

SHRI VIJAYENDRA PAL SINGH: We have Chanakya. You might have quoted Chanakya. We have Bismarck. Chanakya has been the greatest diplomat and Bismarck has been the greatest diplomat. I do not know why you have to really get down to Machiavellian. Everybody knows what machiavellian was all about, an unscrupulous guy. And that is what you are trying to quote. That is why, we have a lot of concern on this issue. As I have already said, our Party is not against the nuclear deal as such. But our concerns are primarily about the national security interest.

Let me put it on record that I want to salute all our scientists, Dr. Homi Baba, Dr. Vikram Sarabhai, Dr. Sethna, Dr. Raja Ramanna, etc., who have taken our three-stage nuclear programme ahead. What worries us today? This three-stage nuclear programme that we have developed is a unique programme in the sense that no other country has, in the third stage, thorium. Large quantity of thorium is available in India. It is to the extent that world's forty per cent of thorium sources is in India. If you can inject thorium in the third stage we will have an indigenous nuclear fuel.

If that programme is aborted by this deal, then we are going to be in real trouble because America wants to sell their own products and their reactors which have been spelt out earlier. They are hard bargainers. We just want to say: "Please be cautious." It has been happening all over, for very many years. They have done wrongs to a lot of countries. A lot of countries have complained about the way they have their deals. Even in the WTO, as you are well aware, they wanted to arm twist their way in the markets. Why is it that America signed this?

If you go into the details of it, one reason is economics, like selling reactors, and the other reason is to put us in the inspections of IAEA so that they can do their hound nosing on all our nuclear plants. Is that the reason that they have done it? They are not concerned about India having a nuclear power of 30,000 megawatts, etc. They are not interested in that. If you go into the details of it you will find that this whole deal is one-sided. That is what we are wanting to caution you about. Any deal should always be a two-way street. We feel that this has a tilt towards Americans. That is what our worry is.

Let me also talk about separation that the hon. Minister was talking about. Why is it that the CIRUS Reactor has been kept under the inspections? That is a

question that you must answer. Is there any moratorium on the production of fissile material? Have any negotiations been done on the FMCT? What is our present status on the FMCT? What is our status going to be compared to the nations which are signatories of the NPT? Will there be a discrimination of any kind from them? Or will we be at par with them? Subsequently, will the IAEA have a protocol of inspections different from the NPT? Or will it be the same? Will the American inspectors, along with the IAEA, go sniping around, as I had said earlier, all our nuclear facilities?

Fourthly, if there is a shifting of goals which has been much talked about after the reconciliation, what the hon. Minister was talking about in both the Houses—in the Senate and the Congress—what is the stand the hon. Prime Minister is going to take?

Sir, let me remind you here that the League of Nations which was promoted by one of their Presidents was thrown out by the reconciliation of both Houses. If a situation of that kind happens where are we going to land up?

Lastly, if we go down the memory lane, do you recall Tarapur and our other plants? The fuel was stopped because of some reason or the other. They are going to find some reason or the other to really stop the fuel after we having paid for all the reactors and millions and millions of dollars. If that is the situation and we do not get the uranium and we do not get on the thorium which is locally available to us, what are we going to land up with?

Sir, these are my queries.

MR. SPEAKER: I am extremely thankful to you for your cooperation.

THE PRIME MINISTER (DR. MANMOHAN SINGH):

Mr. Speaker, Sir, as I listened to the debate, I felt being proud to be an Indian. This debate has clearly shown that when it comes to safeguarding India's supreme national interests, there are no party differences. There are concerns, there can be worries, but the nation will speak with one voice in defence of its interests and that is the message that comes out loud and clear. Let me say that I take pride in that. But I also recognise that it casts on me a great responsibility that I should be worthy of this trust that the House has displayed in the motivation behind this deal.

[Dr. Manmohan Singh]

Sir, I will take some time to spell out the big picture as I see it where India is in the world and where we ought to be moving and how we are going to move in that direction. I do recognise that we live in a world of unequal powers and those who are strong have always a tendency to twist the arms of others.

