

(vii) NEED FOR DIRECTION TO M.M.T.C. TO RESTORE SUPPLIES OF ALUMINIUM TO THE UTENSIL UNITS IN TAMIL NADU

SHRI N. KANDASWAMY (Tiruchengode): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the two thousand and odd aluminium utensils manufacturing units in Tamil Nadu are on the verge of winding up because of the wayward approach of the Metals and Minerals Trading Corporation of India. Suddenly, M.M.T.C. has suspended the supplies of imported commercial grade aluminium since the last week of March, 1981. The actual users had made the payment for the imported metal and delivery orders were issued, but suddenly, on March 23, the MMTC informed the actual users that the delivery orders stood withdrawn.

Recently only the MMTC resorted to the price hike of Rs. 2700 per tonne and these units were trying to come out of the red. The MMTC's argument of 'stock-taking' does not sound plausible for withdrawing the delivery orders. It is widely believed that this is a pre-emptive step on the part of the MMTC anticipating a price increase by the Government for aluminium. Here, it is worth mentioning that aluminium utensils which were once upon a time the poor man's cooking vessels have become fancy and luxury items of affluent sections of society. The aluminium utensils industry pays excise levy of Rs. 1,300 per tonne. Though it is known to the Government that aluminium utensils are used by the common people, yet aluminium containers have not been included in the list of 72 items eligible for excise concessions. Aluminium has also not been included in the list of items of special importance under the Central Sales Tax Act so that multiplication of sales tax subject to special excise levy at State level could be avoided. I demand that the Government should direct the MMTC to restore supplies of aluminium to these units immediately.

(viii) NEED TO INCREASE THE CREDIT DEPOSIT ON RATES OF NATIONALISED BANKS IN WEST BENGAL

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA HALDER (Durgapur): Mr. Chairman, Sir, West Bengal has been deprived of the benefit of an additional investment of about Rs. 500 crores because of the Commercial Banks failure to raise the credit-deposit ratio in the State to the same level as in Maharashtra. The performance of commercial banks in the rural area had been the worst in West Bengal. While the credit-deposit ratio in the rural areas till the end of June 1980 was 104.39 per cent in Andhra Pradesh, 88.85 per cent in Tamil Nadu, 87.09 per cent in Orissa, 76.40 per cent in Maharashtra and 62.13 per cent in Bihar but it is 34.72 per cent in West Bengal. All this in spite of the fact that the average recovery of loans in West Bengal was around the national average.

Sir, I wonder why the commercial banks were so shy of advancing loans to the poorest sections of the rural people in West Bengal? Besides, the recovery of loans from the big capitalists was also very unsatisfactory. In West Bengal, about Rs. 230 crores remained unrealised from the big capitalists.

Under the circumstances, I urge upon the Government to increase the credit deposit ratio in West Bengal in comparison to the other States and I also demand that the Minister concerned should give a statement in the House in this regard.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS, 1981-82—  
—contd.

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE—contd.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, the House will take up further discussion on the Demands for Grants under the control of the Ministry of Defence. There is a long list of Members who want to speak. The Prime Minister has to reply at 5.00 p.m. I request the hon. Members to refrain themselves from making lengthy speeches.

Now, Mr. Mani Ram Bagri.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Basirhat): These observations should have been made yesterday. Yesterday people were allowed to speak for 45 minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are now coming nearer to the close...

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI (Patna): Every Party should be given sufficient time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mani Ram Bagri.

श्री मनी राम बागड़ी (बिहार) : बहुत कम समय में मैं अपनी बात कहना चाहूंगा। अन्त में ऐसी पार्टी के हाथ में गज है जिन के अन्दर आदमियों की कमी है। मुझे क्या आती है रक्षा मंत्री जी की तरफ देख कर। अकेली जान पर सारा बोझा डाल दिया गया है। प्रधान मंत्री भी वहीं हैं, रक्षा मंत्री भी वही है और पार्टी की अध्यक्ष भी वही है। क्योंकि आदमियों की कमी है इस वास्ते संभावित: उनको सारा बोझा उठाना पड़ेगा। उसके अन्दर कुछ अड़चने आ सकती हैं। जैसे रक्षा मंत्री न अभी जम्मू काश्मीर में भाषण देते हुए कहा कि आधे घंटे के अन्दर काश्मीर को खत्म किया जा सकता है—

प्रधान मंत्री (श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी) : बिल्कुल ऐसी बात नहीं कही।

श्री मनी राम बागड़ी : अच्छा है आपने सफाई कर दी है। इस तरह की बातें जब आकाशवाणी आदि से आती हैं तो गलतफहमी फैलती है। बहुत अच्छा किया जो आपने सफाई कर दी है और कह दिया कि आने ऐसी

बात बिल्कुल नहीं कही। जनता को इस का पता लग गया है।

रक्षा का जब सवाल आता है तब मुझे हंसी आती है कि नकलची की तरफ कभी अमरीका और कभी रूस की तरफ हम झुक जाते हैं इनकी तरफ दौड़ते हैं। हम में दृढ़ता नहीं है। रक्षा के वास्ते शक्ति की जरूरत होती है। मनोबल की जरूरत होती है। इंसान को पहले पेट भर रोटी मिले उसके बाद मनोबल आता है। हथियार तीसरे दर्जे की चीज हैं। भारत में जहां गरीबी की सतह से नीचे इतने लोग हैं, इतनी बड़ी उनकी तादाद है वजाय इसके कि लोगों का पेट भरने की कोशिश हो, हथियारों पर इतना पग लगा देना, देश-रक्षा नहीं है। यह तो जाने या अनजाने रूस या अमरीका ने इन दो बड़ी ताकतों का शिकार होने वाली बात है। रक्षा मंत्री रक्षा के नाते रक्षा पलटन बनाना चाहते हैं तो वह किस रास्ते से बनाएं? हथियारों से या गांधीजी ने शान्ति पलटन बनाने की जो बात कही थी, वैसा करके। क्या उस तरफ भी आपका ध्यान जा रहा है? फौज का भी आप संगठन करते हैं और किस तरीके से करते हैं यह भी आप देखें। तरह तरह से दिवारें खड़ी करके आप फौज का संगठन कैसे करेंगे? एक तरफ वे लोग हैं जो गले में लंगोट डालते हैं, अंग्रेजी में गिटपिट करते हैं, काटे छुरी से खाने के आदी हैं और यूरोपीय और अमरीकी सभ्यता से प्रभावित हैं और दूसरी तरफ हिन्दुस्तान के जिन लोगों के ऊपर आपने रक्षा का भार डाला है, उनका जो रहन-सहन है, उनका जो खान पान है, उस में जो इतना बड़ा अन्तर है, उस अन्तर को आप किस तरह से मिटाने जा रहे हैं, इसको भी आप देखें।

कितनी ही लड़ाइयां हम ने जाने अनजाने में लड़ी हैं। मैं दोष किसी को नहीं देता। भारत पाक बंगला देश लड़ाइयां हुई हैं। नतीजा क्या निकला। आखिर हिन्दुस्तान एक है। अगर पाकिस्तान और हिन्दुस्तान में लड़ाई होती है तो समझ लो कि गांधी का हिन्दुस्तान एक है और हिन्दुस्तान की यह लड़ाई है। हिन्दू मुसलमान के नाम पर कांटे छुरी से लड़ाई होती थी लेकिन आज हथियार इकट्ठे इस लिए किए जा रहे हैं और इस वास्ते ये उद्वेग कए जा रहे हैं ताकि इनको लड़ाया जा सके। मजहब के नाम पर कांटे और छुरी से पहले लड़ाई की चालें होती थीं लेकिन आज एटम बम और मैबर जैटों से लड़ाने की जाने अनजाने में साजिशें हो रही हैं और हम उसके शिकार हो रहे हैं। मैं चता हूं आप जरा सोच लें।

जब सदर साहब, लड़ाई का मन बनाना होता है तब सरकारें ऐसे किया करती हैं। अगर गलत काम पाकिस्तान की सरकार करे तो क्या हम भी करेंगे? अगर कुत्ता किसी को काट जाये तो कुत्ते को जा कर के कोई दूसरा आदमी काटेगा? अच्छी बात वह है अगर एशिया में, और एशिया में नहीं तो हिन्दुस्तान के द्वीप में, आप ऐसी बातें न चलने दें।

14hrs.

श्री: यह खर्चा, मैं समझ गया था रक्षा पर उतना पैसा भूखे मुल्क का लगाने के लिए वातावरण बना रहे हैं, आकाशवाणी से, रेडियो से, टी० वी० से अखबारों में यह प्रचार कर के कि युद्ध सिर पर आ रहा है, युद्ध सिर पर आ रहा है ताकि यह कुछ बड़े लोगों की जो चाहे रूस हो या अमरीका, मुझे

इससे कोई मतलब नहीं है। यह न समझना कभी किसी को किसी से मदद मिलती है या कभी कोई किसी की खिलाफत नहीं करता है। और हमेशा नीति बना कर चलना पड़ता है। जब राजनीति में जाते हो या अमरीका में जाते हो, न्याते पर जाते हो तो मित्र भी हो और खड़े पैर पर दुश्मन भी बनना पड़े तो उसके लिए भी तैयार हो। रूस भी जाओ, मित्र भी हो, लेकिन वहीं अगर झगड़ा चल जाय, जैसे चीन का हिन्दी चीनी भाई भाई के नारे के समय हुआ, जब चीन से लड़ाई हो रही थी तो अमरीका ने मदद की, और जब बांगला देश से लड़ाई थी तो रूस की मदद बल नहीं थी। इसका मतलब यह है कि इसको किसी का शिकार नहीं बनने देना चाहिए। अगर अफगानिस्तान के अन्दर रूस की फौजें हैं, तो उधर सातवां बहरी बेड़ा अमरीका का डीगोगाशिया में है। इन सब हालात को देखते हुए मैं चाहता हूं कि आप कृपया गरीबी को मिटाने पर ज्यादा पैसा खर्च कीजिए हथियारों के बजाय और बम से कम चाहे वह आपके काम आये या न आये एक शांति सेना की स्थापना भी जरूर कीजिए। गांधी जी कोई हवाई बात नहीं करते थे जो निःशस्त्र शांति सेना की बात करते थे। आखिर दुनिया में अगर अमन शांति होगी तो हथियारों से नहीं होगी, बल्कि उनके खत्म करने से होगी। आप कम से कम उसकी एक मूर्ति तो रखिए, थोड़ी बहुत स्थापना तो उसकी कीजिए। बगैर हथियारों के भी शांति की सेना भारत के अन्दर है जो कुछ करने वाली है।

अन्त में एक बात और कहूंगा रक्षा मंत्री से, प्रधान मंत्री से नहीं कह रहा हूं, रक्षा मंत्री से कह रहा हूं कि अब यह दोनों कंधों पर बजन न रखिए।

[श्री मनी राम धागड़ी]

मुझ को तरस आता है, औरों को आये या न आये। आखिर उम्र का तकाजा है। जब आप बोलती हैं तो रक्षा मंत्री के नाते उस पर बहस चल जाती है। आप कभी मां के दिल से बोलती हो, कभी पत्नी के दिल से बोलती हो, लेकिन फिर भारत उसकी नीति बना लेता है। नारी को पति से ज्यादा और कोई दुःख नहीं होता। तब फिर चर्चा चल जाती है। जब पति से ज्यादा दुख नारी का नहीं होगा तो फिर सतियां पैदा होंगी। लेकिन अगर नारी सन्तान को अपना सर्वस्व मानती है तो फिर मातृभूमि से प्यार होगा, फिर उसकी रक्षा होगी। यह बहुत सी बातें हैं जिनको मोच कर के बोला चाहिए।

SHRI JITENDRA PRASAD (Shah-jahanpur): Sir, a lot has been said yesterday and to-day about the super-powers, the international situation and also the situation around us. I would confine myself only to Pakistan.

Sir, it is really a matter of great concern to us—this massive arming of Pakistan by the USA. No doubt, it would escalate tension in the Indian sub-continent and also start an arms race. A few days ago our hon. Prime Minister has rightly said that we are not afraid of Pakistan or its acquiring of arms. But our past experience has shown that the arms so acquired have been used against us.

Sir, I understand that the Reagan Administration in the U.S.A. has proposed 43 per cent cut in the economic aid. It comes to 85 million dollars to us. On the other hand, two billion dollars worth of arms are being given to Pakistan. I wonder if the Americans would like to ascertain the views of the people of Pakistan whether the people of Pakistan want to become

cannon fodder for Americans. My information is that it is the military regime which is wanting all these arms. I am sure the people of Pakistan always want to be friends of India. It is clear that arming of Pakistan by U.S.A. will have serious developments in our neighbourhood which cannot go unnoticed. I am sure that Government is taking appropriate measures and, as our Minister for Defence has stated yesterday, we are prepared for every eventuality.

Sir, the report of the Ministry of Defence presented for the year 1980-81 has rightly cautioned the country and the world against the deteriorating 'international environment for peace' and perceptible escalation of tension in the immediate neighbourhood of India. The outbreak of Armed conflict between Iran and Iraq in September last and developments in Afghanistan and the competition of big powers for making their presence felt in the Indian Ocean are additional burning issues of vital importance which has not escaped the attention of the Government. We are proud to have well formed disciplined armed forces. Our soldiers, sailors and airmen are well trained and they are second to none.

It is very heartening to know that various steps are being taken to modernise our armed forces and, according to the Report, considerably higher percentage of money is being spent on modernisation. Substantial increases have been made in the mechanisation of fire power, cross country mobility and the fighting capabilities of our troops. The Research and Development Wing has also been rendering valuable advice in scientific aspects of military operations, equipment and logistics.

I would like to deal with the Coast Guard Organisation which was formed about four years ago. First it was under the Ministry of Home Affairs. In 1978 it came under the Ministry of Defence. We have a coastline which measures 6,083 k.m. and the operation

area of the force will be about 2 lakh square kilometers. In 1978, an outlay of Rs. 160 crores was earmarked for six years. Three off-shore patrol vessels with the capacity of 750 tons with the helicopters were to be secured. But Sir, about four years have passed. According to my information, this force has only two frigates and 5 patrol boats which, I think, they are not even seaworthy.

In the Report of 1981-82, it is mentioned that for the purchase of three offshore patrol vessels from Mazagon Dock a sanction of Rs. 46.5 crores has been accorded but the first vessel is going to come in 1983. That is after two years. According to my estimates, the total estimated investment in the offshore area will be about Rs. 2,000 crores till the next Sixth Plan and in the present level of fishing, etc. We can estimate another Rs. 1,000 crores. With such a large investment, and security of the country this force is inadequate. My suggestion is this.

What is needed is in-shore patrol vessels in coastal areas and inland water territories. In addition to this, off-shore vessels for the western coast with helicopters which already are being procured from the Mazagon Docks. In addition to this, a number of medium range aircraft are required, about 30 to 40 light aircraft—both the aircraft and patrol vessel will act as a composite team to check border violations in India.

I would stress that about four years have passed since this vital organisation was formed but due attention has not been given. I request the Government to make more allocations for this so that the coast guard force may work as an effective force.

Now, Sir, a topic has been agitating my mind and that is the Army officers going to the court for the redressal of their grievances. Even a High Court Judge has observed

and I quote from the newspaper cutting;

“Hearing arguments for the admission of a Naib Subedar's writ petition on March 5, Mr. Justice Dalip Kapoor of the Delhi High Court suddenly asked: ‘Why is it that so many Army cases are now coming to the courts?’ The question caught the attention of all present in the court room, Defence counsel, himself a senior retired Army officer, too was taken by surprise.

If a senior High Court Judge was asking such a question, it surely meant that even the judiciary was worried over the phenomenon of a large number of Army men knocking at its door for justice. There was a time when the judiciary seldom interfered with the Army administration. The situation seems to have vastly changed now.

‘Until some years ago, hardly any Army officer ever came to the court with a complaint’, Mr. Kapoor noted.”

In my opinion whenever a decision of an officer is turned down by a court or any other agency indiscipline starts from there. This is a very serious problem and I would request the Government to take up this matter in all seriousness. I feel that either there is absence of an independent appellate tribunal or there is some lacunae in the Army Act because Army men march to civil courts is increasing in number.

Sir, I am told that the Judge Advocate-General—which is the judiciary of the Army—is appointed by the Army Chief and he is under the Adjutant General which is the Executive wing of the Army. Both the prosecution and Judiciary are under one person. This may be one of the reasons why the Army men feel that fair justice will not be given to them.

But, Sir, discipline and motivation are two binding factors in the Army and if they are under-mined I think there will be no Army. At any cost discipline has to be maintained. I shall quote some officer—I will not name him—who went to the court and said that his fellow officer was given extension and, as such, he should also get an extension in service. The court gave a stay order. The officer has retired but he has been allowed to retain telephones and bungalow and all other perquisites. He is maintaining it till the case is decided. This is one of the many examples which I am giving. In the Armed Forces once you start allowing that the soldier can say 'no' then there is no end to it. You know in the battle-field when the soldier knows he is going to die even then he cannot say 'no' to his officer. Same is the case over here and, as such, this practice should be stopped. I am willing to say that even if an amendment to the Constitution is required we should go ahead with it and do it or provide some independent appellate tribunal for Army officers but the court should be debarred for the Army people.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please conclude.

SHRI JITENDRA PRASAD: Sir a word about Ordnance factories. I happen to come from a constituency which has an Ordnance factory. It is mentioned in the Report that the Ordnance factories are encouraging subsidiary industry. Sir, this factory is situated in my constituency for the last seventy years and no subsidiary industry has been encouraged over there. I would point out that there should be a ban that those items which are produced by the ordnance factories should not be given to the private sector. I can quote many instances. Many items which are made in the ordnance factories are also given for production to the private sector, for reasons best known to them.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: (Diamond Harbour): We are expected to know the reasons.

SHRI JITENDRA PRASAD: I have made a suggestion that the sitting of uniforms of para-military forces and other Government agencies should be done by the ordnance factories. There is another point which I wish to say. The full utilisation of the installed capacity is not taking place in many of the ordnance factories. I know of the case of the ordnance factory at Shajahanpur where the full capacity is not being utilised. I have suggested certain measures and I hope that they are under active consideration of the Government. Another point I wish to make is that the machines of these ordnance factories are very old. Research and Development has to play a major role in renovating these ordnance factories because the overall output and the efficiency of these machines have gone down.

Sir the Ordnance factories are producing vital goods needed for the defence of the country. Defence is very vital to protect the country. There should not be any political activities which hamper production, go-slow or any strike. Such a thing should not be encouraged in these ordnance factories, as it is not encouraged in the Defence Forces.

Lastly, I repeat what Gen Sparrow has said about ex-servicemen. After retirement some avenues should be opened to them so that they can be rehabilitated and they can live an honourable life. Thank you very much. I support the Demands for the Ministry of Defence.

SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT (East Delhi) Sir, I must say right at the start that the speech of Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee yesterday (I am sorry I say it with great respect to him) was most disappointing. I think it did not do justice to our country to our people and to the policies for which India has consistently stood for. It was rather very disappointing for us to hear from him that both

India and Pakistan have missed an opportunity. He was thereby trying to equate India and Pakistan and trying to blame both the countries, as if they were both responsible for not creating a climate of friendship. While it is a fact that India all along has done its best to develop friendship with Pakistan in the past also, the wars that we had with Pakistan, were really thrust upon us by Pakistan. This is not my view. This has been the view of the whole nation. This was the view of the Parliament; this was the view of Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee and others. Then came the Simla agreement; I do not think whether in the history of the world we had such an example of an attitude which was taken by India under Mrs. Gandhi's leadership. All the territories which we got control of were returned back. At that time Shri Vajpayee was saying something different. When the territory was returned, Shri Vajpayee and some of his colleagues went over to those territories; I remember he went on a camel's back; he picked up a little handful of dust and put that on his forehead and said, this is *India ki mitti* and we will take it back. But the Simla Agreement has been described as a sell-out by Mrs. Indira Gandhi. That is what he and his friends said. When he became Foreign Minister he said nothing like that, and it is a good thing. Now, Sir, coming to the latest situation that has developed around our borders, here also, I am happy he has realised that the cold-war has come to the doors of India and he said that the situation is critical, grave and difficult. It was only recently, some time ago. I remember it and I cannot be wrong; I cannot be challenged on facts. The speeches of Shri Vajpayee in the session of the Bhartiya Janata Party at Bombay were reported in the press and before that also, he said: "Well, Mrs. Gandhi is talking of the dangers from abroad, there is no danger from abroad, this is all imagination. Actually,

कन्धी को खतरा बाहर मे नहीं है, खतरा अन्दर मे है

Even during the debate on the Ministry of External Affairs, his colleague of the Bhartiya Janata Party, Shri Ram Jethmalani said: "What difference does it make if a few guns, if a few things, if a few planes are given to Pakistan by foreign powers? Why are you making a noise about it?" This is what was said in this House by Shri Ram Jethmalani. All of us were present. Shri Vajpayee even went to the extent of saying in one of his speeches not in the House, but outside, that India's defence expenditure should be cut down. He is on record; he said it only a month ago. He was appreciating the situation in a different manner. I am glad that Shrimati Indira Gandhi has been warning the nation. Shrimati Gandhi does not want war; India does not want war, this nation does not want war and Shrimati Gandhi has always taken recourse to peaceful means with dignity, with resoluteness and with understanding. She does not want war. She avoided the Bangladesh war also. That was thrust on us. She knocked from pillar to post in the chanceries of the world so that they exercise their persuasive capacity on Pakistan to avoid the war, but the war came, it was thrust on us, and we fought it. Shri Vajpayee has been very unfair to India, unfair to the Indian nation by saying that India is responsible for not creating a climate of friendship with Pakistan. Equating India and Pakistan is being very unfair and unjust to our country.

