17.39 hrs.

STATEMENT RE. RECONSTITUTION OF MINORITIES COMMISSION

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI DHANIK LAL MANDAL): Madam Chairman, consequent on the resignation of Shri M. R. Masani as Chairman, minorities Commission, Government have decided to reconstitute the Minorities Commission with Shri Justice M. R. A. Ansari as Chairman and Prof. V. V John, Dr. Miss Alooj Destur, Shri Kushak Bakula and Air Chief Marshal Arjan Singh (Retired) as Members.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH (Nandyal): Madam, he said that the Prime Minister was misleading the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, no. He did not say that. You misheard him.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: Madam, I am referring to Mr. Masani's speech.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am sorry, on a statement made like this, there are no questions allowed.

HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION

BAR ON NUCLEAR EXPLOSIONS BY INDIA

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai): Madam Chairman, the statement made by the Prime Minister in the course of his visit to USA that India will not undertake nuclear explosions even for peaceful purposes has created much concern in the minds of people like me, a humble student of science.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI MORARJI DESAI): May I correct the hon. Member? I made the statement first here and not outside.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: But it has received quite a lot of publicity all over the world.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN (Idukki): In our country also.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: In our country also, or wherever it may be. It has created some concern, I should say great concern, in the minds of people like us, humble students of science, as to why and what stands in the way of not having nuclear explosions even for peaceful purposes.

Madam, I want to draw your attention to the fact that during the last 35 years, since 1944 when the first nuclear blast was made, once every 10 days there was one nuclear blast undertaken by one power or the other. All told, about 2000 nuclear devices have been exploded by USA, Russia, France, China and UK. This is not all for developing destructive weapans, but also for peaceful purposes. I want to draw the attention of this House to the fact that our present industrial civilisation based on coal and oil energy is likely to be extinct by the next century. Unless we can devise some other new sources of nuclear energy such as nuclear power, it has given, I should say, a new leap to the world's civilisation, some kind of a second industrial revolution has been brought in. That itself is a serious concern for the whole of the world as to how much we can harness this nuclear power for sustaining, helping and for the survival of our industrial civilisation of the future.

Madam, I will not deal with the destructive objective of nuclear explosion although I want to draw the attention of the hon. Prime Minister to the fact that after development of nuclear technology for explosion, the whole concept and character of war has undergone a revolutionary change. Even the conventional arms mostly of the nuclear powers are possessed with nuclear weapons of 1 kilo tonne or 2 kilo tonnes which are called nuclear guns. And these nuclear guns can be used anywhere and they are included in the conventional arms and these

conventional arms can cause deep devastation. Even for a limited devastation they can be used, I don't know. We cannot ignore the reality that the whole concept and character of war has thoroughly changed. And where there is a possibility of our potential enemy possessing these nuclear arms of conventional type which can be used—leave a side the strategic weapon of the nuclear type—will we risk the future security of our country? I leave this for the Prime Minister to consider. But I have a question in my mind, because our potential enemy may possess, at any time, nuclear weapons of 1 or 2 kilo-tonne type which are a thousand times more powerfull than the black-buster type of bombs that can be moved. Our potential enemy can even have them exported or imported. There is no necessity for a missile and other things. They can be used by nuclear guns.

When our first nuclear device was exploded in Rajasthan, it was categorically mentioned that the whole object of this explosion was for the utilization or for developing blast technology of nuclear engineering for peaceful purposes. It was made very categorically clear to the world, but here was a hue and cry all over the world against this kind of nuclear blast.

What is the meaning of peaceful use of nuclear energy? There are three types of use. You can use the radio isotopers for medical purposes, you can use it for developing food technology, for industry and for other purposes. Secondly, you can use it for developing nuclear power plants. But there is another aspect of it. Nuclear explosion can be used for peaceful, constructive and developmental purposes also. There is a possibility of that. In an arid area, in a desert, you can make a big lake or a big reservoir of water or construct a dam. or make a road or a harbour. You can even have exploration for, and exploitation of oil. You can even have the liquefaction of natural gases underground. It is possible. There are other possibilities also. Non-ferrous ore can be exploited. There are immense other possibilities. Naturally, all the countries of the world, advanced countries, e.g. USA and Russia have undertaken innumerable nuclear blast technology sudies for developmental purposes. I have something wonderful to present Just a few years ago, Russia was undertaking a peaceful nuclear blast for changing the course of the river flowing into the Caspian Sea. This is called Pochira-Kama River Canal. By this, they have changed the course of the river, and now the northern river is flowing into the Caspian Sea. Not only that, Russia has undertaken a number of other projects for peaceful utilization of blast technology, of nuclear explosion. USA is not falling behind. It has also undertaken many projects, and they have developed it. Canada, Australia, Egypt, Thailand, Venezuela and many other countries have already done feasibility studies. And if USA, Russia or China agrees to help them, they are ready to undertake this new technology of nuclear engineering for developmental and constructive purposes.

