

15.35 hrs.

serial numbers of the cut motions they would like to move.

DEMANDS* FOR GRANTS (GENERAL), 1980-81—Contd.

Motion moved:

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The House will now take up discussion and voting on Demand Nos. 20 to 25 relating to the Ministry of Defence for which 6 hours have been allotted.

Hon. Members whose cut motions to the Demands for Grants have been circulated, may, if they desire to move their cut motions, send slips to the Table within 15 minutes indicating the

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts on Revenue Account and Capital Account shown in the fourth column of the Order Paper be granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1981, in respect of the heads of demands entered in the second column thereof against Demands Nos. 20 to 25 relating to the Ministry of Defence."

Demands for Grants, 1980-81 in respect of the Ministry of Defence submitted to the vote of Lok Sabha

No. of Demand	Name of Demand	Amount of Demand for Grant on account voted by the House on 14-3-1980		Amount of Demand for Grant submitted to the vote of the House	
		Revenue Rs.	Capital Rs.	Revenue Rs.	Capital Rs.
1	2	3		4	
		Revenue	Capital	Revenue	Capital
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE					
20	Ministry of Defence	40,02,15,000	31,30,93,000	79,08,51,000	62,61,87,000
21	Defence Services—Army	748,70,54,000	..	1409,64,13,000	..
22	Defence Services—Navy	76,88,15,000	..	139,66,45,000	..
23	Defence Services—Air Force	287,57,66,000	..	578,90,54,000	..
24	Defence Services—Pensions	67,08,33,000	..	161,54,15,000	..
25	Capital Outlay on Defence Services	..	87,84,02,000	..	232,62,98,000

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Now, Mr. Ram Vilas Paswan to speak. you have been allotted 23 minutes. I will ring the bell as soon as your time is over.

*Moved with the recommendation of the President.

श्री राम बिलास पासवान (हाजीपुर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, कल एक प्रश्न के जवाब में रक्षा राज्य मंत्री ने कहा था कि वह हमेशा प्रत्येक बात का रीव्यू करते हैं, स्वयं हर बात को देखने की कोशिश करते हैं और वहाँ सुधार की आवश्यकता होती है, वह करते हैं। लेकिन मैंने देखा है कि डिफेंस सर्विसिज एस्टीमेट्स, 1980-81 के पेज 86 पर डिमान्ड नम्बर 25 में आरिजिनल कैपिटल आउटले दिखाया गया है 235.56 करोड़ रुपये और उसको रिवाइज करके दिखाया गया है 204.1 करोड़ रुपये। यह डिमान्ड आर्मी, नौवी और एयर फ़ोर्स के बारे में है। इसमें शार्टफ़ाल 31.55 करोड़ रुपये है। इस शार्टफ़ाल का कोई कारण नहीं बताया गया है।

[SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL in the Chair]

15.38 hrs.

सरकार बजट बना कर जनता पर टंकम लगाती है, मगर उसके बाद भी शार्टफ़ाल हो रहा है। इसी तरह पेज 99 पर बताया गया है कि वाटर मालाई स्कीम के लिए 3.96 करोड़ रुपये रखे गये थे, लेकिन खर्च हुए केवल 3.67 करोड़ रुपये। इसमें भी शार्टफ़ाल का कारण नहीं बताया गया है।

आज हमारी पश्चिमी सीमा पर पाकिस्तान तैयार खड़ा है। उसके पास एम-47 और एम-48 टैंक और 105 एम एम गन हैं, जो सीमा पर तैनात हैं। पूर्वी सीमा पर मिज़ो रेबल सक्रिय है, जिसके पास एन्टी-टैंक राकेट्स हैं। पाकिस्तान एक इस्लामिक एटॉमिक बम बना रहा है। चीन को यु एस ए आयुधों की आपूर्ति कर रहा है एक तरफ तो यह सब कुछ मच है और दूसरी तरफ बहा पर जो बजट बनया जाता है, वह भी खर्च नहीं कर पा रहे हैं।

मैं एक रिपोर्ट देखी है। पता नहीं, वह कहा तक मही है। अगर वह मही है, तो हमारे देश के लिए एक बहुत खतरनाक बात है। सरकार की ओर कहा जाता है कि हम सब मामलों में आत्मनिर्भर हो गए हैं, हमारा सैन्य बल बढ़ गया है। मैं चीन और हिन्दुस्तान के तुलनात्मक आकड़े देख रहा था। कोई भी ऐसा आइटेम नहीं है, जिसमें हम चीन से आगे बढ़े हैं।

रक्षा मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री सो० पी० एन० सिंह) : होसल में आगे हैं।

श्री राम बिलास पासवान : उसमें मैं आपके साथ हूँ। रहना भी चाहिए। जनसंख्या के आंकड़े तो संवेदित हैं। हमारा प्रतिरक्षा व्यय 3,000 करोड़ रुपये है और चीन का प्रतिरक्षा व्यय

29,000 करोड़ रुपये है। भारत की सेना 10.96 लाख है, जबकि चीन की सेना 43.25 लाख है। फिर उसी तरह आर्म्स डिवीजन है, इन्फेन्ट्री डिवीजन है, माउन्टेन डिवीजन है, इन्डिपेंडेंट आर्म्स है, इन्डिपेंडेंट रेजिमेंट है, पैरा ब्रिगेड है, काम्बट एयर क्लफ्ट है, यह सब पूरी लिस्ट है, और उसकी फिगर भी है, ये सारे जो हैं, लाइट काम्बर्स, ट्रांसपोर्ट प्लेन्स, हेलीकोप्टर्स, सजमैरिन एयर क्राफ्ट्स कैरियर सबमैरिनस क्वॉर्स, कारबेट्स, ये जितने हैं, मैं देख रहा था, कोई भी आइटेम, कोई भी चीज ऐसी नहीं है जिस में उस से ज्यादा आप के पास शक्ति हो। सिर्फ होसला है आप के पास लेकिन युद्ध के मंडान में होसला भी चाहिए, और हथियार भी चाहिए, टोनों चीज चाहिए। मैं आप से इतना ही कह रहा था कि आप उस को देखिए और जो लोग बजट बनाते हैं वह उसको देखें।

मैं एक बात डिफेंस की कहता हूँ। एक पैरा मिलिट्री फोर्स आप के पास काम करती है, सी० आर० पी० है, आसाम राइफल्स है, जिसे डिफेंस ने ले ही लिया है, बी० एस० एफ० है, और भी बहुत हैं, इंडो तिबेट फोर्सिज हैं, इन तमाम को आप ने ले रखा है। आज एक नया टेकनिक चल रहा है सब को एक कर के चलने की, हर मज को एक ही दवा में ठीक करने की, डिफेंस चाहता है कि वह सारे का सारा मामला अपने पाम ले कर चलते रहे। उस में क्या होता है कि एक विभाग की मोनोपली हो जाती है। मैं तो आप से आग्रह करूंगा कि देखिए सब चीजों को हम लोग इस आधार पर न कह दिया करे कि यह डिफेंस का मामला है, यह पब्लिक इटरेस्ट में नहीं खोला जा सकता है। जब सारी चीज पर बहम होती है और एक एक चीज से हम रोजमर्रा जुड़े हुए हैं तो सब चीजों को यह कह कर कि यह डिफेंस का मामला है, यह नाकेट चीज है, इसको खोला नहीं जायगा, मैं कहूंगा कि इस नीति पर पुनर्विचार कीजिए, और यह तो जो आपका डिफेंस वा चल रहा है कि सब को मिला कर हम अपने कब्जे में कर लें, यह ठीक नहीं है। जबकि 1962 में युद्ध हुआ, 1962 के युद्ध में आप को कोई पता नहीं चला और सब जब युद्ध छार गए तो अधिकारियों ने कह दिया कि हमारे पास साज सामान की कमी थी, हमारे पाम में हथियार नहीं हैं, उस के नाम पर फिर उनको रिवाइ दे दिया। जब 1965 का युद्ध हुआ तो कुछ आप ने दिया और कुछ आप ने लिया, सब मिला जुला कर बराबर रहा, लेकिन आप ने कह दिया कि हम जीते हैं। ठीक है जीते हैं, फिर आप रिवाइ दे दिया। 71 का युद्ध हुआ, फिर आप ने रिवाइ दे दिया। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ यह सारी चीज जो चल रही है इस को आप देखें।

अभी मैं एक पेपर देख रहा था, मंत्री जी ने शायद यह पेपर देखा होगा, यह 'आगनाज़र' है, इसमें अभी निकला है कि 400 करोड़ रुपये

का आपने सबैरिन का कामेट किया। अब वह जो टीम गई थी, वह दो देशों में घूमि, स्वीडन में भी घूमि और पश्चिम जर्मनी में भी घूमि। उस टीम ने स्वीकार किया कि स्वीडन को सब चीज अच्छी है पश्चिम जर्मनी के माकबिले में, कम दाम में भी है और वह जो आप एक एग्जिमेंट करते हैं वह सारी चीज जनवरी माह में ही कर के भेज दी। यहां से जो टीम गई थी उस टीम ने भी रेकमेंड किया लेकिन फिर आप ने पश्चिम जर्मनी के साथ एग्जिमेंट किया। यह आप का मामला है, मैं यह नहीं कहता कि कौन सही है, कौन गलत है, जो एक्सपर्ट लोग है वह बतलाएंगे। लेकिन इस में एक लाइन जो दी गयी है वह इनती खतरनाक लाइन है, मैं पढ़ कर सुनाता हूं, इस में आप का नाम लिया गया है, इस में दिया गया है :

* * *

श्री सी० पी० एन० सिंह : एक क्लैरिफिकेशन मैं आप से चाहता हूं। क्या जिस अखबार को आप कोट कर रहे हैं वह हिन्दुस्ता में मागा जाना अखबार है ?

श्री राम विलास पासवान : आप की लाइब्रेरी में है, भारत की संसद् में रखा जाता है।

SHRI C. P. N. SINGH: I seek your protection. I would like to know whether the newspaper report is going to be considered in this House.

श्री राम विलास पासवान : हम यह कहने हैं कि आप इसका जवाब दीजिए कि यह सही है या गलत है? यह अखबार आप की पार्लियामेंट की लाइब्रेरी में रखा हुआ है। जब जवाब देंगे मंत्री जी तो मैं आप से आग्रह करूंगा ... (व्यवधान) ...

सभापति महोदय : पासवान जी, हमारी पार्लियामेंट में ऐसा हुआ करता है कि आप किसी न्यूजपेपर को कोट कर रहे हैं तो वह उस में जो कुछ लिखा गया है वह सही है यह माविन करने की जिम्मेदारी आप पर होती है।

श्री राम विलास पासवान : नहीं, ऐसा नहीं है।

सभापति महोदय : प्लीज हीयर मी। मैं आप से कह रहा हूं कि जब भी कभी किसी पेपर को, किसी न्यूजपेपर को, किसी किताब को यहां पर आप कोट करते हैं तो सिर्फ उस किताब में लिखा गया है इस लिए उस को आप कोट नहीं कर सकते।

श्री राम विलास पासवान : : क्यों ?