Sir, I recall that as a young boy, I once heard Man Singh who along with Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose was the founder of the INA. In a speech he said in Punjabi: *Duniya Mardi Zoran Noon-Lakh Laanat Kamzoran Noon-*. The world worships the mighty and the powerful; the weak and feeble are always at the receiving end.

I do recognise that we can realise our destiny only by working hard, to become a major people of the evolving global economy. It is only then that India will acquire that respect, that credibility and that power which is our legitimate goal. After all, we are a country with great civilisational heritage, a country of one billion people with a freedom struggle which should be the envy of every country in the world. But all these wishes can be realised only if India emerges economically as a strong nation.

Today, there is a change in the mood of the world towards India. After the experiences of the last 50 to 60 years, the world today marvels that there is a country like India, a country of one billion people, a country in which you can find all great religions represented in its population mix, a country committed to the rule of law, a country committed to respect for all fundamental human freedoms. The world recognises today that there is no country in the world of India's size, of India's diversity, of India's complexity seeking to social and economic salvation in the framework of an open society and an open economy. That is why there is such great interest.

Whenever a country emerges, those who are in power get worried. But whether you like it or not, I sense today a willingness in the rest of the world to help India to realise its inherent potential because in India's civilisational heritages, our people have never gone to other countries as conquerors. They have gone as traders, they have gone as preachers, they have gone as men and women of goodwill and the world respects us for that. That is what India is about. That is what Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru said on the eve of Independence when he said: "Our dreams are for India but they are not for India alone. They are dreams for the oppressed world as a whole." So, Sir, I would respectfully urge this august

House to recognise the changed mood of the world towards India. This is not to say that power politics is a thing of the past; that there will never be any attempt to twist our arms. We will protect ourselves to ensure against the risks that are there. But it would be wrong for us not to take advantage of the opportunities that are now on the horizon. I sincerely believe that it is in the interest of our country to have good relations with all the major powers. I make no apology that we seek good relations with the United States. The United States is a pre-eminent power. But, for that matter, in the last two years that I have been the Prime Minister, we have made big efforts to come closer to Russia, to come closer to the European Union, to come closer to China, to come closer to the Arab world.

We had the privilege of welcoming His Majesty the King of Saudi Arabia as our honoured guest on Republic Day. When he went back, what did he say to me? He said: "Mr. Prime Minister, the world talks about energy shortage. As long as Saudi Arabia is there, you can take it that we will take care of your energy requirements." So, this may be a unipolar world. But we have operated in a manner which strengthen our linkages with all the big powers, with all our neighbours. We are seeking a new set of relationship with the Asian countries. Let me say that I also consider it our obligation to work hard to normalise, to expand and develop our relations with our neighbours including Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Nepal and Bangladesh. We will remain committed to that. That is our civilisational heritage. That is the meaning of our freedom struggle as I understand.

The second thing that I do wish to say is this. I was born in a village where there was no electricity. I never saw any electricity until I went to study in the neighbouring tehsil headquarters. Our women in rural homes use wood. They spoil their eye-sight in the process. Development will remain a mirage for millions and millions of our people unless we change that picture.

In the old days, whenever one went to the old Soviet Union, it used to be written boldly everywhere that socialism is Soviets plus electricity. The Soviets may have disappeared, but the role of electricity in modernisation and in expansion of economic and social opportunities for the people is a reality and, therefore, if India's struggle for its economic and social development is to succeed, we need ever-increasing amounts of energy.

There are two types of things which are at work today which determine the demand for energy in our country. First is the normal growth process. As growth takes place, commercial energy demand increases roughly at the same rate, if not more than the rate of growth of national income. But in our country, there is the other revolution and that is the modernisation of our rural economy and the replacement of non-commercial energy, like firewood and other non-commercial sources of energy, by commercial energy. So, history tells us that in the process of development, if our economy is to grow at the rate of 8 to 10 per cent, our demand for commercial energy will probably increase at the minimum at the same rate or probably even more.

