

15.51 hrs.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Twentieth Report

SHRI KHADILKAR (Khed): I beg to move:

"That this House agrees with the Twentieth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 21st February 1968"

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That this House agrees with the Twentieth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 21st February 1968".

The motion was adopted.

15.52 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE: DEFENCE NEEDS OF INDIA—Contd.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: We shall resume discussion of the following Resolution moved by Shri Ranjeet Singh on the 22nd December 1967:

"This House resolves that a Standing Parliamentary Committee on Defence be appointed to study the problems of India's defence needs and periodically to keep scrutinising her defence preparedness and suggest ways and means to the Government to ensure the security of the country's frontiers".

Out of two hours allotted, the hon. Mover has taken so far 40 minutes. 1 hour and 40 minutes remain. He may continue his speech and conclude in ten minutes.

SHRI RANJIT SINGH (Khalilabad): Twelve.

Hon. Members may be reminded that this Resolution continues from the

last session. I will now conclude my observations in a few minutes. To refresh your memory, I had recounted how certain inherent weaknesses of democracy, primarily the conscious desire for peace leading to the sub-conscious make-believe of peace lulls democracies into a sense of complacency. Therefore, in the past no democracy has been prepared for a war that its people could see under their very nose. The example of Britain was cited and indeed, we cannot forget the example of the USA which, with Pearl Harbour only a month away, had almost rejected the famous Selective Services Bill necessary for increase in the strength of the US armed forces, passing it by a ridiculously thin majority of 23.

Therefore, I plead that in considering this Resolution, we concern ourselves here with nothing but the truth, nothing but the objective analysis of our defence needs, nothing but the stark facts that glaringly point to the imperative necessity for the acceptance of this Resolution. I hope that for once our international Minister of Defence will gather the courage, that for once our Government will display the foresight to accept this Resolution. I still have faith in both bodies.

In case there are any reservations advanced, let me destroy beforehand those pueril answers that have been prepared for our international Minister by his ill-advisers. The first argument is going to be on the ground of defence secrecy. What according to our Defence Minister, is defence secrecy? I had pointed out last time that a pamphlet circulated on the organisation of the Chinese Army is marked 'top secret'. Let me now disclose to you that hundreds of pamphlets on the detailed organisation of our defence forces are not even marked 'confidential'. Whose secrets is the Defence Minister guarding? China's but our Defence Minister does not know of such perverted sense of secrecy that prevails in the Defence head-

[Shri Ranjit Singh]

quarters. I shall point out to you another example of this secrecy. If you ask the Defence Minister about the performance of the Vijayanta tank, he will say that it is a secret and he cannot give out the details. But the Vijayanta tank uses guns manufactured in England. It uses an engine that has been designed by the United States; it uses Asok Leyland engine. All its performances are available from the open market. But he will not give them out. If we ask him about the performance of the MIG aircraft, he will say that it is a secret but if you look up any international journal on aircraft industry, you will get every information. This is his secrecy. Yet he is going to harp on this secrecy. I shall warn him that he cannot exploit any ignorance in this House because at least on this side it does not exist. That after all is his own sense of secrecy? There is another case. He will refuse to give any information to this House on machine guns that we have ordered from Fabrique National, Belgium. He will say that it is not in public interest. But when I visited that factory in Belgium I found that the number of machine guns that we had ordered from that factory was given out publicly and it was displayed. It is then that I came to know that we had ordered these machine guns. If we ask about the Russian SU 7, then again he will say it is not in the public interest. But its details can be had from any journal on aircraft. Secrecy in modern concept of defence does not lie in preventing a small culvert or a wayside railway station from being photographed. Yet, even on some urinals you may find the sign "photography prohibited". I shall allow that for some persons that may be the proper place to be safeguarded because it is there that they will seek shelter when war comes. You cannot prevent the enemy agents from photographing anything. There are cameras now built into small lighters into coat lapels with lenses in the buttons or tiepins. What needs to be safeguard-

ed is your strategy, your tactical plans and the proposed committee is not going to touch these.

May I further ask the Defence Minister: from whom is he going to keep our defence a secret? From the USA? After the Chinese aggression a team of experts from the United States came and it is they who have drafted all our future expansion programmes for the armed forces. It is they who felt that we needed twenty divisions to hold the Chinese. It is on that plan that we are working. It is they who planned how much air force we should have. It is they who planned all our air defence arrangements.

श्री शशि भूषण वाजपेयी (खारगोन) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह क्या गलत बर्तन करते हैं ? यह अमेरिकन प्रॉपेगेंडा करते हैं कि अमरीका हमारे देश की फौज का प्लान बनाता है। इस तरह का बेकार का अमरीका का प्रॉपेगेंडा करते इन को शर्म नहीं आती ?

श्री रणजित सिंह : माननीय सदस्य कुछ समझते तो हैं नहीं बेकार यू ही बोलें जा रहे हैं।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Does he make any statement which goes against the general security of the country? The Minister is sitting here. If he is making any incorrect statements he will contradict him.

SHRI RANJIT SINGH: I am only saying that the security arrangements had been evolved by having the Americans probe into our plan and arrangements. He is not understanding it. I can well understand his groans and grunts because he is forced by his party to commit such zoological antics now and then. (An Hon. Member: There is no party whip on this issue): I am not talking of party whip. I know there is no whip

am not concerned with any party. I am concerned only with the bare truth.

Look at the other side. Are we going to keep these things a secret from Russia? We have had their experts who came here. All our weaponry system is based on the Russian weaponry system. We are getting tools from them and we are getting aircraft from them and we are going to manufacture MIG aircraft here. It is they who are planning the weaponry system over here, and our organisation over here. The Americans plan our divisions; they gave detailed outline plan on our mountain division and the Russians are planning all our weaponry system. From whom are we going to keep these things secret? From our own countrymen and from this House? I hope the hon. Member will now understand the point that I am making.

16 hrs.

There is another assumption, that we might keep these things a secret from China. It is just an assumption that the left hand will not come to know what the right hand does. When the Russians know something, how can you say that the Chinese will not come to know of these things?

Another thing that I would like to point out is that the modern concept of defence does not lie in preventing the enemy from knowing our strength; it lies in preventing the enemy from knowing our intentions. I had been to certain foreign countries; Israel for instance. They permitted me to photograph every installation. There was no secrecy because they know that these installations are already photographed by the enemy.

I assure Sardar Sahib, or, if he would prefer to be called Sardarji, that I have no intention to advocate that a committee should pry under his veil where strategy tactics and planning are concerned. But the iron curtain must be removed, must be

lifted now, from the state of morale, from the state of corruption and the state of inter-service, inter-arm and inter-departmental conflicts that tell upon the nation's security, and there, this committee must and will interfere. The Defence Minister alone cannot. If he could, the following situations could never have arisen.

There was an embodiment of certain units on an emergency basis in 1960. Some of these units were unique in the whole of India. For instance, amongst this was a regiment of medium artillery of which we had only four in the whole country. Three months before the Chinese aggression orders went from the Ministry of Defence that these units should be disembodied and everybody was to be sent home. And when did this disembodiment start? Just before the Chinese attack and throughout the period when the Chinese were advancing in our territory, our people were being sent home; the arm was being reduced. On the one hand, orders had gone to call up special reserves, and on the other hand, the army was being reduced. When the Chinese ceased fire, these people were called back and re-embodied. And do you know when they were disembodied again? Just nine days before Pakistan attacked Kutch. On the 1st April this unit was disembodied. Along with it six more units were disembodied. On the 9th April, Pakistan attacked Kutch and on the 27th April, these people got their recall back. After we had agreed to cease-fire in Kutch, these people were recalled. Again, with another disembodiment of these units, the strength of the army was cut. On the 31st August, 1965, these units were disembodied, and on the 1st August, 1965, Pakistan attacked with Six Armoured Divisions in Chaamb. We all know that. During the advance of Pakistan through Chaamb, these units were being disembodied.

Sir, that is why a defence probe is essential as to who is behind this

[Shri Ranjit Singh]

lessening of the strength of the armed forces at the moment of crisis. It is such a committee consisting of members of all shades of opinion that will go into it and it is such a committee alone that will get all the information regarding such matters and the effect of such things.

Let me point out another case. During one of the battles, there was a solitary case, when under the stress of battle, the Commanding Officer and 10 men remained on the spot facing the enemy shelling, and the rest of the battalion disappeared. This Commanding Officer was there only for a period of six days in actual command of the unit, and in six days he could not do anything. But instead of being rewarded for having held to his post, for having remained at his post, he has been removed because somebody on the top was not satisfied with his boldness.

There was a case of another high-ranking officer who displayed exemplary courage by remaining on the front under the direct fire and shelling of the enemy, but because his superior did not see eye to eye with him, he was charged with cowardice and shunted out. We all know it was a wrong action, but we are not ready to rectify it. This type of committee can rectify it and raise the morale of the people, because the morale suffers on account of such things.

I will mention another case which will stun the House. There was a battalion called the Second Battalion of Assam Regiment, posted in Srinagar in a very remote spot. It was very difficult to get water up to the trenches of the troops there. The commanding officer had brought his family and the troops had to fetch water for his family from a distance of 1½ miles. One day one person made a stray remark in privacy, which a soldier is always permitted to make, viz., "If this person's wife had not been here, we would not have had to face this situation of fetching water from a mile for his family."

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have got a long list of members who want to speak. He should conclude now.

SHRI RANJIT SINGH: You know, Sir, it is a matter of national importance. Nobody can disclose these things. I will finish in five more minutes. What I am pointing out is the root cause of the trouble in Mizoland. Because of this remark of a soldier, the commanding officer stopped the food of the whole battalion, something that is never done in the army. The soldier's stomach is never touched. In the evening, when they went to the langar, they found that food had not been prepared. They opened the langar, had their dinner and after a hearty meal retired to bed. Next day the commanding officer reported to the Brigade Commander that the battalion had revolted. Next day, a group of people wanted to go to the commanding officer to apologise to him for this misunderstanding. But when he saw them coming, he left his mess, ran away to the Brigade Headquarters and reported that the battalion was coming to kill him. The Brigade Commander came with tanks over there with another battalion to arrest this battalion. He found that the battalion was not in revolt and nobody was armed or was raising any hue and cry. But for two months, the whole battalion was put in an operation called "operation pinjra" It is a shame upon us that in Alwar, in small enclosures of barbed wire barricades, the people were separated one by one and were exhibited like cattle for two months. There was a general court-martial and they were sentenced. The high officers came to know that it was wrong, but in order to protect the honour of a single commanding officer, they punished the whole battalion. Those people filed a writ in the Supreme Court. They were summarily dismissed from the army and they are now leading the Mizo revolt because a majority of them were Mizos. Such a thing would

not have occurred if we had a committee of this type, because somebody would have informed.

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SHRI SWARAN SINGH): What would a committee do in such a case?

SHRI RANJIT SINGH: You will never understand defence matters. That is the whole trouble. That is why I have called you the International Minister of Defence, because you are concerned not with our defence, but with the defence of Vietnam, Korea, Israel and so on.

SHRI MANOHARAN (Madras North): This is an unfair remark.

SHRI RANJIT SINGH: If he also thinks that is an unfair remark, I will take it back. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH (Rohtak): We have got a very competent Defence Minister. There is no doubt about it.

SHRI RANJIT SINGH: The aim of this Committee would be merely to function as a watchdog to ensure that the morale of the services, their strength, their consciousness and faith in their leaders do not dwindle by such acts as I have narrated. I do not mean it is going to interfere with the functions of the Defence Minister. It is going to help the Defence Minister.

I would request the Government to let this leadership be now diversified instead of being personified. A *sainik's* morale depends mainly upon the leadership he possesses. We have reached a state of affairs when one single man is not there to infuse confidence into him. There is no Lal Bahadur Shastri. There is no Jawaharlal Nehru. Therefore, let him derive confidence from a body of people representing all shades of opinion. It is only they who can assure the House and assure the Prime Minister that the country is well prepared in all directions for its defence.

I will request now that this great cause be supported by all sections of

the House. I have much to say, but I pass the ball to other colleagues for swifter shot at the goal.

I thank you, Sir, I thank the House for giving me this opportunity. I will say again, as I said in the opening part of my speech that if I have said something provocative it should not be taken as something against the resolution. It may be taken against me personally but not against the cause which I am advocating.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"This House resolves that a Standing Parliamentary Committee on Defence be appointed to study the problems of India's defence needs and periodically to keep scrutinizing her defence preparedness and suggest ways and means to the Government to ensure the security of the country's frontiers."

There are two amendments. Are hon. Members moving them?

SHRI E. K. NAYANAR (Palghat): Sir, I beg to move:

That in the resolution,

add at the end—

"and such suggestions must be endorsed by Parliament." (1)

SHRI BEDABRATA BARUA (Kaliabor): Sir, I beg to move:

That in the resolution,—

for "periodically to keep scrutinizing her defence preparedness and suggest ways and means to the Government to ensure the security of the country's frontiers"

substitute—

"to make necessary suggestions in that regard" (2)

श्री अमृत नाहाटा (बाडमेर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस प्रस्ताव को रखते समय, माननीय सदस्य मेजर रणजीत सिंह जी ने एक बात स्पष्ट कर दी। उन्होंने पहले ही कहा कि प्रजातंत्रीय देश कमजोर देश होता है।

श्री रणजीत सिंह : यह तो नहीं कहा। मैंने कहा चन्द कमजोरियां होती हैं।

श्री अमृत नाहाटा : मैं नोट करता हूँ।

"I will give example of how on the question of defence even England, perpetually fighting wars since hundreds of years, maintaining an empire by the force of might, failed owing to the inherent weaknesses of democracy. The psychology of a democratic Government is a psychology of peace."

SHRI RANJIT SINGH: Some weaknesses. I have pointed them out.

SHRI AMRIT NAHATA: You said "owing to the inherent weaknesses" not "some".

यही आपने कहा है कि प्रजातंत्र के अन्दर कुछ कमजोरियां निहित हैं। सब नहीं हैं।

SHRI RANJIT SINGH: This is his approach.

SHRI AMRIT NAHATA: Yes, this is my approach because it is not a secret that the leaders of their party have repeatedly called democracy a 'brothel' and Parliament 'talking shops.'