सभापति महोदय : उस में जो कुछ लिखा गया है वह सही है यह बताने की जिम्मेदारी आप को लेनी पड़ती है। अगर आप नहीं ले सकते हैं तो उस को आप को कोट नहीं करना चाहिए।

श्री राम विलास पासवान : मैंने आप को पढ़ कर सुना दिया। मैं ने अखबार का नाम पढ़ कर सुना दिया। आप ऐसा ब्लैम मत दीजिए।

सभापति महोदय : पासवान जा, मैं रूलिंग बोल कर दे रहा हूं, मैं आप को यहां पर और कोई चीज नहीं बता रहा हूं। जो भी कुछ आप कोट करना चाहते हैं वह कोट कर रहे हैं तो वह सही हैं यह बताने की जिम्मेदारी आप की होती है। सिर्फ वह चीज छापी गई है किसी कागज पर, ब्लैक एण्ड व्हाइट में आई है, इस लिए आप उसको कोट कर सकते हैं--ऐसा नहीं हो सकता है। अगर आप ऐसा कर रहे हैं तो पूरी जिम्मेदारी आपको लेनी पड़ेगी।

श्री राम विलास पासवान : मैंने पहले ही मंत्री महोदय से कहा कि एक अखबार में इस तरह से निकला है। अगर यह गलत है तो मंत्री महोदय को जवाब देने वक्त स्वतंत्रता रहेगी वे कह दें कि यह गलत है। (Interruption)

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. I have answered that the papers are not quoted. No

श्री राम विलास पासवान : अभी कल मैं जगुआर के मामले में मंत्री जी का जवाब सुन रहा था। आप बनलाइये कि जगुआर गलत है या सही, उसकी डील हुई, नहीं हुई, आखिर उस समय भी अफसर ही रहे होंगे जिन्होंने डील को हीना। तीन महीने पहले भी वही अफसर थे जिन्होंने कहा था कि जगुआर बहुत अच्छा है और आज तीन महीने बाद भी वही अफसर हैं जो कहते हैं कि खराब है। आप उनसे पूछिए कि तीन महीने पहले क्या उनकी वह राय नहीं थी? यह सारी चीजें जो चलती है इस के लिए क्या सरकार इस तरह की कोई बाडी का निर्माण करना चाहती है जैसे कि दूसरे देशों में नेशनल सिक्योरिटी कांसिल है जो तमाम चीजें मिलिट्री की, डिफेंस को हो रही है उनको रैब्यू करती है और देखती रहती है कि कौन कौन चीजें हो रही है फिर ये सारी चीजें सरकार की जानकारों में

[श्री राम विलास पासवान]

लाते हैं। उसी तरह से क्या आप भी कोई बाड़ी बनाने जा रहे हैं? आप लोगों के दिमाग में गलतफहमी पैदा हो जाती है और डिफेंस के नाम पर सब चीजे दबा दी जाती है, कह दिया जाता है कि जनहित के दृष्टिकोण से उसको बतलाना ठीक नहीं होगा। अगर ऐसी कोई बाड़ी होगी तो इन चीजों को देखती रहेगी।

सभापति जी अभी मैंने पढ़ा था कि ताइवान के 3700 फिशिंग वस्त्र हमारे पानी में घूम रहे हैं। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो आपकी नेवी है, जो आपकी कोस्टल गार्ड फोर्स है उसको आप मजबूत क्यों नहीं करते हैं? म लाइपेरी में खोज रहा था लेकिन मुझ मिला नहीं, म चाहुंगा मंत्री जी बतायें कि 8 साल पहले श्री सी० सुब्रह्मण्यम कमेटी बनी थी जिस ने सारी दुनिया में घूम कर काफी पसा खर्च किया था उस कमेटी ने कोई रिपोर्ट दी या नहीं? अगर कोई रिपोर्ट उस कमेटी ने दी थी तो उस पर क्या कार्यवाही की गई?

इसी प्रकार से एक डिफेंस रिसर्च इंस्टीट्यूट है, म देख रहा था कि उसका क्या काम होता है, उसकी कोई रिपोर्ट आती है या नहीं लेकिन एक बार प्रखबार में यह जरूर पढ़ा था कि इंस्टीट्यूट न काफी फिल्टर बनाया है लेकिन उसका डिफेंस से क्या सम्बन्ध है? (व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय: पासवान जी, आपका टाइम बहुत थोड़ा है।

श्री राम विलास पासवान: मैं अपनी पार्टी से अकेला वक्ता हूँ। जब आप घंटी बजा देंगे, म बठ जाऊंगा।

सभापति महोदय: आपके 30 मिनट हैं जिसमें 20 मिनट आप बोल चुके हैं।

श्री राम विलास पासवान: ऐसा मत कीजिए। मने 40 पर बोलना शुरू किया है अभी दस मिनट ही बोला हूँ। म घड़ी देख रहा था।

सभापति महोदय: आपका जितना टाइम है वह मिल जायेगा।

श्री रामविलास पासवान: सभापति महोदय रक्षा मंत्रालय में जाति के नाम पर रजिमेंट है। पहले हो सकता है कि किसी खास जाति के लोग बहादुर रहे हों, लेकिन आज तो ऐसी परिस्थिति नहीं है। आज परिस्थिति बदली है, इसलिए म आपसे आग्रह करूंगा कि आप इसको खत्म कीजिए।

एक माननीय सदस्य: तो क्या पासवान रजिमेंट बगा दें।

श्री राम विलास पासवान: जब जातियों के आधार पर ही बनाना है तो पासवान रजिमेंट, मुसलमान रजिमेंट या और किसी भी जाति के नाम पर रजिमेंट बना दीजिए। नहीं तो जितने भी रजिमेंट आज जातियों के नाम पर चल रहे हैं, उन सब को बन्द कीजिए। इस बात को चाहे पक्ष के लोग हों या विपक्ष के लोग हों, जरूर महसूस करते होंगे, कि इसको बन्द कर दिया जागा चाहिए।

दूसरी बात म यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो आर्थिक व सामाजिक असमानता और कृष्यवस्था देश में है उसका भी असर डिफेंस पर पड़ता है। इस बात से कोई इन्कार नहीं कर सकता है जो आपके आफिसर हैं जो आपके जवान हैं इन दोनों में काफी असमानता है। मेरा मंत्री महोदय से आग्रह है कि इस सम्बन्ध में कोई नई नीति निकालने की कोशिश करें, जिससे इस असमानता को दूर किया जा सके।

आपके यहां बहुत सी आर्डिनेंस फैक्ट्रीज हैं, इन सब फैक्ट्रीयों में उत्पादन दूसरी फैक्ट्रीज की तुलना में कम हो गया है। इन सब फैक्ट्रीयों में सामान बनता है लेकिन कुछ सामान दूसरी फैक्ट्रीयों से ले लिया जाता है, जैसे ट्रक है, वह टाटा से लिया जाता है। मेरा आप से आग्रह है कि ये तमाम चीजों का आप समन्वय स्थापित कर के अपने यहां अपने तरीके से प्रो:क्वशग कीजिए।

एक आदमी युद्ध के लिए तो अच्छा हो सकता है, लेकिन वही आदमी नामल पीरीयड में फैक्ट्री चलाने के लिए अच्छा नहीं भी हो सकता है। इसलिए म आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि आप उन में देखें कि जो फैक्ट्री चलाता है, जिसकी फैक्ट्री चलाने की जवाबदेही होती है, वह ठीक तरह से काम कर सकता है या नहीं कर सकता है। वहां मजदूरों का मामला उठता है और भी दूसरे मामले उठते हैं, जिनको डील करना पड़ता है क्या वह आदमी उन मामलों को डील करने में फिट है या नहीं हैं। मैं आप से आग्रह करना चाहता हूँ कि आप एक हाई-पावर्ड कमेटी बनाइए जो देख कि राष्ट्रीय विकास में ये फैक्ट्रियां कितनी मदद कर रही हैं। उसकी जो कमेटी है, उसका यूटीलाइजेशन हो रहा है या नहीं हो रहा है। जो वहां लैबरर्स हैं उनके बोनस का मामला है, आप उनको बोनस दे रहे हैं या नहीं दे रहे हैं। आपने पी० एण्ड टी० और रेलवे मजदूरों को तो बोनस दिया, बहुत अच्छा काम किया, तो कम से कम इन मजदूरों को बोनस देने के बारे में व्यवस्था कीजिए।

आपके सामने पुनर्वास की समस्या है। डिफेंस में 35-36 साल की अवस्था में ही जवान अवकाश प्राप्त कर लेता है। 35-36 साल की अवस्था में अवकाश प्राप्त करने के बाद, उसके पास शिक्षा और अनुशासन होने के बावजूद भी, वह बकार बैठा रहता है लेकिन उसका राष्ट्रीय विकास में कोई उपयोग नहीं होता है, यूटिलाइजेशन नहीं होता है। 60 हजार जवान प्रतिवर्ष अवकाश प्राप्त करते हैं, जिनकी उम्र 30-32 और 35-36 साल की होती है। मेरा आप से आग्रह है कि आप ऐसी कोई व्यवस्था कीजिए, जिससे इनका उपयोग राष्ट्रीय विकास में किया जा सके।

आपने अपनी रिपोर्ट में कहा है कि पुनर्वास नगण्य मात्रा में है, तो इससे तो समस्या का समाधान नहीं होगा। मैं आपसे आग्रह करता हूँ कि आप इस पुनर्वास की समस्या को भी देखें। मैं एक बात की आरंभ मंत्री जी का ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ इस पर टुडे दिल से सोच भी रहे हैं, कि जो हमारी मिजिटी है, जो हमारी आर्मी है, उसका इस्तेमाल हम लोग घरेलू काम के लिए न करें। यदि हम इनका इस्तेमाल घरेलू कामों में करेंगे तो हमसे मरम्माये उत्पन्न होती चली जायेंगी। जब 1962 का युद्ध रहा था, उस समय बेलंग जब रास्ते से गुजरते थे, तो हमारी मां-बहनें, बेटी, भाई हैं, उनमें से कोई माला पहनाता था, कोई राखी बान्धता था। इस प्रकार ये सारा चीजे होती थी। लेकिन आज उसी आर्मी का इस्तेमाल आप घर के कामों में कर रहे हैं। आप अमम के मामले को ले लीजिए, आप न वहां अपनी आर्मी को लगा रखा है। अखबारों में निकलता है कि आर्मी के द्वारा रेप होता है यह बिल्कुल गलत बात है। हमारी आर्मी ऐसा नहीं कर सकती है, लेकिन इस तरह की बातों से आर्मी पर क्या प्रभाव पड़ता है—आप को सांचना चाहिए। वह डीमीर-लाइज होती है। हमारी आर्मी का काम दुश्मन से लड़ना है और वह बहादुरी से लड़ेगी, लेकिन अगर आप उस का इस्तेमाल गांव के आदिमियों पर करेंगे, देश के नागरिकों पर करेंगे तो वह उस दिलेरी से नहीं लड़ सकती है, जिस दिलेरी से वह दुश्मन का मुकाबला करती है और इससे आप के लिए और देश के लिए एक समस्या उत्पन्न हो जायगी। इस लिए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि घर के कामों के लिए आप के पास पुलिस है, दूसरी फोर्स है, उन का इस्तेमाल कीजिए, आर्मी का इस्तेमाल इन कामों के लिए न कीजिए। आप उस को सरहद की रक्षा के लिए भेजते हैं, उस काम को आप उस से कराइये, घर के कामों में उस का इस्तेमाल बन्द कीजिए।

एक माननीय सदस्य : विदेशियों को निकालना है।

श्री रामविलास पासवान : उन को निकालिये, कौन मना करता है। विदेशी जहां कहीं भी हों, उन को निकालिये, इसमें कौन विघ्न डाल रहा है ?

श्रीमती संयोगिता राय (पाणाजी) : जनता रिज्मि में भी आर्मी का इस्तेमाल आप लोगों ने किया है।

श्री राम विलास पासवान : अब मैं सीमाक्षेत्र की तरफ आप का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ। आज सीमा क्षेत्र की समस्या बहुत गम्भीर समस्या है। सीमा क्षेत्र की समस्या को आप इस तरह से रोक सकते हैं कि सीमा क्षेत्र का विकास कीजिये। वहां काटेज इण्डस्ट्रीज, स्माल स्केल इण्डस्ट्रीज लगाइये। जब तक आप इन को नहीं लगायेंगे, वहां शोषण होता रहेगा, जो विदेशी होगा, वह भी शोषण करेगा। दूसरी बात—जितने लोग वहां पर है उनको हथियारों की ट्रेनिंग दीजिये। आप प्रश्न उठायेंगे कि बहुत से लोग ऐसे हैं जिनको देश की राष्ट्रीयता में विश्वास नहीं है। यह ड्यूटी आप की है, आप इमको देखिये, लेकिन जो हमारे सीमावर्ती क्षेत्र हैं, वहां लोगों को हथियार की ट्रेनिंग दीजिये, ताकि बुरे दिनों में वे दुश्मनों का मुकाबला करने के काबिल हो सके। इस के साथ ही वहां काटेज और स्माल स्केल इण्डस्ट्रीज लगा कर उनके विकास के साधन मुहिया कीजिये। विगत 30 वर्षों से हमारा सीमा क्षेत्र विकास के मामले में बिल्कुल अछूता है और यही कारण है कि वे लोग दिलचस्पी नहीं लेते हैं।

अन्त में मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ—एक तरफ आपके पास चाइना का आफर आ रहा है, दूसरी तरफ पाकिस्तान के विदेश मंत्री भी यहां आये हुए हैं। लेकिन यह भी जरूरी है कि हम अपनी सुरक्षा के मामले में और हथियारों के मामले में पूर्णतया सजग रहे, दिलेरी के मामले में हमारे मन्सूबे और हीमले बूलन्द रहें। जो पुराने सिद्धांत है कि हथियारों पर कम से कम खर्च हो, विश्व में कम से कम द्वन्द्व हो, युद्ध हो, इस मामले पर भी ध्यान देने की आवश्यकता है। आप इस तरह से देखिये—आज हथियारों पर विश्व में डेढ़ हजार करोड़ रुपया प्रतिदिन खर्च होता है, युद्ध के साधनों पर इतना पसा खर्च होता है। आज विश्व में इतने हथियार मौजूद है कि 10 बार दुनिया का विघटन किया जा सकता है, हर आदमी के सिर पर 4 टन वजन के विस्फोटक पदार्थ मौजूद हैं। मैं आप से यह भी कहूंगा कि दुनिया का जो सब से नाभी जनरल हुआ है—मैकथर—उस ने गांधी जी के देहान्त के अवसर पर कहा था—

[श्री राम बिलास पासवान]

"If civilisation is to survive, then men cannot fail to take note of Gandhi's plea that the use of force to resolve conflicts is not only wrong but it also contains within itself germs of our self-destruction."

