

[Shri Satya Narayan Sinha]

- (3) State Bank of Hyderabad Bill;
- (4) Terminal Tax on Railway Passengers Bill;
- (5) Young Persons Harmful Publications Bill;
- (6) Territorial Army (Amendment) Bill; and
- (7) Feridabad Development Corporation Bill.

Shri Gidwani (Thana): What about the Medical Council Bill?

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: It will come later.

RESOLUTION RE NUCLEAR AND THERMO-NUCLEAR TESTS—concl'd.

Shri Tek Chand (Ambala-Simla): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I rise to commend the Resolution for adoption. I feel that this Resolution may be a small beginning, but it has very great potentialities and its adoption may be the seed of saving mankind from the doom which threatens it.

I am reminded of an old adage—perhaps the author of it was a pessimist. That adage to my mind, was always true, but never was it truer than it is now. The adage is, *Homo homini lupus est*. If you study history, whether ancient, medieval or modern, it stands testimony to the fact that “man to man is a wolf.” There is one noticeable feature so far as the animal world is concerned. They do not destroy their own genre. But, humanity, especially the more civilised humanity seems to vie with itself in committing genocide, in engaging itself in the destruction of its own specie. It seems to be a novel feature of human race. Man seems to have entered into conspiracy with man for self-extinction. These are matters which cannot be dismissed as some hon. friends have endeavoured to do so by scoffing at the timidity of those who wish to pin-point world attention to this

matter. They cannot be dismissed by one sweep of the arm by saying, produce better antidotes, better counter weapons. I was a little amazed at the questionable cogency and the malappropriateness of the Sanskrit sloka:

अप्रतः चतुरो वेदपृष्ठतः सशरं वनुः  
इंद्रं ब्रह्मं इंद क्षात्रं शापादपि शरादपि ।

It is a most dangerous dogma. I could understand what the hon. Prime Minister said: Hydrogen bomb or Panch Shila. The importance lies in the disjunctive “or”, not in the conjunctive “and”. The doctrine underlying the sloka seems to be self-contradictory. It is understandable if it is either शापादपि or शरादपि. It cannot be शापादपि and or शरादपि. There is a choice, there is an option. One option leads to destruction and the other to survival.

Shri B. S. Murthy: Both lead to destruction, both शापादपि and शरादपि.

Shri Tek Chand: I am reminded of an English couplet:

“Onward, onward Christian  
soldiers. March to foreign lands,  
With Bibles in your pockets.

And bayonets in your hands.”

Another similarly erroneous, and equally illogical philosophy is:

*Si vis pacem para bellum.*

If you desire peace, prepare yourself for war. These are dangerous doctrines. Their uselessness, their futility stands established and proved by history times out of number. If you want war, you cannot have peace. War will not bring about peace.

This being the situation, there seems to have been a sort of rivalry going on between the scientists of one country and the scientists of another in trying to evolve, in trying to forge armaments which might bring about a complete extinction of the human race. The question therefore is: is it:

scoffable as some of the hon. friends seem to suggest that we should have such a resolution?

Let us examine the language of the resolution. To my mind, every part of this resolution is worthy of adoption, acceptance and dissemination. The resolution suggests that the Government should set up an international scientists' commission with the co-operation and goodwill of all nations to investigate forthwith into the effects and extent of the harm caused and caused by nuclear and thermo-nuclear tests and explosions which are becoming dangerous and deadly for millions of humanity. Therefore, investigation to my mind is necessary, it is also equally desirable. There may be some—and I must say they are a lot—who are not convinced of the destructive potentiality of these weapons. Therefore, it will be meet and proper if the scientists of all countries were to put their heads together and try to tell the world, the ignorant, the doubting, the jesting world, that these experiments have led to destructive results to this extent—so far and no farther—or they have the potentiality of destroying the human species or the major portion of the living world. When you have the testimony of the accredited scientists of the world with their profound experience and knowledge, their consideration, their determinations and findings will rivet the attention of the world to the gravity of the danger that looms large.