Sir, questions have been raised whether we need nuclear power. I think Shri Suresh Prabhu knows this area as nobody else does. There have been important studies. I am not claiming that nuclear energy is the only way out for meeting the demand for energy in our country. We have important reserves of coal, we must exploit them. But as I look at the demand for energy, our coal reserves would be exhausted in about 45 years. We have sizeable amount of hydel resources, but they are in distant areas and we all know the type of problems that arise when you make use of hydro potential like resettlement cost, relief operation and also, I think, the costs associated with the risks arising out of being in unsafe seismic zones.

We, now, know, at least, that there is an uncertain future for hydrocarbons. There is uncertainty about supplies, there is uncertainty about prices. The price of oil has increased from less than \$ 30 per barrel two years ago to \$ 75 per barrel and there are very many people who tell me that, probably in a very short period of time, it will increase to \$ 100 per barrel. We are short of hydrocarbons. We consume about 110 million tonnes of oil. We produce only 30 million tonnes. We have not increased our oil production in the last 10-15 years. In this environment, if India's development is not to be frustrated by the shortage of energy, I think, it is incumbent on any Government to think of widening its options with regard to the supply of energy. All that I am saying as to why we need a nuclear deal is that we must ensure that the development of our economy will not be hampered by lack of adequate commercial energy. I am, therefore, seeking to enlarge the energy options that are available to our country. We must utilise those options even if what I am saying about the future of hydrocarbons does not materialise. But it would be imprudent on the part of the Government not to make

use of opportunities to widen development options, to widen the energy options. This is the reason why we through it is necessary to look around if this ambition of ours can be satisfied.

We are short of uranium. Our uranium is also relatively high cost compared to the cost of production in the rest of the world. The available estimates as of now are that we have uranium only for the production of nuclear energy equal to 10,000 MW and that too for a period of only 30 years. I believe, we must take a long-term view of our future possibilities.

If that is the picture, if there are international trading opportunities to increase the availability of uranium for us, if there are opportunities through international trade to promote a mutually beneficial exchange of technologies, that will help India's ambitions to emerge as a major pole of the evolving global economy we should exploit these opportunities. That is the vision which inspires us to look for opportunities, to remove this nuclear apartheid regime which has stifled the growth of India's nuclear power for the last three decades or more.

Mr. Speaker Sir, hon. Gen. Khanduri quoted to me what I had said in the other House that India's nuclear programme began with emphasis on nuclear energy, and that Defence came later. That, I believe, is a correct statement. If you read Panditji's statements, if you read Dr. Bhaba's statement, I think, our emphasis, by and large, has always been on peaceful uses of atomic energy. That is the reason why as early as 1960, India championed the cause of a comprehensive test ban in United Nations For a. We remain committed to the vision of Rajiv Gandhi for a nuclear free world.

It must be said of the vision of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, of Indira Gandhi, of Rajiv Gandhi that they were idealists, but they also recognised that we live in a very uncertain world. We do not control our environment and who can today say that they were not wise men and women. In the uncertain world that we live in, in a world of unequal power, the nuclear weapons are a reality. This country must keep its strategic option and that is why India's programme for strategic assets, nuclear assets was a precious heritage which came to this country, thanks to the efforts of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Indira Gandhi and Rajiv Gandhi.

You have my assurance, Sir, that we will do nothing to hurt this national heritage as long we will work steadfastly for universal, nuclear disarmament. But until,

[Dr. Manmohan Singh]

I know that the day is not going to come tomorrow, day after but hopefully some day it will materialise. But until then we cannot give up this strategic option. I assure you and through you, Sir, the House and the country that there is nothing in this nuclear deal which will hurt the strategic autonomy that this country must have with regard to the management of its nuclear weapons programme.

Sir, a number of issues have been raised and I do not think, it would be proper for me to go one by one, the ground which I covered in the other House, but some broad concerns, which have figured in the debate here, I will take them on board. The first one is the autonomy of our foreign policy. I wish to assure you, Sir—as I said a few moments ago—that this nuclear deal is not a device to be a subservient to any country whether it is United States or any other country. We have a proud heritage, a heritage from our freedom struggle. Mahatma Gandhi said once: "I want to build in this country a house open on all four sides so that winds of change may blow in from each and every direction. But, I refuse to be blown off my feet by any one influence. I must have the courage and the ability to stand on my own feet." That is the motivation, that is the inspiration for our foreign policy.

