

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Shrimati Ila Palchoudhuri .

SHRIMATI ILA PAL CHOUDHURI (Krishnagar) : *rose*.

AN HON. MEMBER : What about the half-an-hour discussion ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Please wait. Let her start.

SHRIMATI ILA PAL CHOUDHURI : When I heard the Member opposite. . . .

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : You can continue tomorrow. Now we take up the half-an-hour discussion.

18.37 hrs.

HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION

MANUFACTURE OF ATOM BOMB BY INDIA

श्री कंबरलाल गुप्त (दिल्ली-मदर) : उपाध्यक्ष जी, हमारे देश के चारों तरफ दो शत्रु हैं— एक चीन और दूसरा पाकिस्तान। चीन के पास 150 एटमबम हैं और चीन न्यूक्लियर पावर में जितनी प्रगति की है, शायद दुनिया की आशाओं से ज्यादा प्रगति की है। यू० एस० ए० गवर्नमेंट का एस्टीमेट भी गलत हो गया है। पाकिस्तान भी तेजी से उसकी तरफ बढ़ रहा है और आज हमारे देश में हमारा हिमालय और हमारे समुद्र हमारी रक्षा नहीं कर पा रहे हैं। एक तरह से एटमबम हमारे लिये It is a must for our survival. हमारा सर्वाइवल इस के बगैर नहीं हो सकता In spite of the Indian Army, Navy and Air Force, India is to-day defenceless against China.

उपाध्यक्षजी, मैं फ्रांस के एक बहुत बड़े जनरल को यहां पर कोट करना चाहता हूँ जो पिछले दिनों भारत में आये थे। उनका नाम था— जनरल प्रोफर, उन्होंने पेरिस जा कर एक आर्टिकल लिखा जो वहां के एक अखबार में छपा। उन्होंने लिखा—

“In the long run the principal menace to India's security comes from China's nuclear power.”

अब अध्यक्ष महोदय, सवाल यह पैदा होता है कि चाइना जो हमारा शत्रु है उसके पास एटम बम हैं तो हमारे पास उसका क्या जवाब है, ये जो ट्रेडिशनल आर्म्स है ये उसका जवाब नहीं दे सकते। या तो हम किसी ब्लाक के साथ जायें, अमरीका या रूस के साथ जायें, लेकिन वह हमारी पालिसी नहीं है और होने भी नहीं चाहिये। दूसरा मार्ग यह हो सकता है कि हम खुद एटम बम बनायें या हम यह सोचें कि चाइना कभी एटम बम इस्तेमाल नहीं करेगा और करेगा तो रूस या अमरीका हमारी मदद करेंगे— ये चार आल्टरनेटिव्स हो सकते हैं।

अब यह सोचना कि चाइना कभी एटम बम इस्तेमाल नहीं करेगा— मैं इस बात को नहीं मानता, वह जरूर इस्तेमाल करेगा। लेकिन किम हालत में नहीं करेगा— आपका याद होगा 1952 में यु. एस. ए. ने चाइना को कहा था कि तुम 38 पैरलल कोरिया में क्रॉस न करो, अगर क्रॉस करोगे तो हम न्यूक्लियर पावर यूज कर सकते हैं, नतीजा यह हुआ कि चाइना ने उसको क्रॉस नहीं किया। 1958 में अमरीका ने चाइना को कहा कि वह न्यूक्लियर पावर का इस्तेमाल करेगा अगर उसने क्यूमाय और मत्सू आइलैंड्स को आक्यूपाई करने की कोशिश की। उसी तरह से रीसेन्टली 1966 में अमरीका ने उसको कहा कि तुम वियतनाम के मामले में इन्टरफीयर न करो, वरना न्यूक्लियर वैपनज का इस्तेमाल हो सकता है, परिणाम यह हुआ कि आगे बढ़ने की उसकी हिम्मत नहीं पड़ी। इसलिये यह कहना कि चाइना इस्तेमाल नहीं करेगा, यह गलत बात है।

दूसरे— अगर वह इस्तेमाल करेगा तो क्या रूस और अमरीका हमारी मदद के लिये आयेंगे? दूसरे क्यों मदद के लिये आयेंगे।

आपको याद होगा जब पाकिस्तान ने अमरीकी टैंकों के साथ हम पर हमला किया, हम चिल्लाये कि पाकिस्तान अमरीकी टैंक इस्तेमाल कर रहा है, लेकिन अमरीका ने उस वक्त कोई ध्यान नहीं दिया। यह जो अम्ब्रेला बना है, जिससे हम आशा करते है कि यह बारिश में काम न आये, बल्कि ऐसे मौके पर काम में आए, यह तो तब ही काम में आ सकता है, जबकि उसमें उनका स्वार्थ सिद्ध होगा, वरना यह काम में नहीं आ सकता।

