

dustry (Shri Manubhai Shah): I beg to move:

"That in pursuance of sub-rule (1) (e) of Rule 4 of the Coir Industry Rules, 1954, as amended by SRO. No. 3983, dated the 12th December, 1957, the Members of Lok Sabha do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Speaker may direct, two Members from among themselves to serve as Members of the Coir Board for the next term to be specified by the Central Government."

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That in pursuance of sub-rule (1) (e) of Rule 4 of the Coir Industry Rules, 1954, as amended by SRO. No. 3983, dated the 12th December, 1957, the Members of Lok Sabha do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Speaker may direct, two Members from among themselves to serve as Members of the Coir Board for the next term to be specified by the Central Government."

The motion was adopted.

12.13 hrs.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS*—contd.

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up discussion and voting on Demand Nos. 8 to 10 and 115 relating to the Ministry of Defence for which 10 hours have been allotted.

Hon. Members desirous of moving their cut motions may send slips to the Table within 15 minutes indicating which of the cut motions they would like to move.

DEMAND No. 8—MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 49,62,000 be granted to the

President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, in respect of 'Ministry of Defence'."

DEMAND No. 9—DEFENCE SERVICES, EFFECTIVE

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 6,63,17,76,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, in respect of 'Defence Services, Effective'."

DEMAND No. 10—DEFENCE SERVICES, NON-EFFECTIVE

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 17,32,50,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, in respect of 'Defence Service, Non-effective'."

DEMAND No. 115—DEFENCE CAPITAL OUTLAY

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,45,53,92,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, in respect of 'Defence Capital Outlay'."

These demands are now before the House.

Shri Indrajit Gupta (Calcutta South West): **Mr. Speaker,** Sir, when we are discussing the Demands of the

*Moved with the recommendation of the President.

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

Defence Ministry this year, our thoughts must go first to all those men of the Indian army who will never come back again to their families and their dependants, the men many of whose bodies, I believe, were never recovered, as also to the men who have been in captivity and whom we expect to welcome back very soon amongst us, and also to all the others who may have been maimed and crippled beyond all recovery. All these men did their patriotic duty with great courage, and I believe that the whole purpose of the Defence Budget for the coming year is to use it in such a way and to spend it in such a way that a similar fate may not overtake our men again.

Then I would also like to say a word of good wishes to the new Defence Minister. I believe he, more than anyone else, is conscious of the very very difficult job and responsibility he holds. I am sure he cannot forget that the crisis caused by the Chinese aggression last October/November resulted in heavy casualties not only on the front, but also elsewhere, leading to the exit of his predecessor, the exit of the then Chief of the Army Staff, the exit of the Chief of the General Staff who was later Commander of the Task Force in NEFA. That is quite a heavy toll, and I am sure that the new Defence Minister, who will certainly have the wishes of this House that he would be able to do a good job, cannot but be haunted to some extent by the spectre of his predecessor behind him and perhaps—I do not know—the danger of another spectre of Shri Patnaik in front of him.

I do not wish to say very much about the background in which we are meeting to discuss these Demands. I mean the background of the crisis which we faced in October/November, because though I would like to say quite a lot about it, I refrain from doing so because we have been assured repeatedly on the floor of the

House that a top-level military probe is already on into the causes of those reverses. Therefore, I do not wish to rake up all the questions which have arisen in the minds of the people of this country, and very many suspicious and allegations, which may or may not be true, but which are certainly being bandied about everywhere in the market place. I hope the probe will be effective and thorough and will be able to get at the real facts.

Nevertheless, may I just refer to one or two questions without making any allegations against anybody, questions which, I think in all humility, should be considered in the course of this probe? I am sure they will be, but I just want to mention one or two things which worry everybody very much. Were these reverses due only—I stress the word 'only'—to inferior equipment, inferior firepower, and the superiority the Chinese enjoyed in numbers or the value of surprise in so far as they indulged in unconventional tactics—I would not call them guerilla tactics, the word 'guerilla' is being used very loosely nowadays, but certainly unconventional tactics? Were these the only factors responsible? That is to say, are we to be concerned in this probe only with the question of the physical build-up of our armed strength? Certainly that is a basic thing, but the probe must go into something else too. Because I believe that the history of the world is replete with examples and instances of armies which were inferior to their opponents in numbers and equipment but were able to hold their own and give a good account of themselves, and sometimes even won victory because they were superior in other things—in morale, in the individual consciousness of the fighting soldier, in discipline and training and were more ably led than their opponents. This is a question which has to be gone into, because if the Chinese certainly had the advantage of

