

certain further sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the services of the financial year 1966-67, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That Clauses 1 to 3, the Schedule, the Enacting Formula and the Title stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 1 to 3, the Schedule, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

Shri K. C. Pant: I beg to move:

"That the Bill be passed."

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

17.32 hrs.

**"THE UNTOLD STORY" BY
LT.-GEN. KAUL**

Mr. Speaker: Now we take up the half-an-hour discussion. Mr. A. K. Gopalan.

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Kasergod): This is "The Untold Story"—500 pages—written by Lt.-Gen. Kaul...

Mr. Speaker: A number of names are there. If all of them want to speak, it will be impossible. I think 15 minutes may be taken by the Members and the Minister may take 10 of 15 minutes to reply.

Shri Indrajit Gupta (Alipore): In such cases the practice has been that members who send up their names are permitted to ask one question each and not make a speech.

Mr. Speaker: I agree. I have no objection. I will only say that it will curtail the Minister's time.

Mr. A. K. Gopalan may continue.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I request the Defence Minister that the untold story may be told and hereafter it may not remain as an untold story. Gen. Kaul's book, "The Untold Story", has evoked a spate of controversy all over the country because it has direct bearing on the working of the Armed Forces and also on our Defence preparedness. The book also contains very serious allegations against the Cabinet Ministers, both past and present.

Coming as it does from a top military official of the Indian Army, who was in charge of the NEFA operations in 1962 and who, according to the late Prime Minister, Nehru, was "one of our brightest and best officers in the Army", it is most surprising that this statement should have gone unchallenged at the hands of the Government till now. Four editions of this book have already been published and it has had wide circulation in this country as well as outside. Very serious allegations have been made in that book about our defence preparations, about our military officers and about those who were in charge of defence. There were also other controversies which had been raised, which I shall presently point out. But till now nothing has been said regarding these things. What is more surprising is that Government are keeping a studied silence, especially when Mr. Kaul makes it appear to the Public that he was publishing these facts in pursuance of late Pandit Nehru's advice. He refers to Pandit Nehru as having written to him on the 20th September, 1963 as follows:

"When the suitable time comes, you can put some facts, as you think necessary, before the public; it seems to me that in the pre-

*Half-an-Hour discussion.

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

sett mood any such statement by you would not be of much help."

Then, taking a clue from what Prime Minister Nehru wrote to him, Gen. Kaul, while describing the purpose of book says as follows:

"It is better in the long run to be told the truth so that we may learn by our mistakes than to be kept in the dark regarding certain unpalatable facts."

This is a very serious thing. I do not want to make any comment on it at all except to say that he says that there are some unpalatable facts and Government must learn some lessons, and, therefore, it is better to tell the truth and, therefore, he as the Army General is telling the truth and placing it before the public.

Coming to the main points, the book reveals firstly that while in service, representatives of foreign Governments were in close touch with Mr. Kaul, discussing military and political situations in India by means of direct meetings and regular personal correspondence.

Referring to one such meeting, Mr. Ellsworth Bunker, former US Ambassador to India in 1959, wrote to Mr. Kaul as follows:

"It is not often that such a feeling of sympathy and identity of views is aroused at a first meeting as I feel has developed in our conversation that night."

We do not know what 'that night' is. Anyhow, that night, so many things might have happened, and he says that on that night there had been identity of views as far as he and Mr. Kaul were concerned, and, therefore, he says that he remembers that day very well because a feeling of sympathy an identity of views had been aroused. Is it not obvious that they must have exchanged views on serious military and political problems

facing our country to the extent of reaching a common understanding behind the back of Government? I can understand a military officer saying it, but here was a diplomat writing to him and saying that they had identity of views. What were those identical views? Were they identical views as far as the defence of the country was concerned? Were they identical views as far as political and military matters were concerned? If so, what were they? Nothing has been said so far about these.

Referring to similar meeting with Mr. Kaul, Mr. Chester Bowles, the present Ambassador of the USA in India, in a letter addressed to Mr. Kaul in 1963, states:

"I vividly remember our conversation in early March, 1962 in which you had accurately predicted that China would attack during the summer or the autumn months of that year."

Matters went to such a pass that Mr. Kaul submitted his resignation to the authorities only after a discussion with Gen. Adams of the US Army and Gen. Hull of the British Army in the presence of Lt. Gen. Sen. So, let us trace that. There are secret letters there is correspondence, and there is close contact with foreign discussed. At the time of resignation also, the resignation comes only after consulting Gen. Adams and Gen. Hull. It seems that even for resignation they were to be consulted. Before also they had been consulted; therefore, I do not know whether for resignation also they had been consulted.