यह भी हो सकता है जैसे कश्मीर का सवाल आया और अब रूस वालों की राय भी बदलती जा रही है, अमरीका कहता है कि कश्मीर पाकिस्तान की तरफ होना चाहिए और चीन भी दबाव डाले इस मामले में तो अगर ये चारों पावस एक हो गई और आप पर दबाव डाला कि आप कश्मीर दे दीजिए तो आप क्या करेंगे? मैं सरकार से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इसका जवाब क्या है? क्या देश की डिफेन्स और सिक्योरिटी इसी तरह से नंगी रहेगी? यह एक सवाल है जिसका जवाब सरकार को देना चाहिए हम शांतिप्रिय देश हैं लेकिन यह एटम बम जो होगा वह एक डेटरेन्ट होगा। हम किसी पर आक्रमण नहीं करना चाहते लेकिन कोई हम पर आक्रमण नहीं करेगा उसके लिए यह डेटरेन्ट होगा।

अब सवाल कास्ट की आती है। हमारे जो सरकार के एकसपर्ट है वे कहते है कि 8 हजार करोड़ आयेगी। मैं समझता हूँ यह एक एकसड चीज है। 8 हजार करोड़ की कास्ट कमी नहीं आ सकती है। जो यू० एन० आ० की फीगर्स है उन फ्रीगर्स को लेकर के, जितना डेवलपमेंट अब हमने कर लिया है और उसके अलावा डालर की कीमत उन्होंने साढ़े सात रुपए लगाई लेकिन चूँकि हमारा लेबर सस्ता है—साढ़े चार रुपए उसकी कीमत लगाने के बाद और हिन्दुस्तान में लेबर जितना सस्ता है उसको देखते हुए मेरा ख्याल है करीब आठ सौ करोड़ के एटम बम बनाने पर खर्चा आयेगा। प्रोफेसर स्वामी

जो कि आवर्ड यूनिवर्सिटी के लीडिंग एकोनामिस्ट है उनका कहना है कि करीब साढ़े सात सौ करोड़ एटम बम पर कास्ट आयेगी। और उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इसमें सवाल सिर्फ कास्ट का ही नहीं है बल्कि सवाल हमारी आजादी और हमारी एग्जिस्टेंस का है। इसके रास्ते में ऐसे का सवाल नहीं आना चाहिए। यह पॉलिटिकल सवाल है। इसकी एकानामी क्या है, वह सवाल तो बाद में पैदा होता है। पहले तो हमें एक पॉलिटिकल डिसेंजन लेना है कि आया हमें एटम बम बनाना है या नहीं बनाना है। इस पॉलिटिकल डिसेंजन के बाद एकोनामिक्स उनकी टार्जिंग और फेजिंग को डिटेमिन करेगी। लेकिन यहाँ तो उसका उस्ता हो रहा है। इसलिए मेरा कहना है कि इसमें कास्ट का सवाल नहीं आता है। मन्त्रों महोदय यह कहेंगे कि रुपया कहां से आये, सारा डेवलपमेंट रुक जायेगा। लेकिन सवाल यह नहीं है। अगर कन्ट्री के सामने यह प्रॉब्लम रखी जाये कि कन्ट्री की डिफेन्स, सिक्योरिटी, आजादी खतरे में है ऐसे शत्रु के मुकाबले में जिसके बारे में कुछ नहीं कहा जा सकता तो लाग अपनी वेल्ट टाइटन करने जो भी सरकार मांगेगी वह देंगे। वे अपना घर नालाम करके रुपया देगे। सन 65 की लड़ाई में हमने इस बात को देखा है कि हिन्दुस्तान के आदमी इस बात के लिए तैयार हैं लेकिन इसका डिटेमिनेशन सरकार से होना है। लेकिन सरकार तो गोल माल बातें करती है। आज हमारा डिफेन्स नंगा है, इसका जवाब सरकार को देना होगा।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, अगर हम एटम बम बना लेते हैं तो हमारी प्रॉस्पेरिटी भी बढ़ेगी। हमारी इन्डस्ट्री में रेवल्यूशन हो जायेगा। हमारी चीजें सस्ती हों आयेगी। हमारा इम्पोर्ट जितना आज है उसमें आधा ही रह जायेगा। जितने इंजीनियर्स आज हमारे यहाँ अनाम्प्लायड हैं उनमें से एक भी अनाम्प्लायड नहीं रह जायेगा, सब के सब इसमें लग जायेंगे। हमारे देश का जितना ब्रेन ड्रेन है, आज हमारे देश का जितना ब्रेन अमरीका में है, अमरीका में हिन्दुस्तानियों की संख्या सबसे ज्यादा है, टेक्निकल लोग जाँकि