I want to know from my Government: what stands in the way of utilization of this blast technology for developing nuclear engineering for constructive and developmental purposes. India is a big country. It is possible to have a big lake in Rajasthan; it is possible to change the course of Brahmaputra. And we can change even the mountainous roads. We can have an easier exploration of oil and gas on the West Coast. There are many other, immense possiblities. I do not want go into the details. But what stands in the way of using the blast technology of nuclear explosion for peaceful and constructive purposes? Is it a moral question? If it is a moral question, are we not using TNT or dynamite for our engineering purpose, for mining, for road building, for many other constructive purposes? Now it is the same blast technology only, instead of TNT, if we use one kilo or two kilo tonne blast, it

[Shri Samar Guha]

would be more powerful, million times more powerful and the cost ratio would be less. If it is so, and if you use blast technology for one purpose, what stands in the way of using the blast technology of nuclear explosion for similar purposes? If it is a moral question....

MR. CHAIRMAN: He should conclude.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: It is a technical subject.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Four more Members have given notice of questions.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Only one question they will ask.

I know there are certain other constraints. Even if we take a moral posture that we will not undertake nuclear explosion, whether for peaceful purposes or development of weaponry, may be there are constraints; I know. Our constraints are that Ranapratapsagar is dependent on supply of heavy water from Russia. Tarapur is dependent on supply of enriched uranium from America. Only one project, the Nangal heavy water project, one ten-tonne unit is functioning. We entered into a contract with the French Company for developing a 50-tonne Baroda plant, 50-tonne Tuticorin plant and with a German Company to develop 50-tonne Talcher plant and 60-tonne Kota Plant. But what happened? These plants were to be commissioned by 1977. But now only Baroda plant suffered from an explosion and it will take at least four years more for them just to reach the take-off stage.

Why has it happened? Why is it so? I think we have enough scientific talent in our Atomic Energy Commission and also in our engineering field. We have to see why this delay is being caused. Is it deliberate? Or, is there something wrong the way our engineers can expedite the completion of this heavy water project?

I also want to know another thing. What stands in the way of re-processing the waste fuel of Tarapur? These are the constraints that are standing in the way. If it is not a moral question, these are the constraints. It is possible that you can have the re-processing of the Tarapur waste; plutonium can be re-cycled into our Tarapur plant. We have got sufficient resources; at the present moment, the huge waste, where we have to put it, we do not know.

For Tarapur in the initial agreement there was no stipulation that we would not be allowed to reprocess waste fuel'. There was no such stipulation that even for peaceful purposes we shall not use our fuel that we are getting out of Taraur. It is the American interpretation. Why should be succumb to that?

Another point I want to know is about enriched uranium. I do not understand one thing. Our Atomic Energy Commission is a wonderful body, talented body. In Jaduguda we have enough uranium reserves. We can feed 20 Ranapratapsagar type of plants for one century from our own Jaduguda resource of uranium. We can develop a technology of separating the fissile isotopes or the lower isotopes, that is, uranium 235 from uranium 238. It can be. After all, why do we not put our skill? It is possible with the latest method of separating the fissile element, from the heavy element, uranium 235 from uranium 238 it is possible with the lesser separation method. We have our talent, we have our scientific talent, I am sure; I know it definitely. Our scientists in the Atomic Energy Commission, are capable of developing of their own, even if they do not get the technology from the outside world. It is possible given the will.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think this is a good point on which you can conclude. It is a very good point to conclude.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Don't disturb me please.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am not disturbing you. I am requesting you to conclude. It is not a disturbance.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Just a few minutes more. This is not an ordinary, political speech.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I agree it is not, but kindly conclude.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: I am concluding.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Because you are going beyond your original point.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: It is a scientific speech. It is not making a public speech, going here and there, saying anything.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right, you will only shut out the reply.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: What I was saying is that if the will, the initiative, the finance and leadership is given to our Atomic Energy Commission, it is possible to develop the latest separation method by which within three years, from the laboratory stage to the factory, the preparation of enriched uranium is possible. I want to know from the hon. Prime Minister whether all the initiative, incentive and leadership and also encouragement will be given to our Atomic Energy Commission for developing this laser separation method for preparation of enriched uranium.