The resignation comes after consulting both Adams and Hull, the US and British officers. The country is in the dark as to how many more leading government officials and foreign dignitaries still keep contact and correspond behind the back of the Government. This has serious repercussions on the

security and sovereignty of our country, especially in the light of the CIA ramifications which this House discussed the other day.

Another question bearing on the supremacy of the civil over the military authority is the admission by Gen. Kaul that he managed to permit a number of foreign correspondents including that of the American *Time* magazine to visit the forward areas during the 1962 military operations defying government orders prohibiting such visits. Here is a General who says that Government had said that nothing should be done like that, but 'I' defied that order and invited so many foreign correspondents and they had gone to the forward areas, correspondents of the *Time* magazine and others. When defiance of government orders pertaining to the defence of the country occurs, what would happen to the defence of the country—I do not know. Nothing has been said as to whether this is correct, and if correct, what action had been taken. Nobody knows.

The *modus operandi* by which military secrets are passed on to foreigners is exposed in the book when the General writes this with reference to senior officials:

"They also talk loosely at various cocktail parties and other places".

These military officers talk 'loosely' about politicians 'in order to win cheap popularity with foreigners in whose presence they derided India'. 'All that some foreign dignitary has to do is to ask some of our officers to low down on any matter, and more often than not he was promptly obliged'.

"Much secret information"—

I want the Defence Minister to note this—

"leaked out in this and also in other ways and reached unauthorised groups and individuals".

Is there any more serious thing that has to be said?

Much secret information leaked out, not only this thing but many other things also, to groups and individuals in this country. What is that secret? Military secret.

Gen. Kaul has given an example of a certain document from Shri Nehru's office which found its way to a foreign establishment in Delhi. Though in the beginning, Nehru found it hard to believe, he searched for this document and found that it was missing. He has also given an example of an army officer who was found guilty of anti-national and indiscreet utterances but was exonerated by the court of inquiry.

The irresponsible behaviour of some of the senior army officers has been described by Gen. Kaul in the following words:

"Some of the senior officers were in the habit of making tendentious and indiscreet remarks openly against our national leaders and extolled the erstwhile British rulers of India. They suggested at times that some sort of dictatorial rule was the only way to get our affairs out of the mess in which they were".

Very very serious things they used to talk about the political leaders, Ministers and others. They have said that British rule is better and some dictatorial rule must be there. That means that 'we' must see that this Government is removed'.

Even the Generals of the Army were not free from this blame, according to Gen. Kaul.

"There were some Generals who even during 1952-54 were placating politicians and other dignitaries and indulging in certain activities not in conformity with service traditions and military etiquette".

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

Even when such things were said in public, I wonder at the silence of the Government of India.

The General does not spare Government either. We have so far heard about the army, how secrets are going out from the army Generals, how they are secretly talking and corresponding and discussing military and political affairs with foreign dignitaries. Now he comes to the Government.

Gen. Kaul does not spare the Government either, in regard to their conduct relating to the military operations in NEFA area. In fact, he levels a charge against the Government of having issued military orders against the advice of the highest military command. Referring to what passed on in a defence meeting on September 22, 1962, he writes:

"After some discussion it was decided by the Government that as a matter of policy there was no alternative but to evict the Chinese from the Dhola area. The Army Chief then asked for a written directive from the Government.... which was issued. He (Army Chief) asked for written authority because he was being told to evict the Chinese in spite of his pointing out the consequences of such a step."

Mr. Kaul repeats that Gen. Thapar also met the Prime Minister on 2nd October, 1962 and told him:

"This was the first time that we were going to use force against the Chinese though for good reasons (as against walking into a vacuum without opposition, a practice followed by us so far) and this was bound to have serious repercussions. Nehru said he had good reasons to believe that the Chinese would not take any strong action against us."

Referring to the late Prime Minister's press statement on 12th October, 1962 just before going to Ceylon, Mr.

Kaul accuses the late Pandit Nehru in so many words, as he writes:

"He (Nehru) said he had given orders to the army to drive the Chinese out of the territory of NEFA. This was contrary to the orders he had given me on the night of 11th October in a conference held in his residence."