[श्री कंबरलाल गुप्त]

वहाँ गए हुए है, यह बड़े आश्चर्य की बात है। मैं आपसे द्वारा बताना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे जा आफिसर्स है, क्लस तीर से जा इनके क्वेश्चन है, मुझे दुख है कि डा० भाभा ने जो एक कन्वेंशन रखा था, वे उससे परे जाना चाहते हैं वे अमरीका और रूस के दिभाग में चलते हैं। अमरीका और रूस हिन्दुस्तान को मजबूत देखना नहीं चाहते है। वे इस देश को हमेशा कमजोर देखना चाहते है ताकि उनको पंजां व हमेशा के लिए हिन्दुस्तान रहे। अगर आप एटम बम बनाते है तो देश में एक अटल विश्वास आयेगा कि हां, हमारे पास भी एटम बम है, हमारी भी कुछ ताकत है, हम फिर ऊँचा करके दुनिया के सामने चल सकते है। हमारे इन्डस्ट्री, हमारी अनाएम्प्लॉमेंट प्रॉब्लम, हमारी इम्पोर्टर्स इतना चीज हमारे यहाँ बढ़ेगी कि हमारे देश की एकानामी का धक्का लगने के बजाये, मैं समझता हूँ हमारे देश की एकानामी बहुत आगे बढ़ जायेगी।

अब आखीर में एक सवाल आता है कि नान प्रॉलिफरेशन ट्रीटी के बारे में हमारे देश के उपर दबाव पड़ रहा है। मुझे मालूम है कि दोनों बड़ी बड़ी पावर्स हमारे देश पर दबाव डाल रहे हैं कि इसपर साइन करा। मुझे खुशी है कि हमारी सरकार मजबूती से उसका मुकाबला कर रही है। लेकिन आप यह ध्यान करिए कि इसपर हम साइन नहीं करेंगे क्योंकि देश की सेक्योरिटी के लिए यह जरूरी है। वे अपने आप तो एटम बम बना रहे है, उनके पास टेक्निकल ना-हाउ है, वे यह भी नहीं कहते कि हमारे पास जो एटम बम है उनका इस्टिमेट करेगे लेकिन दूसरों से कहते है कि आप मत बनाइये क्योंकि वे अपने बराबर में किसी का रखना नहीं चाहते। यह एक अजीब बात है। हो सकता है कि आखीर में हमने एटम बम नहीं बनाया तो एक तरह से आप समझ लीजिए कि हमें सूसाइड के साथ रिकन्साइल करता चाहिए। हमने रिकन्साइल कर लिया कि हमारी आत्महत्या होने वाली है।

अब मैं दो तीन सवाल पूछ कर समाप्त करूंगा। पहले तो मैं प्रधान मन्त्री को बधाई देता हूँ कि उन्होंने कन्सल्टेटिव कमेटी में कहा कि हम इसकी कास्ट के बारे में स्टडी करेगे और इसकी फीजिबिलिटी के बारे में हम स्टडी करेगे। ता इसकी कास्ट कितनी आयेगी इसमें लिए प्रोफेसर स्वामी को भी बुलाइये जाकि एक एक्सपर्ट है और दूसरे लोगों को भी बुलाकर इसकी कास्ट, इसकी फीजिबिलिटी, कहाँ हम है, कितने दिनों में हम इसको बना सकते है - देश चाहता है कि आप ये सब बातें बताये।

दूसरे - क्या यह सरकार, जो उसकी इस वक्त पोजीशन है कि हम एटम बम नहीं बनायेगे उसपर रेव्यू करने के लिए तैयार है? मैं कहता हूँ कि कम से कम यह कमिटीमें तो मत करिए कि हम नहीं बनायेगे। अगर आप कुछ भी नहीं करना चाहते तो कम से कम यही कहिए कि हम कुछ भी नहीं कहना चाहते - बना भी सकते है, नहीं भी बना सकते है। कम से कम इस तरह से नान-कमिंटल तो होइये।

अब मैं सरकार से कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह देश की मिक्वांरिटी और डिफेन्स का म्वाल है, हमें किसी पाटों का म्वाल नहीं है। जब चाटना का म्वाल आता है तो हो सकता है कि हमारी मिलिट्री पावर कन्वेंशनल आर्म्स में बहुत अच्छी होगी लेकिन न्यूक्लियर वीपंस के सामने हम टिक नहीं पायेगे। इसका जवाब देश सरकार से चाहता हूँ। मैं मंत्री महादय से प्रार्थना करूंगा कि वे ऐसा जवाब दें जिससे कि देश में तसल्ली हो और देश जोकि आगे बढ़ना चाहता है उसकी तसल्ली हो।