जब माननीय सदस्य कह रहे हैं कि प्रजातंत्र में कुछ निहित कमजोरियां हैं तो इसको उनके मुंह से सुन कर मुझे कोई आश्चर्य नहीं हुआ। इसका कारण यह है जिस दल में वह हैं उस दल ने प्रजातंत्र के प्रति अपनी हिकारत को कभी छिपाया नहीं है।

SHRI RANJIT SINGH: The hon. Member should know the facts about our party.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: (Delhi Sardar): How can we remove his ignorance, Sir?

SHRI RANJIT SINGH: Sardar Sahib being the senior member of the Congress present in the House should control this hon. Member.

श्री अमृत नाहाटा : गुरु गोलवलकर ने प्रजातंत्र को बंश्यालय कहा है। अगर जनसंघ वाले कहते हैं कि गोलवलकर साहब उनके नेता नहीं हैं और उनकी बात को वे नहीं मानते हैं तो यह बात उनके मुंह से सुन कर मुझे खुशी होगी।

श्री कंवरलाल गुप्त : नहीं है।

श्री अमृत नाहाटा : कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है उनका आपकी पार्टी के साथ? अगर आप यह कहते हैं कि कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है तो मुझे खुशी होगी। उनके नेतृत्व को आपने माना है। अगर आप कहेंगे कि नहीं माना है तो मुझे यह जानकर खुशी होगी। मेरी तो यह मान्यता है कि गुरु गोलवलकर इनके स्पिरिचुअल गुरु हैं।

16.15 hrs.

[SHRI MANOHARAN in the Chair]

एक माननीय सदस्य : महात्मा गांधी क्या आप के नहीं थे ?

श्री अमृत नाहाटा : महात्मा गांधी कांग्रेस के मैम्बर नहीं थे। लेकिन कांग्रेस ने कभी इसको छिपाया नहीं कि महात्मा गांधी हमारे नेता हैं। लेकिन ये लोग तो कहते हैं

श्री रणजीत सिंह : रेजोल्यूशन पर बोलें अदरवाइज लैट मोर नासिजेबल परसन स्पीक।

श्री अमृत नाहाटा : जब आप पर आती है तब आप टाइटले हैं।

मेरी मान्यता है कि प्रजातंत्र में निहित कमजोरियां हैं यह बतल गलत है। बल्कि दुनिया में यह सक्ति हो चुका है कि चाहे

सैनिक शक्ति के क्षेत्र में हो और चाहे आर्थिक क्षेत्र में हो, प्रजातांत्रिक स्वरूप की जो सरकारें होती हैं वे दृढ़ और मजबूत सरकारें होती हैं। लेकिन इसके साथ साथ मैं इस बात को जरूर मानता हूँ कि सुरक्षा अज के युग में कोई एक क्लोज, एक बन्द चीज नहीं है। आज के युग में यह कहना कि यह कुछ खास चन्द मुट्ठी भर स्पेशलिस्टों की चीज है, नहीं नहीं है। वियतनाम ने यह साबित कर दिया है कि साधारण, जनता, सामान्य लोग देश की रक्षा करने में जब आगे बढ़ते हैं तो बड़ी बड़ी फौजी ताकत उनके सामने धूल चाटती है।

मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि डिफेंस के मामले में सारे देश की जनता को आगस्त्य करना चाहिये। हमारी डिफेंस की क्या रिक्वायरमेंट्स हैं, क्या आवश्यकताएँ हैं हमें यह मान कर चलना है और हमने यह सिद्धांत स्वीकार भी किया है और देश में कई बार इसकी घोषणा भी की है कि हमारे यहाँ सिविल आथॉरिटी सुप्रीम है और अगर सिविल आथॉरिटी सुप्रीम है तो पार्लिमेंट सुप्रीम है। यहाँ डिफेंस का बजट आता है, उस पर बहस होती है। मेरा ख्याल है कि हमारे आदरणीय सुरक्षा मंत्री समय समय पर पार्लियामेंट के सदस्यों की राय भी लेते हैं और उनको लेनी भी चाहिये। जिस तरह से दूसरे मंत्रालयों के लिए सलाहकार समितियाँ बनी हुई हैं, पार्लिमेंट के सदस्यों की उसी प्रकार से इस समिति शायद इनके मंत्रालय के लिए भी बनी हुई है और अगर नहीं बनी हुई है तो इस प्रकार की समिति की उसकी स्थापना कर देनी चाहिये। मैं समझता हूँ कि मंत्री महोदय इससे सहमत होंगे। जब सिविल आथॉरिटी सुप्रीम है और हम नागरिकों...

श्री रणजित सिंह : यह कहाँ से इस में आ गया ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: May I suggest to the hon. Mover that he is

not serving his cause by continuous running commentary?

SHRI RANJIT SINGH: It is not my fault. This is a national cause.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: This is the type of thing which I do not want him to do. Even when I am speaking he is interrupting. I would suggest that there is no use making a running commentary when another Member is speaking. That will only consume time unnecessarily. No speaker says or expects that everybody should agree with what he says, much less a person like Shri Ranjit Singh, who may have a lot of experience about the army but no experience of public life or Parliament.

SHRI RANJIT SINGH: How does he say that I am a public man. I have come here after going through the elections. Why does he say that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is his opinion. Why do you bother about it?

SHRI RANJIT SINGH: He says that I have no experience of public life.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: He says that other people do not understand defence. But if it is pointed out to him that he does not understand parliamentary matters, he at once gets up excited.

SHRI AMRIT NAHATA: The mover contradicts himself when he says that Members of Parliament do not understand defence and only those who are in the army understand defence. By saying that he is contradicting himself.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now let him speak on the subject.

श्री अमृत नहटा : यह सही है कि हमारी सेनाओं में अफसर शाही है, हमारी सेनाओं में अहंकार है और जब कोई फैसले किये जाते हैं तो समझ लिया जाता है कि उन्होंने जो फैसला कर लिया है वह खुदा का फैसला है। इस प्रकार की संभावना से, इस प्रकार की गलती से बचना चाहिये। इससे बचने के

[श्री अनृत नहाटा]

लिए यह आवश्यक है कि नागरिकों के प्रतिनिधि निगरानी रख फौज पर और निगरानी रखने का तरीका यह पार्लिमेंट है, हमारी पी०ए०सी० है, हमारी पार्लिमेंट के सदस्यों की सलाहकार समिति है जिस को बुला कर समय समय पर सुरक्षा मंत्री जी राय लेते हैं और हमारे इस सदन के प्रतिनिधि स्वयं हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि सुरक्षा मंत्री सारी चीज पर ध्यान रखें। इसके लिए यह आवश्यक है कि वह अपनी सत्ता को, अपनी शक्ति को अधिक जागरूकता से डिफेंस फोर्सेस पर लागू करें। उनके जो अफसर हैं उनके जो अधिकारी हैं जिनके बारे में मूवर ने टाप ब्रास कहा है, उनकी राय को आँख मूंद कर न मान लिया करें। बल्कि सिविल रिप्रजेंटेटिव होने के नाते, इस देश की जनता के प्रतिनिधि होने के नाते बहुत गहराई से उनके सुझावों पर, उनके जो ब्रीफ्स होते हैं उन पर विचार करके उन पर कुछ फैसले किया करें।

यह प्रस्ताव डिफेंस नीडज़ से संबंध रखता है इसलिए मैं सुरक्षा मंत्री जी का विशेष ध्यान पाकिस्तान के साथ जो राजस्थान की सीमा लगती है उसकी तरफ दिलाना चाहता हूँ क्योंकि वहाँ की डिफेंस नीडज़ को अब तक इग्नोर किया गया है। पिछले हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के युद्ध में पाकिस्तान ने हमारी सबसे अधिक भूमि पर कब्जा जैसलमेर और बाड़मेर के क्षेत्र में किया था, क्योंकि उस क्षेत्र में डिफेंस की तरफ कोई ध्यान नहीं दिया गया था। मैं मानता हूँ कि अब ध्यान दिया जा रहा है और सड़कें बन रही हैं, लेकिन वे बिल्कुल न काफी हैं। समय समय पर मैंने सुरक्षा मंत्रालय का ध्यान इस ओर आकर्षित किया है। मैंने एक पूरा स्मृति पत्र डिफेंस रोडज़ पर दिया है। मैंने यह भी माँग की है कि जिम

प्रकार डिफेंस के लिए पोखरण से जैसलमेर तक रेलवे लाइन बनाई जा रही है, उसी प्रकार डिफेंस के लिए जैसलमेर से बाड़मेर तक रेलवे लाइन बनाना बहुत जरूरी है।

मैंने यह भी माँग की है कि राजस्थान नहर को सिर्फ सिंचाई की नहर न समझा जाय, बल्कि हमारे देश की सुरक्षा के दृष्टिकोण से उस नहर का बनाया जाना बहुत जरूरी है। वह नहर हमारे लिए इच्छोगिल कैनल का काम करेगी। मैं डिफेंस मिनिस्टर का ध्यान इस तरफ दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि यह एक बाडर है, जो डिफेंस के दृष्टिकोण से बिल्कुल इग्नोर किया गया है। एक बार मैंने इस संबंध में कुछ सुझाव दिये, तो मजक में कहा गया कि क्या इतने लम्बे बाडर पर दीवार खड़ी कर दें। कोई दीवार खड़ी करने का सवाल नहीं है। लेकिन वहाँ पर सड़कों का जाल बिछ जाना चाहिये, रेलवे लाइनें बिछाई जानी चाहिए, संचार व्यवस्था की की जानी चाहिए और राजस्थान कैनल बनाई जानी चाहिए।

अन्त में मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे लोग बहादुर हैं और उन्होंने आत्ममरण और उस से उत्पन्न स्थिति का मुकाबला बहादुरी से किया है, लेकिन जब तक कम से कम डिफेंस रेक्वायरमेंट्स पूरी नहीं की जायेंगी तब तक हमारा बाडर कमजोर रहेगा। मैं सुरक्षा मंत्री का ध्यान विशेष रूप से इस ओर दिलाना चाहता हूँ।

आप ने मुझे वक्त दिया, उम के लिए धन्यवाद।

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN (Wandiwash): Mr. Chairman, I cannot claim to be an expert on defence but I am trying to become an expert on defence. I come from a place which is contributing so much to the defence of this country. M district, North

Arcot, Tamil Nad, is at present having 43,000 servicemen.

SHRI KAMALANATHAN (Krishnagiri): Krishnagiri, my constituency, also.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN: First of all, at the outset, I must thank our friend, Major Ranjit Singh, for having brought forward this Resolution which has focussed the attention of this House on the problems of defence. In his pamphlet he has suggested ways and means of improving our defence potentiality. He has visited recently a country which in four or five days has won a major battle. He has suggested from his own experience what can be learnt from this country.

As far as our country is concerned, we are spending huge amount of money on defence. I do not decry that, but at the same time we cannot afford to allot so much money for defence because it talks away more than half of our Budget when we have other fields also, for example, agriculture, industry and the welfare of the downtrodden.

Some of the other countries do not have a large army but they have large reserves. We can follow that example. Our Defence Minister was also connected with the Foreign Ministry for a long time and it is good that one aware of foreign policy as well as of defence, because our defence policy is dependent on foreign policy.

We have two enemy countries on both sides. Our defence problem has to be discussed from that view. We cannot always be preaching peace outside and be enemies to our neighbours. We have to pursue a policy of negotiations. My hon. friend, Major Ranjit Singh, will not accept this suggestion because he says that the country must always be ready for a war. That is good to a certain extent; at the same time, we have to keep our doors open for negotiations so that our neighbouring countries will come to terms with us. At the same time, the agreement must be an

honourable agreement to this country also

SHRI INDER J, MALHOTRA (Jammu): Negotiation about what?

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN: For peaceful and honourable settlement.

We have to look at the expense of the Defence Ministry as to how the money sanctioned is being spent. I had an interesting conversation with a military officer. I was asking him about the expenses in defence. He was telling me some interesting things. He said that for a building which can be built with Rs. 1-lakh by the State Government, by the Public Works Department the Defence takes at least Rs. 4 lakhs. They consume so much amount of money. I would request the Defence Minister to go through this and to cut down extravagant expenses of the Defence.

Again, to read the Audit Report, we understand that there are so many lapses and so much extravagant expenditure incurred by the Defence Ministry. In his suggestions, rather, recommendations, Maj. Ranjit Singh has suggested very many things. Some of them are very interesting and must be discussed and some of them must be accepted by the House.

He has suggested, first of all, that this country must be defence-oriented. That has to be accepted by all because, at present, we have two enemies on our borders. He has suggested that there should be only knowledgeable Ministers and officials dealing with defence. I do not know how far this can be implemented in the present set-up in a democratic country. But this suggestion has to be taken very seriously. He has also mentioned that many of our Ministers have not tried to use even a toy pistol. This is an interesting thing. I want to state one thing that when I visited the H.A.L., Bangalore and asked them whether the Defence Minister has visited that factory, where our famous gnat plans are produced, to my surprise. I was told that the Defence

[Shri G. Viswanatham]

Minister has not so far visited the H.A.L., Bangalore.

AN HON. MEMBER: Because it is in the south.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: To clarify, I would like to say that the Minister of Defence Production is in-charge of it and the Minister of Defence Production has visited it almost every 5 to 6 months.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN: This is not only the question of defence production. The Defence Minister should also visit the place where gnat planes are produced in which we have won the battle and defeated Pakistan. We must have a knowledge of it. Previously, I did not have the idea of gnat planes. After visiting the H.A.L. I have got so much idea about that. I would request the Minister to have intimate knowledge of our defence forces.

Another suggestion made is that in the field of education; the curriculum should be defence-oriented. The students in colleges, particularly, must be taught something about defence. That is very necessary in the national interest.

He has given very many suggestions from his experience of the recent visit to Israel. One of the interesting suggestion is that their air force is very superior so that they won the battle against all the Arab forces combined together. We have to keep that in mind. Our radar system is very poor. Even the Defence Minister will not refute that. We have to improve our radar system. Again, as far as air force is concerned, we have got very intelligent airmen who can defeat any other country. But our navy is not strong. Though we have a long coastal line, our Minister and Government have not concentrated their efforts to strengthen the Navy. I think they do not have even a submarine. Even if there is one submarine, they will have it only for showing to the

foreign dignitaries and the VIPS. We must strengthen our Navy also.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He may conclude now.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN: Finally, I would request the Minister that, while spending money, he has to be very prudent and has to take care of each pie that is spent for the defence of this country.