16.00 hrs.

सभापति महोदय मैं आप के माध्यम से मंत्री जी और भारत के प्रधान मंत्री जी से आग्रह करूंगा कि हमारे साथ में और हमारे हाथ में दोनों अस्त्र रहने चाहिए। एक तरफ जहाँ हम शान्ति का नारा देते हैं, वहाँ दूसरी तरफ हमारे पास शक्ति भी मौजूद रहे क्योंकि 1962 से पहले का इतिहास अगर आप देखें चीन के प्रधान मंत्री मि० चाऊ एन लाई "जिन को हमारे हिन्दुस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री यह कह कर मिलवाते थे कि मीट मि० चाऊ एन लाई, प्रीमियर आफ चाइना," जब 1962 का युद्ध हुआ, तो उस ने हम को धक्का दिया और अपनी शक्ति का प्रदर्शन कर दिया और उम के बाद चीन की शक्ति कितनी बढ़ी, यह आप सभी जानते हैं। इसलिए एक तरफ तो हम शान्ति-दूत हैं लेकिन दूसरी तरफ हमारे हाथों में इतनी शक्ति है कि हम किसी भी देश की चुनौती का मुकाबला अच्छी तरह से कर सकें।

आप को धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि आप ने मुझे बोलने का समय दिया। इतना कह कर मैं समाप्त करता हूँ।

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are discussing the Demands of the Defence Ministry. Please allow me to request all the members to be discreet in making allegations or remarks against anybody here. Just now the hon. member had made a remark. I will read out the relevant portion from the *Manual of Business and Procedure*:

"Prior notice is necessary even where allegation based on press reports are made against outsiders.

The members making allegations against outsiders will take full responsibility for their statements. Such statements should be made only after all enquiries are made and members making them are satisfied on some authority which they can rely upon."

Again, I am reading from page 780 of *Practice and Procedure of Parliament* by Kaul and Shakhder:

"A member has to be careful while making an allegation. He has to satisfy himself that the source is reliable and the allegation is based on facts. In effect, he is required to make a *prima facie* investigation into the matter before he writes to the Speaker or the Minister and more so, before he speaks in the House. A notice relating to an allegation based on newspaper reports is not allowed, unless the member tabling it gives the Speaker substantial proof that the allegation has some factual basis. In the notice to the Speaker, the member is required to give brief details about the allegation he proposes to make against a person or another member, so that the Speaker could judge the matter beforehand."

I think the hon. member had not given any notice. So, I order that whatever is objectionable in his speech and whatever objectionable material he has spoken here will not form part of the record

DR SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY (Bombay North-East): The House must be informed as to what the objectionable material is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is not necessary. We cannot bring it on record again. Objection was taken, but even if a member does not get up and take objection, the Chair can say that this is objectionable matter. In this case, notice should have been given not only to the member but also to the Speaker and permission should have been obtained. Only after obtaining the permission, that should have been read out and allegation should have been made against the member. That was not done. So, I am not allowing it to remain as part of the record.

श्री रामबिलास पासवान: यह न्यूजपेपर में दिया है और आप की संसद में यह न्यूजपेपर रहता है।

MR. CHAIRMAN: You cannot rely on newspaper reports alone Shri Gadgil.

SHRI V. N. GADGIL (Pune): Sir, the House is in possession of two texts. One is the Annual Report of the Ministry of Defence and the other is the Demands for Grants. The text contains a number of subjects, but I would like to read the text in the context of the basic issues of defence. Therefore, I shall confine myself to one or two topics.

What is the basic issue of defence? It is common place that defence policy and defence strategy is largely conditioned by the political objective of a nation. For example, it is said that imperialist powers or expansionist power have a particular strategy and particular defence policy. We are not expansionist, we do not indulge in spheres of influence. Our basic political objective is only one, namely, to preserve the territorial integrity of this country. I record that this is the basic objective of our defence policy.

The report rightly states that in the last few months the whole security environment has changed. We were hoping that detente will continue but now such hopes appear to be in the horizon. We were hoping that super powers rivalry will be reduced. The super-powers rivalry continues. And the events in Afghanistan and Iran have shown that indeed the cold war has come near our doorsteps. In this light, we have to consider the Demands for Grants of the Defence Ministry.

I shall first deal with three aspects, firstly replacement and then modernisation. As far as replacement is concerned, the report says that the Navy has acquired Sea Harrier aircraft to replace the aged Sea Hawks on INS Vikrant. The need was there because we do not want age-old aircrafts. But I am not sure whether the previous Government has done any evaluation in the matter. I have an apprehension that a decision was taken almost of

hoc in a casual manner. That is required to be examined. I do not know whether that was a correct decision.

It is necessary for the Air Force to go in for new transport planes because the Dacotas and Packets have become age-old and their replacement was necessary. The report says that a suitable aircraft has been selected. I do not know which one it is. I take it, it is suitable on the basis of evaluation done.

My friend earlier mentioned about replacement of Canberras and Hunters by Jaguars. I am not an expert but from what I read, I am not sure, I feel that that was not correct decision. A plane about whose value from combat point of view, manoeuvrability, stability at high speed, is doubtful, will cost the country Rs. 1300 crores. A plane which was tested and tried like Miraj was not accepted. 50 of Jaguars were sold to countries like Oman and Ecuador and some other small countries. I doubt whether this was a correct decision. It may be that the British industry is saved but I do not know whether our Air Force is saved. I would urge upon the Government to have a second look at that deal and find out whether it is in the interest of the country to change that decision.

With regard to modernisation, here I understand, I may be wrong, that a new tendency has crept in during the Janata rule in the Armed Forces—the Army wanting its own air-fleet, the Navy its own air-fleet and everybody wanting everything. For defence organisation, modernisation means new equipment. We must go in for new things. For example, I have come across in a Science Journal, what is called, the PGMs. That is what is said:

“The experience gained during the Middle-East war, and later developments elsewhere have indicated, that on the battle field of the future, enemy forces could be located, tracked and targeted almost instantaneously, through the use of

[Shri V. N. Gadgil]

data links, computer-assisted engine evaluation and automated fire control. With the estimated first round kill probabilities approaching near certainties and with remote controlled surveillance devices, the need for large size forces to check on the enemies physically will be less important”.

“I understood that precision guided munitions (PGMs) can be designed to attack a tank, ship, aircraft, bridge or radar installation or even a concentration of troops etc... Therefore, we have to consider whether a situation has not arisen when it will soon become prohibitively expensive and defensive weapons. Such countries, therefore, may have to give thought to credible defence deterrence in preference to the enormous increase in offensive military expenditure.”

I do not know whether any thinking has been done on the basis of the latest scientists' data. Therefore, as far as modernisation is concerned, I would urge upon the Government to consider the latest development, particularly what we should learn from the latest Egypt-Israeli conflict and the change of the technique and the management of war.

Again, we are going for imports. Whether it is jaguar or mirage, I am not interested. But should we not develop indigenous technology? Sir, you will find that there is an engine developed by Bangalore laboratories called GTX, Indian design jet aero-engine. Why should we not encourage it? May be the cost will be a little more, may be sometimes we find it superfluous. But we should develop indigenous research abilities so that aero-industry will develop because the one reason why the British aeronautical industry has developed during the last few years is that the defence aeronautical industry took the lead. And the Plowden Committee Report says that it was the defence industry in England that in

fact saved the British economy by the development of British aircraft industry. So, why should we not develop the indigenous aircraft industry?

What happened during the Janata regime? During the Janata regime, the community of scientists was frustrated and this is what in 1978, during the Janata regime, the Director of Aeronautical Laboratories in Bangalore, Dr. Vallur, said:

“We get the uneasy feeling that all is not well with aeronautics in India and that we are at cross-roads and unless some positive decisions are taken now, we are likely to be closing our options for indigenous capability, growth and obtaining a reasonable degree of self-sufficiency in about a decade from now.”

This is the feeling among the scientists' community. Therefore, I would urge upon the Government to encourage our scientists. May be sometimes we find our expenditure a little more, but it does not matter. Let us develop indigenous capacity and from that point of view I would urge upon the Government to look at modernisation.

As far as Navy is concerned, a mention has been made about, I do not know which country. But I would certainly like the Government to go in for submarines. Let us not forget that we have a large coastal protection to be given, a large coast is to be protected. Let us not also forget that it is only 90 miles that divide India from Indonesia. So, it is necessary. I know we are conditioned in such a way that our Defence lays emphasis on coordination between the army and the airforce and we tend to neglect the navy a little more. Now, I would say, let us strengthen the navy because that is the felt necessity of our times. In future you will see that navy will have to play a greater role than in earlier times. Therefore, I would request that we should go in for submarines, not only purchase them, but also produce them indigenously.

That brings me to defence production. We are all familiar with the objectives which are laid down by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. The whole thrust of defence production hinges on the twin objectives. One is self-sufficiency or self-reliance, and the other is to develop indigeneous capabilities in science and other fields. These two have been the objectives of defence production.

That was the policy laid down by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, and in my opinion, vigorously implemented by the late Krishna Menon. What has happened in the last three years? I know there are some constraints, I know that the rate of obsolescence is very high, that the consumption rate is sometimes 60:1. I am familiar with all the problems of defence production. Yet, I would like to invite attention to page 35 of the Report. It shows that out of eight public undertakings, except two, all are either making losses or their profits have been reduced. This is the picture. During the previous regime of Shrimati Indira Gandhi all the undertakings were making profits, but now it is different.

The same is the case with regard to ordnance factories. Here, there is something interesting. In 1975-76 the total value of production issued to the army by the ordnance factories was Rs. 311 crores; in 1976-77 it was Rs. 367 crores; in 1977-78 it was Rs. 386 crores; in 1978-79 it was a little more at Rs. 394 crores in 1979-80 it is Rs. 390 crores. You will see that from 1975-76 there was a big jump of Rs. 56 crores in one year.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY:
When you were Minister.

SHRI V. N. GADGIL: Modesty prevents me from saying who was the Minister then. It is not blowing my trumpet. I am saying that the credit goes to every one, but the fact remains that in the last three years the ordnance factories have not done as well as they should have done.

Therefore, some change, some improvement is necessary. On the lines of the Sir John Malbar Committee in England, the Rajadhyaksha Committee was appointed for the reorganisation of the ordnance factories. I do not know the latest position, but I would urge that a little more emphasis is required to be placed on productivity by the various ordnance factories.

In this connection, Dr. Swamy may be surprised to know one view of mine. I am of the view that the Harness and other factories which are not making lethal weapons may be conveniently handed over to private enterprise because it has become so unwieldy. Therefore, we should go in for other factories which make ammunitions. All these small things we may conveniently, if the House agrees, give over to somebody else.

PROF. N. G. RANGA: Neither small nor big.

SHRI V. N. GADGIL: I have talked about defence policies and defence preparedness. Lastly I want to talk about defence strategy. I know that one should be very hesitant to talk about defence strategy. I am not a military expert, and in the army, as you know, those who talk of military strategy are considered as belonging to the second oldest profession in the world. Therefore, I do not propose to belong to that profession. Nevertheless, I would like to point out one or two things about strategy.