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा (मधुबनी) : उपाध्यक्ष महादय, अब इसके कि मैं म्वाल करूँ, मैं चाहता हूँ कि हम हिन्दुस्तान के पिछले इति-

हास को भी देखें। जितने कारण थे उनमें एक जबर्दस्त कारण यह रहा कि हिन्दुस्तान आखिर में युद्ध के मैदान में अप टू डेट नहीं हुआ। हिन्दुस्तान हर एक बात में आगे था लेकिन लड़ाई के मैदान में और देशों के मुकाबले हिन्दुस्तान अप टू डेट नहीं रहा और इसी लिए हिन्दुस्तान की किम्मत का पलड़ा इधर से उधर हों गया। आप पानीपत की पहली लड़ाई को देखें। और भी इसी तरह के उदाहरण हैं कि जब यहां पर अंग्रेज आये तो उनके पास फायर आर्म्स थे लेकिन जब आखिर में फौजला होने लगा तो पलड़ा इधर से उधर चला गया। इसलिए यह सोचना होगा कि आने वाले दिनों में हिन्दुस्तान फिर वही रिक्त नै तो फिर कहीं आजादी का पलड़ा इधर से उधर न हों जाये। पं० जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने अपनी पुस्तक, डिस्कवरी आफ इंडिया में लिखा है कि हिन्दुस्तान पीछे क्यों गया जबकि और देश आगे बढ़ गए। इस सन्दर्भ में मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या डा० भामा ने कहा था, जबकि वे जीवित थे कि हिन्दुस्तान की कंपेन्सिबिलिटी 18 महीने में एटम बम बनाने की है। जबकि चाइनीज इन्वेजन हुआ था उस वक्त उन्होंने जेनिवा में यह स्टेटमेंट दिया था। यदि यह बात सही है तो हिन्दुस्तान ने उस दिशा में क्या प्रगति की है ?

दूसरे क्या यह सही नहीं है कि डा० भामा ने इसकी कास्ट को फीगर आउट किया था कि 15 लाख या 18 लाख, जो भी उनका हिसाब था, वह खर्चा पड़ेगा एटम बम बनाने में ? यदि यह सही आकड़े हैं तो हिन्दुस्तान का क्या दिक्कत हो रही है उनको बनाने में ? जब एक एक टूअर में लाखों रुपया खर्च किया जाता है तो वैसे दो चार टूअर बन्द कर दिए जायेंगे और एटम बम को बनाया जा सकता है।

तीसरी बात यह है कि न्यूक्लियर इन्वेजन चाहे इधर से हों या उधर से हों, उसका मुकाबला करने के लिए अप टू डेट मान में आपके पास क्या इलाज है ? चौथी बात यह कि पीस-फुल परंप्रजे के लिए आपके पास जा न्यूक्लियर

मशीनरी या प्लान्ट है उसको आप जरूरत पड़ने पर जल्दी से बार परंप्रजे के लिए कन्वर्ट कर लेंगे, क्या यह कंपेन्सिबिलिटी आप में है ?

आखिरी बात मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि पाकिस्तान को अमरीका न्यूक्लियर मेटेरियल दे रहा है, क्या उसकी आपके पास कोई जानकारी है ?

SHRI SRADHAKAR SUPAKAR (Sambalpur) : We know that under the Constitution of India the Government can enter into a treaty and it is not necessary that it should be approved beforehand by the representatives of the people. All we ask the hon. Minister is to give this House an assurance that so far as this vital problem of signing or not signing this non-proliferation treaty is concerned, they will not take any positive step of signing this treaty without first obtaining the opinion of this House. Secondly, having regard to the importance of the problem, will the Government give us an assurance that even if they are determined not to make the atom bomb for almost all time to come, they will prepare a strong infra structure by which, if there is any short time danger of our being attacked by China or Pakistan with the help of China and other powers, we should be in a position to meet the threat without taking recourse to help from other nuclear powers ?

SHRI A. SREEDHARAN (Badagara) : In the field of atomic development we began fairly well, and in 1954 we were ten years ahead of China in the atomic field, but due to the gross inefficiency and indifference of this Government, China has stolen a march over us, in spite of the fact that we have a tremendous potential in atomic minerals. Compared to other countries we are even richer than the U. S. A. in atomic minerals, but the Government have not taken into consideration the exigencies of modern warfare. No modern war can be fought with conventional weapons.