surprise, we also had an advantage—we were fighting on our own soil, the Chinese were not. We had behind us a rear which was enthusiastic and patriotic and mobilised to a very high degree. We also had the advantage, I think, which is a political advantage but nevertheless very important, of the support, almost universal support I would say, of friendly Powers, who, by their words and deeds, succeeded in isolating the aggressor, and I believe played a very decisive part in compelling him to withdraw. ...

These are questions which arise because I found in the September number of the United Services Institution Journal, in an article written just on the eve of the Chinese attack, Maj. Gen. Som Dutt, considered I believe to be quite an expert in these matters, writes:

"The Chinese have paid considerable attention to the realities of life rather than to academic approaches to the methods of conducting war."

Then, he says:

"Whatever the circumstances be, however, where the people's support and military intelligence are not forthcoming, guerilla tactics by themselves can achieve little."

This was written before the Chinese attack. I would like to know in the light of the subsequent events whether our military leaders would be inclined to make a reassessment of this kind of thinking by what I may be allowed to call our top brass. Because, what happened? Did the Chinese have the people's support when they invaded our country? There is no evidence of that. It says, "people's support and military intelligence are not forthcoming." Then, are we to be driven to the conclusion that their military intelligence was superior to ours?

Many things have been said and heard and written and read by us. I do not want to go into all that. But I find it difficult to believe that the Indian jawan who has won so much military fame on battle fields abroad, who won renown as an unrivalled fighting man in North Africa and Italy under British officers when we were not yet independent, for some reason or other could not live up to his reputation—not courage, I am not questioning his courage, but his fighting capacity—when he was defending his own independent country, standing on his own soil and fighting under his own officers. I believe this is something which calls for a great deal of thought.

So, the questions that I would like to raise are in a very general way whether the morale and discipline in the army are what they used to be or not, and if not, why not. I hope the probe will go into this. Have we gone soft in some way or other, soft in relation to the standards which the Indian Army at one time kept before itself, if so, why and in what respects?

About our system of intelligence, I have heard that there is no separate system of military intelligence as such, that we have to depend for basic intelligence requirements on the Central Intelligence Bureau which functions under Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri. I do not know whether in any country this kind of system prevails.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): We have heard the same thing.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: I would like to know what the facts are.

Then, to my mind the key link in operational efficiency on the field is the question of the relations between the men and their officers, the confidence of the men in their officers. This probe must go into this question whether there has been any weakening of this key link, and if so, why,

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

who is responsible and how it can be rectified.

There is another question. If the basic training and the pattern of military exercises that we follow still remain based largely on the tactics and the thought of World War II, then surely it is time for us to wake up. I believe the conduct of individual men in the battle-field is, in the last resort, nothing but a reflection of the habits that they learn during their training.

I feel that there is some legacy that we have inherited from the British in this matter, this military matter, which we are very loathe to give up. It cost us dear and may cost us dear again unless we set our house in order. The final question is, whether a false "sense of security" let us down and, if so, to what extent. I believe that by and large this nation was kept in the dark as to the realities on the border. I am sorry to say that a section of the press has played its part in nursing very dangerous illusions among our people. All sorts of things, stories, were put out in the press, grossly under-estimating the fighting capacity and ability of the Chinese. I think there can be nothing more stupid than that. All sorts of stories were put out, telling us that they have no discipline; they have not got proper provisions and no food to eat; that they have not got proper clothing; that they do not know how to fight—all sorts of things. Therefore, when we are asked to hand over a grant of almost Rs. 900 crores to the Government to make proper arrangements for defending this country, I want to know whether we will be continued to be denied knowledge, some knowledge at least, of the pattern of spending simply on the ground of security.