SHRI NARENDRA SINGH MAHIDA (Anand): I understand Major Ranjit Singh's spirit and feelings because Army possesses very fine men and we all are anxious to improve our defence needs. I appreciate his sincerity. I recall my own experience 37 years back, when he was probably very small. I have received regular training in the army and I have some background. I was connected with the Queen Victoria's Own Corps of Guide, a famous British Regiment. The circumstances then were such that one could not survive that ill-treatment which one received in those days. I have been very close to the defence forces in India. Many members of our family are there and I have also seen some other Armies in the world. I have also seen the working of famous Luftwaffe while receiving training in gliding in Germany and I have also seen the spit of pre-War Germans. We are a peace-loving country but have to learn a lot in regard to defence and its needs, and I very much appreciate the suggestion that there should be a standing Parliamentary Committee on this matter. It is a welcome suggestion. But the conditions in England and other places are different; many of the Members of Parliament have seen both the Wars, the First and the Second, but here, I am afraid our Members are very keen only on talking—of course, they should be; but when we have established an MPs Rifle Club, the response is very poor. I would wish our Members to learn the art of shooting, to defend themselves (Interrup-

tions). We should learn the art of shooting for self-defence, not for shooting at others but to defend. I request all our Members here to join the Club and learn the art of shooting.

Defence is a very vast subject and as one of our Members very rightly said, it has to be under the civil authority. We also have a record of it, we have the famous Chanakya's saying, given 2500 years back, that "Kshatriyatva" should be under Brahmanatva i.e. the military authorities must be under the civil authorities.

I am very glad, Major Ranjit Singh, after receiving training in the Army has come to us and has given us the sincere advice. He may be a little less tolerant because he is overzealous about the defence progress in the country. Of course, there are no two opinions about this. We possess the finest material in the jawans that we have in India. I am proud that jawans, as nowhere in the history of the world has been standing as a gaint for the last six years from Ladakh to NEFA to defend the borders. We must realise that nowhere in the history of the world has an Army stood at a height of 12 to 15 thousand feet for six years, and for that, how much we pay to our Jawans. I visited the front in August last and I am proud that they are standing today under 45 feet of snow without grumbling while we are talking about the defence needs. I should say that their spirit is worth praising; it is not merely the material that counts; but much more the spirit. We have defeated the Pakistanis and we shall defend our country and defeat the Chinese also if they attack our country. It is the spirit which is important and the material comes in the second sense; the spirit has made our jawans what they are. They can stand up and fight all over the world. In the battles that have been fought like the battle of Casino by the eighth division in Italy, even the Germans ran away from the famous gorkhas. Recently along with a team 3251 L.S.—10

of Members of Parliament, had visited Tithwal front and our jawans were inspired and happy to see us. I request Members of Parliament to go to our various fronts after the winter season is over. All they want is a little pat. Certain materials are required and we are now supplying them.

Defence is a subject which is very important, and near to my heart. But if any thing is neglected amongst us here today, it is the defence subject. It is no use criticising the Minister. Let us admit we have less knowledge about defence services. We cannot now fight with swords and old weapons. The need is there to modernise our Army. If we have to reduce some of our extra staff, we should understand, it is not a question of unemployment. It is a question of modernisation; and when we modernise, it has to be expensive. We have to learn from many nations. We are yet a developing country. We have not got all the know-how. So if we have help from the Russians or the Americans, there is no harm about it. If we think that they know our secrets, yet we should not publish them further and we should not allow our papers to be in the hands of our enemies. Recently the Iranian General was here. We had conducted him to Nathu La and other places. That does not mean that we are showing them our secrets. Secrets have to be preserved. There should not be any laxity in that matter. But defence is a subject which cannot be openly discussed in the House, and cannot be lightly treated. The Minister is expected to give us all the information about our strength, about our divisions and all other things. We know the recent incidents about the Award of the Kutch Tribunal. I was the first to go there in 1965. And the Kutch Award has to be judged from the strategical point of view, not merely from the point of view of the political part of the award. We are just now worried and feel that this is a wrong award.

[Shri Narendra Singh Mahida]

These are political matters which ultimately lead to defence matters. Defence matters have to be understood. Whether the award is accepted or not, it is a different thing. It is for Members of Parliament to consider. My plea is this: Please consider all this from defence point of view as well. Even if we accept the award, and our defence strategy will have to be adjusted. So defence is very important—especially in the border areas. At the same time I wish that Members of Parliament take more interest in defence matters. I wish that Minister takes us around. Because many of us have not even seen a tank. Some might say: is there water in the tank? So, we are yet children in the matter of defence. So, let us learn. I would request the Hon'ble Minister of Defence to take our Members of Parliament to different places to see the tanks, the aeroplanes, machine-guns and all those things.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore): I rise to add a few words in support of the hon. Member, Major Ranjeet Singh's plea for a new Committee of Parliament Members to be set up, to be taken into confidence on defence matters, and also to act as some sort of advisory body at least to the Government on this question. Our party is dissatisfied with the functions and the rôle of these informal consultative committees, which are attached to the various Ministries. And certainly, as far as defence matters are concerned, a consultative committee of that type is not serving any useful purpose whatsoever.

My hon. friend, Shri Mahida, just now said that it is not possible to discuss defence matters openly in Parliament. Of course, these are relative terms, because we have seen that in Parliament in Britain or even in the US Congress, very much more discussed than we are permitted ever to discuss or even to receive information on in this House. Never-

theless, I agree with him that there is a certain field which cannot be opened up perhaps for public discussion always. For this reason, this type of committee suggested here is, I think, a very good and sound idea.

There are two aspects to this question. One is that of national defence from the security point of view, which is a national question transcending all political differences. There is also the financial implication. I shall just refer to it briefly because I find that a former Governor of the Reserve Bank of India, Shri H. V. R. Iengar, is reported in the press as having said at a meeting of the Rotary Club of Calcutta on the 13th instant that in his opinion, the basic cause of the present economic recession in the country is what he describes as the gigantic defence expenditure we are having to incur. Nobody has grudged this to Government since 1962 when the defence budget was boosted up to its present proportions of 800 to 900 crores of rupees per year, when we have felt that it is necessary for the defence of the country. But the time has come when everybody in the country is seriously concerned over the question as to whether this money is being properly spent or not, how much of it is being wasted, what part of it is put to infructuous or unproductive purposes and whether the money that is being expended can be put to better use or not.

I have a suggestion to make. I think the time has come after six years when this kind of defence budget outside the general budget should no longer be permitted as a luxury or an extravagance. It is time the defence budget was incorporated in the general budget and made part of it so that it could be budgeted for as a whole on the basis of whatever available resources there are in the country, and could be discussed and debated in that way. This allotment of Rs. 800—900 crores giving a sort of blank cheque to the Defence Ministry to do what they like with it, and

then not being answerable to the House in the sense that whenever certain questions are raised, the veil of secrecy in the name of public interest descends upon it, is something which I think we should give the go-by to.

Only recently, the estimates Committee reported on one aspect of defence. I was glad to see it the other day. I have not had time to study it. But I notice one point which some of us have been making repeatedly, year after year, in the discussion on defence matters that more money should be allotted for defence research, not less. Because we find that the amount devoted to defence research in our country is proportionately much less than is spent by other countries. Essence of our defence programme should be self-reliance so that more should be spent on indigenous research by our defence scientists in research laboratories in this country so that we become less and less dependent on external sources.

The Estimates Committee has more or less substantiated this criticism and suggested that this amount should be increased. It is much too niggardly now. These matters are there. There is no time to go into details.

I will just refer briefly to one matter which troubles us, the question of self-sufficiency in aircraft. For example, I know it is very difficult now overnight to become self-sufficient in all types of aircraft required for modern military operations. But we have to progress towards that. Some good work has been done—I do not deny it. But we find from reports available to us that the Government is dabbling, in so many types and varieties of projects that the essence which should be there of a minimum amount of standardisation in aircraft, which is linked up with the question of spare parts, components and everything, that aspect is being neglected very seriously which may land us in very great difficulties.

For example, we know that Hawker-Hunter aircraft have been purchased from Britain. We have had to purchase them outright. The expenditure is not disclosed to us on the ground of public interest. This was the reply given to a question yesterday or the day before.

We are told that certain planes have been bought from Italy, diverted from somewhere else. That was not divulged. In reply to my question, it was said that it was not in public interest to disclose details. Anyway we can assume that large amounts of money are spent and we know that modern aircraft are very expensive things. Thus large sums are spent for the direct purchase of combat planes from outside. At the same time we have not been told about all our projects which are on hand for so many years. For instance, we are not told about the HF 24 project. It was to become a supersonic plane. It was held up for technical reasons. Perhaps you will say that we cannot discuss all that in the House. Therefore, I should like a committee like that where we can know at least something about these things. What has happened to the Indo-UAR project? Some persons are in favour of it; others are against it. As far as I know, Government has not given up that project. For how many more years will it go on and when is it anticipated to be ready? It was to have a supersonic engine from the UAR and an aircraft body built in India. There is then the MIG project. When it stabilises itself, it can make us self-reliant in one type of fighter aircraft. Progress reports about that project also are not made available because of public interest. I was amazed to find that an amount of Rs. 8 lakhs had been advanced by the Government to an American gentleman, Alan Bragg, to set up a workshop in Simla in the mountains. I have seen it myself from a distance; I do not think I shall be allowed to enter it. The Ministry of Defence thought that he was an expert in designing helicopters and he is supposed to develop some

(Shri Indrajit Gupta)

prototype of helicopter for our Air Force. Several years have passed and my reports indicate that the machine he has designed had failed to get off the ground; it is static. Several Defence Ministry experts had been visiting that place to see the progress but I do not know what their report is. At the same time we are buying helicopters from foreign sources and some are being developed at Bangalore. Yet so many lakhs of our money are spent on this projects. He is a US citizen living in this country. I cannot understand what is going on.

When we talk of defence expenditure, it is not because we are against any defence effort. But surely this country and Parliament are entitled to know whether this money is spent properly or wasted on useless projects. That is why I say that this idea of having a committee is quite attractive. We know the bottlenecks in various ordnance factories. We know that Ambajhari and Chanda projects were facing difficulties. At one stage the Americans and the British stopped giving us aid and the know-how and so these were held up. Where are we going to discuss these matters? We must discuss it somewhere, if not here. I thank you for the opportunity you have given me and I strongly support the idea behind this resolution. The form of the committee could be the subject of further discussions but the idea is sound and so I support this resolution.

श्री रणधीर सिंह (रोहताक) : आदरणीय चेयरमैन साहब, बहुत अहमियत का प्रस्ताव हाउस के सामने है। मेजर रणजीत सिंह ने तमाम फौज पर, बल्कि मैं कहूंगा तमाम देश पर, एक अहसास किया है कि उन्होंने यह प्रस्ताव हाउस के सामने पेश किया और मुझे ज्ञाति तौर पर मौलाना दिया कि मैं अपने विचार आपकी मार्फत अपने डिफेंस मिनिस्टर तक पहुंचाऊँ। मैं इस बात का खास तौर पर एतराफ करता हूँ और शाबाशी देता हूँ डिफेंस

मिनिस्टर साहब को, क्योंकि मैं ने खुद जाकर देखा है कि हमारा डिफेंस आजकल, क्या नेफा, क्या काश्मीर, क्या लद्दाख और क्या हमारा साहिल, हर जगह हमारी डिफेंस प्रियेयडनेस आज के पांच साल पहले से दुगुनी और तीन गुनी है।

बौरडर रोड्स, मेन सप्लाय लाईस आफ कम्प्युनिकेशन को देखा, अपनी फोसैज और अपनी डिफेंस को देखा उस से मैं मुतमईन हूँ और उस दिशा में अच्छे इंतजाम के लिए मैं अपने होम मिनिस्टर साहब को बघाई देता हूँ।

इसके अलावा जो फौजों के खाने, कपड़े और जो उन के आर्मिमेंट्स हैं उन में मैंने दुगुनी और तिगुनी बड़होत्तरी देखी लेकिन जो खास बात उन के नोटिस में लाना चाहता हूँ वह इस वास्ते भी कि हमारे जो मौजूदा डिफेंस मिनिस्टर हैं वह एक मार्शल बैंकप्राउन्ड रखते हैं क्योंकि वह पंजाब को बिलीग करते हैं और हमारे पंजाब के, हरियाणा के ही क्या वह तो सारे देश के हैं और उन के दिल में जो फौज के लिए एक तड़प होनी चाहिये वह उन में कूट कूट कर भरी हुई है।

लेकिन जो कमियां कुछ थोड़ी सी हैं वह मैं उन के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। इस देश का 2500 मील का रकबा, वह 2500 मील का साहिल दुश्मन के हमले से हमेशा एक बनरेबुल स्पॉट है, हमेशा इस का खतरा बना रहता है। उस की सरहद चाहे वह चीन के साथ मिलती हो, तिब्बत के साथ मिलती हो या पाकिस्तान के साथ मिलती हो, वह इसे तरीके से दुश्मनों से घिरी हुई है और वह दुश्मन भी ऐसा खतरनाक है जोकि 24 घंटे हिन्दुस्तान से लोहा लेने के मसूबे बनाता रहता है। कैम्बोली अपनी किताब "दी प्रिंस" में लिखता है कि जहां पड़ोसी मजबूत हो जाय, साजिशी हो जाय, खतरनाक हो जाय तो उस से आदमी को बीबीसों बंदे

चौकन्ना रहना चाहिए। ऐसे दुश्मन से सदैव हर षड़ी सतक रहना चाहिए।

आजकल पहाड़ों पर जो हमारी फौज के रहने की हालत है उस की तरफ मैं आप का और डिफेंस मिनिस्टर साहब की तवज्जह खींचना चाहता हूँ। कितने खतरनाक हालात में, कितने सख्त हालात में हमारी फौज देश का बचाव करती है? हर एक हिन्दुस्तानी को इस बात की सोचना है कि हमारी फौज का एक, एक जवान साल के बारहों महीने, दिन के चौबीसों घंटे, रात दिन अपने देश को बचाने के लिए, अपने पचास करोड़ आई, बहनों को इज्जत, उन के माल, जायदाद आदि को बचाने के लिये कितनी कठिन परिस्थितियों में चौबीसों घंटे अपने कर्तव्य पालन में जुटा रहता है कि कोई ठिकाना नहीं। उसे अपनी ड्यूटी के सिलसिले में काफी कठिनाइयों से दो, चार होना पड़ता है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि उसको तरफ देश तबछाह दे और उनको आवश्यक सहूलियत प्रदान करने का ब्यगस्था को प।