Why do I mention all this, the constraints about the preparation of heavy water, constraints about the preparation of enriched uranium? Because I do not accept this moral posture that India will not undertake nuclear explosion for even peaceful purposes. We have every right, we are not using it for destructive purposes. If we can use TNT for our blast technology, can we not use it for a more powerful blast technology, for similar purposes? If we can get removed all these constraints and have heavy water quickly, even leaving aside heavy water if we can have enriched uranium within two or three years, we can make ourselves independent of all the threats, all the coercion from the entire world, from the five not even five, from USA and Russia, who are trying to monopolise....

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think you have made your point.

SHRI SAMAR GUTA: They are trying to monopolise all the nuclear technology, nuclear power and nuclear energy, brow-beating all the other States, as if it is their right only to have a monopoly of having nuclear engineering or other use of nuclear energy also.

I want to conclude by making a request to the hon. Prime Minister. Let us not take a moral posture in regard to the development of nuclear technology for peaceful explosion of nuclear. It can be used for peaceful purposes, constructive purposes, developmental purposes. An under-developed country like India requires it.

Secondly, also I want to draw attention to one thing. We missed one industrial development because we were underdeveloped. If we miss another chance for industrial development, that will be the next stage.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think you have made your-point.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Let us not go back to the bullock cart age by giving up nuclear energy. I do not know whether the former Prime Minister, after the Pokharan explosion, gave an assurance to the USA not to undertake fresh tests, and that momentum also is working. I would humbly request that, giving up the moral posture, we should take a

[Shri Samar Guha]

realistic stand and try to make our wonderful organisation...

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think you are now repeating yourself.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Let us not eclipse this under a shadow that we are apathetic towards scientific leadership.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will you please conclude now? Do not go on repeating. Mr. Unnikrishnan.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Last sentence.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have called Unnikrishnan. You kindly resume your seat. You have to finish some time.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: This is the last sentence.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Of how many words?

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Our Atomic Energy Commission and the talented scientists there are the pride of our nation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I told you that is a point you have made earlier.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: I would humbly request the hon. Prime Minister that taking a moral posture, let us not eclipse their initiative and talent by developing an apathetic attitude towards them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Unnikrishnan. Question, not a speech.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN (Badagara): I will introduce my question. Self-reliant development of atomic energy for peaceful purpose has been our aim, as also the aim and goal of our scientific community. We have withstood pressures from all the nuclear Powers in the past and we undertook the Pokharan explosion. I recall Dr. Homi Sethna's speech to the International Atomic Energy Agency.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will you please be brief? You can ask a question for elucidation.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: If you don't take my time, I shall be brief.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do not take your time. You are taking the time of the House. Kindly be brief.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: Now, I find that the Prime Minister in his speech to the United Nations had said that 'in fact, we have gone further and abjured nuclear explosions even for peaceful purposes'. Possibly he has taken a moral posture as he used to do before and said this. We would like to know whether he has said this in reference to the advice tendered by the scientists community.

What I want to know in relation to this agreement about which this Half-an-hour discussion has been raised here is: is it a fact that there is a pressure from the United States for full-scope safeguards and whether he has given any such assurance and whether this speech reflects this pressure?

Prof. Samar Guha who has raised this discussion, has also posed a question. Whether it is a fact that the former Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, had stopped all peaceful nuclear explosions. The House would like to know whether it is as a result of any pressure from the United States or the Soviet Union or any other country.

Apart from what is raised, here, is there a pressure on full-scope safeguards? Is it a fact that the United States Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act will cover all our nuclear installations whereas the Soviet Agreement dated 17-11-77 is confined only to one plant? That is the difference. We want to be enlightened on this. Whether it is

a fact that we have agreed to this and whether we have agreed to full-scope safeguards.