In many matters, we often remind ourselves that we have modelled ourselves on the British model. May I just remind the Minister that if he

were to refer to the defence estimates of the British War Office, and the annual report of the British Secretary of War—which he submits at the time of the budget estimates—he will find that there is a marked contrast in the attitude towards security that we are displaying and the British are displaying. The amount of information that is there—I do not say everything must be given to us—is welcome. After all, this is the sovereign Parliament of the country. But even a paper like the *Statesman* was obliged to comment only a week ago as follows:

"New Delhi's thinking on security still runs on old, out-dated lines. Between the alien Government of former days and its reluctant subjects there was naturally a lack of rapport and trust; perverse caution in the dissemination of any information of any interest was then the order of the day; publication was against the public interest—according to bureaucratic thinking which was then final. This legacy has lasted too long since Independence which came sixteen years ago."

We have not given even the breakdown as to how this enormous sum of money is being allocated between the three services.

A few days ago, Shri Patnaik shot off his mouth in the United States, and there was a big furore in this country. I was sorry to read—I was not present in the House—that the Prime Minister has said that it is the practice in the United States to talk publicly much more about these things and therefore Shri Patnaik was adjusting himself to that practice. But I must say, without going as far as the United States, one thing: if we look at the United Kingdom, it is the parliamentary practice there. I am not concerned with practice outside Parliament. Who does not remember that the British House of Commons

carried on a prolonged and protracted debate on the rival merits of the Skybolt missile and the Polaris missile—which would be a better weapon? Especially in a matter of top military security, Britain did a thing like that—a debate on the rival merits of the two types of missiles, on which at one time it seemed that the fate of the British Government might depend. It was debated at length in the British House of Commons. I am not asking even for that type of thing here. But I would like to know what type of security is this, which is denied to the sovereign Parliament of this country,—even that much information which I am sure would leak out and will leak out to foreign powers. What is the meaning of this? I am sure that a carbon copy of any list of weapons and equipment which may be supplied to us surely goes to Pakistan and perhaps *via* Pakistan to China too now. But it will be denied to us. Therefore, this question of a false sense of security which may have played its part in the debacle of October-November should also be probed into, and I would request the Government to at least take this sovereign Parliament into its confidence as far as it is possible and not to give us this sort of Demands for Grants which it is almost impossible to understand anything about, because it is necessary to grasp the significance I think, of this enormous defence budget demands which have been placed before us by this Ministry.

For a country like ours the significance of this is something historic. In 1961-62, the defence Demands were of the order of Rs. 311 crores. In 1962-63, they were of the order of Rs. 376 crores. In 1963-64 they are of the order of Rs. 867 crores, which means an increase of 131 per cent. As a proportion of the total national revenue the Defence Demands for Grants in 1961-62 were 28 per cent, in 1962-63 they were 24.9 per cent and this year they are 41 per cent of the total revenue. Out of the increase by Rs.

610 crores in the total budget provision this year, defence alone accounts for an increase of Rs. 491 crores. This Rs. 867 crores is equal to £ 619 millions which, just as a matter of interest, is almost 40 per cent of the United Kingdom's defence budget of £ 1,665 millions in 1961-62—a major military power.

Therefore, I would just like to pose this question. What is the political and military significance of this huge burden which the Government of India has proposed and which, so far as I know, no one has opposed? We may have quarrelled over how you were going to realise this revenue, but certainly we have not quarrelled over the quantum of it. What is the significance? First of all, I would like to say, it has a significance which goes beyond our borders. For the world at large, for our friends as well as any potential aggressors or actual aggressors, it has a significance. I believe, it is a declaration of self-reliance in national defence. Otherwise, this Rs. 900 crores has no meaning. It is a declaration of self-reliance, it is a declaration of non-alignment from military blocs. I hope the Government realises it. I hope some of my friends on my left when they vote for the budget demands will realise that they are voting for non-alignment and standing on their own feet. Otherwise, as I said, it has no meaning, and we should not vote for it. It is a pledge to stand on our own feet, to build our own independent strength at the cost of enormous sacrifice and to rely on our own resources first and foremost. I think, Sir, this is really the fiscal counterpart of the foreign policy of non-alignment. It means that we are not prepared to walk into anybody's bloc. It means we are not prepared to crawl under anybody's umbrella for protection, because if we want to come under somebody else's umbrella we do not need Rs. 900 crores for it; it could be managed in a different way. This needs to be stressed because we all know that

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

very strong pressures are still being exercised in the country from inside and outside the ruling party, and I believe that the Government should resist them at all costs, because we have no desire to go the way of any country which belongs to SEATO or CENTO. At least one ex-Commander-in-Chief of the Indian Army is tub-thumping his way up and down the country. Because he is an ex-military man his words might be listened to with some amount of respect by people. He is certainly putting across this line of thought, which has nothing in common with the policy of self-dependence and self-reliance in the matter of defence.

