

17.31 hrs.

#### HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION

##### SUPPLY OF URANIUM FOR TARAPUR

MR. CHAIRMAN: We now take up the half-hour discussion.

SHRI P. M. SAYEED (Lakshadweep): This half-hour discussion has been necessitated by the incomplete, rather unsatisfactory answers given by the hon. Prime Minister the other day.

We have been hearing day in and day out that this Tarapur plant has not been regularly supplied with enriched uranium from the USA. We all know that we have entered into a contract with the United States for 30 years ending in 1994 in his reply to the starred question, the hon. Prime Minister stated that so far the quantum of enriched uranium that we have received is 217 tonnes, or about 5,050 kg. of enriched uranium.

The question comes up why the supply of enriched uranium is frequently halted. Even when the American Government has given clearance, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, under the pretext of hearing the environmental groups, gets it postponed. A couple of days back, it was again mentioned in the *Indian Express* that the enriched uranium for which we have placed an order—16.8 tonnes and 19.8 tonnes—was scheduled to be shipped this month, but this has been deferred to the next year.

It is said that it is only in order to convince the U.S. administration that the Indian nuclear installations are to be subjected to full scope safeguards inspection by the agencies of the U.S. According to this contract, the International Atomic Energy Agency are regularly inspecting Tarapur, and they have never mentioned anything objectionable about the use of enriched uranium. Again, the U.S. has also gone on record that

India has never violated its contractual obligations in using this enriched uranium. President Carter's Special Adviser on Atomic Matters has also expressed satisfaction at the statement of the hon. Prime Minister. In spite of all these things, the U.S. supplies to Tarapur have been irregular.

Now, recently, the Government of India appointed an international committee of scientists to inspect the full-scope safeguards of the atomic installations of India. My fear is that this matter of atomic installations and scientific advancement is concerned with our security. Unilaterally, the United States is asking India alone to be subjected to such conditions.

For example, the other day, I found in the newspapers that the United States has given permission to France to sell a power plant to China. As you know, China has already occupied a considerable chunk of our land and our relations have not been normal. On the other hand, the United States itself is building up fast-breeder reactor. Once upon a time, Mr. Carter was opposed to it. Now, he himself has sanctioned to develop it. Also, he has given permission impliedly to the West European countries and they are also going towards advancement in the field of atomic energy and nuclear weapons.

On the other side, Pakistan is doing it. Sometime back, in the *Hindu*, it was reported that in the occupied Kashmir there is going to be some atomic plant. The President of Pakistan, a week back, said, 'The lasting friendship with India depends on the settlement of the Kashmir question'.

The appointment of an international committee of scientists to go into full-scope safeguards of India's nuclear installations alone is, therefore, discriminatory and against us. Not only that. It will be blackmailing us.

According to the contractual obligations, the United States is bound to

[Shri P. M. Sayeed]

supply enriched uranium for 30 years. They have now made a law, the nuclear non-proliferation Act, according to which, by September 10, 1979, all the applications pending for atomic material will be processed and, unless and until the full-scope inspection of all our atomic installations is permitted, this contract is not going to be honoured.

My question is simple. Is the committee appointed by the Government of India a bilateral committee consisting of our scientists also in which case it is not only the responsibility of the committee to see the full-scope safeguards of the atomic installations of India but it is also permitted to see the installations of the United States also. Secondly, if this committee is not a bilateral committee, is it a committee consisting of scientists from nuclear weapon countries, like, France, United States, U. K., Western Europe and other countries, so that all the nuclear weapon countries will be inspected for full-scope safeguards by this committee? If so, then I have no grudge, otherwise, if it is only in the case of India, to insist upon this Committee is nothing but blackmailing. Therefore, my question is this if the international contractual obligations are violated unilaterally by any country then, as the case of any ordinary contractual obligation, there must be a penal clause in the case of the countries involved and, therefore, my suggestion would be to see that the Indian Government takes this matter to the International Court of Justice at the Hague.