I would like to say that it is only in 1971, under the leadership of Mrs. Gandhi that we departed from conventional strategy, and it yielded results, because, as I started by saying, our basic political objective was preservation of territorial integrity, with the result that we become a conservative State in military terms. As Liddel Hart has pointed out:

“The problem of a conservative State is to find the type of strategy that is suited to fulfil its in-

[Shri V. N. Gadgil]

herrently more limited object in the most strength-conserving way, so as to ensure its "future as well as its present. At first glance it might seem that pure defence would be the most economical method, but this implies static defence and historical experience warns us that it is a dangerously brittle method on which to rely."

Till 1971 it seems to me that the pattern was initial hesitation, followed by improvised action. It is only in 1971, under the leadership of Mrs. Gandhi, that the initiative remained with us throughout the war. Therefore, rethinking is necessary from the point of view of strategy, particularly in view of the fact that Pakistan is likely to go in for the nuclear bomb.

It is that aspect, to which I want to refer in a little more detail. What are our options? The first option is what I call, Morarji Desai option.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: More sensible option.

SHRI N. V. GADGIL: I was astonished when Mr. Morarji Desai said this in the United Nations. "In fact we have gone further and abjured nuclear explosions even for peaceful purposes." He went one step further and said that even if Pakistan makes a bomb, we shall not go in for explosion even for peaceful purposes. I am surprised, how Atalji and others agreed with it. I have heard his speeches. I remember them. I am surprised.

Deshabhimān, Desh-gaurav, Asmitā, Ahankar, Prakhar rashtravad—Where is all this? With the little knowledge that I possess, I claim that the future of this country and the independence of this country cannot be guaranteed by submarines alone, by bombers alone, by frigates alone, the only assurance of our independence, the only guarantee of our sovereignty is possession of nuclear technology.

Therefore, I say that, what Morarji Desai said is a surrender of our sovereignty in favour of big powers. That we should not countenance. Therefore, Morarji Desai option is out. Then what remains? Only three options remain. As I said, I am no expert, but I would like to debate on it. As I can see, in my opinion, there are three options. The first is going nuclear ourselves and going in for a bomb. That probably will strain our foreign posture in the UN and other places. Whether there are advantages or disadvantages we have to weigh these things. The second option is that we expand our conventional arms to such an extent that even if there is a nuclear attack followed by conventional wars, we will have superiority over others. But this will be available only in a short time frame. For a long time, this is not the option, which, in my opinion, will be available. The third is what is called the strategy of uncertainty, which we have been using for a long time. very successfully. Keep the uncertainty there, keep them guessing, tell them that we are not going in for a weapon, but at the same time, we will continue our tests, nuclear tests and even thermo-nuclear tests and any minute, 'if you go in for a bomb, we will also be entitled to'. there can be no moral restraint. That is the third strategy.

The last strategy, which, perhaps, my friend, Dr Swamy may like, is Israel strategy what is—called Israel Syndrome strategy, which means, you keep the last wire unconnected, manufacture a bomb, but keep the last wire unconnected. Perhaps, Dr. Swamy would like it, I do not know. These are the options. there should be a thinking at the higher places as to which kind of strategy we should go in for. I have dealt with the three problems I have raised viz., defence policy, defence preparedness and defence strategy.

Lastly, I would like to talk about our Jawans. As somebody made a reference—I will not go into the de-

tails—justice is being done to our jawans, after their retirement. Sixty thousand retire, not enough is being provided for them. I know what they do for the country. I have been corresponding with the LIC, for example for the last seven years for giving seniority and other benefits which the Government had announced, but a number of times, the replies came in the negative. I have corresponded with the army authorities, they are no better, they are as bureaucratic. I am reminded of a British tommy, who wrote to his Colonel after his retirement: "Sir. After what I have gone through in the army, let the army go to blazes". You know what reply he received. The reply was: "Dear Sir, I am in receipt of your letter. If you want any information about the movement of troops, please apply under Application No. so and so". This is the kind of thing that goes on. Therefore, resettlement is necessary for these reasons. I have seen with my own eyes—I want to end with that—what the jawans do for us. Some years back, with some of my colleagues in Parliament, we went to Pakistan/China border, we went up to a height of 16,800 feet. As you know, when you go above 13,000 ft.; there is less oxygen and you find it difficult to breathe. At that place, they sit, nine months a year, they sit with snow, they do not get letter from home it takes one month. No entertainment is available, even the radio reception is very feeble. They have to sit in the dark, in the bunker continuously under mental strain because enemies are there on the opposite. In that condition, they sit. Some of us went there. There was a unit of 20. We went there and asked them "What are your demand? When did they say? Did they say, "Increase our Casual Leave"? Did they say. "Increase our TA/DA"? I am proud to say, our jawans said, "Our demand is only one. Once you give an order for attack, please do not give an order to withdraw". That was the reply of our jawans, the finest jawans in the world. When we started going back,

somehow it occurred to me to ask another question. I asked them, "We are going back. What is your message to the people of India". As soon as I asked, "What is your message to the people of India? We are going back", an extraordinary thing happened. Twenty hands went up with rifles and from twenty mouths came the reply, "Bharat Mata Ki Jai." When these words echoed and re-echoed over the snow-clad mountains of Himalayas and came back to me, I am not ashamed to say that I was so moved, I was so touched, that tears welled up in my eyes.

This is the kind of thing they do for the country. What do we do for them after re-settlement? Therefore, so long as we have the finest jawans like them, we have very little to worry, provided they are given good leadership. Fortunately now, we have the leadership in the person of Mrs Indira Gandhi. She is handling the Defence Department apart from being the Prime Minister. The one quality that makes her the tallest leader in this country is the enormous courage that she has. We have seen many times, in 1971, in various other places, whether there was any trouble in the party or outside, whether it was a national calamity or even a private calamity like the other day, she has stood by us courageously—a courage which I do not know how it comes. But the only explanation that I can give is: It is a courage which is hereditary; it is a courage which is spiritual.

I am tempted to say this because of one thing I came across—I will quote that and I will sit down. I came across a letter from Motilal Nehru, the other day, addressed to the Viceroy. The Viceroy apparently had written to him, "Let us compromise". And what is the reply of Motilal Nehru? The reply of Motilal Nehru, the Nehru family, I quote, "I am always prepared for an honourable peace. But till there is one drop

[Shri V. N. Gadgil]

of Nehru blood in any living child, there will not be and cannot be "surrender".

So long as that leadership is there and the finest soldiers we have, the country is safe.

SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT (East Delhi): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I begin with my submissions on the demands of the Ministry of Defence—my hon. friend, Mr. Gadgil has already done it very well—and I join him in expressing my warm appreciation for the officers and the jawans and all others who are in one way or other engaged in defending our country, who are on borders or who are working elsewhere in any part of our country.

I am sorry to say that the debate on a matter like defence—I have great personal respect for him and I am not going to say about what you have already expunged; I need not say much on that—started with a speech by Mr. Ram Vilas Paswan and I am sorry to say to what state of affairs the Opposition in this country has gone. I am really pained to say that. He started saying so many things, that China has this, that China has that, that China has mountain divisions, that China has all the things that he mentioned, and he said, China is better than us, China is stronger than us, all that clearly by implication meant that he showed a lot of fondness and appreciation of China in comparison to our own country. One can say that; I cannot take exception to that. But what I am respectfully submitting is this, at the same time, in the same breath, he said that a lot of money is taken away by the defence budget and he made a very strong plea for the reduction of expenditure on defence. On the one hand, he said that the army and

defence should be strengthened, while on the other hand, he made a usual plea which sometimes people make for reducing expenditure on defence budget. They were, to my mind, clearly inconsistent. With respect I wish to say that he talked of our research work and that was done, to my mind, if I have understood him correctly, with some ridicule. Not to speak of having any pride in what India has achieved during all these years since we became free, I found some kind of a sense of ridicule for what we have done on the Defence front. While I am quite conscious of the fact that Defence is a matter which has to be conditioned by circumstances in the whole world, global developments and other developments, technological changes, our own constraints on our resources and other things, the vastness of our country, the big borders, sea and land borders, that we have to defend, and so many other things, yet, since we became free, in the matter of defence what late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru laid for this country, which later on has been nursed very well by our leader, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, and all others who have worked as a team in various factories and laboratories and in various fields, is something of which our nation can rightly feel proud. I have read some journals. In matters of defence, certainly, we are not equal to some Super Powers. That is true. Maybe, here and there, China is in advance of us, in certain things; I cannot dispute that. But the fact of the matter is this. In some of the journals which I have read, they have asked whether, in matters of defence, it is proper to call India as just a developing nation or it should be called a nation which is, more or less, developed. That is what has been said in some of the journals. I was reading the journal of the Institute for Strategic Studies; in that they were talking about our nuclear options, and so on. These were the observations which were made there. We had just very small, petty, ordnance factories when we became

free. And what have we today? What are we not manufacturing now? How much have we advanced! In certain matters like ammunition, and small arms, we have become more or less self-reliant. We have tanks, planes and other things. Every day we have been trying to advance. Even with those constraints on our resources and other things, we have borrowed certain imported technology, and we have, in many cases, improved upon it. That has been tested in the fields. Our Vijayanta tanks were tested against the American tanks. They are still being improved. The same is the case with our aircraft and our electronic system. In some matters we have been exporting and we have earned foreign exchange. It is true that we are not equal to some of the Super Powers in matters of defence. But, I can certainly say, we have advanced a great deal during the period since we became free and we can rightly feel proud of that. And that was proved during all the challenges that our nation had to meet. We learnt even from the Chinese aggression against us. After that, our Government improved the things and we have taken steps for becoming self-reliant, and our defence potential in terms of both numbers and quality, in terms of our striking power, in terms of further modernisation, has improved considerably. We are all very much proud of that. But we are sorry to see that some of our people do not have the sense of pride in what our country has achieved. We must certainly strive for more, try for more, and we must achieve more, but there is no reason why we should not feel proud of what we have done.

Now, these questions are all very much interconnected: the external affairs are interconnected, the science and technology developments are interconnected, the industries which are connected with defence production are interconnected, our relations with our neighbours are very much interconnected.

Just now, Mr. Gadgil was talking about our nuclear options, and he said, one was Morarji option. I am only adding this. Mr. Morarji Desai, the former Prime Minister of India, was independent of the whole country. Of course, during the Janata Party rule, everybody was independent; the Prime Minister was independent of the nation. Ministers were independent of the Prime Minister. Officials were independent of the Ministers and everybody was independent of everybody else. And that is why they are there. . . . (Interruptions) I am talking on defence. Now, Mr. Morarji Desai went to the extent of saying not only two things which Mr. Gadgil just now said but he said a third thing also. He said that the nuclear explosion that India had at Pokharn was not for peaceful purposes. . . .

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: He never said that.

SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT: He said it. I dare say he said it. He became a witness in the world court against India. That was the public stand he took. I am not going much into that. I am saying and Mr. Gadgil was saying that our answer is nuclear technology. Sir, I am a very mild man. I am a peace-loving man. I believe in the Congress ideology. Mrs. Gandhi wants nuclear technology for peaceful purposes. As a Congress worker somehow or other I have come to the conclusion very hesitatingly that there is no option for India except a nuclear deterrent and India will have to manufacture a nuclear bomb. I stand for that. This is my opinion. You may like it or you may not like it. You were talking of it. With India's constraints and resources and our battle against poverty, I feel India will have no option particularly when China has it. There are talks of Pakistan developing it. Even Dr. Bhabha said that the only way is either you have to use a deterrent or at least have the threat to use that

[Shri H. K. L. Bhagat]

deterrent. That was what he said. He did not say exactly what I am saying and what I feel is that India has to do. We have to keep in view the vastly changing character of wars which might take place in the coming years. That might be different. They may not be the same type of conventional wars. The importance of tanks may be that what it was or it may not be. Or it may be more of missiles and more of radars and other things. But this is a subject, I must confess honestly, on which I am speaking without much knowledge. But, still as a common man, as a layman, I feel that our strategy has to be kept in view keeping the very nature of wars that might take place in future. The whole world is changing very fast. Just as it is pointed out in the Annual Report, new tensions have grown in the South-East Asia and South-West Asia. There is the problem in Afghanistan. The Indian Ocean is now more sensitive than before and in spite of our repeated protests, USA has been going on as they wanted to and in fact they have increased their activities in this part of the world. So, what is going to happen we have to anticipate and act accordingly. I will just conclude in a few minutes.