यह मानी हुई बात है कि वह हमारे बहादुर फौजी जवान जो सकड़ों मील-दूर अपने घरों से पड़े हुए हैं और देश को रक्षा कर रहे हैं, सालों उन्हें अपना घर देखना नसीब नहीं होता है आखिर वह भी इंसान हैं और वह भी दिल रखते हैं और उनको भी अपने स्त्री, बच्चे आदि याद आते हैं। इस के लिए मैं डिफेंस मिनिस्टर साहब से कहना चाहूंगा कि उस आदमी को 4-6 महीने के लिए दो, चार साल में पीस टाइम स्टेशन पर अपने बच्चे लाने का बंदोब त होना चाहिये। अपनी फमिलीज से इतने लम्बे-लम्बे अर्से के लिए जुदा रहने से जो तकलीफ उन फौजियों को होती है उस से हमारे डिफेंस मिनिस्टर साहब बखबी वाकिफ हैं। वह भी उसी माशाल इलाके से आते हैं जहां से मैं आता हूँ। माशाल, फौजी उनके से आप भी ताल्लुक रखते हैं और मैं भी ताल्लुक रखता हूँ। हमारे और आप के

खानदानों से दर्जनों आदमी फौज में गये हुए हैं और इसलिए मैं उस तकलीफ को जाती तीर पर समझता हूँ।

एक चीज खास तीर पर आप नोट फरमायें कि हमारे फौजी जवान दो, दो और तीन, तीन साल तक अपने घरों पर नहीं आ पाते हैं और जो उन्हें एक या दो महीने की छुट्टी मिलती भी है वह अर्सा बहुत थोड़ा होता है। इसलिए मैं चाहूंगा कि मिनिस्टर साहब द्वारा कुछ ऐसा बंदोबस्त किया जाय कि 6-7 महीने के बाद वह कुछ ज्यादा लम्बे अर्से के लिए अपने घरों पर आ सके। लेकिन अगर उनको इतनी छुट्टी नहीं दे सकते और मैं वाकिफ हूँ कि हमारा देश आज किन ताजुक हालात में से गुजर रहा है और ऐसे समय हम अपने दुश्मनों से चौबीसों घंटे चौकन्न बने रहना है तो उस हालत में मैं यह चाहूंगा कि ज्यादा से ज्यादा पीस टाइम स्टेशंस पर मिलटरी जवानों के लिए, मिलटरी अफसरों के लिए फमिली क्वार्टर्स आप बनायें। यह एक ऐसी चीज है जिसकी कि तरफ मैं आप का तवज्जह दिलाना चाहता हूँ।

हमारे फौजी जवानों को जो दूर मोर्चों पर, सरहदों पर तैनात हैं उन को जहां भगवान याद आता है, देश याद आता है वहां उनको अपने बाल बच्चे भी याद आते हैं। मैं एक जाति बात कहना चाहता हूँ कि उन जवानों को अपने घरों से गैरहाजिरी में कई दफे उनके बीबी, बच्चों का तंग किया जाता है, लिटिगेशंस से तंग होते हैं और दूसरों के अलावा उन के खुद कुनबे वाले भी तंग करते हैं। अब वह बेचारे फौजी जवान 10-20 साल नौकरी में रहते हैं और वह हर महीने अपनी तनख्वाह अपने घरों पर भेज दिया करते हैं जहां कि उनकी फमिलीज होती है।

वहां पर ज्वएंट फमिलीज होती है, बाप, चाचा, मां चाची, ताऊ, ताई आदि

[श्री रणधीर सिंह]

जो घर पर होते हैं वह सारी उस फौजी जवान की तनख्वाह हज्म कर लेते हैं और 10-20 साल की नौकरी करने के बाद जब वह वापिस रिटायर होकर घर पर आता है तो उस जवान आदमी को पेंशन 10 या 20 रुपये मिलती है। उस के कुटुम्ब के दूसरे सदस्य खर्च आदि को लेकर झगड़ा करते हैं और कहते हैं कि इतने में कैसे उसका और उसके परिवार का गुजर चल सकता है और वह अलग हो जाय, अपना अलग बंदोबस्त कर ले। अब आप ही बतलाइये कि सारी उम्र तो वह एक कुली की तरह से बोझा डोता है, तनख्वाह सारी हर महोने अपनी घर भेजता है और जब वह रिटायर होकर घर आता है तो चूंकि उस बेचारे की पेंशन बहुत एकम मिलती है, इसलिए घर वाले भी उसे ज्वाएंट फैमिली से अलग कर देते हैं तो उसे बड़ा दिक्कत का सामना करना पाता है क्योंकि वह तो फक्कड़ होता है उसके पास कुछ होता नहीं है। यह एक प्रैक्टिकल डिफिकल्टी उन को अपने जीवन में पेश आती है। मंत्री महोदय इधर ध्यान दें और आप इस किस्म की सहुलियत देने की व्यवस्था करें कि जो उस का फैमिली ऐलाटमेंट हो उस पैसे का कुछ परसेंट कम्पलसरी तौर पर बचाया जा सके। कुछ आप करते हैं लेकिन वह थोड़ा है और मैं चाहूंगा कि उस थोड़े को और बढ़ाया जाय। ऐसा करने से उन में एक सिक्योरिटी की भावना पैदा होगी और वह खद अपने पैरों पर खड़ा हो सकने के लक्ष्यक हो सकेगा।

जैस मैंने पहले कहा उसके कुनबे वाले उसे ज्वाएंट फैमिली से अलग कर देते हैं क्योंकि आज हमारे देश में मैटीरियलिज्म आ गयी है और इसलिए जरूरी है कि जब वह अपने कुनबे से अपने, बाल बच्चों को लेकर अलग है तो उसे थोड़ी बहुत सिक्योरिटी हासिल रहे।

यह मैं मानता हूं कि फौजियों को अपने बच्चों को पढ़ाने के सिलसिले में और लिटिगेशंस के सिलसिले में सहुलियतें मिली हुई हैं लेकिन उन को अमली रूप नहीं दिया जाता है। मैं चाहूंगा कि घर पर उस की तकलीफ न हो, इस के लिए सरदार प्रताप सिंह कैरों जो सहुलियतें देते थे मैं खास तौर से उन का नाम लेकर कहना चाहता हूं और मैं समझता हूं कि आप में प्रताप सिंह कैरों से कम मोर्शल रिप्रट नहीं है और उन फौजियों को चाहे वह राजस्थान के हों, पंजाब के हों, कहीं के भी हों, हर जगह के फौजियों को आप ज्यादा से ज्यादा सहुलियतें दें।

एक बात जो मैं फिर डिफेंस मिनिस्टर को खिदमत में अर्ज करना चाहूंगा वह है फौजी जवानों और अफसरों की तनख्वाहों में इजाफा। हमारे यह फौजी जवान फिटियंस पर बड़े ही कठिन हालात में ड्यटी दे रहे हैं सालों अपने घर से जुदा रहते हैं उनको जो तनख्वाह मिलती है वह बहुत थोड़ी मिलती है। मैं तो यहां तक कहूंगा कि उन की तनख्वाह बढ़ाने के लिए अगर कोई स्पेशल टैक्स भी लगाना पड़े तो उसे लगाने से भी आप को हिचकिचाना नहीं चाहिए। हमारी फौज के सिपाहियों और अफसरों की तनख्वाहें बढ़ाइये। जहां हम देश की सुरक्षा की खातिर विजयांता टैक्स, सैबरजैट्स और रीकुवएल गंस पर या दूसरे आवश्यक हथियारों के निर्माण आदि पर पैसा खर्च करते हैं और वह मैं आवश्यक खर्चा मानता हूं। वहां यह भी जरूरी है कि जो आप के फौजी जवान हों वह भी संतुष्ट हों, आर्मी आप की कंटेंटड हो तभी वह अपनी उस अहम ड्यटी को मुस्तैदी से अदा कर सकती है। फौजी जवानों का आज के हालात में बहुत कम तनख्वाह मिलती है। देखने में यह आता है कि और सविसेज की तनख्वाहों में बड़होत्तरी के लिए आये दिनों यहां पार्लियामेंट के बाहर प्रदर्शन आदि होते

हैं, नारे आदि लगते हैं और इस तरह उनकी तनख्वाह बढ़ जाती है लेकिन जो हमारे भाई यहां से हजारों मील दूर बैठे हैं उन की इस तरह की कोई आवाज यहां पार्लियामेंट के दरवाजे तक नहीं आती है। उनकी कोई लेबर या ट्रेड यूनियन नहीं है। जैसा कि हमारे महीदा जी, भेजर साहब और अन्य माननीय सदस्यों ने उनकी कंडीशंस को बेहतर बनाने और तनख्वाहों में इजाफा करने की मांग की है, मैं भी अपनी आवाज उन के साथ मिलाते हुए कहनी चाँहूंगा कि चाहे उस के लिए ऐक्सचेंजर पर बॉन्ड ही क्यों न पड़े हमें फौजियों की तनख्वाहों को बढ़ाना चाहिए। मैं इस बात को नहीं मानता कि हमारे पास इस के लिए पैसा नहीं है। जब तक आप उन की तनख्वाहों में बढ़ोत्तरी नहीं करेंगे वह सैटिस्फाइड नहीं होंगे और एक सैटिस्फाइड आर्मी रखनी आवश्यक है। जब आप और जगह मंहगाई भत्ता आदि देते हैं और तनख्वाहों में इजाफा करते हैं तो फौज की क्यों नहीं देते? हम लोग पापुलेशन को सहूलियत वगैरह देने की बात करते हैं और वह ठीक है लेकिन आखिर को सिविल को फौज की तरफ भी तो देखना चाहिए क्योंकि इस देश की रक्षा करने की अहम जिम्मेदारी उनके कंधों पर है और वह लौंग बड़ी कठिन परिस्थितियों में इस काम को अंजाम दे रहे हैं। वह देश के लिए अपनी जान लड़ा रहे हैं, जानों की बाजी लगा कर देश की हिफाजत कर रहे हैं और जरूरी है कि उनकी हमलत को बेहतर बनाया जाय और उन्हें रिलीफ दी जाये। वह ऐसी जगहों पर इयटो दे रहे हैं जहां इंसान तो इंसान परिन्दा भी जिंदा नहीं रह सकता है, ऐसे जोखिम और कठिनाइयों से घरे हुए स्थानों पर वह खड़े हुए हैं और वर्षों अपने बाल, बच्चों से जुदा रहते हैं। इस लिए इधर कास तबज्जह देने की जरूरत है।

मैं केवल एक मिनट में अपनी बात समाप्त कर दूंगा। मुझे कहना पड़ रहा है कि हमारी

इंटीलिजेंस सर्विस कमजोर है चाहे वह इंटीलिजेंस नैवी की हो, ऐयर की हो या आउन्ड आर्मी की हो। उस को मजबूत बनाना हमारे लिए बहुत जरूरी है।

एक आखिरी बात जो मैं कहना चाँहूंगा वह यह है कि आप एम० पी० लोगों में से जैसे हमारे महीदा साहब हैं, हमारी बहन श्रीमती मुकर्जी हैं या भेजर साहब हैं ऐसे आर्मी में दिलचस्पी रखने वाले मंत्रियों को इंटरसैशन के दौरान आर्मी, नैवी और ऐयर की युनिट्स में भेज दिया करें जो कि उन की कंडीशंस को स्पैट पर स्टडी कर सकें और वह मिनिस्टर माहब को उनकी बेहतरी के लिए और जिससे कि काम में भी और सुधार आये, अपने सुझाव दिया करें। ऐसा करने से हमारे जवानों को इनकैंरिजमेंट भी मिलेगा कि हां इस देश के निर्वाचित प्रतिनिधि हम में दिलचस्पी रखते हैं। आप ने जो मुझे बोलने का समय दिया उसके लिए मैं मशकूर हूँ।

17 hrs.

SHRI E. K. NAYANAR (Palghat):
Sir, I accept most of the suggestions that have been put forward in the resolution but I want to suggest one amendment that the recommendations of the Committee should be placed before Parliament and discussed.

The hon. Members who preceded me have spoken on the subject of defence. Parliament Members do not know what is going on in defence. When war breaks out collection is made, but we do not know what is going on in the Defence Department.

Sir, every year the method of warfare is changing. The modern warfare is not what it was some years before. The main force of war is jawans. Weapons are also needed but, as Shri Randhir Singh also pointed out, jawans constitute the

[Shri E. K. Nayanar]

greatest force. I am not a military man like Shri Ranjit Singh, but number of soldiers belonging to Kerala are even now working at places 3500 miles away from their homes and that too at places 18500 feet above the sea level in the Kashmir area. The Hitler-technique of war is gone. Hitler attacked Poland in 1939. When he failed with the mighty Red Army of the Soviet Union in 1945 he withdrew and drank a cup of poison-water. Red Army means the technique of jawans as the main force. Romell attacked North-West Africa in 1941 but at last he had to withdraw from that area. What happened to America? The 18-nation army attacked Korea in 1952. It tried to cross Yalu, but it had to withdraw. What is happening in Vietnam during the last eight years? Only three crores of peasantry in Vietnam are resisting the so-called mighty power. I am not calling America a mighty power. With all its modern weapons, with its modern bombs and rockets it is not able to bring round the Vietnam people. Only three crores of ordinary peasantry, jawans, in Vietnam are fighting during the last eight years with the help of the surrounding nations.

The only thing that is needed is a political agitation among the jawans. Our country with 50 crores of people has the mightiest force. Why can't we put the same spirit in our jawans? The other day I was travelling in a train. There I met a Commissioned Officer who was going to be retrenched. He was recruited in 1962. He got training for three or four years. He was recruited in the Emergency Commission. He was asking me: "What am I going to do? What am I going to do with my family?" He said that Government spent thousands of rupees on him to give him training and he was now going to be retrenched. The funniest thing is that Government are going

to recruit new Commissioned Officers also. Those who have fought, who have got training are being retrenched and new people are being taken in. It is just like the *Narayanathu Bharanthan* a mad man who used to pull a stone all the way up the hill and then leave it allowing it to come down. Just like that trained officers are being retrenched and new people are being taken to be trained. The Defence Department is prepared to take only 20 per cent of the Commissioned Officers. The rest of them are going to be retrenched.