Also,—though I may be overlapping a bit into the field of external affairs but it is so vitally bound up with the question of defence that I think the House should be reminded—though we are grateful for all the assistance that has come, from whichever side it may have come, we cannot remain blind to the fact that certain direct and indirect pressures or certain visible and invisible strings are sought to be attached. I cannot be blind to the fact that the United States' insistence on a settlement in Kashmir is certainly, it seems to me, hardening President Ayub Khan's intransigence. Anyone who has read his speech delivered last Friday in Lyallpur will know what he is saying. If this is the price which is to be extorted from us for arms aid, certainly we will not be prepared to pay that price.

Then, there is the right which, I believe, the United States has claimed and, according to the Press, we have conceded, that in the case of arms which are given to us by them two conditions have to be fulfilled. One is that these arms are not to be used except against China; and, secondly, the right to inspect and observe the use of these arms at the front must be given to United States military missions and observers. Now, it may be argued that they are giving us a

gift and, therefore, why should they not have this right. I would ask, what is the value of this gift? What is the grace in this gift? If we are their real friends and they claim to be real friends for giving us this gift of arms, is it that they cannot trust us as to how we use them? Sir, it is a very undesirable thing. If this is the price of free gifts of weapons, then too we should think about it seriously.

Then Sir, the United Kingdom Government, of course, is also helping us. But I cannot fail to see, at the same time, the fact—of course, it is within their right and one cannot question their right—that Britain is at the same moment negotiating with China to sell Britannia and Viscount planes to them for possible use to be converted into troop carriers. They can do it. It is their right. But what is the politics operating behind it? Therefore, Sir, I will say that this question, from whichever angle one looks at it, brings us back to the conclusion that, ultimately, when we are to rely on our own strength primarily and take assistance in a way which will not in any way infringe upon our national sovereignty, there is no other way out but to see that this enormous budget is expended to the best possible advantage by our own efforts and along lines which will yield the most positive results in the shortest possible time.

Then, an idea is being aired about, in the Press at least, that because the Chinese adopted certain unconventional guerilla tactics we should take the help or advice of American experts in this matter because they have the experience of fighting in Korea and South Vietnam. But I find from the American Magazine *News Week* that the Americans themselves have admitted that in the guise of advisers, experts and trainers there are 11,000 United States military personnel at this moment in South Vietnam and they have not been able to get the better of the guerillas who are fighting there in their own country. I

would like to know whether in our own armed forces there are not officers capable of assimilating and giving this type of training on mountain warfare or jungle warfare to our men. I believe there were Indian officers, at least a few, attached to the Chindits who went in the last war and dropped behind the Japanese lines in Burma and who operated there. Where are those officers? Why cannot we utilise their services? I hope the Defence Minister will go into this matter further.

Then, Sir, the significance of this budget at home, for our own people, is that this is the biggest sacrifice they have ever been called upon to make. They are going to willingly undertake much privation and suffering. But, in exchange for what? I believe it is in exchange for their right to demand that these defence grants are spent wisely and well, and the right to take the Government to task, and bring this Government to book if it fails, and the Parliament, as the representatives of the people, has that task too. "Maximum results; minimum waste" this is what we want to see.

I am not trying to go into the Audit Report which has been supplied to us, but it tells a very dismal tale, and I believe Audit Report year after year have told more or less the same tale of unutilized grants, shortfalls in key items, unwanted and obsolete surplus stores piling up all over the country, infructuous production—I am just going through the headings of this Report—non-utilisation of imported equipments, irregularity in handling tenders, avoidable delays leading to higher expenditure and so on. This is, I am afraid what the country has been going through and it will not tolerate a repetition of what has been revealed in this Audit Report and in the Report of the Public Accounts Committee. But, unfortunately, the risk of its repetition becomes all the greater because of the huge amount of money which is involved. A Ministry which is accustomed to spend rat-

her under Rs. 400 crores in a single year is now being given an amount of almost Rs. 900 crores, and we know very well how the second law of Parkinson operates—the more money you give to people to spend the more they spend.

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): They waste.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: They will spend more according to Parkinson's law. Therefore, it is a big responsibility which the Government is placing upon itself by asking for this enormous amount of money.