Reference has been made to a particular vote on Iran. We have civilizational ties and links with Iran as we have with the Arab world. We will work hard to strengthen those civilizational and cultural links, give them a new orientation, strengthen our economic links. And the gas pipeline project is a part of that process. We will work to make it a reality. But, that particular vote was in the context of one particular thing that we had to determine, and that is—the international community asked this question—Iran is a signatory to the NPT. Therefore, our view is that it must enjoy all the rights it has as a member of the NPT; it must also honour all the obligations that go with the members of NPT, nothing more and nothing less. Fortunately, things have moved in this direction. Right from the beginning, whether it is in the International Atomic Energy Agency or in the United Nations, we have consistently taken a view that this is not a matter to be resolved by coercive methods; debate, dialogue and discussion is the answer. I am glad, for example that things are moving in that direction. The Iranian Government, for example, have responded constructively to various proposals made by the P-5. And I sincerely hope that this will promote a constructive dialogue among all the interested parties. The problems relating to Iran's

nuclear programme can be resolved without exercise of coercive elements which we do not approve of.

Further, Sir, our record in the last two years is an open record. We have made efforts to promote good relations with China. I am very happy that last year Premier Wen came here; this year we are hoping to welcome the President of China, President Hu Jintao. The Prime Minister of Japan, Mr. Koizumi came here last year. Russian President Putin came here. Our relations with Russia, our relations with China, our relations with Japan, our relations with the European Union, and with ASEAN countries have taken a turn for the better. So, the House has my assurance that independence of our foreign policy and making it subservient only to our national interest will be ensured by us.

A number of questions have been raised with regard to our fast breeder programme. The House has my assurance that the proto type fast breeder programme, that is under way now, will be totally kept out of the purview of any surveillance by any agency.

If, in future, our programme develops and if we produce civilian fast breeders, we will then decide whether to designate them as civilian or military. So long as they are military, there is no question of putting them under any safeguard. So, I give my assurance that nothing will be done to impinge on the autonomy of the fast breeder programme.

A reference has been made about the three-stage nuclear fuel cycle, whether we have given any commitment or is there anything in this deal which will hurt the growth of thorium as a fuel of the future. There is nothing of that sort contemplated. I do not know where this idea came from. I saw this in *The Hindu* yesterday but as far as I know, there is nothing in this deal which says that we will give up the three-tier fuel cycle. The programme to pursue research in thorium-related technology will not be compromised.

Sir, Gen. Khanduri has asked me about the veracity of certain statements made by one particular American diplomat. I am sorry, I am not able to comment on what he said or what he did not say. He did not confide in me before he went on the television channel. Therefore, I am not able to enlighten as to what did this particular gentleman mean. But I can assure you, I believe if we stick by the July 18th Statement, we have got a very

good deal, a deal which I have been told was the ambition of the previous Government to negotiate but which they were not able to negotiate.

The question is, what is our status? Are we going to be regarded as a nuclear weapons State? Let me be very clear. A nuclear weapons State has a particular connotation. Since NPT cannot be negotiated until the whole Treaty can be re-negotiated, I think, it will be wrong on my part to say that we have been given the status of nuclear weapons State, and that fact was reflected in the July 18th Statement. It does not talk of India as a nuclear weapons State. It talks of India as a country with advanced nuclear technology, which should enjoy all the rights and obligations which countries similarly placed enjoy. It will be so because the safeguards agreement that we will sign with the International Atomic Energy Agency will not be the safeguards agreement signed by all other non nuclear weapons States. It will be a safeguards agreement unique to India because India's position is unique. We do not fall into the category of non-nuclear weapons State. The July 18th Statement recognizes clearly and unambiguously that India has a strategic programme, India has a military programme, and that programme is totally out of the preview of any international inspections of any kind.

Sir, questions have been raised. Please forgive me, Sir. I am just searching the relevant papers.