17.04 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY -SPEAKER in the Chair]

While I was in Poona three members of the armed services, who come from Kerala, told me that they are being retrenched, even though they have put in a service of 8 to 10 years. You will be surprised to know that the reason is that they have not passed a Hindi examination. So, the question of Hindi has penetrated into even military service. Merely because they have not passed a Hindi examination, they are being retrenched in Poona. Those people met me and complained to me about it.

Then, while we are spending Rs. 1,000 crores every year on defence our jawans are very poorly paid. The behaviour of the officers towards the jawans is also far from satisfactory. The mentality of imperialist bureaucrat of the British period still persists in the armed services. That should be changed. The jawans must be given political education. The patriotic urge must be injected into the jawans. The economic position of the jawan has its effect on his efficiency. While a jawan is fighting for the country at an altitude of 16,000 ft. he is always thinking of his poor family which is not able to balance its budget 3,000 miles

away from him. So, I would say that the Defence Minister must look into the poor conditions of service of the armed services personnel and try to improve them.

Now there is a restriction on the types of books and newspapers which they can read. By imposing such a restriction, which is a legacy of the British period, we are keeping our jawans ignorant of what is happening in the country or outside. That should stop. All books and literature must be freely accessible to them so that they can improve their literacy.

The Defence Minister should make a sincere effort to reduce the expenditure on defence. Already, so many States are demanding a cut in defence expenditure. While reducing the expenditure on unnecessary items, he should ensure that the salaries of the jawans are improved in order to give them confidence that this government will look after them. That is the only way in which we can have a strong defence force. Also, those who are retrenched from the armed services must be provided with alternative jobs.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: How much time will the Minister need?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I will take 15 minutes.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Another 10 minutes will be required by the mover to reply. We have already spent 20 minutes on this on the earlier day. Today we have to conclude it by 5.33 p.m. I can extend it by another 15 minutes. At least by 6 O'Clock we must give an opportunity to the next Member to move his Resolution, so that it may not lapse. I want to accommodate as many hon. Members as possible. I have already got 5 or 6 names with me and others are appearing on the scene. I will

try to accommodate at least those who had given their names long ago.

SHRIMATI SHARDA MUKERJEE (Ratnagiri): Sir, this debate, like all debates on defence, I think, is liable to end up in an emotional crescendo. I think, the matter under discussion is not welfare amenities for the services and so on; the matter under discussion is whether a standing parliamentary committee to look into the problems of defence need and to scrutinize defence preparedness etc. should be appointed. I quite agree that there should be a parliamentary committee because parliamentary committees are necessary for control of defence matters in a democracy, but I do not agree that a parliamentary committee which will scrutinize defence preparedness and also defence strategy should be set up. Therefore, much as I sympathise with Major Ranjit Singh's efforts and appreciate his efforts, I think, I cannot support this Resolution.

What are the Conventions prevailing in this country? Shri Nayanar, just before me, said that the officers are liable to behave in a bureaucratic manner. Once upon a time I had much to do with the services. I was an officer's wife and let me tell Shri Nayanar for his elucidation that when my husband was the Chief of Air Staff, among the children whom I used to drive to school was an airman's child. In the Air Force today there are schools where airmen's children and officers' children go together.

So, it is not enough to hear what one person or another person tells you about what is happening. It is necessary to appreciate the situation as a whole, to go and live in an area, stay with the people and be among them to understand what the situation is. Somebody who has got a chip on his shoulder or some sort of a resentment may come and tell you some inflated story. It is also

[Shrimati Sharda Mukerjee]

our duty to check up whether it is true or not.

Regarding retrenchment, if we expanded during war time, it is only natural that there should be retrenchment later on. Every country faces this. During a war or an emergency you have to increase your manpower strength and you do not expect to carry that manpower when the emergency is over. If this is the manner in which the parliamentary committee is going to be effective on defence matters, you can appreciate my doubts about having a parliamentary committee of this nature.

There is another thing with regard to this parliamentary committee. You know that apart from the security angle there is also the discipline angle. Therefore, if these people who are disgruntled already, without there being a parliamentary committee for them to approach and tell what is going on, how much more will be the danger when there is a parliamentary committee? Every fellow who wants a transfer or who thinks that he has been superseded will immediately rush to a member of the parliamentary committee. I have gone through it. I know that these people constantly take advantage of this situation whenever they go.....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Do you imagine that without a parliamentary committee being there Members of Parliament are not being approached?

SHRIMATI SHARDA MUKERJEE: They may come, but when you are a member of the parliamentary committee, you must admit that you are in a more powerful position. As long as you are only a Member of Parliament, it is a different matter. But when you are a member of a parliamentary committee, you may be in a position to ring up X, Y or Z and say, "Look here, is it true that

you have promoted A, B or C when D, E or F should have been promoted?" Is that the situation that you want to bring about?

Then, there is already a considerable effort going on in various directions regarding certain political ideologies. As Shri Nayanar said, there is not enough political education among the forces. That is one thing we do not want. Whatever government is in power after fair elections, the armed forces must follow the policies of that government. Therefore, we do not want our armed forces to be political. Until democracy is established in this country over a number of years and there is a proper convention which has come about, I do not think that the same sort of pattern which obtains in America or other places can be followed in our country. For instance, in America I asked somebody, "What is the difference between your Democratic Party and the Republican Party?" They said that the only difference was that one was in and the other was out. That is not the case in our country. The case in our country is that whether it is students, whether it is religion or community, language or anything, everything becomes a political problem. Do you want your defence forces to be brought into this political net? Would you want that? That means to say that at the time of war one political party will say, "No, no; we do not think that you should fight against China or Pakistan" and those people who have access to that political way of thinking or who are influenced by that political way of thinking will say, "Why should we fight?" So, you cannot have this sort of a thing. The convention in the armed forces is that they must follow the policy as laid down by the Government in power. Therefore, I would say that the parliamentary committee can, by all means, go into the defence production aspect of it,

can, by all means, look into the welfare activities but they should not, in any way, have anything to do with the problems of defence needs or to scrutinise defence preparedness because that is too wide and too comprehensive a field for the politicians to enter.

श्री किशोराजी शर्मा (मधुबनी): उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह जो प्रस्ताव है यह डिफेंस नीडज के सम्बन्ध में है। मैं सुरक्षा मंत्री से जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या अपनी सुरक्षा की दृष्टि से यह भी तैयारी की जा रही है कि कि यदि भारत की सरजमीन पर कोई न्यूक्लियर अफेसिव होता है, कोई न्यूक्लियर हमला होता है तो उसका मुकाबला करने के लिए आप में पूरी शक्ति है? भारत के इतिहास को आप देखें। उसकी देखने हुए यह बहुत ही जरूरी चीज है कि आप पूरी तैयारी करके रखें। दुनिया के मुल्क जिस रूप में तैयार हैं मैदान जंग में कदने के लिए उसी तरह से क्या भारत भी तैयार है या नहीं, यह मैं मंत्री महोदय से जानना चाहूंगा। हिन्दुस्तान के इतिहास में एक बहुत बड़ी बात यह रही है कि जिस समय हिन्दुस्तान जीत रहा होता था उसी समय आधुनिक हथियार चुंकि दुश्मन इस्तेमाल कर लेता था इस वास्ते इसकी हिम्मत पलट जाती थी। इसी कारण से हिन्दुस्तान की किस्मत का पलड़ा इधर से उधर होता गया। हिन्दुस्तान में दौलत थी, हिन्दुस्तान की तिजोरें थी, हिन्दुस्तान एक बड़ा देश था लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान दुनिया के दूसरे मुल्कों के मुकाबले में युद्ध के मैदान में अपटूडेट नहीं था और इसीलिए इसको मुंह की खानी पड़ी और पीछे हटना पड़ा, मोर्चों से। इसी कारण से यह गुलाम हुआ। यही समस्या आज भी हिन्दुस्तान के सामने है। क्या भारत अब फिर वही गलती दोहराने जा रहा है जो गलती इसने पहले की है और जिस की वजह से हिन्दुस्तान दुनिया के दूसरे

मुल्कों के मुकाबले में पिछड़ गया, गुलाम बन गया? दोही उदाहरण इस सम्बन्ध में मैं देना चाहूंगा।

एक उदाहरण मैं पानीपत की पहली लड़ाई का देना चाहता हूँ। उस वक़्त हिन्दुस्तान की फौज में जोश था, हिन्दुस्तान की फौज की तलवार में तीकत थी। हिन्दुस्तान की फौज के सामने हमलावर के पैर उखड़ रहे थे। मैदान उसके हाथ में लगने वाला था। लेकिन एक वक़्त मैदान दुश्मन के हाथ लग जाता है। दुश्मन पानी में वजू करता है और उस जमाने की नई ईजाद यानी तोप को सामने लाता है और जिस मैदान से उसके पैर उखड़ रहे थे देखते ही देखते वह उस मैदान का फातहा हो जाता है। हिन्दुस्तान की फौज में जोश था, सब कुछ था लेकिन युद्ध के मैदान में हिन्दुस्तान अपटूडेट नहीं था इस वास्ते हिन्दुस्तान को किस्मत का पलड़ा इधर से उधर हो गया।

दूसरी नज़ीर मैं सूरत की देना चाहता हूँ महावीर शिवा दिल्ली की मरकजी हुकूमत को, मुंगलिया खेमें की कई बार रौंद चुके थे। दिल्ली की मरकजी हुकूमत में ताकत नहीं थी कि शिवा जी की तलवार के सामने वह खड़ी हो सके। लेकिन बाद में उसी सूरत में थोड़ी दूरी पर अंग्रेजी किला था। उस में चार अंग्रेजी बंदे रहते थे। जिन को दिन के उजले में रौंद दिया गया था। और जिन के आघे से ज्यादा आदमी मर चुके थे लेकिन इतना होने पर भी चालाक और चालवाज चार अंग्रेज बंदे चारों कोनों पर खड़े हो गए और फायर आम्ब्रं चारों तरफ चलाने लग गए। महावीर शिवा की कौर्जे चारों तरफ मडराने लगी। युद्ध कौशल होने के बावजूद भी क्योंकि उन के पास आधुनिक शस्त्रास्त्र नहीं थे इस वास्ते उनको वहां से वापिस भा जाना पड़ा। कहने का मतलब यह है कि फायर आम्ब्रं अगर होते तो हिन्दुस्तान का

[श्री शिव चन्द्र झा]

पलड़ा उधर से इधर आ जाता । यही समस्या आज हिन्दुस्तान के सामने है । इतिहास इसका साक्षी है । आपके पास सैनिक शक्ति है । लेकिन जिस तरह से और दुनिया के मुल्कों के पास अपटूडेट हथियार हैं क्या उस तरह के भारत के पास भी हैं और क्या वह उनको बना रहा है । हिन्दुस्तान पर अगर कोई न्यूक्लियर हमला होगा तो क्या उस के लिए हिन्दुस्तान तैयार है । इस के लिए कौन जिम्मेदार है ? क्योंकि वैसी तैयारी आप भी नहीं कर रहे हैं । जहाँ हम दर्शन की बात करते हैं, बुद्ध, तिलक, महात्मा गांधी, और बिनोबा की भूमि की बात करते हैं उस के साथ हमें यह भी याद रखना होगा कि यह चाणक्य की भूमि भी है, चन्द्रगुप्त की तलवार की भूमि भी है, यह खुदी राम बोस और भगत सिंह की भूमि भी है । हमें ऐसे कदम उठाने चाहिये , ऐसा रस्ता निकालना चाहिये जिस से बाद में आगे चल कर हमें पश्चाताप न करना पड़े, हमें पछतावा न हो और वैसी गलती हम से न हो जैसी कि हिन्दुस्तान पहले करता रहा है और जिन के बारे में हिन्दुस्तान का इतिहास साक्षी है ।

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, स्पीकरों की लिस्ट में मेरा नाम पहला है । मैंने अभी सभापति से बात की थी । उन्होंने कहा था, कि मेरा नम्बर अभी आयेगा । तब से तीन सदस्य बोल चुके हैं, लेकिन मुझे नहीं बुलाया गया है ।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: We must realise one thing on Private Member's business, I have got a long list.....

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त : जिसका नाम पहले आया तो, उस को पहले बुलाया जाना चाहिए ।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He will get his chance. I must also see that those who rasely speak in the House get an opportunity to speak. That is my attempt. He will get his turn...

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त : लेकिन जिस का नाम पहले आया था, उस को पहले बुलाया जाना चाहिए था ।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: For instance, Mr. Shastri's name was the first, but he has not yet been called. Mr. Barua

SHRI BEDABRATA BARUA (Kaliabor): The question that has been raised by the Mover is not essentially a military question because it involves political or Parliamentary control over the Armēd Forces of India. In that way, it is not a question of experts supervising the functioning of the Army. It is essentially a question of Parliamentary control over the Armed Forces of India. The Mover himself said in his speech in the last Session that it also involves the question of Generals running away with democracy. It may be that it is essential that Parliament goes into the details of the functioning of the Army, so that the trends that are opposed to democracy may be scutled at the starting point. It is also important that Parliamen should have conrol over the Army without trying to impair the efficiency of the Armed Forces because the Armed Forces need to function under certain discipline and under a certain unified command and control. As Shrimati Sharda Mukerjee said, the unified command and control is likely to be affected if there is individual interference, as politicians are want to do.

Then there is also the question of secrecy. A lot of unwanted and

meaningless secrecy is imposed over our country to the annoyance of the people who visit this country and our own people. While the Americans have mapped out by satellites and rockets every inch of the world, we are imposing this needless and meaningless secrecy over airports, etc.

Unless there is control, we will meet with the same situation as in Mizo or NEFA. Control over the Army is essential for even they proved in NEFA and Mizo operations that they could be wrong. A certain amount of supervision is, therefore, essential. It is not a question of confidence in the Army. As I said, control over Army was considered essential in regard to Chinese or Mizo situation.