Today's newspapers say that a country like France has developed guided missiles to deliver atomic warheads in any part of the world with tremendous precision.

[Shri A. Sreedharan]

This factor has got to be borne in mind. The Government has never been tired of telling us that the manufacture of the atomic bomb will entail a lot of expenditure. My colleague Mr. Gupta has pointed out that according to modern estimates what is required will be only Rs. 750 crores. I do not think it is going to be very difficult to raise this amount because we have yet to collect Rs. 400 crores of income tax arrears. We can mobilise our resources to manufacture the atom bomb if only we plug the loopholes by which good, precious money is flowing out.

Time and again the hon. Defence Minister has been telling us that we are thoroughly prepared for any eventuality in the event of an aggression, that if Pakistan or China attacked we are ready to meet the challenge. If tomorrow China attacks us and uses the atom bomb, what would be his defence weapon to meet it. India has no atom bomb. Will he depend upon some of the big powers which have the atom bomb and will he assure the House that by depending upon them he will not become a satellite of those Powers ?

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE AND STEEL AND HEAVY ENGINEERING (SHRI SWARAN SINGH) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can understand the anxiety of hon. Members. This matter has been before the House on several occasions. The important thing to consider now is whether any particular aspect has been highlighted which necessitates a change in our policy. The arguments advanced by my esteemed friend Shri Gupta and repeated by other hon. Members were already placed before the House and they had been very carefully considered and weighed by the Government. We have taken the view that we have to assess the priorities and see what is the risk involved.

Situated as we are with long borders with Pakistan and China and knowing the type of relationship that prevails today between us and our two neighbours, let us clearly understand what is the total threat and what is the type of threat that

we are facing. The first thing we should remember is that in any defence arrangement we cannot show any let-up in our preparedness for a conventional conflict. That means that for preparations against conventional war and saving the country's sovereignty and integrity from any interference, we have to maintain a certain minimum number of armed forces. In this respect the Air Force and the Army with all the supporting equipment and arms assume high importance. It is after considering this that we have come to the conclusion that a certain army has to be maintained and certain minimum number of Air Force Squadrons should be maintained.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI (New-Delhi) : The question is about nuclear arms.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I know your views but you have to be patient.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : On a point of order.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I do not give in; what point of order can arise at this stage ?... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : The hon. Minister is giving the impression that nothing new has happened. In fact the NPT has been ratified the other day. In this context the Minister himself has made a statement on the floor of the House. He is against vertical proliferation. That is the crux of the matter...

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I shall ignore this interruption as there is no point of order.

When we talk about defence we have to keep before us a certain minimum commitment to maintain our army and our Air Force and to sustain it by the type of equipment which we have been able to mostly manufacture ourselves. In essential critical items of a sophisticated nature, we have not hesitated to import them. It is quite obvious that the resources of the country that can be earmarked for defence have

to be taken note of. Thus some inescapable commitments have to be kept in view in order to find out whether there is any surplus which can be utilised for the type of things which had been mentioned by my hon. friends opposite. It is very brave for anybody to say: let us take a political decision; economics will take care of itself. The history of the world shows that any country that has taken a political decision without caring for economic consequences finds itself in wilderness; it will be unwise for any country. We know of other countries which always talked of confrontation and containment and adopted other aggressive postures. History is witness to the collapse of any such bravados and brave statements unless they are backed by technological and economic resources. Why I am mentioning that the build-up or the organisation of conventional aspect is absolutely inescapable is because of the proximity of long land borders with both our neighbours. These problems are not faced by many countries. For instance, even such a powerful country as the United States does not face such a problem. So, our resources have, in the first priority, to be earmarked for the development of our conventional defence potential and this is an essential thing which is absolutely inescapable.

19 hrs.

Having said that, what do we expect over the next five to ten years? This question of hostility of Pakistan against us, the continued pressure from China, the collusion between China and Pakistan—these are the aspects about which I have dwelt at considerable length on several occasions before this House, and I would not repeat it. Our careful assessment is that for several years to come, the essential threat that we will have to face will be of conventional warfare.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA :
What is your basis?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : This is the entire basis, and therefore, if there is any risk of a nuclear character, still, the main threat will continue to be of a conventional warfare, and it will be

wrong for any person who is in charge of defence to show the slightest let up in the matter of build-up on the conventional side.

