

(श्री बी० पी० मोयें)

है, उनके हक में ज्यादा सुप्रीम कोर्ट के फसले आपको मिलेंगे। चाहे कोई भी सरकार हो, हवाई हो या लिम्पे जी की ही-पार्टी की हो या किसी भी दूसरी पार्टी की हो या आगे बने जहां तक संविधान के इन्टरप्रेटेशन का सवाल है, ऐसे जजों की नियुक्ति होनी चाहिये जिनके सामने हमेशा यह ध्यान रहे कि यह देश जनतंत्रीय है और जनता को ध्यान में रख कर, सामाजिक, आर्थिक विषमता को दूर करने के लिये कानूनों का उन्हें इन्टरप्रेटेशन करना है। इन विचारों वाले जजों की जब तक नियुक्ति नहीं होगी तक देश का शोषित सर्वहारा समाज आगे नहीं बढ़ सकेगा। संविधान शोषितों के लिये बना है, जनता के लिये बना है न कि जनता संविधान के लिये बनी है। जनता के हित में संविधान को तोड़ा मरोड़ा जा सकता है लेकिन संविधान के लिये जनता को तोड़ा मरोड़ा नहीं जा सकता है। यह सदन अगर इसको सामने रखेगा तो कोई भी आपस में बहस नहीं होगी, सारी बहस समाप्त हो जाती है। तब इस बिल की कोई आवश्यकता ही नहीं रह जाती है।

श्री मधु लिम्पे (बांका) : जो बहस एक दफा यहां हो चुकी है उसे मैं दोहराना नहीं चाहता। हम लोगों को विचार यह करना है कि न्यायालयों की स्वतन्त्रता को बनाए रखते हुए हमारे जो सामाजिक आर्थिक और राजनीतिक उद्देश्य हैं उनको किस तरह प्राप्त किया जाए और न्यायालय के कामकाज में जो वृद्धियां हैं उनको कैसे दूर किया जाए। इसलिए न्यायाधीशों की नियुक्ति के सवाल के बारे में मेरे सवाल से हम लोगों को नए सिरे से विचार करना चाहिए।

एक बहस को यहां पर खामबन्दा छोड़ दिया गया है। मेरी राय में वह नकली बहस है। एक मौलिक अधिकार बनाम निदेशक सिद्धांत। दूसरी नकली बहस न्यायालय बनाम पार्लियमेंट और कार्यपालिका। ये दोनों नकली बहस हैं।

मेरे से पहले श्री साठे साहब ने अपना भाषण दिया।

उन के कहने का यह मतलब था कि जब हम निदेशक सिद्धांतों पर भ्रमल करते हैं, तो सुप्रीम कोर्ट उस में बाधा डालती है। लेकिन मैं श्री साठे से पूछूंगा कि क्या वह सचमुच यह समझते हैं कि निदेशक सिद्धांतों के कार्यन्वयन में सुप्रीम कोर्टकी हाबाधा है। मैं समझता हूँ कि सिर्फ सबीक्च अदालत नहीं कार्यपालिका और जिस पार्लियामेंट या कार्यपालिका का विशाल बहुमत है, उन का प्रतिक्रियावादी दृष्टिकोण ही सब से बड़ी बाधा है।

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member may continue on the next occasion. As the time has been extended for this debate, this debate will go over to the next session.

17.30 hrs.

#### HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION

#### DEVELOPMENT OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS FOR DEFENCE OF THE COUNTRY

MR. CHAIRMAN: We now take up the Half-an-Hour Discussion. Shri Samar Guha.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai): Mr. Chairman, Sir, it is a matter of surprise as also apprehension that when such an important subject, the development of nuclear weapons for defence of the country, is being discussed on the floor of the House, none of the senior Ministers, either Shri Jagjivan Ram or Shri Vidya Charan Shukla, is present here.

