawatt?

There was a reference to our making use of the coal reserves. It must be understood that even now we are importing coal because our coal is second grade. Not only does it lead to importing coal but also it does not produce the type of good quality power that a good quality coal would have produced. We are in the position of importing coal. That import of coal will stop. We will be self-dependent.

The other thing is about oil, the other catalyst for producing power. Today, a barrel of oil costs 60 dollars and we are importing 17 million tonnes of oil at this rate of 60 dollars per barrel. It is very likely that the price will rise to 100 dollars in the next one or two years. What will be the mind-boggling expenditure that we shall then be incurring for importing oil?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. Please conclude now.

SHRI NIKHIL KUMAR: It will all go if there is a nuclear power to us and we will be able to generate the type of energy that we require.

Sir, because you have asked me to stop, I am concluding.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am requesting you to conclude your speech.

SHRI NIKHIL KUMAR: Every nation finds some time to dream. That time to dream had come to India now. We will dream of the future. We will dream of not only this millennium but others. Our succeeding generations will then think about what has been done between the 2nd and the 5th of March, 2006 and will then say that it is because of that that India is where it is now. It is not only a pipe dream. It will come to reality.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It have to call the next speaker. Please conclude now.

SHRI NIKHIL KUMAR: This till then be a tribute to our leaders beginning with Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and

[Shri Nikhil Kumar]

it will come to our Chairperson Shrimati Sonia Gandhi, and our hon. Prime Minister Sardar Manmohan Singhji. I wish them all the best.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Ms. Mehbooba Mufti to speak now only for five minutes.

SHRI NIKHIL KUMAR: Finally, all this would not have been possible had it not been for our community of scientists led by Homi Bhabha, Vikram Sarabhai and the illustrious band of their successors. Most importantly, this very important deal that has been signed is because of the very hard bargain.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have called the next speaker. Please sit down now.

SHRI NIKHIL KUMAR: It is because of them that we achieved this. Thank you very much.

SHRI UDAY SINGH: Sir, do I have the time to give a reply to him? ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is between you and him.

...*(Interruptions)*

[Translation]

MS. MEHBOOBA MUFTI (Anantnag): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, be it any deal or treaty if it is in the interest of the nation then I extend my full support to it. I have heard the views of Shri Kharabela Swain from the opposition benches and of Shri Kapil Sibal from the treasury benches. I can not give any expert opinion in that, since a layman cannot understand these things, yet it is my concern because the situation in which this deal was signed has further polarised our society and country.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, an opinion has been formed through the media that the nuclear deal which has been signed only recently is in National interest, however, the minorities who are demonstrating outside are perhaps against this deal. I would like to clarify something over here that not only the Muslim countries are against the President Bush but we all know his ratings within his own country. That is not only the opinion of the minorities over there but also of the ones over here which got manifested due to the Iraq factor and the condition of prisoners in the Abu Graib jail. The countries which preach us on human rights violation what is taking place in their own country is reported everyday in the news.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, right now Shri Kapil Sibal ji very rightly said that when we were developing nuclear weapons for peaceful purposes in 1974, during the regime of Prime Minister Shrimati Indira Gandhi, even then U.S. tried best to stop us, but we did not pay any heed to its opposition. We were of the belief that these experiments were being done for peaceful purposes. Iran is doing the same thing. We did not check ourselves then, can we stop Iran now? I do not think it would be of any use. The U.S. has always wanted the world to be its puddle in the same manner in which Tony Blair has been taking their line so far. They want to make certain countries their protege and keep the rest of the world at their feet, owing to which there is resentment and this surfaced in the Danish Cartoon incident. What minorities were demonstrating was against Bush and against the Indo-U.S. Nuclear Deal but I think, that our hon. Prime Minister is very prudent and an economic expert.

15.00 hrs.

[English]

He is the fountain head of economic revolution in our country.

[Translation]

And he would have been watchful of the interest of the country while signing this deal. We must not forget that the minority population is 15-20 crore in the country. At times it is better to defer a decision in view of the condition because the condition in which this deal was signed. I believe our society was further polarised. I would like to share this opinion that

[English]

We, the minorities, are equal shareholders of this country.

[Translation]

Our future is as much linked to the future of the country as of anybody else. Therefore whenever a decision is taken it is always to be taken care of that the opinion of the minorities be paid heed to. In the last few days I have noticed that if some unwarranted incident takes place between the people belonging to minority community and those belonging to majorities, people will start blaming it to the appeasement policy of the UPA Government to the minorities. I am apprehensive of the

polarization across the country on the lines of pre-partition. Our land has been divided would we be dividing people now? It would be very precarious since we are suffering from the outcomes of partition for the last 58 years. We are experiencing so many problems. The problem of Jammu Kashmir is an offshoot of it and now

[English]

We cannot afford to divide people.

[Translation]

So I would request the U.P.A. Government and the opposition not to politicize the issue of minorities versus majorities. Whatever is good for the country is good for minorities, too.

[English]

Please take care of the sensitivities of the minority communities.

SHRI TAPIR GAO (Arunachal East): Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, our learned and senior politicians in this august House have expressed their views on this agreement in lot of detail and they are all talking about future generations of the country. I, being the future generation of this country, would like to take part in the discussion on this matter.

At the very outset, I would say that senior leader, hon. Minister Shri Priya Ranjan Dasmuni has stated one line that the seeds of this Indo-US agreement were sown by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee. Here, I would like to mention that the blueprint or draft of what Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee had sown in Indo-US relations has been over-drafted by the UPA Government. Here, I would like to mention that the Indo-US friendship should be truly a friendship, not a submissive friendship. By what Dr. Manmohan Singh has done, it is a submissive friendship, and this reflects the country in the world.

In the South Asia, India was the leader. Right from the days of Nehru till this agreement, countries in our Subcontinent were looking towards us. After this agreement, the South Asian countries, like our neighbours, are now looking towards India as a non-aligned leader with submissiveness to USA.

Even prior to the US President's visit to India, they had got disagreement with their Ministers. Our hon.

Minister, Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar was strong enough to establish Indo-Iran gas pipeline and apprehending that his ability to establish Indo-Iran gas pipeline could have a mark on the US President Bush's visit to India, before his arrival in India, the portfolio of Shri Aiyar had been changed. Why are we talking about power generation? Why are we separating nuclear and military reactors? Shri Nikhil Kumar was citing that the coal deposits of this country are second grade. Why can not our Power Minister, Shri Sushil Kumar Shinde, say that we have got the capacity of generating hydro-electric power that is required in the country today? In the North-East region we can generate the requirement of power of this country.

Sir, we are disarming our armed forces in front of the world by this agreement. We are making our armed forces to stand without arms in the eyes of the people of this world.