Therefore, in this matter, my charge against this Government is that, by the very acceptance of this Committee to go into the full-scope safeguards of the installations—by yielding to this extent—the Government has surrendered our sovereignty and security. That is my charge because China is also not completely friendly with us; Pakistan is also not totally or a hun-

dred per cent friendly with us. If this Committee is going to go into the details of our installations, America is likely to leak them out and they will be known to these countries and our security and scientific advancement will be leaked out there. Therefore, even if this Committee consists of our scientists also, they must be allowed to inspect the United State installations. In the case of France, America has not insisted upon such safeguards, and in the case of other countries also it has not insisted. In the case of Israel, America has fully equipped the atomic installations. There also, our interest is there, as we have already seen. In the Arab world and the Gulf countries, our interest is there. Under these circumstances, accepting the appointment of this Committee to inspect our installations is nothing but surrendering our sovereignty and security. Therefore, these two things....

MR. CHAIRMAN: You are repeating it again and again. You have made your point already.

SHRI SAUGATA ROY (Barrackpore): He is emphatic on the 'surrender' question this is his vital point.

SHRI P. M. SAYEED: Therefore, I would like to know whether the Government is prepared to go into the appointment of this Committee afresh and, secondly, in case the Government of the United States violates the obligation of supplying enriched uranium after 1979, whether the Government of India is prepared to go to the world Court at the Hague.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI MORARJI DESAI): I can understand the anxiety of my hon. friend Shri Sayeed, about the whole question of the rights of this country in this matter. But all this criticism, if I may say so, is due to a misunderstanding of the whole situation owing

to a failure to grasp all the facts as they are.

In the first place, the Committee that is going to consider what safeguards should be is not going to inspect any of our installations. They have no right to do that: it is not appointed for that purpose. But there should be non-proliferation in the world. In that, we are all interested. And it will go into what safeguards can be applicable to all countries, not merely to this country. I will never agree to any Committee for having safeguards only for this country, anywhere, at any time. There is no question of agreeing to it.

**SHRI SAUGATA ROY:** But you are opening up the installations for inspection.

**SHRI MORARJI DESAI:** Not at all. They would not inspect. Only if the safeguards are acceptable and are applicable to all countries then only we will agree it. Then it will be inspection for all, not only for us, it cannot be only for us. And this Committee is not only of American scientists: one American scientist, another Indian, another of a third country nominated by India, and another of a third country nominated by the USA. In addition to the four scientists the fifth would be the Chairman, that Chairman will be the Chairman of the IAEA, that is, the International Atomic Energy Agency. That is how this Committee will be formed. It is not of one country. Therefore, there need be no anxiety about this. Nobody is going to barter away any rights of our country; at least, this Government will be the last to do so. Therefore, there need be no anxiety about it. But we cannot say that we will not examine what safeguards are necessary which will be applicable to all for the purpose of seeing that there is non-proliferation. There is no question about that. The question is whether the safeguards will be applicable to all, and the inspection also applies to all,

not to this country alone which can never be agreed to.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Including China and Pakistan?

**SHRI MORARJI DESAI:** Those who agree, those who are party to the agreement, will all be involved in it. But this has to be considered by that Committee as to what the safe guards will be. That has first to be considered. And the International Agency applies to the whole world, not only to the one country.

Then it was said that the USA asked France, or permitted France, to give plants to China. I know nothing about it. This is only some information in papers. That does not mean anything; I cannot base anything on that. But all this will be considered also by the Committee, if it is so, then they have no qualification to talk about anything else. That is all I would say. But before that I cannot go on asking for explanation of other countries why they have done this. I have no authority to do that I have no right to do so. Therefore, all this need not be considered at all from that point of view.

The supply of enriched uranium to us, according to the contract, has not been regulated by any schedule made in the Agreement. There is unfortunately no schedule made in the Agreement. But it was to be given according to requirements for a particular year and should not exceed the requirement—that has also been agreed to. Therefore, we cannot make more indents, that is, larger indents, than what are required immediately. That is also in the Agreement. But if they go on delaying which started after 1976 then, we will have to ask for more, and if they refuse to do it, we are free then to utilise our own resources and also use the spent fuel there for our own purposes. Then we are not bound by any Agreement after that, and we are, at any rate, confident that we can find

[Shri Morarji Desai]

our own ways and means to see that we are not handicapped in future. Beyond that I cannot specify anything more....