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR (Gandhinagar): This is a very important subject affecting our vital interests and involving our honour and self-respect and, of course, our security and strength. This subject is, I agree, urgent, crucial, sensitive and delicate. India's nuclear policy, particularly enunciated by the new Janata Government, is not only clear but very emphatic, and I think to a very large extent, rightly so.

Prime Minister Morarjibhai Desai's moral fervour on this particular aspect is very well known. We share it; we value it. But the only question is, whether we are sometimes not overpowered by it. The question is, we are dealing with hard realities of international politics rather than with soft morality on national or international issues. The USA and USSR are two super powers who, for a variety of reasons and for a variety of interests, may be at war against each other, but on subduing all other nations including us they are one. Therefore, I believe, the Prime Minister in his interview on 1st September, 1977 with an American correspondent said in so many words: "Both US and USSR have been applying pressure on us for the last two years". That is what he said.

Now, India's stand is quite clear (a) we will not manufacture nuclear weapons, (b) we will not even test nuclear devices for peaceful purposes and (c) we will not agree to throw open India-built nuclear installations unless all the nuclear powers agree to submit all their installations for similar inspection.

In view of this background, may I respectfully ask the Prime Minister these questions:

(a) Is the policy of not having nuclear explosion even for peaceful purposes taken under any kind of pressure brought to bear on us of either USA or Russia?

(b) Is this decision, that we will not have nuclear explosion even for peaceful purposes, taken because of our helplessness regarding some vital ingredients we need to import from USA/USSR?

(c) Why do we go to the extreme position and adhere to this extreme stance at a comparatively early stage of our negotiations?

(d) What, if any, are the political gains accruing to us because of this particular policy?

(e) What about our efforts at self-reliance?

(f) What about the attitude of the scientific community involved in nuclear research? The Prime Minister knows about it, more than all of us naturally. What is the attitude of that community to this new decision taken by the Government?

These are my questions to the Prime Minister and I would like to have answers from him.

डा० रामजी सिंह (भागलपुर) : सभापति महोदया, वैज्ञानिकों का कहना है कि वे लोग भारतवर्ष की शांतिपूर्ण आणविक नीति के सम्बन्ध में विस्मित हैं। मैं उनके कमेंट्स को ही पढ़ देता हूं—

"They say, unless the right questions are asked by an enlightened public and answered responsibly by the Government, our atomic energy programme will slide down the hilt. It was and is, they say, our pride, but the future is bleak."

प्रधान मंत्री जी के वक्तव्य पर कि शान्तिपूर्ण कार्यों के लिये आणविक परीक्षण नहीं किया जा सकता— इस के सम्बन्ध में वैज्ञानिकों ने प्रहार करते हुए कहा—

"Scientists are even more surprised by Mr. Desai's assertion that there is no such thing as peaceful nuclear explosion. This, they feel,

[Dr. Ramji Singh]

is a singularly ill-informed comment—both the USSR and US until at least the latter gave them up for tactical and political reasons."

मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि आणविक परीक्षण के शान्तिपूर्ण कार्य के लिए भी जो यह घोषणा की गई है कि हम नहीं करेंगे—क्या यह निर्णय वैज्ञानिकता के आधार पर है या राजनीतिक आधार पर है ?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Prime Minister.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI MORARJI DESAI): Madam Chairman...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Only two minutes left.

Is it the pleasure of the House to extend the time?

HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: That I know very well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How long will the Prime Minister take?

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: I will not take long. I have got to answer the questions raised.

Let me first say that the nuclear policy that we have enunciated is not at the dictation of any power. And it will not be at the dictation of anybody. If we consider anything wrong, I am not going to accept it, whatever may be the pressure from anywhere, either from here or from outside. That I would like to make very clear.

It is then, said that it is a moral posture. I am not in the habit of taking any posture. I do not believe in postures at all. If a morality is for my personal purpose, it is a different thing. I do not inflict it on the nation. That is not the question. (*Interruptions*) Will you hear me or will you go on with your habit always?

18.00 hrs.

I do not know. You are just incorrigible. That is what I see. There is not much time. Why do you want to waste it?