Just one or two points more and I am done. Of course, I have neither the capacity, nor the desire, to make any suggestions as to how it should be spent, but I would plead with the Government that some system of priorities has got to be fixed up very firmly. There is a lot of talk in the air of expanding everything. Of course, if one has got the resources, who would not want it? We want to expand the army, navy, air force, NCC, ACC, civil defence, production, everything.....

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): Except navy.

Shri Indrajit Gupta:.....and also get equipments from abroad. But, obviously, we have to cut the coat according to the cloth. Either we do that or we give up this policy and ask somebody else to come and protect us. As we are not in a position which will allow us in one year to have simultaneous expansion of all this—we cannot do it; this country is not in a position to do it—we must work out some sort of priorities and make the most direct and the least confused approach that we can towards our objective.

In this context, I would plead with the Government to consider the desirability of a plan. Why should the country not have a defence plan too, just like in other sectors? In the first instance I would plead, a three-year defence plan should be worked

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

out and put before the country, at least in its broad outlines. Unless we do that, I believe that spending will be haphazard, we will tend to live from hand to mouth and a whole lot of unnecessary expenditure will be incurred and unnecessary burdens will have to be placed on the people again and again. Therefore, remembering that we have not an up-to-date armament industry, and in matters of technology and scientific research we are well behind other advanced countries of the west, yet we have to do the job within the limited framework, I would suggest that the first requirement—I am only indicating what I consider to be a few of the major priorities; the operation requirements of the 2,500 miles of Himalayan border from Kashmir and Ladakh at one end to NEFA, Assam and Tripura at the other are naturally supreme—I would suggest that the first requirement is the professional army, of course, a mobile army, trained in a new way, capable of quick action, decisive action, adequately equipped at least with small arms of the latest varieties if possible, and trained in a new way. We want to see an army which can move through this kind of terrain, depending on its own supplies, without air-dropping, an army which can move at night across jungles where there is no track, an army which can climb over mountains without using lights. If others can do it, we will have to do it too. If we cannot, we shall never be able to defend this area successfully.

Secondly, the training of the individual soldier, in my opinion, should be directed towards making him a good individual fighting man, equipping him individually as a soldier with greater fire power. I am told, I do not know, that a majority of our jawans who were sent up for operational duties on the Himalayan borders, though they may be properly trained in other matters, though they may be very well trained for drill on

the parade ground and so on, they did not know how to climb a tree or how to swim a river. These are very obvious things. So, I think we shall have to consider what we mean when we say that we want a well-trained army and that too in large numbers.

Behind this border force, I think almost every one is agreed, assuming there is an aggression again and assuming the aggressor can come down to the plains, we need reserves of heavy armaments, tanks, air support and so on. That must come second; second or simultaneous; of course, I do not mean in the sense of time. Then comes helicopters, transport planes and reconnaissance planes. I am saying this because we are talking of the expansion of the Air Force in general terms. What is to be given priority? I would suggest that helicopters, transport planes and reconnaissance planes in the first place, without which the mobile type of army in this front will never be able to function and move. Then we need other logistical requirements like vehicles, mules, houses etc., which were adapted for that terrain. that, I am told, is being looked into, and the Minister has made some statement in the Consultative Committee of his Ministry. We also heard reports about how the wireless system broke down during the operations and how the messages were intercepted by the Chinese and so on. I do not know whether it is correct, but, in any case, high priority must be given to the organisation of an efficient and direct wireless network in those areas.

About the Air Force, I mentioned the need for a plan and said that the Air Force has got to decide now, looking ahead three or four years, what we are going to concentrate on, because nothing gets obsolete so soon as a fighting plane. Of course, I believe that the coming up of the MIG factory may prove the turning point

in one sense, in the same sense as the coming up of the Bhilai steel plant is having its repercussions in Rourkela and Durgapur. I hope and believe that the coming of the MIG plant may see an improvement in the production of the HF-24 and GNAT fighter and also the technical difficulties and bottlenecks which we are constantly being told about in the Annual Reports may now diminish after the MIG factory begins functioning properly. But that is not enough. As the Prime Minister has said in some statement which I read, we are thinking of buying missiles, ground to air missiles. If, so, we have to think seriously of scrapping our normal functional air force in the sense of fighters or fighter-bombers. I do not know what is the plan and what they are thinking of but the most elementary, the cheapest type of ground to air missile in the United Kingdom costs £ 30,000 to £ 50,000 each which means between Rs. 5 lakhs to Rs. 7 lakhs. Either we scrap the air force, as we know it popularly, and decide that in three to five years we shall switch over to missiles or, if it is a fantastic suggestion, we shall have to decide now what else we are going to do to expand our air force.