What I very respectfully wish to submit is this. India has stood the test of time and India is going to stand the test of time. Just now when Mr. Gadgil was referring to Mrs. Gandhi, Mr. Subramanian Swamy was saying, what has this got to do with defence? Mr. Swamy thinks that the leadership of the country has nothing to do with defence. According to him anybody and everybody can handle it and that is where he has learnt nothing. He survived the Indira storm. So it seems that he has learnt nothing. Afterwards in the Assembly elections his own candidates have been washed away. What I am saying is that the internal strength is the best answer to exter-

nal aggression and that is the best defence. And there cannot be internal strength in a vast country like India without a good, competent and strong national leadership with the national backing and that Mrs. Gandhi alone can provide. . . . (Interruptions) Sir, privately they recognise it. This is not my own opinion only. . . . (Interruptions) Sir, I am just mentioning an incident. Mrs. Gandhi lost in February. . . . (Interruptions) Do not talk such things. Don't think that I am as small as you are. (Interruptions) My dear friend, during these three years I had been with her but you were sending us to your bloody jail. . . . (Interruptions)

SHRI RATANSINH RAJDA (Bombay South): Is the word "bloody" Parliamentary?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just a minute.

SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT: I am just finishing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just a minute. The word 'bloody' ordinarily should not be used. But, if it goes with the 'jail', it is all right.

SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT: Now, Sir, I am concluding by narrating one small incident.

Mrs. Gandhi lost in February 1977 elections. In June and July 1979. (Interruptions).

AN HON. MEMBER: Does it relate to the Defence?

SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT: It relates to Defence. In June and July 1979, she went to Delhi to see the floods and to help the flood-stricken people. She went towards Najafgarh side. Some of us came with her. The jawans who were working there—hundreds of them—as soon as they came to know that Mrs. Gandhi had reached there, they all came to her and they showed their courtesy and showed their respect.

We could see their faces shining with joy. She was not Prime Minister Mrs. Gandhi. Mrs. Gandhi was defeated at that time in the Elections. (Interruptions) I am just finishing. You know what happened? The army jawans were so very keen to have a photograph with her. They gave us tea. But she declined. The army had respect for Mrs. Gandhi.

Lastly, Sir, I agree with Mr. Gadgil that the Navy should be given much greater attention. Ex-servicemen's settlement needs much greater attention to be paid than what is being done to them. There are 50,000 or 60,000 or one lakh of them who, after leaving their jobs in the early thirties should be accommodated with understanding and sympathy.

With these words, Sir, I support the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of Defence.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have one announcement to make. A list showing the numbers of cut motions to the Demands for Grants in respect of the Ministry of Defence treated as moved on the basis of the slips received from Members concerned, has been put up on the Notice Board for the information of Members.

In case any Member finds any discrepancy in the list, he may kindly bring it to the notice of the Officer at the Table immediately.

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA (Madhubani): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced to Re. 1".

[Failure to infuse the spirit of secularism, socialism and democracy in our defence personnel (1)].

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced to Re. 1".

[Failure to democratise defence personnel set up and inculcate spirit of fraternity among the officers and jawans by having common messes and sports (2)].

SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE (Panskura): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced to Re. 1".

[Failure to form a Bengali Regiment (3)].

SHRI BAPUSAHEB PARULEKAR (Ratnagiri): I beg to move:—

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Failure to check malpractices in Defence services (5)]

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Failure to create most up-to-date intelligence system at National level (6)].

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Failure to create an organisation which should be an effective and continuous link between the Government and defence services to achieve co-ordination and cohesion in defence matters (7)].

"That the demand under the head 'Defence Services—Army' be reduced by Rs. 100"

[Failure to augment armed forces quantitatively and qualitatively adequate to meet the threat contingencies (26)].

"That the demand under the head 'Defence Services—Army' be reduced by Rs. 100"

[Shri Bapusaheb Parulekar]

[Failure to augment anti-tank capability by not yet introducing Precision Guided Missiles and helicopters equipped with the latest types of anti-tank missiles (27)].

"That the demand under the head 'Defence Services—Army' be reduced by Rs. 100"

[Failure in not establishing a fully mechanised corps levels formation to operate in border area of Rajasthan desert (28)].

"That the demand under the head 'Defence services—Navy' be reduced by Rs. 100"

[Failure in not augmenting naval force, including submarine unit taking into consideration the length of coastal line of the country (29)].

"That the demand under the head 'Defence Services—Pensions' be reduced by Rs. 100"

[Failure to pay proper attention to ex-servicemen with reference to pension and other facilities to enable them to lead a respectable life (31)].

SHRI R. K. MHALGI (Thane): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100"

[Failure to democratise fully the Cantonment Boards (14)].

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100"

[Plight of ex-servicemen in Maharashtra, because of the ineffective implementation of various Government schemes for them (15)].

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Need for the Soldiers Board for the district of Thana in Maharashtra (16)].

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Need to consider the representation made by Ex-servicemen's Welfare Association in the month of May, 1980 requesting to increase the pension with minimum of Rs. 100/- per month (17)].

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Need to consider the representation of the ex-employees of Cantonment Boards of Belgaum (Karnataka) regarding their pension and other benefits (18)].

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100".

[India's military preparedness in view of Pakistan's decision to make Atom Bomb (19)].

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Need to withdraw the restrictions in the ordnance estates for public meetings (20)].

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Need to give more facilities and amenities to Armed Forces Personnel (21)].

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Need to remove the out-dated system of "Darbars" in Armed Forces (22)].

“That the demand under the head ‘Ministry of Defence’ be reduced by Rs. 100”.

[Need to solve various problems faced by the inhabitants in the ordnance Estate of Ambarnath, District Thana (Maharashtra) (23)].

“That the demand under the head ‘Ministry of Defence’ be reduced by Rs. 100”.

[Need to utilise the services of retired army officers even in peace time (24)].

“That the demand under the head ‘Ministry of Defence’ be reduced by Rs. 100”.

[Need to have a coordination of Defence Ministry and External Affairs Ministry (25)].

“That the demand under the head ‘Ministry of Defence’ be reduced by Rs. 100”.

[Delay in setting various issues connected with the proposal to allow Maharashtra Industrial Development Corporation to use railway siding at Ambazari near Nagpur for Hingra Industrial estate in Nagpur (32)].

“That the demand under the head ‘Ministry of Defence’ be reduced by Rs. 100”.

[Failure to properly manage lands in Bombay and Pune under the control of the Defence Ministry and thereby allowing establishments of slums thereon and, at the same time extremely slow progress of identification of various problems connected with the improvement of slums in cooperation with the Bombay Municipal Corporation and other agencies of the State Government (33)].

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Basirhat: I beg to move:

“That the demand under the head ‘Ministry of Defence’ be reduced by Rs. 100”.

[Non-payment of 15 days wages as productivity-linked bonus to nearly 3 lakhs of civilian employees of Defence Units (34)].

“That the demand under the head ‘Ministry of Defence’ be reduced by Rs. 100”.

[Non-implementation of decisions taken on 11-8-79 regarding automatic promotion of civilian employees after 15 years of stagnation in one scale (35)].

“That the demand under the head ‘Ministry of Defence’ be reduced by Rs. 100”.

[Immediate need to stop disbandment of Ordnance Depot, Alipore, Calcutta (36)].

“That the demand under the head ‘Ministry of Defence’ be reduced by Rs. 100”.

[Need for revival of Permanent Negotiating Machinery for civilian employees of Defence units (37)].

“That the demand under the head ‘Ministry of Defence’ be reduced by Rs. 100”.

[Need to bring civilian employees of Defence units within the purview of the payment of Bonus Act (38)].

“That the demand under the head ‘Ministry of Defence’ be reduced by Rs. 100”.

[Need to grant continuity of service to 31 employees recently reinstated in West Bengal Defence units (39)].

“That the demand under the head ‘Ministry of Defence’ be reduced by Rs. 100”.

[Need for reinstatement of civilian employees dismissed, removed from service or discharged, for trade union activities (40)].

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100"

[Need for treating Canteen employees in all defence units as Government Servants (41)].

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Need to improve working of the Ordnance Factories Board by inclusion of workers' representatives in it (42)].

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Need to check the discrimination between industrial and non-industrial employees in the matter of leave (43)].

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Denial of trade union rights to civilian employees in J&K area (44)].

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Non-implementation of Expert Classification Committee Report (45)].

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Non-implementation of Oberoi Committee's Report (46)].

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Repressive measures to prevent representation of grievances by employees of Border Roads Organisation in Assam (47)].

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Need to reorganise and expand HAL factory at Barrackpore, West Bengal (48)].

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced to Re. 1".

[Failure to replace outmoded system of independent structures and functioning of the three Services by a single unified and integrated Communal controlling all military plans and logistics (64)].

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced to Re. 1".

[Failure to introduce strict cost control for cutting out wasteful expenditure and unproductive manpower in the Defence structure of the country (65)]

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI
(Patna): I beg to move—

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced to Re. 1".

[Failure to make the payment of bonus to all defence employees so far (52)].

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced to Re. 1".

[Need to inculcate the principles of democracy, secularism and socialism among defence personnel (53)].

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced to Re. 1".

[Need to eradicate the feeling of higher and lower rank from defence services (54)].

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced to Re. 1".

[Failure to remove the malpractices and other vices from the defence services (55)].

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced to Re. 1".

[Need to strengthen defence preparedness with the help of socialist countries (56)].

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced to Re. 1".

[Failure to make Cantonment Boards completely democratic bodies (57)].

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced to Re. 1".

[Failure to accept the demands of All-India Defence Employees Federation relating to their service conditions (58)].

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced to Re. 1".

[Need to check discrimination in defence personnel (59)].

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced to Re. 1".

[Need to provide special financial assistance to Danapur Cantonment Board (60)].

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced to Re. 1".

[Failure to check malpractices in the recruitment office of Danapur (61)].

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced to Re. 1".

[Need to improve the Danapur Cantonment by providing better roads and checking shortage of water (62)].

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced to Re. 1".

[Need to reduce the tax imposed on the residence of Danapur Cantonment Board (63)].

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Need to make adequate arrangements for the resettlement of ex-service men (66)].

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Failure to check discrimination with the jawans by the officers of defence services (67)].

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to provide adequate facilities to jawans (68)].

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to increase the pension of ex-servicemen. (69)]

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to accept the demands of ex-servicemen, immediately (70)].

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to do away with the 'Darbar' system in defence services (71)].

SHRI N. E. HORO (Khunti): I beg to move:

“That the demand under the head ‘Ministry of Defence’ be reduced by Rs. 100.”

[Failure to recruit Adivasis in sufficient number in the Defence services (72)].

“That the demand under the head ‘Ministry of Defence’ be reduced by Rs. 100.”

[Failure to organise an Adivasi Regiment (73)].

“That the demand under the head ‘Ministry of Defence’ be reduced by Rs. 100.”

[Failure to release the land of the G.E.L. Church at Ranchi with proper compensation at present market rate with retrospective effect (74)].

“That the demand under the head ‘Ministry of Defence’ be reduced by Rs. 100.”

[Need to increase the amount of pension to Ex-servicemen (75)].

MR. CHAIRMAN: The next gentleman who has to speak is from the C.P.M. Party. But, I have received a letter from Shri Indrajit Gupta that he has to go early. So, I would like to allow him to speak before him.

Mr. Gupta. You have eight minutes at your disposal.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Basirhat): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am thankful to you for having given me this opportunity to speak. On a subject like this, to expect one to speak within ten minutes, is a bit of a tall order. However, I seek your indulgence to give me some time more.

Sir, Mr. Gadgil has said some things, Mr. Bhagat also has said some things, to which I shall come later. I am really in agreement with some of

those things. For example, Mr. Gadgil spoke about the urgent need for developing the indigenous aircraft technology. I was also going to dilate on some of these matters.

Mr. Bhagat mentioned them, perhaps, not in the sense in which I would like to mention. The best defence is the internal condition of a country. But he translated it almost entirely in terms of the Prime Minister's leadership. The Prime Minister's leadership is no doubt important in this matter. I do not deny it. But the internal strength of a country cannot be made synonymous with the role played by the Prime Minister.

We have seen that billions of dollars worth of the most sophisticated weapons in the world had been provided by the United States of America. They would not supply them for an ignominious defeat in the Viet-nam. I do not know how many computers and how many sophisticated gadgets and so on the Viet-nam had. But, certainly, we can say that they were able to defeat the most powerful military machine in the world... on the basis primarily of their internal strength, the unity of their nation, their high morale, their patriotism and their heroic courage. Not that we are lacking those things. I am second to none in admiration of our jawans for what they have done. But, Sir, I think—so far as I know—the policy of our Government upto this day is that we lop nuclear technology including, if necessary, technology for peaceful explosions. But I do not think that the government has yet adopted a policy of going in for a nuclear bomb. Now, members of the ruling party are very strenuously advocating that we should make this change in our policy. It is for her when she replies to spell it out. I do not know if Mr. Agha Shahi has left this country or not...