Let us see, what has happened now. In terms of the Simla agreement, Kashmir is a bilateral issue. Pakistan is taking it to where. They are taking it to Islamic Conference, and raising it in various forums and various places. The Pakistan press has been carrying on an anti-Indian propaganda and Zi-ul Rahman's military regime is doing so many things, which a friendly nation would not do. We all admire, the whole nation admires Shrimati Gandhi for the con-

siderable patience and restraint and tactful understanding of the situation which she has been showing.

Now, there are nows that Pakistan is going to manufacture nuclear bomb. There are reports that clandestinely Pakistan is getting nuclear material from various countries including America. Now, there are reports that it is no longer going to be a clandestine thing; it is going to be quite open. Even the agreement that India had with America regarding the Tarapur Plant has not been honoured by America. In fact, it is being dishonoured. The supplies have not been made and whenever they have been made, they have not been made in time. We saw a report in the Statesman today that India is being put in a very difficult position, when they start supplying this to Pakistan. It looks to me that Pakistan is going to have a nuclear bomb or a hydrogen bomb sooner or later. Are we responsible for this development? Are we doing it?

We all know, where Pakistan is building its air bases. At whose frontiers? They are not on the frontiers of Afghanistan, they are on the borders of India. Pakistan is building air bases on the borders of India. Pakistan is not interested, I dare say, with fighting Russia. If the Americans dream that Pakistan will be able to or would like to fight Russia, they are sadly mistaken. The people of Pakistan want peace with India and the Indian people also want peace with Pakistan. If the military dictator, the adventurist, ever indulges in military adventure, it will be against India, neither against Afghanistan or against Russia. It is not in the interest of Pakistan itself to take these arms. It is against the interest of Pakistan itself. The first to be destroyed in that process would be Pakistan itself. Countries in the far eastern places, howsoever strong they might be, in the past have not

been able to save any country. We have the example of Vietnam. The brave people of Vietnam fought with their nails, fingers against all kinds of weapons. They defeated the mightiest imperialist power. We have the example of Iran. The Shahanshah of Iran had the best of the arms, the best of the armoury in the world. And yet what happened, we all know. Therefore, it is not in Pakistan's interest. America would not be able to save Pakistan at all. In these situations and circumstances Indiraji and our Government is doing its best to avoid confrontation and to reduce tension.

The Government to which Mr. Vajpayee belonged, bent before the American Administration. Mr. Desai went to the extent of saying that we will not have any peaceful nuclear explosion. He gave this assurance to America. He even condemned the explosion that had taken place in Pokharan, about which the whole nation felt proud. Mr. Desai, the former Prime Minister, is on the record having said: 'I am not sure this was for peaceful purpose.' He became a witness against India. Mr. Vajpayee was part of his Government. During his period they went under their knees and practised what is known as 'boot-strain diplomacy'. With all their bended knees they could not bring America to their side even by accepting their viewpoint and blaming Mrs. Gandhi. To America he was very very unfair when he said 'nobody is a permanent friend and nobody is a permanent foe. As far as this goes, it is absolutely all right. He quoted some letter probably by Shri D. P. Dhar saying that the US is going to be hostile for a long time. 'I want to know in 1981 what is Mrs. Gandhi's position', implying that we are responsible, India is responsible for whatever relations that exist between India and USA. Mr. Vajpayee has been very unfair to India. India has done its best to befriend USA.

What India has not done? India has done the right things. Situation on our borders is grave today in any respect.

On Afghanistan he said when the Russian troops entered Afghanistan, there is mention in the Report it was the culmination of events. What are the events, he says, in Pakistan? if you read this Report you will find it mentions events. It does not mention events in Afghanistan only. It mentions events all around. We have not justified the presence of the Soviet troops in Afghanistan. This Government said, well we do not like any foreign troops in any country. It has been clearly said. And there are innumerable developments which have resulted in tension. So, that is the situation. India has to be strengthened. There has been greater allocation in the Defence Budget. I feel more allocations are needed for the defence of the country; much more. Though financially we are in a tight position and we are emphasising on development of the country, but I feel that there is perhaps no option left for this country in whatever difficult circumstances we might be; we might have to live on half a bread, but we cannot compromise with India's honour and independence. We have no option but to go to manufacture nuclear and hydrogen bombs and I ask for it.

Our Armed Forces are brave; Our Commanders are good; our Officers and men are good. Our Government is trying to help them. It has improved their promotional prospects; it has done many things. But much more remains to be done for their betterment, for the welfare of the ex-servicemen and many other things.

For meeting any situation of a country, any external situation, the country must be strong on domestic front. The battles are not only fought on the battle-front, they are fought in factories and farms. What is needed

in India today if no Hullagulla, no Rasta Roko, no Garhbarh, no Andolan. Factories and fields must run. In West Bengal also. (*Interruption*) and no where. You are no exception. Now what I am saying it that strengthening of the country . . . (*Interruptions*) Why are you touchy about West Bengal?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please wind up.

SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT: So, a strong domestic front is very essential for the defence of the country; and luckily, I would say we have passed through trials and tribulations. We have been tried through very difficult times; and we don't want, and don't need any certificates from Henry Kissinger or anybody else. But Henry Kissinger, while describing Mrs. Gandhi's meetings with Nixon (*Interruptions*) said that the one person whom they could not bend or break was Mrs. Gandhi. Under her leadership, India is bound to grow from strength to strength.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Basirhat): First of all, I would like to say that a number of speakers have, of course, dwelt on the subject matter of Chapter I of this Report, viz national security environment. The way it is written here and placed before us, I think, is very disappointing. I do not know what the object behind it is. Is it some kind of a diplomatic balancing or something? I do not know what it is exactly.

But I must make 1 or 2 observations. First of all, about my friend General Sparrow whom I admire very much as a soldier. I was not present when he spoke yesterday. If I am wrong, I can be corrected. But I have read his speech from the record. He has said something which amounts to giving indirectly—that might not have been his intention—an *alibi* to the Americans for their build up in the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf by suggesting that the Soviet

presence in Afghanistan is meant to seize the oil supplies and to cut them off to US; and that, therefore, since the poor USA which is situated 7,000 miles away cannot do anything about it, they had to come there, i.e. into the Gulf and the Ocean. (*Interruptions*) If it is incorrect, he should get the record corrected. I am not responsible for it. If he has not said it, I am very happy.

The only point I am trying to make is that the gallant General, or any other Member for that matter, should not make formulations here which are at variance with what the Minister of External Affairs himself has said only a few days ago in his reply to the debate on his own Minister's Demands for Grants. He should do his home-work better because the Minister of External Affairs went out of his way, if I may say so, even to make an indirect criticism—he is welcome to do it—of Mr. Brezhnev for having agreed to sit down and talk on the question of Afghanistan, along with the question of Persian Gulf. Mr Narasimha Rao said that the two should not be mixed up. (*Interruptions*)

**SHRI R. S. SPARROW:** Every word that I said was a fact.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA:** I am not talking about fact or fiction.

**SHRI R. S. SPARROW:** Since my name has been mentioned, I have to say that I only gave the facts out.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA:** I am not talking about fact or fiction. Gen. Sparrow I said that members of the ruling party should not say things which are not in accord with the formulations or perceptions made by their own External Affairs Minister. That is all I am saying. You may be right, for all I know.

Of course, in paragraph six of this Chapter, where it dwells on the ques-

tion of the arming of Pakistan—which is the thing about which everybody in this country is so seriously worried—there is not a word about from where these arms are coming, though everybody knows. Have they dropped from Heaven? Where are they coming from—these sophisticated armaments you are talking about? But for some reason, we decided in this particular place not to mention it. Although every day it is being discussed and mentioned on the Floor of the House through questions and on other occasions. I must say that, the grants that you are making for your Military Intelligence Services, I suggest, they should be seriously cut down because Mr. Deng Xiaoping had told Mr. Subramaniam Swamy in Peaking, according to the paper, that there is no danger at all for two reasons from China. One is that they cannot cross Tibet because of lack of oxygen, and the second is that India has got many more troops than China have got on the border. Mr. Subramaniam Swamy could find this out so easily by one visit to Peaking. I do not know what your Military Intelligence Services is doing. There grants should be cut down.

I would like to ask the Prime Minister either to confirm or to deny the rumours and reports which we are hearing all the time even in the precincts of the building that every time when Mr. Subramaniam Swamy goes to Pakistan or to Peaking on his Private visit, he is given some sort of an informal briefing. Well, I do not know by whom. (*Interruptions*) Then you should certainly refute that because he told me himself. I am sorry I have to say this in his absence, but I am prepared to repeat it when he comes back. He told me himself that before he goes to these visits, he does meet and he should meet, I suppose,—he is a Member of Parliament—the Minister of External Affairs. Now the people are spreading whispering reports around that he is given some kind of an informal brief.

I think this whole matter of his visits is getting too much publicity; and it does not reflect very well on some other things which you are saying and doing in this country.

I also agree with Mr. Vajpayee for one. There is no question, no theory has been made out about permanent friends and permanent foes. In any case, there are no astrologers in this House. We can only proceed on the basis of our past experience... (*Interruptions*) and the present situation as we see it. But I would remind the House that generally everybody, America's enemies as well as America's friends are admitting openly today that there is a deliberate attempt being made to go back to the days of the cold war, the attempt to wreck denete altogether and to return to the days of the cold war is something which is worrying not only the adversaries of America but its own allies and friends also.

With your permission, I would just like to quote from some material. I came across a very interesting thing just now which I would like to share with the House. This appeared in the London Publication *Spectator* of 28th of February. This *Spectator*, everybody knows is quite a conservative paper. It says as follows:

"In a recent publication on the life of Walter Lippmann, written by Ronald Steel, there is an amusing conversation between John Foster Dulles and Lippmann that has been reported."

Mr. John Foster Dulles, as you remember, was considered to be a real architect and champion of the cold war. It further says:

"I now quote the conversation between the great columnist and the American Secretary of State:

"Foster", he said, "What do you think you are going to accomplish

with that thing SEATO (the South East Asia Treaty Organisation)? You've got mostly Europeans in it plus Pakistan which is nowhere near Southeast Asia." "Look, Walter," Dulles said, blinking hard behind his thick glasses, "I've got to get some real fighting men into the South of Asia. The only Asians who can really fight are the Pakistanis. That's why we need them in the alliance. We could never get along without the Gurkhas."

"But Foster," Lippmann reminded him, "the Gurkhas aren't Pakistanis, they're Indians."

"Well," responded Dulles, unperturbed by such nitpicking.

"They may not be Pakistanis, but they're Moslems."

"No, I'm afraid they're not Moslems either, they're Hindus."

"No matter," Dulles replied....

Did you hear that, General Haig? They're Hindus."

This what appeared in the *Spectator*. Later on, they say, that Edwin Meese, Mr. Reagan's principal adviser, reminded his listeners the other day. "The President has said many times," that is, the present President, that "he would like potential or real adversaries to go to bed every night wondering what we will do the next day." Some potential or real friends of America should be these days going to bed with much the same thought.

So, I think it is quite obvious who is trying to create this atmosphere of tension and cold war and threat of war in the world today.

I find an item which appeared in a local paper, the *Statesman*, and that is what I would like the Prime Minister to tell us whether it has any basis or not. The *Statesman* writes that

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

the Armed Services Committee of the United States House of Representatives which visited this country, a few months ago—as you know, a party of Senators and Members of the House came—and according to the *Statesman*, this Committee had a session with India's Joint Chiefs of Staff. The Congressman Price reported: "They believe"—that is the Joint Chief of Staff, our Joint Chiefs of Staff—"that the Soviets intend to move down one of these days, down through Afghanistan and they are particularly concerned." He said, "The Joint Chiefs told" his Committee, "that we are very much interested in co-operation with the U.S.A.". Because, they are—apparently according to Congressman Price—very much apprehensive that the Soviets are going to move down through Afghanistan. I do not know. These things are published in responsible newspapers and if they can get hold of these items of news, then I think the House should be taken into confidence. First of all, did this party of United States Senators and the Members of the House of Representatives really have a session with our Joint Chiefs of Staff? If they had, did they exchange any views of this type? I find it difficult to believe that our Chiefs of Staff have said any such thing. These things are published in public. Nobody refutes them. It is my job to raise these things here. The Minister should tell us what the position is.

Now, last year I had we dwelt—tried to dwell somewhat—on the theme of cost effectiveness. Nobody here is ever opposing or grudging the Grants which are asked for by the Ministry of Defence, for obvious reasons and this huge amount of money which is voted is really required. We know that. All that we want to be convinced is about the cost effectiveness, that every single penny that is voted here is properly and usefully spent and is not being wasted. That is the responsibility of the Government. And, last year, I think I was

supported in this matter by a former Minister of Defence Production, my friend, Mr. Gadgil who pointed out here how, many crores of rupees have been spent over the years in trying to have the aeronautics industry to produce our own deep strike penetration aircraft. But we have failed. We could not even raise its capacity from Mark I to Mark II that famous model which was called Kanut, which we were trying to develop and which has been abandoned now. Similarly, I would like to know about the tanks this year, because we are now in for a situation where naturally, it is obvious that we have to strengthen our position as regards tanks. I am not saying, for a moment, that no tanks should be purchased from outside. Some tanks are required. They may have to be purchased from outside also. But my point is that should it be done at the expense of negating or writing off whatever our own indigenous technology and scientists and engineers and all that they have developed in this country? You can supplement them, surely, with necessary imports. Nobody denies that. But this tank—a main battle tank which we were to produce, an indigenous battle tank for our own forces, which has been a scheme from 1970 and now in 1981, we find that it is nowhere in sight at all! Why is this? We are producing the Vijayanta tanks for many years now in the Avadi factory and I find that a journal called the International Defence Review which is published from Geneva has described our Vijayanta tank as:—

"A robust and simple and easy to operate battle tank of good mobility and firepower which should continue the tradition of the Centurion."

This is what an international journal has written. I do not say that the Vijayanta tank as it is today is adequate for our purposes. We may have

a thousand or more of them in stock. But we were informed here some time ago that the Government has decided to write them off. I want to know what we propose to do with this Vijayanta.

That brings me to the question of Centurions, which is admittedly one of the best tanks that has ever been produced, not by us, of course. We still have 300 or more of them. We find this extraordinary situation where a few years ago some of these Centurions were sold by us, later on it transpired, to some gentleman by the name of Mr. Michele, who is one of the ubiquitous agents of international arms merchants and dealers; and, these tanks were found to have reached South Africa. After all, what we do in defence matters cannot run counter to our foreign policy. It is obvious. We have sold recently some Centurion spares. We decided not to sell the tanks, but we decided to sell the spares through this firm called Auto Levy. There is a big demand in the world today for Centurions and the spares of Centurions, because procedures have been evolved by which these Centurions can be 'retrofitted' at much lower cost than buying new tanks. The Israelis have retrofitted about a thousand of them. The Israelis have the reputation of being good at desert warfare and they have been using these Centurions which they claim to be one of the best in the world. We have sold one batch of Centurions which later appeared in South Africa. Now the Centurion spares which we have sold recently through this firm Auto-Levy—I do not know—they may appear in Israel, which will be also against our foreign policy. I would like to know what kind of check or control is being kept on these things and whether any end-user certificate, which is prescribed, is strictly adhered to.

Today, members have been given this book—The Public Accounts

Committee 13th Report—which says in black and white that 35 or 350 thousand items up military stores were sold by us for export and they landed up in some country for which they were not meant! They were exported to one country and they ended up in some other country. Our own PAC has said:

"The diversion of stores to a country other than that for which they were intended—and this country was the same to whom the stores were earlier refused on political considerations."

We do not know which country it is; it is not named. If this can happen, it can happen in the case of tanks and tanks' spares also.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have taken 15 minutes.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: What is to be done? Please extend the time for the debate or do something. Once a year we are allowed to speak on such a vital matter. I regret to say that this consultative committee of the Defence Ministry of which I have been a member for so many years, is hardly meeting nowadays. We do not get any information. When and where are we to speak or say anything? I am only craving your indulgence for one or two minutes.

While some people in the world are out shopping for Centurions and spares of Centurions because they can be put to very good use, there are some people, I fear in this country who are anxious to have all these Centurions declared obsolete and out of date as quickly as possible so that in the name of not being left behind in the race of modern technology, we should go in for the most expensive and modern weapons that can be found and which have to be bought. And, if you are not buying on Government to Government basis,

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

then you will have to go through gentlemen like Mr. Machele or firms like Auto Levy. This thing requires a thorough probe, because we are voting Rs. 4000 crores. Nobody grudges it, but we must know that this money is being properly spent and not being diverted into wrong channels. The main battle tank project of ours has failed. The aircraft project also has failed. Are we to become more and more dependent only on foreign sources of supply, when we should be becoming more and more self-reliant? We cannot become hundred per cent self-reliance overnight. I admit that. But we have got a base which other countries roundabout us have not got. Pakistan has not got any industrial scientific or technological base as we have got. We are much more developed. We have got scientists, technicians and people who are second to none in the world. And it is on them that we should depend and rely much more than what we are doing. I submit that what is being given for research and development is absolutely niggardly. Much more should be spent on that head. We should have self-confidence in our own people and see to it that as soon as possible, we cut down our dependence on foreign supplies because in the long run that is not in the interest of our country.

I hope that the impending visit of the British Prime Minister, Mrs. Margaret Thatcher, to this country is no going to be made an occasion for doing shopping because the Britishers are always proverbially referred to as a nation of shopkeepers. They always like to sell hardware and other things. That is what they are busy with specially nowadays because their markets are rather dwindling. We do not want Mrs. Thatcher's visit here to become an occasion for them to sell us Chieftain tanks. They have made special

Rolls Royce engines for the Chieftain tanks to be given to the Shah of Iran. But unfortunately that contract has collapsed because the Shah is longer there. And they are left with those Rolls Royce engines now. I do not want India to be made the dumping ground via Mrs. Margaret Thatcher for these Rolls Royce engines which could not be given to the Shah and, therefore, we have to buy them now along with some Chieftain tanks. This vigilance I hope, will be exercised by the proper quarters. Mrs. Thatcher's smiles and all that should not make our leaders fall into such traps.