Our party supports this agreement, but we have designed the blueprint for the Indo-US relations. The UPA Government has replaced the blueprint laid-down by the NDA Government. This is an agreement between Dr. Manmohan Singh and Mr. George Bush only. I am saying this because Mr. George Bush has not taken the US Congress into confidence with regard to this matter, and Dr. Manmohan Singh has also not taken the Indian Parliament into confidence with regard to this issue. Therefore, we cannot trust the future of this agreement.

What is Dr. Manmohan Singh going to do with regard to this nuclear agreement? The UPA Government has changed our blueprint for the Indo-US relations. Therefore, our request to the UPA Government is to make our blueprint in the right perspective.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Next speaker is Shri Vijayendra Pal Singh. Mr. Singh, I will be able to give you only five minutes to speak on this issue. It is my humble request to please conclude within five minutes.

SHRI VIJAYENDRA PAL SINGH (Bhilwara): Sir, will I be given only five minutes to speak?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am sorry, but I can give you only five minutes.

SHRI VIJAYENDRA PAL SINGH: Sir, I stand to speak on the debate under Rule 193. Let me not waste time on the peripheries as a lot has been said from both sides of the House. I will come to the specifics of this issue.

[Shri Vijayendra Pal Singh]

The hon. Minister had asked us: "Are we for this agreement or not?" It is very difficult to answer in only 'Yes', or 'No' on this issue. But I will say this much that the needs of the country for energy, especially, electricity are tremendous. Today, we have a capability of about 1,35,000 MW, but with the *Rajiv Gandhi Grameen Vidyut Yojana*, the demand is set to go up. The assessment is not there for it, but my assessment is that the requirement, in another five years, is going to be between 3,00,000 MW and 4,00,000 MW. We do not have coal, and we do not have the capability of importing coal because it is a very expensive energy. We also do not have gas and oil. Where are we going to meet the demand? I am asking this because the gap is going to get more and more.

If we have to achieve between 8 per cent and 10 per cent GDP growth rate, then the issue of electricity is the most important. If the BJP Government and the NDA Government had the choice, then we also wanted to have nuclear fuel and technology for our plants. I am saying this because today nuclear fuel is the cheapest internationally. But as we showed interest in it, most of the countries realised that they cannot do away with nuclear energy to that extent. Therefore, we agreed to this agreement.

15.09 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

I think that it is a historic agreement for the energy sector, but there are other issues also. One cannot just say that this is it. We have thorium, which is one of the largest in the world, but we need the Fast Breeder Reactors and the technology to do it. If we do not sign this, then I think that we would not be able to achieve what we will be able to achieve for another 30 years or 40 years.

But there are problems and I will come to that. How are you going to separate the civilian and the military nuclear programme? That is one issue. The other big issue is that tomorrow IAEA may find some fault and make. ...*(Interruptions)*

Sir, please do not go on and on. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: We should remember that we should not interrupt each other.

SHRI VIJAYENDRA PAL SINGH: Sir, he is making a running commentary. I am wanting to raise some good points, but he is disturbing me. I have got only five minutes to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: You should remember this when we do that ourselves. I am not encouraging him, but everybody should remember that it is not a good habit.

SHRI VIJAYENDRA PAL SINGH: My request to them is to keep quiet and let me complete my speech.

If they find some fault and they make us a guinea-pig like Iran and Iraq and they stop our nuclear fuel also, where is the guarantee? Even if we are not at fault and they do it, where is the guarantee? I want the Prime Minister to reply to this. Otherwise, I feel it is a great and historic agreement to that extent.

Again, I will categorically say that this must be spelled out. If everybody had been taken into confidence, if the Leader of the Opposition has been taken into confidence, and then if this has been done, I think, we would have had a better deal than the deal that has been stuck.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI ANAND SHARMA): This debate in the House today is on a subject of great national import for the people of India and for the people of the world as such. It is but natural that it has generated a lot of interest and heat. This debate also results from the *suo motu* statements made by the Prime Minister first on the 27th of February and then on the 7th of March on the understanding reached between India and the United States of America on Civilian Nuclear Energy Cooperation. I would say that this is also a fulfilment of the assurance given by the Prime Minister and the Government that whatever will be done, will be done in a transparent manner and through the House, through the Parliament, the people of India shall be taken into confidence. There have been references by many hon. Members that the Parliament and the people have not been taken into confidence. That is not correct. This debate amply proves, and the previous two *suo motu* statements of our Prime Minister, that this Government had nothing to hide, this Government believes in the essence of democracy that any issue which is of concern to our people, to our nation, must be discussed in a fair manner.

This is also an opportunity to inform the country at large as to what are the contours of this Agreement and how will it be in the interest of India and the society in general. It will also help in removing certain misapprehensions and misgivings. It is natural for people to have reservations. There has been criticism, some of which *bona fide*, some of which has been based on speculative reports, but there has also been motivated opposition to create misgivings and confusion amongst the people in general. I hope, through this debate, which was initiated this morning from our side and many other learned Members, those misapprehensions would be dispelled. The Indo-US relations have undergone a qualitative change in recent years. There has been a long period prior that of drift, distrust and suspicion.

Today, the two largest democracies of the world are engaged in a multi-dimensional relationship. One aspect of which is being discussed here and the others which have been referred to were the Knowledge Commission on Agriculture and the cooperation in the field of science and technology. So, when we talk of relations between the two nations, the sovereign States, they can never be frozen in a given time zone. India in the past has played its role, which was expected of this country and safeguarded its interests. Governments after Government, ever since Independence, Pandit Nehru, along with Dr. Homi Bhabha, the guide, the mentor and the father of the India's atomic energy programme safeguarded the interests of the country. Since then many claims have been made. Let me point out that it was in 1948 that India's Atomic Energy Act was first adopted. From 1948, we started the journey. Nuclear Policy Energy Cooperation was incorporated in 1954. Many Members of this House were not even born when the Act was first enacted. Even I was not born. Today, we can go back, reiterate and see what the achievements have been in a very difficult background, over the last five decades and more.

Some doubts have been expressed about the new understanding which has been reached. Have we compromised with the national security? Have we compromised with our sovereign decision-making processes? Have we retracted in any manner from our policy decision with regard to the IAEA or the NPT? Why India-specific agreement has to be negotiated with the IAEA?

I would first of all say that India's interests have been safeguarded in every respect, they have not been

compromised and any insinuation to that effect would be incorrect and unwarranted and hurtful. Hurtful for one reason that this is the UPA Government, a coalition Government, led by the Congress Prime Minister, who is himself known for his integrity and credentials. So, the Congress Party and its leaders as I was referring earlier as to how we have traversed this path, this long and arduous journey. It was way back in 1974 when India first made a very loud announcement of its nuclear capability, the then Prime Minister, Indira Gandhi had the courage to take that decision not only to explode the atom but also making it clear that it was for peaceful use. Today, when I hear the claims that something was done eight years ago to make India nuclear capable, Sir, I can only feel sorry for those who make themselves believe that the statements and the claims which they make are true because the facts and history make a different statement.