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: (Bombay-North East): He has reached Islamabad.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: He has reached Islamabad. Have you got a message!

It is a serious thing that Mr. Agha Shahi every now and then and General Zia-ul-Haq have been floating this idea that India and Pakistan should get together and coordinate their military requirements and so on. To me it is an absurd proposition. But anyway it is only Mr. Subramaniam Swamy in our country who some time ago made a public statement saying that if we really wanted to convince Pakistan about our peaceful bonafides then we should supply arms to Pakistan.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: I stand by it.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: We can say all sorts of things.

Sir, as far as nuclear technology goes we are already in possession of quite considerable nuclear technology. That development should go on whether we should take to the path of making a bomb or not it is for the government to decide. I am against it at this stage. For many reasons the implications of it need to be spelt out. It is not possible to do it within the limited time at my disposal. I firmly believe that a country like ours, which is still in its economy, industry, trade and commerce and foreign aid deplorable in my opinion after thirty-two years of Independence, still so much dependant on other countries and on big powers and western countries, should not talk lightly when they talk of developing bomb. When we can pick up independence in these matters and stand on our own feet then we can think of these things otherwise the implications are dangerous.

Sir, I want to deal with one or two topics. We are here now eighteen years after this traumatic experience of 1962 war. It was only after that experience that we took to Defence planning—five years defence plans and then a rolling defence

plan was adopted for the first time. The accent was on modernisation and specialised training, on further development, on self-reliance and on integrated battle techniques—the need for which we had felt so acutely in those dark days.

I do not know where this planning is now. Somebody should tell us. This book which is given to us every year with very minor changes here and there is the same book which can be repeated year after year but tells us nothing. I think this is one of the few Parliaments in the world—which are having a parliamentary system—where Members are kept so much in the dark about the realities of our defence establishments and structure and condition.

I find in Great Britain they have now decided amidst quite a storm of public protests, to allow some American missiles. They have announced that 160 US nuclear "Cruise" missiles will be based to England. In the House of Commons, the British Defence Secretary, Mr. Francis Pym, on the 17th of June speaking in the House of Commons had even revealed the exact places in Great Britain where the missiles are going to be located. He has not hidden anything. He has mentioned the fact that two little-known air bases—I am quoting from a newspaper cutting—Molesworth 97 kms north of London and Greenham Common 97 kms to the east of London are two places where these missiles, highly secret missiles, are going to be located in Britain. You know, where the missile is located that place also becomes the target in the event of any hostilities or war. The British can be quite sure that if there is a war, then those places are the very first targets of the enemy attacks. But still they do not go to Parliament and say: for reasons of national security, we cannot tell you anything. This is going very far ahead. Compared with this, we are told nothing. It is almost impossible to have a fruitful debate on Defence in the Indian Parliament because of the secretive nature of the Government's approach to the whole thing.

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

However, in 1963, the first Defence budget, after the war with China, was about Rs. 867 crores. Now, in 1980, our budget has gone up to Rs. 3600 crores, may be it may go up to Rs. 4,000 crores. So, this is not a small matter. This country is facing very great economic pressures, runaway inflation and huge budgetary deficits and financial constraints which only the Finance Minister can tell you about. In such a situation when we are spending such an enormous amount, I think the least that this House can expect is that we must be convinced that this money is being properly spent. Where the country never grudges money being expended for the purposes of Defence it has the right to know whether the vast amount of money is being properly spent purposefully spent, that proper costing is being done, that wasteful expenditure is not being indulged in. That is the point. I am afraid you will get very little out of this. If you read the Defence Audit Reports every year, quite a shocking state of affairs is revealed. But the Defence Audit Reports compass is quite limited. You will find there how many instances are given even in the Defence Audit Reports on wasteful expenditure. About this thing nothing is said to us, nothing is told to us. The Comptroller and Auditor General's report of 1978-79 had dealt at length with the question of what happened to the famous aircraft project which we had floated in 1972. I remember, for developing our own Mark-II engine for the Marut aircraft, not Maruti but Marut—we are making the aircraft called Marut—and we were supposed to develop our own Mark-II engine for it and from 1972 to 1979, the report of the Comptroller and Auditor General shows what a vast amount of money has been spent on this project and today it has been virtually abandoned. Mr. Gadgil has talked about indigenous aircraft technology. I want to know why this House has never been told up till today as to why this Project of Mark-II engine of Marut had to

be given up and why it has been virtually abandoned. Why could not we develop it? We were making Gnat planes in this country, we have been manufacturing Mig planes in this country for several years. I think all the designs and drawings which are necessary down to the last nut and bolt of that Mig-21 made at the Koraput Factory have been provided by our collaborators. We know who those collaborators are. They hid nothing. The entire technical know how was given but even after so many years, 18 years, after the Chinese War we are still going in for more and more expensive aircrafts from abroad which we must buy. I do not know. We must see it over the years as a process where we were and where we are now. We are, compared with our neighbours on this sub-continent at any rate, industrially far developed. It is a big advantage for us. We have got engineers, we have got technicians, who are second to none in the world. We have got heavy industry base which our neighbours do not have. Why this continuous search all the time for buying expensive equipment from abroad. Can you keep up in this race? You would not be able to. Shri Gadgil rightly pointed out that the obsolescence is so rapid, modern weapons are changing so much, their cost is going up so much, if you wish to keep in this race, I do not know how our economy and financial structure can stand it. It is impossible. Not only the Vietnamese but other people also have shown that you can manage, you can fight and you can win without having so much expensive and sophisticated armoury at your disposal. The poor Shah of Iran who equipped and armed himself so much—the Americans poured lavishly all the latest equipment they could on him from tanks to aircrafts and everything could not save himself from the unarmed people; his own people no doubt, but they were unarmed people. When they were aroused and they did not want him there, they saw to it that he had to leave the country. What happened to his armament?

What I want to say is that the cost, of the defence expenditure of ours must be tailored to our capacity also. We have not got unlimited capacity; we should not start imagining ourselves to be at par with nations which can spend so much, huge astronomical sums on armament. We do not want to do that also. In a country where everyday we are talking of about 60 per cent people living below the poverty line, it is a crushing burden which has unfortunately got to be borne by us because of the dangers which we are facing on all sides. But surely the House must be satisfied that this money is being properly spent.

The other point which I wish to make is about the command pattern and the staff pattern of our defence structure. I find in the Defence Services Estimates which has been given to us, if you look at it carefully, there is a slight grudging admission here between the lines that the command structure is not what it should be. It is put in the other way. On page 91 of the Defence Services Estimates, it is stated:

“Although the three Branches of the Defence Services—the Army, the Navy and the Air Force—are under the general control of the ministry, they normally function directly under their respective Chiefs of Staff....”

On page 92, it says:

“The Chief of Staff of each Service is in complete command of the service under him..... It is obvious that defence of the country involves a joint effort by all the three Services. Hence a Committee consisting of the three Chiefs of Staff is constituted....”

And this Committee meets from time to time.

What I wanted to say is that over the years since we have taken to defence planning, I thought, what we were moving towards, and should

move towards that is the most modern concept of all and on the basis of which your expenditure can come down also was to have one integrated unified command. You cannot go on like this with Army separate, Navy and Air Force independent and only have at the top a Committee of Chiefs of Staff which meets now and again, or meets the Prime Minister. This is an outmoded technique which we have inherited from the past, from the days of British. I do not know why we are clinging to it. Here, it is admitted that closer coordination is necessary. It is not a question of closer coordination. Shri Gadgil was referring to the lessons of the modern war and the campaigns. That aspect is also to be considered and a unified command is necessary today in conditions of modern warfare, not the three separate wings functioning independently of each other.

Mr. Gadgil said: the Navy wants its own air force, and the Army wants its own air force. What is the meaning of that? Which country has got that kind of a structure now? They have a unified command. I think it is high time that we broke with the old traditions and ideas, and moved towards the integrated command idea.

17 hrs.

The Ministry's job as such, in my opinion, should be to control the finance and the liaison in certain things like provisions, procurement etc. I think the Ministry has become too big as a part from the services, there is no reason why this non-combatant part of the structure should go on growing fatter and fatter, and becoming larger and larger. In fact, if the integrated command is brought about, with a smaller and more business-like Ministry you will find that a lot of duplication, an enormous amount of duplication, is going to be cut out; and the costs can be reduced.

I can talk about it in more detail, but there is no time. I also want to know something more about Jaguar.

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

The Minister of State has made some kind of an equivocal statement in the press. It does not mean very much, at least to me. I want to know, for example, whether each Jaguar costs Rs. 11 crores.

Now, the newspaper report says this: they apparently seem to be in receipt of a brief. It is said, as a result of the briefing of the Ministry, that simultaneously with the Jaguar, there is also some more afoot, and there are negotiations for the acquisition of the multi-role MIG-23. I do not know whether it is a fact or not. He should tell us. MIG-23, I am told costs Rs. 4.5 crores per unit as against Rs. 11 crores for the Jaguar. What are we doing? Are we going in for both, or are we going in only for Jaguar or have we decided to ditch the Jaguar—Mr. Morarji Desai's Jaguar—and going now in for MIG; or what? And, must all our old types of aircraft have to be replaced by some corresponding new aircraft from abroad? Has every Canberra, every Hunter, every Sukhoi and every Gnat to be replaced by finding another expensive aircraft from abroad, without developing our own technology? I think this is a peculiar way of going about things. Where will it end? We will not be able to bear the burden in a year or two.

We are saying always that we have self-reliance in small arms. I think this anti-tank weapon which is fired from the infantry-man's shoulder is also a small arm. Even that, we have not been able to develop. Even that we have to buy from Sweden now. This Carl Gustav 84 m.m. anti-tank weapon—can we not make it in our own country? I think we can. This Vijayanta tank is being made in our country for years. Yet, every now and then we read—Sir, we have to depend on what we read; we are not told anything—that we are now having to go in for to purchase more modern and more expensive tanks from abroad.

Experience shows that the decisive value is not only of weapons, but also of the man—of the man behind the gun. That means the soldier; that means the Defence factory worker and that means other industrial workers. It means the ex-Service men; it means the farmers who are the main recruiting stock of the Army in our country. And it is their morale, it is their sense of unity and their patriotism—which is our biggest potential.

This Army of ours has always been the symbol of national integration in our country. But the Indian Army is coming under very heavy strains just now because of what is happening in various parts of the country. And, unfortunately this Army, as somebody said here a little while ago, is being committed more and more to deal with these movements which are opposed to national integration, which are divisive movements, disruptive movements, secessionist movements and which stand for something which is just the opposite of what the Indian armed forces have always stood for. And I think it is not a good thing; it is not good for the morale of the Army also. Therefore, I think we should try to get these matters settled as quickly as we can, by political means rather than by military means, so that the Army can really concentrate on the job with which it is being entrusted, namely, the defence of our borders.

Lastly, I want to say this: just now I have received this information. This is an example. I would like Government to look into it. I am talking about reducing costs or using this money to the best possible purpose; but I am told that there are orders, quite big orders worth some crores of rupees for shell forgings—105 m.m. shell forgings and so on, which instead of being given to public sector undertakings which are quoting lower rates, lower prices, have been given to some private sector firm in Ludhiana, a huge amount

for trackings and for shell forgings; and in spite of the fact that two public sector undertakings have offered to supply at lower rates, this particular contractor is being favoured. There may be some kind of hanky-panky here, Sir; and I think this matter should be looked into. This is the type of thing which requires much closer control and strict eyes on these things so that this money we are spending is not wasted.

SHRI RAJESH PILOT (Bharatpur): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to speak with a tremendous sense of pride of having served in our gallant armed forces. I rise to speak also with a sense of deep gratification that here is a Government representing the will, the wisdom and the aspirations of millions and millions of our countrymen and reflecting their determination to spare no efforts to keep our armed forces as the finest in the world. Here is a Government which fully realises that the members of our armed forces have, time and again, risen to the call of duty, whenever the need arose, and, without hesitation, offered the supreme sacrifice in defence of the Motherland. Here is a Government which is fully alive to the dictum that it is not merely the machine but the man behind the machine that counts

17.07 hrs.

