

Shri S. C. Samanta (Tamluk): In 1923 railway finance was separated from general finance, by a convention. A resolution was passed accordingly in the then Central legislature and the railway had complete control over its finances and organisations. By this, it was not meant that the Government had no control over railway finances. The Government had of course overall control. But now, we find that at intervals, these conventions and resolutions are being renewed and reviewed according to the amounts that are to be allotted to the general finances from the railway finances. According to that convention and resolution, the railway had presented their budget every year, and the general budget had nothing to do with it. This year, all of a sudden, in the general finance, an increase of railway fares has been mentioned. Why has it been done? Why has the Railway Minister, in his speech, mentioned that about the increase of passenger fares, "I am not doing anything but the Finance Minister may do something"? Why should it be so?

May we not claim from this House that that resolution and convention should first be brought before this House, passed, and then, necessary procedure be followed? I think this procedure should be adopted, and the procedure that has been taken should be corrected in future. I hope that the Railway Minister will give thought to this matter.

The present Railway Minister was the Minister of Communications some-time ago. I brought in a resolution to the effect that the posts and telegraphs finances should be separated from general revenues. They could not accept it. My proposal then was that if they could not separate posts and telegraphs finances—a subject which is akin to the railways in many respects—they should take up the railway finances with the general finances, and no discrimination need be made. Still, that was not done. Now, the Communications Minister

having becoming the Railway Minister has yielded to the Finance Minister encroaching upon the thing. I think a time will come when railway finance will be amalgamated with the general finance.

Sir, my friend Shri Dange suggested yesterday that the electrification of railways can wait. I would beg of him to reconsider it. The improvement programmes that has been taken up and considered by the Railway Board and by this House, in respect of the first and second Five Year Plans prove that all items cannot wait and that all items should be taken up. This electrification of lines was considered for a long time. It is not for any imaginary purpose that Rs. 80 crores will be spent on electrification. It is a necessity. Last year, a committee was appointed by the railways to go into the question of overcrowding in trains. They dealt with overcrowding in Bombay, Calcutta and Madras and in some other places. They have submitted their report as to how to tackle with overcrowding. We always decry the railways because they cannot provide space for passengers who have sometimes to ascend to the top of the trains for travelling. For the transport of goods and passengers, should we not take the necessary measures? The railway line that has been proposed...

17 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

Mr. Speaker: Order, order; it is now 5 o'clock. The hon. Member may resume his speech tomorrow.

RESOLUTION RE: THERMO-NUCLEAR TEST EXPLOSIONS

The Minister of Defence (Shri Krishna Menon) rose—

Shri V. Raju (Vishakhapatnam): With your permission, I would like to say a few words. I am rising on a point of order for the reason that the

Government is not giving us sufficient opportunity to debate foreign affairs during the current session. Therefore.....

Mr. Speaker: No, hon. Member has not the right to interrupt the proceedings of this House.

Shri V. Raju: That is true, but we would like you to permit a long debate on this issue.

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. Member wants to make any submission, he will kindly write to me. Without my permission, except those things that are in the Order Paper, nothing else can be raised, unless it is a point of order which will prevent the further proceedings of the House. He may write to me or see me.

Shri V. Raju: I hope you will give us an opportunity to debate foreign affairs.

Mr. Speaker: Whatever is reasonable I will always do.

Shri Krishna Menon: The resolution that stands in my name, I have submitted on behalf of the Ministry of External Affairs and is one which causes concern not only to the Members of this House and this country, but the vast majority of peoples in the world. This matter came before the House for the first time in February, 1954, when in a statement made by the Prime Minister, this House called for what was called a stand-still agreement on atomic explosions—nuclear and thermo-nuclear explosions. Since then this idea has gathered momentum in the world. While there are considerable differences regarding the general problem of disarmament or the degree of control and inspection that have to be introduced in regard to nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons, there has been a growing volume of opinion in every country.....

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Firozabad): On a point of order, Sir. Can the

hon. member speak without the resolution being formally moved in the House?

Mr. Speaker: He will first of all speak and move the resolution at the end; it does not matter.

Shri Krishna Menon:with reference to making a beginning in that direction for the suspension of these weapons. This resolution has been before the House; it has been circulated. But in view of the observation which has now been made, I will read it out. I hoped that the time of the House would be saved.

Mr. Speaker: I take it that the hon. Member moves it as in the Order Paper.

Shri Krishna Menon: I move the resolution as it is on the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker: I will treat it as moved. The hon. Member can proceed.

Shri Krishna Menon: The time that is available to the House to debate this matter is so brief that it is essential in the beginning to mention its scope and its purpose. The resolution deals, in the first paragraph, with the general problem of nuclear and thermo-nuclear war. But the bulk of it is concerned with the mere immediate concerns in regard to the effects of radiation arising from these experiments with reference to mass destruction.

I want to say at this stage that the approach that the Government makes to his problem in moving this resolution before this House is not one of criticism of any other great power concerned in regard to the general policy. This resolution is not on the issue of foreign policy, but is concerned with the results on humanity the present generation and the future and is intended to express the view of this House and this country to push on the gathering momentum to add to the gathering momentum for the suspension of nuclear and thermo-nuclear tests, so that in the course of

the observations one has to make, if references are made to the participation of any particular country or to the explosions for which they are responsible, it may not be taken, not in this House but outside, that it is intended as a criticism of a destructive character.

Secondly, I would like to say that nothing that is said either by myself or in this debate will ever be construed by our people or others as any desire or any lack of recognition of the great revolutionary changes and the revolutionary progress that has been made by the discovery or rather the release of atomic power. The fact that we condemn and regret the use of this power of mass destruction does not mean that we lag behind anyone in the desire to see nuclear and thermo-nuclear power develop for peaceful purposes. Therefore, while hard things may be said and the picture that is drawn of the destruction in works both to the world as it is today and the generations that will come after us may be gruesome, that is only one side of the picture. Given the capacity of man to apply his great talents and resources at his disposal for the services of mankind, this new power, the beginning of which was known to the world, which was made available to the world in the beginning of this century, can be of very great service.

The resolution deals in the first paragraph with the long-term problem of the prohibition of atomic weapons. This country and the Government on behalf of this country have said in every international discussion, in every international gathering which has debated this point, that we stand unqualifiedly and without reservations for the total prohibition of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons and all forms of nuclear and thermo-nuclear and biological war. Therefore, there is nothing new that is stated here; we have started and used our own initiative and such opportunities as presented themselves to

promote the efforts towards restraining the further development of these weapons.

The approach to the short-term problems is contained in paragraphs 2 to 6. At this stage, one should refer to the beginning of the development of this new energy, going back to the beginning of this century, in 1919 when Lord Rutherford split the atom. But he did not believe—he died in 1937—that atomic energy would ever be used in large-scale war. Till 1937 it was regarded as a laboratory experiment, interesting in its way and a great contribution to science. In 1932 came the experiments of Cockraft (and also Chadwick on neutrons) who disintegrated the atom using artificially accelerated particles for bombardment. It is from that time onwards that the new development begins. In 1938, a year before the war, when in Germany work was being done on further atomic researches, Hahn and Strassman started work on the splitting of the uranium atom. From that period, the whole of the atomic power has come into the field of weapons.

So far as the use of them as, what is popularly known as bombs, was concerned, in the July of 1954 at Alamagordo, in New Mexico, the United States exploded the first nuclear bomb. Compared to the modern bomb it was a little toy. The next month two bombs were dropped in Japan, one on Hiroshima and the other on Nagasaki. I will refer to them in a short while when we deal with the destructive effects of these bombs.

These weapons, Sir, are of three kinds. It is necessary to refer to them not in order to introduce into a parliamentary debate a great deal of detail, but it has reference to the present-day developments. The first of these atom bombs, a typical-sized one which has an explosive power equivalent to 20,000 tons of T.N.T., is what is called a fission bomb and it consists of fissile materials, such as

[Shri Krishna Menon]

uranium-235, plutonium and a number of other materials. Now the atomic powers have moved far away from there and today the atomic bomb hold is merely used as a match to ignite the hydrogen bomb.

The second type of bomb is the fusion bomb where explosive action arises from the sudden evolution of energy in a "fusion" process in which various forms of hydrogen interact to produce helium. Now what happens is that the process that takes place is essentially analogous to combustion, but the 'match' required to "ignite" it must produce an initial temperature of some millions of degrees centigrade. Such temperatures could only be achieved by using an atomic bomb. The temperature that is produced in the core of a thermonuclear bomb is several times, I am told, the temperature at the centre of the sun.

Now comes the third type of bomb about which there is a considerable amount of discussion. But it is believed that the two great atomic powers have already tested them. That is the fission-fusion-fission bomb. That is worse than the fission of the atom bomb and fusion of the hydrogen bomb. This third type of bomb, believed to have been tested, consists of H-bomb surrounded by a shell of ordinary uranium. Copious quantities of fast neutrons are produced. They are able to produce fission in uranium-235. The explosive power of an A-Bomb may be increased enormously without any proportionate increase in cost. Bombs of this type in the 10-million ton TNT equivalent class have been believed to have been tested. This is the latest development in regard to this terrific power of destruction.

Now, the normal effects of these bombs are three-fold. One, the blast that they create; the mere pushing of air that destroys edifices, structures and anything that is around. The second is the heat that is generated and the third is radiation. The greater part of what I have to say this afternoon will be devoted to the last, but

both in Hiroshima and Nagasaki the damage was largely carried by blast and heat; in Hiroshima nearly 90 per cent. of the houses were destroyed by the blast and the heat; and about 365,000 people of that city were afflicted.

In regard to the effects of the bombing of these two Japanese cities, studies made afterwards showed that people who were there at that time and survived, or even the soldiers who went there thereafter, suffered from the effects of radiation and some of them began to show signs of leukemia — blood-cell cancer — and other types of diseases.

Now the effect of this bomb today compared to hydrogen bomb as I said a little while ago was equivalent to some 20,000 tons of TNT. But a modern hydrogen bomb, a typical bomb, is about twenty megatons. I believe the last one exploded was 17. These new bombs are a million times more powerful than the bombs dropped at Nagasaki and Hiroshima.

Shri Bharucha (East Khandesh): Thousand times more powerful.

Shri Krishna Menon: Yes, thousand times. We, therefore, are in a position of having to compare what may be called this process of nuclear war as against the molecular war of old times. The use of these weapons today are not confined to the bombs, a large stockpile of which exist in every country, but their introduction into what are called tactical weapons, where it is assumed that an atomic head in a cannon will produce the effect of a thousand tons of TNT, and if you use a thousand of them you have very considerable effects in this way. It is also known that these tactical weapons are portable and could be used as molecular weapons were used before as conventional armament. If you add to it the use of atomic weapons as warheads to guide missiles, then you have a situation where the world is faced by the effect of this destructive power in a way where no country, no institution can escape and humanity as a whole

can only perish. If these weapons were used for war purposes, there would be very little left in the world, in the way of civilisation as we know it. I think it is useful for the purpose of this debate, as the impact of what we say here may have on public opinion, to refer to one or two of these effects.

I will read the first one, which is on the individual. This comes from an American Army Colonel who addressed the Sixty-Second Annual Convention of the Association of Military Surgeons in the United States. This is what he said:

"An atom bomb explosion produces coagulation of the tissues and the mechanical destruction of the choroid, in the retina by converting the tissue fluids into steam and thereby exploding the retina."

That is the effect on the individual.

I have here considerable material with regard to the bombing of the two Japanese towns. In Hiroshima most of the wooden houses within a radius of one kilometre from the hypocenter were instantly crushed to pieces and the whole of the town was destroyed. What is more important is that concrete buildings though they showed a greater endurance, were also subject to fire and blast, and destroyed.

The bomb dropped on Nagasaki was more powerful than that of Hiroshima, but its destructive force was greatly influenced by the hilly terrain of the city. This is a factor that goes into such protection as one may seek from atomic warfare. The number of afflicted people in Hiroshima were: 78,000 dead; 37,000 wounded; 14,000 were not to be found; 235,000 afflicted; making a total of 365,000 in a small city of Hiroshima.

Scientific experiments have been made as to the results of atomic war and the atomic bombardment on a country under present conditions. The present conditions vastly very from Hiroshima and Nagasaki. I think the

most informative of these are the civil defence operations conducted in the United States in June 1955 under what is called "Operation Alert". In the 1955 exercises it was assumed that the United States was struck by about sixty atomic and hydrogen bombs. Based on the data collected by the Bomb Damages Assessment Group of the Civil Defence Administration it was estimated that at the end of the first day of the attack more than eight million people were killed and another eight million would have died a few weeks later. About a quarter of the deaths would have been caused by radio-active fallout; that means, even if they had been hundreds of miles away from the explosions, they would still get killed. "It is also estimated that the attack would have damaged 11 million dwelling units and rendered about 25 million people homeless. In New York alone, a five megaton bomb at surface-burst (that is, burst on the ground) would have killed about 3 million people, that is 38 per cent. of New York's population, and injured another 23 per cent. That is, out of every eight New Yorkers about three were estimated killed and two injured."