Here, we must compliment, we must salute our scientists, the nuclear establishment which actually worked in a regime of denial, discrimination, in isolation, literally reinventing the wheel, they mastered completely fuel cycle to make India nuclear capable. There should not be any doubt on that. Implicit in July 18 Agreement is the recognition of that technology, recognition of India being a responsible nation State with advanced nuclear technology.

They talk that there is no recognition. As my learned friend Shri Swain was saying that recognition of India as a nuclear State, is implicit in that very Agreement. When that recognition is accepted that India as a civilian nuclear programme and India also as a strategic nuclear programme, that is where the talk of separation comes. If the recognition was not there, nobody will tell us to separate the two. But when it comes to separation, it is a sovereign determination, it is the India's decision as to which facility will be civilian and which facility will be the military one or the strategic one. The Prime Minister had said that in his three Statements before this House and the other House in July last year, February and again on the 7th of March. What is the Agreement that has been reached? It is transparent; it reiterates what we had stated throughout that 'India shall only determine'. What our requirements will be, which facilities our nuclear establishments concur with to put in the civilian list for the IAEA safeguards and which facilities should remain in the strategic list.

[Shri Anand Sharma]

Before the visit of the US President took place and before the Agreement was reached, there were many speculative reports and debates generated about India's fast breeder reactors, proto-type fast breeder reactors as to whether we are going to compromise on that. Now, the Prime Minister and the Agreement makes it very clear that if they are kept out for one reason that our scientists are working in a very important area of research, this is also important from the strategic perspective. So, it is we who have taken this sovereign decision. There is no capping for the production of the fissile material. There is no cap on building future reactors. Even about future reactors, it will be our determination which one should be in the civilian list and which one should be in the strategic list. Where has India's interest been compromised? India's interest has been better served. We are trying to unlock the NSG through this Agreement. Once it meets the endorsement of the US Congress, the unlocking of the Nuclear Supply Group (NSG) would lead access to the technology, dual use technology and also India joining the rest of the world. The top nuclear scientists of the world will benefit from the knowledge and experience of the Indian nuclear scientists who have already been invited for the IATA Programme and Futuregen Programme. When it comes to deterrence, my friend Shri Swain was saying that we had compromised on deterrence. The Prime Minister's statement makes it amply clear that it is India that shall determine what its requirements are. The deterrence will be determined by us. Nobody is telling us what should be our deterrent. We should have no doubts on that count.

With regard to India-specific safeguard, which Shri Swain was referring to here, a clarification is required. It is India-specific because India belongs to a unique category. India is a non-signatory of the NPT. We did not sign the NPT. That was the principal decision to safeguard India's interest. India felt and rightly so that that Treaty was discriminatory, that was unequal. The Prime Minister Shrimati Indira Gandhi saw a long-term interest of India. Shrimati Indira Gandhi then decided and the subsequent Congress Governments adhered to it that unless and until India is given equal treatment and respect for recognition for its nuclear capabilities, India will not sign the NPT. That is why, IAEA safeguard would be India-specific. That does not mean that the interest of the country is being compromised.

Sir, if I may just quickly point out, on this issue, the Safeguards Agreement with the IAEA is being negotiated.

It will not be similar to that of a Nuclear Weapon State, that was being said, or Non-Nuclear Weapon State. Mr. Swain is right there, and I have explained to him why it will be different; why it will be India-specific.

But, Sir, the Prime Minister's Statement has categorically mentioned this. If you go through the Statement carefully, through this Agreement, it is recognised that India will have the same advantages and benefits, which any other Nuclear State has. At the same time, we commit ourselves to the same responsibilities and the same obligations, which other Nuclear States have.

Now, the question is about certain other charges which have been made with regard to, firstly, about the need, the justification of having the nuclear energy at all; then, on what is quantum of generation in other countries; what is quantum of generation in India; the projected 10,000 by the year 2000 have not been reached. It is merely 2.7 per cent, under three per cent of our power generation. But the issue here is of a fuel mixed clean energy and energy securities. The fossil fuels are depleted. If we have the capability, then surely, India should benefit from the technology, which it has accomplished to generate nuclear energy in large quantities because we grow, our requirements will be huge. About our energy needs, on the amount, which we are importing, the spiralling oil prices have been a matter of concern. So, if we do not take these steps now, we will be failing the future generations and also compromising with India's growth and India's strength.

Sir, there was some confusion created about the thorium reserves and the thorium cycles that whether India has moved away from that through this Agreement and by subjecting itself to international safeguards. Mr. Swain is very knowledgeable. I would say that there, three-stage nuclear development plan was conceived by the father of our nuclear establishment, Dr. Homi Bhabha. Stage-I was about uranium and heavy water leading to plutonium, making uranium fuelled reactors. The Stage-II of fast breeder reactors is plutonium and thorium. The Stage-III is the fast breeder reactor when uranium 2.3.3 would be used along with thorium. That is why the fast breeder reactors, the prototype reactors remain out and the research continues.

So, Sir, since the hon. Prime Minister has to reply to this debate, I would only say that all the misconceptions which were there, some of that is because of their frozen mind, some is routed in a history of suspicion, and some

of that is purely motivated. I would only submit with all humility to this House that the Agreements, which this Government has reached, have taken care of not only the present security interest of the country but also the long-term energy needs and security needs. There should not be any doubt in any one's mind that this Government can ever compromise or negotiate with India's national security, India's honour, India's sovereign decision-making and also taking decisions on various other related matters. Many hon. Members had referred to certain decisions, which India takes, are being influenced because of these Agreements or a growing understanding. That is incorrect. I can say, in sincerity, that India takes decisions on international issues, matters of international importance on its independent judgement, on merits and India shall continue to play the role in the coming years and decades.

MR. SPEAKER: It was decided that the hon. Prime Minister would reply at 1530 hours. It is just 1530 hours now but I have received request from two Members. I can allow them if they can restrict to three minutes each. If Members are agreeable, I will call Shri Mahtab.

SHRI MADHUSUDAN MISTRY (Sabarkantha): Sir, those who have written speeches, they can lay them on the Table of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, they are welcome to do so.

Shri Mahtab, you may mention just two or three points. Your Leader has spoken very elaborately.

SHRI B. MAHTAB (Cuttack): Thank you for allowing me to participate in this discussion. We know, in this world there are three types of people; people who do not know what happens, people know when something happens and people make things happen. I would like to come to the point.

The key to the understanding of Indo-US deal, it is termed, is the acceptance by the US and other major powers that India is to be treated as an exception to the Non Proliferation Treaty. This is the general impression that is going around. I would also like to mention, the discussion which has been going on inside this House and outside, seems to be conditioned by 60 years of cold war mindset. I would refer to the statement which an Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, Mr. Nicholas Bern has made in Washington. He has stated:

"India has a strategic programme. The US and other countries have not recognised that programme."