श्री गुलाम नबी आजाद (वाशिम) :

सभापति जी, मुझ से पहले मेरे बहुत सारे बुजुर्ग डिफेंस बजट पर बोले और बहुत सारे मशवरे उन्होंने इस सदन के सामने रखे। जब से यह दुनियां बनी है, तब से जंगों और लड़ाइयों का एक तार-तरीका चलता रहा और तभी से आज तक इसमें कई परिवर्तन आये।

मैं आज इस विषय में अपने मशवरे इस बात पर रखूंगा कि हालात को देखते हुए वक्त किस तेजी से आगे बढ़ रहा है और दुनिया की साइंस और टेक्नोलाजी किस तरह आगे बढ़ रही है। उसके साथ साथ आज हमारे डिफेंस में अगर किसी चीज की जरूरत है तो तो वह मार्डनइजेशन की जरूरत है जैसा कि कि मैंने पहले कहा कि एक जमाना था कि जब पत्थर से लड़ाई की जाती थी उसके बाद तीर कमान वजूद में आये और समय के साथ साथ मार्डनइजेशन होती गई और फिर तलवार के साथ लड़ाई लड़ी जाने लगी जिसके पास ज्यादा तेज धार तलवार हो वह लोग जंग जीतने लगे। उसके साथ साथ कुछ ममालिक उन्होंने घोड़ों का इस्तेमाल शुरू किया और घोड़े पर जो जंगी सवार होते थे,

वह जंग जीतने लगे। और उसके बाद हथियों का इस्तेमाल हुआ। इस तरह से अगर आप इतिहास, तारीख, को देखेंगे तो तत्पर के जमाने से लेकर आज तक सारी दुनिया में किसी न किसी तरीके से माडर्नइ-जेशन होती जा रही है।

हमारा मुल्क एक बहुत बड़ा मुल्क है, और जो हमारे हमसाथा ममालिक है, उनमें से कई ऐसे मुल्क है, जिनकी पालिसीज और प्रिंसिपलज हमारे मुल्क से मेल नहीं खाने हैं। कुछ ऐसे भी मुल्क है, जो अपने आपको बड़ी बड़ी ताकतों के साथ जोड़े हुए है, और उन बड़ी ताकतों का जँहल या उनका सोचने का तौर-तरीका भी हमारे मुल्क से मेल नहीं खाना है। इसलिए आज के मौके पर मैं कहूँगा कि दुनिया की साइंस, टेक्नॉलॉजी और इंजीनियरिंग की डेवलपमेंट को देखते हुए हमारी डिफेंस पालिसी में सब से ज्यादा जोर इस बात पर देना चाहिए कि किस तरह से हम अपनी अर्म्स, नेवी, और एयर फोर्स में माडर्नइजेशन लायें।

जब 1971 में पाकिस्तान के साथ हमारी लड़ाई हुई, तो उसका मुकाबला करने के लिए हमारे पास भी कुछ हथियार थे। हमने उनके टैंकों का मुकाबला एन्टी-टैंक मिसाइलज से किया। उस वक्त पाकिस्तान के पास कुछ मिराज हवाई जहाज थे। 1971 के बाद जब उसके पास और मिराज आए तो हम सब से बड़ी जंगी हवाई जहाज जैगुआर लाए। लेकिन जब से अफगानिस्तान में यू एस एस आर ने अपनी फौजें भेजी और अपनी एक्टिविटीज को तेज किया, तब से यू एस ए ने भी पाकिस्तान को अपनी इमदाद को और तेजी से बढ़ा दिया।

आज हमारे मुल्क के सामने सब से बड़ा खतरा यह है कि हमारा जो हम-

साथा मुल्क पाकिस्तान है यू एस ए ने उसको एफ-16 हवाई जहाज देना मंजूर कर लिया है, जो इस वक्त दुनिया का सबसे माडर्न सब से तेज-रफतार और बेहतरीन फाइटर है। जहाँ उसके मुकाबले के लिए हमें अपने मुल्क में भी फाइटर हवाई जहाज तैयार करने चाहिए, वहाँ मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी तब्जुह इस तरफ दिशाउंगा कि हमें अमरीका के साथ बात करनी चाहिए इस बरेसगीर में अमन करने के लिए उसे पाकिस्तान को एफ-16 हवाई जहाज नहीं देने चाहिए, जो कि इस वक्त दुनिया का सबसे बड़ा और तेजतरी जंगी हवाई जहाज है, क्योंकि इससे इस बरेसगीर में हवाई जहाजों और दूसरे हथियारों की दौड़ और भी तेज होगी।

जहाँ तक हमारी नेवी का सवाल है पुराने जमाने में कहा जाता था कि हूल्ज दि सी, विल रूल दि वर्ल्ड लेकिन आज के जमाने में जमीनी लड़ाई होती है और ज्यादा महत्व हवाई लड़ाई रखती है। हिन्दुस्तान इतना बड़ा मुल्क है जिसके साथ बहुत से समुन्दर लगे हुए है लिहाजा दूसरे कई ममालिक के लिए यह जरूरी हो या नहीं, मगर हिन्दुस्तान जैसे मुल्क में, जिसके इर्द-गिर्द समुन्दर है, आज भी हमें इस बात का ध्यान रखना होगा कि हमारी नेवी ज्यादा से ज्यादा मजबूत हो।

to giving indirectly that gthim—t

जहाँ तक नेवी का सवाल है कुछ सौ वर्ष पहले हमारे मुल्क के अंदर और विदेशी मुल्कों के अंदर लकड़ी के जहाज हुआ करते थे। हिन्दुस्तान की तवारीख है कि जब अंग्रेज यहाँ आए तो वह समुद्र के जरिए आए तिजार्त के सिल-सिले में और जो उस वक्त के लकड़ी के जहाज हुआ करते थे हमारे नेवी के वह बहुत कमजोर और बहुत कम-

[श्री गुलाम नबी आजाद]

रफ्तार वाले हुआ करते थे। उन में मार्टिन मशोनरी नहीं हुआ करती थी। उन्नोसवीं सदी में दुनिया में मेटल के जहाज बनने शुरू हुए जो उस से जरा मार्टिन थे लेकिन हमारे मुल्क के अंदर आजादी के वाद जो नेवी के जहाज थे उन पर ज्यादा कंसंट्रेशन शुरू हुआ। लिहाजा इस वक्त दुनिया की साइंस और टेक्नोलॉजी को देखते हुए इस बात की जरूरत है कि हम अपने नेवी के जो जहाज हैं उन को भी माडर्नाइज करें और आज जो मुल्क के अंदर और सारी दुनिया के अंदर स्टीम शिप्स हैं उन को और माडर्नाइज करें ताकि वह ज्यादा से ज्यादा तेज चलें, उन की कैपसिटी ज्यादा से ज्यादा हो, उन की क्वालिटी ज्यादा अच्छी हो और उन में इस तरह के माडर्नाइज्ड और सोफिस्टिकेटेड आर्मामेंट्स हों जिन से हम दूर तक फायर कर सकें और दूर तक अपने दुश्मन को देख सकें।

जहां तक हिन्द महासागर का सवाल है, हिन्द महासागर न सिर्फ हिन्दुस्तान के लिए, बल्कि सारी दुनिया के लिए स्ट्रेटेजिक प्वाइंट से एक खास अहमियत रखता है हिन्दुस्तान के नक्शे में। 1971 में हिन्द महासागर को यूनाइटेड नेशंस ने जोन आफ पीस डिक्लेयर किया था। लेकिन आज हम देखते हैं कि बड़ी-बड़ी जितनी ताकतें हैं यू एस ए, यू एस एस आर अपनी नेवी की ताकतों को वहां मजबूत करते जा रहे हैं। इसलिए जरूरत इस बात की है कि हमारा मुल्क भी इस तरफ पूरी तबज्जह दे। जैसाकि के एम पणिकर ने अपनी बुक में कहा है—

Sardar K. M. Panikker in his book, "The Problems of Indian Territories" said:

"Attack from the sea is more dangerous to the freedom of India than any from her land frontier."

इसलिए मैं डिफेंस मिनिस्ट्री की तबज्जह इस तरफ दिलाऊंगा कि जहां हम अपनी जमीनी फौज को मजबूत करते हैं वहां हमें अपनी नेवी की फौज को भी मजबूत करना होगा और उस के साथ-साथ एयर फोर्स को भी मजबूत करना होगा, उस को हमें ज्यादा से ज्यादा माडर्नाइज करना होगा।

जहां तक हमारी आर्डिनेंस फैक्ट्रीज का सवाल है आर्डिनेंस फैक्ट्रीज को भी हमें बहुत माडर्नाइज करना होगा ताकि हमारे मुल्क के अंदर जितना भी जंगी साजो-सामान है वह बने और सामान के साथ-साथ हमारे मुल्क में जो बेकारी और बेरोजगारी है उस को भी इस से बहुत मदद मिल सकती है। मुझे पूरी उम्मीद है कि इन तमाम चीजों को नजर में रखा जायगा।

प्रोमोशंस का जहां तक सवाल है 1950 में एयर फोर्स हिन्दुस्तान में सबसे ज्यादा तनख्वाह पाता था लेकिन जब से हमारे मुल्क में आई ए एस और आइ एफ एस शुरू हो गया तब से एयर फोर्स बहुत नीचे चला गया और एयर फोर्स और आर्मी का स्टैंडर्ड आफ लिविंग भी बहुत नीचे चला गया। मेरे कहने का मतलब यह नहीं है कि आइ ए एस या आइ एफ एस को कम तनख्वाह दें लेकिन हमारा एयर फोर्स जो हमारी जान की और हमारे मुल्क की हिफाजत करता है उस को ज्यादा से ज्यादा तनख्वाह दें।

इस के साथ ही मैं अपना आखिरी सजेशन रखूंगा कि भारत की अखंडता,

भारत की एकता, भारत की स्वतंत्रता और भारत की रक्षा के लिए मुल्क को इस वक्त सब से ज्यादा जरूरत लीडरशिप की है। जिस तरह हर फील्ड में लीडरशिप होती है चाहे वह इंडस्ट्री हो या और कोई फील्ड हो, इसी तरह से आर्मी में भी लीडरशिप की बहुत जरूरत है और लीडरशिप वह होनी चाहिए जिस के मन में जज्बा हो कुर्बानी का, जिस के मन में जज्बा हो तमाम चीजों को इकट्ठा करने का और हमारा जैसा मुल्क है जहां कई जवानों बोली जाती है, कई मजहब हैं और कई नस्ल और रंग के लोग हैं, ऐसे मुल्क में हम को ऐसी लीडरशिप की और ज्यादा जरूरत है। इसी तरह से डिफेंस में भी लीडरशिप की जरूरत है। आर्मी, नैवी और एयर फोर्स—इन तीनों के लिए एक ऐसे लीडर की जरूरत है जोकि इनको इकट्ठा रखकर अपने मुल्क की रक्षा कर सके और तीनों पर अपना कंट्रोल रख सके। हमारे लिए यह बड़ी खुशी की बात है कि हमारे पास एक ऐसी लीडर है, हमारी प्रधान मंत्री श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी, जोकि इन तीनों सर्विसेज को इकट्ठा रखकर मुल्क की सलामती और मुल्क को आगे ले जाने के लिए काम कर रही हैं।

SHRIMATI SUKHBUNS KAUR (Gurdaspur): Defence preparedness has been a matter of continuous concern. This great nation of ours with its teeming millions with aspirations of peace and progress has been subjected to hostility several times. The aspirations of our people and their rightful expectation, of dignified and decent living can be achieved by optimum utilisation of the resources. But, unfortunately, significant change in the situation in the international region and particularly the propensi-

ties and predilections of our neighbours leave us with no option but to diversify some of our resources for defence. Peaceful co-existence and mutual respect for integrity of each other and the territorial integrity of our neighbour has been the cornerstone of our policy. But the recent and the significant development in the region around us in the recent past has caused great concern. There seems to be no doubt that the Reagan Administration has made up its mind to renew extensive arms supplies to Pakistan. In the vastly changed circumstances of the 80s the United States Government is reviving the policy of John Foster Dulles of the 50s. That, no doubt, is causing great misunderstanding and concern in our country. About two to two and a half million dollars worth of arms are being supplied to Pakistan. In the next year that is going to be \$5 million worth. That must not be considered as a mere peanuts considering that U.S. normally sells arms to its favoured allies at highly concessional rates. It is said that arms are being supplied for protection against Afghanistan. But we must realise that this is not so. The major portion of Pakistan armies have been positioned against India and not against Afghanistan to stem the communist expansion.

The 1959 Agreement obliges the U.S. Government to assist Pakistan only in case of attack by a Communist country but Gen. Zia wants this treaty to cover India as well. We have seen in the past, not a single U.S. weapon was fired anywhere else, against anybody else except India. All this brings us to the question of what the other countries have and what we have or what our forces have? Details have been given by my colleagues of the arms that the other nations have and Pakistan has. But what do we need? I would like to start with the Army. We have artillery, infantry to fight the modern war.

[Shrimati Sukhbans Kaur]

But in plains warfare tank is most decisive and dominant weapon. In the tank fire power, mobility and flexibility to the commander is given. Some ridiculous proposals have been advanced by the soldiers of yester years that tanks should be replaced by anti-tank system which is cheaper. But war in these days is intensive, continuous and is fought day and night in hilly terrain and in all kinds of weather. Anti-tank missiles can fire at tanks within range and with visibility. That is all. But it becomes open to enemy fire as soon as it moves to another place. Whereas tanks can fight day and night and have their own communication which gives the commander flexibility in manoeuvrability modify his plans instantaneously and seize fleeting opportunities in war.

There is an argument that because of anti-tank missiles, tanks are becoming more vulnerable. Regarding that also I was reading a report that our research is working on a hard-pierce armour. Therefore that argument that they are becoming vulnerable does not hold ground. I would also say that anti-tank missiles cannot replace tanks. They are complementary to each other. All the countries are realising this and that is why we see that constantly they are updating them and they are also adding more tanks to the armed forces in spite of the fact that sophisticated weapons have been introduced in the army.

While on the subject of missiles, I would like to draw the attention of the Defence Minister to the fact that we do have first-generation missiles and, while we are on the second-generation missiles, we should now be working on the third-generation missiles.

Regarding the Navy, we know that gun-boat diplomacy is rife in the

Indian Ocean and that Super Powers are deploying their task forces in furtherance of their political objectives. Therefore, our Navy should be strengthened as a threshold of deterrence. Firstly, the asset of the Indian Ocean is very important to India for trade which is nearly worth Rs. 12,000 crores. Most of it is carried by sea. Therefore, we must have a strong Navy to escort commercial shipping into our areas because it is obvious that any nation which has the power to interfere in commercial shipping can disrupt the Indian economy.

The Indian Ocean is very rich in natural resources and that has also to be protected. The exploitation of off-shore oil is important for the Indian economy and national development requires off-shore drilling and rigs which might be situated upto 100 miles into the ocean which are open to under-water and submarine attacks. We require Navy for that also. Again, for fisheries which is an important asset, the Navy is required.

One point which I would like to express about Navy is that with the advent of satellite the enemy is in a position to exactly know, see and identify all the bases that we have in India. I believe that because of the satellite, the pictures are so good that you can even locate a man or a vehicle on the earth. Therefore, the air-force bases can be seen. They can be identified and, in case of they are readily seen. There is one base that we have, which can be identified but which the satellite pictures cannot show where it will be today, tomorrow or in a week's time. I am referring to the Vikrant. That is one major base we have as an aircraft carrier to our advantage.

Some hon. Members from the Opposition referred to the Vikrant as an obsolete aircraft. I may inform the House and, I think, most of the hon. Members know that the Vikrant is undergoing modernisation programme. The sensors and the radars are

being replaced and some of the armament also are being replaced. She will be virtually a new ship when she re-enters service. Even the deck is being modified for the sea harrier aircraft. We are not the only country which is modernising our ship. Other countries are also doing it. For the information of the House, I may point out that even Australia has a aircraft like Vikrant.

Lastly, I come to the air force. In 1971, our aircraft short-range and limited armament capacity did engage the enemy and did come out with flying colours. But this does not obliterate the fact that there are major shortcomings. If we want to attack every potential of the aggressor, what is needed is a deep penetrating aircraft. We have got Jaguar. But, as the same time, we have heard that U.S.A. is giving Pakistan F-16. What is the Government doing about it? Are we satisfied with what we have got? I request the Government to look into it because this is a very important aspect and Air Force, in modern warfare, has a very important role to play. While on the subject of Air Force, I would like to say that, like the other forces, they have certain disadvantages of pay problems, but particularly for Air Force, the wastage rate is 30 per cent, casualty rate, even in peace times is high. Special incentives should be given to them because of the importance of Air Force in warfare, so that they can fight the war well.

Along with strike aircraft, the communication system for the Air Force is very important. Therefore, radars or any other sophisticated equipment that they require, should be given to them.

There is one thing which I would like to bring to the notice of this

august House—it is a very disturbing thing . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have reinforced Navy, you have reinforced Air Force. Now, please try to conclude.

SHRIMATI SUKHBUNS KAUR: There is a tendency on the part of the officers of the Armed Forces to rush to High Courts and Supreme Court to seek redress of alleged military wrongs to them. I am second to none in my respect for the courts. But we want them to give consideration to this. There are certain provisions in the Constitution—articles 33, 136(2), 227(4), 310 and 311—which exclude the Armed Forces from the jurisdiction of these Courts. In spite of the fact that we respect the judgments, I appeal to the courts that consideration should be given to this so that we do not set such a trend which might be hard to retract later on. This is likely to erode the discipline of the Armed Forces.

My hon. friend, who was speaking a little while ago, was giving an example. An officer, in war or battle, is asked to go an fight. 95 per cent of the time he knows that he going to die. But he goes because of the discipline. You can imagine a situation as to what will happen if he feels that he has an option. What will happen to the security of the country if that discipline is lost? That discipline is not built in a day or two, it takes centuries to build that discipline. It is, therefore, requested that Government should look into this respect.

I conclude by saying that the independence that we value so much and this great nation of ours for which our forefathers and great leaders had made so many sacrifices, is not safe and secure unless the present-day generation also is prepared to make some sacrifices in their material comforts.

श्री राम बिलास पासवान (हाजीपुर): सभापति महोदय, देश की सुरक्षा का भार सिर्फ सरकार पर ही नहीं है तथा यह किसी एक पार्टी का मामला भी नहीं है—यह समूचे देश से सम्बन्ध रखता है। अभी हमारे पूर्व-वक्ताओं ने जो चिन्ता व्यक्त की है, मैं उसमें आप ने आप को सम्बद्ध करता हूँ। आज जो विभिन्न परिस्थितियाँ देश के चारों तरफ मंडरा रही हैं तथा जो समस्या आ कर खड़ी हो गई हैं उनके सम्बन्ध में जब कभी उधर के माननीय सदस्य बोलते हैं तो ऐसा लगता है कि इतने गहन विषय पर वे गम्भीरता पूर्वक नहीं बोल रहे हैं।

अभी एक कोशिश चल रही है कि पाकिस्तान, चीन और अमरीका इन तीनों को एक खेमे में गठबंधन में जोड़ा जाये। मैं समझता हूँ—यह बहुत ही खतरनाक चाल होगी, यदि हमारा सरकार ने इस होने वाले गठबंधन को तोड़ने का काम नहीं किया। हमारे जो अफगानिस्तान का मामला है उसके सम्बन्ध में हमारे अनेक साथियों ने अपनी राय जाहिर की है। जो लंका का मामला है वह भी हमारे सामने है। लंका में एक “दिकोमली” नेत्र-बन्ध है जिसको “आइ-ग्राफ-दि-इण्डियन-ऑशन” भी कहते हैं। वह न हमारे कब्जे में है, न श्री लंका के कब्जे में है, वह अमरीका के कब्जे में है, चीन का कब्जा तिब्बत पर है। इसलिए यह सारे का सारा आप की वगत में माहौल खड़ा है और इस परिस्थिति में हम यह तय करने के लिये बैठे हैं और हम सोच रहे हैं कि हमारी रक्षानोति क्या हो। मैं आप का ध्यान इस बात की तरफ खींचना चाहूँगा कि आप ने टोटल

डिफेन्स का जो बजट रखा है वह लगभग 3793 करोड़ रुपये का है और उसमें आर्मी का बजट 2254 करोड़ रुपये, एयर फोर्स के लिए इन्होंने 966 करोड़ रुपये रखे हैं और नेवी पर केवल 291 करोड़ रुपये इन्होंने रखे हैं। अब ये जो 291 करोड़ रुपये रखे गये हैं इस में जो कोस्ट गार्ड का बजट है, वह भी जोड़ दिया है। मैं आप के माध्यम से सरकार से जानाना चाहूँगा कि जिस हिन्दुस्तान की कोस्ट लाइन 3,000 मील से ज्यादा है, जहाँ एकोनामिक जोन 20 किलोमीटर से बढ़ा कर आप ने 200 किलोमीटर कर दिया है, जहाँ हम यह देख रहे हैं कि अण्डमान-निकोबार में लोग पहुँच जाते हैं और उस द्वीप में लोग रहते हैं और आप को इस का पता भी नहीं रहता है, जहाँ बगल में ताइवान से मछली मारने के लिए लोग बंगाल की खाड़ी में पहुँच जाते हैं, ऐसी परिस्थिति में जहाँ आप ने कुल डिफेन्स का 3793 करोड़ रुपये का बजट रखा है, उसमें से केवल 291 करोड़ रुपये आपने नेवी को दिया है। यह मैं समझता हूँ कि यह उचित नहीं है और आप को निश्चित रूप से इस राशि को बढ़ाना चाहिए और नेवी को, नौसेना को जो रक्षा की दृष्टि से निगलेक्ट किया जा रहा है, सरकार को उसके बारे में सोचना चाहिए और बहुत मजबूत करना चाहिए। उसको काफी मजबूत करने की आवश्यकता है।

एयर फोर्स का जहाँ तक मामला है, सी० सुब्रहमण्यम कमेटी को इस के बारे में एक रिपोर्ट थी और उस कमेटी ने अपनी रिपोर्ट में कहा था कि हमारे पास उस समय स्टेन्डर्डाइज्ड एयरोप्लेन नहीं थे और मैं समझता

हूँ कि आज भी उसकी आवश्यकता है, आज भी उनका अभाव है। मैं समझता हूँ कि निश्चित रूप से ऐसे एयर-प्लेन की आवश्यकता है और एयर-फोर्स को मजबूत करने के लिए सरकार उन की आवश्यकता को महसूस करे और एयरफोर्स की उस आवश्यकता की पूर्ति करे।

सभापति महोदय, काफी वक्ताओं ने काफी बातें कह दी हैं लेकिन मैं आप के माध्यम से मंत्री जी से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आर्मी के अन्दर कुछ आर्गनाइजेशनस हैं, कुछ विभाग हैं, उन में जो कुछ हो रहा है, उस तरफ इस सदन का ध्यान खींचना चाहूंगा। अभी हमारे एक साथी ने कहा कि आर्मी में इन्डिस्टिपलिन बहुत बढ़ता जा रहा है और आर्मी वाले धड़ल्ले से सुप्रीम कोर्ट में जा रहे हैं, हाई कोर्ट में जा रहे हैं। स्वाभाविक है कि जब देश आजाद हुआ है और जब एक तरफ हमारा यह नारा है कि जवान और किसान एक ही परिवार के हैं, तो ऐसी परिस्थिति में देश की आजादी की झलक, देश की आजादी की छाप उन के दिमाग में भी है लेकिन उन की समस्याओं का समाधान नहीं हो पाता है। वहाँ पर भी जुल्म होते हैं। वहाँ पर भी आफिसर हैं, जो ह्यूमन बींग हैं और उन के द्वारा भी गलती हो सकती है और हो भी रही होगी और उन की समस्या का निदान वहाँ न मिलने के कारण, हम को ऐसा लगता है, कि वे कोर्ट में जा रहे हैं, अपने दायरे से बाहर जा कर सुप्रीम कोर्ट में जा रहे हैं, दूसरी जगहों पर जा रहे हैं। अभी आज के अखबार में निकला है कि 400 शेंड्यूल्ड कास्ट्स और शेंड्यूल्ड ट्राइव्स के एम्पलाइज, जो पब्लिक सेक्टर हैवी मशीनरिज

फैक्टरी, एवाडी, में काम करते हैं, ने रिजाइन कर दिया :

Four hundred Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe employees of the public sector Heavy Vehicles factory at Avadi today and yesterday tendered their resignations according to the Federation of SC & ST Employees.