And further on, he states:

"It is my surmise that Nehru took up a posture of courage when he knew that we were militarily weak, in the hope that, with these bold (though contradictory) statements the Chinese might be deterred from attacking India."

What is this. This book contains these things, and even today the Government has not said anything about. He has also said in the book that the Government cannot answer, can never answer, because this is true. The public believes that since the Government has not answered him so far, what has been said in the *Untold Story* by Mr. Kaul is correct.

These and similar other innumerable grave charges and statements have been made by Mr. Kaul in his book which has gone into its fourth edition within a short period of three months. I do not know how many more editions will come. Even after this, I want to know from the Government why it is maintaining discreet silence. I am unable to understand the conduct of the Government in not publishing even at this late stage the report of the Henderson Committee which went into the question bearing on the military operations in 1962.

Mr. Kaul also makes another charge. He asserts that he offered to give oral evidence before this Committee and charges that he was not allowed to do so. He wanted to give evidence before Mr. Henderson, but Gen. Chaudhury did not allow him to go and give

evidence. In the face of such assertions, why is the Government keeping silent?

I wish to state that by their conduct the Government is opening the door for all sorts of conclusions. The Government is openly challenged by the well-known commentator, Mr. Nirad C. Chaudhuri, in the columns of the *Times of India* dated 1st February, wherein he wrote:

"I waited many days to see if any contradictions were coming from the persons mentioned and the Government. None has, on the most important, i.e. the military side. The three persons who could be expected to react most strongly to the charges, Mrs. Gandhi, Mr. Menon and Gen Chaudhary, have all refused to comment. Neither Mrs. Gandhi nor Menon is ever unready to take up a polemical challenge and give back in the way of vituperation more than what they receive, but they have been very discreetly reticent."

He says further: and it is important:

"General Chaudhari who contributed to a newspaper as a military correspondent when in service has now shown disinclination to say anything though it is a question of the prestige of the military authorities of India. I can only assume that they are not replying because they cannot."

I am not saying this; it is Nirad Chaudhuri who says this. He goes on writing, 1, 2, 3 and 4 articles and he says: this Government does not say anything or has not said anything as they cannot say anything.

Even after such an open challenge if the Government prefers to keep silent the people naturally think that there is still some untold story which they are yet to hear. If Mr. Kaul is free to write an untold story, this House is

entitled to know from the Government what that story is because if that story is untold, there will be more difficulties. The sovereignty, integrity and the defence of our country are involved. People will begin to believe that the Government has nothing to say and whatever said there is true.

Shri Jyotirmoy Basu (Diamond Harbour): Gen Kaul has admitted that he had been in close consultation with various foreigners and with American Pentagon. Did he take Government's permission and if permission was given what was the reason for granting such a permission?

Shri C. K. Chakrapani (Ponnai): Gen. Kaul says in his book that he met General Chaudhuri and asked him permission to appear before the Handerson Enquiry Commission. It seems from Kaul's account that permission was granted in the beginning but later on he was asked to give only a written statement. May I know whether any detailed investigation is necessary to find out whether Kaul's assertion is correct? How is it that the Defence Ministry even after three months find it difficult to admit or deny Kaul's charges?

Shri Umanath (Pudukkottai): From what has been published in the book, it is clear that military authorities are free to have personal meetings at cocktail parties an even private correspondence notwithstanding the rules to the contrary. If that is so, has the Government gone into these matters because this sort of behaviour opens many avenues for CIA agents or the agents of any foreign intelligence agency and has the Government formulated any code of conduct for military officials to prevent a recurrence of such things?

Shri Baburao Patel (Shajapur): The most important thing has been missed by our Communist comrades. On page 349 Gen. Kaul has come to this final conclusion:

[Shri Baburao Patel]

"I say with full sense of responsibility and without animus that three men must be held answerable for the state of affairs I have portrayed in the last few pages: Nehru, Krishna Menon and Morarji Desai; Nehru for allowing this to happen under his captaincy; Krishna Menon for not taking appropriate and expeditious steps to deal with certain grave matters and situations concerning the defence of the country; and Morarji Desai for not making sufficient funds available for essential defence requirements."

Out of these three, two are out of our reach. One is in heaven and one has joined the Communists. We still have Shri Morarji Desai here who can answer some questions regarding what reply happened about the financial appropriations that were needed for defence. I suggest that the Government should appoint an enquiry commission to investigate into the charges made in this book with a view to—

Mr. Speaker: You are expected to put only one question, if you have any doubt.