THE MINISTER OF STATE (DEFENCE PRODUCTION) IN THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE (SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA): I am here.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Sir, when ever there is any news about the nuclear blasts in China or about China's capability of making inter-

continental or continental ballistic missiles, there is a flash of news in our country, big headlines in our papers. Recently, also, our Atomic Energy people took much pride because one of the latest, the 15th Chinese nuclear blasts, was first detected through our instrument of Atomic Energy.

Whenever the question is raised, what about the threat from our neighbour who is getting itself equipped with modern nuclear weapons, what is the basis of our security, we hear certain heroics from our Defence Ministry. Every time, they say, "We have got adequate preparation to meet any contingency from any side", meaning even from the side of China.

Such an assurance is utter nonsense. It is a bluff to the country. Anybody having even an elementary knowledge of A.B.C. of nuclear weapons knows that if China unleashed any nuclear attack on the northern complex of our defence, the whole of our northern complex of defence can be knocked down by China within a few minutes. I used the word "heroics", but it is worse than heroics to assure the country that by our mere conventional weapons we can meet the challenge of any potential enemy, of any potential aggression with nuclear weapons or conventional type nuclear weapons.

We must remember that today the word "political power" has become synonymous with the word "nuclear power". The five countries which really wield political power of the whole world today are the nuclear powers,—America, Russia, China, France and U.K. Our Government has done quite well by not signing the non-proliferation treaty. But I could not understand why our country also joined the chorus of condemning the latest French nuclear tests. I feel, with the nuclear monopoly of super powers in black-

mailing the whole world community by having certain *detente* between themselves to wield all political power through nuclear power, both China and France are doing service to world community by trying to break that monopoly over nuclear weapons. We should desist from condemning either China or France for the reason that we should not block our option for the future for developing nuclear weapons for ourselves. What is the latest position in the world? From 1956 to 1973, USA undertook 478 nuclear tests or nuclear blasts, Russia—232, Britain—22, France—47 and China—15. These two big powers....

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): We blasted their test.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: These two super powers have developed a peculiar kind of logic for having monopoly over nuclear weapons. The super powers have conveniently brain-washed the people in this and other countries into believing that nuclear weapons are moral for them but are immoral for other countries. In their hands, these nuclear weapons become deterrents and constitute the bulwark of peace but nuclear weapons in others' hands, according to their logic, will lead to a holocaust, a dangerous arms race, etc. It is a tragedy that twenty-six years after the imperialistic rule over us, we are being driven to believe in this kind of logic.

We have to understand to-day that the concept of warfare or the military science has undergone a radical change. The concept of conventional warfare is increasingly becoming obsolete. There are two types of nuclear weapons which have been developed by the super powers. One is the strategic nuclear weapons and the other is the tactical nuclear weapons. The strategic nuclear weapons are likely to be used through the mechanism of missiles, either continental or inter-continental, with warheads, multi-warheads even,

[Shri Samar Guha]

and they have also equipped certain other gadgets like sub-marines with these nuclear weapons which could create disaster. It has also to be remembered that there are tactical nuclear weapons also. Tactical nuclear weapons mean atomic weapons of the Hiroshima type. Not only so, these tactical weapons are being converted into some kind of conventional weapons by the NATO and the Warsaw powers. They are making nuclear guns, atomic mortars, etc. These tactical nuclear weapons are now being employed for the conventional warfare. Not only so, the laser beam is being used to trigger off such nuclear weapons.

As I said, the concepts of tactical war, tactical weapons and the conventional war have undergone a radical change. So, even if there is any conventional war between India and its neighbours, I mean the neighbour equipped with nuclear weapons, then they may not use the strategic weapons against us but if they use even the tactical nuclear weapons in a conventional war. I do not know what is the answer that our country has. As I said, we may have many heroes but the answer is, I repeat again, within a few minutes the whole of our northern complex of defence can be knocked out by China and at such a critical situation we can surrender at the feet of the super powers, but no super power will come to our rescue. This is the position of our country.