आप देखें कि 400 शेंड्यूल्ड कास्ट्स और शेंड्यूल्ड ट्राइव्स के एम्पलाइज ने रिजाइन कर दिया, रेजिगनेशन दे दिया। अब यह डिफेंस का मामला है। क्यों रिजाइन किया, इस में मैं इस समय नहीं जाना चाहता लेकिन अगर 400 एम्पलाइज, और वे भी बीकर सैक्शनस और शेंड्यूल्ड कास्ट्स और शेंड्यूल्ड ट्राइव्स के हैं रिजाइन कर देते हैं, तो इस का मतलब यह है कि वहाँ कुछ न कुछ उन के साथ इन्-जस्टिस हो रही है, उस समुदाय के साथ इन्जस्टिस हो रही है। तो वह जाएगा, दूसरी जगहों पर जाएगा, हाई कोर्ट और सुप्रीम कोर्ट में जाएगा। तो मैं सरकार से मांग करता हूँ कि वह इस पर पुनर्विचार करे और अभी जे. आर्मी के अन्दर, सेना के अन्दर रक्षा मंत्रालय में जे. न्याय की पद्धति है, उस में परिवर्तन करे। उस के लिए अगर कोई एपेलेट ट्रिब्यूनल बनाने की आवश्यकता हो, तो वह आप बनाइए। यदि है तो उससे भी बड़ी चीज बनाइए। सुप्रीम कोर्ट में मामला जाता है तो इसका मतलब है कि कहीं न कहीं वहाँ लोगों को न्याय नहीं मिलता है या वे सन्तुष्ट नहीं होते हैं। उनको संतुष्ट आप कैसे करेंगे? सुप्रीम कोर्ट तक मैं जब मामले धड़ल्ले से आ रहे हैं तो इसका मतलब है फीज में डिसिप्लिन जो है उस पर खतरे का प्रश्न चिन्ह लगना उसका यह सूचक है

/श्री राम विलास पासवान/

मैंने पिछली बार नाम के आधार पर रेजीमेंट्स के नामकरण के सवाल को उठाया था। प्रश्न भी मैंने किया था। सिख रेजीमेंट्स, राजपूत रेजीमेंट, ब्राह्मण रेजीमेंट, जाट रेजीमेंट, ये जातियों के नाम पर रेजीमेंट्स हैं इनको आम खत्म करें। तर्क के लिए आप कह सकते हैं कि दूसरी जातियों के लोग भी उनमें जा सकते हैं, उसकी उनको छूट है लेकिन व्यवहार में ऐसा नहीं होता है, दूसरे उनमें नहीं जा सकते हैं। आप मैरिट को देखते हैं। लड़ाई को देखते हैं। लड़ाई में कितनी किसी में ताकत है, कितनी उसकी लम्बाई चौड़ाई है यह सब आप देखते हैं। आप नेशनल एवार्ड देते हैं, परमवीर चक्र देते हैं, उनके नाम पर आप रेजीमेंट्स रखें, ए बी सी डी आदि नामों से रखें लेकिन कास्ट के नाम पर न रखें और अगर कास्ट के नाम पर रखना ही है तो शोड्यूलड कास्ट और शंड्यूलड ट्राइब्स के नाम पर भी रखें, बैकवर्ड क्लामेंस के नाम पर भी रखें। जब प्रश्न किया जाता है तो कह दिया जाता कि हिस्टोरिकल मामला इससे जुड़ा हुआ है, ऐतिहासिक मामला इससे जुड़ा हुआ है, उन लोगों के मेंटीमेंट्स पर इससे धक्का लगेगा। उनके मेंटीमेंट्स पर लगता है तो क्या हम लोगों के मेंटीमेंट्स पर नहीं लगता है? 33 साल की आजादी के बाद तो कास्ट के नाम पर रेजीमेंट्स के नाम रखना बन्द आप करें और जो रखे हुए हैं उनको हटायें।

रिपोर्ट को हम देखते हैं तो उसमें यह पाते हैं कि आपने एक डायरेक्टर जनरल आफ इन्स्पेक्शन रखा हुआ है। वही खरीदता भी है और वही इन्स्पेक्शन भी करता है। दोनों काम वही करता है। पी यू सी की रिपोर्ट अभी प्रकाशित हुई है। लोग उस पर चर्चा कर रहे हैं हिन्दुस्तान टाइम्स में भी उस पर चर्चा हुई है। एक हजार करोड़ रुपए का सामान खरीदा जाता है

और उसका इन्स्पेक्शन होता है। आपको चाहिए कि आप ऐसा संगठन बनाएं जिस पर कोई उंगली न उठा सके, उसकी ईमानदारी पर प्रश्न वाचक चिन्ह न लग सके।

आपका एक कौन्टीन स्टोर डिपार्टमेंट है। वहां भी खरीद बिक्री का काम होता है। उसमें भी वही मामला है। एक आपका डायरेक्टर जनरल रिहैबिलिटेशन है। उसका क्या काम है? पिछली बार भी मैंने इसके बारे में पूछा था। रिहैबिलिटेशन का क्या काम वहां होता है कुछ पता नहीं। एम्प्लॉईमेंट एसक्सचेंजिज में कितने लोगों ने नाम दर्ज कराए और कितने लोगों को नौकरियां दीं कुछ पता नहीं चलता है। उसका क्या फंक्शन है, यह आज तक हम लोगों की समझ में नहीं आया।

ग्राडनेंस फैक्टरीज के कर्मचारियों का मामला भी है। पिछली बार भी मैंने वहां काम करने वाले कर्मचारियों का मामला उठाया था। उनको आप बोनस देते हैं। लेकिन अभी भी बहुत सी फैक्टरीयां हैं जहां इसकी अदायगी नहीं हो पायी है।

रिसर्च एन्ड डिवलपमेंट विंग को आप मजबूत करें। उसमें अभी तक कुछ काम नहीं हुआ है। पिछले पांच साल की रिपोर्टस आप देख लें। इसके बारे में आप उनमें कुछ नहीं पायेंगे। इसको भी आप मजबूत करें।

शार्ट सर्विस कमीशन के बारे में मैं कुछ कहना चाहता हूं। एमरजेंसी आती है तो इसमें लोगों को नियुक्त कर लिया जाता है। अब भी आएगी तो नियुक्तियां हो जायेंगी। पांच साल तक उन लोगों को आप रखेंगे उसके बाद हटा देंगे। जब रखते हैं तब तो देखते हैं कि 5 फुट छ: इंच से उसकी लम्बाई कम न हो, तीन

इंच कम भी हुई तो नहीं लेते हैं। उसकी छाती को देखते हैं, श्रृंखणिक योग्यता को देखते हैं और बहुत सखी वरतते हैं लेकिन पांच साल के बाद उसको नौकरी से निकाल बाहर कर देते हैं और यह देखने की कोशिश नहीं करते कि इस तरह के लोगों में से कितनों ने तंग आकर आत्म हत्या कर ली है कहां जा कर वे नौकरी करेंगे? उनको आप रेग्युलराइज कर सकते हैं, किसी और रूप में उनको रख सकते हैं। पांच साल तक उससे काम कराने के बाद जो आप बेरहमी से, बिना सोचे समझे, उसके भविष्य का क्या होगा, इस पर ध्यान दिए बगैर निकाल बाहर करते हैं यह ठीक नहीं है। इस बारे में आपको निश्चय ही कुछ करना चाहिये।

रक्षा मंत्रालय का देश की रक्षा से सम्बन्ध है। यह बहुत गम्भीर मामला है। जब पार्लियामेंट में सवाल पूछा जाता है तो कह दिया जाता है कि इससे देश की सुरक्षा जुड़ी हुई है, इन वास्ते इसको बताना सम्भव नहीं, उचित नहीं। और उचित भी नहीं है। हो सकता है कि उचित न हो। लेकिन कोई चीज डिफेंस में अभी तक सुरक्षा के दृष्टिकोण से जिसको आप नहीं बताना चाहते वह सब कुछ लोगों को मिल जाता है। रोज रिटायर्ड जनरलों के आर्टिकल अखबारों में निकलते रहते हैं जिसमें उनका कुछ पैसा मिल जाता है और इस प्रकार सारी चीजें लोगों को पता चलती रहती हैं देश में भी और विदेशों का भी। तो यह जो सारी चीजें हो रही हैं, और भ्रष्टाचार के जो प्रश्न उठते हैं, मैंने पिछली बार भी कहा था कि आप कोई ऐसी कमेटी बनायें जो वाच-डाग का काम करे। ठीक है आप सुरक्षा की दृष्टि से नहीं बताना चाहते लेकिन कम से कम यह तो देखें कि इसमें कोई भ्रष्टाचार तो नहीं आ रहा है। 1962

में युद्ध हुआ और भारत सरकार को पता नहीं कैसे युद्ध हो गया सारी चीजें हो गई और आपने उनको दोष दे दिया और उसने आपको दोष दे दिया। तो आप पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बरो को, सब पोलिटिकल पार्टिज के मेम्बरो की एक स्टैंडिंग कमेटी बना दें जो वाच डाग का काम करे जो देखे कि क्या चीजें हो रही हैं, कहीं कोई भ्रष्टाचार तो नहीं पनप रहा है आप देखेंगे कि सलाहकार समिति है। लेकिन अभी माननीय इन्द्रजीत गुप्त ने कहा कि उसकी बैठक ही नहीं हुई। उसकी बैठक नहीं होगी और दूसरी कोई कमेटी बनायेंगे नहीं तो यह सारी चीजें होती रहेंगी।

श्री जितेन्द्र प्रसाद : सलाहकार समिति की बैठक हुई है।

श्री राम खिलान पासवान : अभी गुप्त जी ने कहा कि नहीं हुई। हों तो मालूम नहीं क्योंकि हम उनके सदस्य नहीं हैं।

दूसरी बात यह है कि हम लोगों को प्रत्येक सवाल मैरिट के आधार पर लेना चाहिये और गुणदोषों के आधार पर जांच करनी चाहिये। आप जनता पार्टी को दोष देंगे कि उसके रिजिम में क्या यह हुआ। आज क्या हो रहा है? आज क्या आप चारों तरफ से घिरे हुये हैं? आज तक गुट-निरपेक्षता और संरक्षण की नीति हमारे समझ में नहीं आयी। गुटनिरपेक्षता का यह तो मतलब नहीं है कि एक कमजोरको कोई मारता रहे और हम संरक्षित हो कर चुपचाप देखते रहें। यह नहीं है। गुटनिरपेक्षता की नीति के आधार पर आपको गुण दोष के आधार पर मुंह खोलना चाहिये।

इंडियन ओशन में दोनों सुपर पावर्स के मिलिटरी बेसेज हैं—अमरीका का डीगो गार्शिया में और रूस का इथोपिया में।

### राम विलास पाठवान

इंडियन ओपिन में आप क्क्यों विदेशी शक्तियों को पनपने दे रहे हैं ? हम क्क्यों नहीं उसका विरोध करते हैं कि हम किसी का बेस नहीं बनने देना चाहते ? तो मैं सरकार से कहना चाहता हूँ कि जहाँ तक सरकार को रक्षा नाति का मामला है, देश की रक्षा का मामला है, हम उसके साथ हैं, हमारे जैसा आदमी देश को समृद्धि भी चाहता है और यह भी नहीं हम चाहेंगे कि रक्षा के मामले में कमजोर रहें ताकि चीन झटपट को तरह हमको कोई ले जाये । आज जो मामला नज़दक पहुंच गया है, पाकिस्तान और अफ़ग़ानिस्तान तथा एशियन देशों में जो युद्ध भूमि बन रही है मैं चाहूंगा सरकार कोशिश करे, सरकार के पास ऐसी रणनीति होना चाहिये जिसके मुनाबिक या तो युद्ध न हो जाँ थर्ड वर्ड वार का खतरा सर पर मंडरा रहा है । मैं यह कह रहा हूँ कि हमारे तिर पर तृतीय विश्व युद्ध का मामला मंडरा रहा है, भारत सरकार कोशिश करे कि यह युद्ध न हो । यदि उसमें नाकापयावी होता है तो हमारी सरकार यह कोशिश करे कि एशिया की भूमि पर यह युद्ध न हो, यह युद्ध कहीं और ही हो । जिसको अरना शक्ति फैलानी हो वह उन अरने वहाँ फ़ैराये, लेकिन अन्त में यदि युद्ध हो जाँ तो हम युद्ध का मुकाबला भी दृढ़ता से कर सकें और करारा जवाब दे सकें और बुलन्दो के साथ जवाब दे सकें, यह हमारी नाति होनी चाहिये ।

इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ समापति जो मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ और मैं समझता हूँ कि आपक अनुसार मैंने एक मिनट का समय भी पूरा नहीं लिया है ।

**SHRI AMARINDER SINGH**  
(Patiala): Sir, I rise to support the Demands of the Ministry of Defence.

Sir, in the course of the last two days' debate a considerable amount has been said over global and regional imbalances. I would like to raise a few points concerning the security of this country. First, Sir, China today has built up a very sophisticated nuclear strike force, secondly, the establishment with the announcement Pakistan /US axis has got more firmly of 400 million Defence Aid to be possibly built up to two billion over the next few years; and thirdly more significantly Pakistans race for a nuclear weapon.

Sir, if we are to contend with this build up in our neighbourhood, and if we are to combat any military adventurism in the near future, then firstly, I think we must build up conventional weapon superiority over Pakistan, and secondly, in view of the Chinese nuclear build up, and Pakistan's race for a nuclear weapon, India must consider whether we too should accept the nuclear option.

As far as conventional weapons balance is concerned, a considerable amount has already been said, in this House, and the Press has been carrying this for some time. I would only like to say this that we know of the sophisticated fighter bomber aircraft, which has been mentioned, Pakistan is likely to build upto five Squadrons at this. In addition to this, it is manning four squadrons in Saudi Arabia and with the Defence Agreement that exists between these two countries, if ever we have a confrontation with Pakistan again, we will have to contend with nine squadrons of this sophisticated aircraft, which is giving them a very formidable strike potential.

On the ground we are told that they expect about 200 tanks of the M-60 type, about one Brigade, Sir. That seems their current plan. This is also likely to further increase with the additional aid which they may get to two or three brigades. If they have these formations both in the air

and on the ground, then we are going to be outgunned both in the air and on the ground. So we must today consider how we can possibly combat this threat, where the weapons should come from, and what sort of weapons are required. We must not consider the cost factor as the defence of the nation could be in jeopardy. We should look for the finest tanks and the finest aircraft to combat this threat and we must then get them.

As far as the nuclear potential of our neighbours is concerned, we are aware of the Chinese build up. We know that today they possess about 149 missiles both ICBMs and IRBMs, which they have got deployed and they are further adding to their arsenal. We also know that all these missiles, that they possess can be redeployed and be within striking distance of our country. We also know that Pakistan is likely to explode its nuclear device sometimes later this autumn, and very shortly afterwards it can develop its own weapon. This, Sir, is the nuclear build up around us.

We know from the past both in 1965 and 1971, of a direct threat of Chinese intervention, in aid of Pakistan, and now with the possession of a sophisticated nuclear strike capability this threat could be even more significant in the future. Let us take an example, Sir. Assume we are at war. We do not want war with anybody. We have always stood for friendship with all particularly our neighbours. But we have had to—four times in the past 36 years—call on our Defence Forces to defend our borders. Sir, can anybody guarantee there will be no fifth? If there is a confrontation and we are engaged in a conventional battle on the field and in that battle Pakistan is being defeated, and if they possess a nuclear weapon, do we seriously believe that they will not use it. I go one step further. I say even if they do not use that weapon. Suppose they just make this announcement that the 'Indian Air Force has been bombing

us for the last ten days and we, intend day after tomorrow, to drop our bomb on a city in Northern India." That is all that they have to say, Sir. Can we understand the impact on the morale of the nation that this statement is going to have on the morale of the Army in the field? Half our Defence Services come from North India. Nobody will know which city is the target. What is the impact likely to be on their morale, knowing that their families may disappear three days hence? This is something which we must seriously consider. If the Government feels that a nuclear threat is probable, or even possible, we have no alternative, no matter what the critics may say about this programme we must have no weapon. Many of them will raise the moral aspect, many of them will raise financial implications, the cost factor etc. People are going to talk about world opinion. We must consider the strategic necessity of this programme. This is something required for the defence of the country. When the time comes nobody is going to come to our aid. Each country has to decide what is required for the defence of its people. And that decision, Sir, must be made in this House.

I come now to another aspect which has been showing a disturbing trend, and which is a matter of concern in all the three Services, that is, our junior leadership. No Defence Force can sustain itself without a regular and, constant flow of young people who can be trained to be junior leader today and who will later on, occupy senior positions. We today find that we are not getting sufficient quantities of such men, and that too men of the right type. There is a reason for this. It is that the Defence Forces do not offer enough incentives in their pay and emoluments, and in their service conditions. It is a disrupted life and there are various other factors also contributing to this. On the other hand, we have the private sector—for instance. The private

[Shri Amarinder Singh]

sector offers better emoluments. So, you find all our brighter people going there. They get the glamour by joining the IAS, IFS and other such services; our young people prefer to apply for these jobs. Right down, at the bottom rung of the ladder you get them applying for the Defence Services. Therefore, Sir, we must get to the root cause of this.

Today we are recruiting youngsters whom we are training up as our junior leaders. They are going to be the future leaders of our Defence Services. They are going to be formation commanders; and eventually, 30 years hence, they are going to lead the services in the country. If we are not going to get the right kind of person now, you can understand what will happen with the way the world is developing, and the complex situations that are developing, you can understand what then is going to be our fate in the future.

Let us get to the basics of this. Let me give you one example to illustrate my point about the salary and emoluments. In 1947, a captain was getting Rs. 450 a month. Today the same captain is getting Rs. 1,110. But the value of the rupee over this period has fallen to 16 paise. So, in real purchasing power terms that officer is not getting even 38 per cent of what he got in 1947. In addition to this, he has to pay for every conceivable thing—his accommodation, his clothing, electricity, water etc. We have got 11 lakh people in uniform; 10 lakh of them are other ranks and JCOs; they get everything free. And their salaries, over the 1947 level, have been increased by 350 per cent. Today, in the officer cadre, as I was mentioning, we are down to a stage where they don't have any purchasing power. In addition, they get nothing free, they have to pay for everything. Sir, we must give proper incentives to our youngsters to come forward; and the only incentive is that we must review the salary and allowances structure. I realise that in-

flation is not restricted to the Defence Services. I am aware of that. But the nature of duties in the Defence Services are completely different. For example, nobody knows how long he has to live.

Take my example. I am a product of the National Defence Academy. We are called a corps when we join. We are then split into various squadrons. In my squadron, there were 18 of us when we graduated. Today we are only ten left. This is my meaning of an insecure way of life. Of the 20 years an officer serves, for anything up to 12 years, he is in a field area. All these things have to be considered. Pay and allowances must be an incentive enough for our currently serving officers to stay on and youngsters to come forward to join the Services. This is a matter which I hope will engage the attention of the Government. Serious thought should be given to this, because the whole future of our nation could some day be in jeopardy. I would like to mention first two points regarding ex-servicemen. I come from a State where in every village, and every house in that village has either somebody who is serving in the defence services, somebody who has retired from the defence services or somebody who is thinking of joining them.