The blast effect of a single thermo-nuclear weapon is enough to destroy the very largest of the cities. Its radiological effect is enough to devastate an area as much as that of some of the largest States in our country. 100,000 square miles can probably be taken as a reasonable figure for the area of radiological hazard arising from a multi-megaton bomb. 100,000 square miles is not a small area. It is in fact somewhat less than 1/500th part of the total land surface of the earth.

The British research on this, the results of which are more conservative, as can be expected, states thus:

"Given a sufficient number of bombs, no part of the world would escape exposure to biologically significant levels of radiation; to a greater

[Shri Krishna Menon]

or less degree, a legacy of genetic damage would be incurred and an increased incidence of delayed effects on the individual would probably be induced. Although it is difficult to imagine the general occurrence of radiation intensities which would eliminate the entire human race, atomic warfare on a large scale could not fail to increase for many generations the load of distress and suffering that individuals and all human societies would be called upon to support."

An Army General, General Gavin, was called before the Senate Enquiry Committee last year, and he was asked by Senator Duff what he thought would be the effect of atomic explosions, of bombs dropped on Siberia, on the Russian people. This was his answer. He said he was not really competent, and he said 'you have to ask the Air Force'. This is what he said:

"Current planning estimates run on the order of several hundred million deaths that would be either way depending upon which way the wind blew."

Therefore, it is possible for the people who release the bombs themselves to be killed.

"If the wind blew to the south-east they would be mostly in the U.S.S.R., although they would extend into the Japanese territory and perhaps down into the Philippine area. If the wind blew the other way, they would extend well back up into Western Europe. And I use the figure 'several hundred million', which contrasts with one estimates that we hitherto have."

Now, this is the situation in war time. But, fortunately, although there are threats of war, we never had the experience of the use of these weapons for the purpose of mass destruction, except the two cases I have mentioned, at the end of the Second World War.

But we are now concerned with the large number of explosions that are taking place, each one probably more stupendous in its effect. And if we are to understand the power of these explosions I think the best thing is to say that the last explosion of the United States, the big one that was exploded in Bikini in 1954, followed by that of the U.S.S.R. in November 1955, are both supposed to be multi-megaton bombs. And scientists have calculated—and I am told accurately—that the explosive power of each one of these bombs is more than double the explosive power of the explosives used in all the wars in civilisation.

Shri Bharucha: Three times as much.

Shri Krishna Menon: We are informed that the chemical explosive required to make this kind of bomb would cost Rs. 2,000 crores and would occupy many hundreds of buildings like this; and at the same time, one of the bombs would probably cost a few crores of rupees. It might interest the Finance Minister to know that there is some economy factor, but of a character which is very gruesome.

On the whole, the calculations are that there have been 110 of these atomic and thermo-nuclear explosions, seventy by the United States, thirty by the Soviet Union and ten by the United Kingdom. I would like to say here that these are only rough estimates, because each of these countries is not likely to reveal the exact figures.

Now, in regard to the effects of these explosions, I would like to deal with them under four heads. The first of them are the general effects of these explosions. The purpose of this Resolution in asking for a stand-still suspension of these explosions is that on the one hand that would be the first step towards atomic disarmament, and if there be no further experimentation, if the world powers

concerned were brought to the position that there would be no more experimentation, it means that there would be no more manufacture; there will be a holding back of the progress towards atomic destruction. That is one part.

* But much more than that—and that is what concerns the vast masses of the people, naturally, on account of the suffering that will be inflicted—are the effects of the explosions themselves, apart from any war. Even if there is no war, if the experiments are made, what are the effects? Those effects are of the third kind, to which I have referred, arising from radiation, which may be either on the skin surface or it may damage and do injury to every part of our anatomy.

The latest about these general effects has been spoken of by the Nobel prize winner, Dr. Linus Pauling, chemist at the California Institute of Technology, when he said that the bomb test scheduled for the Christmas Island in the Pacific—now over—would lead to one thousand deaths from leukaemia, that is cancer of the blood. If the bomb tests are carried on at their present rate, he said, the number of children born in each generation with such serious effects as feeble-mindedness and deformities will be increased by 200,000. "All scientists are agreed that the effects of the H-bomb tests are very small when compared with natural radiation", Dr. Pauling said, "But when you convert these effects to many people, the number becomes large enough to anyone interested in human suffering to be concerned about it."

It is estimated that the children of the present population of the United States will be some 100 million. And today two millions of them suffer from deformities and other results of mutations in the normal course, but as a result of these tests those will be increased by several thousands, and may be much more. And if the tests

were carried on on a larger scale, it would be difficult to say what would happen.

According to the British Medical Journal, British opinion so far as the official, scientific side is concerned, has rather tended to say that it is not so bad as it looks. The general argument has been that in the human frame there is so much radiation—that is true—arising from the radiation of the rocks around us or the potassium in the body and other causes. There is natural radiation, and therefore the argument advanced—not by scientists, but by politicians in the United Nations—is, "You have so much radiation in you, so what does it matter if there is a little more?" The answer to that is, it is just like saying that normally when we stand we probably carry on our bodies somewhere round 15 lbs. of atmospheric weight per square inch, and so with another 15 lbs. we will not feel uncomfortable. So it is just a question of the margin. I think, Sir, I must go through this very quickly.

The British say—this is from the British Medical Journal Lancet:

"We are alarmed at what may happen if tests go on much longer and we are unconvinced that harm has not already been done. It seems that the Government in its attitude to the control of nuclear tests, is depending too much on certain reassuring facts and not making enough allowance for the big gaps in knowledge."

I referred to the general effects with regard to radiation. But the main effects arise from three sources. One is contamination, the other is genetic effects of the mutations that are induced which lead to the birth of imbeciles or deformed creatures, and all kinds of things like that. Now, with regard to contamination—it is not as though one picks out from one country, but it seems we have more information about it—the first big hydrogen bomb was exploded in 1954,

[Sari Krishna Menon]

and the world did not know of its real nature till two years later. The reason was that it happened that during the explosion, the Japanese fishing craft called *Fortunate Dragon*—not so fortunate in this particular case—carried 23 fishermen who were affected, and that came to the attention of the Navy authorities in the United States, and their treatment and looking after and the general publicity brought to the world the information about the effects of the hydrogen bomb. In Bikini, which bomb is regarded as of the same size as the bomb exploded by the Soviet Union a few months afterwards, these are the results:

"Thirteen months after the first hydrogen bomb test in Bikini in 1954, the contaminated water mass of the Pacific Ocean, at the scene of the explosion, had spread over one million square miles."

"Two days after the 1954 tests the radioactivity of the surface waters near Bikini was observed to be a million times greater than the naturally occurring radio-activity. This material was transported and diluted by ocean currents, and four months later concentrations three times the natural radiation were found 1,500 miles from the test area; thirteen months later the contaminated water mass had spread over a million square miles. Artificial activity had been reduced to about one-fifth the natural activity, but could be detected 3,500 miles from the source."

This is the result of the examination and reporting on the sequel of Bikini bomb.

There was a report in Indian newspapers at that time that many articles of food sold in Calcutta had been found to be contaminated by radio-activity by a team of scientists of the Calcutta University College of Science. I have not been able to discover what further investigations were made in regard to them. For lack of time, I will not read out the remainder.

Perhaps, the most far-reaching effect of radiation is what happens to posterity. About this, there is little direct knowledge. Even if we accepted the view that the present hazards are small, in view of the common judgment that the far-reaching effects are not known, are not measured, the exploding of these bombs in such a way as would affect posterity becomes a grave danger. The British Research Council says:

"There is little direct knowledge of the genetic effects of ionizing radiations on man, but with certain reservations it is justifiable to draw upon our knowledge of the effects of radiation on other organisms."

Experiments have been made on flies and since they breed so quickly, it is possible to know for how many generations it would have effect and so on. In the case of man, it would take a century to find out.

"Damage to genetic materials cumulative and irreparable.

It must be realised that genetic studies inevitably tend to be slow and that sufficient knowledge on which to base these firm conclusions will be accumulated only after many years of intensified research."

The American conclusions on this are far more emphatic. The National Academy of Sciences of the United States says:

"The basic fact is—and no competent persons doubt this—that radiations produce mutations and that mutations are, in general, harmful. It is difficult, at the present state of knowledge of genetics, to estimate just how much of what kind of harm will appear in each future generation after mutant genes are induced by radiations. Different geneticists prefer different ways of describing this situations; but they all come out with the unanimous conclusions that the potential danger is great."

The same conclusions have been more emphatically reached by more recent investigation. The effect on

genes and chromosomes which are measured in the lower species are regarded as sufficient to know that, if there were an atomic war or even if there were not, but the test explosions continued, are enough to induce mutations in the whole world of a character which will affect a considerable part of the population. So much for genetic effects.

Perhaps the worst effect of the fall-out from these nuclear bombs is the consequences of ingestion of radioactive substances which comes either from the air or from the soil. A substance which the scientists call **strontium 90** first came to public knowledge only as a result of thermo-nuclear explosions. This particular aspect must concern us a great deal more today. Because, during the last two or three years, these bombs instead of being exploded on the surface or near the surface, are now exploded high up in higher atmosphere. Therefore, the immediate consequences, for example, of any explosion in Christmas Island would be very small. The fact is, from the fall-out from these bombs, the most harmful substance—I am not dealing with all the substance—is that called **strontium 90** which is chemically akin to calcium and therefore, is absorbed in the body in the same way as calcium is absorbed. The great American authority Dr. Lapp of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, who, incidentally in reviewing the book that had been published by the Government of India, referred to the soundness of the inferences drawn and wondered how the Government of India came into possession of all this knowledge, and suggested that the time had come for de-classifying the information, says:

“The unique nature of the hazard is indicated by the fact that one ounce of radio-strontium, or about a teaspoonful, contains the equivalent of the maximum possible amount for every person on earth. The number of atoms in an ounce of material is so astronomical, even when divided

by the population of the earth, that it amounts to 70 trillion per person. Many pounds of radio-strontium—(and this is the important part, for, after all we have been talking about ounces)—are produced in a super-bomb explosion.”

Dr. Kothari, the Adviser to the Defence Ministry tells me that the amount of radio-strontium that came out or would have come out from the 15 megaton explosion is about 30 pounds. But, fortunately for us, or account of the enormous heat that generated, the whole of the substance goes up into higher atmosphere and probably may take ten years to come down. By the time it comes down its radioactive effect becomes less. Its half life is about 10,000 days. It emits rays which are harmful to us, when it descends from the atmosphere, it settles on the ground or on plants and foliage which are eaten by cattle. The cattle transmit some of the **strontium 90** to the human beings. Fortunately for us, there are certain defence mechanisms against strontium in the plant itself and in the cattle. But, it is pointed out that in the countries of Asia, particularly in countries like this, where the greater part of calcium comes from vegetables, the danger is greater. In Western European countries and the economically advanced countries, a greater part of the calcium is absorbed in the human body through milk. But, here, the greater part comes from vegetable substances. We, probably, would have 10 to 100 times more harmful consequences from the fall-out strontium than the European population would have. That is not an argument for not eating vegetables. But, those are the facts. The considerable amount of strontium that is released, when it gets into the human body, works into bone in the same way as calcium does. Calcium builds the bone. Strontium creates bone cancer and also induces leukaemia and cancerous diseases. There is no known method of treatment of this though many

[Shri Krishna Menon]

claims are made. There are other radio-active substances in same way. But, this is considered to be the worst enemy in this matter.

I would like to read a little more about strontium because it is probably the worst hazard in this. Giving evidence before the United States Congress, a Member of the United States Atomic Energy Commission whose name is not revealed, said:

"Let me be more specific. One of the nuclear products released by any nuclear explosion is a substance that is called radio-active strontium. Unlike ordinary strontium, this strontium gives off beta radiation, which is one of the three kinds of radiation emitted by radium. Prior to the atomic age, there was no radio-active strontium in the atmosphere of the earth."

Now, that increases the responsibility of those who have today the power to stop these explosions.

"There was no such material before the commencement of these explosions. The gentleman in question continued:

"Of the radio active strontium released in an explosion of a large thermo-nuclear weapon, some falls to earth rather quickly over thousands of square miles and some is shot up into the stratosphere. From thence, it settles down, diffusing throughout the whole envelope of atmosphere that surrounds the earth. Rain-fall speeds its descent, but it comes down slowly; only a fraction of it is deposited on the earth during the course of a year. From the earth's soil, radio-active strontium passes into food and then into the human body, where it is absorbed into the bone structure."