If in a situation like this, we have to take a careful view of the implication which are there, what is the position? I agree with Mr. Kanwarlal Gupta that the problem is no doubt political; and there are political ramifications of it. What has happened now? It has been mentioned that the signing of the nuclear proliferation treaty has altered the situation. But I have carefully considered this aspect and even Mr. Sondhi was good enough to concede that I have enunciated the government viewpoint in relation to the non-proliferation treaty in this House, and I adhere to that view. I continue to hold the view that we can never agree to sign a non-proliferation treaty which is essentially discriminatory in its character, which does not take note of vertical proliferation and which does not take us even a step further towards stopping the mad race of increasing the nuclear arsenal of the super-powers and those who belong to the nuclear club. Also, even in the development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, it puts constraints and restraints which are totally unacceptable to us. For all these reasons, we have taken the attitude that we will not sign the nuclear proliferation treaty, and we will not sign it. That is a decision which has been made clear in the United Nations, in the Disarmament Conference and even in the discussions relating to the non-proliferation treaty. Nothing more has happened.

Everybody knew that after the non-proliferation treaty is ratified by 40 countries or so, it will become operative. That minimum number of ratifying countries has been reached, and there are several countries who have signed this non proliferation treaty. There are several countries who have not signed this treaty. That has not altered either the nature of the threat to us or the overall problem that we face in the matter of defence.

A great deal has been said and figures have been quoted from newspapers and the rest about the cost aspect of this programme. It will be absolutely naive for us to rely upon figures without a careful scrutiny. The United Nations constituted a Group and they have gone into this,

SHRI KANWARLAL GUPTA : Will you have your own study?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : The United Nations undertook a study of the cost aspect and they have put forward certain figures. They have produced a document which is a public document. It is not a private document, and copies of it can easily be obtained.

There are other aspects of it, but about the matter of the cost involved, there should be informed opinion. It is necessary for us to understand the implication. According to an expert committee of nuclear scientists appointed by the Secretary General of the UN, any country desirous of being equipped with modest nuclear capability would require an outlay of 170 million dollars or roughly Rs. 130 crores per annum, spread over a period of about 10 years. That means, the total comes to Rs. 1300 crores. This is not enough, unless you have got a sophisticated delivery system. For that, you in fact require 560 million dollars or Rs. 420 crores per annum. This when spread over a period of about 10 years, will come to Rs. 4200 crores.

SHRI M. L. SONDHAI : What are these things — ICBMs IRBMs or what? We do not want to strike the United States. We only want something to deter China or Pakistan.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : We do not want to strike a monastery. If the hon. member has any sense of geography, he will know that to hit the populous part of China, it must go up to 2000 miles. Any deterrent must be credible.

As I said, the total comes to about Rs. 4200 crores+1300 crores in a period of ten years. One has to consider that. If we take a decision, we should view all the aspects. It is no use saying, take a political decision the economies will take care of itself. Unfortunately, economics does not take care of this.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA : On a point of order, Sir, The Prime Minister said, Government will have a study of its own regarding the cost and feasibility of the atom bomb.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: Then why did you want to raise this discussion? Why not wait for the Government study? If you provoke a discussion, you should be prepared to hear the other view also. There is no use glossing over hard facts. I am coming to what the Prime Minister said.

My friend asked about France. I have got the figures. For a twenty-year programme spreading from 1956 to 1976, out of which 14 years have already passed, the total provision is 15,000 crores. We should also remember that France is not yet a first rate nuclear power. They have thought of it more in terms of what Mr. Kanwar Lal Gupta has thought of, i.e. as a political handle rather than real striking power of the type that Soviet Union or USA have developed today. It is therefore necessary for us to take all these things into consideration and then take a decision.

I have also got another information. Nuclear development, striking capacity as well as fissionable bomb have a tendency to become out of date very soon. A most modest estimate is that just to keep up the capacity you have to spend another Rs. 500 crores to 700 crores a year to keep pace with the replacements of what become obsolete in a cycle of nine years.

SHRI M. L. SONDHAI : Are you going to be stopped by the non-proliferation treaty? If he could not give any satisfactory explanation then we have to presume that he is repeating what Mr. Kosygin told him in Moscow.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I hope he does not take his lesson from any body else.

SHRI M. L. SONDHAI : I take it from the soil, from India.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I have taken the figures from the United Nations paper in which outstanding scientists from both nuclear and non-nuclear countries have participated. It is a scientific document and I would commend it for careful study. This is about the level of cost.

Then, what is experience of other countries? Can I assure the country that if we possess 30 or 40 bombs then the country

will be secure against the threat? I would be doing an injustice to my responsibility I were to give that impression. It is like saying that the other side has got, 1,000 tanks or so, well, as a moral booster let us have a couple of tanks. It does not function that way.