[**SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE** in the Chair]

In this age of specialisation and sophistication, 'tomorrow' often overtakes us even before we have assimilated 'yesterday', and the cost that one pays for being up-to-date is not only unavoidable but, in fact, is absolutely essential. In this context, we fully support the several measures that Government have recently taken in the modernisation and re-equipment of our armed forces.

While modernisation is a vital process, equally important, if not more,

is the attention that is paid to personnel aspects—moral aspects; aspects which recognise the supreme importance of the human element. Here again, I welcome the several measures that Government has promptly taken after assumption of office. Improvements in the career prospects of both officers and men, and liberalisation of rules for compensation in lieu of quarters are major steps in the right direction and have, without doubt, done much to reassure the men of our armed forces of Government's concern of their welfare.

However, we must not ignore the fact that the armed forces, unfortunately, have gradually become less and less attractive as a career for our young men. Their career prospects still remain substantially below those obtaining in other fields. Living and working conditions are also far more difficult. In fact, while, a few years ago, a career in the armed forces was one of the most coveted once in recent years this is not the same.

I certainly agree that important measures have already been taken, but I plead that, for special categories of personnel who, not only in war, but in their daily life during peace as well, face a great element of risk and hazard, additional incentives are necessary. Our aircrew, for example, deserve a better consideration than what has been given to them so far. I may mention that in almost every other country, the compensation that they give, usually in the form of a flying pay, is much more than what we give to our aircrew. Even compared to the emoluments of the civilian pilots in our country, the air and ground crew who man our Air Force are placed at a tremendous disadvantage. We must find ways and means of reducing this disparity.

Recent events in Iran and Afghanistan only highlight our vulnerability to super power moves. The rapid

[Shri Rajesh Pilot]

change in the environment in Iran resulting in the ouster of the Shah and subsequent developments was neither foreseen nor forecast by any agency. There would not have been so many American hostages if it had been of direct interest to us in a military sense is the subsequent re-arming of Pakistan. With super power moves in the area we are forced to react and reassess the threat to us based on the enhanced military capabilities of potential adversaries.

It is essential not only to periodically reassess the continuing changes in the geo-strategic environment, but also to review our plans and programmes in the light of such reassessment and prune or modify them as considered necessary. We must look into overall policy to stop the drift towards greater independence. Effective solution should be there; we should meet their requirements. In fact effort should be made to go one step further. It is well known that inter-dependence breeds greater co-operation and generates a climate to adapt themselves to improving the overall effectiveness. Modern warfare calls not only for the closest cooperation and co-ordination between the three Services for conduct of successful operations but also between the Services and other agencies of Government, by all elements within the nation. Here I may mention that government efforts to give more attention to the public sector has been appreciated by the public. Servicing in the Hindustan Aircraft Ltd. today is better, where we repaired our aircraft; we have gone for production of our aircraft in HAL. Ordnance factories have also achieved self-sufficiency in small arms like rifles, carbines, motorguns and connected ammunitions. Of course we have also gone one step further; ordnance factories have sent consultancy teams to foreign countries.

I have a few suggestions for modernisation of our Defence Services

for the on consideration of the hon. Defence Minister. In the Air Force, we must have fighter-bombers fleet equipped with aircraft with deep penetration capabilities and with high radius of action. This point has to be considered when we are thinking of having new aircraft. Our present aircraft, namely, Hunters, Canberras, etc require replacement immediately. About transport helicopters, my senior colleague Mr. Gadgil had already mentioned. Dakotas which are still in operation in the north-eastern sector are to be replaced with better carriage capacity and performance. I may mention here that today we are not in a position to transport one corps of the Armed Forces from the Eastern to the Western Sector; till such time we do not have a transport fleet, the difficulty will be there; the transport fleet has to be increased. It is time when we had more transport aircraft. If it is required that we have to transfer our troops from west to east, or east to west, we may cut a very sorry figure; we will fail in that operation. I suggest that some more transport squadrons or aircraft should be added at a very early date. Helicopters with better passenger carrying capacity and better load carrying capacity should be considered.

The difficulty we have today is the modernisation of our communication system. In our Army we have a communication system which requires modernisation. The border road projects are to be intensified. I think work has been done in the north-eastern sector and in the western sector on the border roads. This is a project which has to be taken up seriously and should be intensified in a serious manner. Mr. Gadgil has already mentioned about the submarine for our Navy; I certainly recommend that the government must consider that.

I will now give some suggestions regarding educational facilities. So far as education facility for the children of defence personnel is concern-

ed, we have Kendriya Vidyalayas all over the country, but considering the number of defence personnel and the stations, the number of these schools is very less. I am mentioning these factors because I have passed through these stages and the practical difficulties which I am pointing out are the difficulties which most of the service people face. They are always at a disadvantage in the matter of education facilities because Kendriya Vidyalayas are not available at all the stations and there are cases where the children of our service personnel have to travel 30 to 40 KM daily for attending school. So, I suggest that this factor must be taken seriously.

As mentioned in one of these books, married accommodation for sepoys is available at just 35 per cent of stations. This is a very low percentage. It should be increased at least to 50 per cent.

Today family pension in defence services is, I think, 20 per cent of the pension which a service personnel would get which is very low pension. If a service personnel dies in war, he gets a slightly higher pension. But take the case when an air force pilot dies on duty because of an air accident. His wife does not get that much pension if she would get if her husband died in war. So, I suggest that the family pension should be increased from 20 per cent to whatever the Government feels can be done.

We have separate family accommodation in both western and eastern sectors, but it is not adequate. We have started this project, but I suggest that more separate family accommodation must be sanctioned, especially in the north-eastern sector and western sector.

When a civilian dies in an air accident he gets Rs. 2 lakhs as compensation. But when a service person-

nel dies in an accident in an air force aircraft, he gets only Rs. 1 lakh. This disparity should be removed.

Coming to re-settlement facilities, agencies in the public sector like gas agencies, petrol pump agencies, etc. are given to the service personnel after retirement. But slowly and slowly this percentage is going down. I request the Government to keep a check on this. Particularly, the disparity between war widows and widows whose husbands were killed in peace duty should be narrowed down.

Voluntary retirement should be encouraged, subject to the rules and regulations, so that if some people feel that they could have a better career after retiring from the defence services, they could do so.

If possible, incentive should be given to the retired personnel by way of a free pass as per the status of the person—officer or other ranks,—till they survive in this world. I am not suggesting this incentive for persons retiring say, after ten years or such short periods. If a person has put in pensionable service and retires, he should be given this concession, which he gets during his service time.

I conclude with a tribute once again to the men of our armed forces for their silent and dedicated record of service and with a tribute also to the Government for the manner in which our Prime Minister and under her able guidance the Ministry of Defence are tackling the problems of our armed forces.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL (Latur):
Sir, I rise to support the Demands of the Defence Ministry. I am sure that this House will not grudge granting the demands of the Defence Ministry. The amount demanded is a little more than what was demanded last year. In the altered circumstances and because of the increase in

[Shri Shivraj V. Patil]

the prices of things, I am sure the demand for more money will be acceded to by this honourable House. India is a peace-loving country and at no time in history, Indian forces had marched outside with sword and fire, to win the territories of other countries, to dominate over other people and to increase the influence of our country in certain parts of the world. Today also India values peace and tranquillity. India wants that there should be true peace and tranquillity in all parts of the world. We are not preparing ourselves to attack anybody; we are not preparing to create influence in certain parts of the world or to grab pieces of land of any other country. We want to prepare ourselves to defend the sovereignty, integrity, peace and tranquillity of our country and the system which we have adopted in our country. For that purpose, we want our defence forces, we want to manufacture weapons and formulate our policy.

In my opinion, we may not be required to face a global war. Today, the world is having atomic bombs, nuclear bombs and what not. It is realised by all countries that if a global war is started, not only the human beings but life itself will be exterminated. So, with this realisation, I think, there will not be a global war in the world. There is very little danger of that kind of a global war at least in the near future. But I am not sure whether we would not be required to face small wars in the world. Small wars may be started, fought and inflicted upon other countries not only to acquire a territory of that country but to teach a lesson to that country, to humiliate and to see that the kind of political system adopted by that country is disrupted. If this thing happens, then the countries in the world which want to be independent should defend themselves. I am not sure whether

we will be required to fight a war of this nature. But in 1947, 1962, 1965 and 1971 we had to fight wars. All those wars were actually inflicted upon us. We did not start those wars nor did we create conditions for starting that type of war. But the conditions were created by others. We were just trapped in those conditions and we had to defend ourselves.

Today, we have to consider the situation that is existing in this part of the world and then we have to formulate our defence policy. Pakistan is our immediate neighbour. Only yesterday, the Foreign Minister of Pakistan visited this country. We want that Pakistan should prosper, the bond of friendship between the two countries should be strengthened. In the past, Pakistan used to say that India was not accepting the existence of Pakistan itself. Pakistan had grabbed certain piece of our land. Since its inception, Pakistan has been purchasing arms from different countries. Now, Pakistan is preparing to manufacture atomic weapons. We cannot forget this fact while formulating our defence policy.

China is our next immediate neighbour. It is a very big and vast country. It has got a very huge population. We have a very long border with China. China believes in a philosophy which may not be acceptable to so many people. China says that war is inevitable and unless and until there is war, we will not be able to create a new system in the world. They say that even the third world war will not destroy humanity but there will be some people to create the world in a new fashion. If a neighbour of this kind is there, we have to think as to how much of defence preparedness has to be there in our country. In Diego Garcia, the bases are created, and from there the super power is trying to control the activities in the littoral States. The super power is trying to control the open sea. I had said, Sir, in this House itself that sea is becoming more

and more important. What do we find in the sea? The food, the ores, the oil and other things are very precious and they are all exploited. The sea is the virgin land in a way and people are attaching more and more importance to the open sea. Our attention is attracted towards that. So, the super power wants to control the open sea and the route also, and I do not know at what time it may turn into a disastrous thing, at what time we may be required to defend ourselves. Our coast is also a very long one and it is necessary for us to defend ourselves. So, in my opinion, if we want to defend this country's integrity and the territory and the system we had adopted, we shall have to be ready to face the danger in the Himalayan regions and in the sea. We have to be prepared to face the danger from that side in the Himalayan region and from the sea also. The question would be whether we are prepared for that. And in my not very informed opinion we are prepared for that. Of course, we have been saying that we should pay attention to navy more and more and we should see that the navy develops. I am also of the same opinion. Now, the wars will not be fought so much on the land as they will be fought in the sea or in the air or in space. So, we will have to be prepared for a war in the sea. In our country we are paying attention to the army, we are paying attention to the navy and we are paying attention to the air force also. But in my opinion the emphasis has to shift a little from army to navy. The balance may be correct at this time, but it has to be shifted a little to navy and we may have to pay more attention to air force also. As things stand today, probably we are doing very well. But we are planning for 20 years to come—we are not planning for one year or five years or ten years—and we will have to see where the wars are to be fought and how the wars are to be fought and what wing of defence has to be strengthened more, and in my opinion we shall have to attach

more importance to the navy and to the air force in future. At present of course what we are doing is correct, it is not wrong, but in future we shall have to attach more importance to the navy and to the air force.

Sir, the weapons we are producing here are good weapons, no doubt. But if we want to be self-reliant, in my opinion we have to pay more attention to the research and to the development of scientific knowledge. That is a key to everything in our country. That is a key which can solve the problem of poverty in our country, that is a key which can solve the problem of defence in our country. So, emphasis has to be on scientific development and research. I will not go into all the details, I will not talk about ordnance factories and the public sector factories and all other things. But the key is the most important thing. If we want to be self-reliant, it is necessary that we should carry on research by spending more money, by attracting more talents, by paying more attention to that aspect of defence and if we do that and if we succeed in that, I think we will be able to defend ourselves well, we will be able to equip our army well.

Sir, it is said in this House, and I do agree, that weapons are important. Machine is important, but more than the machine, the man is important—the man who has to deal with the machine, the man who has to use the machine. If the hand is not ready, if the heart is not ready, if the mind is not ready, if the hand, the heart and the soul are not strong and spirited, it would not be possible for us to make use of the weapons that are available. What is it we are doing to create a strong hand, a strong heart and a strong soul? That is the question before us. It may not lie exactly within the parameters of the Defence Ministry, it is not the Defence Ministry alone which can cope with this problem, it may not be Government alone which has to do some-

† [Shri Shivraj V. Patil]

thing in this matter, but unless we do that, we will not have a strong defence force in our country.