Coming to the navy, I asked a question the other day for this very purpose. I do not know if anybody seriously contemplates the possibility of aggression in the near future against us from the sea. By whom it will be carried out, I do not know. I am all for keeping the navy and expanding it and so on, because our very long coast line demands it. But where will it come in the system of priorities? We have invested in a very expansive aircraft carrier, though, I believe, we have not got aggressive designs against anybody else. But everybody knows that in modern warfare, the aircraft carrier is the most vulnerable possible target from the air. Would it not be better to think in terms of submarines and light torpedo craft. If so, how do we propose to acquire or build or get them?

Then comes the question of the Defence Research and Development Council. I feel a very high priority must be given to its work. Therefore, for fixing all these priorities, the question of a plan comes to the forefront and I would plead with the Government for thinking along these lines and preparing if not a five year plan, at least a three year plan, so that waste is cut down to the minimum and intolerable and unnecessary burdens are not put on the people year after year.

Finally I would say one word about defence production and I will have finished. There is a very dangerous portent to my mind in this country and that is the constant efforts which have been made and the voices which have been raised by certain interested quarters to give the private sector its share in the production of arms and equipment and weapons. I want a statement from the Government to this question when the reply is given to this debate, because it is a question of policy. What do they propose to do? Have they given any type of assurance direct or indirect to the monopolists of the private sector regarding this? At the moment, in the industry policy resolution, the production of arms and ammunition is reserved strictly for the public sector. We do not want private armament kings of the type that we see operating in certain western countries to develop in our country with all sorts of disastrous results, both military and political. We would insist that as far as production of weapons, arms and ammunition goes, this must be kept reserved for the public sector strictly and the necessary expansion should be carried out there. As far as other defence production goes, i.e. stores components and that type of thing, the whole mass of equipment which the Defence Ministry requires, there I have no quarrel with them.

This question came up a little while ago. I believe from my own experience of the engineering industry that there is plenty of unused idle capacity lying in the private sector,

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

which can be put to good use if it is properly assessed and it should be done, so that at least import substitution can go a long way forward and the bill we pay every year to foreign creditors may be cut down rapidly. I believe the railway equipment committee has done a much better job than the defence people have done in this respect. During the last war, the Director General of Munitions Production at that time used to go round personally from one private factory to another, assessing the capacity and the amount of surplus capacity which could be switched over to the needs of defence production. The Chairman of the Indian Engineering Association has made a statement in which he has given a long list of the different types of operations in which a very high percentage of unused capacity is lying idle. This should be put to good use. I have no objection to that at all, because it will mean saving very valuable foreign exchange. But as far as the question of arms and equipment goes, the private sector must not be allowed to intrude into this sector. If it does, it will be at own own peril.

I do not wish to take up more time. I am sure subsequent speakers will also refer to the conditions of the jawans and the necessity for some improvement in some directions which we are all feeling very urgently. I would have said a few words, but I will not. I will simply conclude by reminding the Defence Minister that there are some direction in which I believe that our jawans are probably treated worse than their equivalent ranks in the armies of other countries. I have no time to detail those steps; I hope subsequent speakers will mention them. Even in U.K. a committee has been set up under the chairmanship of Sir James Grigg, who was Finance Minister once in India, and that commission has recommended that the pays and pensions of the armed forces in the British army must be reviewed regularly at intervals of

not less than two years. I am not saying that we must imitate that and set up a similar procedure here. But this whole question must be given much more attention that it has been given in the past. If the jawan is to fight with more enthusiasm, more heroism, more energy and more self-dedication for the defence of the country, as we are sure he is capable of doing, those matters in which injustice is still being done to him, those matters in which there are deficiencies, must be made up as soon as possible. That is the least that they can demand of us. It is not enough simply to give lip service to their gallantry. We are doing that on every possible occasion. I do not believe that the fighting man is satisfied just by hearing politicians praising his courage. He has got enough and abundant courage; he does not want it from us. But he does want that we should use our powers to give him a fair deal, so that he will be more secure in this job and fight with a better heart.