And this is what it does:

"Here its beta rays, if intense enough, can cause bone tumours. We know that there is a limit to

the amount of this strontium that the human body can absorb without harmful effects. Beyond that limit, danger lies and even death."

The problem is to fix the limit I have read out the quantity of radio-strontium that falls out from one explosion. The statement goes on:

"In any event, there is a limit to the tolerable amount of radio-strontium that can be deposited in the soil. Consequently, there is a limit to the number of large thermo-nuclear explosions that human race can withstand.

"The sheer fact of this effect is certain. The new power we have in hand can affect the lives of generations still unborn."

That is the evidence given to the United States Congress by a Member of their own Atomic Energy Commission.

Let me refer to the Japanese testimony on this subject. Dr. Tadayoshi Duke of the St. Paul's University, Japan, after a detailed examination of the problem of 'Contamination of the World by Fall-out from Nuclear Test Explosions', has observed (March 1957):

"The conclusions which may be drawn from the above considerations are that, even if the tests of nuclear weapons are stopped right now, the average amount of accumulating strontium 90 is bound to exceed the maximum permissible amount for the population.

"Further more, if the tests are continued at the rate of today, the average amount of accumulating strontium 90 will exceed the maximum permissible amount for the occupational workers."

This statement has not been substantiated by anybody else.

It is believed that the explosion of one of these megaton bombs is equivalent to a ton of radium, that is to say equivalent to the radio activity of a ton of radium. The total quantity of radium so far produced is only a few pounds. Fortunately for us the radio-activity that is liberated in the explosion does not last as long as that of radium. Radium would probably last for thousands of years, but this goes away after some time, but at any rate, the amount of discharge at the time of explosion is considered equivalent to a ton of radium.

These are the effects which are now being seen all over the world. The Japanese have protested to a very considerable extent. They have made representations to various Governments against the contamination and the pollution of air and water.

It is no argument to say that any country is exploding bombs on its own territory. I have heard it said in defence of the Soviet Union or in extenuation of their bomb explosions that they have offered to suspend the tests. I think we are entitled to ask: if they have offered, why don't they suspend them? Secondly, it has been argued that it is on their own territory. It may be on their own territory, but the atmospheric envelope of this air cannot be partitioned, and what is more, nobody can control these winds. Even in Bikini, when the wind velocity was only about 20 miles an hour, it extended to 50 miles on one side and 120 miles the other way in a few hours.

That takes us to the present position as to the stage of discussion on this matter and to the position we take up. The Government of India have asked for total suspension of these tests. They have even suggested that any country that takes the initiative in this suspension would make contribution to the whole problem of suspension. And this is not

merely a sentimental position, because when you look at the destructive atomic power and the development that has been reached, it is like this. The atomic Powers today, certainly the two great Powers, have got the capacity, have got weapons of destructive capacity, to wipe out this planet. So, if that is so, what is the use of having ten times the power of wiping out. You can wipe us out only once. Therefore, there is nothing more to be gained by these experiments of these weapons. And their consequences are very serious.

It is true that each country has stated that it will stop the tests if the others stop it, and they have also in the joint communique issued when the Prime Minister went to Moscow both condemned the use of these explosions. I have not got the phraseology here, but it says something about stopping them, but we have said in this resolution that any country that either tries to reach agreement or takes the initiative in suspending these tests would make a great contribution in relieving the great concern of humanity all over, particularly in the countries that are near the centres of the explosions. Most of these explosions take place in the Pacific Ocean or in the large land mass of the Soviet Union or in the deserts of Nevada in the United States, but as I said, the wind does not wait for anybody, and it depends on which way it blows.

It is somewhat of a misleading situation that today these explosions take place high up in the air, and as happened the other day—I speak here as a layman—when the United Kingdom arranged for a bomber plane to go through the cloud, and it was reported there was not much damage. There could not be very much because it was exploded very much high up and the fallout comes down slowly only after a few months or a few years. Therefore, we are likely to be consoled that on account of the

[Shri Krishna Menon]

new technique of exploding it so high it is not easy to contaminate and therefore the results are not so bad.

Now, our attempts in this connection, both before the Disarmament Commission and the United Nations, and the momentum of public opinion and the various interventions made by the Prime Minister with regard to foreign countries during exchanges of views have resulted no doubt in the momentum of world opinion. In 1954 when this statement was made in this House, that was the first time a call was made for suspension. It is true there are millions and millions of people today who join movements, sign manifestoes and so on in support of it, and of course, there is the feeling in every country, Governments apart, that there must be a suspension of these tests.

The objections raised are that it is not possible to detect these explosions and therefore if one country suspends it, the other country which is not so moral—and each one says the other is not so moral—would go on with the tests and would be at the greatest advantage. The Government of India from the very beginning have opposed this position. First of all, they have said that from the amount of scientific knowledge at their disposal it is not correct to say that you can explode a Hydrogen bomb in your pocket, that is to say, detection is always possible. Though this position is put forward by the Governments of the atomic countries, scientists themselves have supported the view that we have taken. In the *Bulletin of Atomic Scientists* published in the United States this matter is discussed and it is said there:

"It is by now generally known that testing of thermo-nuclear weapons cannot be concealed from the world; its cessation therefore will not need verification by international inspection, which has been the bone of contention between West and East ever since.

U.N. negotiations concerning the control of atomic energy began in 1945. The testing of inter-continental missiles is not equally easily detected from outside the testing country—if the latter has at its disposal the land masses of Siberia, or the wide reaches of the Pacific. However, a relatively small number of extra-territorial, internationally manned radar stations within each large country would probably suffice to make the concealment of such tests impossible. It can be suggested, therefore, that foolproof control of the perfection of inter-continental ballistic missiles, as such, as well as that of nuclear warheads, is technically feasible without excessive interference with national sovereignties. The possibility of freezing the arms race in the way suggested....

—in fact, this was one of the proposals put by the Government of India before the Disarmament Commission to freeze the arms race—

"The possibility of freezing the arms race, in the way suggested thus depends only on whether the U.S. and the Soviet Union want this to happen, and not on technical difficulties which stand in the way of an agreed and controlled elimination of existing weapons....

....Furthermore, they argue, only such a freeze can prevent the nations not now in the van of the arms race from acquiring weapons of mass destruction. The acquisition of atomic weapons by smaller powers is bound to create a multilateral danger, less predictable and less controllable than the present danger of the outbreak of atomic war by one of the two armed camps.

....Their belief that we are now offered literally the last opportunity to avoid an irrevocable deadlock of mutual terror is a sober

estimate of reality, and not an exaggeration to whip up support for a pet disarmament plan."

Therefore, there is no reason to think that by and large these tests cannot be detected.

A new proposal has been now put forward more or less as an answer to the demand for total suspension.

This was made before the Disarmament Commission, when India presented her proposals, and came from the United Kingdom in what is called the limitation and registration of tests. Government have taken the view and have propounded it before the Commission and later, that this proposal of the limitation or regulation of tests is by far worse than the present situation, because the limitation of tests and their registration would mean that some international authority is given to the use of atomic weapons. You legalise them; you give it a moral sanction.

But, apart from that, no one really considers that limitation or registration of tests is possible, because if the argument against suspension is that you cannot detect the other fellow's explosion, that would equally apply to this, because limitation means control, and control means detection; and if it cannot be detected for the purpose of suspension, how can detection take place for the purpose of limitation?

Therefore, it appears to us merely as a political response to a genuine demand for the total suspension of weapons. Therefore, the Government of India, in all the conferences, despite the fact that, much to our regret, Japan has supported this position, have been definitely opposed to this so-called compromise position, because the number of tests that are registered and conducted would be adequate to bring about all the evils to which I have referred a little while ago.

May I say here that we have now reached a stage when the continuation

of these explosions have passed on to nearer or greater potential harm than ever before. While it is true, as I said in the beginning, that this country would never stand against the experiments that are necessary for the progress of science, we are not dealing with that particular aspect at the present time.

We are passing to an age when these weapons, whether they be thermo-nuclear or nuclear, are becoming part of the ordinary arms race of Governments. Their manufacture is becoming easier, and their costs are going down. As I said, even when it was first brought about, the cost was very small. Now, they have discovered other processes which bring down the cost further. And with the knowledge of atomic science all over the world, and what is more, the application of atomic energy for peaceful purposes, which would develop techniques in every country, which would develop experts in every country, the manufacture of these weapons by a considerable number of nations becomes more and more probable.

While in 1945, the control of atomic energy was first mooted in the United Nations, the problem was much simpler than it is today, because the stocks of raw material were known, the processes were known, and it was possible to exert control much better than now.

Therefore, we are now passing on to a stage where the atomic weapon is becoming a greater menace because of the capacity of its great spread. It is also known that in the military alliances in which the atomic powers are engaged, the use of tactical weapons is regarded as normal. And while, so far as the United States is concerned, these tactical weapons cannot be passed on to anybody without Congressional sanction, in the event of a war or in the event of a conflict of a large-scale kind, their importation would be a matter of only a few days or hours, as the case may be, according to the methods of transport.

[Shri Krishna Menon]

Therefore, this resolution seeks to express the concern of this House, indeed, as has been expressed by the Parliament of Japan, recently by the legislature in West Germany, as expressed by the Heads of States in many places, and by large number of bodies of public opinion, who have studied this matter.

Finally, I would like to say that though it is true that the great discoveries in this field, and indeed, in the atomic field, are largely in the hands of these three very great Powers, the contribution that has made it possible is not confined to them. Today, if you ask our scientists, they will tell you that today this development has been possible by the contributions made to the development of atomic science by people all over the world, not excluding our Bhabha and Krishnan and what is more not excluding the mathematical contributions of Ramanujam long before the atom was split. Therefore, this power is not their own. It has been derived from the common contributions of humanity. It can be used for the purposes of its advancement. But now it largely threatens, if war broke out, to exterminate large portions of the human race, if not all of it, and all those civilisations, as we know it. It is, therefore, necessary that such efforts as we can make by the organisation of world opinion should be mobilised for the purpose of saving humanity from the present situation. While one can cynically say, 'What is the use of passing resolution?' we may not be blind to the fact that during the last two or three years, while tests have gone on and more and more tests are going on, equally the volume of opinion has increased, and the consideration of suspension has come to be debated upon, though the objections are put forward.

So, any support that we as a Government and as a country give, any gathering of the forces in this direction, would be a contribution towards obtaining the suspension of these weapons, which I am convinced, would be a first step towards atomic disarmament.

Once these tests stop, then there must be a full impact on the atomic race as such.

Sir, there are 19 amendments to this resolution. I can only say that these amendments reflect the amount of concern in the House in regard to this problem, and also the interest taken in the study of it, and in supporting, even as the movers of the amendments consider, a more emphatic denunciation of this matter. We have examined these amendments; they largely fall into call for action of a character which has been discussed in this House before, such as that the Prime Minister should call the other Prime Ministers together, or that he should call another Bandung Conference, or that we should come out of the Commonwealth or that we should stop taking aid and so on and so forth. Of course, all these problems have their own ordinary merits or otherwise. But I regret that it is not possible to accept any of these amendments. They have served their purpose.

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): Amendments are not being put to vote now.

Some Hon. Members: The amendments have not been moved yet.

Mr. Speaker: It is open to the hon. Minister to state in advance what his opinion is on these amendments because they are on the Order Paper.

Shri Raghunath Singh: The amendments are not on the Order Paper. They have not been placed before the House.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Mahendra Pratap (Mathura): This talk has been a crime. Psychologically, this talk has been a crime. May I explain?

Shri Krishna Menon: If the amendments are not before us, I am very happy. On the other hand, if they are going to be pressed, I tell you what the position is. So far as this resolution is concerned, it is not possible to incorporate these amendments, for the reasons I have mentioned.

I beg to move:

"This House views with anxiety and concern the continued development and production of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons of mass destruction which if employed in any armed conflict, would spell the destruction of mankind and civilisation.

(2) This House expresses its more immediate and grave concern about the present menace arising from the harmful and unpredictable effects of radiation consequent on the continuing explosions of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons for test purposes which are carried out by the United States, the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom.

(3) This House regrets and deplores that despite the declared intentions of all nations not to embark upon war and in the face of the mounting opinion and anxiety in the world in regard to the grave and growing menace of these tests of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons, to the present and the future of mankind, the Great Powers concerned have not abandoned their programmes of such test explosions. They already proved injurious to populations, in lands both far and near to the location of such tests and dangerously pollute the world's air and water and threaten the present and future generations with known and unknown risks and consequences.

(4) This House further expresses its considered opinion that the proposals at present canvassed for the so-called Limitation and Registration of these tests will not help to rid the world of the dreadful consequences of radiation to present and future generations, nor pave the way to the abandonment of these weapons of mass destruction. On the other hand, such regularisation would tend to make thermo-nuclear war seem

more legitimate and to appear to have the sanction of the world community.