These are the statements which are made to convince the American Congress. He said:

"The deal would bring India into the non-proliferation mainstream. The Pact will allow India for the first time in life of its nuclear programme to be able to submit itself in a transparent way for international inspection. We think (Mr. Bern and his associates think) that this is a major gain for non-proliferation community."

Mr. Bern has further said:

"All civilian reactors built by India in future would come under international safeguards."

I would like to know from the Prime Minister how he view this comment of US. Has US recognised India as a nuclear weapon State? Has US recognised India's strategic programme? Does the Pact bring India into the NPT mainstream? Lastly, whether all reactors built by India in future would come under international safeguards?

I would remind this House, especially when a statement has come from Beijing that India to abandon all nuclear weapons. This type of advice to dismantle nuclear weapons should be to persuade allies in Islamabad. This is not there from China. But the strategy here should change; what I understand from my knowledge. My contention would be and I request the Prime Minister, is that now, we are in a different stage. Should not India strive along with US to bring China under the same regime that we have entered into? Already, the NPT regime which was there earlier is now a thing of the past. We have entered a new regime. Should not we strive along with US to bring China and other nuclear weapon States to come under that regime?

*SHRIMATI TEJASWINI SEERAMESH (Kanakapura): Respected Sir, I rise to support the Government's stand on India's nuclear separation plan which took place during the visit of hon. President of the United States, Mr. George W. Bush recently to India.

I heard many debates from the respected principal Opposition Party leaders. They were trying to draw the attention of the nation regarding pressure politics from the US.

*The speech was laid on the Table.

[Shrimati Tejaswini Seeramesh]

Sir, let me convince my opponent speakers here that they need not suspect the UPA Government's commitment to safeguard the interests of Indian Government's independent Foreign Policy or national security. Our Party, the Indian National Congress historically proved it. Mrs. Indira Gandhi's leadership during 1974, she took the bold decision and successfully tested India's first ever-nuclear test for the peaceful purpose.

One can see the then leadership's apprehension about India's security during cold war period. Mrs. Indira Gandhiji never yielded to any super power at that time. She never compromised India's independent decision making sovereign power. In fact, she made India proud and self-secure. I feel this highest House must salute such greatest leaders of India who rose above party lines.

Today, we are living in a different global situation. World has become global village. Every party of the globe was exposed to scientific and technical advancement. We are using our scientific knowledge to prosper this society. In this context, we must see the recent US President's visit to India and agreement on civil nuclear energy.

Today, energy is the most needy thing in the world. Majority of the world is depending on the Middle East for the fuel. India's energy demand is growing day-by-day. We cannot let down our people from development and progress. It is our duty as a responsible democratic nation to take care of their need. Let us accept the realities and act in this direction. Recent agreement on civil nuclear energy is a step ahead in this direction.

According to the hon. Prime Minister's *suo motu* Statement in this House on March 7, 2006, he made many things clear as follows. At present, there are 22 thermal reactors in operation or currently under construction in the country. Fourteen of these will be placed under safeguards by 2014 in a phased manner. These reactors will raise the energy production from 19 per cent to 65 per cent. But the separation of these nuclear reactors—civil or military—will be absolutely an Indian decision. What else do we need? No one can suspect country's determination of self-rule. The guard the sovereignty of the nation, I believe my Government will take the principal opponent party into confidence. So, to take the country on the path of the progress, let us go together with this decision also as one nation.

From 1959 to 2006, five U.S. Presidents visited India in different political situations. Today, world is changing

and like wise we too must change. Terrorism is the most major threat to the humanity on the Earth. So all of us must come nearer to curb this menace. Peace and prosperity should be our motive to achieve. We must exhibit the world unity in diversity while maintaining the different cultures as also religions and languages. The United States, a superpower, at last realised its vulnerability to the terrorism, the day when WTC, New York was attacked by suicide bombers. In this new political perspective, let us understand and believe United States' concern towards curbing terrorism.

Let us come to the issue how India will be benefited due to this nuclear deal. India would be recognised as a *de facto* nuclear power, something it had been demanding ever since it exploded a nuclear device in 1974. That would allow it benefits such as importing nuclear technology and fuel from any of the countries that are members of the Nuclear Suppliers Group. It will be able to import giant reactors of over 1000 megawatt from France and Russia. The deal would ensure that it had access to fuel for its existing plants. With assured fuel supply and technology, our Prime Minister, Dr. Manmohan Singhji has announced that we would like to see the nuclear power sector generate over 40,000 megawatt within a decade.

The US President, Mr. George W. Bush visited India with new approach. The US Administration sees India as a major strategic partner and ally in global affairs. That is why, it understood that energy is critical for India's needs apart from access to high technology in other areas. The former Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, Shri R. Chidambaram points out that the US could make use of India's superior know-how on nuke power technology for its energy initiatives elsewhere. For India, getting rid of the nuclear albatross would give it substantially more clout to demand a permanent seat in the UN Security Council.

The United States President's successful visit to India ensured India that it can achieve second Green Revolution which is the need of the hour today. Not only that, even though Mr. Bush visited Pakistan after India, he respected India's leadership and sovereignty by not referring to Kashmir issue, about which Pakistan always mislead the United States. After 1998 Pokharan series nuclear tests, the US was very much hostile towards India. But today due to our sincere and honest efforts, the US understood our commitment towards peace, brotherhood and prosperity. It is, no doubt, an historical achievement for both the countries.

Let us take forward the world by better understanding and mutual trust as also respect for each other. In my view, Governments may change in India, but our principles, values and commitment cannot change. With this great development, we can hope for better India and secured India. I would like to congratulate my proud Prime Minister and the UPA Chairperson, Madam Soniaji for this great achievement. Our Party sacrificed great lives for the country's sovereignty.

*SHRI FRANCIS FANTHOM (Nominated): Sir, President Bush's visit is historic in terms of the relationship between the two countries not only for the bonding it generated but for the broad avenues it addressed on which a strong, reliable and mutually beneficial friendship can be built in terms of the global order prevailing in the context of the knowledge economy. The world no longer operates on the principles of 'exclusion' and egalitarian idealism. As we realise ourselves that global relationships are a matter of individual participative inputs and not based on blocs where collectivism directs outcomes. The competitive world of the 21st Century requires nations to think global but act local each one safeguarding its own interest.

It is a world of paradoxes and contradictions it appears to be chaotic but not without a system. In a world of complexities sophistication is the transactional mode. The new Indo-US agreement is a judicious balance between India's long term energy and security interests and America's expectation that Indian nuclear capability be firewalled from potential military applications.

The Prime Minister has our highest appreciation for safeguarding national interest to the extent desirable, for the nation's security and reducing suspicion and speculation in the international community.