Shri Baburao Patel: My question is this: Will the Government appoint a commission of enquiry to investigate the charges made in this book with a view to seeing that such things do not repeat themselves again when we have to defend the country again?

Some hon. Member rose—

Mr. Speaker: I do not mind calling all of you; not that I have any objection. It is merely a half-hour discussion. The Minister also should reply. Therefore, I cannot call all the hon. Members who rise now.

An hon. Member: Only one question.

Mr. Speaker: Then, if I allow one Member whose name is not here, the others also could be allowed. Please see my delicacy also. Therefore, I am calling only those names which are here. If I go on calling others, it will

become a two-hour debate and not a half-hour discussion.

Shri E. K. Nayanaar (Palghat): When questions were raised in the past about the state of affairs in the army, they were always, evaded by the Defence Minister on security grounds. However, from Kaul's book, it appears that more secret information was given to foreign dignitaries and possibly to CIA agents and other foreign secret agencies. May I know what steps were taken by the Government to put an end to the clandestine relationship between our senior army officers and foreign dignitaries behind the back of the Government?

Shri V. V. Menon (Ernakulam): A story was being circulated quietly that Gen. Kaul left the battle-front and ran to Delhi, though it was denied in Parliament. Pandit Nehru paid tributes to him even after his retirement, but the story remained in circulation. Gen. Kaul might have written certain things in order to defend his position, and it is quite possible that he might have glossed over some other important facts. Certain things mentioned by Kaul do not need any investigation. Government have only to say yes or no in the matter. For instance, he challenged the correctness of the Prime Minister's statement on the 12th November, 1962. Even on such important matters, the Government prefers to remain silent. May I know the reason for the delay in issuing a clarification even on such questions?

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (हापुड़) : मिलीटरी के रिटायर्ड जनरल और बड़े बड़े अफसरों द्वारा इस प्रकार की पुस्तकें लिखने और उनके प्रकाशित होने से लाभ और हानि दोनों होने की सम्भावनायें हैं। लाभ इस तरह से कि कुछ इस प्रकार के तथ्य हो सकते हैं जो कि जनता की आंखों से बिल्कुल दूर रहते हैं उनसे देश को परिचय मिले और कम से कम आगे के लिये तत्कालीन शासक आर्थिक

बोल कर काम करें। हाणि इस दृष्टि से कि कुछ आपरेशनल सीक्रेट्स इस प्रकार की होती हैं जिन के प्रकट होने के कुछ देश का नुकसान होने की सम्भावनायें हो सकती हैं। इन दोनों ही पक्षों पर विचार करते हुए मुझे पता नहीं कि दूसरे देशों में इस सम्बन्ध में क्या परम्परायें हैं और रिटायर्ड जनरल्स के इस प्रकार की पुस्तकें लिखने और उनके प्रकाशित होने की क्या व्यवस्था है किन्तु भारत सरकार ने इस पुस्तक के प्रकाशित होने के बाद या इस प्रकार की और एक आधा पुस्तकें प्रकाशित होने के बाद क्या भविष्य के लिये कोई परम्परा निर्धारित की है कि मिलिटरी के रिटायर्ड जनरल्स को पुस्तकें लिखने की अनुमति होगी और बाद में जो इस प्रकार के छिपे हुए तथ्य हैं उनको प्रकाशित होने की इजाजत दी जायेगी ?

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंघेर) : मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या चीनी आक्रमण के समय सेना के नेताओं द्वारा कोई ऐसा परिपत्र जारी किया गया था कि अगर किसी जगह का पतन आसन्न हो यानी जल्दी होने वाला हो तो उन जगहों को छोड़ दिया जाये और इस परिपत्र के कारण एक एक जगह पर डट कर मुकाबला करने की तबियत सेना में नहीं रही और सेना और बомडीला सारी जगहों का पतन हुआ ? साथ ही साथ मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि गोआ में तो पुर्तगाल के खिलाफ हम ने हवाई जहाजों का इस्तेमाल किया लेकिन चीन बूँक एक बड़ा देश है क्या इसलिये डर के मारे हम ने अपने हवाई जहाजों का इस्तेमाल नहीं किया जिससे हमारी सेना का एक डिवीजन खत्म हो गया ?

Shri Indrajit Gupta rose—

Mr. Speaker: His name is not there.

18 hrs.

Shri Indrajit Gupta (Alipore): I have sent my name.