(5) This House earnestly appeals to each and all of the three Great Powers concerned at least to suspend without further delay their programmes for the explosions for test purposes of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons pending agreement on their discontinuance and the abandonment of the production and stock-piling of such weapons.

(6) This House considers that if any or all the Powers concerned take the initiative or agree to the suspension of their test-explussions, a substantial contribution would be made to rid the world of the fear which has led to the present armaments race and open the way for the lowering of tensions, progress towards disarmament and international co-operation and peace."

I commend this Resolution to the acceptance of this House.

Mr. Speaker: So far as the reference to the amendments by the sponsor of the resolution is concerned, the sponsor has got all the amendments before him; every hon. Member has got them on the Order Paper: He will only have a right of reply at the end. In advance, he wants to tell the House what his opinion is on these amendments which are on the Order Paper. Such of them as are admissible will be admitted; others may not be admitted. But there is no harm, and the hon. Minister is quite in order if he refers to what has been tabled here, on the supposition that they will be admitted, even if they have not been moved; in fact, they cannot be moved now. And after they are moved, once again, the hon. Minister may not have an opportunity to speak here. Hon. Members may, therefore, read the rules. I shall now place the resolution before the House

Shri Mohamed Imam: (Chitaldrug):
I want to seek some information from the Minister.

Mr. Speaker: Not now; later on I shall first put the resolution before the House.

Mr. Speaker: Resolution moved:

"This House views with anxiety and concern the continued development and production of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons of mass destruction which if employed in any armed conflict, would spell the destruction of mankind and civilization.

(2) This House expresses its more immediate and grave concern about the present menace arising from the harmful and unpredictable effects of radiation consequent on the continuing explosions of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons for test purposes which are carried out by the United States, the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom.

(3) This House regrets and deplores that despite the declared intentions of all nations not to embark upon war and in the face of the mounting opinion and anxiety in the world in regard to the grave and growing menace of these tests of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons, to the present and the future of mankind, the Great Powers concerned have not abandoned their programmes of such test-explosions. These have already proved injurious to populations in lands both far and near to the location of such tests and dangerously pollute the world's air and water and threaten the present and future generations with known and unknown risks and consequences.

(4) This House further expresses its considered opinion that the proposals at present canvassed for the so-called Limitation and Registration of these tests will not help to rid the world of

the dreadful consequences of radiation to present and future generations, nor pave the way to the abandonment of these weapons of mass destruction. On the other hand, such regularisation would tend to make thermo-nuclear war seem more legitimate and to appear to have the sanction of world community.

(5) This House earnestly appeals to each and all of the three Great Powers concerned at least to suspend without further delay their programmes for the explosions for test purposes of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons pending agreement on their discontinuance and the abandonment of the production and stock-piling of such weapons.

(6) This House considers that if any or all the Powers concerned take the initiative or agree to the suspension of their test-explosions, a substantial contribution would be made to rid the world of the fear which has led to the present armaments race and open the way for the lowering of tensions, progress towards disarmament and international co-operation and peace".

A number of amendments have been tabled. I would like to know how many hon. Members who have tabled the amendments are present in the House, and whether they want to press any of them.

Shri Bharucha: I want to move amendment No. 1.

Shri U. C. Patnaik (Ganjam): I want to move amendment No. 13.

Shrimati Parvati Krishnan (Coimbatore): I want to move amendment No. 12.

Shri Raghunath Singh: I would like to move amendment No. 2.

Shrimati Ita Palchoudhuri (Nabadwip): I want to move amendment No. 5.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati):
Amendment in my name, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: What is the number?

Shri Hem Barua: I do not know.

Mr. Speaker: I cannot admit it; I am not going to waive notice.

Shri Supakar (Sambalpur): No. 10, Sir.

Shri Sivraj (Chingleput—Reserved—Sch. Castes): No. 19.

Shri U. C. Patnalk: No. 13.

Shri Raghunath Singh: No. 2, Sir.

Shrimati Ila Palchoudhuri: No. 5.

Shrimati Manjula Debi (Goalpara)
No. 18.

Shri Dasappa (Bangalore): No. 11.

Shri Shree Narayan Das (Darbhanga): No. 3

Shri Radha Raman (Chandni Chowk): No. 16.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Hissar): No. 8.

Shri H. C. Mathur (Pali): No. 4.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad (Gaya):
No. 17.

18 hrs.

Mr. Speaker: Subject to admissibility, these amendments will be treated as moved. They are :

1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18 and 19.

Shri Bharucha: I beg to move:

That at the end of the Resolution, the following be added, namely:—

“(7) That with the above ends in view, this House recommends to the Government:—

(a) to convene a conference of Asiatic and African Powers opposed to continuation of nuclear tests to evolve immediate and

effective measures to dissuade nuclear Powers from further test explosions;

(b) to convey to the Government of United Kingdom that unless further tests are forthwith suspended, India may have seriously to consider the question of withdrawing from the Commonwealth; and

(c) to convey to the Governments of U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. that unless further tests are forthwith suspended, India may have seriously to consider the question of declining any further gratuitous aid or outright donations for her internal economic development from both these countries”.

Shri Raghunath Singh: I beg to move:

That at the end of the Resolution, the following be added, namely:—

“(7) This House is of opinion that India should leave the Commonwealth if any member nation of the Commonwealth pursue the policy of producing and testing the thermo-nuclear test explosions.

(8) The Government of India should move the U.N.O. to restrain its members to produce and test thermo-nuclear weapons failing which all the peace loving nations of the world should unite and resort to social and economic boycott of such nations”.

Shri Shree Narayan Das: I beg to move:

“That at the end of the Resolution, the following be added, namely:—

“(7) That with the above ends in view, this House recommends to the Government:—

(a) to take suitable steps to constitute a National Council for the prevention of thermo-nuclear test explosions after convening an All

[Shri Shree Narayan Das]

India Conference of those interested in it representing all parties and views; and

(b) to take suitable steps to convene an International Conference for the prevention of thermo-nuclear test explosions representing all nations with a view to mobilise world opinion against it as also to constitute a World Council for the purpose".

Shri H. C. Mathur: I beg to move:

That at the end of the Resolution, the following be added, namely:—

"(7) This House considers these thermo-nuclear test explosions as acts of aggression against human race and condemns them as such".

Shrimati Ila Palchoudhuri: I beg to move:

That at the end of the Resolution, the following be added, namely:—

"(7) With the above ends in view, this House recommends to the Government:—

(a) to convene a conference in India on the lines of the Bandung Conference—of all such Powers of the world who hold similar views as India in regard to the use and tests of atomic and nuclear weapons with a view to making a joint declaration of their views and appealing to nuclear Powers to desist from making further test explosions and use of nuclear and atomic weapons for destruction of humanity; and

(b) to evolve a scheme for close co-operation of various countries in regard to peaceful uses of the atom".

Shri Naludurgker: I beg to move:

That at the end of the Resolution, the following be added, namely:—

"(7) This House appeals to all other nations of the world to bring possible effective pressure upon these three great Powers for

the discontinuation of the production and explosion of these nuclear and thermonuclear weapons."

Shri D. C. Sharma: I beg to move:

That at the end of the Resolution the following be added, namely:—

"(7) With the above objectives in view, this House recommends to the Government of India to intensify its efforts at national and international levels so as to secure the total abolition of such tests and the total banning of the manufacture of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons."

Shri Supakar: I beg to move:—

That at the end of the Resolution, the following be added, namely:—

"(7) This House humbly urges upon the United Nations Organisation to so amend its Charter as to incorporate in its 'Purposes and Principles', the total and immediate ban on the production, use or the test explosion of any nuclear or thermo-nuclear weapons by any nation".

Shri H. C. Dasappa: I beg to move:

That at the end of the Resolution, the following be added, namely:—

"(7) With these ends in view this House recommends to the Government of India the desirability of initiating talks with all such Nations or the world as are in agreement with the above objectives for the purposes of mobilising world opinion against production of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons, their test explosions and their use in case of war and of making the world safe for humanity."

Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan: I beg to move:

That at the end of the Resolution, the following be added, namely:—

"(7) With the above ends in view, this House recommends:—

(a) that the Government take steps to convene a Conference

[Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan]

of the Powers opposed to continuation of nuclear tests to evolve immediate and effective measures to dissuade nuclear Powers from further nuclear tests and stock-piling of nuclear weapons; and

- (b) that the appeal of this House be forwarded to the Parliaments of the U.S.A., U.S.S.R. and the U.K.”.

Shri U. C. Patnaik: I beg to move:

That at the end of the Resolution the following be added, namely:—

“(7) This House recommends to the Government of India,—

- (a) to take the initiative and launch a world-wide campaign against nuclear and thermo-nuclear tests;
- (b) to call for a meeting of Asian and African nations to protest against individual Western nations defiling the air and water of Afro-Asian countries while endangering humanity itself by these tests, for their own defence preparations; and
- (c) in particular to warn the United Kingdom in unambiguous terms that India will quit the Commonwealth if Britain persists in these anti-humanitarian activities”.

Shri Radha Raman: I beg to move:

That at the end of the Resolution, the following be added, namely:—

“(7) This House requests the Prime Minister of India to take immediate steps as will lead to a Conference of Prime Ministers of such countries as have been holding thermo-nuclear test explosions, with a view to achieve the above objects”.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: I beg to move:

That at the end of the Resolution, the following be added, namely:—

“(7) This House is of opinion that an ultimatum should be given to the U.S.A. only to stop its test explosions failing which the Government of India will make an offer either of a federal union or of a military alliance to China and Russia”.

Shrimati Manjula Debi: I beg to move:

That at the end of the Resolution, the following be added, namely:—

“(7) This House is of opinion that India should send delegation to the three Big Powers to stop immediately further nuclear or thermo-nuclear tests. This delegation may be of National or International character, representing the world opinion against the use of these deadly weapons against mankind.”

Shri Siva Raj: I beg to move:

That in the Resolution—

In para 6 add at the end—

“and this House appeals, in the name of humanity, to the people of the United States, the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom to join with the people of India in their effort to make their respective Governments to stop further test explosions.”

Mr. Speaker: All these amendments are before the House.

Shri Mohammed Imam: May I make a submission, Sir? This is a very important subject and all of us are anxious to take part in the debate. There are so many amendments and the time at our disposal is very limited. So, I submit that if the Minister is agreeable, this resolution may be taken up on another day and a full day may be fixed or at least

a few hours. It is quite necessary on account of the importance of the matter which concerns all.

Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan: I would like to support it.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Prime Minister want to say anything about the suggestion?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): They can have a week if they can find time. I cannot find it.

Mr. Speaker: These amendments whose numbers have been read out are also before the House along with the resolution. Hon. Members can go on till 7 o'clock. Each hon. Member may get about 10 minutes.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao (Khammam): What can be said in 10 minutes? I will make a submission. You are aware that on Friday, there is a Private Members' day and there will be 2½ hours. On that day Private Members will have a chance only to introduce Bills and there is no chance for the Bills to be taken into consideration. These 2½ hours may be allotted for this.

Shri Raghunath Singh: That is a very good suggestion.

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): The matter should be finished today.

Shri U. C. Patnaik: In view of the fact that the hon. Minister himself has taken one hour and there is only one hour more for all the Members who are anxious to speak, I would suggest that on Saturday some time be given to this.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Certainly, Sir, if you consider that necessary or desirable, the House will sit a little late today, till half past seven or even eight. (Interruptions.) I might point out that I am placed in a slight difficulty. I do not mind if the hon. Members do not want their private Resolutions on Friday and that time

is taken for this. But I am naturally interested in this Resolution and it was my intention to say a few words at the conclusion of the debate. My colleague will not speak again; I shall wind up.

Perhaps the House knows that the Prime Minister of Japan is coming here tomorrow and he will be here on Friday especially. It may be that much of my time on Friday may be taken up in discussions with him. I would have welcome a longer discussion of the subject. The Government does not want to stifle discussion on this important subject but it is a question of finding time. So far as I know, I have no doubt that there is no one in this House who does not agree with the Resolution as far as it goes. They wish to add things to it; that is the point. Now, whatever they wish to add may be for positive action which can be considered alone with other suggestions at other times, separately. If it not an essential part of this. There is a certain importance that a Resolution of this type should be passed fairly early to have the effect which we would like it to have. If it is postponed for sometime and then the debate goes on, I submit, with all humility, that it loses force, although certainly, important speeches will be delivered.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now sit till 8 o'clock, if necessary, and at any rate till 7.30. There is no harm if we sit occasionally a little late. Spokesmen of the various groups will have an opportunity to speak and every hon. Member who has tabled an amendment cannot expect to speak. They will be allowed fifteen minutes each.

Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on behalf of the communist group in Parliament and on behalf of party members outside the Parliament and, in fact, on behalf of the women of our country who have a particular interest in this problem and in this Resolution, I welcome this Resolution, that has been tabled today because it gives us an opportunity to

[Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan]

discuss a matter that is of vital importance as the hon. Mover himself said—of vital importance not only to our people but to mankind as a whole.

It is a welcome feature—a feature for a change—that the Government has taken the initiative to place before Parliament a subject which is unanimously in the interest of our people; it has placed before Parliament a subject which is of utmost importance to the country and to the world.

But, at the same time, I cannot but express a sense of disappointment. While speaking on the Resolution and in the wording of the Resolution itself, admirable sentiments are expressed. On an issue like this, it is not enough if we remain content with sentiments. It is necessary that, apart from sentiments, we should be able to visualise, to envisage a way out of the impasse that seems to be facing the world and the people of the world. This is my only grudge, and it is with a view to overcome this lacuna in the resolution that I have brought forward two amendments, which give an indication of some positive action that might be taken by the Government and by Parliament.

We are holding this discussion today in the background of an intensified arms race by the three Great Powers, particularly intensified in the field of the thermo-nuclear weapons. We are meeting today in the atmosphere of an increase in the cold war, and also of drawing away from friendly contacts that might have been developing during the last two or three years. It is in this atmosphere that we are meeting and discussing this resolution. Therefore, when we discuss it, we must discuss it with a view that we put an end to this, that we want to put forward certain proposals, put forward certain ideas before our people, before the Parliament and before the

world, which will lead to end the cold war, which will help to bring closer contact between the people of various nations, and which also will help to bring a stop to this mad and frenzied arms race that is taking place in the world today.

The hon. Mover of the resolution, for reasons that he expressed, did not comment on, or even did not draw attention to the fact that certain proposals have been made by one side and another. There is only one proposal that he referred to, but he did not refer to the fact that it is the Soviet Union that took the initiative in putting forward certain proposals for a basis of discussion and those proposals were rejected, and the alternative proposal was the proposal of giving notice of the tests that are to take place.

Now, the very attitude that the United States and the British have taken towards this whole issue of the nuclear tests in one that causes grave apprehension. The hon. Mover went into great detail as to the various technicalities of the developments in modern science which have led to the manufacture of hydrogen bombs. He went into great details as to the various scientists' opinion that are there, as to the effects and after effects of the explosions of the various nuclear weapons. I would like to remind the House that today, even though the Bikini test took place on the 1st March, 1954, the after-effects of that test are being felt in the islands in the Pacific. A well-known and eminent scientist of France, Prof. Paul Berthold, has given an interview to the Press in various countries pointing out that in his travels in the Pacific he came across the after-effects of the Bikini Island test two years later. We know today that already after-effects are going on as a result of the Bikini test. We have read in the newspapers only a few days ago that a child in Saigon died as a result of being drenched in radio-active rain. So, it is no longer a matter of speculation; we know that

these after-effects are there. We know that our present generation and the future is threatened by the after-effects of thermo-nuclear tests.

Today, Sir, in the year 1957, the danger of war is not only a danger of killing. When war breaks out, it is not only a danger of massacre on a large scale, it is not only going to be a repetition on a much larger scale of what happened during the second world war. Today the danger of war exists even at this very minute. With the thermo-nuclear tests being in the offing, with these tests being conducted, with the scientists giving their reports that once these tests are conducted certainly humanity is in danger for a large number of years, we cannot hope just to sit back, we cannot trust on ordinary appeals to Government, but we have to go one step further and take an initiative in mobilising, in channelising world opinion and the opinion in our country, in order to bring to bear sanity on those powers—that today are carrying on this mad arms race.

Various scientists were quoted by the hon. Member who moved the resolution. He also quoted the opinion of one scientist where there is a certain amount of, shall I say, softening or toning down of the after-effects of the nuclear tests.

But another eminent scientist, Prof. Joliot Curie has also referred to this matter, and this is what he says:

"An attempt is made to oppose the opinions of scientific experts and to create confusion as to the reality of the dangers. A few days ago eighteen German scientists, including Professor Otto Hahn, who discovered the fission of uranium, warned the Government of the German Federal Republic. The world press gave this warning wide publicity, but at once some radios announced that biologists in the United States had found by experimenting on animals a product which, if introduced into the human organism,

would protect it against the damaging effects of radiation. This news, so rapidly announced, certainly without due control, is one of the manifestations of psychological war designed probably to minimise the effect of the German scientists' appeal by claiming the disquiet of public opinion."

So, we have to take all these various reports very carefully, but certainly there is one feature that is common to all countries. Today, apart from those who are the paid hacks and the paid scientists of imperialists at the same time, by and large, the scientists are of one opinion when they say that the effects of radiation are certainly very harmful and, as to the protection that may be found out, science is very far behind. There is no outstanding scientist who has yet held forth that promise to the world. Certainly, it is indeed the tragedy that so many great scientists including Madam Curie, one of the leading women scientists of the world, sacrificed their lives in order to carry out research in radium, in order to give to humanity something for curing diseases and for helping humanity to live in better conditions, free from the fear of disease; while they sacrificed their lives because of the effect of radiation, because of the work they did for science. They fell a prey to sickness and they were the martyrs to the cause of science. They would turn in their graves if they knew that whatever they contributed, whatever research they did, is today being used in order to create weapons of destruction, in order to carry out tests that really spell destruction of humanity. This is the reality today.

Sir, what we expect of our Government is that having taken the initiative in bringing this resolution before us, having taken the initiative in giving the Members of Parliament an opportunity to discuss this issue, having taken this initiative, they can go

[Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan]

one step forward and convene a conference not only of the Bandung powers, because, today, it is not only the Bandung powers that are concerned with it; it is not only the Bandung powers that have been raising their voice against the thermo-nuclear weapons, but all those powers today where the people, by and large, are voicings, themselves though their Governments, through their Parliament against the thermo-nuclear tests. This is how we can bring pressure on those powers which have to be brought under control and which will have to be brought together in a summit conference in order to carry on discussion in an atmosphere free from suspicion, free from fear and supported by the majority of the people in order to come to an amicable agreement over this issue.

We have our doubts and our fears, much as we welcome this resolution, because, only in Christmas last year, the Prime Minister went to the United States of America and had talks with the President of the United States of America. After those talks what did we learn? We learnt that the Americans were now posted with the aspirations of the Asian people; they are well posted with the improvements that are there in Asia, but soon after that, a very strange understanding has dawned upon them. Certainly, the American people showed their love of our country. But, unfortunately for the American people, the American Government have gone back on whatever understanding was given to them, and there has been an intensification of infiltration of United States policy in Arab States with an attempt to isolate President Nasser.

Two years ago, at the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference, a resolution was adopted; a resolution wherein these sentiments have been embodied, sentiments that the nuclear tests should be brought to an end, that the Commonwealth Premiers, all

of them, would get together and try to do their level best to bring the weight of their opinions on the powers that were carrying on the nuclear tests. But yet today the leading member of the Commonwealth, the guiding star of the Commonwealth is the country which is responsible for the tests that are due to take place in Christmas Islands.....

An Hon. Member: That have taken place.....

Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan:..that have taken place and will continue in the Christmas Islands. That is why we have always this fear. Why is it that there is no action? We do not say that the Indian Government has not been doing whatever it could do. We have certainly welcomed every step that has been taken towards stopping the tests. We welcomed the proposals that were being put before the sub-commission on disarmament. But today there has to be a qualitative change in what our Government does. The times have passed when sentiments have to be expressed. Today the women are marching in the streets of Japan. Women have taken the initiative in Germany. Even in West Germany, today the Parliament has passed a resolution. Throughout the world today there is a feeling that certainly something has got to be done. Throughout the world in the middle of the suspicion that exists, in the middle of this growing cold war, there is one very very welcome feature, and that is that the force of public opinion has become something very special and very effective in international life. Here is our Government which has got the force of public opinion, not only of our people, but all the people throughout Asia, people in America, people in the United Kingdom and people in every country in the world behind it on his issue. They have got the force of this public opinion behind them. They will have the moral support of the people throughout the world and they will certainly have

the support of the Governments of many other countries. With this force behind you, the only force which will lead to final victory in this particular case, the only force that can help to bring sanity in this world, remember that you will be certainly victorious. There is no need to be diffident about this. There is no need to feel that you are alone or that yet you might be stepping on tender corns. The time is gone to play cricket and today we have to do something else, to forget the old school tie and certainly move forward in a courageous manner, because mankind will never forgive those who miss their opportunities. Today if you take this magnificent opportunity that is before you, not only the mankind of today, but mankind for generations to come will think not only with pleasure, but with gratitude and remember that it is because this initiative was taken, because the public opinion of the world could be channelised by the initiative you have taken, that the threat of war, that the threat of mass destruction even without war could be averted.

This is my appeal to the Government that this initiative be taken, that the traditions and the culture of our people be taken forward, that the cries of those millions of women do not fall on deaf ears, that the cries of unborn children do not fall on deaf ears, that our children and grandchildren should live in a world safe not only from war, but from the after-effects of radiation and safe also from the potentialities of the experiments that are being carried on with regard to the manufacture of destructive weapons.

With these few words, I would like to request the hon. Member once again to reconsider his attitude towards the amendments. If this particular amendment is not acceptable to him, he can at least come forward with some amendment which will be the operative part of this resolution and which will go beyond just repeating the appeal that has been repeated time and again on the floor of various

Parliaments, time and again in various international gatherings and time and again in the various joint statements that the Prime Ministers of various countries have thought fit to put before the people of the world.

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I must confess at the very outset that I have not fully recovered from the fall-out of the atomic speech delivered by the hon. the Defence Minister. I have a feeling, Sir, that the hon. Minister perhaps could have saved himself the trouble of giving us the origin, the growth and the present dangers of nuclear fission. I think, Sir, he could have perhaps made an assumption which would not have proved wrong that the legislators assembled in this sovereign body of the country certainly are aware of the dangers of atomic and hydrogen bombs.

After having said this during the brief time that I have at my disposal, I shall try to confine myself to the main part of this resolution today. This is not the first time, Sir, that mankind has hovered on the brink of a catastrophe and this House can perhaps recall with pride that in trying to save the world from plunging headlong into this disaster this country has played a leading role. I do not want to strike an unduly patriotic note, Sir, but when we are moving this resolution, I have this in my mind. I do not want this House to join the queue of those peace councils, peace organisations, which have been passing time without number long platitudinous resolutions on the desirability of having peace and stopping all explosions. In the past when this country, its Parliament and its Government, took a definite stand the world took it most seriously. I want, Sir, that we act on this resolution also in such a way that once again we can persuade the world about the underlying sincerity of this country, its parliament and government. There are reasons why I am saying this and I will proceed to give them soon enough.

[Shri Nath Pai]

Before that I would, however, like to say this. The desire for avoiding the use of atom for war, and to use them for peaceful purposes is one that transcends all curtains, all those imaginary curtains, about which we have been told, iron curtains, bamboo curtains and other curtains. This is a desire that is, I think, fully shared by people of all countries throughout the world, because it is our future that is threatened, and more and more particularly if the scientists are to be believed, the future of generations that are to come. We do not want to quote an Alfred Schweitzer, or Oppenheimer, or Otto hahn or scientists from the USSR, or the USA, because we have seen what an atomic bomb can do. We do not want to bother ourselves about megatons, whether they were 20,000 tons TNT, TRI nitro-toluene, or something else. There is Nagasaki and Hiroshima standing and warning as a beacon before mankind. That was just enough and if that was not enough the fate of the unfortunate Japanese fishermen who suffered from the fall-out when they were as much as two hundred miles from the scene of the explosion would have been enough. This is a thing, Sir, that is like a thorn on the minds of all citizens throughout the world. That is a common factor. We find the leaders of the two blocs who have manufactured, these mobs, "with atomic bombs in their hands hidden behind them saying, 'You stop your explosion; I will stop after you have done.' That thing has been going on. I am reminded of that touching cartoon by David Low where the leaders of the two blocs with the deadly weapons hidden behind them, each looking at the other and saying, 'You stop yours; you are manufacturing'".

India can play her part here because it is our *bona fides* that perhaps will be believed by the world. When I make this statement it is with a sense of fear and apprehension. It is true that the two blocs talk con-

tinuously of the necessity or the desirability of stopping the explosions, stopping the tests. What prevents them? I think the Prime Minister has repeatedly hit the nail on the head when he said that at the core of the whole problem is the atmosphere of fear and suspicion that the two blocs entertain about one another. And unless we do as, I think, very largely this country and its Government have been doing, i.e. to try to help and remove this fear and suspicion we will not be solving this problem.