To me the 'Deal' provides for the creation of a participative platform safeguarding the interests as well as creating an inclusive platform in the international community. The Prime Minister's suo-moto statement on civil nuclear energy cooperation with the United States dated 7 March 2006 for implementation of the Separation Plan states that the meeting provided an opportunity to review progress in developing a 'strategic partnership'. A strategic partnership by its thrusts is purpose driven and requires the creation of an appreciation that mutuality requires a shared platform where stake holding brings

risks and benefits to both partners. This strategic partnership covered the expansion of ties in the fields of agriculture, economic and trade cooperation, energy security and clean environment, strengthening innovation and the knowledge economy, issues related to global safety and security and on strengthening democracy. Each of these areas is of significant importance to the nation.

The Prime Minister has our highest appreciation for including a broad spectrum of spheres, crucially important for the nation. With soft disposition shaping a firm handshake, he has given to the country a shared partnership integrating economic, security and social objectives on which the future of the nation's progress can be placed. It is the nation's aspiration that 'ending India's nuclear isolation' should not be at the expense of sharing information regarding national security. The nation has defended its ideology, its borders, its economic strength and its beliefs and practices and God willing we will continue to safeguard our special identity in community of nations.

The Prime Minister has the trust of all sections of the people that he will not surrender on this score the 'peoples pride in themselves' despite the prevailing pressures. While the nation is prepared for strategic partnership it shall not surrender before 'insolent might'.

I wish to conclude by complementing the Prime Minister for his steady resolve to uphold the nation's interest in the global community. What some people consider 'bartering' national interests must see the outcomes, invitation to join the 'table' does not mean that invitations have been accepted and bargains executed.

The Tribune 3 March, 2006 in its editorial with minor modification stated "In a world of cynics, skeptics and petty politicians Prime Minister Manmohan Singh chose to be a statesman, looking ahead to building a new relationship for the 21st Century". I commend him for this foresightful treaty.

MR. SPEAKER: Md. Salim, you can speak if you can finish your speech in three minutes, otherwise, I am sorry.

MD. SALIM (Calcutta-North East): It is difficult to sum up in three minutes but I will not repeat the arguments which have already been made by my colleague, Shri Rupchand Pal and other colleagues.

*The speech was laid on the Table.

[Md. Salim]

I am not very optimistic. I must congratulate them also unexpectedly because the concern expressed by the Left Parties, a large section of the scientific community and the people in regard to the Indo-US Agreement have been taken care of. We have seen that some of the points have been taken care of. We are told about separation, long term policy, phasing out, etc. I am not going to repeat that but this has been taken into consideration.

Having said that, Mr. Kapil Sibal was quoting Mr. Rajiv Gandhi's speech. That is good and I appreciate that. Shri Anand Sharma told from 1948 to till date about the development and the role of Indian National Congress and the Government of India. I do appreciate that. But only speeches or quotations will not suffice.

[Translation]

We create illusion and we are in the habit of raising anyone to a high pedestal of God be it Mahatma Gandhi or any saint. And then we follow our own course. We would only refer to such great personalities. This will not suffice. There was a plan of action beside the speech of Shri Rajiv Gandhi. They forgot that plan of action. Why do not they quote that plan of action that should also get due consideration? I disagree with Shri Nikhil Kumar that the society, the country and the world is going through transition and we should change accordingly. We shall leave something behind. I would like to ask him how this change takes place? Suddenly we have started talking of Energy security. In 1984 we decided that we should have 10 thousand megawatt of nuclear energy. Whereas presently we are in a situation to produce only 2.35 per cent of the said target.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: You do not address him.

[Translation]

MD. SALIM: Who educates us.

[English]

I know Karl Marx. I have also heard Rebecca Marc.

[Translation]

When fast track power plants from Cogentrix to Enron were coming to India that time Rebecca Marc assured

they would educate us. They were also talking of educating politicians and the media. Enron even gave a threat. Everyone rejoiced that the problem of power supply would be solved. Once counter guarantee is given and we accept all their terms and conditions. Today what is our condition? One cannot light the signboard in Mumbai Rebecca Marc is not educating now but someone must be doing the job? I am asking the august House who is educating us now?

[English]

Why are we not getting educated from our Standing Committee's Report? The standing committee on Energy.

[Translation]

They have been saying it for the last five years, I am not quoting because there is paucity of time. It would have been better, had we gone through it. There is only one line that we could not fulfil the target.

[English]

because of lack of fund.

[Translation]

This is being stated by the Standing Committee. Wherefrom we will raise thousand crore rupees. We have not been able to fulfil the target despite the technology

[English]

I pay tribute to our scientific community for what we have achieved.

[Translation]

I am not quoting but our country has proved that we are against proliferation. Through the horizontal proliferation of nuclear technology is pointed out by them that it should not reach to other country or terrorist group, do we question America on the kind of vertical proliferation it is engaged into through nuclear weapons to the space and Missile defence Programme. It was stated in the plan of Action that there should be no vertical expansion. In this very agreement it was given I am not digressing.

MR. SPEAKER: If you have a written speech, you can lay it.

[*Translation*]

MD. SALIM: It has been referred to on page 8 of the agreement. I am not talking of Jain Hawala. It is written there:-

[*English*]

"The United States is willing to incorporate assurances regarding fuel supply in the bilateral US-Indo Agreement on peaceful uses of nuclear energy under Section 123 of the US Atomic Energy Act. It would be submitted to the US Congress."

[*Translation*]

The U.S. states under Section 1, 2, 3 of the Act. What section 1, 2, 3 state?

[*English*]

"No cooperation with any nation, group of nations or regional defence organisations pursuant to Sections 53, 54... shall be undertaken until..."

I will read only one.

"In the case of non-nuclear weapon State, our requirement as a condition of continued United States nuclear supply under the Agreement for cooperation with IAEA safeguards be maintained with respect to all nuclear materials in a peaceful nuclear activities within the territory of such State under its jurisdiction or carried out under its control anywhere."

[*Translation*]

We are talking of autonomy, sovereignty, it is stated in the Act. These are our apprehensions. I would not like to go in detail. ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Please conclude now.

MD. SALIM: The strategy which we are talking about. ...(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: Give your best remaining points, if any.

[*Translation*]

MD. SALIM: Sir, I am covering my last point. I will only refer to the agreement in terms of democracy. Sir, I get more nervous when you ring the bell. ...(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

Paragraph 12 of Page 6 says: "...must be acceptable to Parliament and public opinion."

[*Translation*]

They have got this weapon. They are making this agreement. The American President says that when their Congress and their Parliament would give its acceptance they will enter into an agreement, then we should follow suit. ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Please conclude now.