Mr. Speaker: A number of Members have sent their names. But half an hour is over. He may kindly sit down. I have called the Minister.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: That is all right, but please do not say that my name is not there.

The Minister of Defence (Shri Swaran Singh): Sir, I share the concern which has been shown by several hon. Members who have participated in this discussion about the implementations of the leakage of vital information through various sources. I am one with them that we should view this problem in the perspective of national security and also we should learn lessons for the future about the steps to be taken.

I would like to remind the House that Mr. Chavan made a lengthy statement covering about 9 pages giving important information to this House in 1963. He also listed the various steps that had been taken by the Defence Forces and the Government as a result of the investigation of the various aspects that had cropped up at the time of the Chinese aggression of 1962. Several questions were put and answered then. It will not be necessary for me to go over the whole ground. But I have thought it fit to mention this, so that the House might be aware of the fact that most of these aspects had been gone into by what has been referred to by Mr. Gopalan, i.e. the Handerson Brooks Report, and all the information that could be given at that time, consistent with the security of the country was given. Mr. Chavan also explained why it was not in the interest of the security of the country to publish that report.

डा० राम बनोहर लोहिया (कन्नौज) :

आसन्न पतन के परिपत्र का कभी जबाब नहीं दिया गया। इस सदन में कई बार यह सवाल उठाया गया लेकिन आसन्न पतन के परिपत्र का जबाब कभी किसी मंत्री ने, बख्शान साहब ने, नेहरू साहब ने नहीं दिया। सिवाय अपना

[डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

सिर झुकाने के नेहरू साहब ने कुछ नहीं किया था ।

Shri Swaran Singh: That was a separate question. I have not said anything yet myself about it. I was only explaining that the report which had been prepared by Gen. Handerson Brooks was mentioned by Mr. Chavan in his statement and based on that report he had given all the information that could be given. He also explained why that report could not be published, because the publication of that report would not be in public interest. In fact, it would be harmful to national security. That position still remains. That answers Mr. Gopalan's suggestion about the publication of that report.

Several aspects have been thrown up as a result of this discussion. It will not be proper for me to go into all those details, but I would like to say that there are two aspects of the book which are receiving Government's attention. One is the extent to which Gen. Kaul has violated the provisions of the Official Secrets Act. In several places he has made references to certain documents, certain confidential talks and several other matters. It is but proper that we should get all that material carefully examined with a view to find out if any of those disclosures comes within the penal provisions of the Official Secrets Act.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : जुर्माना होगा या जेल ?

श्री स्वर्ण सिंह : मेरे बस में न जुर्माना करना है और न जेल । यह अदालतों का काम है । डा० साहब जानते हैं कि यह अदालतों का काम है और आपकी भी यही इच्छा है कि एग्जिक्यूटिव के जिम्मे यह न हो बल्कि अदालतें ही इसको करें ।

That should also answer partly the query that was raised by my hon. friend, Shri Prakash Vir Shastri. Ac-

cording to the existing rules, after retirement any military officer who publishes a book need not take any permission as such, but if he uses any information that comes to his knowledge in his official capacity and comes within the definition of the 'official secrets' as defined in the Official Secrets Act, then he takes a risk and exposes himself to penal action if on examination it is found that such penal action is called for. One has to distinguish between the historical aspect, the political aspect of what might be described as opinions on certain facts from disclosure of vital information. Whereas in a free country like ours purely from the historical point of view authors have got the right to publish books but, at the same time, they have to take the consequences if in doing so they draw upon any information that comes within the mischief of the Official Secrets Act. We are carefully examining the various passages, some of the important passages in the book, to find out the position. After checking the relevant material, if the disclosures that have been made or the statements that are contained there in any way contravene the provisions of the Official Secrets Act....

Shri Randhir Singh (Rohtak): Is the offence cognizable or non-cognizable?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं चाहूंगा कि आपको हो । उन बेचारों को क्यों तंग करते हैं ।

Shri Swaran Singh: Sir, this running commentary is difficult to handle.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : कानून के मुताबिक है । सरदार साहब धरारा गए हैं ।

Shri Swaran Singh: Therefore, it is being examined from that point of view. This answers some of the points that have been raised by Shri Gopalan and other colleagues.

An hon. Member: How long will the examination take (*Interruption*).

Shri Swaran Singh: I do not think it should take long. But the passages are long and the material has to be scrutinised.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: The book is widely being distributed and widely being read. Is it proper for the Government to allow circulation of the book when the whole thing is under examination?