India had been able to play some part in the lessening of this fear and this suspicion. What has happened today? This is what I want to say, that when we pass this resolution I do not want the people in the world to feel that "here they are joining the ranks of those who always raise the cry of peace, peace, peace in all the languages of the world or say 'stop the atomic bomb'." In the past, when India came out with a proposal, the world took it most seriously. There was danger in Korea, and India came with a solution. We are proud of this fact that this nation contributed very largely in stabilising peace and averting a major catastrophe in that area, which would not have happened but for the sagacity and wisdom which this old nation brought to bear on the problem. Then again the world hovered precipitously on the danger of a major catastrophe in Indo-China. Once again we contributed something to bring about sanity to a mad world. But I do not feel that we are enjoying today that wonderful position which we then enjoyed, and I am very sorry to say this. I will not be going much into the past, but if this appeal is to be taken with that degree of seriousness with which the pronouncements of this nation and its Parliament have been treated by the world, we must go to something that has happened in the immediate past. Permit me, Sir, to say this, because I never make personal remarks; I was touring many countries in Europe

during the past few months; and I found people whose love for this country cannot be impeached, whose loyalty to the cause of this country and whose basic belief in the integrity and honesty of the political stand this country has taken from time to time cannot be impeached, express some anxiety, some worry about what we have been doing. The world has believed in our approach, evaluated and accepted it on the basis of the face value of it. But there is no longer that conviction in the world that if there be any power throughout the world which approaches international problems not with any axe of its own to grind but really basing its policy on certain moral principles whatever the propaganda machines of the other blocs may say, it was India whose foreign policy was based and guided by certain moral principles. I think, Sir, the very unfortunate things that led to the equivocations, to the vascillations on defining our attitude towards the tragedy in Hungary have made many people worry about the moral basis of our country. Can we blame them? It was our Prime Minister who in Miltonic terms in his memorable address delivered to the American Congress had said, "When freedom is threatened, justice is menaced or aggression takes place; we shall not, and cannot, remain neutral". That is a policy epitomized in a few words..which no one could have questioned or can question. The world was legitimately expecting that we adhere to that policy embodied in those golden words. Many people, I am sorry to say, think that we fell from that standard. In our foreign policy, we have to restore the old confidence, if an appeal like this is to succeed, that never shall this nation defect from its path of approaching and deciding foreign policy on sheer merits. We shall not be lectured or cowed down. How nicely were we told when we were needing rice and there was the danger of starvation, 'we will rather go hungry and die than sell the basic principles of our foreign policy.' That

was some stuff. Once again the world will have to be shown what India has to contribute. We cannot threaten as other nations threaten," if you do not do this, our Sixth Fleet will be coming." We cannot threaten the world, "if you do not stop aggression, our rockets will be flying against you." What was our sanction? What was the basis? Historians will be wondering for a time, how could a nation, militarily so poor,—with due respect to our Defence Minister, militarily so poor—have played so important a role in the counsels of the world. It was the moral sanctions you had created, supported by the combined will of 400 million people. That was the basis and foundation of the foreign policy of this nation. Once again we will have to bear the force of this moral sanction of India to persuade those who are power-mad and going from one explosion to another. If we do so, we may once again play our due part in bringing sanity to this world.

The atom has got, perhaps, potentialities of destruction of the world. But, it can re-create another world too. We have quoted scientists about the dangers of atomic explosions. Perhaps, in taking the new task upon which we are about to embark, let us remember that the most conservative estimate shows that we can conquer the deserts of Sahara, Gobi and Rajasthan if the atom is harnessed to peaceful purposes. We can wipe away all the poverty, all the squalor, all the misery if the atom is harnessed. Who disagrees that it can be and it should be harnessed? But, there is one nation that can persuade the world to throw away the bomb and use the atom, and that is India. That we can do if we show once again that we stand firmly committed to the policy of non-involvement, not shaken by any threat or any promise. Difficulties, there will be. We shall encounter them and face them boldly. Neither promise, nor threats shall deflect us from that path. If we do this the world will be persuaded to listen to the voice of this nation.

Shri V. Raju (Visakhapatnam):

Sir, it was with a great deal of interest that I listened to the speech of the Defence Minister. As the House would remember, I rose to ask permission to have a full-dress debate on foreign affairs. I do feel that during this session, Parliament should be allowed to debate Foreign affairs. You, Sir, were very kind and pleased to inform me that I should write to you and you may then allot a day for Foreign affairs separately and that today's debate may be restricted to the atom bomb and hydrogen bomb tests that are taking place.

Mr. Speaker: I did not say that day will be allotted.

Shri V. Raju: I did not say you said it. I said that you asked me to write to you and that you might consider the possibility of having a full-dress debate on Foreign affairs. However, I have the feeling that, although this Resolution is very close to or borders closely on Foreign affairs, the greater stress today is upon the scientific aspects of atomic weapons on the one hand and the moral case for the banning of those weapons. I do not want to spoil the harmony in this House by saying that a pious resolution of this nature would not achieve the objective that we attempt to fulfil. There can be no dispute throughout the world that atomic weapons should not be used. There is also no dispute that the development of atomic weapons, that is, the active test of these weapons is itself dangerous irrespective of their being used during war. Further, the testing of the weapons themselves is a type of war on mankind *in toto*. It is a universal war that is being fought between all little men in the world whether they are Russians or Chinese or Indians or Americans and the various Governments that are fighting this war against the common man of these countries. And nowhere in this resolution do I find a condemnation of any one of these Governments

for waging war against mankind totally and excusing themselves in the fact that they by testing these weapons are hoping to defend merely their individualistic civilisations or patterns of living which they have evolved. I think the Defence Minister was very keen on saying that it is not our purpose to criticise any one of the great Powers. Then what is the purpose of this resolution, I would ask. I say we must condemn all of them collectively if necessary, without any fear or favour as far as we are concerned, and therefore to that extent, if we have no fear of condemning the great Powers, whether it be the U.S.A., U.S.S.R., or the U.K., then we must basically consider the case for this condemnation.

What exactly would we gain by this condemnation? What exactly do we lose by this condemnation? If I was told to discuss mere *real politik*,— and I think most political parties and more so parties which are in power tend to become *real politik*, and as such when we become *real politik* we forget even the hereditary background of the evolution of our political party. It is not for me from the Opposition to discuss the question of non co-operation and satyagraha. I think there is a larger group of direct living *sishtas* or students of Mahatma Gandhi. They in their very huge fight for the Indian revolution used the whole question and technique of non-violence. They took suffering upon themselves. The negative process was used to prove something very positively that man through the path of peace, through the acceptance of an inner suffering could achieve the freedom of his country. In a similar manner, I would like to say here and now that the use of the technique of non co-operation can and should be introduced in our foreign policy, especially when it deals with the case of atomic weapons and their use. If this is not taken in hand at

this moment, then this resolution becomes meaningless. I also could subscribe to it, because whatever you call it, strontium 90 or 900, would become part of my diet. I am a vegetarian myself and I would not like to start eating meat merely because of the danger of an atomic fallout. And what about the poor animals who eat vegetables. We are I suppose indirectly going to consume all those things. All these fears are there. Therefore I would agree to any sort of resolution that is passed so far as the scientific aspect of these atomic tests is concerned. But so far as our foreign policy is concerned, so far as the direct effect of our policy on this matter is concerned, I want the Government to be positive. It is not merely a question of destruction from the atomic bomb or the hydrogen bomb. The whole question of destruction even from the bow and arrow arises at this stage of the history of mankind. The present Government as a Government of a sovereign State uses all forms of armaments. I can name you a more destructive weapon, possibly a more gruesome type of weapon which is being used in the world today. It is the Napalm bomb. It is far worse than the atomic and hydrogen bombs. At least they kill us outright, but the Napalm bomb destroys the skin surface and burns us completely, and human beings live without having any possibility of having any skin on them. There are many other gruesome weapons which are available, and therefore in our foreign policy we must be prepared at every stage to condemn aggression whatever the cost may be, and this I say the Government of India has not been doing.

Take the question of Egypt just a few months back. What happened? A European country, not merely one, the U.K., but also France and Israel attacked it. I do not know whether to call Israel a European country or an Asian country. All my sympathies are with the Jewish community because I know what Hitler did to

them. I know the difficulty of a minority which strives with an ideal, with a conscious mental ideal, and which can survive after a period of three thousand or four thousand or five thousand years. We, for our part, are very proud of our civilisation which is five thousand or six thousand years old. Why should the Jews also not be proud of their civilisation? Let them be proud of it. The Israeli tribes may have crossed the deserts round about 3,000 or 4,000 B.C. I am very happy that they are as old a civilisation as we are.

But, during all this period, with all the suffering that they have had to go through in these generations, they have not learnt the humility necessary to know that after all, one cannot pay back suffering with the same type of aggression. But this is precisely what they have done in Egypt. And with their European extraction, with the higher percentage of arms aid, and with the dollar loans that they have obtained from the United States, they have been arming themselves also. And what is the position?

The European nations which have got the financial capacity and also the scientific technology to build atomic weapons do not use the atomic bomb; they do not have to. Why should they? To defeat Egypt, you do not have to use atomic weapons. But if you want to have a war somewhere between Western Germany and Eastern Germany, there, of course, you must store atomic weapons, because it is possible that both parties use the same weapons. But as far as Egypt is concerned, we do not have to use atomic weapons.

I would like to ask, 'What did the Indian Government do in this situation?'. I know there are many friends here—and I am not one of them; I would like to make that clear—who would like to vitiate that issue with certain internal problems that arose at the same time in Eastern Europe. I am not one of

[Shri V. Raju]

those who have felt that merely because the Egyptian question was there, and the Hungarian question was also there at the same time, we should go into them, and we should equally balance these issues in our foreign policy. Even among the spokesmen of the ruling party, some took one side, while some others took the other side; some condemned the Prime Minister and his Government for being too lenient on the Hungarian question. There were others who did likewise on the Egyptian question.

I take neither side in this issue. But I would like to point out clearly one thing. Even on the basis of humanitarian considerations, did we condemn in this Parliament, in this House, the action of a superior nation to try and rape an inferior or weaker nation? We took no such action. Even today, the Government of India cannot declare a policy of no war against even its own neighbours. We have not come to peace even with Pakistan. I would say, let us take unilateral action and pass a resolution that we will not use our ancient Sherman tanks against them—or perhaps we are a little more advanced at the moment; we are buying what are called jet fighters which can go through the sound barrier, by diving and not while on a level flight, while probably our neighbours are supposed to have fighters which travel through the sound barrier on level flights; so, we are still slightly inferior to them, as far as conventional armaments are concerned. But, during all these years, why did we not pass a resolution, making it the opinion of this House, that, whatever the occasion may be, we shall not go to war? That does not mean, of course, that if Pakistan or somebody else attacks us, we should not defend ourselves. But, let there be a categorical statement that we would never consider the question of war. Let such a resolution be passed in this House, and let us and not merely the question of our own neighbours, but let us also

pass a resolution condemning all aggression, including the British aggression in Egypt. Let us be positive in our actions. Let us leave the Commonwealth. Let us take action against the British for having....

An Hon. Member: What action?

Shri V. Raju: Leave the Commonwealth. After all, I am not concerned with the money you have got or the financial contacts that you have to maintain with the Commonwealth. I am not here to give you answers or to pick out your chest-nuts out of your fire. If your foreign policy is to be practical, if it is to lead to some sort of benefits internally, that is your business. You should find out why you have failed in those regions. As far as I am concerned I am dealing with the question of war and aggression and I say that unless we categorically state that we ban the use of all weapons, conventional or otherwise, these mere platitudes will be of no avail. After all we are not a small nation; we are one-fifth of the human race. (An Hon. Member: One-sixth). We are one-sixth and possibly the oldest with our neighbours the Chinese as far as continued civilisation or tradition is concerned. And I am sure that if one-sixth of the human race non co-operated with the world in many ways—there are many ways of this non co-operation—and actively and positively condemned the aggressor—in this case, Russia, America and Britain—for continued testing of these atomic weapons, I am sure there will be more salutary and positive benefit than by this House passing this resolution.

Shri Supakar: I thank the hon. Defence Minister for bringing a resolution which voices the feeling of the whole of India at her horror in the use and testing of atomic weapons by big Powers. But, I am sorry to say that he is not able to accept my amendment.

Explosions

I submit that it is not enough if we appeal to the three big nations who are experimenting with these nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons and playing with the lives of hundreds and thousands of people. I submit that it is not enough to call a conference of nations which are powerless spectators of this growing menace to the world population. It is not even enough to condemn the big powers in their playing with these terrible weapons which may some day cause the destruction of mankind. I would submit that the world, after the year 1945, has put much of its faith in the United Nations Organisation and we must see that the United Nations Organisation has, as an article of faith, the banning of nuclear weapons and the manufacture and testing explosions of these nuclear weapons.