19.00 hrs.

SHRI VIJAYENDRA PAL SINGH: Are you justifying the reconciliation? ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: It does not matter.

...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: He can do that. But he is trying to find out a paper; and he can do. Kindly show this much of courtesy.

...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI VIJAYENDRA PAL SINGH: Can you explain about the July 18 Accord as to what is going to happen? ...(*Interruptions*)

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH: Sir, a question was asked about the position on moratorium on production of fissile

material and what we have agreed to. We have not agreed to any moratorium on the production of fissile material. All that we have agreed to is the same thing, which the previous Government had agreed to, that we will work towards a multilaterally negotiated and internationally verifiable treaty in this regard. Until that, there is no question of accepting any limit on the production of fissile material.

Sir, a question had been raised about the separation and how costly it will be. Some figures had been mentioned by some hon. Members stating 40 billion dollars, as the cost of separation. I do not know where this cost estimate originates. Doubts had also been raised about our accepting the separation of civil and military and nuclear facilities since Nuclear Weapon States do not accept such separation and retain the right to withdraw safeguards from their nuclear facilities. In our case, the July 2005 Statement acknowledges that India should be regarded as a State with advanced nuclear technology enjoying the same benefits and advantages as other States with nuclear technology, such as the United States. The July Statement did not refer to India as a Nuclear Weapon State as this has a particular connotation in the NPT. The July Statement, however, explicitly acknowledges the existence of India's military nuclear facility. This meant that India would not attract full scope safeguard such as those that apply to the Non-Nuclear Weapon States that are signatories to the NPT, and there would be no curb on continuation of India's nuclear weapon related activities.

In these important respects, India would be very much on par with the five Nuclear Weapon States, who are signatories to the NPT. The Separation Plan provides for India Specific Safeguards Agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency, with assurances of uninterrupted supply of fuels to reactors together with India's right to take corrective measures, in the event fuel supplies are interrupted. There is no question of separate agreement in this regard with the United States.

MAJ. GEN. (RETD.) B.C. KHANDURI: Sir, what about the cost of separation?

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH: I would come to it.

Sir, as far as I know, we have taken all precautions in working out the Separation Plan. Whatever costs are there, they are within the realm of practical economics and political calculations. This 40 billion dollar figure, I

[Dr. Manmohan Singh]

think, is totally misleading. I do not know what is the basis of that.

MAJ. GEN. (RETD.) B.C. KHANDURI: What is the exact calculation?

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH: Well, I cannot divulge this, I think, at this stage. But there are no unacceptable additional financial burdens, which are being placed on our nuclear programme as a result of dividing our programmes between a civilian and a military programme. I do believe that it is a good thing for our country for the future growth of both our civilian programme and our military programme, that this wall should exist. We have, for example, DRDO, which deals with the missile programme.

We have the Space Department which deals with peaceful uses of space technology, and I do believe it has created greater cost consciousness. It has created greater sense of accountability and the same will apply as a result of the two programmes being kept separate. I am satisfied insofar as I have been told that the financial costs of the operations are not, I think, anywhere near the figures which are being quoted.

PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA: It is 40 million. What is the estimate? ...*(Interruptions)*

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH: As of now, this is something which can be taken care of by the normal programmes of the Department of Atomic Energy. ...*(Interruptions)*

PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA: What is the estimate? This is something which is very important. He is making a statement...*(Interruptions)*

THE MINISTER OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY AND MINISTER OF EARTH SCIENCES (SHRI KAPIL SIBAL): Did Mr. Jaswant Singh take it up with Strobe Talbot? ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: No, forget about that. Mr. Malhotra, you have raised a question. The hon. Prime Minister said, we shall be able to provide for that.

...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: All these details cannot be discussed.

...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: You are entitled to.