Today, there are 70 lakh ex-servicemen in this country and we are told that 60,000 retire each year to join this large number. Today, Sir, there are two matters which engage the attention of the ex-servicemen. One is rehabilitation when they retire. The second is the pension structure. For the last 30 odd years, we have had a Department of Resettlement, but the entire emphasis of that Department has been concentrated on getting individual agencies, helping them to get engaged in small scale industries or sending them to the Nicobar Islands or somewhere, for resettlement. But this is the first time that a practical scheme has been put forward by them, and that is pre-release training—training our soldiers six

months before they retire. So far we are considering sending them to the public sector industry so that they can learn a trade and then be released from the services. This is a practical solution. I believe that this scheme is starting from this month. Two thousand people are to be sent to the public sector for this purpose as a beginning. I would like to broaden this further. I would like the Government to consider a legislation to include private industries as well. The members to be sent to any industry could depend upon its turn-over, and of its employment potential. Let us get them in there. Sixty thousand is a large figure Sir. Let all industries take these people in, and train them in trade. I am then sure that most of them would be absorbed by their parent industries. All those who are not absorbed, will emerge qualified people. When they come out they can be given opportunities of preparing schemes. Let them present those schemes to banks and let the banks treat these schemes on a priority basis as they do for certain other sections of society. They should advance loans for five years or six-years at a concessional rate of interest.

I think if we could do this, if we can include the Private sector, if they could train these people and if the banks are ordered to do this, then the great resentment which is therein will certainly ease.

The second point is pensions. Six times pensions have been increased since 1961, 1973 and 1979 were the last two increases. In both these cases the quantum of pension was increased considerably, but applied only to those people who retired after the 1st of April of that year. I will give you one example to explain my point. A jawan who retired, say, in 1961 or 1962 gets a pension of Rs. 25 per month. A Subedar with 28 years of service gets a pension of Rs. 104 per month. Jawans who retired after 1973 get

a pension of Rs. 149—Rs. 45 more than a Subedar who retired in the previous year.

They came to me often, Sir, and tell me that they have served for 28 years. From World War II to Kashmir in 1974, in China in 1962, in Pakistan in 1965 as well as in 1971. They ask me, "whether their services to the country are in any way less than those who have retired later on?" I cannot give them any answer Sir, because I agree with them. These old soldeires have served this nation most devotedly. Many of them have given their arms, legs, their whole life in the services of the nation. I think this is a point of discrimination and should be urgently considered and done away with. I am speaking about those who retired and are from a small Indian Defence Service which existed pre-1962—the number of them would not be that large. People who retire today and onwards may be 60,000 or 70,000 in the years to come, but this number is very small. They have dedicated their life to the service of this nation and I think this matter should engage the urgent attention of the Government and something should be done in this regard at an early date.

**SHRI UTTAM RATHOD (Hingoli):** Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of Defence.

Yesterday, when Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee spoke, he referred to a sentence from the Report of the Ministry of Defence for 1980-81. He read out a sentence: "The developments in Afghanistan at the end of 1979 were a culmination of a series of interconnected events."

He wanted to know the events. I will tell him the events.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** He is not here now.

**SHRI UTTAM RATHOD:** Let him not be here

**SHRI R. K. MHALGI:** We are here.

**SHRI UTTAM RATHOD:** Think you. In a recent book written by Mr. Mahesh Joshi on Assam, "Indian Conflict", he has mentioned, "China in Tibet, Russia in Afghanistan have equally common, comparable and compelling interests to defend. The Chinese occupation of Tibet in 1950 was to make the Russian intervention in Afghanistan so much inevitable in 1980. The movement of politics is very slow and it is therefore conceived through cause and effect, in myth and mystery."

The Second World War has done so many good things. It has given us a new vocabulary, which added 'cold war', 'limited war', the 'general war' what not. And it also created the super powers. And, according to me the super powers are only the five veto powers which are represented in the United Nations Security Council. And these Super Powers actually control the politics, economics and everything of the whole world. Their alignment may change from time to time, but one thing remains, That they do not allow any country—any non-aligned country, or for that matter any newly independent nation—to come up and remain out of the gamut of these people. That reminds me, of a tribal recreation—sort of recreation that is followed in my area. We call it a cock fight. When man has almost finished fighting between himself with his opponent he thought of a different thing. And he thought, 'let us have a cock fight.' So he got one cock, he fed it well and when the fight was to be arranged he saw that some blades were put to their legs and the fight was arranged. To day these five real Super Powers are almost indulging in the same thing and they

have made it impossible for any non-aligned or even the newly independent nation to remain out of their camp. And that is why I think it is for India which realises that it is time that we must alert all these nations which are free and away from these Super Powers. We all know that India is almost encircled by countries which are not very friendly to us. My predecessors have already spoken about China and Pakistan. I need not refer to it. But there are certain countries whose freedom struggle was almost helped by us, like Indonesia and England which are not very friendly with us and a time may come when it will be difficult for us to protect our integrity and sovereignty. And as such, it is essential that we give more attention to our Armed Forces and equip ourselves well so that we can retain our integrity and sovereignty.

15.55 hrs.

[SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI in the Chair]

Yesterday, when Mr. Sukhadia spoke, he spoke about the Defence expenditure. He said, 3.5 per cent of the total GNP is being spent today on defence. I think our Minister of State also said the same thing. I may tell you that the very calculation of GNP is not correct. According to me, the GNP comprises of agriculture, which forms nearly 50 per cent of it, 10 per cent services and the rest is industrial product and so on. You must have seen that during the last 33 years, agricultural production has been undervalued throughout. We have been raising this issue here over and over again. During Mr. Chitta Basu's resolution which wanted the APC to be restructured, we spoke about it. Somebody spoke about it when the demands of the Agriculture Ministry were discussed last year. But nothing

was done. Our GNP if we calculate the reasonable remunerative price of the agricultural produce, our GNP would go up by 40 to 50 per cent. That means instead of 100 it becomes 150. Now if you calculate the expenditure on our defence, you will be shocked that it comes to 2.4 or 2.5 per cent. That is all we are spending on defence. But even about that, there are people like Mr. Bagri who complain. I am really shocked about it.

Today we are producing defence equipment through our factories. We are purchasing some of our defence needs from countries which have friendly relations with us. While doing so, as Madam rightly said last year, we are not depending only on one country. We are trying to have the most efficient and also at the same time the cheapest equipment which will serve our purpose. In a way, it is a good thing. But are we going to wait only for this? A time may come when they may stop the supply to you. They may try to stop the supply of spare parts. Has it not been done in the past? It has been done. So, I suggest that more emphasis should be put on R&D. The HAL which was started in 1944 should be asked to accept the challenge and produce the aircraft that we require.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please conclude. You have taken 10 minutes.

SHRI UTTAM RATHOD. We are discussing the Defence demands. A soldier is expected to fight to the last. Let Parliamentarians speak to the last!

Defence matters are treated as a great secret. Last year, Mr. Indrajit Gupta said that it should not be so. He also quoted the practice in U.K. and the strategy they are following. I would also suggest, please tell us something about our defence personnel, our defence preparedness and our research that we are doing so

that we will have a feeling that we are really equipped and we can defend our borders. Otherwise, it happens that when one comes across a book like *Himalayan Blunder* or *Unfought War*, one is completely disillusioned and one thinks that even our great forces on which we depend for our security are playing something which is not expected of them. I feel that a National Security Council on the US pattern to advise the Government should be formed. In this National Security Council, we should have retired members from all the three Defence Forces, some scientists, educationists, persons who have knowledge of foreign affairs and other people who can contribute to the formation of the defence policy in this country. If that is done, we would not be depending on the bureaucrats who are likely to commit so many mistakes. May I tell you one example? In '*Himalayan Blunder*' the author has quoted one example. That was when China occupied Tibet. They called some civilian to give a talk on the occupation of Tibet. While that man went on giving the talk, an Instructor who was a soldier, happened to ask him a cross question. Ultimately it became impossible for the civilian to reply. So what I mean is that do not leave these things to bureaucrats and politicians only. These are the two sections who think that they know everything. They are likely to commit some follies. That is why, I suggest that there should be a national security council to advise the Government.

Lastly, I would like to refer to the speech of Capt. Amarendra Singh. He spoke about the benefits, salaries and emoluments that are given to soldiers. I know that it is not possible for us to give what the US or UK forces are getting. But at the same time, we ought to know one thing. This is a country where 45 per cent of the people live below the

poverty line. If you know that fact, you must be able to adjust yourselves in what you are getting. But I may tell you that the Government will give you whatever is possible. Do not think that we are going to leave you like that.

About ex-servicemen, it is only during the war and for a week or two thereafter that the State Governments take keen interest in them. After that they forget about it. I was associated myself for nearly 22 years with the Legislature. I know the working of the States. They completely forget them. So, the Central Government should fix up responsibility on the State Governments so that these ex-servicemen are settled in life well and care is taken of.

SHRI C. T. DHANDAPANI (Pol-lachi): Mr. Chairman, Sir, at the outset, I would like to say a few words about the Report which is being discussed now.

There was a time when Members used to resist and oppose the increased allocation of funds to the Demands of the Defence Ministry. Now the time has changed. No Member of this House has said about the increased allocation of funds towards defence expenditure. From this we can come to the conclusion that all the Members and the entire nation have a feeling that our defence forces should be strengthened adequately.

The Report contains the policy of the Government and circumstances prevailing in the neighbouring countries. The Report talks about the military presence of great powers in the Indian Ocean and in the Gulf Region. At another place, it points out the bogey that is being raised by our neighbouring country on Kashmir issue, which has already been settled once. Again this issue

has been raised by a particular country in the international forum for which there is no justification at all.

Coming to the performance of the Government, specially the Defence Ministry, a Committee was constituted to do some future planning. As far as India is concerned, we never bothered about increasing the strength of our defence forces till 1962. Then, in view of the Chinese aggression, we had to augment our strength considerably to defend ourselves. The Government prepared a five year plan, which will be over by the year 1984.

In the matter of research and development, Government have made some progress in the modernisation of our forces by inducting sophisticated weapons. The industrial units managed by the Department of Defence Production have also done very well.

The policy which is being pursued by both the Ministry of Defence and the Ministry of External Affairs is that we are not in confrontation with any government. We stand for peace and tranquility, not only in the sub-continent but in the entire world. That is why till a certain stage our Government was not eager to strengthen our defence forces just to wage a war against any country.

Even though we have faced three wars after independence and that too quite successfully, we have no intention to make such an attempt against any country. Even though India is so strong in many fields, we have not increased our defence strength to that extent. Some time back, our defence strength in comparison with Pakistan was as follows: army 20 : 1; navy 10 : 1 and air force 5 : 1. Now Pakistan has acquired sophisticated arms from other countries and made itself ten times stronger than what

it was in 1965. Yet, we have not increased our strength correspondingly.

As our Prime Minister stated categorically some time ago, we are not interested in an arms race, because we do not want our economic condition to be adversely affected. But, at the same time, we are disturbed to know that Pakistan is being helped with arms by the United States. According to reports in the press, it appears that there is some misunderstanding between India and the United States.

As far as I know, the Indian Government has no intention to quarrel with any nation, either capitalist or socialist or whatever it may be. But there is a propaganda against India and just to support that propaganda the United States is giving some help, some assistance or some loan or whatever it may be in the form of weapons to a country which is opposing us. It is not good for a developed country to help another country where there is no democracy at all. It is because a weak country can use the weapons against a democratic country when that country's leadership wants its survival. So, the U.S. Government should think over this issue. At the same time, I would like to request the U.S. Government through this august House that the Indian Ocean area as well as other areas should be treated as peace zones. Many non-aligned countries have categorically stated and made an appeal to the Big Powers that these zones should be kept as zones free from other aggressor countries. But the United States have established some forces in Diego Garcia and also they are monitoring a satellite which is capable of monitoring one-third of the world. It is also a threat to peace.

Another important thing is that in the Report it has been said about the Law of the Sea. In the Report

it is seen that our Government have confidence that the matter is going to be settled in the Tenth Conference of the U.N.O. Unfortunately, some multinational companies blocked it and the U.S. Government is also supporting the multinational companies. So, I would request this Conference as well as the US Government to refrain from this and come to an agreement in this matter.

About the nuclear war it has been stated that even Pakistanis are in a position to manufacture nuclear weapons. In this context I would like to say that the Government should come forward and they must have re-thinking on this line. Many times it was categorically stated by the Government, 'We are going to use nuclear power for peaceful purposes', but now, the times have changed. Not only that it is not to be used against anybody, but just to help others also we must manufacture nuclear weapons as for instance, Libya has sought the know-how from the Indian Government.

Sir, there is a calculated campaign going on in Pakistan and other countries against India. It has been reported in the press about Pakistan's campaign against India as well as the present leadership of Mrs. Indira Gandhi. The campaign is still going on. This is not good for a neighbouring country. They should stop this kind of maligning attitude.

Another important thing is that our senior leaders in this country are diverting this issue in some other way. I would like to say that one of the senior leaders of this country has stated:

"Bogey has been raised to divert the attention of the people from the real problems like soaring prices, unemployment and the breakdown of law and order."

The Prime Minister and other important leaders of this country are very much concerned about our

[Shri C. T. Dhandapani]

neighbouring countries which are strengthening their forces. They may use them against India at any time.

The Prime Minister has cautioned the public that there is threat of war. Not only they have stated that there is apprehension in the minds of the people—they may wage war against India—but our senior leaders who are responsible leaders in this country have not felt like that. They allege that just to divert the attention of the people they have said like this. I do not think so. For a political party and for Government many ways are there to divert the attention of the people. Government don't need to take this issue for the purpose of diverting the attention of the people.

Before I conclude I would like to say that the Indian Government is aligned with the non-aligned group. We remain neutral in all the cases. We are not for any confrontation with any Government. We say we are neutral but at the same time, I would like to appeal to the Indian Government, we must be very strong. We should strengthen our forces either by acquiring arms or we can manufacture arms ourselves. I would like to say that Alexander Hamidtan one of the three authors of federalist papers which were published in the year 1787 in New York made a correct observation about neutrality and self-defence of a country in which he wrote—

“The right of neutrality will only be respected when they are defended by an adequate power. A Nation despicable by the weakness forfeits even the privilege of being neutral.”

Therefore, just saying neutral or non-aligned we should not be suppressed by others. We should not get destroyed by others.

We must strengthen our armed forces at any cost.

SHRI M. S. SANJEEVI RAO:  
(Kakinada): I rise to support the demands for grants relating to the Ministry of Defence.

The Defence Ministry covers a wide spectrum of activities and to our fortune it is being administered by our Prime Minister ably assisted by Shri Patil.

At the outset I want to congratulate the Government for their effective steps in all the three Armed forces—Army, Navy and Air Force—to achieve self reliance and self sufficiency as far as possible. In this decade of Atomic Age, the Defence forces heavily rely on the advanced science and technology, whether it is in armaments, whether it is aeronautics, electronics, communication, radar, high altitude, agriculture and to be exact all sectors of Defence Services. Having recognised this important and vital factor, our Prime Minister, like her father Pandit Nehru who is a firm believer of science and technology, has rightly taken a decision to create a new Department for Defence Research and Development, in the Ministry of Defence. The entire country, particularly the scientists all over the country, welcome this Department and they are grateful to you for this noble gesture in recognition of their services.

As per the Report of the Defence Ministry, the Defence scientists are performing an excellent job and they are second to none in the world. If you look at it a little analytically, the Aeronautical Research Laboratory, in collaboration with Mishra Dhatu Nigam, is developing alloys needed for gas turbine materials for evaluation of specifications and type test schedules to achieve self reliance in the critical alloy metals which have been imported so far.

The research and development activity in the Armament field covers a wide span of disciplines which include weapons, ammunition, explosives and ballistics.

Looking to the Electronics, Radar and Instrumentation groups these scientists at their respective laboratories have developed a number of product of considerable significance. Of particular significance is the infantry battlefield surveillance radar and the light field artillery radar which the country should be proud of.

Developments in military operations over the last decade have clearly established the necessity of rockets and missiles as an essential armament not only for offence but for defence also. The development of these complex weapon systems requires build up of competence and know-how of various disciplines and technologies. We are happy that a firm-base has been built wherein the sophisticated technology is involved in developing rockets and missiles. Here, I appeal to Defence scientists to closely work in collaboration with the scientists of the Department of Space who have recently launched the Rohini with their three-stage satellite launch vehicle.

I appeal to the Prime Minister not to curb the enthusiasm of our scientists for reaching their ultimate goal of launching Intermediate Ballistic Missiles (I.B.M.). I have discussed that with a few scientists not only from the Defence but also from the Space Department and I am told that our scientists are in a position to design, fabricate, assemble and successfully launch Intermediate Ballistic Missile on their own. It is not only to boost up the morale of armed forces but it also acts as a tonic to a number of our scientists, consultants and engineers working all over the world. Please remember that the entire world recognised our technical capabilities only when we exploited our nuclear device in 1974. Then

only the developing countries have started giving us a number of contracts.

Now, I would like to mention about the importance of Navy. You are all aware, thanks to the United Nations, our country has acquired a territory of 2.2 million sq. miles. This new territory contains valuable poly-metallic nodules, oil, gas and marine fish. The protection of off-shore establishment such as Bombay High and the associated surveillance of the sea bed are all additional responsibilities of the Navy. We are producing already 8 million tonnes of crude oil and by 1984-85 we hope to produce 17 million tonnes which will approximately cost at the present prices, about Rs. 5000 crores.

In addition, the scientists of the Institute of Indian oceanography have started mining manganese, cobalt, nickel, copper and tin in the form of Nodules from the sea bed which has stunned the entire world. To be precise the entire future economy of the country is in the new ocean territory which we acquired recently. Only by increasing and strengthening our navy in a massive way, we can protect our enlarging maritime interests like sea bed mining, oil, gas, fisheries, transport, pollution and, above all, the off-shore islands. But what have we done? If you analyse the size and the capabilities of the Navy, you will find that it is most depressing and alarming. We have less than half a dozen maritime aircraft for surveillance of the surface and under-water for the three seas around our country. We are hardly adding one or two ships or frigates at a time spread over years to replace the ships which have become old. The number of ships or force level in 1980 is less than that in 1970; particularly at a time when Pakistan has doubled its force level.

Lastly, I would like to tell you that the submarines we have are outdated. The time has come when we must have submarines which could

be propelled by nuclear energy. All the advanced countries are having that. I want to know what steps we are taking to acquire nuclear-propelled submarines. I am sure the hon. Madam Prime Minister knows that we have made tremendous strides in nuclear technology and as such we are in a position not only to maintain the nuclear-propelled submarines but also, at a later stage, to manufacture them.

One more point. I want to talk about rehabilitation. The Great Nicobar Islands which sit astride Malacca straits constitute one of the four busiest focal or choking points in the world, at a strategic position: the other three choking points are the Bay of Biscay, the Gulf of Mexico and the Gulf of Aden. I want that the Ministry should take effective steps to see that the Greater Nicobar Islands are effectively improved and a lot of ex-servicemen are rehabilitated there. The Campbell Bay Port can be developed in such a way that it will be a rival to the Ports of Singapore and Penang.

I once again congratulate the Ministry of Defence for their performance, and I support the Demands for Grants.

SHRI KAMAL NATH (Chhindwara): Sir, yesterday and today we have been discussing the Demands for Grants in respect of a Ministry whose performance cannot be judged every day. What I mean to say is that the performance of the Defence organisation is not something that you see in front of your eyes. It is not something that can be calculated. The performance of other organisations, other Departments, can be calculated in figures, in terms of production, profit and loss. You can even calculate the performance of my friends here in terms of the disruptions caused by them to public life and economy. But it is not so with the Defence forces. I shall not hastily sit in judgment over the performance, preparedness or budgetary demands of our armed forces. We should not forget that the last time we went to

war ten years ago, and this is a fact which none of my friends would regret. Meanwhile, there have been numerous law and order situations and many natural calamities where our armed forces had to be called. As such the Budget of Defence and the criticism of lack of cost-consciousness, as one of my friends earlier on in the debate, has mentioned, cannot be looked at in isolation from a total picture especially when the barometer of performance of this Ministry is blood and sweat, is discipline and integrity. Even a cursory look at the annual reports of the Defence Ministry over the past ten years will prove that the entire weaponry and military hardware have been changed lock, stock and barrel. I shall give here only a few examples.

The Missile system that the army uses to-day against tanks and personnel carriers has advanced at least by three generations from what it did in 1971. The mainstay of our fleet of fighter-interceptors, the advanced MIG, is much more sophisticated than the original MIG 21s that we had in 1971. The increase in the level of sophistication and fire-power, let me clearly say, is not unique for India.

Sir, we must accept the reality that military preparedness, is a relative concept. So, when we talk of preparedness, we must ask ourselves—"preparedness in relation to whom". Obviously, our preparedness has to be measured in terms of that of our potential enemies. Here comes the question of our threat perception.

Of the four times that India had gone to war, thrice it has been against Pakistan and once against China. ...

SOME HON. MEMBERS: We never went to war. We have been dragged into war.

SHRI KAMAL NATH: Our threat perception has to be conditioned by our past experience.

SHRI RATANSINH RAJDA (BOMBAY SOUTH): We were dragged into the war and we had not gone to a war.