The Defence Minister has spoken in great detail about the devastating effect of these weapons, and how they may some day cause the destruction of the human race. It is high time that we put an effective check to the cold war that is being waged by the big nations which had divided themselves into practically two blocs and are canvassing the support of the other nations to make the world come to a total conflagration. This cold war is gaining ground and more and more military alliances and treaties like the SEATO, MEDO, NATO, etc. are coming into being and are increasing in numbers. At the same time, these horrible explosions and experiments are growing in number and volume with dangerous consequences. It is time for us to put all our pressure on the UNO to take a bold step in curbing these dangerous tendencies of the big powers.

You will remember how the League of Nations was born out of the ravages of the First World War and how it was sabotaged by the formation of military alliances. After the formation of the U.N.O. about 12 years ago at the end of the Second World War, we find all these military alliances and these test explosions are being carried

out. At this stage, we must take a bold step and approach the U.N.O. to be active and put pressure on them to stop this cold war and nuclear explosions for all times to come.

We are the heirs of Lord Buddha, Asoka and Mahatma Gandhi and we should take the lead in this matter and take up the case in the U.N.O. and ask it to incorporate this as an article of faith in view of the fact that the U.N.O. is going to meet within a month to consider the possibility of amending its Charter.

Though the Defence Minister may not agree to accept my amendment, I hope he will do his best and that our representative in the U.N.O. will do their best to see that those powers which carry out those dangerous experiments and who play with the toy of mass suicide of human race are brought to book and that they are no longer allowed to play with this toy.

19 hrs.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kannara): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the hon. Prime Minister whilst inaugurating the first reactor institution in Bombay during the last year said:

"We shall not utilise our atomic energy for violence. I am sure even my successor Governments will honour this pledge."

This, Sir, is our sheet anchor and the core of our defence and foreign policy. This policy is based on our ancient philosophy of tolerance, on the policy of Panch Shila which we not merely declare but practice. We shall not display any panic when bombs may fall around us or far from us. We are not carried away by the ravages of any philosophy, be it communistic or aggressive capitalism.

The Prime Minister, on an earlier occasion when the U.S.A. were carrying on nuclear tests around Japanese waters expressed grave concern on behalf of the nation, that these tests were carried on to the utter detriment

[Shri Joachim Alva]

of the Japanese people—that was about two or three years ago—and thereby struck a chord of kinship with our Japanese brethren. The voice of the Eastern people has been raised, not seldom against these tests being carried on in the Asiatic and African zones. Africa has been so far spared. The Marshal Islands, the Pacific Islands and the Christmas Islands—the name bears the name of Christ—are being used for experiments by the powers of the West or even by the U.S.S.R.

We want to know why Japan was bombed on August 6, 1945 at Hiroshima, when Japan had sought peace, when Japan had begged for peace even before the second war ended through the intervention of the Vatican. Why was Japan selected as a testing ground by President Truman to drop this atomic bomb, when the war was over on one side of the western world and the war was just getting over on the other side of the eastern world also?

Two or three years after, the war ended in Europe I was in the Skoda Factory at Praha. The manager of that factory told me—that is one of the largest factories of Europe that the Americans bombed the factory and they were reduced to ashes when the war was almost getting over. When Hitlerite aggression was rampant in Czechoslovakia, we have known how Hitler reduced a village next door to Prague and the villagers said that not even cats, mice and dogs were spared of the terror. That village is famed in the history of freedom and known as LIDDICE. Today it is not a question of cats, mice and dogs. Everything will be destroyed by nuclear warfare.

I want to know how America with its prosperity can afford the risk of a war; how the U.S.S.R. with all the horrors that it underwent under Hitlerite aggression can afford the risk of a nuclear war. Maurice Dobb has said in his book *Soviet Economic Development Since 1917* (Publisher

Routledge & Kegan Paul) on the development of Soviet Russia detailing the effects of Hitlerite destruction. He says:

"The countryside in the path of the German retreat for hundreds of miles was made a wasteland, devoid of livestock and buildings and often of inhabitants. Nearly 2,000 towns, 70,000 villages and factories employing 4 million persons were partially or wholly destroyed, according to official calculations, and 25 million persons were rendered homeless. Contemporary Soviet estimates placed the sum of this appalling devastation at half the material devastation in Europe."

Whilst, on the other hand, looking at the prosperity of United States of America one shudders to know how the United States of America is risking away its prosperity in the pit of nuclear war. The prosperity of the United States of America has been described in *The World The Dollar Built* by Gunther Stein (Publisher: Dobson). This is the description of U.S.A. prosperity immediately after the war. It says:

"The United States, as a whole, has never been so prosperous in peace time as in the late forties and early fifties. This may seem surprising in view of the enormous post-war growth of America's national income pyramid. It stood at 183 billion dollars at the climax of the war, in 1944. By 1947 it reached almost 200 billion dollars, nearly as much as the combined incomes of all other nations on earth. By 1948 it was 223 billion dollars. In 1949, at 217 billion dollars it still equalled two-fifths of the aggregate of a world that had practically recovered from the war, or the combined incomes of all Western Europe, the British Commonwealth, all of Asia, Africa and South America."

19.6 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair]

I am describing the prosperity of the United States on the one hand and its possible destruction and how the U.S.S.R. suffered in Hitlerite Germany to show how the two great powers are tossed against each other.

Admiral Strauss, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission of the U.S.A. has said that the United States and the U.S.S.R. today are engaged "the cold war of the class-rooms". It is not merely a cold war of the class-rooms but a hot warfare that will blow humanity to pieces.

The resolution moved by the hon. Defence Minister is in consonance with the motion that was passed exactly two years ago at Bandung. There, 29 nations resolved that,

"This conference considered that disarmament and the prohibition of the production, experimentation and the use of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons of war were imperative to save mankind and civilisation from the fear and prospect of wholesale destruction".

That is the resolution passed by the Bandung Powers consisting of 29 nations—African and Asian Powers—in April, 1955. This resolution has come up before the Parliament of India at the appropriate time, not a day later, so that the attention of peace-loving Indians and the peace-loving peoples of Asia and Africa may be focussed and united together, so that we may unequivocally express our voice on the side of peace.

In the Nehru-Bulgarian-Khrushchev statement of 13th December, 1955, the leaders of the U.S.S.R. and India thus declare:

"In particular, the leaders of both countries wish to emphasise again their strong conviction that there should be unconditional prohibition of the production, use and experimentation of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons".

Unfortunately, the Marshal of the British Royal Air Force, Sir John Slessor, says:

"The hydrogen bomb carries for us a message not of despair but of hope".

This is the way the militarists have got the upper hand over the civilian populations and the civilian ministers expressing a language on behalf of the populations. It was the Labour Party in Britain that sanctioned the production of the atom bomb; and it is the Tory Government that sanctioned the production of the hydrogen bomb. Exactly a month ago in the House of Commons, there was a big debate on defence matters, when the Tories passed a resolution expressing their belief in the ultimate deterrent of the hydrogen bomb. The Labour Party moved an amendment saying that they did not believe in the deterrent of the hydrogen bomb, but it was too late for the Labour Party itself to turn the course of events so as to make its voice felt clearly. It had divisions in its own ranks and it could not face both ways. Mr. Duncan Sandys, the British Minister of Defence, said in the debate, spotlighting the intention of the West that "nuclear disarmament by itself would be disastrous since it would give decisive military superiority to Russia which would always be able to maintain a larger conventional force".

It is a great pity that President Eisenhower is perhaps overwhelmed by the opinion of the powerful Pentagon. Then again, the NATO, as the heart and core of the entire defence policy of Western Europe, stated that they are opposed to the banning of the tests of hydrogen bomb. They have stated their clear opposition to it. So, on one side, we have one part of the world declaring its opposition to the banning of tests and the other willing to give it up. I hope the resolution as expressed by other countries and as expressed by the hon. Defence Minister and some other Governments as well as this Parliament of India, will

[Shri Joachim Alva]

emphasise the spirit of opposition to the nuclear weapons.

The world was living in fear during the second world war that Hitler would unleash the bacteriological or germ warfare from his armoury; but even Hitler did not dare to unleash bacteriological or germ warfare, though of course he sent V-2 rockets across Britain. But today, by pulling the simple trigger, the world can go to pieces, through the showing or display of the armed might of nations by their nuclear weapons. We stand aghast and feel that a war is coming near us with a dreadful prospect of atomic weapons. The arming of Pakistan with the U.S. arms may result in a "Pearl Harbouring" of the Indian Air Force. It is a possibility which we cannot ignore or forget. However rosy the prospect of peace may be between India and Pakistan, there may be the possibility of our Indian Air Force and our defence forces being "Pearl Harboured" in a second by the Pakistan Air Force and her military strength as a result of their being armed by the superior weapons of the U.S.A. Yet we shall remain calm and serene and hopeful of the future, without any bitterness towards our enemies or towards those who are raising one type of warfare against the other. We have witnessed in our generation right before our eyes the wanton destruction of Egypt by France and England. England was the leader of democracy, but may it be said to the credit of the British Labour Party that they stuck to a man and prevented the Tories from carrying on their programme of aggression aided by a free world, aided by America and the effective intervention of the U.S.S.R. But what we cannot understand is the Eighth Fleet of the U.S.A. being stationed in the Mediterranean within an easy reach of 1,500 miles of the bombing range of Hungary, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Poland and even Moscow, then coming down on Beirut, showing them their fists and telling the Jordans, "We have come in a friendly spirit; if you want help, we

are ready to help you". This is not the temper of peace. This is not the temper of peace shown by great men of the calibre, nobility and standing of President Eisenhower, who have seen the ravages of war. But if the Pentagon and other NATO leaders are determined by show of might to disturb this temper of peace, the world stands shaken up. The great progress made at Geneva at the Summit meeting and the moral elevation that the world then experienced has been sabotaged; and, today we are on the brink when a simple trigger perhaps will destroy this part or that part of the world.

It is in the fitness of things that India, as a nation wedded to non-violence, wedded to peace, a nation that has had the grand old leader, Mahatma Gandhi, a country down the ages giving the message of peace, should now enforce this message to the world; that we pass this resolution unanimously without a dissenting voice, whatever the amendments may be.

I found my esteemed friend, Mr. Nath Pai, who has done fairly good work for the cause of Goa abroad, splashing cream, butter and honey when he spoke about our foreign policy. But he brought a bit of gall when he said that he did not approve, or that his friends in Europe did not approve, of our stand on Hungary. I wish my friend had read the debates in the last Parliament when this matter of Hungary was debated at length and the replies the hon. Prime Minister gave in regard to the stand taken by the gallant leader of our delegation, Shri Menon at the U.N. in regard to Hungary. Had he been fortified with the perusal of the debates in the Indian Parliament on the question of Hungary itself, he perhaps would have been in a better position to round off what he gave us in terms of praise.

I shall not take much time of this House. I would say this much that Africa and Asia are really perturbed.

Africa and Asia shall no more be made the guinea-pigs for further experimentations in the nuclear tests. We today are on the brink of this disaster and perhaps the combined voice of the world, the combined voice of the peoples of the world, will finally triumph and achieve for us what perhaps armies and battalions may not be able to do. Ours may be the only lonely voice; ours may be a voice that may not be heard by the powers that be, may be in Washington or Moscow. But, as I stated already, the peoples on one side of Europe, the whole of Europe, have seen the ravages of war and would not risk facing another war. Whilst one nation is full of prosperity, I want to know why the Atlantic Ocean is not made the testing ground for these experiments and why the Eastern waters alone are being chosen for experiments. I hope that our voice will reach across the corridors of time, across the corridors of the chancelleries of the world and in the next few weeks a strong voice will rise in all parts of the world, so that the prohibition and the suspension of these nuclear tests may be a reality.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, on many previous occasions, hon. Members sitting opposite have complained about our foreign policy and complained chiefly because they said that we acted as knight errands going out into the far corners of the world and taking upon ourselves the burdens of other countries. Today I was happy to find that what we have done in the past on many occasions was referred to with some degree of appreciation. It took some time perhaps for the facts to sink into the minds of hon. Members on the opposite side.

19.15 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair.*]

Some of those who used to criticise us, today spoke in appreciation of what we have been doing. At the same time we are called upon to do something which we were warned previously not to do.

Some hon. Members have sent their amendments and have spoken on this motion. What is this? Mere sentiments. Stand up and do the right; check others from doing evil; prevent others doing that. Be knight errands, hold the world by your broad shoulders. Now I do not quite understand these two contradictory approaches to this problem.

Some Members have said that in this long resolution there is no condemnation, not a word of condemnation. Now that gives me a clue as to what this wonderful action was that was demanded. The action presumably was strong language of condemnation. That in the mind of some hon. Members has become the biggest action they can indulge in—strong language.

This is too serious a matter to be dealt with in this way. It is true that this resolution expresses sentiments, in moderate, temperate language, nevertheless it expresses them powerfully and strongly. And it is no small matter for this Parliament of India to express its sentiments in a formal resolution.