Our jawans have fought in the First and Second World wars. They have fought four or five wars on our land also after independence, and in all the wars, they have proved their mettle. They have earned the admiration of the people of the world. They are strong, they have the capacity to fight and face any danger. They have the imagination to attack and defend, they have the capacity to face all kinds of dangers. But if you want to increase that capacity of theirs, it would be necessary to provide them more facilities when they are on the border, when they are getting training. Not only that. It would be necessary to see that they are free from worries that their kith and kin are not looked after properly. They should not be worried about their future also, what would happen to them if they lose a limb. That kind of anxiety should not be there in their mind. If we create a system which will give them the confidence that in all such circumstances they will be properly protected, I think they will have a very strong morale, they would be very strong at heart to face any kind of enemy. At present they are doing it, and doing it extremely well. They have earned not only our admiration, but the admiration of the people throughout the world, but if we want to make them more strong, more efficient, more capable, I think that would be necessary.

More than that, they should feel that they are fighting for a cause. If they feel that they are fighting for a cause, they will feel strong. What is the cause? The cause is not merely our own country, because if we attach importance to our national boundaries, we may be able to win certain wars, but we may not be able to protect this big world of ours from nuclear holocaust. They have to be enlightened that they are fighting for their own

country as well as for mankind. If a feeling of that kind is created in their mind, if they feel that they are fighting for the poor people throughout the world, to create a just world order, if that is inculcated, they would have a really strong morale, and our army would become invincible.

My hon. friend Shri Bhagat was saying that we have a very great leader in our country, and because of that leader our boundaries are safe and our defences are very strong. A criticism was levelled against this saying that a person should not be equated with the entire defence of this country. I do not quarrel with this kind of proposition, because machines may be there, the equipment may be there, but in the absence of a proper leader, the defence force may feel helpless. Only if a proper leader is there, can an army function usefully. People want a rallying point where everybody can feel confident and safe. Of course, the strength of the country is the strength of the people, the strength of the economy, the strength of the spiritual forces in this country. But if you do not provide a point where all these kinds of forces are concentrated, it would not be possible for us to defend our country and to be very strong. I think in Mrs. Gandhi, our Prime Minister, we have that kind of leadership. She is the focal point where the people can keep their faith, the army can keep their faith, where the people outside our country can also keep faith. Because we have an army of people who are strong, because we are manufacturing good weapons, because we have a leader of the kind of Mrs. Gandhi as our Prime Minister, I think, our borders are safe. We would be able to protect ourselves not only that, we would be able to evolve a policy, a philosophy which would be capable of protecting the entire world. We want to lead the world, we want to be leader of the world in the spiritual sense, not in the spiritual sense of religious people, but in a different sense, in

creating something which will be helpful to all the people in protecting the world, in warding off the danger of the thermo-nuclear war. We would like to lead the world, we would like to contribute some ideas towards that and by doing that, we would be defending the world as well as ourselves.

I have done.

SHRI HANNAN MOLLAH (Ulu-beria): Mr. Chairman, Sir, in the face of the serious economic crisis that we are facing today, we find that the Government proposes to spend Rs. 327 crores more on defence. As a non-developmental expenditure, this cannot be seen as anything other than yet another burden on the back of our people. But the question is whether the burden is worth it. This can only be assessed by looking at the foreign policy outlook, the budget reflects. Today, we are still faced with the problem of decolonisation and national self-defence. Our primary task is to mend the fences purposely left broken by British colonialism. The basis of this, was communalism and one-sided border agreements for which we have paid heavily in the past and are still paying in terms of bad relations with our neighbours. This forces us to maintain a large and expensive standing army which naturally does not allow us to take up the developmental works. A vigorous pursuance of non-alignment policy, consistent struggle against imperialist forces, growing friendship with the socialist camp instead of opportunistic bourgeoisie landlord policy of playing between two camps, pursuing an independent policy alone, can help us to keep our border in peace and pay more attention to the development of our national economy and ultimately strengthen our defence potentiality.

17.39 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

The British colonial legacy caused

serious gaps in our defence structure, which we are still maintaining. Are we serious about the imperialist threat we are facing? Take the case of the growing US presence in the Indian ocean, specially their strong base in Diego Garcia. Its attack on Iran, its fomenting of communal, sectarian and secessionist warfare in the Middle East, South East Asia and especially in our north eastern region, all point to the need for naval vigilance. We have a big coastline to defend.

Does the budget reflect this priority? No, it does not. Although the naval budget represents a mere 5 per cent of the total budget, still the increase over last year is only Rs. 4 crores whereas the army budget has increased by Rs. 190 crores and the air force budget has increase by Rs. 34 crores. Thus, an already relatively weak arm of our defence structure is being further weakened in the face of growing imperialist threat.

Obviously, this Government does not take the threat seriously as can be seen from the recent arms deal with USA reported in *The Hindu* of June 21, detailing the sale of outdated missiles which have also been provided to our neighbours for obvious reasons. This is on the eve of nuclear blackmail over the fuel for the Tarapore reactor which can hardly be considered a wise decision. This may appeal to the bourgeois Government as a method of playing between the forces of socialism and imperialism. But it leaves serious gaps in our defence capability. It cannot be condoned. It will make it extremely difficult for us to defend our sovereignty should the need arise. The defence blackmail by US imperialism is nothing new. The history of wars we have fought on the sub-continent provides ample proof of it.

Nor does the Government appear to place much reliance on the capacity of the Indian people to defend them-

[Shri Hannan Mollah]

selves. Not only has the expenditure on defence Research and Development been allocated less than 2 per cent of the total budget, there is reason to believe that the Indian defence production is retreating in the face of foreign dependence, as the labour force employed in ordnance factories and public sector undertakings connected with defence production showed a decline of 10,000 workers against the figures of the last two years. Why this decline of 10,000 labour force? Moreover, 600 employees of the ordnance depot at Alipore, Calcutta, the oldest organisation of the Army ordnance corps established in 1765, are seriously affected by the decision of its disbandment from last month. In spite of developing of our own indigenous growth, we are dealing with imperialists. The private sector is encouraged with orders from the Defence Ministry. Specially, the Military Engineering Service has been a free zone of looting for the contractors.

The capacities of our ordnance factories and the public sector undertakings are not fully utilised. We are not mobilising all our resources, our scientists and engineers, and our men. But we are depending on foreign countries. Seeing this serious state of affairs, it is imperative that the Rajadhaksha Committee Report on Defence Production should be placed on the Table of the House and its recommendations should be discussed and implemented.

Now, I will say something about boosting up the morale of our jawans who are the real defenders of our country. They should be given their due. They are doing so much for our country. We are proud of them. But their political rights, to read any newspaper they like, and the right to a secret ballot, are denied to them while their officers are enjoying those rights. But the jawans

are not enjoying those rights. How can you raise their morale?

Also, the inequalities that characterise our society are reflected even more acutely in the army, in our defence structure. The jawans often suffer discriminatory treatment in respect of hours of work, medical and residential facilities, not to speak of the pitiful condition of war widows. Moreover, the practice of using the jawans as servants in the homes of officers is yet another bone of contention which cannot help raise the morale of the fighting forces. Can we expect a force to stand up to the strain of warfare when serious inequalities characterise the Army? The Chief of Staff gets an entertainment allowance of Rs. 6,600 a year, that is, Rs. 550 per month, while a trained sepoy gets a salary of only Rs. 265 per month; a new recruit gets only Rs. 175, and a boy just Rs. 50. Can this raise the morale of the fighting forces?

Now, see the condition of the ex-servicemen. Out of 60,000 ex-servicemen, every year, only 10,000 to 15,000 get jobs. What would be the effect on the morale of the jawans who are fighting on our borders when they know that, after losing the job in the military, they will be unemployed? So, this should be taken into consideration and should be taken a serious note of.

The democratic rights to civilian forces like those in the Border Roads Organization have not yet been recognised. What prevents the Government from recognising the Officers' Association of HAL, Bangalore? The House should be taken into confidence and informed. The industrial relations should be good in the defence industries. There are 3,20,000 defence employees who are not getting bonus. Why?

An Ordnance Factories Board has been formed. But representation to the workers in the Board has been denied. Why should this be denied?

After all, good industrial relations should be maintained.

The Government gave the assurance that there would be automatic promotion of labour after 15 years of stagnation in a particular scale. But that has not so far been implemented. This is the condition.

In the Military Engineering Service, the contract system should be abolished—

The defence employees should be given trade union rights. Their victimised leaders should be reinstated.

The service conditions of defence employees should be improved. Without that, good relations cannot be established in the defence industries.

In Defence Production, orders worth Rs. 20 crores have been placed on a contractor in Ludhiana, they have been given to the private sector. There are some unholy things here. One Under Secretary is related. That should be probed into. The House should be taken into confidence and the inquiry report should be placed on the Table of the House. What are they doing with public money in the defence industries? These things are happening. We do not believe that they will be able to do this.

The Budget in no way reflects a policy adequate to the needs of the country. It still stresses the handing over of the defence of the country to largely land-bound mercenary forces, a policy that is outdated, expensive and wasteful. It falls squarely into the hands of unscrupulous arms dealers. A policy like this can hardly serve to defend the people, without a radical change in outlook which so far there is no reason to expect.

SHRI R. S. SPARROW (Jullundur):
I rise to support the Defence Budget. The six Demands for Grants, in my view, have been adequately spread out and worked out.

Sir, the subject is a very complex subject and is, of course, one of the important subjects for any country and has to be viewed dispassionately and in a very cool fashion. I have said that it is a very complex subject. I would like to explain this within a few minutes and then I will touch on certain other important aspects concerning this.

We are all agreed that our Armed forces have to be very strong so that they can effectively defend our frontiers. The stipulation, of course, comes in in the form of paucity of funds. The difficulty to meet that, a big tussle goes on between defence requirements and the expense *vis-a-vis* the new type of equipment that keeps on coming in and the obsolete weapons and equipment that need to be eased out. That makes the burden on the Exchequer very heavy. Our subject, our problem in India becomes more complex when you see how the situation is obtaining around our country.

As chance would have it, we have some ambitious neighbours around and we have had a taste of them. Since 1947 till 1971 Indo-Pak war, repeated trouble has been on our borders. And one of our neighbours as it so happens, namely, Pakistan, has once again become quite strong militarily. In my opinion, she has become stronger than what it was in 1971. Mr. Jimmy Carter, President of America, as you will recall, cancelled the old ban that had been imposed not to provide Pakistan with arms and he revoked that in December 1979, soon after the Afghanistan affair. And, he promised arms to them to the tune of 150 million dollars to Pakistan. Not only that, 400 million dollars worth of economic and arms aid was further to be given and speeded up as opportunity would develop. Over and above that, we have all read and we know that some of the European allies and friends are out to help Pakistan in one form or the other and the *détente*-seeking China is always there to help Pakistan.

[Shri R. S. Sparrow]

In that context, I would like to pose the question to Mr. Jimmy Carter, the President of America, that if at all Pakistan has to be made that strong—with what aim in view? If Pakistan holds strength and might, which way to the aggression going to be? Is it meant to go against Afghanistan? Or is it meant to go against India? If not, against whom?

Mr. Agha Shahj was here. All the hopes that we had, did not work out very nicely, according to the newspaper. We will come to know more about it. But, that is not the point. The point is: how to deal with Zia-ul-Haq.

AN HON. MEMBER: I think there is something wrong with mike.

MR. SPEAKER: Let him come forward.

SHRI R. S. SPARROW: I was mentioning about the collection of arms and armaments by Pakistan. The whole history repetitively has shown time and again that whenever American, particularly, boosted Pakistan with arms and armaments, these were used to upset the stability of the India sub-continent; in one form or the other, it was so done. It has been happening. I wanted to ask....

MR. SPEAKER: May I know the pleasure of the House for Mr. Sparrow concluding his speech today?

DR. KARAN SINGH (Udhampur): I think he can conclude in five minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: Okay. Let him go on.

SHRI R. S. SPARROW: I have, with your kind permission, Mr. Speaker, besides bringing out this question to explain the complexity of the situation and the problem that we, as a country, have to face, some other problems also. I have to pose, through you, to the Government. So, for that reason, I would specifically wish to submit that if it is not possible for you to allow me more time for one reason or the other, I may be permitted to continue my speech tomorrow morning.

DR. KARAN SINGH: Yes, he may continue tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: All right. The House stands adjourned to meet at 11 A.M. tomorrow.

18.00 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Friday, July 18, 1980/Asadha 27, 1902 (Saka).