It was said here that we are stopping our nuclear research as a result of this policy. I do not know my friend Mr. Samar Guha claims he has great knowledge about this.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: I have not used the word 'great'. I have used the word 'humble'.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: You say: "humble", but pose as great.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: This was the subject I had to teach in the university. I know where I am.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: There is an impression on me. I may be wrong, but I must say it. By saying humble, one does not become humble. Now the question is whether we are stopping our nuclear research. There is no question of stopping it. There is no question of not using nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. We are doing it fully. And is any explosion necessary for peaceful purpose? That is the question.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Yes.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: It is not necessary. I will say why? After all, there must be a distinction between blasting for purposes of mining or for purposes of oil exploration. That is different. That is not a nuclear explosion. Blasting can serve a useful purpose if their are no risks involved. I have not ruled out such blasts but that would be only if I am satisfied about the necessity. (*Interruptions*) That is a different thing altogether. But a blast is not like this explosion which took place at Pokharan. That was quite

different. Explosions are not necessary for research in peaceful purposes. Enough research is done; enough knowledge is available and we can utilise all of it and therefore research is not necessary in that respect. The explosion that was made at Pokharan had left behind platonium. God knows how much danger it poses. I am trying to find it out; and it is a question with which I feel seriously concerned. Some of the scientists themselves have wirtten to me. Therefore, it is a question which I have to consider. Even in the matter of blasts, many countries have given up these blasts because they create environmental hazards and hazards for the population even in a limited manner; and that is what has got to be considered. It is therefore that I would not like to say that I will use them for peaceful purposes without considering the consequences. Even the use of nuclear energy for electric purpose is fraught with this kind of danger and we are trying to separate it and see that it does not happen. Then only it is worth using it. Otherwise, we have to find out other methods even for energy purposes which are safer for mankind and we do not involve ourselves into great hazards about which people are very worried. Peaceful purposes can be production of power, use of isotops in industry medicine, research and agriculture, production of new varieties of seeds, using radiation, use of nuclear energy in industrial uses, as for example, radiography which add to the quality of industrial products. These are lines of uses which do not require any explosion. The other uses of blast have been given up by several countries, because it has created great environmental hazards.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: This is not correct.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: He thinks that he has all the knowledge and he does not even want to hear me. I do not want to contradict him, but this is not right. I am saying something which is a fact in several countries. Only Russia is using it. It is a vast country and there they can take risks. That is a different matter. But even they have come around now in the Test Ban Treaty that explosions will be stopped for all purposes.

That is what they are saying. I have every hope that that Treaty will be signed, maybe for five years or maybe for three years. But that is going to be signed. Therefore, what does this show? It is not necessary at all to have this kind of explosion of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. If I am not convinced of that, I would not have said this. And it is not because of any pressure, either from Russia or from America, in this matter that I have said this. There is no question of that whatsoever. Their pressure is for us to sign this Treaty for safeguards which we are refusing. Because they are carrying on and they want us to sign I do not want to do that. Unless they come round to accept this position, there cannot be signing of this Treaty: there must be equality in the matter and no discrimination between the two. That is what I have told them there. I have told them that they have to do it, and they are trying to see that. For that, if we have to suffer inconveniences, we will suffer inconveniences. But we will not submit to that kind of discrimination, because, that is a matter of national honour. It is not a question of merely this or that. That is why, this question, as has been put by my hon. friends does not appear to have been looked at from the point of view which I am putting before you.

I do not know whom my hon. friend —who calls himself a Sarvodaya man —quoted. If that is his idea of Sarvodaya, then I am not only surprised but pained that this is how 'Sarvodaya' should be vitiated. But he can

[Shri Morarji Desai]

quote, and he is free to do so. I do not know which scientist it is. I would like to discuss with him....

MR. CHAIRMAN: He is very widely read.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: There are people like that. I can discuss with them. I am not averse to getting knowledge; it may come from anywhere; and I can revise my views if I am convinced that I am wrong. But I am convinced about it at all. And it is not without consulting the scientists. There are scientists and scientists. There are differences of opinion among them. Scientists found out nuclear energy, and scientists used it also for weapons. Whom do we take—those who use it for weapons or those who want it for peaceful purposes? This is what has got to be considered. And if that is considered coolly, my hon. friends will find that that is not a question of moral posture only, that we are wedded to see that the world does not use the nuclear energy for weapons. That is why we have had this policy; not now; I have not made a new policy; it has been there ever since Hiroshima came in and it was done by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru who declared it from house-tops. It is that policy which is continuing. But even here and there were differences of opinion. I know, I had a discussion with Dr. Bhabha also. He also thought that atomic weapons could be made. But when I discussed with him, he came round to the conclusion that that was not wise. But his successors have said that it would be very wrong to do that. There are differences like that between scientists. But will these matters be decided only by scientists? We have to decide them properly, as a Government and as a nation, as to what we will follow and what we will do. Do we want the world to go into hazards? If we do not want the world to go into hazards like this, we have also got to do things which we think proper. It is from that point of view that we are saying.