Mr. Speaker: No question is allowed when the Minister is replying.

Shri Randhir Singh: The book should be proscribed.

Shri Swaran Singh: I also share the desire of the hon. Members that this examination should be expeditiously undertaken. I will do my best to ensure that the examination is quickly completed.

There is another aspect of the book, namely the political aspect, whether the author has tried to put a picture in such a manner that certain political personalities or our leaders have been criticised. There are two aspects of that. One is covered by what I have already described, namely, the disclosure of information which should not have been disclosed. The other is an expression of opinion about what happened. Some of these things, I would like to say again, have already come before this House. For instance, the statement made by Shri Jawaharlalji when he was going to Ceylon was explained by the late Prime Minister himself—Shri Jawaharlalji—on the floor of this House, explaining the circumstances under which that statement was made. He also explained the content of that statement and how it was made. If hon. Members are interested in the historical aspect, they can see those reports. In a nutshell what he said was that this was a broad instruction that was given on behalf of the Government, of which he was the head, that aggression is to be vacated and about the tactical methods, date, timing and manner in which it was to be undertaken, they were all left.....

Shri Randhir Singh: What about proscribing the book?(interruptions)

Mr. Speaker: This is a half an hour discussion and already more time has been taken.

Shri K. K. Nayar (Bahraich): Sir, I am rising on a point of order. Now, various questions have been addressed to the Defence Minister which touch many points. In the reply the Defence Minister has been pleased to tell us that the Government is contemplating penal action against General Kaul in various respects(interruptions) Hon. Members on the other side have been used to speak. They must now get into the habit of listening also. What I wish to point out is that the public mind is agitated and the discussion here today is a reflection of that agitation. The public wants to know what the truth is behind what General Kaul has said. We understand that Government is contemplating action against General Kaul....(interruptions) My point of order is this. Are we to be kept in the dark about the truth of what General Kaul has said; are we to be told merely that the Government are in the position of a person who is defamed and will take action for defamation but will not disclose whether the truth has been told and whether the defamatory aspersions are true or false.

Mr. Speaker: We have already spent 45 minutes on this. We will have to close the debate.

Shri Swaran Singh: I would like to clarify that those passages where criticism has been made against political leaders, those are, as I have mentioned already, divisible into two parts. One is expression of opinion of their handlings of the affair, about which we are well accustomed to hear comments, either of approbation or of criticism. We will examine that, but there are limitations, especially in the case of those who are not in Government, like Shri Krishna Menon, for instance. Unless he himself chooses to make any

[Shri Swaran Singh]

statement, trying to clarify those things which may in his view be essential for him, we can ask him only on those points about which disclosure of any information which should not have been disclosed are there where it is attributed to him. We can make informal enquiries from him on that issue. But on most of these things the expression of opinion will have to be matched by a counter-presentation. Certainly, Government will give a counter-presentation of important facts.

An hon. Member: When?

Shri Swaran Singh: We cannot go on contradicting each and every thing. After all, this is not the way we deal with these matters, but on important issues certainly we will examine this matter and where it is necessary we will also give the other version.

One other important point which requires a reply is the mention of certain meetings with foreign dignitaries, foreign press people and the like.

I would like to say very categorically that officers, civil and military, who are in Government service, can of course meet in certain cases, with prior permission at appropriate level, foreign dignitaries or ambassadors, but they are expected to make a report or keep a record of their talk and send it officially to the higher authorities so that one knows what took place.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: It is only with permission.

Shri Swaran Singh: I am coming to that.

The search that we have been able to make so far does not disclose that General Kaul had sent any minutes or record of his conversation with any of these representatives of foreign Governments and dignitaries. He has also himself mentioned in his book about the manner in which he had asked the then Defence Minister, Shri Krishna Menon, to permit him to have that meeting. For that one has to depend on his word. From the record, at any rate, we have not yet been able

to trace anything which might confirm it.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: He was asked, "Why do you not become a citizen of America?" It is in the book that that was the reply given.

Shri Swaran Singh: The rules on this issue are very clear and the general conduct that is expected of officers, both civil and military, is well-known and well-established.... (Interruption) If there is any contravention of that certainly that is a serious matter.

Shri Jyotirmoy Basu: Let us know how much of it is true and how much a lie in that book.

Shri S. S. Kothari (Maudsaur): Will the Government ever be firm in any serious matter?