SHRI KAMAL NATH: And, a country's direct perception is always conditioned by past experience. It is our threat perception which will help us to arrive at a correct balance between over-arming ourselves and under-arming ourselves. Arming ourselves against Bangladesh and Pakistan is one thing. ...

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Bangladesh?

SHRI KAMAL NATH: And arming ourselves against the threat from any of the super-powers is another story. With a Rs. 500 crore arms shipment from the USA to Pakistan in the office, one just need not be told from where the threat to our security lies. We must remember that we are in the midst of an Arms race and an Arms race is not a Sunday Cricket Match which you may or may not join. It is the Pakistan military Junta which has begun the Arms race and no Indian Government worth its name can sit back and watch. But the point is: is it a race with Pakistan alone? With India's industrial and technological resources Pakistan is hardly any match. If Pakistan alone were there, there is no match at all. In our case, I think, the race is really with the American generosity towards Pakistan. It is the American aid to Pakistan that has been putting new strains on our resources and our combat-readiness. We must also note that Pakistan is being armed by many countries. It has French Mirages, German missiles, American F-15 aircraft and the radar system and to top this all, it has enough petro-dollars to replenish its stock of spares. This has put us in a difficult situation. Both in 1965 and 1971, the two wars we had with Pakistan were fought in largely black-and-white situations. Their arsenal was known to us and our arsenal was

known to them. We must remember that since then a lot of developments have taken place. We must remember that the military equipment and the arms developed during and before the Vietnam war have lost all their element of surprise. And this is because the Vietnam war was indeed an international free-market for exchange of military information. However, Pakistan's arm build-up is a post-Vietnam phenomenon, as a result of which the strength of surprise is on Pakistan's side. To counter that, all that we can do is to take the least possible chance of being outgunned, and this is possible only by drawing our arms supplies from a large number of sources, including our own. It is heartening to find that we have already started doing so, and all our eggs are no longer in one basket. We can surprise the enemy only by versatility, not by uniformity. Sir, in this connection, I want to remind the Hon'ble Members of this House that next time when we meet to discuss the Demands of the Ministry of Defence, may be Pakistan has already emerged as a nuclear power. The question is: it has come in the course of various debates—what should we do? Should we still be debating the issue of bomb *versus* no-bomb? I know it should really come under Atomic Energy. But, since this is somewhat connected with Defence also and since the hon. Prime Minister holds the portfolio of both, I would like to mention a few words. I feel there are two extreme approaches to the issue. One of these is the Vajpayee approach, that is, open and strident advocacy for the bomb which our hon. Colleague, Shri Atal Behari Vajpayee, used to make in the pre-Janata period when he was a leader of the Jan Sangh. But, now that approach is no longer 'atal'. It is no longer consistent. In that he advocated for the bomb; he was quite vocal about it. The other approach is the Morarji Desai approach. (*Interruptions*) He went to the extent of telling the world that we would not even do any atomic research which called for any kind of detonation. I think both are bad approaches. By shouting for the

bomb, which was earlier the Vajpayee approach, you make it impossible for your friends to supply you with know-how, the conventional military aid and also from buying various raw materials etc. On the other hand, by surrendering to the blackmail of nuclear powers, you also close your options as Morarji Desai did. The only way out is the one which we are following now is the approach of our Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi. It is simply this that we must not shout from the housetop. We need not have a big bang everyday; we need not set off a noisy and polluting chain reaction all the time. We must be ready so that—before you can say the word go—our nuclear knowledge can be converted into nuclear strength. This is true not only of warhead research but also of research on the delivery system and the related ballistics.

I would, in passing, like to mention about the public sector defence organisation since I do not have much time. All the nine Defence public sector undertakings in the country are making profits except Garden Reach Workshop—the Shipbuilders and Engineers. It is in Calcutta. I won't say anything more than that. But, I would appeal to my friends that these undertakings employ one lakh people. There is a social component and there is an economic component. The indirect social benefit of investment in defence is quite enormous. I am talking about the economy of the cantonment areas and ammunition depots etc. In this connection, I would like to mention that because of the social benefits and economic upliftment which takes place in cantonment areas and in various areas where the ammunition depots are there may at least they be newly located in backward areas and in tribal areas which are bound to be strategically all right. I would like to reiterate my appeal which I have made to the hon. Minister of State for Defence Shri Shivraj Patil numerous times, and I do so also today—I would like to put it on record

—that in my District, the district of Chhindwara, there was a survey conducted some years ago and it was found to be ideally suitable for the ammunition depot. I would request that this may be considered.

Coming back to the main discussion, I would like to mention a few words: . . .

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You have already exhausted your time. I am sorry.

SHRI KAMAL NATH: Two more minutes please.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: All right. You conclude now. You have made very good points.

SHRI KAMAL NATH: I would like to mention a few words. For me the military history down the centuries, from the war of Kurukshetra to the war of Vietnam signifies the victory of man over arms. How else can we explain the Vietnam war? The Vietnam militia were fighting against the American G.I.s.—the Mamberger fed and the coco cola fed American G.I.s. Fortunately in our armed forces we have men who are jawans—not the G.I.s.—who carry a few arms and ammunitions. But they are rooted in a society which is far most able. In our northern and north-eastern frontiers, the jawans are away for several months and their devotion should be reciprocated by society, at the time of resettling the ex-servicemen.

As per the present arrangement, 10 per cent of Group C Central Government posts and 14.5 per cent of Group C Public Undertakings jobs are reserved for them. In Group D, the figures are 20 and 24.5 per cent respectively. I humbly submit to the hon. Minister that the disparity between the two groups may be done away with, so that 20 per cent of all Group C and D Central Government jobs and 25 per cent of the jobs in Public Undertakings may be reserved for the ex-servicemen. In addition, we must also not forget that our defence officers have got fine managerial talent.

Lastly, I would like to say a few words about our training colleges, the Rashtriya Indian Military College in Dehra Dun, our National Defence Academy in Kharagvasla, and the Indian Military Academy in Dehra Dun. While talking about them, my memory goes back to the days when I was in a school there; I used to look at them with awe and admire the impeccable order and impeccable discipline. I have learnt and I know that these institutions from which shall emerge the future officers of our Armed Forces require major repairs and renovations. It is my specific appeal that out of the budgetary grants, which we shall be passing today, adequate provision should be made for the renovation and repairs of these institutions.

Lastly, I would recommend greater facilities for recreation for our jawans. With the increase in budget, commensurate increase should also be made for recreational facilities of our jawans who are away from their families, homes and friends for a long time. I do not mean that they do not have any recreational facilities; they have, but I would appeal that those should be made commensurate with the increase in the budget amount.

**SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN** (Badagara): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, this debate is taking place here at a time when we have possibly entered the most dangerous decade of our existence as a free nation and also when the nature of war itself is changing. The security environment of India, I would contend, has undergone a considerable change during the last one year. It is not only because the nature of war and weaponry is undergoing a sea change, because of the PGM, or what they call, position-guided ammunitions and the night-fighting capabilities, with which we would be confronted during the decade; but the fact and possibility of the emergence of our neighbour Pakistan as a nuclear power—a fact of life which cannot be wished away by anyone; and

the open support of the new US Administration to push Pakistan as a policeman of the region. These new dimensions calls for a national consensus. I entirely agree with Shri Vajpayee when he called for a national consensus on the problems of national defence.

As far as the budget is concerned, we have, more or less, kept the defence budget at an even level of 3.4 or 3.5 per cent of the GNP over the years, but it would be good to remind the Defence Ministry that we are a country of poor people, we may not be a poor nation, and this should be constantly borne in mind when we buy sophisticated equipment from abroad or when we handle this money in any way. There are two points to be emphasised in this regard, and one was done by my friend, Mr. Indrajit Gupta when he talked of cost effectiveness and also of inventory control in Defence Stores and Establishments. That is why I regret to say that this Ministry during the year under review has not been very careful in dealing with people's money.

And if at all I have to say anything my friend Mr. C.P.N. Singh will forgive me that I have very grave misgivings about the way in which a friend of mine, the former Minister of State has handled the Centurion Tanks' deal. While speaking on the External Affairs and Defence Debate in this very same House in 1979 on March 27 and April 2, I had brought the same issue before the House and had criticised the Janata Government on this issue and many who are sitting there on the other side had supported me then. I had alleged then, Sir, quoting from Western publications that the Indian tanks had reached South Africa through Michele and Co. Ninety tanks were loaded in Bombay between 14th and 27th January, 1978 in a Liberian ship called 'SCAN FUJI' and unloaded in Port Eliza-

beth in South Africa on February 21, 1978 and it never reached its destination in Spain. Some of those who are on Treasury benches had supported me, when I made this charge in 1979. But my charge today is that this Minister who produces Michele as a respectable witness of complaint... (*Interruptions*)

**SHRI K. LAKKAPPA (Tumkur):** Sir, he has brought out certain facts and he says that he is making a charge. Well, a Member under 352 cannot make any charge against a Minister or a Member. Therefore, I request the Hon. Chair that while making a speech he should be within the four corners of the rules and the conduct of business. If there is anything derogatory to 352 and 353, the Hon. Deputy-Speaker has to expunge or to pull him up. Therefore, I would like to submit to you that the Member has a responsibility and he should not make any such aspersions, charges against any Member or any authority or against any Minister.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Mr. Lakkappa, we have already drawn the Member's attention to this. He will abide by it and he has agreed to abide by it. And if he makes any charge, he has also been told that he will take responsibility to whatever he says.

**SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN:** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I repeat, my charge is that this Minister who produces Michele is a respectable witness to complain against a distinguished Member of Parliament ignored all warnings and advice, given in this context by our own Ambassador in Spain on 29th February, 1980 and 10th April 1980; and through *aide-memoires* by the British High Commissioner...

**SHRI K. LAKKAPPA:** if he wants to make any charge or allegation he has to give notice under 353. If he wants to convince under 353, he

has to say 352 will not apply, because he cannot make allegation under 352. Rules are very clear. Even under 353, the cases he is mentioning, the previous Minister and also the present Minister and regarding that deal. I would like to quote even Shakhder and Kaul.

Kindly bear with me for a moment. Mr. Deputy-Speaker, the rules are very clear. If he has given under 353.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Please sit down. Mr. Unnikrishnan has written this letter to the Speaker, Lok Sabha, Parliament House. It says:

"While speaking during the debate on the demands of the Ministry of Defence, I wish to refer to the former Minister of State for Defence Mr. C.P.N. Singh, presently Minister for Science and Technology. I shall also refer to the names of Mr. W.R.M. Michele and Mr. Edward Levy of Levy Auto, with respect to the Centurion tanks/spares transactions."

And Mr. Unnikrishnan has been told about the Rules of Procedure, by the Speaker. We have told him. (*Interruptions*) And, he has given all this information here.

**THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS AND IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI MALLIKARJUN):** This matter has been raised in the Rajya Sabha, and it has also been replied to, properly. Will you allow the Minister also to reply.

**SHRI K. LAKKAPPA:** Under rule 353...

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Mr. Lakkappa, according to you, he is making some allegations against the Minister. The Minister will have the right to reply. Why do you worry?

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: The rules are very clear.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The Minister will have the right to reply.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: He is making an allegation or aspersion, under rule 353.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: According to you, allegations have been made. He takes the responsibility for all the allegations he is making.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: Yes; not only I take the responsibility. They can deny it.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: Another point. The same allegations were being discussed on the Floor of the House in the Rajya Sabha; and the concerned Minister refuted these allegations, and the matter was dropped. I have moved a privilege motion in respect of the same allegations; and the subject-matter is pending for a decision before this honourable House. I have moved a privilege motion. (*Interruptions*) When the House is seized of the subject matter, can he make aspersions or any allegations on the same subject? (*Interruptions*)

PROF. P. J. KURIEN (Mavelikara): You have over-ruled his point of order. Why is he speaking?

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: According to rule 353 and according to Kaul and Shandher, if he wants to bring in an allegation or make an aspersion against a person in authority—'authority' includes a Minister—it must be moved by a motion. (*Interruptions*).

PROF. P. J. KURIEN: Sir, you have given your ruling. How then is he speaking? (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I will read out what is said in Kaul and Shandher for your information. It says:

"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 *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, a member is required to give brief details about the allegation which he proposes to make against a person or another member, so that the Speaker could judge the matter beforehand."

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: That is not the point. It is against a person in high authority. You see Explanation under rule 352. It says: "The words 'persons in high authority'... (*Interruptions*)"

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I must hear him. He is on a point of order.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: It says:

"The words 'persons in high authority' mean persons whose conduct can only be discussed on a substantive motion drawn in proper terms under the Constitution or such other persons whose conduct, in the opinion of the Speaker, should be discussed..."

That means, a substantive motion has to be moved, if the person is a person in high authority. A person in high authority is a Minister today; and the Member cannot bring them under rule 352 and protect

himself, and make such allegations which even otherwise have been substantially discussed in the other House. It has been ruled out; it has been dropped. Now, they have got no reason. That is why they are shouting too much. Under these circumstances, if they want to make any allegation or cast any aspersion against a person who is in authority... (*Interruptions*) I can understand if it is against other members. But a person who is in authority is the Minister and they cannot make such allegations and all these things... Therefore, they should not be allowed. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He has already given in writing I have allowed him to state this thing here; and he has taken the responsibility. Therefore, I am allowing him to speak. (*Interruptions*) But you must abide by the rules. That is a request to you. (*Interruptions*) No, no, the subject is over (*Interruptions*)

PROF. K. K. TEWARY (Buxar): I am on a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: What is your point of order?

PROF. K. K. TEWARI: The allegation is defined in this *Handbook*. I am reading out the relevant portion. On page 97, it says as follows:

"No allegation of a defamatory or incriminatory nature should be made by a member against any persons..."

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He has quoted the *Handbook*.

(*Interruptions*)

PROF. K. K. TEWARI: You said, he had intimated. Now the second

portion which is relevant to this debate is as follows on page 97:

"The Speaker may, however, at any time prohibit any member from making any such allegation if he is of opinion that such allegation is derogatory to the dignity of the House or that no public interest would be served by making such allegation.

No public interest is being served by this charge. This is baseless. Therefore, I think that you should not allow the member. It is within your right, within your power—you can prohibit any member from making any allegation, if it is not in the interest of the public.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have already allowed him to speak and I am going according to the *Handbook* only. (*Interruptions*) He is going to speak. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI HERIKESH BAHADUR (Gorakhpur): I am on a point of order under Rule 349(vii).

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Tytler, please... (*Interruptions*) Mr. Herikesh, you please address to me. (*Interruptions*) Mr. Tytler, please take your seat. (*Interruptions*) Mr. Herikesh, what is your point of order? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI HERIKESH BAHADUR: My point of order is this.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: What is this Mr. Tytler? Nothing is going on record.

(*Interruptions*)\*\*

---

\*\*Not recorded.

17 hrs.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Nothing is going on record now.

*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: My appeal to hon. Members is, let us conduct the proceedings with decency and decorum. I would make an appeal. You do not show your hands. You show your voice. Please sit down. Let us conduct the proceedings with decency and decorum. Please be seated. Please sit down. Yes, Shri Harikesh Bahadur, what is the point of order? Come to the front side. Come here and raise your point of order.

*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You are indifferent seats in different places. You can come here. What is the point of order? He is on a point of order.

*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have already told you.

*(Interruptions)*

AN HON. MEMBER: He is not abiding by the rules. You define public interest which is served by making these allegations.

*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He is only standing there. He is not raising the point of order.

SHRI HARIKESH BAHADUR: Sir,

'While the House is sitting, a Member shall stick to his seat while raising a point of order.'

All these Members who are raising the points of order are not sitting in their seats. *(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Are you sitting?

*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: There is no point of order. Sit down. Do not waste time.

*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have already given my ruling. There is no point of order. Do not spoil it. Please sit down. I request you. Yes, now, Mr. Shiv Shankar.

*(Interruptions)*

THE MINISTER OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI P. SHIV SHANKAR): The point of order that I raise, though it might appear to be highly technical, is whether to the facts of this case Rule 353 applies. *(Interruptions)* I am raising a point of order. Excuse me. My submission is Rule 353 does not apply to this case. And may I just bring to your kind notice what I would like to say so that you may appreciate my point, and then you may give your ruling? So far as rule 353 is concerned, it says—

"No allegation of a defamatory or incriminatory nature shall be made by a member against any person..."

Now the word used is 'person'. So far as Rule 353 is concerned, with reference to that notice has to be given to the person concerned as also to the Speaker. Now, my submission is, the person against whom the allegation is sought to be made is a Minister. Therefore, in my submission the specific rule which applies to him would be either 352 clause (ii) or 352 clause (v). I will make my submission first with reference to Rule 352 Clause (ii) and then 352, clause (v). Rule 352 clause (ii) says—

"A member, while speaking shall not—make a personal charge against a member;"

This gentleman is a Member as also a Minister. Now, I will take you to Rule 352(v) for a moment. It would read:

"A member while speaking shall not—reflect upon the conduct of

persons in high authority unless the discussion is based..."

(Interruptions)

There is nothing to laugh at all. Kindly try to listen. I would request you... (Interruptions) I am prepared to sit down if there is nothing in my argument. If I can raise a point I am perfectly entitled to... (Interruptions) There is nothing to laugh at.

I am saying,

"reflect upon the conduct of persons in high authority unless the discussion is based on a substantive motion drawn in proper "terms;"

Then follows the explanation.

"Explanation: The words 'persons in high authority' mean persons whose conduct can only be discussed on a substantive motion drawn in proper terms under the Constitution or such other persons whose conduct, in the opinion of the Speaker should be discussed on a substantive motion drawn up in terms to be approved by him."

Therefore, so far as rule 352(v) is concerned, a substantive motion will have to be drawn in proper terms. That applies to two types of cases as per the Explanation. One is, those against whom constitutional protection is there and the second class of people are those against whom the Speaker himself gives protection. May I now request you to see Kaul and Shakhder for a while—Volume II, page 779? The first part—so far as the Explanation is concerned which deals with persons protected by the Constitution—I will leave it. I am only reading with reference to the second class of people I have mentioned above. I would request you to read from the sixth line, the sentence beginning with the words 'other high functionaries.' I would

like to read the whole thing so that the position becomes clear:

"Conduct of high dignitaries cannot be questioned incidentally in the course of a speech by a member on a Bill, motion, resolution or in any other form of discussion. The Constitution provides for discussion on the conduct of some of the authorities in the manner indicated therein, e.g. President, Vice-President, Speaker, Deputy-Speaker, Judges of the Supreme Court and High Courts, Comptroller and Auditor General, Chief Election Commissioner, etc."

The next sentence is a little significant:

"Other high functionaries such as the Governors, Ministers, statutory authorities, can be discussed on appropriate motions drawn in a form approved by the Speaker."

If you read rule 352(v), Explanation, this would be the latter part of the Explanation, namely, "such other persons whose conduct, in the opinion of the Speaker, should be discussed on a substantive motion drawn up in terms to be approved by him". So, the Ministers fall in this latter category, as decided by the Speaker and as opined by Shakhder. Therefore, the question of application of rule 353 does not arise. The question of giving notice to the Minister or the Speaker does not arise. Here is a Minister against whom a charge is made. The specific rule applicable is rule 352(v) or rule 352(ii). Therefore, I submit that he cannot raise all these issues.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, I have to give my ruling.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I want to say something. He has misled the House.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He has raised a point of order and now I have to give my ruling.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I rise on a point of order. You have to hear the point of order.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am competent to dispose of it.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: He has misled the House. Kindly come to Article 105 of the Indian Constitution which is supreme in this country. It says:

"Subject to the provisions of the Constitution and to the rules and standing orders regulating the procedure of Parliament, there shall be freedom of speech in Parliament."

We have no standing orders. We have only the one Bible and that is the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Subject to the rules.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I am coming to that. Mr. Shiv Shankar is a lawyer. He had been a professional lawyer. He must be still in profession. I am no match to him (*Interruptions*) I am complimenting him.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He is only Minister of Law here. Other things we are not concerned.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Also unlawful laws. Kindly try to understand. First of all, a person includes a Minister; it includes a Member. You kindly read 353. It says:

"No allegation of a defamatory or incriminatory nature shall be made by a member against any person."

The most important word in this is 'any person'. This 'any person' includes excepting specifically mentioned President, Vice-President, Supreme Court Judges, High Court Judges, etc. All others, they come under the purview of Rule 353. Therefore, if due notice has been given to the Speaker with advance copies to the Minister, the hon. Member has a right to bring

allegations if he is of opinion that they are correct. The Minister has a right to deny or denigrate him and do what he likes. Running away from charges of corruption is no good. They should face it boldly. They have a right to deny and tell Mr. Unnikrishnan that you are telling fabricated stories. So, Rule 353 is absolutely clear in this regard. (*Interruptions*)

PROF. P. J. KURIEN: Rule 376 sub-clause (3) says:

"Subject to conditions referred to in sub-rules (1) and (2), a member may formulate a point of order and the Speaker shall decide whether the point raised is a point of order and if so, give his decision thereon, which shall be final."