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH: Questions had been raised about the CIRUS and APSARA reactors. This has been raised in both the Houses. I think Shri Yaswant Sinha raised it in the other House as to why the CIRUS experimental reactor and the Fuel Core of the APSARA have been included in the Separation Plan and whether this will not result in a decline in the fissile material availability for our strategic programme. That is the question. In my statement on March 7, 2006, I had explained the rationale why India had agreed to those provisions in the Separation Plan. The CIRUS reactor will be permanently shut down in 2010. The Fuel Core of APSARA was purchased from France and we have indicated our willingness to shift it from the present location and make it available for placing under safeguards in 2010. CIRUS and APSARA are located in the Bhaba Atomic Energy Centre and we do not want Bhaba Atomic Energy Centre to be subject to any of these safeguards. That is the reason.

Therefore, we have decided to take these steps rather than allow intrusive inspections of nuclear facilities of high national security importance. I would like to assure the hon. Members that these steps do not impact at all on the needs of our strategic programme nor will they hinder on going research and development. If and when required, we have the full freedom to build new facilities to cater to our national requirements.

Questions have also been raised about the detonation of nuclear tests in the future. Sir, we have made it quite clear to the United States that India is not willing to give any commitment about the future tests. All that we are willing to state—and that is the position which was also stated by the previous Government—is 'unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests.'

Now the question arises, what happens if our national security considerations require us to have it? Who can contemplate all the possibilities in the future? I think in that case, we will, of course, have the sovereign right to take whatever measures we can to protect our interests. But I cannot accept. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Very well, it is afterwards.

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH: So, I have stated the position. We are not willing to have it in the Treaty or the Agreement that we will sign. We are not in favour of

having a bilateral CTBT. I think that position has been unambiguously made clear to the United States.

About the American inspectors, I have explained that all that we will sign with the International Atomic Energy Agency is an India-specific safeguards agreement and there is no question of American inspectors roaming about our nuclear facilities.

On shifting of goalposts, I stated in the other House that no legislature of a foreign country can bind our country. The sole consideration for us will be our own perceptions of our national interest. But, by the same logic, I cannot prevent the US Congress in its deliberations. Now, if the outcome of these deliberations is a piece of legislation which introduces some extraneous element not envisaged in the July 18 statement, not envisaged in the March separation plan statement, then, of course, we will draw appropriate conclusions. But, I sincerely hope that that stage will not come. I have personally conveyed all our concerns, the concerns which I mentioned in detail in the other House. I could go on explaining them. But, I think that will take unduly long time. All these concerns have been raised with the United States Government both at the official level and at my level. President Bush has assured me that it is not his intention to change the goalposts which were agreed to in the Joint Statement of July 18.

The Congressional process is still not complete. I cannot predict which way it will go. But if it goes in the direction in which it hurts us or which introduces extraneous considerations into this matter, we will draw the appropriate conclusion. The House can be rest assured that we will do nothing which will compromise the integrity of our strategic programme. There is no scope for capping of our strategic programme. The decision about the future of our strategic programme will be determined by the people, by the Government, by this Parliament and no outside power will have any influence in this regard.

I believe, Sir, I have covered most of the points. With these words I once again thank the hon. Members. I think this debate has been characterised by a common assertion of national will. I thank all the hon. Members. I thank Khanduriji because when Members of his Party spoke in the other House they said that they disown even the July 18 Statement. But when I heard hon. Members on the other side today, I was encouraged to believe that it is still not too late to work for a broad

national consensus. I will work in that direction. It is very important that the whole country should speak with one voice when it comes to a matter as important as is sought to be covered by the nuclear deal. ...(*Interruptions*)

PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA: Sir, with all the assurances that the hon. Prime Minister has given to this House and to the country, does he think that the deal will go through and if it does not go through what happens? ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: He has said that if any legislation is passed which is not acceptable, it will not go through. He has said that.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA: Sir, he has said that it will not be acceptable. Then what will happen to the deal? We ask this question. ...(*Interruptions*)

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI): When it happens, then we will consider it. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI KINJARAPU YERRANNAIDU (Srikakulam): Sir, after the negotiations between the hon. Prime Minister and President George Bush, if the US Congress has modified our Agreement and tomorrow if they pass that draft law as it is, then it will be violation of our 18th July Agreement.

MR. SPEAKER: He has said that.