**SHRI SAUGATA ROY:** It should be scrapped immediately. They have delayed it enough.

**SHRI MORARJI DESAI:** Then the scrapping will be ours. It is very easy for people who are not responsible to say that. I will have to foot the bill. Therefore, I cannot talk in the same language....

**SHRI P. M. SAYEED:** What about the penal clause, if there is any?

**SHRI MORARJI DESAI:** There is no such clause, but so far we have been supplied with what has been indented for. They have not lessened it. I cannot say that there is a breach. It is delayed but we are not therefore short of it just now. But if that happens then we will ask for more. If they say 'No', then we are free. But to go to a court will be absolutely futile for us because then everything will be held up. Even the power plant will be held up afterwards.

**SHR K. GOPAL (Karur):** Ask for a special court.

**SHRI MORARJI DESAI:** We have to find our own remedies for it and I think we have capacity enough to find alternatives. I have no doubt about it. Therefore, I would only request my hon. friend not to worry too much, let him worry a little, but not much. cannot say he should be free of worry because that is easier said than done.

बोबरी बलबीर सिंह (होशियारपुर) : जिस कनेटी में हिन्दुस्तान का नुमासना होता उसको पाकिस्तान बाल इन्सपकट करने दें ?

श्री मोरार जी-देसाई : वहां पर इनका कोई इन्सपकशन नहीं करना है। हमारे वहां की नहीं करना है, दूसरी जगह की इनका इन्सपकशन नहीं करना है।

**SHRI P. M. SAYEED:** What exactly is the purpose of this Committee?

**SHRI MORARJI DESAI:** The purpose of the committee is to consider what safeguards can there be which may be applicable to all for seeing that all proliferation is stopped everywhere. That is the purpose of this committee and how can I say that that should not be done?

Therefore, there is no question of inspection by this committee of our installations and I have always said and I have told them that unless their installations are inspected, we cannot allow our installations to be inspected by anybody. That will never be possible. We have very definitely told them and there is no doubt about it.

**SHRI SAUGATA ROY:** Have you told them coldly and bluntly?

**SHRI MORARJI DESAI:** I do not talk bluntly or coldly; but I said it warmly. Therefore, I hope my hon friend will be satisfied with what I have said.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Shri Ramoowalia—he is not there, Shri Badri Narayan.

**SHRI A. R. BADRI NARAYAN (Shimoga):** It is a matter of supreme satisfaction and pardonable pride that our country has developed nuclear capabilities and for this reason the big powers are rather apprehensive and even suspicious of us. You have on more than one occasion said that our nuclear capabilities will be used only for peaceful purposes. I think that should satisfy them. You have also emphatically said that the safeguards could be only universal and not one-sided. It is all very right.

The question that I am putting to you is: when we have all these capabilities, why have we not anticipated

our own requirements? Why have we got to go and stretch our hand and ask somebody who is willing or unwilling to give? Why have we to stretch our hands to them and be at the mercy of these people? I am asking. What are the other alternatives? In the event of the foreign powers refusing to give us our requirements, what is the alternative solution on hand? I would like to know.

**SHRI MORARJI DESAI:** I cannot disclose.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Faleiro.

**SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO (Mormugao):** The hon. Prime Minister has very candidly admitted yesterday in the other House that though there may not be technical violation of the agreement by the United States Administration in supplying the uranium in time, definitely, the U.S. is not carrying out the agreement properly.

Apart from this, reference has already been made to the legislation which will come into effect on 30th September next year after which the U.S. will not, or, is not supposed to supply enriched uranium to any country including India.

Again, the Chairman of the U.S. Foreign Relations Committee has informed President Carter that the Committee will not approve of any further shipment of enriched uranium to India specifically after September, 1979. The agreement for the supply of enriched uranium by the U.S. is to operate upto 1983. The assumption that could then justifiably be made is that the U.S. Administration, as things are going on now, will not supply us or will not be able to supply to us the required uranium. The hon. Prime Minister has said that it is not in the public interest to disclose what alternatives are contemplated in such a case.