Prof. Tiwary quoted the same Rule 352 which the hon. Minister has also quoted. On that you gave your ruling.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have already given my ruling. (*Interruptions*)

PROF. P. J. KURIEN: That is final. This is the procedure. You gave ruling to Prof. Tiwary's point and that is final.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO (Morungao): Just about a fortnight ago, a booklet containing the relevant rulings on these points of making charges against Members and Ministers was circulated to the Members. At least I have received it. There are two specific and distinct rulings of the Speaker of 1967. In the 60s there were two rulings—one ruling is the mode of making charges against Members and the other ruling is the mode of making stout charges against Ministers. Substance of these rulings is already contained in the rules themselves and in Kaul & Shakhder. The substance is this Allegation can be made against a Minister provided the substance of the allegation is given to the Speaker. It is not enough to say that

"I want to say something regarding Mr. X." He has to say what he wants to say regarding Mr. X, the substance of the allegation..... (*interruptions*) The substance of the allegation, the contents of the allegation, must be given to the Speaker so that the Minister can reply. Secondly, arising from the ruling, the evidence, material or proof in support of those allegations must also be submitted to the Speaker so that evidence can be gauged, assessed and appreciated by the Minister. Sir, from what you have stated, neither of these things has been done. Therefore, the name of the Minister cannot be involved and no allegation can be made.

SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT (East Delhi): In the rules, provision is given in rule 353.

AN HON. MEMBER: On what is he speaking?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: On this point of order, I am ascertaining the views of all the hon. Members.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Just now you referred to freedom of speech. I will give you the original time. Don't worry.

SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT: What I am very respectfully submitting is that in the rules there are provisions for two categories. One is the general category of persons and the other is persons in authority.... (*Interruptions*) I know the rules of interpretation. Suppose the interpretation of these friends is accepted of rule 353, then rule 352 will become redundant. The rule making authority in their wisdom, very rightly provided for rule 352 so that, if allegations are made on men in authority, whether the Ministers or other category, there is provision for substantive motion. In that case, the general clause does not apply; only the other clause of the rule will apply. So, Shri Shiv

Shankar is absolutely correct in what he said.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now I am giving my ruling on the point of order raised by Shri Shiv Shankar, the hon. Minister of Law. I have gone through *Kaul and Shakdher* I agree with Shri Shiv Shankar that the Constitution provides for discussion on the conduct of some of the authorities in the manner indicated therein. The conduct of the Supreme Court and High Court Judges, the Comptroller and Auditor-General, Ministers and statutory authorities can be discussed on an appropriate motion, drawn in a form approved by the Speaker. Therefore Shri Unnikrishnan cannot mention the name of the Minister, Shri C. P. N. Singh. He should not reflect on the conduct of the Minister.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN (Badagara): This House is entitled; it is in charge of the Consolidated Fund of India.... (*Interruptions*) So, if against a Minister I want to make a charge, I can make it.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You cannot, unless you bring in a substantive motion.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: Sir, I am on a point of order now.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA (Tumkur): Sir, you have already given a ruling and still....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I will go through the proceedings.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: That is final. Nobody questions my ruling. It will be a contempt of the House.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: I am on a point of order. If there is a motion on the conduct of a Minister, it can only be discussed as a censure motion, which has been provided for,

which was moved against Shri Morarji Desai in this House, which was moved by me against Shri Charan Singh, which was moved against Shri L. N. Mishra in this House. That is a separate category. That refers only to the censure motion against the conduct of a Minister in respect of a commission or omission. That is entirely different. That specific reference does not prevent a Member from referring to it in the Discussion on the Demands. If you want to shut out members from discharging their duties, when we have to vote on the Demands and discussion on demands in the form of a debate, if that is the option they have chosen, I have nothing to say. But whatever I have to say, whatever criticism I have to offer, regarding the performance of the Minister, I shall continue and you will not stop me. Now please listen

What I am saying is, I repeat, that the Minister ignored the warning and advice given in the context by the Indian Ambassador in Madrid on the 29th February.... (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: In spite of my ruling, if he makes mention of allegations against the Minister it will not go on record.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am only acting according to the rules. It is very clear.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Allegations cannot be made.

SHRI CHANDRAJIT YADAV (Azamgarh): I am on a point of order.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He is on a point of order.

(*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): About your Ruling, I want a clarification.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You are not entitled to a clarification. No clarification on a Ruling.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: My Ruling is final. There is no question of clarification. That cannot also be discussed and debated.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: My Ruling is final. It cannot be discussed or debated. No clarification on my Ruling.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have only quoted a Ruling given previously, and therefore....

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: It has no relation.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: No clarification.

(*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Sir, I am on a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Chandrajit Yadav is on a point of order first.

SHRI CHANDRAJIT YADAV: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, while Mr. Unnikrishnan....

SHRI V. KISHORE CHANDRA S. DEO (Parvathipuram): You are not sitting in the Chair....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He is on a point of order. Please sit down.

SHRI CHANDRAJIT YADAV: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I want to raise this question.... (*Interruptions*). Mr. Deputy-Speaker, you have given a Ruling and I feel that Mr. Unnikrishnan....

PROF. P. J. KURIEN: Why are you so much afraid of allegation?

SHRI K. P. Unnikrishnan: Let me say, there was no such letter....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Yadav, I am only quoting the previous Ruling.

SHRI CHANDRAJIT YADAV: I am saying about what you have quoted. Mr. Unnikrishnan accepted what you were quoting. Then he said that the Minister ignored the warning of the Ambassador and after that you made an observation . . . (Interruptions). Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, you made a general observation that whatever allegation is made will not go on record.

It means this kind of ruling cannot be accepted. If you feel something is wrong, you can say that this will not go on record. But you cannot make a general observation. You cannot give this right to the reporters here who are reporting. They are not the people to judge about the statements of the Members. It is a serious observation if it goes unchallenged. Then you are giving right to the reporters. Whatever is generally thought to be an allegation will not go on record, you can say that it is an allegation, it will not go on record, and I can accept that.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I was only mentioning . . . . .

(Interruptions)

SHRI CHANDRAJIT YADAV: It is not an aspersion to say that the Minister ignored the warning of an Ambassador or the Minister ignored the warning of the Department. This is not an allegation. Therefore, I think we will not accept this kind of ruling. Kindly revise your ruling.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You can proceed, Mr. Unnikrishnan, with your speech.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY AND ELECTRONICS (SHRI C. P. N. SINGH): In view of what Mr. Chandrajit Yadav raised, I categorically say that no Ambassador sent me any recommendation.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRIISHNAN: I can clarify further and further.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): I am rising on a point of order.

My point of order is even after your ruling I want to know from the Chair when the debate goes on, according to the conventions of this House, is there no line of demarcation between criticism and malafide allegations? There is a distinction between the two. Even the Prime Minister of the country cannot escape criticism in this country and cannot take shelter behind . . . (Interruptions) and the criticism will go on in a sharp manner and I do not think 353 Members will be able to stop any criticism even of the Minister so long as it does not constitute defamation.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You can continue, Mr. Unnikrishnan.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRIISHNAN: If what the Minister of State for Science and Technology has said just now is correct, that is a very pathetic admission! That means he has not been reading his files when he passed orders. That means that he has not gone through what it is all about. If he is striking a posture of innocence, I do not know, that makes the matter worse!

Again, I repeat there were letters from our Ambassador in Spain, in Madrid, dated 29th February, 1980 and 10th April, 1980 which, the Ministry of External Affairs passed on to the Ministry of Defence and Aide-memoires by the British High Commissioner in India warning against dealing with these people. Although FERRO IMPORTS of Michele did not produce the valid End User Certificate and a clean bank guarantee—two non-negotiable terms—that were set for the transaction; their *bonafides* was accepted by the Defence Ministry, and conditions that were insisted upon by Parliament through

the 81st Report of the Public Accounts Committee and also subsequently re-affirmed by the Action Taken Report of PAC which has submitted its report to the House in this Session. He quoted the lowest price of \$ 26500 as against FFE which quoted \$ 36000, and VICKERS \$ 80,000. Was it not in the knowledge of the Ministry of Defence that 'Ferro, Imports' is a front firm for 'Interarms' Manchester of Cummins, one of the biggest and notorious arms dealers in the world fomenting civil strife everywhere, fomenting wars everywhere, called the death merchants by 'The Time' Magazine and Anthony Sampson. Therefore, what I want to know is whether on 12th May, 1980 the Minister of State of Defence sent it a recommendation to the Prime Minister to sell it the thanks in a "de-militarised condition", although in the 25th April meeting, a Lt. Gen. who had been DGOS then had claimed that it is technically impossible to demilitarise it? On 22nd May, 1980 Prime Minister directed, again I repeat—that conditions stipulated are not violated—that is the End Users Certificate, that we should know where it is going and sought the Finance Minister's opinion. On 28th May, 1980 the Finance Minister,—a wise man that he is—again insisted on the End Users Certificate and asked the Defence Ministry to reconsider and defer the proposal. But the Minister who is in a hurry, on 3rd June, 1980 while simultaneously processing—the date is very important, 3rd June—the spares deal; suggests and asks that preference may be given to those who have an End Users Certificate. Not that it is necessary; and that we shall insist on it; but preference may be given to those who produce an End Users Certificate!

Here, in this country, unfortunately, the Prime Minister and the Finance Minister proposes but a Minister of State disposes! That was the condition then.

Now, coming to the Levy Auto of Canada, a proposal was considered on 15th April, 1980 and rejected outright. He was not considered as a serious bidder then. But Edward Levy and his Indian associates did not leave things there! On 23rd May, 1980 a decision had been taken to sell the spares independently when the price offered was not even the price of scrap and this was the opinion of a Major General whose views were not even recorded in the minutes of the meeting and had to be included in the minutes at the insistence of the Chief of Staff of the Army.

On 27th May, 1980, the Minister approved the deal and, on 3rd June, 1980, in a clumsy, hand-written, note, he claimed that spares deal has already been delinked by another note of the same date. What was the price offered for these spares of 5000 tonnes? It was Rs. 70 lakhs or 9 lakh dollars, when 800 tonnes of AMX-13 spares had fetched 8-1/2 lakh dollars, a few months back. It is not my view.

What happens to the End Users Certificate? This is gone! That is why, not only the Generals, even the Prime Minister could not agree and the Finance Minister said that the price is lesser than the scrap value and so why not sell it to the Metals Scrap Trading Corporation, a public sector firm. But the Minister will not have it.

On 7th July, 1980, as the MSTC Inspection team came, it was already sold. I believe that a post-dated cheque was given and the deal was clinched. That is why we are raising this issue. This is the anatomy of a shady and disgraceful deal for which this Government owes an explanation to the people of the country in terms of its foreign policy implications as well as the sordid manner in which

[Shri K. P. Unnikrishnan]

it was carried through. That is why we are interested in raising this issue. I leave it at that. I leave it to the Prime Minister. If she does not find anything extraordinary in all this, I leave it at that. But the Government in any democratic country has a moral responsibility to uphold public morality. And from what I have seen here, all that I can say is, I am sorry for it.

As long as the Defence Budget appropriations are voted by this House and there is an outgo from the Consolidated Fund of India, we have a responsibility, before we vote, to discharge and it is in the discharge of these responsibilities that I have spoken.

That is why I come back, to say there should be a national consensus on Defence and cooperation also from this side, yes, but the resources voted by the House and the materials produced and procured should be dealt with, nurtured, with greater care. That is my point.

Now, I want to come back to the question of security environment. The House is aware that the nuclear non-proliferation treaty of United States had carried an amendment by Senator Stuart Symington which in substance said that the countries "believed to be making nuclear weapons cannot be recipients of US arms". The above amendment is being repealed to enable Pakistan to receive US arms and support. It is a very significant development which we cannot fail to notice. The fact of repeal of this amendment shows that Pakistan has not convinced US that it is not manufacturing nuclear weaponry; that the United States considers it important to support and arm Pakistan, and that it is even prepared to give legitimacy, legislative legitimacy, to Pakistan's nuclear aspirations and programmes by a Congressional legislative amendment. Obviously, the U.S. has developed an immense

strategic stake in Pakistan. That is why, the U.S. Secretary of State, Mr. Alexander Haig, has talked about a "strategic consensus from Pakistan to Turkey". It is not a question of earlier mutuality of interests, it is not a question of committed relationship which they had in Sixties and Seventies, which the U.S. and Pakistan always had, resulting in sending of the Flagship 'Enterprise' in 1971.

We did not object, and we need not object, to Pakistan receiving arms from its own chosen sources. For example, during the days of President Bhutto, in 1972 to 1977, Pakistan received about two billion dollars worth of arms from China, France, etc. financed by the Middle-Eastern sources. But what we are objecting to and what we have to take note of is not the arms, as such but, I repeat, the so-called "strategic consensus" concept outlined by Mr. Haig and its consequences for us; the open U.S. endorsement of Pakistan's nuclear weaponry programme; and the U.S. involvement and commitment in South Asia. That is why, the apologists of U.S. talk about the developments in Afghanistan, Iran and Gulf. What is the U.S. stake in Gulf? The history of the Rapid Deployment Force has a different story to tell. The basic question, as has been pointed out...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please conclude.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRIISHNAN: These are very important. All my time was taken away... (Interruptions)

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND WORKS AND HOUSING (SHRI BHISHMA NARAIN SINGH): Then we have to sit beyond 6.00...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Then we have to sit beyond 6.00...

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

**SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN:** The basic U.S. interests are:

(a) the 10,000 sq. miles of Saudi Arabian oil-fields, ports and installations should remain open for them; and

(b) there should be no internal changes or social upheavals in Saudi Arabia and the Gulf countries. That is a basic commitment.

Historically, we should remember, the Rapid Deployment Force was sanctioned before the Afghanistan developments and the developments in Gulf, and it is not meant only against the USSR as such, as it would be a tactical impossibility for the USSR to strike from these places except from Azerbaijan. There also, the U.S. policy has talked about "non-Soviet threats to their vital interests", to which I have referred earlier. That is why, you find a chain of bases all around, whether it is Berbera in Somalia or Rasbenas in Egypt or Mom-bassa in Kenya, Masirah in Oman, and so on. All these form a ring around these oil-bearing countries of West Asia.

Arms secured thus have a habit of adding to domestic tension and tension in armed forces. The 'strategic consensus' which Mr. Haig has talked about also means the U.S. developing a vested interest in the Pakistan armed forces and a new leverage in the internal situation of Pakistan. We have to learn a lesson from history, and I hope that the people of Pakistan will learn it; otherwise, there will be another procession of Generals as we have seen in Korea, Vietnam and so on. This is what I called a new dimension to our security environment. I would urge on the Prime Minister to appeal to the people of Pakistan, to our brethren in Pakistan, with whom we have ties of centuries, not to lend their support to this U.S. interventionist moves. They have nothing to gain from it. Now, the politicians may use, in many man-

ners, all these situations to their advantage and more so those who believe in authoritarian structures. But I cannot understand the former Prime Minister, Shri Morarji Desai, or Dr. Subramaniam Swamy, when they talk about our military preparedness that are going on now. May I point out to them that there have been more arms deals and agreements initiated and concluded during Morarji bhai's days whether it is Jaguar, Mig 22 or 25, T 72 Tanks or the submarines and modernisation programme. I am not talking about it because this country, as I said earlier, cannot afford to compromise, cannot afford to be negligent and cannot afford to slip up. But the point again, I would again repeat, is that there should be a national consensus on national defence.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, the Prime Minister will reply.

SHRI JOYOTIRMOY BOSU rose.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: No please, you have taken more than the allotted time.

DR. KARAN SINGH (Udhampur: What about us? We have not got the chance... (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: No, please. The allotted time is over. Only Dr. Karan Singh I allow—because he has not spoken even once.

DR. KARAN SINGH: I am grateful to you for allowing me to speak because in this House an independent member also has a right to be heard...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Care of the minority interests.

DR. KARAN SINGH: Since we discussed defence last time in this House, there has been, as has been pointed out in the debate by many speakers, a sharp deterioration in the international situation and the *detente* is virtually dead. There are cold winds sweeping across the oceans and the

[Dr. Karan Singh]

continents. There has been a new polarisation. The Afghanistan issue, unfortunately, has not been resolved and far from their withdrawal from Afghanistan, there are more Soviet troops there now. The United States has reacted by a very aggressive posture which is striking terror, I think, more into the hearts of its friends than of its foes because the sort of statements that it has made since the new administration came into power, has sent a chill up the spines of many people.

Sir, the Iraq-Iran war continues, and the massive rearming of Pakistan is something which impinges very directly upon our national interests. I have read one or two comments in the Western Press about the Indian 'over-reaction' to the arming of Pakistan. May I submit that we have had 33 years of bitter experience in this country. Time and again armaments are given to Pakistan, supposedly to fight communism. I do not know whether a single bullet has ever fought communism, but it has certainly fought us, it has killed our citizens, it has killed our troops and we have been subjected to aggression in this country for the last 33 years. Sir, we have to fight back. Now we have to meet this threat. Sir, there is a very strong possibility that Pakistan is developing nuclear capability—I will not go into the long story of the Islamic bomb or Pakistan bomb and so on, but it is clear that Pakistan's nuclear capability is increasing and developing very rapidly. Sir, there are no guns which fire only in one direction and no bomb which can be thrown only in one direction. All this imposes a crushing burden on this nation for no fault of ours. The Americans have been arming Pakistan long before Afghanistan trouble. It is their old policy followed from the days of the late-lamented Dulles....

**SHRI JOYTIRMOY BOSU:** Why lamented?

**DR. KARAN SINGH:** As a result, it is putting a crushing burden on us

which has got to be met in two ways. I would submit to the hon. Prime Minister. The first is through diplomatic moves. I do feel that in resolving the Afghanistan issue we are in a unique position. We had excellent relations with Afghanistan and we have good relations with the Soviet Union. I would appeal to the Prime Minister not simply to let the matter go to the Non-aligned Conference and be done with it. It has got to be followed up. India is the only country to-day which has got to follow up the Afghanistan issue, not only because it is good in itself but because our own national interest is involved. We have got to speak to the United States, we have got to speak to the Arab countries and some friendly countries who have got some defence arrangements with Pakistan. We have got to carry on our initiative.

Sir, we have also got to have defence preparedness, because unless the national security is safeguarded, nothing else in this country makes any sense. We have got to fight poverty, but we cannot in any way give second priority to national defence. And we have one great asset—the asset to which many Members have referred. That is our magnificent fighting forces. For the last thirtythree years from 1948-49—the Kashmir Operation—right down to 1971, I have had occasion to be in very close touch with the Armed Forces. I remember calling upon my colleague, Gen Sparrow when he was in Pakistan territory during the 1965 war. I have seen them in all sorts of circumstances. They are magnificent forces. Last week we were at the Investiture ceremony in Rashtrapati Bhawan, where many of the M.Ps were there. It was a heart-warming sight to see this magnificent forces drawn from all corners of this country, all religions, all regions, all languages, united in their devotion and dedication to preserve our national interests.

Sir, we have got to give our armed forces whatever they require to ful-

fil their responsibilities. Rs. 4,200 crores is the defence demand. Nobody will grudge it. But, I would like to ask the Prime Minister one question. In any defence planning and in any defence project, it is only the apex of a vast hidden iceberg as it were. It involves the total productive capacity of the country—its economic sinews, its factories, its fields, its public sector, its private sector, its universities and its IITs.

I would like to know about this Defence Plan. It is mentioned on page 4, para 7 of this Report. But who actually draws up this Defence Plan? Is there an apex body in this country like the National Security Council in the US? Is there an apex body where all the strands of our national policy are drawn together and then the plan is formulated? We are told that there is a Committee within the Ministry of Defence. That is not good enough. Defence is something much more than simply the Ministry of Defence. It involves the total capacity of the nation. I would like the Prime Minister to please enlighten the House as to what is the organisation that draws up this Plan. Is the Plan drawn up in such a manner that it is constantly updated as a result of technological development and do we have a long enough perspective plan? The second point on which I want to seek a clarification from the Prime Minister is this. After planning comes the question of administration and implementation. Our procedures in the Government of India are tortuous, repetitive and are conducive to delays. There has been talk of streamlining of procedures. In Defence, particularly, I would submit that you need streamlined procedures because of the obsolescence factor and also because of the crisis management situation that may arise at any time. May I know from the Prime Minister whether in fact they have taken any concrete steps to streamline the defence administration to give more powers, for example, to the Service Chiefs? I un-

derstand the powers of the Service Chiefs to-day are considerably less than the financial powers of a Secretary to the Government of India. Unless there is a proper decentralisation and devolution of powers, you will not get the administration streamlined. That is required. And that is the point upon which I would urge on the Prime Minister to enlighten this House.