We are talking from a very high pedestal with a peculiar posture that we are a nation believing in peace and, therefore, it is our moral principle that we do not want to go into developing nuclear weapons. This is like the logic of a eunuch preaching the morality of brahmacharya or this is like that kind of debate on discrimination of violence and non-violence when a fish-eater argues with a meat-eater that 'I am more non-violent than you are'. If we use the conventional

weapons, then what right have we to say 'No, we will not use tactical nuclear weapons on ethical ground? Tactical weapons include nuclear weapons also as part of recent development of the concept of conventional weapons.

I know it is not easy to go into the development of nuclear weapons overnight. In this House I have raised Debate on nuclear blasts and nuclear weapons many times. For the last three years the Government said that India has undertaken the policy that if need be, for the peaceful purposes, India will undertake nuclear blast test. But upto now no preparations were made. For the last three years no preparations were made, for it no reasonable arguments were given. The question of ecology or identification of geological strata is often revised. We have not yet undertaken any preliminary experiments just to get ourselves acquainted with the nuclear blast technology what to speak of using it for effective purpose. It is very clear to us that the fissile materials or the nuclear fuels that we get from Apsara or Tarapore or from Ranapratapsagar cannot be used by us, because, we are bound by the contract with Canada. We cannot use this material although we have the capability, if we can, if we wish, if we dare. We have the capability for making at least one dozen and a half of Hiroshima-type tactical nuclear weapons. We have that much of fuel resources. But we are not free. But we have no free fuels. That point must be clearly understood, this is the main reason why we are not in a position to undertake preliminary nuclear blast test. The country should not be hoodwinked by saying that we can do it, but for ecological, geological and other reasons we are not undertaking it.

There was a national debate in the year 1970 on nuclear weapons. This debate was organised by the Parliamentary Scientific Committee as also the Institute, of Defence Studies and Analysis. Those who participated

there included Members of Parliament, eminent scientists, academicians, ex-servicemen etc. The overwhelming opinion, barring from a minor few, was that India should go to develop nuclear weapons and for that we should make a start, we should start with the preparatory works to set up allied industrial and technological complex.

I am not advocating for any sort of crash programme for developing tactical, what to speak of, strategic nuclear weapon.

Some people say, is it possible for a country like ours to develop nuclear weapons from the economic point of view? I will not go into much argument about it, but I want to say this. Is it not an utter shame for any one in this country where black money transactions were well worth Rs. 7000 crores four years ago and above Rs. 10,000 crores now, (and consequently the tax evaded may be of the order of Rs. 1500 crores per annum) and where the smuggling is of the order of Rs. 400 crores per annum, to say, 'this country cannot afford a weapons programme for economic reasons'? Anyone who repeats this argument will condemn himself as one who has no commitment to the nation and its security and who values superficially the sovereignty of this country.

Sir, soon after the seminar mentioned earlier, Dr. Sarabhai prepared a Ten-year Profile for Development of Atomic Energy in our country. In this House we don't get any opportunity to discuss the nuclear programme.

Sir, I was a Member of the Atomic Consultative Committee for many years. I do not know why, this year, I was dropped. I raised the question again and again and for the last four years, it is being dodged once and again. Dr. Sarabhai is no more with us. He wanted to quickly adopt the draft 10-year Atomic Profile for creat-