MD. SALIM: Sir, when we become partners of U.S. then we should exercise our democratic rights through Parliament because the U.S. is famous across the world for aspiring to exploit someone more and more. So we should not allow it to happen to us and for that matter he should address it to the Parliament.

[*English*]

I demand a parliamentary forum in this regard.

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER: You bring a Constitution (Amendment) Bill. Parliament is discussing this for the last few hours.

[*Translation*]

MD. SALIM: We have capable people in the country and we should discuss with them and what we have given to them and what we have got in return, we should know. ...(*Interruptions*) It can be discussed with the hon. Prime Minister and Chairman of Rajya Sabha. ...(*Interruptions*) It is not an issue of the Left. ...(*Interruptions*) It is also not a diplomatic issue. ...(*Interruptions*) I am concluding. ...(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

Sir, the statement says "...democracy and meeting international challenges." ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Brevity is a virtue. I would request you to please take your seat.

THE PRIME MINISTER (DR. MANMOHAN SINGH): Sir, we are dealing with an issue which is of great importance to the future of our country. I had promised the hon. House that we will come before Parliament, to share with Parliament and through Parliament, with the public opinion at large, the pros and cons of this nuclear and other related issues which figure in the joint statement issued after the visit of President Bush.

Sir, on three occasions, I have made statements in this House as well as in the other House. They were on 29th July last year, 27th February this year and on the 7th March this year. That is a measure of our commitment to proper accountability and transparency in dealing with a very sensitive and important issue in our country. I have listened carefully to the views of the hon. Members of this august House on discussions with the US on civilian nuclear energy in the larger context of Indo-US relations. I thank the hon. Members for their views on this very important subject.

Sir, one important comment made by Shri C.K. Chandrappan and Shri Rupchand Pal was an expression of fear. Their fear was that, by entering into this arrangement with the United States of America, are we losing a sense of focus and direction in pursuit of an independent foreign policy?

Sir, I have said on more than one occasion that our Foreign Policy which is rooted in our civilisational heritage and also in pursuit of our enlightened national interest is what guides us in dealing with various countries. The United States of America is a global power. Their interests do not all the time converge with India's interests. But there are opportunities, there are occasions when our interests do converge and I believe that it is the duty of any Government of India to take advantage of all those opportunities which widen the development options that become available to us. That is precisely what we have done in dealing with the United States of America.

I wish to assure the hon. House that while we have been working towards strengthening our relations with the United States of America, we have not forgotten our traditional strategic partners. For example, today our relations with Russia are warmer and stronger than ever before; our relations with France today are stronger and warmer; today our relations with China are stronger and

warmer. Even today while the House is meeting, our two Special Representatives are discussing the issues of boundary settlement. We have used the space that is open to us to increase our engagements with the countries of South-East Asia, with Japan and Korea. That is how it should be.

I can assure this hon. House that pursuit of India's enlightened national interest is the dominating concern and it is this concern which has guided us in dealing with the United States.

It is certainly true that although an important component of this Agreement with the United States deals with the civilian nuclear energy, there are also other important initiatives listed in the Joint Statement. There is the knowledge initiative in the field of agriculture. What does it involve? It involves the use of technical knowledge, experience and expertise available in the United States of America to upgrade the quality of agricultural research and extension services in our country, particularly through the medium of various agricultural universities and agricultural research institutes. I do not know why there should be any objection to that.

It is a fact that when the first Green Revolution came to our country, it was the work essentially of great American scientists, like Norman Borlaug, which helped us. The United States, particularly the Land Grant Colleges of the United States of America played a major role in helping us to set up major agricultural universities and that is how the Green Revolution came about in our country. For the last many years our agricultural productivity has reached a plateau. We need a second Green Revolution and we need new technologies to upgrade and enhance our agricultural productivity. If there is, in the United States, knowledge which can help us in that process. I do not see any harm in making use of that. Cooperation in science and technology in globalised world is becoming increasingly a necessary tool of widening our development options. If we are serious about dealing with the productivity stagnation in Indian agriculture, then, I am certainly prepared to look at wherever facilities or technologies exist which can upgrade our technology skills. I do not see we are doing anything which hurts the interests of our country.

One a reference has been made about the CEOs meeting. It is certainly true that when I met President Bush in July, we had a discussion about increased

requirements of India for capital from abroad. He said to me: "Well, we are not in the business of giving aid. But there is a lot of private capital." I would like the US influence to be so exercised that they do recognise the importance of India as a major recipient of these capital flows. He said: "Maybe, we should set up a small group of five people from the United States, five people from India. Let them work out a strategy which will ensure that the private sector in both the countries would become more aware of the possibilities of mutually beneficial cooperation."

Out of that came a report. That report is now a public document. I have no hesitation, in due course of time, in placing it on the Table of the House. There are various suggestions. We will examine them. If there is any action which is required to implement any of those suggestions, that action will be taken taking full advantage of the laws, procedures that we have in this country. But I have no hesitation in making that report available to the House and I will do that. Some of those suggestions are like this. For example, there is a suggestion about Mumbai becoming a major international financial centre. I think, I myself, when I was the Governor of the Reserve Bank of India, floated this idea way back in the early 1980s. It has not become a reality. I do believe that there is a lot of merit in that proposal now, particularly when we have removed most of the exchange controls while our requirements of capital are increasing day by day. This is one of the suggestions coming from the CEOs' group. We will examine them in accordance with our rules, in accordance with our procedure and in accordance with our laws. Therefore, there should be no reason for anyone to doubt that anything will be done at the back of Parliament or that we will do anything which would hurt the interests of the country as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I now come to the civilian nuclear energy cooperation. What is the background of what we have done? Our economy is now growing at the rate of 7 to 8 per cent *per annum*. It is our ambition to ensure that we grow at the rate of 8 to 10 per cent. I do believe that the savings and the investment profile of our country point to 10 per cent growth rate becoming a feasible proposition. ...(*Interruptions*) But it is one thing to have savings; it is another to have energy security. I have calculated—and this is corroborated by expert advice—that if our economy grows by one per cent, we need the additional supply of commercial energy of one per cent. If our economy has to grow at the rate of 10

per cent *per annum*, we need the supply of commercial energy also to increase at 10 per cent per annum.

We are today excessively dependent on import of hydrocarbons from the Middle-East, from West Asia to meet our requirements of commercial energy. We consume normally about 110 million tonnes of oil and we produce no more than 30 million tonnes. This dependence on the outside world is going to increase. There are obvious uncertainties both with regard to supply as well as with regard to prices of hydrocarbons in the world market to which I do not have to go right now.