Some of the hon. Members have tried to suggest and insinuate that those who are of our way of thinking happen to be in the grip of a fear-complex. This resolution, according to them, is a counsel of the cowards. According to my hon. friend Shri Deshpande, there should be an antidote, a more destructive weapon discovered so that the disasters created by this weapon may be

averted. This is a most dangerous doctrine of a suicidal maniac, and not of a person who wants to create something constructive, something that is beautiful, that is peaceful, something that will conduce to the happiness of mankind. Therefore, these accusations of timidity are ill-founded. The position before the world today is that such tests as have taken place have disclosed dangerous potentialities. They have tried to show by actual effects that these weapons can create misery for the masses, for the millions, not for the few. That being the position, I feel that if there was a conference of the like contemplated and visualised by the author of the resolution, that will in itself grip and rivet the attention of the entire world, the result of which will be that the mind of man will be diverted and he will think of the dangers that lie ahead. Ignorance can be as dangerous as half-knowledge, and therefore if under ignorance humanity or a portion of humanity is in a state of stupor, in a state of indifference, then they will receive a rude and a very desirable and necessary shock and they will then be alive to the situation more vividly, more realistically than they are today.

I congratulate the author of the resolution and I have great pleasure in tendering it my fullest support.

**Shri C. R. Narasimhan** (Krishnagiri): This House should really be very grateful to Shri Gidwani for moving this very useful resolution and also for the reason that through him we had the benefit of having an eye-witness account of what happened in Hiroshima as a result of the first atom bomb dropped there. His description was very vivid and heart-rending. It is really unnecessary to search for further scientific opinion when an eye-witness account of this nature is available to august Assemblies like this, and that too from Members of the House itself.

[Shri C. R. Narasimhan]

This morning the Prime Minister ended his speech, as already referred to by another Member, with these poignant words, namely: Panch Shila or Hydrogen bomb. In other words, it is co-existence or co-annihilation. It is co-annihilation that is overshadowing every inhabitant of this planet, irrespective of nationality, race, religion or ideology. Whatever be the nationality, race, religion or ideology, this kind of piling up instruments of destruction, if allowed, will bring only co-annihilation and nothing else. (*Interruption*). That is to say, those who possess these weapons will annihilate one another as also our country and other countries associated with ourselves who are pleading for co-existence. That is one thing.

Most of the Members thought that we were discussing really either the policy of peace or the policy of war or things like that. The scope of this Resolution is somewhat limited. We have seen aggression in Egypt and also some incidents in Hungary. We are worried that there is aggression against a friendly country and that it is being trespassed. That is really philanthropic on our part. But we have forgotten the fact that we, along with a group of other nations who are not interested either of the power blocs—either of the Soviet Union or the United States—have ourselves been victims of aggression in the form of these nuclear tests. That is objected to by this Resolution.

What is the effect of these nuclear tests? It is poisoning the air, water and food on which mankind subsists. Therefore, we are also victims. Have we not the right to protest; have we not the right to object; have we not the right to take proper action? We may not have enough weapons to force the issue at once. But, are we therefore to simply keep quiet? Should we not, with the assistance of other nations, raise our voice and see that by moral pressure we bring those war-mongering nations to see

reason? Let us not worry about the fact whether we should take to violence as Shri Deshpande was suggesting. This is not the main issue.

The main issue is what right these nations who possess nuclear weapons have to pollute the air, water and food of mankind. It is not only the pollution of the air, water and food of mankind and posterity. We want that reason should prevail. For reason to prevail we should take all available steps. One of them is persuasion and moral pressure. That is why I say that if this House, representing as it does 40 crores of human beings, passes a resolution and authorises its able Prime Minister to take further action, naturally good results will flow. We have to be optimistic in the matter and we have to protest for all our rights. That is the main object of this Resolution and I do not think that there should be any objection for Government to accept this. They should see that by accepting this Resolution they are making their own contribution in making the power blocs reasonable in this matter.