Sir, although I am definitely one of the least knowledgeable persons in

these matters in this House, I am as much concerned as anyone else particularly because this plant supplies energy, a large portion of the energy, required by the two States which neighbour my own territory, that is, Maharashtra and Gujarat.

Sir, I would like to know from the hon. Prime Minister whether he can assure this House that in case of stoppage of supply of enriched uranium by the U.S. Administration to Tarapur, the Tarapur plant will not close down and will not also reduce its working capacity. This is the first part of my question.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** You can put one question only and not in parts. Please conclude.

**SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO:** I know you are always very kind. The second part of my question is: the matter has been raised but it has been left unanswered here as far as my understanding went.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Faleiro, you put a direct question.

**SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO:** My direct question will be that though the hon. Prime Minister is kind enough to tell us that this does not involve an admission of a full scope nuclear safeguards after the formation of this Committee, I want to draw attention to this report, A.P., which is published in the *Economic Times* dated 15th November last datelined, Washington. It said:

"President Jimmy Carter is expected to decide on a proposal to determine whether safeguards against misuse of American Nuclear fuel would hinder India's peaceful development of nuclear energy. The U.S. State Department official, who asked that his name is not used, said that the proposal to appoint a committee of scientists from India, U.S. and other nations was on track".

[Shri Eduardo Faleiro]

So, this points out as per the report that this is a backdoor attempt.. (Interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Still you are not putting your question. You have to put the question. There should be no speech like that. We have got just half-an-hour.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: You have been always kind enough to me and other Members. Only today you are a little bit less kind. I am just wanting to be clarified in my own humble way. I am trying to make my point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You need not make a point. You put your question.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: My point is in the form of a question. What steps has the Government taken to see that through backdoor, through the Committee of panel of scientists the full scope nuclear safeguards are not introduced? In particular, I want to know whether Government is in a position to assure this House that the majority of the member Scientists of this Panel will be from non-nuclear powers and from the non-aligned countries. Secondly, whether this country will also inspect these installations in Israel and South Africa particularly. The third and the last point which is very relevant is this. The whole situation has been...

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am sorry. I have to call another Member. This is not the way.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: This is an important discussion that we are having. I would be very brief. I have not taken much time of the House.

The third point in which I myself and the country in general would like clarification is that it appears the Prime Minister who is always so firm in this House and in the country,

has created an impression that he is less firm when dealing particularly with the American administration.

18 hrs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You are making a speech.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: I am asking a clarification

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am sorry you are going beyond the scope. That is not the way.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: I will finish within half a minute. The hon'ble Prime Minister while speaking here on a similar matter on 25-4-1978 said: 'I have come to the conclusion after going through it carefully that there is no necessity for explosions for peaceful purposes. This is the conclusion I have come to. Experts may have a different view'. But yesterday in the other House the Prime Minister did say—this is very important and the crux of the whole thing—if any explosion can be made without any fall-out and which does not lead to atomic weapons and is only for peaceful purposes that explosion is never debarred. So, my question is what led the Prime Minister to change from his earlier stand in this House that there will be no explosion for peaceful purpose and now to say that there will be explosion for peaceful purposes.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: I will not speak about it at all. It is not relevant. That is not germane to this debate.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: It is germane. You are bringing this statement to suit the American administration.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: Mr. Chairman, how long do you want to go on? There is no quorum.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I put it to the House. If this is the way that the

questions go on then the remaining members cannot be called. There should be some procedure. According to the rules, four persons are entitled. If others do not want to put the question then I will request.... (Interruptions).

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND LABOUR (SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA): Sir, is it the decision of the House to sit after six. The hon'ble members who have raised the question must remember this. (Interruptions).

The hon'ble members who raised the question and speak for twenty minutes to frame the question must remember that the House has not taken a decision to sit after six.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will request the hon'ble Members to put direct questions.

SHRI PURNANARAYAN SINHA (Tarpur): Mr. Chairman, has the House agreed that it will sit beyond six O'clock. (Interruptions).

SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA: The House has not decided to sit beyond six O'clock.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are interested in disposing of the business properly. So, I will request every member to accommodate and cooperate. If questions like this are to be put then naturally we have to adjourn the House. We cannot sit indefinitely. Therefore, I will request the hon'ble Members of the House and the government also. The hon'ble members will put one line question so that we can hear the reply.

SHRI M. V. CHANDRASHEKHARA MURTHY (Kanakapura): The Uranium Corporation of India was established in 1969 to augment uranium resources in the country but so far nothing has been turned out. According to Dr. H. J. Bhabha, the known uranium and thorium reserves available in India....

MR. CHAIRMAN: You are not putting a direct question.

SHRI M. V. CHANDRASHEKHARA MURTHY:....were enough to support an annual consumption equal to that of an industrially advanced country for over 300 years. I would like to put some specific questions to the hon'ble Prime Minister. Whether any investigation has been made to augment uranium resources in the country and in particular in Karnataka. If so, the details thereof. (b) Why don't the Government of India approach the other countries namely USSR who are ready to supply uranium to Tarapur plant, irrespective of political affiliations. (Interruptions)

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: Time has not been extended. Still if you are going to extend I do not think you have any authority of extending the time....I cannot understand....

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, I am in the hands of the House because from the Government side, the question is raised. I put it to the House; whether we want to sit for some more time or not.

(Interruptions)

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN (Idukki): Sir, I would appeal to the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs and the Prime Minister that questions were put and you allowed the questions to be put. We are now at 6.05 p.m. At 6 O'clock it should have been put to the House. It was not put and the Government did not insist on putting it to the House. Therefore, we have agreed to sit for some time and it is a matter of cooperation.

(Interruptions)

It is only for answers to be given that the questions have been put. You permitted the questions. The answers must be forthcoming. Let the Government say that they do not

[Shri C. M. Stephen]

have an answer to give to this question:

**SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA:** Mr. Chairman, since a reference has been made to the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, you will permit me to make a statement. At 6 O'clock it was pointed out to you that the House has not taken any decision to extend the sitting in spite of that fact, we do not want to take protection under this plea. The hon. Prime Minister was willing to answer questions provided questions were short so that brief answers might be given.

**SHRI K. LAKKAPPA (Tumkur):** He was very kind to us but you are not very kind to us.

**SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA:** We wanted to cooperate with the opposition and we wanted to cooperate with the Chair, but if the Opposition thinks that this is an occasion to go on making long speeches under the plea of putting questions, then certainly we have a right to say that the House has not taken a decision to extend the sitting. Therefore, I hope the leader of the Opposition will not compel us to take this stand.

(Interruptions)

**SHRI K. LAKKAPPA:** Why is not the Government taking help from the U.S.S.R.? (Interruptions).

**SHRI MORARJI DESAI:** Sir, I was asked what are the alternatives. I cannot disclose the alternatives. If I disclose them, then again there will be impediments coming and we may not be able to find out a proper solution. Therefore, I cannot disclose that. But we are at it very seriously and, I hope, fruitfully. Then I was

asked to give an assurance that Terepau will not close down. In spite of all my best efforts, if that contingency arises, it arises. I cannot give such a blanket assurance as my hon. Member wants because today I am not in a position to say that I have got that knowledge and I have got everything that I want. If I had that, then I would have snapped my fingers immediately in the air. I would not have then waited for this at all. I would have my self said 'all right let the agreement go'. But I cannot do that. One cannot do so.

(Interruptions)

And then that is all that is asked. About uranium also, we are asked what are we doing. Well, I said we are at it and I hope that we will be able to meet the situation despite some difficulty. That is what we hope. I cannot say positively.

**SHRI K. LAKKAPPA:** Are you going to negotiate with the USSR also?

**SHRI MORARJI DESAI:** My hon. friend does not know that in this matter, the USSR and the USA are agreed. He does not know that.

**SHRI K. LAKKAPPA:** That is why I am asking that question.

**SHRI MORARJI DESAI:** The hon. Member can ask any questions but I cannot go on making any irresponsible statement. I cannot do that. I do not want to do that.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The House now stands adjourned till 11 a.m. on Monday the 4th December.

18.11 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Monday, December 4, 1978/Agrahayana 13, 1900 (Saka).