An hon. Member in an amendment says that this resolution be sent on by post or telegram, or whatever it be, to some other Parliaments, notably to the three great powers which possess these hydrogen and atomic bombs. Now, I submit, Sir, that the passage of this resolution in this House is something much more for the world, not only for our country, but the world, than sending it in an envelope to some other House. I know it has sometimes been the practice of some Parliaments to send resolutions like this to other Parliaments. If I may say so with all respect, Sir, I do not want this practice to be adopted by this House. We pass resolutions and it is for the world to read them and they do read and take notice of them, because we do not pretend, we should not pretend, to do something that is beyond our capacity and power.

Hon. Members have said: you must go and check the cold war; you must

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

do this; you must do that. I was a little surprised with all this, as if this House, or this country,—let us be clear about it—has it in its power to go about managing the affairs of the world, to put an end to the cold war, of checking aggression in Egypt or somewhere else or interfering, or condemning or checking what has happened in Hungary, as if we can do all this. Surely, the first thing for us to realise is how far we can go, and how far we cannot go and not to indulge in talk or in resolutions or in some kind of action which is utterly beyond our capacity. If we have attained some respect in the eyes of other countries of the world, it is because we have spoken with some sense of responsibility, with some sense of, not condemning, but trying to win over the other people, certainly expressing our opinion with firmness but we have always tried not to condemn. And I want to tell the hon. Member who accused us of not condemning, that this is our deliberate, well thought out policy not to condemn. Of course, the mere expression of an opinion is condemnation of a contrary opinion; that is another thing. We may express our opinion strongly, whether here or elsewhere in the United Nations. That is a different matter. But the whole point is this, that when you are dealing with a situation like this, cold war, etc., where parties to that cold war indulge in the strongest language against each other, the moment you enter that sphere of strong language and condemnation, you cease to have any real effect. Immediately, whether you wish it or not, you are parties to the cold war this way or that way. And the approach to reason, the calm approach to reason or to the emotions of the other party is lost. Of course, if I may say so, not that I pretend to act up to it, but it may be said to be, to a small extent, the Gandhian approach. I do not presume to be capable or to be worthy of following Gandhiji in his policy entirely. But anyhow we have all learnt something from him.

But apart from the Gandhian or any approach, may I say this? And when I say Gandhian approach, the hon. Member talked about satyagraha as if satyagraha was something, shall I say, some action devoid of the motives behind it, devoid of the complex of circumstances, devoid of the voice and temper of the person indulging in it. I say if satyagraha is to be talked about, satyagraha should be understood. Satyagraha is not going to prison or breaking people's heads—certainly not—or indulging in strong language or condemnation. That is not satyagraha. It is entirely opposed to the spirit of satyagraha. Merely abstention from using weapons is neither satyagraha nor peace. Satyagraha ultimately is the approach of the mind, the friendly approach of the mind, the peaceful approach of the mind, the approach to win over the other party. However, I cannot go into this question now.

But I do submit that in this particular matter if we go about saying things or doing things which we cannot give effect to, we do not do any credit to ourselves or to the cause we seek to serve. Hon. Members often say "Hold a conference". Am I to summon the leaders of the U.S.A., the U.S.S.R. and U.K. and other countries to come to Delhi and tell them what to do? Surely, Mr. Speaker, to this House I should have thought that such a proposition would have appeared rather unreasonable—I use very very mild language. That is not the way. If someone summoned me like that saying "I will tell you what to do", he will get a curt answer from me, however big the country may be. And for me to summon the great leaders of great countries—whether I like them or not is another matter—would be presumptuous in the extreme. And nobody would come. Conferences are not held in this way—saying that the Prime Minister thinks it worth while to summon the leaders and Prime Ministers and Heads of States and tell them how they should behave! It is

neither diplomacy nor politics of anything. I cannot understand this—"summon a conference, whether anybody comes to it or not, you go on summoning". I suppose hon. Members opposite have got some idea in their heads of some type of conference to which they have got accustomed to attend. But this is a different matter. And even if a conference is held, it will be a different type of conference, and it will be of persons in conflict with each other. It is not asking a few friends to come and having a jamboree about it. Therefore, if we want to be effective, in so far as we can be effective—I do not claim to say that we can be ultimately effective; it is a very difficult thing to presume; one tries to do one's best—how are we to proceed? If we were in a measure effective, say, in the Korean affair or in the Indo-China affair—I think we were, in a measure, effective in helping to bring about peace—it was not through a conference, it was not through powerful speeches; it was through quiet, long continued hard work, conducted in all modesty, without any shouting, without any publicity. Therefore, we managed to achieve some result. Therefore, we cannot consider this matter which has raised, as the House knows well, strong feelings all over the world, lightly.

I think, as hon. Members realise, the basis of it is fear. Fear, overwhelming fear of the other party is some extraordinary thing: these countries which possess hydrogen bombs talking about, we are prepared to give it up if the other party gives it up and nobody gives it up. Wide proposals are put forward; a chain of test explosions is taking place while the proposal is being considered. I am not criticising or condemning even that although I dislike it intensely. I am merely venturing to point out how unrealistic all this business is. The reality is, overwhelming fear that the other party might go ahead, that if we hold our hand even for one day or a month, the other party may go ahead and so do not allow the other party to go ahead.

How to deal with the situation? By command issued from New Delhi? By passing resolutions of condemnation everywhere? I submit that is not the way. We have to proceed as strongly, but as cautiously as possible in this matter. This is not the first time that we have taken up this. The Mover of this Resolution reminded this House how three years ago, I think, in 1954, I ventured to speak on this subject in this House and put forward a proposal in all humility, about the suspension of these tests. At that time, that proposal was rather treated with a certain measure of levity by other countries, by other people that we come into the field and make these proposals not understanding the great issues at stake. Later, this matter was discussed in the Disarmament Sub-Committee of the United Nations. A long statement was made by us about disarmament generally and more particularly about these matters. It is a big statement. Here it is. That was referred to the Disarmament Commission. We have been pegging away at this matter,—pegging away not merely in the broad sense of talking about peace and goodwill among men—that is good—or at public meetings—it does not help by itself—pegging away as precisely, as scientifically, with practical proposals: not vaguely, not by condemning—that is no good—; not merely by talking about peace and goodwill, which are very desirable. That also does not help in solving the problem. We have put forward every time, whether it was Indo-China, whether it was any place, practical suggestions and proposals; whether it was Egypt or any other place, we have always tried to avoid condemnation. The hon. Member has brought in the case of Hungary. Now that is not at issue, but I should like again to repeat—in Hungary what happened? The particular occasion to which he probably refers is when the matter came up before the United Nations. The Secretary-General had been asked to enquire and report. The Secretary-General came and said that he was not ready at that time to report. Thereupon some countries, more particularly

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

our neighbour country, immediately brought up a resolution of condemnation. We said: "You must wait for the report of the Secretary-General and then we can deal with the matter".

Shri Nath Pal: But no tanks need have been used, you would have prevented that. I agree with the rest of you, Sir.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Talking about a certain resolution brought forward by Pakistan especially and some other countries condemning, we said that at that stage when the Secretary-General said he could not report, we should wait for his report. As a matter of fact, if you wish to read what has been said there and in this House, we expressed our strong disapproval at the things that occurred in Budapest and the rest of Hungary, at the killing and the use of tanks and the suppression of what I called in this House a strong national uprising. But again, in that matter too, we were up against a highly difficult and explosive situation which some of us thought might, in the course of days, perhaps blow up into a world war. It is easy enough to express one's opinion, but when one is confronted with such a situation, one has to think first of all of avoiding this huge blow-up and then do anything else. However, that is not the point dealt with here.

My submission to the House is that in this resolution we should confine ourselves to what has been said. In a sense, of course, the resolution itself is disapproval, otherwise we would not ask for it, but if you condemn you close the eyes of other people, and people immediately begin to think this person or this country is ganging up against us, and we enter, whether we wish it or not, into that thick atmosphere of cold war in the mind of the other, and reason does not count there.

The hon. Member said something about a no-war declaration by us in regard to Pakistan, in regard to other

countries, that we should make it unilaterally. I should like to inform the hon. Member—he is new to the House, and that is why he does not know—that we have made it unilaterally, not once but many times, and in writing, in this House. We have stated it perfectly clearly that we will not go to war with Pakistan, we will not use our defence forces against Pakistan on any account unless we are attacked, when certainly we will have to defend ourselves, and we will defend ourselves. I go a step further and say that that is our general policy, and it is on that we try to base our defence forces.

Shri V. Raju: May I interrupt for a moment?

Mr. Speaker: On a point of personal explanation, is it?

Shri V. Raju: When I raised the question of a no-war declaration, I also meant that it carries with it the responsibility to condemn aggression elsewhere also. Mere passing of a no-war declaration without the duty of condemning aggression elsewhere would be totally negative, that is what I would say.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not understand the connection between the two. Whether condemnation is desirable or not may be considered on merits, but I venture to say that in the murky atmosphere of today—at any time, but especially in the murky atmosphere of today—this kind of condemnation of other countries does not convince them of their wrongdoing. In fact, I may say we deal with Pakistan and we have disapproved a great many things that Pakistan has done, but so far as I am concerned, I have tried to restrain myself as much as I can in regard to condemnation etc., of Pakistan's activities.

Now, there are just one or two other matters. I wish to make one thing clear with regard to the criticisms which is made in these amendments,

'What is this? This is only a pious sentiment. What are you going to do about it?' Well, what is suggested to be done, if I may say so, may also be termed a pious sentiment. What more is it? Shouting loudly does not help. It may be an impious sentiment, if you like. Ours is a pious sentiment it may become an impious sentiment, but sentiment all the same. It is said that we should call a conference together; well, it may be some kind of action, but, I have pointed out that conferences are not called in this way, and if they are called, they are not likely to have any response. It is not done in this way.

Therefore, I do submit that we should pass this resolution as it is without bringing in other factors. For instance, I believe, in some amendments, something is said about the Commonwealth; it is said that we should break our contact with the Commonwealth. As to whether it is desirable or not, I do not think it is desirable—I have stated it in the House—for a variety of reasons. It does not come in my way or in the way of my policy or any policy; it helps me to further our policies in various ways. But whether it is desirable or not, it is certainly absolutely undesirable to tuck it up with this thing. Immediately, you bring in other issues. You bring in another mentality here and elsewhere. And your appeal is lost, because this new mentality is created. So, I submit that all these other amendments, these attempts to tuck on things, really take away from this resolution the dignity of this resolution which goes from this House to the world and undoubtedly to those Great Powers which are most concerned, as well as other Powers.

I submit, therefore, that this resolution should be passed as it is.

Mr. Speaker: Is it necessary to continue the debate now?

Several Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members who have not had a chance to speak will have many other chances to speak on various other matters.

Now, is it necessary to put any of the amendments to the vote of the House?

Several Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: So, I take it that none of the amendments is pressed. Does the Defence Minister want to reply?

Shri V. K. Krishna Menon: No.

The amendments were, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker: So, I shall put the resolution to vote.

The question is:

"This House views with anxiety and concern the continued development and production of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons of mass destruction which, if employed in any armed conflict, would spell the destruction of mankind and civilization.

(2) This House expresses its more immediate and grave concern about the present menace arising from the harmful and unpredictable effects of radiation consequent on the continuing explosions of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons for test purposes which are carried out by the United States, the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom.

(3) This House regrets and deplores that despite the declared intentions of all nations not to embark upon war and in the face of the mounting opinion and anxiety in the world in regard to the grave and growing menace of these tests of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons, to the present and the future of mankind, the Great Powers concerned have not abandoned their programmes of such test-explosions. These have already proved injurious to popula-

[Mr. Speaker]

tions in lands both far and near to the location of such tests and dangerously pollute the world's air and water and threaten the present and future generations with known and unknown risks and consequences.

(4) This House further expresses its considered opinion that the proposals at present canvassed for the so-called Limitation and Registration of these tests will not help to rid the world of the dreadful consequences of radiation to present and future generations, nor pave the way to the abandonment of these weapons of mass destruction. On the other hand, such regularisation would tend to make thermo-nuclear war seem more legitimate and to appear to have the sanction of the world community.

(5) This House earnestly appeals to each and all of the three Great Powers concerned at least to sus-

pend without further delay their programmes for the explosions for test purposes of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons pending agreement on their discontinuance and the abandonment of the production and stock-piling of such weapons.

(6) This House considers that if any or all the Powers concerned take the initiative or agree to the suspension of their test-explosions, a substantial contribution would be made to rid the world of the fear which has led to the present armaments race and open the way for the lowering of tensions, progress towards disarmament and international co-operation and peace."

The motion was adopted.

19.38 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, the 3rd May, 1957.