ing requisite background, a certain technological background had to be created. And for that Dr. Sarabhai's Ten-year profile—Ten-year Atomic Plan—had to be adopted. Uptil now, it has not been done. I request once again the Minister of Defence—of course he will say that it is not his subject, but to us, it is a more important point—to understand when the draft plan will be accepted. Anybody having the knowledge of Nuclear Science would want to know the difference between the blast for peaceful purpose and the blast for developing tactical or strategic nuclear weapons. They will say that the distinction between the two is like the distinction between twedledum and tweedledee. If you adopt the experiment for peaceful purpose, the next day you can develop the same technique for developing nuclear blast and if possible, the nuclear weapons. For many years this plan has been dodged. The tragedy is that India is known to be the 13th nuclear power country of the world. And you will be ashamed to know that the criticality of the first Chinese Reactor was after India's India's reactor reached criticality much earlier than China. Where is India to-day and where is China? What are the reasons for this?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now you will please conclude because you are going towards China.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: I am concluding now. I know that we are not in a position, although we are being bluffed, of being told this categorically. We should be told clearly as to why we are not able to do this. Is it due to restrictions imposed on the nuclear fuel that we are preparing? We are preparing nuclear fuel in Apsara; we are preparing in Tarapur; we are also preparing it in Rana Pratapsagar but we are not free to use them. You should say categorically that it will be used for the peaceful purpose only. But, we cannot undertake the nuclear experiments—underground blast.

[Shri Samar Guha]

About Ranapratap Sagar, Second Phase or even Kalapakkam, we are again not free. The French is coming in for Kalapakkam Project. I do not know whether we will be free to get the Canadian aid for Ranapratap Sagar-II phase. It is absolutely necessary for the development of nuclear weapons at least for our future generation, a certain technological complex has to be developed. I know that within a few years it is not possible to prepare the tactical nuclear weapons, what to speak of strategic weapons. We cannot even prepare the tactical nuclear weapons. I once again urge upon the Defence Ministry to create a pressure upon the Ministry of Planning at least to see that the profile that was prepared by Dr. Sarabhai be made use of and prepare a background of atomic technological complex for development of nuclear weaponry. If we choose the option of development of nuclear weaponry for our country, at least a ten year profile that was prepared by Dr. Sarabhai should not be made to be dodged indefinitely but it should be accepted by the Planning Commission and grounds prepared so that if there is any necessity, India can go to the extent of developing the nuclear weapons.

श्री मूलचन्द्र डायर (पाली) : मिस्टर के सुब्रह्मण्यम डायरेक्टर आप दि इन्स्टीट्यूट ऑफ डिफेंस स्टडीज ऐंड एनालिसिस ने कई बार इस बात की सिकरिश्क है कि भारत सरकार को परमाणु बम बनाने चाहिए। जो इस प्रकार के टेकनिशियन्स है, जो इस प्रकार की नौलैज रखते हैं जो इसमें विशेषज्ञ हैं उनकी बात को आप मानते हैं या नहीं? या क्या आप कि यह नीति है कि परमाणु बम बनाना हिंसा है? अगर यह नीति हो तो हमें वह मालूम होना चाहिए। आप इस बात को साफ कहिए कि क्या परमाणु बम बनाना आप की दृष्टि

में हिंसा है? आप के जो टेकनिशियन्स हैं, जिन को आप ने खुद एम्प्लाय किया है और जिनकी इस बात में नौलैज है वह चार बार आप से इसके लिए कहते हैं फिर आप उसको क्यों नहीं मानते हैं? या क्या आप यह समझते हैं कि हमने रशिया से दोस्ती कर ली है, उस दोस्ती के कारण आप को यह अभिमान हो कि जिस वक्त पर चाइना से हमला होगा तो आप को रशिया से मदद मिल जायगी, आप इस पर निर्भर करते हैं या अपने पैरों पर खड़े होना चाहते हैं?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): Sir, according to rules, I will ask only three specific questions. Firstly, the question of expenditure is always brought into the picture.

As far as atomic weapons are concerned, I would like to know whether the Ministry is aware of this fact that the paper on atomic energy prepared by late Dr. Bhabha has categorically stated that the total expenditure that is likely to be incurred for the production of a stock-pile of fifty atom bombs of 2 mega ton weight is likely to be Rs. 10 crores and that for a similar stock-pile of 50 hydrogen bomb with 2 mega ton weight we will incur an expenditure of Rs. 15 crores.