What do we actually see now? There has been aggression in Egypt. America has remained more or less neutral and the Soviet Union has also remained more or less neutral. If they take sides there would be hydrogen bombing and atomic warfare and so they have kept aloof. Meanwhile aggression is going on and, though the Big Powers have remained neutral, it has become fear for other aggressive nations to roam about and occupy areas as they please. Even though the atom bomb remains in their possession and is not being used in war, yet tests and pollution has been taking place in the atmosphere. If further tests continue, further pollution will take place. The Big Powers are not going to use

nuclear weapon light-heartedly. It is as good or as bad as if these weapons were non-existent. While these other powers are roaming about and going merrily with their acts of aggression and colonialism and so on and so forth, we are all looking and allowing the atmosphere to get polluted more and more. Shri Gidwani and other friends want that world opinion should therefore be mobilised to step this kind of madness which is now prevailing. That is the main point that I wish to emphasise.

As we have not taken enough steps, those people who conduct those tests imagine that they have secured a right by prescription to pollute the atmosphere. One of the reasons they seem to put forward is that the actual extent of harm has not been properly assessed and, therefore, the benefit of doubt should go to those who conduct these tests. I think that is objectionable. From the information that scientists have given, we know that they are harmful enough. We know that it is bad enough and it should be stopped. In certain documents, it has been said, on behalf of the Powers that own these weapons and who conduct these tests that they are not as harmful as has been made out. The benefit of doubt should be in favour of the victims, and, in this case, the neutral non-aligning nations and future mankind. It should not be in favour of those who conduct these tests and those who pile up these weapons.

As for calculating the harm and convincing those nations, it should be quite possible for India to convene a conference of scientists—and, if necessary, even Nobel Prize winners—and eminent people and with their aid persuasion can be tried and it can be made clear to the Powers that manufacture these weapons that if they do not stop this there will be annihilation and not freedom as they imagine they are working for.

I have nothing more to say. I think there will be absolutely no mistake on the part of Government if they accept the Resolution either as it is or in a suitably amended form. It will only go towards strengthening and mobilising world opinion against these tests. This is aggression against neutral nations and posterity. I hope Government will carefully examine the matter and give the House the proper lead, so that this House may ultimately give the lead to other nations of the world.

**श्रीमती कमलेन्दुमति शाह** (जिला गढ़वाल—पश्चिम व जिला टिहरी गढ़वाल व जिला बिजनौर—उत्तर) : श्रीमान् आज अणुबम का प्रश्न हमारे सामने है, यह बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण प्रश्न है। मैं तो सदन से केवल यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि जो हमारा पुराना इतिहास है, उस को देखने से पता चलता है कि एक दूसरे से लड़ाई करने में और भाँति भाँति के शस्त्रों का निमाण और उन का प्रयोग करने से हम स्वतंत्रता और शांति स्थापित करने में सफल नहीं हो सके हैं। आज फिर हमारे सामने यह कठिनाई है। वर्षों के बाद आज फिर आकाश में घनघोर बादल छाये हुए हैं जिस से हमें डर हो रहा है कि कहीं फिर से युद्ध न छिड़ जाय। इस के वास्ते हम को क्या करना है? इस के लिये हम को विचार कर के और सलाह कर के यह सोचना है कि हम कैसे इस आफत को अपने ऊपर से हटा सकते हैं और इस से बच सकते हैं।

आज बड़े बड़े तथा शक्तिशाली जो देश हैं उन में आपस में होड़ लग गई है और आज वे अधिकाधिक शस्त्रास्त्र बनाने में जुटे हुए हैं। आज उन के अन्दर यह भावना है कि देखें कौन सब से ज्यादा बलवान हो सकता है। वे समझते हैं कि वे अस्त्र निर्माण व संग्रह से ही बलवान बन सकते हैं जब कि बलवान बनने के लिये कोई और ही उपाय काम में लाये जाने होंगे। अमरीका भाँति भाँति के अणुबम बना रहा है तथा उन का संग्रह कर रहा है। रूस भी इसी