The third point is; there are certain gaps in our defence structure. I won't go into it from the technological point of view. Particularly, as a result of the new re-armament of Pakistan, we have a modernisation plant which has been drawn up some time ago. We would like to be assured by the Prime Minister whether the modernisation plant that is now being undertaken is going to keep in mind the dimension that is being introduced as a result of the massive aid to Pakistan so that this modernisation can be speeded up and made more quick so that we are not in any way left behind in this. Pakistan has got a very big potential fighting force. Its officers and troops are in many other countries also outside Pakistan and they are receiving a lot of sophisticated training. It is not to be underestimated that they can bring a very rapid strike to bear upon us. If a situation like that develops, is our modernisation programme going to keep up with that?

There are many other points, but I would make only two points in the end and conclude.

Last year also I had made a suggestion that in place of the Director General, Resettlement, who is really not able to fulfil the requirements of the ex-servicemen, there should be a Resettlement Commission. I had said that it should be set up so that the reservations for the ex-servicemen are fulfilled. This House standing passed a resolution with regard to reservation for scheduled castes and scheduled tribes. Certainly, everybody will support it. But what about the reservations for the ex-servicemen who

[Dr. Karan Singh]

spend the best years of their life on the frontiers so that all of us can sleep in peace. What about reservations for people who are up in Chasnul at 14000 ft. and who are in Longewala and Kishangarh in temperature of 50 deg. C in the summer? Are they also not due for reservations? Should we not also pass, standing a resolution that the reservations for the ex-servicemen should be honoured? They are not honoured. I can give instance after instance, where the reservations are not honoured, where the State Government taken even hostile attitude—I do not want to mention any particular State—towards ex-servicemen. They are the responsibility of this Parliament. They spend the best years of their lives in the service of the nation. I would urge upon the Prime Minister, who is aware of the problem to do something about it.

Finally, yesterday a very interesting philosophical point was raised as to whether aggression was part of human nature or not. The Prime Minister said that as we progress, we are trying to cut down on wars. But what seems to be happening, in fact is that as civilization moves, on more and more warlike attributes seem to develop. There is enough nuclear fissionable material today on this globe to kill every person twelve times over; four billion people on the globe can be killed twelve times over. This is the result of our growth of civilization. My own view is that it is only when we move on to a higher level of consciousness that this problem will be solved. One day I hope the House will have a debate about the future of human civilization and consciousness. At this stage, I would only say that while we are still at this level, we have got to heed Krishna's exhortation in the *Geetas*

नस्मात् उक्तिः कौन्तेय युद्धाय  
कृतनिश्चयः ।

And, therefore, I support these Demands for Grants.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (Dum Dum):

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the first point that I want to make is about the basic defence policy of India. The basic defence policy of India should be not merely to avoid war but to prevent war and to see to it that India does not get involved in a war. Whenever a war breaks out, our policy should be directed in such a way that India does not get involved in it. We should be spared of that. The ultimate goal, to my mind, should be that there should be no war in the world, but that is a dream in this class divided society. War is the continuation of politics by other means.

At the same time we should not forget and we oblivious of what is happening around us. We are aware of the American game and conspiracy to supply arms to Pakistan. It is not Pakistan as such but it is the American game which may prove dangerous to the entire region. That is with which we should be concerned most. But I do believe that Pakistan by itself cannot be a match for India in any respect whatsoever, and whatever arms it may get. If it embarks on an aggression against India the very existence of Pakistan would be in jeopardy. Unless there is a mad man nobody will think of attacking India.

Sir, our country cannot afford a huge amount on Defence. There should be a drastic cut in it, because we cannot afford it. If we do that we can do away with the Rs. 2,000 crores of inflation that has been injected by Mr. Venkataraman's Budget.

Now, since the nuclear powers do not give up nuclear weapons and they do not even give any public undertaking that they should not be the first to make any nuclear strike, I think India has the inherent right to manufacture atom bomb and acquire nuclear capability. Whether India will do that, of course, is another question. But I do not consider any power in the world has the right to question our right to have atomic fission, even to manufacture atomic bomb. Whether it is done or not is another question.

Then Sir, there is a deep discontent even among the upper echelons of the Army, Air Force and the Navy, because the promotional avenues compared to the IAS and the other All-India Cadre Staff is very much limited.

The Javans get very shabby treatment. Every possible consideration should be given to Javans. They are generally made to do menial work which is beyond description. This is a state of affairs which cannot be allowed to continue.

As regards the naming of the regiments I say regiments named after the States should be disbanded or there should be regiments for all the States of India—Punjab Regiment, Maharashtra Regiment, Karnataka Regiment, Bengal Regiment like that. Either you do away with that or you have for all. Otherwise there will be illfeeling.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI): Mr Deputy-Speaker, Sir, Parliament is the country's watchdog and this debate on Defence Demands provides Hon. Members with an opportunity to fulfil this function in a very crucial sector of our lives. All sections of the House are united in their concern for the safety and integrity of our country. Many important and useful points have been made in the course of the debate as well as in the earlier debate on External Affairs, for Defence and Foreign Affairs are closely inter-related as many hon. Members have mentioned. In fact, they are over-lapping.

A special feature of our Defence Forces is their closeness to our social milieu. They form an integrated part of our community. We are a nation of agriculturists. It is the farmer's son, who tills the land, who seeks employment in our factories and who joins the defence forces. So, the Jawan is very much in touch with the problems of our people. Second-

ly, whenever the Armed Forces have been called upon to aid civil authorities, whether during natural calamities such as floods or drought; or in restoring supplies and services essential to the community, they have acquitted themselves with great credit. In remote and border areas, and even in places which have come under our control during war and later returned, we have found medical, health or other essential services sadly lacking, and our Jawans have not hesitated, in spite of their other work and duties, to come to the relief of the local community.

Since the last but one speaker was boasting of his close contacts with the Army, I might also say that I have visited all our border areas and was even able to go to some of the Pakistan areas we had captured. There I was approached by the local population asking me: "Why can't these people remain to look after us?"

DR. KARAN SINGH: I was not boasting; I was proudly recalling.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I should like to congratulate our Jawans and officers on their commendable spirit of service.

Within the constraints of resources, my Government has attempted to provide as much as possible for the Armed Forces, be it for essential modernization, or for their overall well being and rehabilitation.

Another point which I should like to clarify—is that the Committee on Defence Planning is not a part of the Defence Ministry. It is an inter-Ministerial organization with representatives from Finance, Planning and External Affairs. The Cabinet Secretary is the chairman.

I take this opportunity of reiterating the commitment of Government to maintain the Armed Forces in a state of total preparedness which must naturally take into account not

only equipment, but that everything possible is done to keep at the highest level the morale of the Defence personnel. Normally when we make plans for modernisation we have to keep all developments in mind, because there is no point in making a plan which ignores the various events around us.

The discipline and the courage of our officers and Jawans are well recognized. In peace time, when the nation's attention may not be focussed on them, they continue to guard our frontiers, some of them in the most trying of circumstances, inclement climate and far removed from their families or any type of social life or amenity. They bring dedication to their duties. I should like to convey to them, on behalf of the Government and on my own behalf, and I am sure the House will join me in this, our appreciation and greetings.

Of course there are problems. The forces have to be kept always in fit and fighting condition. A youthful profile has, therefore, to be maintained and because of this, as many as 70,000 personnel are retired annually at a comparatively young age. Finding alternative occupations for them is a national responsibility. We do treat this question with a sense of urgency. A series of measures have been taken for the welfare and rehabilitation of ex-servicemen. The State Governments and the private sector industries have been urged to keep this constantly in mind. Our ex-servicemen are disciplined and trained, and there is no reason why many of them cannot be gainfully employed in various developmental activities.

Sir, I was astounded to see that one of the cut motions implies a lack of feeling of national integration amongst our Defence forces. I am sure the rest of the House will agree that, on the contrary, it is they who set a good example to us in this matter. Some cut motions asked for a substantial increase in the Defence budget. While I share the concern of hon. Members, I must remind them

that it is not our intention to build a war machine or to compete in the arms race. Our aim is primarily to prevent others from disturbing our peace and our development. Our resources are limited. Defence is an integral and important part, and yet only one part of our national endeavour. It cannot be built at the cost of socio-economic development nor would it be effective without a strong economic base or a united, disciplined and contented people. In these circumstances we have made the most judicious allocation of resources for the defence sector. For the year 1980-81, we have provided an increase of Rs. 200 crores over the sanction in the Budget Estimates and for the year 1981-82, we have proposed a marginal increase, raising the total Defence Budget to Rs. 4200 crores. This increase takes into account the rise in the cost of equipment and in the provisions for pay, for allowances and pensionary benefits. While some members want us to cut down our defence expenditure others feel that we are spending too much.

As a percentage of gross national product, our expenditure on Defence is one of the lowest in the world. In 1979, it was: India 3.9; USA 5.2; USSR 11.13; and UK 4.9. For Pakistan it was 5.7 in 1978; we do not have latest figures for Pakistan and they are not available. Similarly, our Defence expenditure as a percentage of Central Government expenditure is also low compared to that of most countries. But we do our best that the needs of the Defence Services should be fully met and not suffer for shortage of funds.

Our programmes to modernise all wings of the Armed Forces are continuing in the perspective of the security environment of the foreseeable future. Schemes have been sanctioned to increase the fire power, the mobility and the means of communication of our army. While our efforts for indigenously developing our main battle tank are continuing, we have, for the intervening period, procured a newer generation of battle tank. The

Air Force has acquired greater punch with the introduction of MIG-23 aircraft and the Jaguar. For the Navy, we have embarked upon a programme of refitting older ships and obtaining general purpose frigates and mine-sweepers. Negotiations to procure SSK submarines have reached an advanced stage.

Self-reliance remains our guiding principle in this as in other spheres of activities. The new Defence Research and Development Department is engaged in designing and developing sophisticated equipment. We are encouraging—the growth of ancillary industries around Defence production establishments. Our ordnance factories are producing a wide variety of stores ranging from machine-guns to bombs and anti-submarine projectiles, for the three services. Some notable achievements in the production field have been the manufacture of medium machine-guns, fitted largely with indigenously produced components, the development of the 9 mm auto-pistol, air field lighting equipment, etc.

The best defence is the prevention of war and that is what India has been involved in during all these years and that is the major preoccupation of our foreign policy. Since our Foreign Minister has dealt very lucidly and comprehensively with our thinking on these matters, with our relations with other countries, and especially with our neighbours as well as with recent developments in the nonalignment movement and other relevant questions such as the North-South problems, I do not need to go into these again.

There is near if not total unanimity in the world on one point. Never in the last two decades has the international outlook been as grim as it is today. This is not merely my own assessment but that of the scores of world leaders from five continents whom I have met in this past year. I am not given to alarm or exaggeration. Yet I must warn that at this time we simply cannot afford to be

complacent or to sit back hoping that matters will somehow be sorted out. It will take the most earnest exertion of all countries, to somehow hang on to peace and to prevent the situation from exploding, or drifting towards disaster. The basic responsibility for peace lies with the big powers. Their attitudes of confrontation will engulf all others. Much that happens in smaller countries is often the result of such outside manoeuvres and manipulations. Yet countries like ours, which are not big powers in the military or any other sense, can and must pull their weight individually and collectively. Peace to us is vital for the consolidation of our independence, for the building of our economy and indeed for our very survival as nations.

There is actual fighting in more than one part of the world. Many other areas are like powder kegs ready to blow up at any inadvertent striking of a match. The focus of the cold war has shifted from Europe to the Indian Ocean littoral. As has been said our South-West and South-East Asia flanks are flash points. New armaments are being piled up in our region, not only around the Indian Ocean but in a number of inland countries.

We are told that the purpose of the militarisation of our area is the containment of the expansionism of one big power by the other, and of ensuring the stability of the Gulf region. In our view this policy is counter-productive. It will virtually prevent a politically negotiated settlement in Afghanistan nor will it bring peace to the Gulf and South-West Asian region. The security of the Gulf should primarily be the responsibility of the Gulf countries themselves who should not allow external interference or pressures in the shaping of their future.

The unresolved crisis in Afghanistan and the continuing conflict in Iraq-Iran have given encouragement to the hawks of many countries. We continue to be deeply concerned that there are

[Dr. Karan Singh]

as yet no signs of improvement in Afghanistan. We stand firmly for the ending of all outside presences in that country, as well as elsewhere, but it would be wrong to think that there is only one foreign intervention. Our advocacy of a political solution to this problem has assumed even greater relevance than when the trouble began, because of the increasing entanglement of the big powers in this entire region. Any solution must obviously balance the views of all concerned parties.

Developments in Afghanistan have given Pakistan an excuse to demand more arms and to other countries to supply them. We are also disturbed that a mischievous campaign has been started in some quarters to suggest that Pakistan needs to be strengthened because of India's designs. This point is patently ridiculous and untrue.

Every country has a duty to look after its defence. But let us remember that in the last ten years, Pakistan has doubled its defence strength. Yet we did not protest then. But the present moves introduce a qualitative difference. Now, Pakistan's defence seems once again to be becoming part of a larger strategic alignment stretching from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific Ocean, to say nothing of the Indian Ocean in between. This is what worries us.

We welcomed Pakistan's entry into the non-aligned movement. But do their new intentions fit in with non-alignment or are they going back to their old policies?

Officially, Pakistan has denied that it is planning to produce nuclear weapons. But these denials have not allayed the fears and suspicions anywhere in the world. In fact, it is in the countries of the West that detailed accounts have been appearing about Pakistan's nuclear preparations. It should be clearly understood that Pakistan's development of nu-

clear bombs will have grave and irreversible consequences on our sub-continent. We have kept our eyes and ears open. We are fully aware of our responsibilities and the House can be confident that we shall respond in an appropriate way to any development. Our own policy has been to use nuclear energy only for peaceful purposes and we crusade for the total banning of all nuclear weapons.

The Pakistan Foreign Minister, Mr. Aga Ghahi has been here twice. In response to his invitation and in pursuance of the Simla Agreement, our Foreign Minister will, I hope soon go to Islamabad. This visit will be in continuation of our patient approach in dealing with Pakistan since the Simla Conference. Some leaders of the opposition parties have been pleased to say outside the House that India with its size need not be afraid of Pakistan. We are not afraid of Pakistan or of anyone else. Size itself is not strength. In fact, without unity and discipline, it can be a liability. But we do care very much for the tranquility of our region and the stability of our neighbourhood. I had expected greater farsightedness from such experienced leaders.

We have expressed our serious misgivings directly to the United States Government through our Ambassador and through Shri G. Parthasarathi who had gone to the United States on some other work. The response of the United States will be known by its actions. Our efforts at friendship and cooperation continue and will continue. But at the same time, we must not ignore the realities or dangers of the unfolding situation. India has never resorted to any step which might be taken as a threat to our neighbouring countries. Indeed we have repeatedly assured them of our policy of respect for their sovereignty and integrity. We want them to live in peace and stability. In fact, the pace of socio-economic development in our own country is linked with events in our neighbourhood. Jawaharlal Nehru's words uttered 25 years ago

that 'the cold war has come to our door-step' is true once again. The gains made through patient international diplomacy over the last 30 years have been swept away by the hot winds of belligerency. The situations in Afghanistan and the Gulf, serious as they are, are not half as menacing as the resumption of the cold war. The powerful nations of Europe and America seem to have a special flair for fighting their wars on the soils of the under-developed and developing countries of Asia and Africa. Added to this are the ocean waters of our region.

We are alarmed at the pronouncements of some major spokesmen of the US Administration which have created disquiet even amongst some of their close allies. We hope that as that Government studies the complex international situation in greater depth and with greater understanding, it will appreciate the need to de-escalate tensions. Experience has shown that military solutions are short-lived and give rise to new problems. Hence no opportunity for a dialogue should be missed. Proposals like those of President Brezhnev should be looked at in this context. The big powers have the primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace. But recent history has shown that the big powers do not always get their own way. Other countries can do a great deal to generate the right atmosphere and to mobilise the voices for peace.

Some have alleged our dependence on a particular country. This allegation is quite baseless. It shows how people, and even hon. Members of Parliament, are influenced by the propaganda of vested interests. This is even anti-national as it reflects on the morale of our forces and our people. We have built a strong techno-economic base. And whenever we have had to buy equipment from abroad to keep abreast of the latest technological developments, we have carefully compared the pros and cons of various offers and have decided the source of procurement only in the best interests

of our country and after ascertaining the equipment most suited to our needs. Keeping in view cost effectiveness, we have in our inventory, equipment and materials not from one country alone but from diverse sources which include France, Germany, Italy, Sweden, UK as well as the USA and the USSR and also from some other countries. In the matter of supplies of spares, no country can blackmail us in times of need.

India is not only a large land mass but comprises also a large number of islands which are strategically situated and vulnerable to external threats. Their defence is a matter of direct national concern. Foreign vessels are showing undue interest in these outlying islands and in our seas. We are taking steps to strengthen the security of those islands.

A point which was mentioned when I visited our islands on both sides—Lakshadweep as well as the Andaman—is that normally when we speak of the length of India we say Kashmir to Kanyakumari. And it was very forcibly brought out that both Minicoy and Pygmalion Point are much more to the south. I request hon. Members that when they refer to the size of India in future, to keep this in mind.

DR. KARAN SINGH: From Ladakh to Pygmalion.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: This brings me on to the larger issue of the oceans around us. Our seas are vital from the point of view of security, from the point of view of natural resources and communication and of our environment. All these years a few big powers considered the Oceans as their preserve. Global attempts have been made in recent years to bring about an acceptable international regime of ocean management. But even these have met with opposition and have recently received a set back. In the meantime we

must be vigilant to safeguard our legitimate rights. We have been and are strengthening our Coast Guard Organisation, and new legislation is being proposed to deter poaching in our waters. A new Department of Ocean Development is being set up and this will be followed by the establishment of an Ocean Commission.

External threat need not always take the form of a military invasion or an attack from outside. Other subtle moves destabilise countries and damage their national fabrics. Outside elements seem to be showing a great deal of interest in fomenting fissiparous movements within our country and encouraging those who indulge in violence. Some time ago, I had drawn attention to elements in the North East which advocated secessionist tendencies. Today similar irresponsible and even more sinister claims of separate nationhood are being heard from other parts of our country—astonishingly even those parts whose sons and daughters have contributed such hard work to the development of our Nation and sacrificed so much to the defence of our borders.

I want to deal with another question to which an hon. Member referred. He concluded on what I had said about civilisation. Civilisation is not synonymous with industrial development or affluence by itself. And when I referred to civilised people, I mean those who are civilised in mind. ... (*Interruptions*) I think it is an American who wrote if I remember the words aright:

"Ill fares the land to hastening  
a prey.

Where wealth accumulates and  
men decay."

**DR. KARAN SINGH:** It is Oliver Goldsmith.

**SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI:** Yes, Goldsmith.

**PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE:** This is one thing on which there can be a national consensus.

**SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI:** So our endeavour is to build that kind of man. It is a very long-term goal. But we hope that step by step we shall get nearer to it.

By the way, hon. Member Shri Indrajit Gupta, said something about our Service Chiefs meeting Senator Price. I am told that they did not meet Senator Price either jointly or singly.

As hon. Members are aware, defence is strongly influenced by and dependent on many other factors. This is one of the reasons why I have kept Defence with me, to forge closer coordination and to introduce more effective institutional arrangements. Modern security implies defence plus foreign policy plus self-reliant technology. It rests on the soundness of the economy, on political cohesion and social harmony. But in the ultimate analysis it is the people who count, their morale, their commitment and patriotic determination. As one hon. Member pointed out, the Vietnamese had neither money, industrial capacity nor military equipment worth the name. The people were poor and short of almost all their needs. Yet, the manner in which they rallied and united, matched their strength against the mightiest and prevailed is the saga of our time. Our own freedom struggle is a shining example of the power of will, endurance and perseverance. The Indian people have this quality in abundant measure. Let us, the political parties and all others, not fail them or our defence forces, by diverting attention or dissipating energies on non-issues.

I urge on the hon. Member to withdraw their cut motions and to adopt the Demands unanimously.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: In view of the appeal of the hon. Prime Minister, may I know whether all the cut motions are being withdrawn?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that all the cut motions, moved by several hon. Members, be withdrawn?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

Cut motions Nos. 7 to 10 and 23 to 80 were, by leave, withdrawn

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now the

question is:

"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, 1982, in respect of the heads of demands entered in the second column thereof against Demand Nos. 19 to 24 relating to the Ministry of Defence."

The motion was adopted.

*Demands for Grants, 1981-82 in respect of the Ministry of Defence voted by Lok Sabha*

No. of Demand	Name of Demand	Amount of Demand for Grant on account voted by the House on 13-3-1981		Amount of Demand for Grant voted by the House	
		Revenue Rs.	Capital Rs.	Revenue Rs.	Capital Rs.
19.	Ministry of Defence	26,13,07,000	17,48,93,000	130,65,33,000	87,44,64,000
20.	Defence Services—Army	404,07,09,000	..	2020,35,42,000	..
21.	Defence Services—Navy	49,87,58,000	..	249,37,92,000	..
22.	Defence Services—Air Force	165,30,83,000	..	826,54,17,000	..
23.	Defence Services—Pensions	47,19,28,000	..	235,96,37,000	..
24.	Capital Outlay on Defence Services	..	67,27,33,000	..	335,36,67,000