What are the Super Powers doing today? I would like to take this opportunity of explaining to the House that a very keen controversy is going on about the anti-ballistic missile programme. Both the United States and USSR have embarked upon what is called an anti-ballistic missile programme to counteract the missile threat.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : But have they reduced their stockpile ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: The estimated expenditure for that is 60 billion dollars. Both sides are now thinking that this is a mad race. In fact, the scientists on either side are trying to convince them that the anti-ballistic missile programme is not likely to succeed and therefore, why should they make such heavy commitments for that. I am not mentioning all this to bolster up the figures. This is a race in which once you enter you cannot stop in some amateurish manner merely because some professor of economics tells you that you can spend this amount and then stop there. This is a thing in which you cannot stop. That is the basic thing. You have to go from one to the other, from atom bomb to the hydrogen bomb, to the missile carrier, to the delivery system and so on.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : This is a new version of the Domino theory.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : What is the conclusion that is to be drawn from this ? I am not saying all this for the sake of argument. The hard reality is that today there is no defence against a nuclear attack. Let us understand it quite clearly. Even the most developed countries have come to the conclusion that they cannot defend themselves against nuclear attacks. Therefore, our effort has been to create a situation where the use of nuclear weapons may be avoided and the mad race for increasing the arsenal and adding more and more of hydrogen bombs, atom bombs

and ballistic missiles that race may be stopped.

Some hon. Members light-heartedly talk of a nuclear strike or nuclear attack. I hope they have studied the figures which have been given. According to the most modest estimate the country which first strikes, and there are only two super-powers which can do that, can kill within half an hour about eight to ten crores of people. When the retaliatory big strike comes the number of persons killed will be about seven crores. So, within about one hour, as many as 17 to 20 crores of people will be killed. We do not know what will happen later. Today their arsenals are so full that the entire world can be obliterated many times and no vegetation and no animal be left. We do not know for how long the after-effects will last.

When we know this destructive aspect of the use of nuclear energy, is it possible that any country will be permitted the use of it in any part of the world, more so against a non-nuclear country?

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : Japan.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : It was used against Japan when the United States was the only country which had nuclear power and no other country had it. Now so many countries have got nuclear power and it will be absolutely mad for any nuclear power to use it against a non-nuclear power. And for what purpose? It is such a destructive thing. Do you think the world will sit with their legs crossed, treaty or no treaty? Do you think that crores of people will be permitted to be just obliterated with all the effects of the fall-out and the other aspects that are so important?

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : This is the most irresponsible statement made by any person.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I would say, it is the most irresponsible criticism.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : I can challenge you.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I know, you can challenge, but you do not understand the point (*Interruption*)

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : You are going against the assurance given by Nehru, Shastri and Shrimati Gandhi. It is a new exercise in political evasion. This is the result of Soviet and American pressure. You have denied the assurance given by the Prime Minister. Let us have full facts and figures. We cannot allow this House being misled.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I want to puncture this sort of balloon which the Jana Sangh Party for political reasons floats from time to time.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : There is on question of Jan Sangh. (*Interruption*)

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : It is my duty to place facts before the House and the country and not to be hushed into anything. (*Interruption*)

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : Has your policy of comprehensive test ban treaty been accepted? Can you show one concrete achievement of your policy? And you come here and mislead this House.

Mr. DEPUTY--SPEAKER : Order, order.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : We have been elected by the people of India. This is an important issue. We want an informed debate on this. It lies in your power. You give a short duration discussion or some other thing.

Mr. DEPUTY--SPEAKER : Please give a separate notice for that.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : The senior Minister is indulging in cheap political vendetta I object to it. If the CP (M) had been here, they would have given him such hell that he would have run away. Do you want the Jana Sangh also to do what the CP (M) does?

Mr. DEPUTY--SPEAKER : At the moment the debate is confined to this. You hear the Minister fully. No purpose will be served by just shouting at him. If you are not satisfied with the answer, there are other avenues open to you; but please do not interrupt him now.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : My hon. friend has mentioned that the Prime Minister had said something in the Informal Committee. Mention was made and accordingly the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission invited the attention of hon. Members to the reports submitted by the Secretary-General to the United Nations on the effects of the possible use of nuclear weapons and the security and economic implication in the acquisition and further development of these weapons. This report was prepared by a panel of international experts of which the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission of India was also a member. Upon the request made by hon. Members, the department agreed to prepare a paper containing authoritative information available on the subject and provide it to them. We will certainly do that. That is an assurance that has been given. The assurance that was given— I should put the record straight—was that the available information will be collated and the information will be supplied after culling it from the various documents.