SHRI KINJARAPU YERRANNAIDU: To scrap those conditions in future will be a big problem for India. If that situation arises, what will be the stand of India? ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: He has thrice touched upon that point. You have not listened to it carefully.

...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI VIJAYENDRA PAL SINGH: Sir, we have been satisfied to a greater extent. But the only question that is not answered by the hon. Prime Minister is this.

MR. SPEAKER: Not Machiavellian.

...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI VIJAYENDRA PAL SINGH: It is about the inter-changeability of our military plans and the nuclear atomic plants and the nuclear civilian plants. Can there be a shift because if we are at par with the countries which have signed NPT, as you had mentioned, those countries have that right to change? Is that a possibility here? Or, have you thought about the inter-changeability? ...*(Interruptions)* We are also supporting this in many ways. ...*(Interruptions)*

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH: It is quite right. ...*(Interruptions)* I am not an expert in nuclear matters. I think, there is a question mark about inter-changeability because we do not have the status of a nuclear weapons State, but there is other feature that we are free to build new reactors and new facilities. It is our prerogative whether we want to call them civilian or military. So, India's options are not being limited.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Members, now there are two other discussions under Rule 193 and also a Bill.

...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Let us take Special Mentions. That is the sweetest subject! Shri Gaurishanker Chaturbhuj Bisen—not present.

SHRI LONAPPAN NAMBADAN (Mukundapuram): Sir, I rise to bring to the notice of the House the situation arising out of the problems being faced by the people of coastal Kerala.

19.17 hrs.

[SHRI VARKALA RADHAKRISHNAN in the Chair]

People in a number of districts in the State are facing the fury of the waves during the monsoon season year after year. The only defence against the rising sea waves during the high tides in the monsoon months are the artificial stonewalls constructed along the affected villages facing the sea and seashores. The most affected coastal talukas in Thrissur district are Chavakkad and Kodungalore. Since the people living in the villages along the coastal areas in Kerala are undergoing untold miseries due to the fury of the high tides, especially during the monsoon period every year, I would request the Central Government to kindly take all necessary steps to sanctioned the amount required to build the stonewalls along the affected areas on a war-footing urgency.

I would also request the Central Government to sanction the required amount for the Ponnani-Kochi canal development for which a request was submitted to the Twelfth Central Finance Commission. Thank you.

DR. K.S. MANOJ (Alleppey): Sir, I also associate with him.

SHRIMATI C.S. SUJATHA (Mavelikara): Sir, I also associate.

[Translation]

SHRI RAJNARAYAN BUDHOLIA (Hamirpur, U.P.): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I want to draw the attention of the Government towards an important subject. The Government policy envisages opening of two Jawahar Navodaya Vidyalayas in each district but this scheme has not been implemented properly so far. There are many districts which have 3 to 5 Kendriya Vidyalayas whereas there are several other districts which do not have even a single Kendriya Vidyalaya. Even there is no Kendriya Vidyalaya in nearby districts of my parliamentary constituency like Mahoba, Hamirpur, Banda, Chitrakoot, Chhatarpur, Jalaun districts nor there is any possibility of opening of Kendriya Vidyalaya there in future. The Government is not making any efforts for it as a result of which the wards of the Central Government employees and other needy students have to face a lot of difficulties. Coupons are issued to the Members of Parliament for admission of two children in the Kendriya Vidyalayas under the discretionary quota which is insufficient. There is an urgent need to set up a Jawahar Navodaya Vidyalayas in Sumerpur town and a Kendriya Vidyalaya in Maudaha town in Hamirpur district and a Jawahar Navodaya Vidyalaya in Kulpahar of Mahoba district and a Kendriya Vidyalaya in Mahoba.

Sir, through you, I request the Central Government that at least two Jawahar Navodaya Vidyalayas and at least one Kendriya Vidyalaya should be opened in each district of the country by relaxing the Government rules and the number of coupons issued to Hon. Members should be increased to at least five coupons per member for admission in Kendriya Vidyalayas.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Shankhlal Majhi is allowed to associate with this matter.