Secondly, I would like to know whether Government would be inclined to accept the fact that whether we go in for harnessing of atomic energy for nuclear technology or for manufacture of weapons, since the initial six or seven processes are quite common, we can keep our nuclear options and proceed with all the initial processes so that, keeping the nuclear options open, at some stage if we take the decision then in that case that option would be feasible.

Thirdly, whether we decide to go in for nuclear weapons or not, should we go out of the way to assure our neighbours that we have made up our mind not to go in for any nuclear

weapons and in a way give them an assurance of safety and security or in the alternative, should we give a feeling to our neighbours that we have kept our nuclear options open, and if we so choose, at some stage, we may go in for manufacture of weapons?

**श्री शिवनाथ सिंह (भुवनेश्वर) :** सभापति जी, आणविक शस्त्रों के निर्माण के सम्बन्ध में हमारी सरकार की नीति क्या हो—इसके सम्बन्ध में आपने अपने जवाब में कहा है—(ए) नो सर (बी) डबल नोट एराइज। मेरे ध्यान से इस प्रकार का जवाब देकर आपने एक बन्धन लगा दिया कि कभी भी हम आणविक शस्त्रों के निर्माण की तरफ ध्यान नहीं देंगे। मैं मानता हूँ हमारी नीति शान्ति की नीति है, हम शान्ति में विश्वास रखते हैं, लेकिन हमारी नीति निर्भर करती है, हमारे पड़ोसियों पर। जब चाइना इस दौड़ में आगे बढ़ने की कोशिश कर रहा है, कल पाकिस्तान भी कोशिश कर सकता है, क्योंकि पाकिस्तान ने इंकार नहीं किया है, उसने नहीं कहा है कि वह आणविक शस्त्रों के निर्माण की तरफ ध्यान नहीं देगा। इस प्रकार के जो हमारे पड़ोसी हैं, जिन से हमारे सम्बन्ध अच्छे नहीं हैं—हम चाहते हैं कि हमारे सम्बन्ध अच्छे हों, लेकिन उस के बावजूद भी वे इस दौड़ में आगे बढ़ना चाहेंगे ऐसी स्थिति में क्या हमारी सरकार चाहती है कि हम कभी भी आणविक शस्त्रों के निर्माण की ओर ध्यान न दें ?

मैं इस लिये ऐसा निवेदन कर रहा हूँ—हो सकता है आप के पास ऐसे साधन हों, हम उनका इस्तेमाल न करें, लेकिन ताकत का मुकाबला ताकत से होता है, कमजोर और ताकत का मुकाबला नहीं होता है। इसलिये मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जब हमारे पड़ोसी आणविक शस्त्रों की ताकत कायम करना चाहते हैं तो उसके मुकाबले की ताकत हम पैदा करना चाहते हैं या नहीं ?

आप कह सकते हैं कि हमारी आणविक स्थिति ऐसी नहीं। लेकिन आणविक स्थिति के न होते हुए भी क्या देश के डिफेंस के लिये सरकार ऐसा करने के लिये तैयार है कि हम अपने डिफेंस को खो देंगे। चाइना ने हमारा बाद स्वतन्त्रता प्राप्त की, लेकिन उसका माइण्ड इस ओर था और वह इस दिशा में आगे बढ़ रहा है। हमारी आणविक स्थिति ज्यादा खराब होने की वजह से क्या हम हमेशा के लिये इस चेंटर को क्लोज करना चाहते हैं या ओपन रखना चाहते हैं ? हम इस बात को कहें कि हम आणविक शस्त्रों को उपयोग नहीं करेंगे लेकिन कैंपेसिटी इवेलप करने में पीछे नहीं हटना चाहिये ताकि जब आवश्यकता हो तो हम उससे काम ले सकें। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ क्या सरकार इस चेंटर को ओपन रखना चाहती है ?

**SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN.** (Tellicherry): Considering the fact that there are million of people in this country who are unemployed, illiterate and hungry, what will be the preference of Government in relation to spending money? Will it be for nuclear weapons or for meeting the basic necessities of our people?