Having said all that, it was my duty to point out the risk of a nuclear explosion, also the cost involved and the economic effect of it. I know that people can lose their temper and simply explode. But in a serious situation like this, unless we understand all the implication there is no use just working one self up. We have adopted a clear policy. And to whittle down that policy and to try to raise the point again and again and not to expect us to follow the policy which we have adopted after very careful consideration is very unfair. There is no use creating an impression without any change in the policy and it will be wrong for the hon. Members to create an impression that there is any change in this considered policy which we have adopted after very careful consideration.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA : You are deceiving the whole country.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Nothing has happened during this period which calls for any change.

I will try to answer the specific points which have been made. The point raised

by Mr. Sreedharan—I have already covered and I have given the figures about the cost.

About signing the non-proliferation treaty I have enunciated the stand of the Government in this respect. We know the opinion of the hon. members and Government's opinion is also the same. There is no need of any assurance in this respect. If there is any change, we will certainly inform the House. We have not yet established the convention of consulting the House before entering into such treaties.

The other point raised is important that we should develop all the technology, all the know-how, all the scientific data and the scientific information so that we maintain our advance in the nuclear field. This is very necessary to develop our strength in the economy, in the industry and in every sphere.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH (Rohtak) : If Pakistan makes an atom bomb, what will be our position ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : They will not succeed.

The other points raised by Shri Shivachandra Jha—I find he has left the House. So I am not called upon to reply to those points.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA : My last question is : will you have a scientific study of the costs and the feasibility ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Science is foreign to Mr. Kanwar Lal Gupta.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA : It may be foreign to me, but what about you ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Mr. Jha raised several points like cost factor, etc. I have already covered them. Then a question was put : if there is a nuclear invasion, will there be any defence ? I have already said that hardly there can be any defence against nuclear invasion. Then a question was put : will USA help Pakistan in manufacturing atom bomb ? They will not because they have not helped any country. If there is any country which has developed the atom bomb, it is on their own. No other country helps except, I think, the Soviet Union did help China in the initial

stages but they further carried it later on their own. I have no doubt that the USA will not help Pakistan to develop nuclear bombs.

Most of Mr. Kanwar Lal Gupta's points were arguments. At the end he also put one or two questions. He said about cost and feasibility study. I have already given the estimate of cost as is available to us. As the Prime Minister has already assured, the relevant data can also be put in the form of a paper containing some pages if the hon. Members want.

SHRI KANWARLAL GUPTA : Not on the basis of the U. N. study but on your own study.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : We agree broadly with the estimate of cost given in the UN paper.

You should not put a question for which you expect an inconvenient answer. You should remember that we have top most scientists and our Principal Adviser is Dr. Vikram Sarabhai : I am very sorry that any doubt should have been raised, about his competence or capacity or his patriotism. He was also a member of that group and scientifically a group of scientists went into all those figures. There is no use shutting your eyes to the realities. If the realities are inconvenient, you should be able to face them rather than shut your eyes to them.

The second question was : why should we say 'No' all the time ? I would ask why should we put such a question ? We should project ourselves in the fast changing situation and make an assessment for some years to come. Why should you ask hypothetical questions. ? You do not expect me to answer hypothetical questions. There is no use raising such hypothetical issues.

Sir, the primary consideration is our security. At the present moment, the policy that we are adopting assures our security. If the situation changes, we can again decide what other action we should take. You should not raise hypothetical questions and then expect me to answer in a hypothetical manner.

[Shri Swaran Singh]

So, Sir, I have covered all the points.

श्री रणधीर सिंह : चारों तरफ एटम बम बन जाय और हम बेगैर एटम बम के रह जायें, ऐसा न कर दीजिएगा ।

श्री कंचर लाल गुप्त : 64 में यही जवाब था, 65 में यही जवाब था और कुछ हुआ नहीं, देश का सत्यानाश करेंगे ।

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I would like to appeal to Hon. Members that it is very wrong and it is not in the interest of the country to raise doubts about the capacity of our country.

श्री कंचर लाल गुप्त : हाउस में राय ले लीजिए, घोपेन राय ।

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : We are not afraid of taking the opinion in the House on these matters.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA : I challenge you; let the opinion of the House be taken, I tell you I will win, don't use your whip.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : There is no question of challenge. (*Interruptions*) There is no question of challenge or counter-challenge. It is a matter which is an important matter, a serious matter, a matter which is of the highest importance and it should not be lost in challenges and counter-challenges. It should not be lost even in the ebullence of Mr. Sondhi. It is a matter for which we should give serious consideration.

19.27 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, March 12, 1970, Phalgun 21, 1891 (Saka)