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am very glad my friend, Mr. Indrajit Gupta, has made a very informed and constructive contribution today. But at the same time, I would like to warn the House about one very dangerous implication of the preliminary remarks that he had made in regard to the morale of our troops and the manner in which they have to be led. We do not want the introduction of that institution of political commissars into our defence forces. Once that is agreed upon, then we can proceed with the consideration of the suggestions that my hon. friend has made.

Before I proceed with my remarks, I would like to read the various suggestions that we have made in our cut motions in order to place before the House the points on which we would like the Defence Minister to give his reply and his consideration. Those points are narrated here. There is need to start more military Acade-

mies, Army Cadet Colleges, Sainik Schools, Army Educational Corps, Training Colleges and Centres; there is need also for having a permanent and another Committee of senior army officers to keep watch over the army expenditure in different departments and ensure economy and efficiency. There is also need for organising and recognising the powers and responsibilities of Army Council and the Defence Consultative Council. There is at present imbalance in the recruitment of officers between different areas and this should be rectified. There is slow progress in recruitment and training of commissioned and non-commissioned officers. There is also failure to ensure adequate protection from air raids into developed areas with the active co-operation and assistance of all friendly countries which had rushed to India's assistance during the last Chinese invasion. There is also failure to develop a nation-wide policy for providing pensions, gratuity and employment to the dependents of the personnel and officers who laid down their lives in the defence of the country and also for those who are permanently disabled in the course of the operations.

Then, there is need to re-organise the Army for guarding Ladakh and the North-Eastern border areas of the country by constituting a separate Himalayan Army and the need to equip the army with modern weapons used in fighting at high altitudes. There is also need to re-organise training at the various Command Headquarters and to train officers of the army in foreign countries in modern warfare whenever necessary and to the extent necessary. Then, there is need for increased welfare activities. There is need to strengthen the Air Force specially as also the Navy and to intensify the efforts concerning increased production through the Defence Production organisation. There is also need to re-organise the Armed Forces Information Centre and the Intelligence De-

partment and to provide accommodation to the Army personnel recruited during the emergency.

13 hrs.

My hon. friend, the hon. leader of the P.S.P. would be going in great detail about the failure to make a thorough probe into the political and military aspects of the recent reverses suffered by our army. Our hon. friend from the Communist party posed certain questions in regard to why we had to meet with those failures during the recent war that China had inflicted upon us. I need only say on very good authority that the Army feels terribly humiliated over the defeats that had come to be inflicted upon us and the manner in which it had been let down, both during that crisis and for over two or three years prior to that crisis, by the kind of political and military leadership that they were given and the country was vouchsafed from the Defence Minister and the Government as a whole.

Some hon. friends have been moot-ing the idea that it would have been a splendid thing indeed for the Government to have impeached the former Defence Minister. But what is the earthly use of taking up one particular Minister? It was the Government as a whole which really deserves to be impeached. But there is not political power enough in this country to impeach it. They can certainly re-organise and reshape themselves and in that way make their obsequance to the country, but they are not prepared to do that also.

My hon. friend from the Communist Benches had given a warning to the new Defence Minister. I join with him in welcoming the new Defence Minister . . . (*Interruption*). I also wish him all success. By wishing him all success I am wishing all success to the country as a whole. I hope that the new Defence Minister will not commit the mistakes that the earlier

[Shri Ranga]

defence Minister had committed. Those earlier mistakes could have been excused if nobody in this country had given him timely warnings; but in spite of those warnings the earlier Defence Minister did what he did or failed to do what he failed to do with the result that the armies, as everyone has said before, were out-manned, outweaponed, outgeneralled and also outnumbered. It was not because proper morale was not there. Indeed our troops were highly patriotic. If there were to be any kind of a political tinge that has to be given to our defence forces, it is only of patriotism and I am glad to say that our armies and our defence forces as a whole are as patriotic, if not more, as all those of us who are not in the defence forces but whose duty it is to stand by our defence forces. What was lacking for them was what was not given by the Government, namely, proper leadership and proper generals.