I would say that this is a very delicate question. I can quote from William Snyder's book on Parliamentary control in Britain. They have said:

"Except for those who hold political office, MPs are not privy to classified information..".

My friend quoted Britain, how Baldwin sent Eden in Thirties and about the Germans' preparation. The actual position in Great Britain is this. I am quoting from this book.

"Except for these who hold political office, MPs are not privy to classified information. Nor are Parliamentary Committee able to receive regularly the secret testimony of political and military leaders on political matters. Illogical and paradoxical as it may seem, Parliamentarians obtain most of their information, even unclassified data, from the Press and other news media."

This is the position in Great Britain.

We should, of course, have some control because of the corruption that may otherwise come into the

Army. I belong to Assam and, therefore, see the Army at close quarters, particularly when they get bogged down at places like Nagaland. They have also to do something with purchases. We should see that there is no deterioration in the Services. It is necessary that all these things are scrutinised.

So far as defence policy is concerned, I have moved an amendment. In that I have said that this matter needs to be considered. If Government agree, there should be a Parliamentary Committee. But its scope should be limited to making suggestions. It may not be able to probe into every aspect of the Army because it may affect our defence arrangements and all that. But defence expenditure and certain other matters need to be scrutinised in the way I have suggested.

I believe the Army of our country, which has certainly been effective, however, suffers from certain traditions, which is again a political matters which has to be considered. We have faced the Chinese on the frontiers. There also they have a different type of system, mentioned by the Mover himself. In the Chinese army, they have completely revolutionised the officer-men relationship. There is something to be said for the officer-men relationship that obtains according to standard traditions in India, USA or in England. But it certainly needs some probe and, possibly, some revision also.

श्री रघुवीर सिंह शास्त्री (बागपत) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं मेजर साहब के इस संकल्प का समर्थन करने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ। कुछ माननीय सदस्यों ने बहुत आशंकाएँ प्रकट की हैं कि यदि यह संसदीय समिति बनाई जायेगी, तो पता नहीं हमारी सीक्रेसी और अन्य गुप्त सूचनाएँ भी सुरक्षित रह सकेंगी या नहीं और यह कि सेना के मामलों में इन्टर-फीयर्स होगा। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि

[श्री रघुवीर सिंह शास्त्री]

इस बात से धी-लगभग सभी मामलीय सदस्य सहमत हैं कि संसद को डिफेंस के मामलात में ज्यादा से ज्यादा रुचि लेनी चाहिए और ज्यादा से ज्यादा दिसचरजी लेकर डिफेंस के कामों में सहयोग देना चाहिए। मैं समझता हूँ कि मेजर साहब के रेजोल्यूशन का उद्देश्य ही यही है कि संसद डिफेंस के मामलों में ज्यादा से ज्यादा रुचि ले और इस के लिए उन्होंने यह एक तरीका बताया है कि संसद एक कमेटी के द्वारा यह काम करे।

इस वक्त पोजीशन यह है कि हमारे बजट का चालीस फीसदी से ज्यादा भाग डिफेंस में चला जाता है और हमारी संसद को उस पर विचार करने के लिए केवल कुछ घंटे मिलते हैं। देश की दृष्टि से जो इतना महत्वपूर्ण विषय है जिस पर राष्ट्रे के करीब हमारा बजट व्यय होता है उस पर अपने अपने विचार प्रकट करने के लिए हमें केवल कुछ घंटे ही मिलते हैं। जैसा कि मैंने अभी कहा है मेजर साहब का संकल्प यह कहता है कि संसद इस विषय में बराबर रुचि लेता रहे और उस के लिए एक तरीका यह है कि संसद की एक समिति बनाई जानी चाहिए।

मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज हमारे देश की डिफेंस प्राब्लेम बहुत व्यापक और स्थायी हो गई है। यूँ तो हमारा बड़ा पुराना देश है और उस को सीमाओं के खतरों, गिदेशी आक्रमणों और उन का मुकाबला करने का बहुत पुराना अनुभव है लेकिन जिस प्रकार का और जितना स्थायी खतरा इस समय है, वह शायद पहले कभी नहीं हुआ। आज हमारे देश की सीमा के एक एक चपे पर दुश्मनों के आक्रमण का खतरा बना हुआ है। ऐसे समय में केवल कुछ लोग और मंत्रिमंडल ही डिफेंस के बारे में चेत और जागरूक रहें इससे काम नहीं चलैगा।

आज इस के लिए सारे देश की जनता के पुरुषार्थ की सहायता लेनी होगी। चाइना के आक्रमण और पाकिस्तान के साथ युद्ध के समय सारे देश की जनता और सब राज-नैतिक दलों ने एक मन हो कर सरकार का साथ दिया और राष्ट्र की रक्षा में सहयोग दिया।

देश की सुरक्षा के लिए सारे देश की जनता का पुरुषार्थ संपुक्त हो और सारे देश की जनता डिफेंस में रुचि ले उस के लिए यह आवश्यक है कि एक संसदीय कमेटी बनाई जाये, क्योंकि यह संसद सारे देश की जनता की भावनाओं, आकांक्षाओं और इच्छाओं का प्रतिनिधित्व करती है।

चूँकि हमारे देश की सुरक्षा के लिए एक स्मार्टी संकट पैदा हो गया है इस लिए देश के कुछ बड़े बड़े नेता राष्ट्रीय सरकार के निर्माण की बात कहते हैं। मैं नहीं कह सकता कि किन परिस्थितियों के कारण यह राष्ट्रीय सरकार नेशनल गवर्नमेंट नहीं बन पा रही है। मैं इस के लिए किसी को दोषी नहीं ठहराता। लेकिन नेशनल गवर्नमेंट बने या न बने एक नेशनल डिफेंस कमेटी तो बन जानी चाहिए। यह एक बहुत महत्वपूर्ण और निर्दोष काम है क्योंकि जब संसद और पोलिटिकल पार्टीज सरकार को सहयोग देना चाहती है तो सरकार को क्या आशंका हो सकती है? और अगर उस को आशंका है तो वह संसद से भी हो सकती है क्योंकि सरकार को संसद को भी सारी सूचना देनी पड़ती है और उस के सम्मने सारा मामला रखना पड़ता है। बावजूद इस के कि संसद हमारे देश की सुप्रीम बाडी है सुरक्षा की खातिर और डिफेंस के इन्ट्रस्ट में सरकार की ओर से उस को सारी बातें नहीं बताई जाती हैं और सारी सूचना नहीं दी जाती है। तो कमेटी को भी प्राप त्रिम हद तक समझते हैं डिफेंस की सूचनायें दी

जा सकती है उसी तरह से जैसे कि आप संसद् को ट्रीट करते हैं उस कमेटी को भी ट्रीट कर सकते हैं ।

इस लिये मैं इन शब्दों के साथ मेजर साहब के इस संकल्प का समर्थन करता हूँ । इस को इस दृष्टि से लिया जाना चाहिये कि जिस प्रकार से संसद् अधिक-से अधिक सहयोग देना चाहती है, अधिक से अधिक ऋचि लेना चाहती है, उसी तरह से एक संसदीय कमेटी बनाई जाय, स्थायी तौर पर, जो संसद् के विचारों का, जनता के विचारों का प्रतिनिधित्व करती रहे ।

श्री प्रेम चन्द्र वर्मा (हमीरपुर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय जो स्ताव माननीय मेजर साहब ने पेश किया है मैं उसकी कद्र करता हूँ । उन्होंने जिन भावनाओं से प्रेरित हो कर यह प्रस्ताव यहां रखा है, वह सराहनीय है । मैं भी एक फौजी फैमिली से ताल्लुक रखता हूँ और जानता हूँ कि फौजी की जिम्बगी कितनी कठिन होती है और उस का फर्ज, उस का कर्तव्य क्या होता है । परन्तु फिर भी उन्होंने जो यह सुझाव दिया है कि एक पालिथामेट्री कमेटी बनाई जाय, मैं उस से सहमत नहीं हूँ । क्योंकि पालिथामेट्री कमेटी का मतलब यह है कि उन सारी चीजों को जो हमारे देशके डिफेन्स से ताल्लुक रखती हैं, उस को हम सब लोगों के सामने रखें, जबकि फौजों का तरीका यह है कि अगर रात को 12 बजकर 1 मिनट पर हमला करना है, तो एक कमाण्डर दुसरे कमाण्डर को नहीं बताता है, मेजर साहब को तो मालूम होगा, 12 बजे ही पता लगता है कि हमें कहां जाना है । इस लिये यह बात मनुस्क्रिप्ट नहीं होगी, क्योंकि इससे पोलिटीकल खैदात न बच पड़ेगी ।

दूसरी बात, ज्ञा साहब ने कहा कि हमने गसतियां की हैं और गलती कर के पीछे जा रहे हैं । उन्होंने पानीपत के मैदान का हवाला दिया, सूरत के मैदान का हवाला

दिया, मैं उन को बताना चाहता हूँ— हानांकि उन्होंने पानीपत के मैदान की मिसालें दे दी, लेकिन उन्होंने यह नहीं बताया कि हिन्दुस्तान फौज की कमजोरी की वजह से कभी गुलाम नहीं हुआ, हिन्दुस्तान की फौज हमेशा ताकतवर रही है और आपको मालूम होगा—गुरू गोविन्द सिंह जी के टाइम में एक-एक सिख सौ-सौ ज़ादमियों से लड़ा । राजपूतों के टाइम में एक-एक राजपूत सौ-सौ मुगलों से लड़ा, मराठों के टाइम में एक-एक मुराठा हजार मुसलमानों से लड़ा है— इस बात को इन्कार नहीं कर सकते हैं । हमारा इतिहास इस बात को बताता है लेकिन अगर हम हारे हैं, अगर हम गुलाम हुए हैं तो गुलामी का कारण एक था—पृथ्वी राज के जमाने में जयचन्द पैदा हुआ महाराणा प्रताप के जमाने में मानसिंह पैदा हुआ और महाराणा ज्ञांसी के टाइम में भी ऐसा ही हमारा साथी पैदा हुआ । हमें इस बात का डर रहता है कि जब चीन के साथ हमारा जंग होगा जब पाकिस्तान के साथ हमारा जंग होगा तो जयचन्द और मानसिंह पैदा हो सकते हैं । इस लिये जब चीन में हमें लड़ना है पाकिस्तान से हमें लड़ना है, तो जयचन्द और मानसिंह को भौका न दें कि वह अपनी कार्यवाहियों से हमारे मुल्क को नुकसान पहुंचायें—इस लिये इन बातों का हमें ध्यान रखना होगा ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरे चन्द छोटे छोटे सुझाव हैं, जिन्हें मैं अपने डिफेन्स मिनिस्टर साहब के सामने अर्ज करना चाहूंगा । मेरा पहाल सुझाव यह है कि डिफेन्स सर्विसिज के अन्दर जो हमारे सिपाही भरती होते हैं— जिस इलाके से मैं ताल्लुक रखता हूँ, फौज के सब से ज्यादा सिपाही कांगड़े के डोंगरे हैं, वे झरू में सिपाही भरती होते हैं और बाद में जा कर सिपाही ही रिटायर होते हैं, हमारे लोम बहुत कम अफसर बनते हैं । मेरी उन से यह अर्ज है कि जब प्रमोशन का टाइम आता है तो जो सिपाही और छोटे अफिसर रेग्यूलर सर्विस

[श्री प्रेम चन्द्र वर्मा]

में हैं, उन के प्रमोशन की परसेन्टेज बढ़ाई जाय, उन को प्रमोशन दिया जाय ।

दूसरे—हमारे फौजी जो फौज में चले जाते हैं, 15 साल सर्विस में रहते हैं, जब चीन और पाकिस्तान का हमला ही या मल्क में डिस्टर्बेन्जेज हों, तो गोलियों का समना करते हैं, हैं, वे बहादुरी से अपनी जान पर खेल जाते हैं, देश की रक्षा के लिये लड़ते हैं, जब वह वापस आते हैं और जमीन को जोतना चाहते हैं तो जमीन उनकी नहीं रहती । क्योंकि हमारे यहां का कानून ऐसा है कि जो बोनेवाला होता है, जमीन उसके पास चली जाती है । मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि इस के बारे में आप जरूर तब्दीली लायें ।

तीसरे—जो लोग फौज में चले जाते हैं, सरहदों पर जाकर लड़ते हैं, जो बरफ में रहते हैं, हम तो यहां पर अपने लिये हीटर जगाते हैं, एयर कन्डीशन में बैठे हुए हैं, लेकिन वे लोग हमारे लिये बंक्स में रहते हैं, उन के बच्चों के लिये, उन की फैमिलीज के लिये कोई न कोई ऐसा इन्तजाम किया जाय, जिससे उनको यह महसूस हो कि हमारी सरकार हमारे बीबी-बच्चों की पीछे से ठीक तरह से देखभाल कर रही है ।

मैं चाहता था कि मेजर साहब के रेजोल्यूशन की ताइद करूं, लेकिन इस लिये कि मैं पार्लियामेन्टी कमेटी बनाने के हक में नहीं हूं, इस लिये इस की ताइद नहीं करता हूं और विरोध करना हूं ।

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त (दिल्ली-सदर) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आपका बहुत धन्यवाद है कि आपने मुझे आखिर में समय दिया । सिद्धान्तरूप में जो प्रस्तावक महोदय ने कहा है मैं उसका समर्थन करता हूं परन्तु मैं यह मानता हूं कि इस प्रकार की जो कमेटी बने, वह पार्लियामेंट की इलैक्ट्रेड कमेटी नहीं होनी चाहिये, सरकार उसे नौमिनेट करे और जो पार्लियामेंट के सदस्य हैं, विशेषतः डिफेंस हा जिनको ज्ञान है, एक्सटर्नल अफेयर्स

का जिनको ज्ञान है या देश की इन्टरनल सिचुएशन के बारे में जिनको अच्छा ज्ञान है, उन लोगों की कमेटी बनाई जानी चाहिये, क्योंकि डिफेंस का सम्बन्ध एक्सटर्नल अफेयर्स से भी है और डिफेंस का सम्बन्ध फाइनेंस और हौम-अफेयर्स से भी है, ये चारों विभाग ठीक चलते हैं तो देश का डिफेंस ठीक रहता है । तो मेरी धारणा यह है कि इस प्रकार के सदस्यों को नौमिनेट करके कमेटी बनाई जाय ।