Secondly, an impression has been given here that political power is synonymous with nuclear power, a very strange philosophy, I should say.

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA:** It is the reality today.

**SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN:** He may think so. I do not agree.

The fact has been so much revealed in the modern world—recent experience of mankind confirms this—that a nuclear power armed to the teeth like the US could not defeat a small country like Vietnam with all their nuclear threats. Even though they sent a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier to the Bay of Bengal, it had no effect on the people of Bangladesh and their liberation struggle. These are all facts of life

[Shri C. K. Chandrappan]

Thirdly, what exactly are Government's plans in relation to the use of nuclear power for peaceful purposes and development? Lastly, what will be the attitude of Government in signing the nuclear non-proliferation treaty?

THE MINISTER OF STATE (DEFENCE PRODUCTION) IN THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE (SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA): The hon. members who have pleaded for our copying the Chinese example as far as nuclear weapons are concerned should be quite clear in their minds that once we start copying China in this respect, the copying will not end there.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: It is not a question of copying, but of assuring our national security. It is the reality. I have not said 'copying'.

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: Let him hold his patience and listen to my arguments. He has been saying that China has done it and we should do it.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: No, I only talked about assuring our national security.

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: I am only trying to impress on the hon. member and the House that if the Chinese have done certain things in their defence strategy, if they have undertaken a certain nuclear policy and development, they have done so against a certain background of the economic policy, social structure and political system they have evolved for themselves. The defence policy or the policy of developing nuclear weapons followed by China cannot be divorced from what she has done in other fields. Therefore, when we are looking at this, I would request hon. members to look at it from the viewpoint purely of our national interests. We should take into account what we are and what we are going to be, what

our national aims are. Are our national aims the same as China's? What is our national aim? Of course, we want to defend and protect ourselves; we do not want to submit to nuclear blackmail of any kind. We are not looking for a nuclear umbrella from any other country. But the hon. member must realise that after the most barbaric happenings in human history perpetrated on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, not one war has been won by those nations who possessed nuclear weapons against other countries who did not possess them; they have always lost that war. You can see the logic of the situation (*Interruptions*). We must see what kind of situation we face here and what are the situations we are likely to face.

18 hrs.

It is very easy to say that we should have nuclear weapons but if they go deeply into the question and not consider it in a superficial manner, I am quite sure that Profs. Samar Guha and Dandavate and many other knowledgeable and intelligent members will come to the same conclusion that Government have come to, that we must have a practical and pragmatic approach to this problem.

I am quite one with Prof. Dandavate when he says that we should keep our nuclear options open. We have; we have not closed them. We have joined no such treaty which bars us from taking another view at any time we like. What we have stated in the House is our present policy. The present policy is dictated by the short term and long term national interests. My time is very limited and I do not want a running commentary from Shri Samar Guha... (*Interruptions*). He should behave with the dignity which he always maintains in this House. When he was giving his views I did not interrupt him and I am now giving my views.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would remind Shri Samar Guha that when he was speaking Members who did not agree

with his view did not interrupt him and now he should not interrupt the Minister. If any pertinent question is left unanswered we shall see afterwards.

**SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA:** I am pleading with the hon. Members who want India to go in for nuclear weapons to consider this matter deeply. If they are particularly interested I offer to arrange a meeting with our scientists and experts and we can discuss this matter thoroughly. They can put forward their viewpoints and scientists and other experts can put forward their viewpoints. These are not matters which could be discussed publicly in detail. I was saying that our policy was to keep our options open and use nuclear power for peaceful purposes.

The basis of our security has been questioned. everybody knows the basis of our security. If you go to the root of the matter the point is not whether we possess nuclear weapons or not. Really the industrial and economic strength of the country is the basis of the security of nation. Only after that other thing comes. I cannot accept this argument that we can be coerced by nuclear blackmail. Taken to its logical conclusion it would mean that any country which has any difference of opinion with a nuclear power must develop nuclear capability of its own. Otherwise it must submit to the nuclear blackmail of those countries. It is not and it cannot be the situation in the modern world. Therefore we do not accept the theory that China can blackmail us by developing nuclear capability.