[श्रीमती कमन्लेदुमति शाह]

तरह से तरह तरह के अस्त्र बना रहा है। दोनों ही इस से हटना नहीं चाहते हैं। रूस इस तरह के विमान बना रहा है जो दूसरे देशों तक अणु बमों को क्षण भर में पहुंचा सकें। इन सब का परिणाम क्या होगा? इन का नतीजा होगा तबाही और बरबादी। आज बड़े बड़े देश भी शान्ति की बात करते हैं और शान्ति स्थापित करने का इरादा रखते हैं और कहते हैं कि उस दिशा में वे प्रयत्न भी कर रहे हैं। परन्तु इस के साथ ही साथ वे अणु बम जैसे प्राचुनिक शस्त्रास्त्रों का निर्माण भी करते जा रहे हैं। इस तरह से कैसे शान्ति स्थापित हो सकती है, यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता। जब तक वे घातक शस्त्रास्त्रों का निर्माण बन्द नहीं करते तब तक कैसे वे शान्ति स्थापन की बात कर सकते हैं यह सोचने की बात है। ऐसी हालत में उन के कहने पर तथा उन के इरादों पर कौन विश्वास कर सकता है। मैं यह कहती हूँ कि यदि आज वे देश व दुनिया में शान्ति कायम रखना चाहते हैं और चाहते हैं कि कोई भी लड़ाई न हो तो उन्हें तुरन्त ही घातक अस्त्रों का निर्माण बन्द कर देना चाहिये। इन अस्त्रों के बनाने पर वे कितना ही द्रव्य व्यर्थ में नष्ट कर रहे हैं। इस द्रव्य को बचा कर वे उन लोगों पर जो भूखों मर रहे हैं और तरह तरह की बीमारियों से पीड़ित हैं, खर्च कर सकते हैं और कई प्रकार से उन को सहायता कर सकते हैं। यदि आज इन बड़े बड़े राष्ट्रों से पूछा जाय कि अणु बमों का वे क्यों संग्रह कर रहे हैं तथा क्यों इन के भंडार बना रहे हैं, तो मुझे विश्वास है कि वे इस का कोई भी उत्तर नहीं दे सकेंगे। इस का कारण यह है कि जिस चीज़ को वे तैयार कर रहे हैं, उस को प्रयोग में लाने के लिये ही तैयार कर रहे हैं।

मेरा यह विश्वास है कि हमारे पास जो श्रद्धे बहुत अस्त्र हैं उन्हीं पर निर्भर रह कर

हमें दुनिया में शान्ति बनाये रखने का प्रयत्न करना चाहिये तथा हमारे प्रधान मंत्री दुनिया में शान्ति बनाये रखने के जो प्रयत्न कर रहे हैं, उन में वह सफल होंगे और वह दुनिया को युद्ध की विभीषिका से बचा सकेंगे।

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I can hardly imagine a resolution before this House which appeals to me more than the present Resolution as well as, if I may add, the amendments which have been proposed, and yet I shall venture to ask now and later the hon. Member not to press it for the simple reason that the Resolution says something which is not exactly in the capacity of this Government to do. It involves our making other Governments to do things. I entirely agree with the Mover and with the other speakers that we should make every effort. The second paragraph of this Resolution I entirely agree with and in fact, as everyone knows, our policy has been that throughout the last few years ever since the menace of nuclear warfare came to face the world, we have been taking up this very line which is represented in this Resolution. The first part of the Resolution speaks about the appointment of a Commission to investigate this. I might tell the House that for the last two or three years we investigated the possibility of some such international body of scientists investigating this together. The suggestion really came from an outside source; the suggestion originally came from Bertrand Russell, who was very anxious that some such steps should be taken. We told him that so far as we are concerned, we welcome it, but how far other countries will be able to co-operate is another matter. In fact, his suggestion was that this should be done by scientists from countries which were not themselves directly involved in making these experiments. that is, some of the great powers, because they were too

intimately concerned with it. The curious aspect of the matter was that the persons who knew most about it, the scientists of countries who had dealt with it practically, not theoretically, would not participate or would not be allowed to participate, and other people who knew only about it more or less in theory from books and articles would participate, so that the actual results would not be very satisfactory.