दूसरी चीज—जैसा अभी शारदा जी ने कहा, मैं उनसे सहमत नहीं हूँ। ठीक है पोलिटिक्स इस में आता है लेकिन जब हमने अपने देश में प्रजातन्त्र बनाया है तो लोगों का पार्टीसिपेशन उसमें जरूर होना चाहिए, डेमोक्रेसी में यह अवश्य होगा । हमारे जो डिफेंस मिनिस्टर हैं, इनका भी किसी पार्टी से सम्बन्ध है, ये भी पालिटिक्स कर सकते हैं, लेकिन यह हमारी डेमोक्रेसी का तरीका है । इसलिये डेमोक्रेसी में अगर आप लोगों का एक्टिव पार्टीसिपेशन चाहते हैं तो आपको यह करना चाहिये । डिफेंस का मामला मैं किमी पार्टी का मामला नहीं समझता, क्योंकि अगर देश का डिफेंस ठीक है, तभी ये जनसंघ पार्टी, कांग्रेस पार्टी या दूसरी पार्टियों रहेंगी, लेकिन अगर देश का डिफेंस ही खतरे में है तो कोई भी पार्टी जिन्दा नहीं रह सकती है और न ही इनके रहने का कोई लाभ है । इसलिये डिफेंस के मामले को पार्टियों से परे समझना चाहिये । देश की आज जो हमारी हालत है, उस में 50 हजार मील जमीन हमारे दुश्मनों के पास है और दुश्मन चारों तरफ से हमें घेरना चाहता है, वह उस मौके की तलाश में है कि कैसे मौका मिले और कैसे वह लपके, ऐसी स्थिति में सब लोगों को साथ लेकर, जो इस देश को अपना मानते हैं, जो राष्ट्रीय दृष्टिकोण रखते हैं, उन लोगों को साथ लेकर उनका एक्टिव पार्टिसिपेशन होना चाहिये । एक बाच-डींग की तरह से यह कमेटी काम करेगी । जैसे

कई मेम्बरों ने उदाहरण दिये, मैं उस की तफसील में नहीं जाना चाहता ।

मान लीजिये जवानों की सर्विस कन्डीशन्स हैं, डिफेन्स प्रोडक्शन की बात है, मैं मानता हूँ कि सीक्रेसी के नाते ऐसा नहीं हो सकता कि सारी चीजें आपके सामने रख दी जायें, लेकिन ऐसा भी तो नहीं होना चाहिये कि कहीं अगर ब्लंडर्स हुई है तो उनका भी पता न लगे और उनसे हमें आगे सबक सीखने का मौका न मिले । जो हैंड्सन कमेटी बनी, उसकी रिपोर्ट हमारे सामने आई । ठीक है, सारे सदन के सामने वह नहीं आ सकती, वह पब्लिश नहीं हो सकती, लेकिन जो विश्वस्त लोग सरकार नामिनेट करेगी कम से कम उन को तो विश्वास में लेकर आपको यह बताना चाहिए कि सरकार ने यह भलें कीं । हर एक सरकार भूल करती है । मैं यह नहीं मानता कि कोई सरकार भूल नहीं करेगी, लेकिन उसके बाद आइन्दा हमारी क्या क्या तैयारियां हों, इसको तो देखना चाहिए । मिनिस्टर महोदय से तो जब सवाल पूछा जाता है कि पाकिस्तान ने सन् 65 के मकाबले डबल सेना कर ली है, अपनी एयर फोर्स बढ़ा ली है, आप क्या कर रहे हैं तो डिफेन्स मिनिस्टर कहते हैं कि हमारी भी बराबर की तैयारी है । कोई भी डिफेन्स मिनिस्टर—केवल स्वर्ण सिंह जी ही नहीं, दुनिया का कोई भी डिफेन्स मिनिस्टर हो, जब उससे सवाल पूछा जाता है कि आप क्या कर रहे हैं तो वह यही कहता है कि हम पूरी तरह से तैयार हैं । चाहे अगले दिन ही वह मरेण्डर कर दे लेकिन कहेगा यही, इसके अलावा उसके पास कोई और जवाब ही नहीं है । इसीलिये मैं यह सजेस्ट करता हूँ कि इस प्रकार की कमेटी जरूरी है जिसके जरिए से पार्लियामेंट को और देश को विश्वास रहे कि सही मानों में हमारी तैयारी हो रही है और हम मकाबला करने के लिये तैयार हैं, किसी पर हमला करने के लिये नहीं बल्कि मुनाबला करने के लिये तैयार हैं ।

3251 L.S.—11

अध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारे माननीय सदस्य ने कहा कि स्वर्ण सिंह जी काम्पिटेन्ट नहीं हैं । मैं तो उनको सब से ज्यादा काम्पिटेन्ट मानता हूँ । वे हमारे एक्सटर्नल अफेयर्स मिनिस्टर, स्टील मिनिस्टर, फूड मिनिस्टर भी रह चुके हैं और उनका नाम भी स्वर्ण है यानी सोना । सोने को चाहे किधर ही ढाल लीजिए, वही बन जाएगा, काँई भी जेवर बना लीजिए वही बन जाएगा, चाहे नेकलेस बना लीजिए या हाथ में पहनने का कोई जेवर बना लीजिए । इसी लिए सरकार कोई भी मिनिस्टरों उनको दे देती है और वे हर जगह अच्छी तरह से काम करते हैं ।

तो मेरा कहना यह है कि अगर सही मानों में हम कोई चीज चाहते हैं, अगर हम चाहते हैं कि पब्लिक पार्टिसिपेशन हो, अमरीका और इंग्लैंड में इस प्रकार की कमेटियां बनी हुई हैं, यहां भी यह कमेटी बन जाये तो उससे पब्लिक पार्टिसिपेशन भी होगा, लोगों में विश्वास भी आयेगा और कहीं पर अगर हमारी गलती होती है कहीं पर कोताही होती है सर्विस कन्डीशन्स की बात है आपस में झगड़े हैं, मैं जानता हूँ कि मिलिट्री में काफी कमियां हैं जिनको कि सुधारने को आवश्यकता है, मैं उनसे तफसील में जाना नहीं चाहता, वे सारी चीज उस कमेटी में आ सकती हैं और वे ठीक हो सकती हैं । इसलिए मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से कहूंगा कि वे पार्टी सि ऊपर उठ कर और देश को सामने रख कर इस पर विचार करें ।

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SHRI SWARAN SINGH): Sir, the discussion on this resolution has quite understandably split over areas which really are not within the compass of this resolution. It was not unexpected and I do not have any objection, because this shows that hon. members have been giving thoughts to defence matters and they have come forward with certain suggestions. We need not take a technical view with regard to the scope of the resolution. But it should be appre-

[Shri Swaran Singh.]

ciated that we will be discussing all these various aspects in greater length when the demands relating to defence come up before this House for consideration. That will be a more appropriate time when we can go into some of the specific points that have been raised about service conditions, hardships being experienced, equipment, etc. They are important, but I am afraid they do not come within the purview of the resolution, which seeks the constitution of a parliamentary committee to go into defence matters. Although I have a strong temptation to touch upon the other points that have been raised, but to save the time of the House, I do not want to go into those aspects. On the committee itself, as to whether there should be a committee, and whether there could be a committee and what should be the scope of that Committee, certain views have been expressed. My task has been greatly lightened particularly by two speeches which were couched in very straight language but extremely informative. In this connection I would like to mention Shrimati Sharda Mukerjee and Shri Mahida. Both of them have given cogent reasons why a committee of this type is not likely to achieve the objective which may be before the mind of the hon. Mover of this resolution. But the complications that will flow from the constitution and working of a committee of the type that is suggested is not likely to solve any of those matters; if anything it is likely to complicate many things as also likely to impinge upon that sphere which should be left to be handled effectively by the army personnel at their various rank formations, the naval officers and the officers of the air force. I have precious little to add to the very cogent arguments of these two hon. Members. Certain other hon. Members also gave thought to this.

The basic point before Parliament in the question of parliamentary

control. What is the most effective way of exercising that parliamentary control? The most effective way is this process of discussion which itself highlights the points and Government is expected to answer those points. Even in relation either to defence production or expenditure control there is the Public Accounts Committee, there is the Auditor General who scrutinises the various transactions, they came up before the Public Accounts Committee and they are contained in the reports of the Public Accounts Committee. I am perfectly in agreement with going very fully and completely into all these transactions of a financial nature, incurring of expenditure and matters which relate to defence production. These are general matters and we should try really to involve Parliament in a more and more purposeful manner.

One method which I thought should be effective was to include such material as we possibly can, erring rather on the side of giving more information than withholding information, in the annual report of the Defence Ministry. I would beg all Members to study that carefully. It may look to be a little voluminous but if they go through it many of the matters which trouble them and about which they want information, they will find it is contained there. Then again, we have the forum of the Informal Consultative Committee where I have never hesitated to give information even of a character which normally cannot be publicly divulged. I must say the confidence that has been reposed in the Member of Parliament functioning there has been respected.

I greatly value that because they make suggestions and leakages have not taken place.

One other matter about which more than one hon. Member made a reference is the question of reluctance

on the part of Government to give information. I will be quite candid that personally and also from the point of view of projecting our defence preparedness and the like I have a strong temptation that information should be given but, at the same time, when it is also pointed out that open statements made on the floor of the House apart from leaking valuable information, might seriously affect our procurement programmes abroad, it might seriously affect our capacity sometimes to get things, I will not be divulging any secret, if I were to say that there are several sources of supply of arms and equipments it is all right, but I have been told clearly that even if others go on guessing that we got this and we got that, it does not bother them. If we make an authoritative statement in Parliament or to the press, they resent it because they find it extremely embarrassing to continue the supply of defence equipments after that authoritative announcement. I have shared this information with you in all earnestness. We should be interested in getting that equipment even if we have to deny this sensation of having the information about the actual receipt of that equipment.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: You should we get them if we can make them here?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: Shri Indrajit Gupta has raised a very valid point: why should we get it from outside; we should make it here. I agree with him completely. But our situation is such that even with the best of will, with the best of effort, it will take time before we manufacture them in the requisite quantity and quality. Our problems are pressing and urgent; they cannot wait till the guns or aircrafts are available from our own manufacture.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: You have not said anything on defence research.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I accept most of the points urged by Shri

Indrajit Gupta, except the constitution of the committee. We should certainly spend more on defence research. We have increased it considerably, both in the nature of defence research and also in the new subjects which should be taken up. We have also taken steps to manufacture a large number of equipment. Some of the information has been made available to the House—for example, MIG programme, HF-24, Gnat, certain transport planes etc. Up to the point to which information can be given, I have not hesitated to give information.

But the point is, to meet the immediate requirements we have to depend on certain imported equipments, I would appeal to the hon. Members to think about the other side of the question. Our Government in the External Affairs Ministry and in several other spheres have been wrongly castigated, saying that our opponent, Pakistan, has got so many transport aircraft and other defence equipments from this country or that country, but what have you done about it? Now, has the Pakistan Government at any time made any statement to the effects that it has received these things? Even the suppliers continue saying "No, your information is incorrect we have not supplied it". So, in this matter the unfortunate state of affairs in the world supply position is that the supplying country is also subjected to all types of pressures. So, naturally, whereas that country would be anxious to supply, it would not like that to be officially confirmed, whether it be India or Pakistan. Therefore, I would appeal to hon. Members to view this question in the proper perspective. Personally, it would give me satisfaction if I were to come here and announce that I have so many MIG aircraft, so many HF 24, so many L-70 guns, tanks and rifles and so on. But, what do we get out of it? Nothing except satisfaction. On the other hand, we unnecessarily expose our suppliers.

[Shri Swaran Singh.]

Sometimes people make light of this element of secrecy. I could understand that, but when a person who has actually been in defence says that, I could only say that he has not yet applied his mind to the various implications and ramifications of that. It is one thing for a person who gives me supply of aircraft to say that he has supplied it. For instance when a Soviet concern comes and helps us technically in organising production etc., they can say that. But to say that I should advertise it and make it known to everybody is something which I cannot understand. What is the utility of it? What is the object of it?

We are getting equipment from various sources and each one is anxious that we should not pass on the information from the one to the other. In that we have a good record. You may accuse me of not giving information, but those with whom we have to deal know that if India receives from one source the information or technical know-how, it will not be passed on the other side. We have honoured that and I am proud of that. That is the tradition that our country should build. Those who supply any know-how or information or any sophisticated equipment should have the confidence that this is not being passed on to the other side.

So, these are matters which cannot be openly discussed although from my own personal point of view it is more irritating and difficult for me to say that I am sorry I cannot give this information. It would be much easier for me to give that information, but I have to weigh the risk involved for the country as compared to my personal embarrassment merely. I have talked in a very frank manner.

I was rather surprised when matters were mentioned by the mover that this happened and that happened. If those things have really happened, Major Ranjit Singh should have passed those things on to me and I certainly

would have looked into it. What is the implication? I would like this House to give grave consideration to the drawbacks that he pointed out. One case he mentioned and he brought in that contest the Commanding Officer had his wife there and that there was some trouble. He ended up by saying that there was general court martial and several people were dismissed. Is it his suggestion that this committee that is sought to be constituted by Parliament should review the cases that are decided by general court martial? Is that the scope of the Committee? I am surprised that a man who has been in the defence services should cite that as an example to show that a committee of this type will ensure that justice will be done. What will be that justice? Even I do not interfere in these judicial matters. There is the general court martial and then there is the appellate system. He himself has been in the army and he knows that the general court martial and other court martials' proceedings are extremely fair.

SHRI NARENDRA SINGH MAHIDA: Military people are poor politicians.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: That is not the point. The point is: Is that the type of work that you expected this committee to do? If it is so, I am afraid, with all his experience of the army, naturally, in view of the fact that he was in a specific limited position, he does not show the depth of vision as to whether this type of interference at the political level will instil discipline or will undermine discipline. The reply is quite obvious. A committee of that type interfering in as to whether there should be a general court martial or not, what was their sentence and what is the punishment that they awarded will be disastrous. No armed forces can be run if the decisions taken in disciplinary and criminal cases are going to be the

subject matter of scrutiny by a parliamentary body.