The cost factor has been referred to. That is not an extremely important consideration. If national security and national interest demand, any amount of money can be spent. But since this question has been raised I should point out that a team of experts appointed by the United Nations

which went into this question to find out the minimum cost for acquiring a credible nuclear force reached the conclusion that for acquiring a modest or elementary nuclear capability 1700 million dollars will have to be spent by a country. That is the opinion of experts, not of countries which are interested in keeping other countries non-nuclear, . . .

**PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE:** Dr. Bhabha's figure excluded the delivery system.

**SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA:** I am not going into Dr. Bhabha's figure. I do not know whether the figures quoted by hon. Members are correct or incorrect.

**PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE:** That was the paper read in the Geneva Conference.

**SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA:** That was a long time back. This matter, besides, is not dealt with by me and therefore, I cannot either confirm or deny the figure that he quoted. 1700 million dollars is the cost that has been estimated. Apart from this initial cost, if we want to keep pace with the technological advancement, we have to spend increasing amounts of money. Then to develop and maintain a delivery system is even costlier. Once you start riding the tiger, you cannot get off. I dare say that if hon. members who understand these matters go into the long-term cost, they themselves will realise that it does not appear advantageous today our country to embark on this policy of nuclear armament. Therefore, at least for the present, it does not appear to us that the policy advocated by Prof. Guha will be in the national interest for us to follow. I am not taking the plea of morality; I don't think anybody should take that plea here. The main thing is the question of national security. Every other consideration is subordinate to it.



[Shri Vidya Charan Shukla]

Therefore, even on these two considerations, I am justifying the present policy because on these considerations alone our present policy is based. Therefore, I would say that the policy we are following today is the best policy in the circumstances. It is not jeopardising our security nor are we submitting to any kind of blackmail either present or future.

Suppose for argument's sake we develop some kind of nuclear capability and spend several billion dollars worth of money every year. We may never use it. Probably that is what is likely to happen; just as other nations have not been able to use it after 1945, we also may not be able to use it. After spending hundreds of crores every year on developing and maintaining the delivery system, etc., still the conventional army, navy and air force cannot be given the go by. They will also have to be developed and maintained intact. I do not think it is the argument of any hon. member that once you develop nuclear capability, we can write off the army, navy and air force. So, maintaining this defence budget which is already quite heavy plus developing and maintaining a nuclear delivery system in case we embark on it, is something which I do not think is in national interest. I would earnestly plead with hon. members not to be guided by sentimental reasons. They must take the hard facts of life into consideration. They must take the international situation into account. They should see the history of nuclear weaponry, how those who have nuclear weapons are faring, how even countries like U.K. and France have fared in the race for nuclear weapons. Their economy has

had tremendous burdens and they are falling out of the race today because they feel it is not in their national interest to keep on doing it. France has recently exploded some nuclear device and, as the hon. Members know, our Judge in the World Court voted against this blast not only because of moral considerations but because of practical considerations. We feel that the present policy that we are following is not only in the national interest but it is in the best interest of all concerned in the world. Our national security and national interests are not at all jeopardised by the policy that we are following at present.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: I am thankful to the hon. Minister that he agreed with me that the options should be kept open. But we cannot develop a nuclear weapon suddenly within a year. Dr. Sarabhai prepared a ten-year profile for the development of atomic energy in this country. I want to know what steps the Government is going to take to carry out the ten-year profile that was prepared by Dr. Sarabhai. The estimates given by the United Nation experts are absolutely irrelevant to Indian conditions; it is much less according to the Indian experts. May I know whether the attention of the Government has been drawn to that opinion given by Indian experts and atomic scientists?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned to meet again at 11 A.M. on Monday.

18.13 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Monday, August 27, 1973/Bhadra 5, 1895 (Saka)*