We have, of course, plentiful reserves of coal but our coal has high ash content and excessive use of coal also runs into the problems of environmental hazards with the growing concerns about CO₂ emissions and the global warming concerns that are now on the horizon. In this background, I think it is to our advantage that we should have additional options with regard to meeting our needs of commercial energy. Nuclear energy offers one such option. It increases our elbow room to manage our quest for our energy security. There are problems with regard to increasing energy consumption via the nuclear route. When I was Secretary in the Ministry of Finance some thirty years ago, I was a member of the Atomic Energy Commission. It was at that time the Atomic Energy Commission had set before the country a target of 10,000 megawatts production capacity. We are today in the year 2006. Our installed capacity is probably 3,000 megawatts. This is not because our scientists are not capable. They are exceedingly well-motivated. They operate on the frontiers of knowledge. They have given a very good account of themselves under very difficult conditions of nuclear apartheid and we all feel very proud of their attainment. But, there are certain harsh facts. We have run into problems with regard to the availability of raw materials. We have run into problems because since 1974 the world community, the dominant countries have erected a regime, which restricts our options in meeting the requirements of our atomic energy, whether in reactors or fuels or by way of inputs. This has hurt our energy programme and that is why in spite of the ambitions that we have had to add to nuclear capacity, we have not been able to do so.

I am not saying that imports are the only route. But, the availability of import, the removal of restrictive international trading regimes which restrict our options with regard to trade in nuclear materials and nuclear

[Dr. Manmohan Singh]

technologies, will certainly increase the maneuverability of our country in meeting the challenge of energy security. That is why when President Bush and I discussed this matter, he told me that this is one area where he recognised India needs a reversal of the attitude of the United States. But, he also said to me that the United States and other members of the Nuclear Suppliers Group are not going to help us build nuclear bombs. I said that is perfectly reasonable, I do not expect the world to do so. So, that is how this idea of separation of the civilian sector and the strategic sector was evolved. What we have done with the United States is not an agenda for dealing with strategic cooperation. It is basically a quest to promote cooperation between India and the members of the Nuclear Suppliers Group in meeting India's requirements of commercial energy.

16.00 hrs.

What I do claim as a plus point for our Government is that while doing this deal to increase our options with regard to meeting all the commercial energy requirements of our country, we have not compromised our autonomy with regard to our strategic programme. This has not been discussed with the United States. We have not agreed to any formula or any proposal which would amount to a cap on our nuclear programme. I have taken full care about it. I had the advice of our atomic scientists and I had the advice of our Armed Forces in working out India's requirement of what would constitute a critical minimum deterrent. We have made sure that we have taken care of India's present requirements and future requirements, as far as possible humanly. Therefore, the country should have the assurance that we have not compromised in any way, when it comes to India's strategic nuclear programme. We have not accepted a cap on that nuclear programme. That decision will have to be made by the Government of India, taking into account the security concerns of our nation and we are alone competent to judge what is desirable and what is not desirable. This is the essence of the arrangement that we have made with the United States of America.

Sir, several issues have been raised with regard to the nuclear agreement. Shri Kharabela Swain mentioned that we have accepted a cap on our strategic nuclear capabilities. I have already mentioned that that is not the case. We have been asked if we have ensured availability of sufficient fissile material and other inputs for our

strategic programme. Let me reassure this House that the Separation Plan has been drawn up in such a manner that it will not adversely affect our strategic programme. There is no question of India accepting a cap on our deterrent potential. Based on assessment of threat scenario, Government have ensured that there would be adequate availability of fissile material and other inputs to meet both current and future requirements of our strategic programme.

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

Sir, questions have also been raised regarding safeguards in perpetuity. I believe Shri Swain referred to it and he also said that assurances for supply have been given by the United States bilaterally while safeguards will be with the International Atomic Energy Agency multilaterally. So, he asked as to how we reconcile and ensure that India's interests are effectively protected. Under the last year's July Statement, India agreed to identify and separate civilian and military facilities and put civilian nuclear facilities under safeguards. The Separation Plan provides for an India-specific safeguards agreement to be negotiated with the International Atomic Energy Agency.

People ask, why is it India specific safeguard? Because it is certainly true that we are not a member of the NPT nuclear powers so we are not in those P5. But we are also not in this other category, that is, non-Nuclear Weapon States. We have a nuclear weapon programme of our own and there is today an implicit recognition of that reality on the part of the rest of the world. Therefore, it is certainly true when we go to sign safeguard agreements with the International Atomic Energy Agency, our safeguards agreement cannot be a carbon copy of either Model I or Model II. It has to be a unique safeguards agreement, which we will work to negotiate with the International Atomic Energy Agency.

I wish to assure the House that India will not accept the safeguard agreements signed by non-Nuclear Weapon

States under the NPT, otherwise called Comprehensive Safeguards. This is precisely because our military facilities will remain outside the purview of safeguards like those of other Nuclear Weapon States. Each of the Nuclear Weapon States has concluded separate safeguard agreements with the International Atomic Energy Agency, listing specific facilities offered for safeguards. Similarly, we too will include in an India Specific Safeguards Agreement a list of facilities offered for International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards.

Sir, such an India specific safeguard agreement is yet to be negotiated. It will be difficult to predict the contents and details. However, it will contain protection against withdrawal of safeguarded nuclear material for a civilian use at any time. It will be negotiated so that India will be permitted to take corrective measures to ensure uninterrupted operation of our civilian nuclear reactors in the event of disruption of foreign fuel supplies.

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

The third issue relates to measures announced by the Government with regard to CIRUS and Apsara Research Reactors, both of which are located at BARC. As I explained in my last *suo motu* statement, we have decided to permanently shut down the CIRUS Reactor in 2010 and to shift the foreign-sourced fuel core of the Apsara Reactor outside BARC. Questions are being asked, why are we doing it? The fuel core will then be available for safeguards in 2010. Let me clarify that only the fuel core will be shifted and not the Reactor. We have decided to take these two steps because the BARC complex is of high national security importance and we will not allow any international inspection in this area. Now, while the CIRUS Reactor was refurbished recently, the associated cost will be more than recovered by the isotopes produced and the research that we will be conducting before it is closed. Both CIRUS and Apsara

are not related to our strategic programme and therefore, our scientists have assured me that these steps announced in the separation plan will have no impact on our strategic programme.

Some Members also expressed concern whether these steps will hinder ongoing research and development. Through this august House, I assure the nation and, in particular, the scientific community that we will take all possible steps to ensure that there is no adverse fallout on research and development. Our scientists will have state-of-the-art facilities to expand the frontiers of knowledge. One of the main criteria motivating us in drawing up the separation plan has been our determination to safeguard the autonomy of our research and development programme. This will be ensured in full measure.