Then he mentioned two or three other interesting matters. I do not want to argue with him because I want to take advantage if he has got any concrete points. He talked of embodiment of regiments. Is it going to be the function of the committee of his concept that it will consider whether each unit is going to be embodied, if it is a territorial unit, or whether it is going to be disembodied? What is this committee going to do? Whether it should be embodied five days or ten days before or after the Chinese aggression or after the Kutch aggression and how many days before it was abolished—these are matters which have to be left to the professional generals and professional heads of the armed forces. No parliamentary committee can decide as to when a particular unit is to be embodied, when it is to be disembodied. We should never think that we are competent to advise in a matter like this.

Then, he talked of another case where a Commanding Officer, because he stayed on a particular position and showed bravery was punished whereas in the other case he did not show bravery and got applause. These are again individual cases which have nothing to do with the parliamentary committee. If the concept of the parliamentary committee is that they are going to look into matters of this type, whatever little enthusiasm or softness I had for this committee idea is eroded when these are the type of instances that are cited with a view to showing that that the committee will do something, which will enhance or increase the discipline or the enthusiasm of the armed forces. Certainly, these are precisely the matter which should never be looked into by a parliamentary committee. After giving very careful thought to it, I have come to this conclusion. Whereas the desire is understandable, I want him to take more interest of a constructive nature of trying to air views with a view to focus the attention of the

country and of the armed forces so that we can take some action. Already with the various bodies that are constituted, whether it be the Consultative Committee, the Public Accounts Committee, the Estimates Committee and the discussions here and the Questions raised here, there is an ample parliamentary control and I would like to assure him that I will not look at these problems from the point of view of a party. It is a national matter and a national problem. I want the cooperation and proper understanding from all quarters, not only from my party.

18 hrs.

With these words, I am sorry I cannot accept the Resolution moved by my hon. friend for constituting a Standing Parliamentary Committee on Defence needs of India.

श्री रवि राय (पुरी) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय अभी मंत्री महोदय ने बतलाया कि उनको बहुत तकलीफ होती है जब वह देश की रक्षा के मिलसिले में कोई सूचना सदन के सामने नहीं दे पाते हैं। मैं आपके जरिये से उन से सवाल पूछना चाहता हूँ। जब चीन का आक्रमण चल रहा था तब जिस कारण से हम लोगों की हार हुई थी उसके बारे में इस सदन में बार-बार मांग करने पर हैडर्सन ब्रुकस को लेकर कभीटी बँठाई गई थी। हम लोगों ने इस सदन में बार-बार मांग की है कि पाकिस्तान के आक्रमण के बाद, जब कि हम लोगों की जीत हुई और हम लोगों का हीसला बढ़ गया, कम से कम भारत सरकार की ओर से हैडर्सन एंड ब्रुकस की रिपोर्ट सदन के सामने पेश की जाय ताकि हमको मालूम हो सके कि हम लोगों के क्या-क्या दोष हैं और किस कारण से हम पीछे हटे। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या अभी भी मंत्री महोदय उस रिपोर्ट को सदन पटल पर रखने के लिये तैयार हैं ताकि हम लोग उस पर बहस कर सकें ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: On this, I would like to say that based on the

[Shri Swaran Singh.]

Handerson Brooks Report, my colleague, Shri Y. B. Chavan, who was the Defence Minister at that time made a very lengthy statement of, I think, about 9 pages or so....

श्री रजि राव : मैं रिपोर्ट के बारे में पूछ रहा हूँ ।

श्री शर्दा सिंह : माननीय सदस्य तुन ले पहले मेरी बात । वह क्यों बार-बार रिपोर्ट की बात लाते हैं ।

That statement was made by him. It was also stated that follow-up action of corrective nature has been taken. I have examined it and, with a view to satisfy the curiosity and the desire of some of the hon. Members, I have come to the conclusion that the stage has not yet arisen when we can place a copy of that Report on the Table of the House.

SHRIMATI SHARDA MUKERJEE: But we have the summary of the Report.

SHRI RANJIT SINGH: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, many points have been raised by the hon. Members who have participated in the discussion and by the hon. Minister. I will deal with them point by point. I start with the points raised by the Defence Minister himself.

There are certain things that have been misunderstood in the spirit of the Resolution. It is not to be an interference in the day-to-day administration of the armed forces. I have already said that we will not touch upon the strategy of the armed forces. The Committee is not going to interfere as to when and why a certain division was placed in Meerut and not at some other place. We are not going to discuss these things. We are not going to interfere in those matters. But sometimes certain things occur repeatedly which may be a pointer to something

and the Committee will take note of it.

The hon. Minister mentioned about the disembodiment of units. I am very sorry to say that he has not understood the absolute seriousness of several units of the Indian Army being disembodied a few days before an enemy attack. It is such a type of thing which points to something. The Committee will not enter the Army Headquarters or the Air Headquarters or the Naval Headquarters, but will only bring to the notice of the proper persons—the Prime Minister and the Defence Minister. At the moment, a lot of Members are receiving a lot of information. It is not that Army officers are completely secluded from being in conversation or contact with MPs. After all, MPs represent them also. It is not that they are not making individual efforts. But if such a Committee is there, then all this information that filters down to MPs will come to this Committee. Why this information cannot be handed over directly to the Defence Minister is because it involves a breach of discipline as per the present code that exists in the Armed Forces. Naturally it should not be encouraged that a Sepoy should write a letter to the Defence Minister or to somebody in authority that his Commanding Officer has not given him leave and all that. We are not going to look into such matters. He has used such pointers as I pointed out as a means of trying to say that I have remained in the Armed Forces with a very limited scope and, therefore, I have not viewed these things from a larger angle. This is not the time for me to eulogise my qualities or my performance in the past. I have only tried to confine the duties of this Committee to such acts that I have pointed out. I have in the very beginning made these very clear. Therefore, the hon. Defence

Minister should get it out of his head that this Committee is for the purpose of examining the day-to-day working.....

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: Those were the instances that he cited.

SHRI RANJIT SINGH: I have cited the instances which have repeatedly taken place—the disembodiment of the units before attacks by the enemy....

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH: These things should not be discussed in the House. This is a question of security.

SHRI RANJIT SINGH: I pointed out the cases which are so remote that they are not going to affect our security at all. I have pointed out cases of a particular nature which are taking place repeatedly and such cases taking place repeatedly affect the general morale of the Armed Forces.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: Is it that disembodiment of a unit should be decided by this Committee?

SHRI RANJIT SINGH: I have made it quite clear. I have just now pointed out to him. I have given a few examples.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH: Security matters should not be discussed here.

SHRI RANJIT SINGH: How is this a security matter? This happened years ago. This is one thing that should be a pointer that, as Mr. Varma pointed out, some Jai Chand exists somewhere in the Defence who reduces the force of the Army just when an enemy attack takes place. It is not a coincidence.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I strongly repudiate any such thing that there is anybody in the Army Headquarters who is interested in reducing the strength. He should be careful in making such statements. It is amazing!

श्री प्रवेश चन्द्र वर्मा : मालूम होता है कि जो बात मैंने कही उसको माननीय सदस्य समझे नहीं। मैं ने मिलिटरी के इन्डर जयचन्द और मान सिंह की बात नहीं कही थी। मैंने पोलिटिकल प्रादमियों के लिये कहा था कि इस कमेटी में आ जायेंगे ।

श्री रणजित सिंह : मैं मिलिटरी की बात नहीं कह रहा हूँ। मैं डिफेन्स की बात कर रहा हूँ। मिलिटरी लाइन्स में सिविलियन सेट-अप भी आता है जिसमें सारे क्लर्क लोग हैं।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: As I stated earlier, any statement which is likely to affect the discipline or the administration or the security should be avoided. What is the scope of the Committee, that is the main question, and the Defence Minister has made it amply clear that the day-to-day administration is left to the High Command in the Army itself.

SHRI RANJIT SINGH: What have I said?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: You said, there is somebody in the Army Headquarters interested in reducing the strength.

SHRI RANJIT SINGH: What I have said is this. We will not interfere in strategy, tactics and the day-to-day administration, but when certain things take place repeatedly and come to the notice of the Committee, then the Committee will not go into the units and all that, but will only bring it to the notice of the competent authority—Prime Minister or the Defence Minister.

SHRI NARENDRA SINGH MAHIDA: Can he cite a single example anywhere in the world, except a little discussion in the Senate of the US, where in their parliaments they have such a committee where the question of embodiment or disembodiment of a unit is discussed? I am very soory the hon. Member is so keen to probe into these things. I would request him to use his knowledge in a bet-

[Shri Narendra Singh Mahida.]

ter way than asking for this committee.

श्री रवि राय : सरमन मत करिये ।

SHRI NARENDRA SINGH MAHIDA: I am not giving a sermon. Let him ask for a committee to deal with wider questions.

श्री रवि राय : जितना समय दिया है उसका घाघ्रा समय और लोग बोलते रहे हैं ।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He has to finish in five minutes.

SHRI RANJIT SINGH: It is a very sad thing that a matter of such national importance affecting our security has been misunderstood. At the same time, it is with full responsibility that I am pointing it out because it is remote in time. I raise this because this should not be repeated.

Mention was made of the informal consultative committee. We all know how it functions. As a Member himself has pointed out, there is general dissatisfaction with the working of this committee. The committee works not as an advisory body, not even as a recommendatory body; it works as a forum where members can bring to the notice of the Minister certain things and where the Minister takes no notice of them. The hon. Defence Minister has himself said that he encourages people in the committee to voice their views and give information. I have attended one of his meetings. of the time allotted for the meeting, half was taken up by the Minister himself in giving us a monologue on the world situation. Then he said that there should be another sitting. He said that he would ensure that. But nothing came out of it.

From that committee and the committee as envisaged in this Resolution, there is a vast difference. I have never said that the Defence

Minister should get up in the House and disclose his day to day purchases and things like that. But there are certain things about defence which we still adhere to in the tradition of 30 years ago. We kept them as secret, knowing that modern armed forces in the world do not now regard these things as things that could be kept secret from the enemy. It is from our own people that we keep them secret.

Shri Amrit Nahata has pointed out that the supremacy of civilians would be violated by this committee. I do not know how he says that. It is to impose the supremacy of the civilians that it is being done. That is the spirit behind this move. The general deterioration in the morale in the country everywhere has seeped to the armed forces also. I am sorry to say it. But we have personal experience of these things. We all know it. It is likely to seep in everywhere. The general sense of political disintegration may not be permitted to seep into the armed forces. For that purpose, we require this committee to suggest ways and means for not only better indoctrination and reorientation of the armed forces, but also for better public participation in defence affairs.

In these days in the modern world there is no distinct category of civilians. Every civilian is a soldier. Sardarji is a soldier, I am a soldier, everybody is a soldier. Our children are potential soldiers. It is not only the 10-lakh strong army that fights at the front that will be called soldiers. There are the crores of citizens and who work in the factories under a disciplinary code like the armed forces, day and night to sustain the defence effort. Therefore, there is no such thing as a civilian in the modern concept. A civilian is a potential soldier.

I have dealt with the fears expressed by certain members. Secrecy cannot be maintained in a democracy as Mr. Verma envisages. As soon as the opposition, SVD, came to power in U.P. a communist became the Home Minister and the first thing he did was to tour the border areas. How can you prevent it? How can you prevent the Kerala Home Minister from getting at the secrets of the Government. He is the man doing everything there. How can you prevent people from winning a particular office in a democracy? Mrs. Sharada Mukerjee said that we should keep political education away from our soldiers.

SHRIMATI SHARDA MUKERJEE: Not theoretical political education but party politics. They may know what democracy is, what dictatorship is. They should not be communist Party members or Jan Sangh members.

SHRI RANJIT SINGH: I should like to say that Lord Louis Mountbatten later Admiral Mountbatten, had one of the largest and the best marxist Hibraries in the world. I know that there are other people well versed in political affairs. But they do not take part in politics. If you read about Marxism, it does not mean that you will take part in politics. Gen. Thimmaiah and Gen. Cariappa—did they not know poltical theory? Those who are voicing the feelings of the top brass do not want the iron curtain to be lifted. I am not making any personal references but I am sorry I have to say that she is looking at things from the angle of an Air Marshal's wife and not from the angle of a common soldier.

SHRIMATI SHARDA MUKERJEE: On a point of order. Since he has made a personal reference to me and said that I was looking at things from the point of view of an Air Marshal's wife I was not born an Air Marshal's wife. Secondly, I meant that you should not try to get political support from those people. I do not think that it would

be a healthy tendency for the Defence Forces to be affiliated to any political organisation. I do not mind their reading about Marxism or about any other 'ism'. There are books in all these 'isms' in every defence library.

SHRI RANJIT SINGH: I was about to conclude my speech. This is the last minute allowed to me and so I thank you. I thank the Defence Minister who has taken such pains to reply to the debate and also certain hon. Members who had seen things in the correct prospective. I thank Mr. Verma, I do not know whether he supports me or not—and also Mr. Barua. Even if the Defence Minister is not ready to agree to my resolution, even if the House rejects my resolution, it may accept his amendment because it is going to do no harm and so the House may accept it.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I shall put the amendments to the vote of the House.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: There is Mr. Nayanar's amendment. Is Mr. Nayanar pressing it?

SHRI E. K. NAYANAR: I think it was accepted. (*Interruption*).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I will put it to the vote.

Amendment No. 1 was put and negatived.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Then there is the amendment of Mr. Bedabrata Barua.

SHRI BEDABRATA BARUA: Sir, I seek the permission of the House to withdraw the amendment.

Amendment No. 2 was, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Then, let us take the resolution moved by Shri Ranjit Singh.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: He is not pressing.

SHRI RANJIT SINGH: I am pressing. Let me see whether you have issued a whip or not.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"This House resolves that a Standing Parliamentary Committee on Defence be appointed to study the problems of India's defence needs and periodically to keep scrutinizing her defence preparedness and suggest ways and means to the Government to ensure the security of the country's frontiers."

The motion was negatived.

18.21 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE: GOLD
CONTROL

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, Mr. Xavier just to move,—

SHRI S. XAVIER (Tirunelveli): Sir, I move the following resolution.

श्री प्रेम चन्द वर्मा (हमीरपुर) :

जनाब, कौरम नहीं है।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Let the bell be rung.—

There is no quorum. The House stands adjourned to meet again on Tuesday the 27th February at 11 a.m.

18.24 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, February 27, 1967/Phalguna 8, 1889 (Saaka).