We found that it was not very easy to do this. Then we felt that instead of waiting for other countries to join in this matter, why should we not make an effort ourselves on that rather low level of published documents and published material to find out what the dangers of nuclear explosion were to humanity. It was that effort that ultimately led to the publication of this book, which hon. Members have no doubt seen, and which of course does not contain any startling new material,—we had to rely on published and semi-published material—nevertheless which, I believe, was the first occasion when all this was brought together under one cover. Previously this material had appeared in highly technical scientific journals which were not available to the public, and if they were available, the public could not understand them. So, in a more or less popular form that material was considered and brought together and put in this book. I might add that this book has been very warmly welcomed by scientists and others elsewhere, not the general public because they find it rather hard to read. But it has met with a very good welcome from many people all over the world simply because it was the first organised attempt to bring these facts before the public in a more or less readable and intelligible form. As a matter of fact, ever since this book was published and even while it was in the Press, new material came out, and no doubt, if and when a second edition of this book appears, there will be much more information given.

The point is that the material naturally does not come out in a conference. In a conference knowledge of the material is exchanged. The knowledge comes out of huge laboratories and tests that are going on in various countries. To begin with, a strict blanket of secrecy was placed on all this. It really began, I think, in 1940, that is, in the war years, when the United States of America started rather earnestly proceeding with these experiments because at that time they were afraid that Germany was going to do it and did not want Germany to do something which they could not do. And so this blanket of secrecy was put on it. Even after the war years that blanket continued. Until very recently it was hardly possible to get to know what was being done and even scientists did not know.

Gradually, of course, many facts in regard to this matter came out. I think the first time that the world attention was rather vividly and tragically drawn to the effects of these test explosions was after the explosion—I forget the place—in Marshall Islands or Bikni where some Japanese fishermen suffered. That immediately brought this from the realm of theory to the realm of actual tragedy, and inevitably some enquiries had to be made and statements had to be made. Probably the statements made then were very much rather on the moderate side. The whole facts were not given. They came out gradually in the next year or two. Anyhow every country which indulged in these experiments did so under this blanket of secrecy, till last year, when a conference took place at Geneva—I mean the Atomic Energy Conference which was presided over by one of our scientists, Dr. Bhabha. For the first time, in that conference, a great many facts came out in the public. They were no doubt known previously to a limited number of scientists but not in a connected way; separately all facts were known. That was very helpful.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

Subsequent to that, there have been quite a number of publications, technical publications, issued by the United States Atomic Energy Commission and also such publications were issued by the U. K. I am not acquainted with any Russian publication on the subject but I know the British and American publications on the subject which brought new facts out. Always, I should like the House to remember that whatever was published was less than what was known because in investigating this phenomena, they were investigating something which was qualitatively different from the previous type of scientific experiments. It is because atomic energy takes us somewhat outside the normal range of the three-dimensional world. The result is that there is always a great deal of uncertainty about the explosion, something that may happen. We may even observe it and see a bit of it. We have not seen something else happening and that is gradually coming out within the ken of men.

So, a commission to investigate would only mean a commission to collect the results of the investigations of others and publish it to the world. When that time comes, even long before that time comes, the whole process—probably the great countries and the small countries—would have stopped; they would have decided not to continue these.

In the nature of things, when each country is continuing its test secretly, it does not want its latest knowledge to be available to the other country and so, it will not be available to any conference or commission or anybody else. Certainly a great deal of knowledge may be available, as it is available today. A formal commission might be helpful but what would be more helpful is that people who are conducting these experiments should publish the results of their experiments. They should not be secret so that they may

be available to others. Then, anybody can collect them.