Shri Swaran Singh: Government have been insisting that this normal code of conduct that is expected of senior officers in the context of their meetings with foreign dignitaries is consistently followed. We have taken a further decision that we will ensure that these meetings take place in accordance with that and that minutes etc. are prepared.

डॉ० राम मनोहर लोहिया : यह एक का मामला नहीं है—यह तीन का मामला है : नेहरू, मेनन, कौल ।

Shri Swaran Singh: Several other matters of detail have been asked and it will not be possible for me to go into all those details in this short time. But I would like to say only one or two things. Shri Chakrapani had asked whether any permission had been granted. I have already said that there is no record of any such permission and we have not been able to trace that.

About the meeting with foreigners I have already explained present position. It will not be fair to draw..... (Interruption)

Shri P. Venkatasubbalah (Nandy): On a point of order. Specific questions have been put and Shri Gopalan has made a specific case about *The Untold Story* and also about the writings of

General Kaul. The hon. Minister has taken 15 to 20 minutes but he has not met any of the points raised by hon. Members. The answer must be precise and to the point.

Shri Swaran Singh: I am very sorry that the hon. Member thinks that away. Because a large number of points had been made, I put them under various headings and have tried to give our view with regard to those points. We will go into all these matters in greater detail and at an appropriate time will inform this hon. House of the action that we have taken.

Shri Kanwarial Gupta (Delhi Sadar): The Untold Story remains untold.

Shri A. K. Sen (Calcutta North West): We wanted to put a few questions.

Mr. Speaker: Now it is too late. You cannot re-open the whole question now.

Shri Randhir Singh (Rohtak): I rose in my seat half a dozen times.

Mr. Speaker: There is no question of rising. Those who had given notice had been called.

Shri Randhir Singh: I have a very pertinent question.

Mr. Speaker: Now it is too late. The half-an-hour debate cannot be continued for more than an hour.

श्री मधु लिवडे : उन्होंने किसी प्रश्न का जवाब नहीं दिया। जब टोका तो कहा बाद में कहेंगे और बाद में बैठ गए।

श्री रणबीर सिंह : इस किताब की छपाई बन्द करवा देनी चाहिए। इस आदमी ने फौज में पार्टीबाजी फैलायी, चारों तरफ हिन्दुस्तान का नाम बदनाम कर दिया, नेफा में हमारे कितने ही हजार आदमी मरवा दिए और अब किताब लिख कर अपने को निर्दोष साबित करना चाहता है। इन को जेल में डाल देना चाहिए।

Mr. Speaker: If you are not satisfied, there are other methods of eliciting further information. The rules are there. You can certainly ask for

further information. There is no difficulty about that. There are so many occasions, the President's Address, the General Budget and so on, when these general issues can be raised. Here, the questions were asked by about a dozen Members and he answered them. If I allow further questions, then we will not be able to finish it. I have allowed everybody who gave notice of this half-an-hour discussion to put a question. If you are not satisfied, there are other methods of doing it. (Interruption).

Shri Jyotirmoy Basu: The Indian Army is getting demoralised.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. We now go to the next item. Shri Vajpayee.

Shri Randhir Singh: We want an assurance from the Minister that some action will be taken against the General.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE (Contd.)

WORK TO RULE CAMPAIGN BY THE TELE-
GRAPHISTS AND SENDING OF TELEGRAMS
BY POST

18.22 hrs.

श्री छदल बिहारी बाजपेयी (बलरामपुर):
आज सबेरे मैंने संचार मन्त्री का ध्यान दिलाया था डाक और तार विभाग के कर्मचारियों ने नियमानुसार काम करने का एक अभियान चलाया था और मेरे ध्यान दिलाने वाले नोटिस के जवाब में मन्त्री महोदय ने एक वक्तव्य दिया था। मैं उनसे दो सवाल पूछना चाहता हूँ। 27 दिसम्बर से यह अभियान चला और इस अभियान के दौरान में एक हजार अस्थायी कर्मचारियों को नौकरी से हटाने का नोटिस दिया गया और कर्मचारी संघ के लगभग सौ पदाधिकारियों को उन के पद से मुनसुल किया गया। मैं मन्त्री महोदय से जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या नियम के अनुसार काम करना ज़रूरी है? और अगर ज़रूरी नहीं है तो इन कर्मचारियों के विरुद्ध कार्यवाही क्यों की गई? और अब जब कर्मचारी संघ ने