Finally, some Members have also expressed concern whether the confidentiality of the strategic programme was fully preserved during the negotiations with the United States. I can assure hon. Members that our discussions with the United States pertained only to those facilities that are being offered for safeguards between 2006 and 2014. The discussion did not cover our strategic programme. Confidential information on our national security and the strategic programme has been and will remain fully protected.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I believe that it is the sentiment of the House that the decisions we have taken lead to welcome resumption of international cooperation. Our understanding will open the doors for cooperation and the development of our civilian nuclear energy sector not only with the United States but also with other key international partners like Russia, United Kingdom and France. At the same time, we will also be able to internationally share our recognised capabilities in the field of civilian nuclear technologies. In this context some Members spoke of the global nuclear energy partnership which is a separate issue from our bilateral discussions with the United States on civil nuclear cooperation. Our comprehensive capabilities across the spectrum and mastery over all aspects of the nuclear fuel cycle are well established and widely recognised. Our possible association with any such international initiative, therefore, can be only on the basis of participation of India as an equal partner with other founding members and as a supplier nation. I would like to emphasise this point. We will not forgo the three-stage Programme which will enable us to utilise our vast thorium reserves in future.

[Dr. Manmohan Singh]

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I believe I have covered most of the points that have been made in this debate. And I repeat what we have done is to widen our development options with regard to ensuring adequate energy security for our country. We have, at the same time, taken full care that our strategic programme is protected. We have, at the same time, taken care that the research and development opportunities in this vital area of national endeavour are not in any way adversely affected by this Agreement. So what we have done, I believe, is a step forward in taking our country on to a higher growth and development trajectory.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: There are three matters which had not been disposed of during earlier period. Shri Sita Ram Singh.

[Translation]

SHRI SITA RAM SINGH (Sheohar): Mr. Speaker, Sir, there is Riga Sugar Mill in a Sitamarhi district of Bihar. There is a distillery factory in this Mill which emanates effluent. This causes contamination of water resulting in spreading of disease due to which a lot of people are falling sick and several people and cattle have died. Children are also suffering from various diseases. The mill owners have not installed effluent treatment plants which they should install. The Government of Bihar was asked to conduct an enquiry and take necessary action in this direction, but no plant has been installed so far. Owing to this reason a lot of people are facing difficulties.

I would request the Union Government to issue directions to the mill owners to this effect so that emission of waste could be checked and clean water could be obtained after purifying the dirty water through setting up of the plant.

SHRI BACHI SINGH RAWAT 'BACHDA' (Almroa): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the border of Dharchula tehsil of Pithoragarh district of Uttaranchal adjoins Tibet and Nepal. A police beat and inner line was set up at Jauljivi in view of its internal security and its international border. This was removed from Jauljivi transferred 150 kilometre up in higher altitude near Goonji towards Lipulek in the wake of improving relations with China and Nepal in the year 1980. In the present scenario international terrorism is totally spread in the country and Nepal is completely adjoining that area. There is a spurt of Maoist activities

so S.S.B. has been deployed there. The inner line shifted 150 kilometre away of higher altitude should be shifted back to Jauljivi, which is the junction of white Ganga river and black Ganga river so that the frequent entry of people could be checked.

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Bhanwar Singh Dangawas to speak. Although, I received your notice very late but since your issue is important. I am giving you a chance to speak.

SHRI BHANWAR SINGH DANGAWAS (Nagaur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the hailstorm, storms and untimely rainfall in Madhya Pradesh has caused huge losses to crops in addition to causing losses to lives.

Although no loss of lives has been reported in Rajasthan so far. Yet hailstorm, storm and untimely rainfall has destroyed all the agriculture crops particularly cumin, mustard and wheat crops. The storm has made the crops fall flat on the ground. The hailstorm has uprooted the cumin crop and the mustard crop that had almost ripened. The rainwater has destroyed the crops that were harvested and lying in the field.

Although the Members from Rajasthan have made their submissions making special reference to Kota Division. However, I would request in regard to my Nagaur constituency by riveting the attention of the Government through you that the farmers of Rajasthan have already lost of Kharif crop owing to famine in Rajasthan and it is an unbearable blow the farmers. If support will not be extended to the farmer than each farmer who is under the burden of debt will have no other recourse than committing suicide.

Through you, I would request the Government to immediately send a team for making an assessment. Full assistance should be provided to the affected farmers. The insurance company should arrange to provide the price of all the crops by at least treating village or village Panchayat as a unit under the Crop Insurance Scheme.

KUNWAR MANVENDRA SINGH (Mathura): The Rajasthan Devsthan Department was set up by the Government of Rajasthan for the protection and management of Devsthan built by the former Rajas and Maharajas of Rajasthan across the country. The Government of Rajasthan is hatching a spiteful conspiracy to hand over these unique, historic and ancient national heritage to private institutions against the constitutional rules to fulfil their vested interests in arbitrary manner.

A controversy is being hatched to transfer the management of the Radha Madhav temple, famous for its rich ancient precious heritage, in the Vrindavan city of my parliamentary constituency Mathura to some Shri Harisewa Trust. The handing over of this Devsthan (pilgrim place) of ancient archaeological importance to private hands is likely to cause irreparable loss to this property and this step has caused resentment among people.

So, it is my request that a high level inquiry should be held to look into this antinational step of Rajasthan Government in national interest and effective and proper steps should be taken to immediately check the unconstitutional act of the State Government. If the Rajasthan Devsthan Department is unable to protect such temples across the country then the management of these ancient heritage of archaeological importance should be handed over to either Archaeological Department or the Tourism Ministry. Otherwise the precious heritage of archaeology in the country will be destroyed.

16.21 hrs.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—*Contd.*

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Dr. Dharendra Agarwal wants to mention the matter for the next week's business. You briefly mention it.

[Translation]

DR. DHIRENDRA AGARWAL (Chatra): Mr. Speaker, Sir, my following proposals may kindly be incorporated in the next week's business:—

1. The work of laying new railway line from Gaya to Tori via Chatra which will reduce the distance of trains plying between Delhi and Ranchi by approximately 200 kilometres.
2. The construction work of incomplete railway line from Wervadih to Chirmiri should be started immediately which will reduce the distance between Howrah and Mumbai by approximately 300 kilometres.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: The House stand adjourned to meet on Monday, the 13th March, 2006 at 11.00 a.m.

16.22 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the clock on Monday, March 13, 2006/Phalguna 22, 1927 (Saka)

INTERNET

The original version of Lok Sabha proceedings is available on Parliament of India Website at the following address :

<http://www.parliamentofindia.nic.in>

LIVE TELECAST OF PROCEEDINGS OF LOK SABHA

Lok Sabha proceedings are being telecast live on the dedicated channel of Doordarshan, viz. DD-Lok Sabha. Live telecast begins at 11 A.M. on everyday the Lok Sabha sits, till the adjournment of the House.

LOK SABHA DEBATES ON SALE

Printed copies of Lok Sabha Debates of English and Hindi Versions and other Parliamentary Publications are available for sale at the Sales Counter, Parliament House, New Delhi-110 001.

© 2005 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

Published under Rules 379 and 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha
(Eleventh Edition) and printed by Shree Enterprises, New Delhi.