In any event, a country like India can hardly call upon the great countries which are chiefly interested in these and ask them to come and sit at a conference to do this. It is for them to take the lead. To some extent, progress has been made lately by the formation of the Atomic Energy Agency, though not exactly in this direction. But, the mere fact of these bodies being formed and scientists from all parts of the world meeting together and discussing—this does bring into light all the different facts which were previously suppressed or hidden.

Then, there is this proposal contained in the second part of the Resolution about moral pressure being used to stop such experiments. I entirely agree. Morally, or whatever it may be, this approach of bringing this matter up repeatedly, whether it be in the United Nations or elsewhere has been adopted not only by India but by some other countries. I entirely agree that this should be done. Again the amendments say something about the discontinuance of nuclear and thermo-nuclear tests. As I have just pointed out, that is just what we have been doing—we and others too—but not succeeding. Some great countries say that this should be done but they themselves do not do it waiting for the other party to do it. The result is: nobody does it.

So far as the spirit of the Resolution is concerned, I entirely accept that. It does, if I may say so with respect, represent the policy that the Government has pursued. So far as giving effect to it is concerned, it seems to me that at this stage for the Government of India to address other Governments to do this or that will hardly be appropriate. One takes a step with some possibility of success and creates some impression. It

becomes too much, too unrealistic and normally a Government does not take an absolutely unrealistic step. An individual may deliver a speech or may issue a statement. But, if a Government goes about issuing rather unrealistic statements, the value of the Government's statements becomes much less. That is my difficulty.

If you like, I can say a few words about the much broader and deeper question which this nuclear energy, has raised. Some hon. Members spoke vehemently about this. One hon. Member referred to the Hindu shastras and went deeply into some kind of ancient cosmology which I am not quite able to follow and I do not quite understand the exact significance of it. But, the point we have to remember is this. The whole idea of science and scientific discovery is a progressive understanding of nature and nature's forces. The whole advance of man, of humanity, has been in so far as man has understood more and more nature's forces and utilised them to his own advantage. Although that phrase can really cover every species of human advance, including spiritual and other fields—that is, extending the boundaries of science to mental and spiritual fields, the basis of science should remain. It can be extended to these fields, provided always the basis of science remains.

This process has uncovered all kinds of forces which existed. Nuclear energy is not something which has come out of nothing. It is there; it has always been there, just as electricity was always there in the clouds and elsewhere till some bright person thought that it could be brought to man's use by various experiments and they brought it to use. We use it to man's advantage.

In the same way, there are other forces which will be discovered. They are terrific forces which bind the world together, which bind the atom together. The result of that has been that man has got this force which he

can use either for the good of humanity or for its destruction. To say that you must not use this energy at all or that you must not produce nuclear energy is rather to say something which is quite impossible. The world is not static; the mind of man is working. To stop the impulse of man to probe into the mysteries of, the universe and its work—it cannot be done and should not be done. If the search for truth involves disaster, disaster will come to us but if humanity gives up the search for truth, then humanity is done for. All science is ultimately the search for truth even though truth may be utilised for evil purposes. Once you have opened out this window of man's mind into the secrets, into some of the secrets of the universe, you cannot close that window. That cannot be done.

Quite apart from political or other reasons, the world is not a static place nor is man's mind static. Therefore, one must realise that nuclear energy has come to stay and that discoveries in regard to nuclear forces will grow more and more.

If that is inevitable, the other question is: how is that to be used? True, it is a difficult question. That naturally depends ultimately on the human being, on man's character, on his integrity, on his ambitions or whatever it is. If man does not grow internally big enough to use these great powers suitably and to humanity's advantage, then he is doomed and there is nothing to rescue him. No one, I suppose, can give an answer to what the future will bring, how humanity will develop. The present outlook is not very bright. All one can do is to try to direct man's thinking in a particular direction.

17 hrs.