I do not know why he brought in heavy water and all that. We do have to manufacture heavy water in proper proportions for our requirements. But that does not require any explosion at all. That is known. If it has not been produced properly or in full quantity, it is because things have gone wrong. But that is not the fault of this Government. That is how it was done. In a hurry every thing was being taken and, therefore, this had to be done. If any safeguards have been agreed to with Russia at that time, it was also because of the past Government. Even about Tarapur, it is asked 'Why don't you re-process'? But there also we are bound by the agreement: we cannot re-process unless they agree. I cannot break the agreement. It is not my creation. It is what I have inherited.

It is Pokharan which created all this trouble, and without any gain. If it had gained us something, I would have been very happy. That is why they are asking now for safeguards. They believe it is only for weapons and nothing else. That is their belief, all over and that is why this has happened. That is why they say 'You must sign this treaty' but we have said we are not going to sign that treaty. I have said there also, and everywhere, that I do not believe that Mrs. Gandhi wanted to use it for any weapon purposes, even when she made the explosion. It was made for political purposes, if I may say so, and no other purpose. It did not advance any knowledge. I am getting all that material which is stored in cupboards, signed and sealed, I am trying to go through it and wade through it and find out what good it has done to us. Nobody knows yet, after all these years. I know only one thing. They have left plutonium in that hole in a much larger quantity than it is in Nanda Devi. And God

knows what can happen! Therefore, I have to be very careful about it. Even Nanda Devi has presented us problems in respect of use of nuclear device, and yet my friends say that we must have these explosions. I hope they will think about it in calm moments and not merely be swept by enthusiasm which might land us into great trouble. That is all that I have got to say.

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR: What about our having self-reliance?

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: We want to be self-reliant and we are self-reliant in several matters.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: I understand the Prime Minister as saying that his announcement that there will be no explosion is on the basis that explosions are not necessary for the purpose of research. If it is scientifically established to our satisfaction that explosions are necesary for the purpose of nuclear research, then would this open declaration that there will be no explosion stand revised? Is it subject to that or it is final? If it is established that explosions are necessary for research purposes, would you revise your stand and say we will go in for explosions?

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: Or would you allow your personal preferences to stand in the way?

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: I don't know what he means by personal preferences.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is only a running commentary. You can answer the question.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: That is what a large number of people believe: let us face it.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: I cannot say anything aobut the future—what I will do and what I will not do. I have said that I am prepared to discuss with scientists. If they come and convince me, then I will consider what is to be done. But I cannot say that I will do this or that. Ultimately the decision must be mine and not that man's. I must make that very clear.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: Is the announcement made in the international plane final or it is open to revision on the basis that the basis on which you had made the announcement has been proved to be untrue? If that is so, will you revise it?

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: When I say it is final, they can also say 'What will happen after you? What will the next Government do?' I cannot say: I cannot bind them. No Governments are ever bound. I cannot bind any future Government. Even if I tried to do so, it will be futile. Nobody can do that. Therefore, that is not the question. I am convinced completely at presen that it is not at all necessary to use nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. We will continue to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes and nobody can prevent us from doing it. That is all I can say. We are self-reliant but they are making us more self-reliant now by

[Shri Morarji Desai]

not helping us. That is good. Our scientists have enough capacity to find out way, but it will take a little time. That is all.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: So, science is developing?

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: That development is going on—but I cannot divulge it. (*Interruptions*).

MR. CHAIRMAN Let us not go on like this. Kindly let the Prime Minister conclude. I think all have had an opportunity to put questions.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: I will conclude now, so that there are no further questions.

18.15 hrs.

BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TWENTIETH REPORT

SHRI K. S. CHAVDA (Patan): I beg to present the Twentieth Report of the Business Advisory Committee.

18.16 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned Till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, July 27 1978/Sravana 5, 1900 (Saka)

GMGIPND—M—1775 LS—