At the present moment, I should say there are two elements in this process of thinking. One is that of fear of powerful elements, fear that if this kind of nuclear age sets in and these weapons are used to destroy

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

each other, then humanity will be destroyed. And that is certainly a powerful check on people using these weapons. The other is a nobler impulse, that we should train humanity to look in a different direction so that these forces which are there—you cannot hide them; they are out and you cannot say that you do not like those forces and therefore bury them; you cannot bury them—are used for proper purposes, for the benefit of humanity. That is the only real question that ultimately arises. People say that you must not do it, but it does not help at all.

Now, so far as the question of nuclear experiments goes, we have been opposed to them—to these big test experiments. But that does not mean that nuclear energy should not be constantly examined, discovered and used. We in India have set up, as the House knows, a Reactor near Bombay. We are setting up a much bigger Reactor which will come into operation year hence or about that period. In about four or five years' time we shall be in a position, probably, to use a good deal of nuclear energy, which can be used for good or evil purposes. It is just like any other power. You can use electricity for good or evil purposes. You cannot run away from electricity; it is there. You can train the nation's mind not to use it for bad purposes, that is a different matter. Are we not to develop nuclear energy—not the bomb, I mean the nuclear energy—in India or in any other country because it might be used or it might be perverted for wrong purposes? That simply means that we do not endeavour to take advantage of a great force while other countries do it.

The history of the last at least 300 or 400 years has been that we in India and other countries in Asia have been static in scientific accomplishments. I regret to say that many minds in India are still completely

static. They are totally unaware of what science means, what these wonderful forces of nature are. They only live in a kind of little well of thinking without looking out of the well. It is a fact. That is how and that is why we fell back in this age of science.

Today we live in a world which is built by science and the progeny and the accomplishments of science. Why are the United States and Soviet Union specially advanced in regard to nuclear energy and other things? Because they have worshipped tremendously at the shrine of science and technology. They produce scientists and technologists in vast numbers every year. The whole atmosphere becomes of scientific thinking, scientific action. That is true. They will advance in every direction, every scientific direction including production of nuclear energy also. Of course there is one thing. They have resources to do so. A small country cannot do so today. It may very well be that after some time the question of resources will not be so important; that is, it may well be that some kind of a nuclear weapon can be produced without very great resources. That would be a time of greater danger for the world, when you may say that almost any odd group can produce it. I do not quite know how the world will face that particular danger. It is quite conceivable, it is not something that is very very unlikely. But, nevertheless, today it is the country with resources only that can do it. Only three countries have so far done it. Apart from the Soviet Union and the United States of America, the United Kingdom is the only country that has really had these test experiments of atomic and hydrogen bombs.

But, as I said, quite apart from this scientific element the other element comes in which, in the normal sense,

takes you in a somewhat different plane—you may call it the moral element, the spiritual element, call it what you like, it is some element in the human being which controls the misdeeds, which restrains the man. After all, one definition for the growth of civilisation is the growth of restraint in the human being; otherwise he is a wild animal. He restrains his impulse, his passions, his activities and co-ordinates them so that they may not come in conflict with those of his fellow men and so on and so forth.

So, this discussion that has taken place on the subject, I welcome it very much although I regret I cannot accept the resolution because of these obvious difficulties. I welcome the discussion partly because it represents our own thinking, the Government's thinking, and partly because this discussion draws people's attention in the country and, maybe, outside. It is a good thing about it. But I cannot accept it because I really cannot give effect to it.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Does the Mover of the resolution want to reply?

**Shri Gidwani:** No, Sir. In view of what the Prime Minister has said, I seek permission of the House to withdraw my resolution.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I take it that the amendments are also not pressed.

*The amendments were, by leave, withdrawn.*

*The Resolution was, by leave, withdrawn.*

**Pandit D. N. Tiwary (Saran South):** Sir, the House may sit for one more minute so that I may move the other resolution.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** That is not possible. If we had extended the time before five o'clock, that might have been a different thing. Now we cannot do it.

17-08 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned at Eleven of the Clock on Monday, the 19th November, 1956.*