We, on this side of the House, had many occasions to warn the Government about the manner in which the then Defence Minister and various others who were associated with him were trying to import politics, groupism, personal idiosyncracies and choices and favouritism into the armies and about the manner in which the leadership of our army and the defence forces was being developed, put together and kept together. But all our warnings were not heeded. We know the result. My hon. friend wants the present Defence Minister to wonder why the earlier Defence Minister had become an earlier one, why the earlier Chief of Army Staff had become an earlier Chief of Army Staff and why another Commander had become an ex-Commander. He should know the reason; the former Defence Minister should know the reason; the earlier Parliament as well as this Parliament also should know the reason because we had been giving these warnings in spite of the frets and frowns of the hon. Prime Minister.

Before I go to the next point let me say that it is not only the defence forces which feel terribly humiliated—and rightly so—but the country as a whole and, at least for my part, I feel awfully humiliated when I found the hon. Prime Minister saying that, after all, in India we only had a few reverses in two or three battles and therefore he felt humiliated by some other people saying that the whole nation was feeling humiliated. All that I can do is to repeat, once again, that I feel humiliated indeed over this attitude displayed by the leader of the Government.

Then, let me take up the need for constituting a Himalayan Army. Of course, generally we say that there is an army, but what I suggest is a number of armies which are given names and numbers also and in that manner I want a Himalayan Army which will be specially constituted, provisioned, trained and armed so that it will be able to operate at high altitudes both in guerilla fashion and in the conventional manner of armies. Everyone knew that so many people from different parts of the country had to go and fight and they fought wonderfully under the most adverse circumstances. But, nevertheless, if a greater percentage of them had been people recruited from the five Himalayan regions, surely our armies could have given a better account of themselves. The sufferings that came to be inflicted upon our people not only by the Chinese but also by the climatic conditions and various other difficulties could have been minimised if only Sikkimese, Nepalese, NEFA people, Bhutanese, Ladakhis and Kashmiris had been recruited in larger numbers and were given the necessary status and strength.

This does not seem to be a revolutionary suggestion because the Ministry itself is thinking of providing special facilities for people who have got to operate at high altitudes and in the Himalayas. They are themselves suggesting additional allowances for them. What I suggest is that it is not

enough to offer additional allowances only but it is necessary to recruit them on a different basis and start them on a different salary basis as also allowances, equipment and all these things so that those people will not have any worry at all in regard to their creature comforts and the necessary equipment. Secondly, they would be able to fight much more spiritedly since they would have the feeling that they are defending their own home and hearth, their own regions and their own cultural environments. So, I hope, my hon. friend, the Defence Minister, will try to give some consideration to this suggestion.

I am glad that they have decided to promote the Jammu and Kashmir Militia battalions and designate them as Ladakh Scouts. Instead of tinkering with this matter in this manner, desirable though it is, it is much better for them to take up that bigger possibility of constituting a Himalayan Army.

Then, there is also need for giving representation, or rather for speedily recruiting more and more officers. There seems to be a niggardly policy at present. If you take more and more of them, it is quite possible that immediately all of them might not come to be employed and needed. But it is best to have as many of them as possible in the Reserve List, pay them a retaining fee, if necessary, and keep them waiting on the waiting list so that at any moment a bigger emergency than the present one comes upon us the Government would be able to lay its hands on that list and send for all these people to come to our rescue.

Then, we want military intelligence. Now, in regard to this matter, it is difficult for me to feel quite secure because we have forces in our country which are aligned with Soviet Russia and China on one side and also with Pakistan on the other. Therefore, I am not quite sure how much of information I can possibly expect our Defence Minister to place at our disposal. I would like to have a full

discussion with him and also with the Prime Minister and more than that, rather along with the Chiefs of Staff. Otherwise, there will be danger. Indeed even now, what you call, about the labourers, the workers, who are employed in the ordnance factories, are we quite sure that a larger percentage of them are entirely tuned only to the call of our motherland and the urge of patriotism and not influenced by some of those highly strung political minds of people whose international contacts and international alliances and international loyalties are found to be so very inconvenient at this present juncture. I am in favour of self-reliance. We are all in favour of the present Defence budget, the amount of money that my hon. friend, the Finance Minister, has found it possible to place at the disposal of the Defence Ministry, not because we feel sure that this money is likely to be spent in a foolproof efficient manner, not because we feel sure that no wastage would take place, but because of our urge of patriotism that there is in the minds of the people and also ourselves. But I do not feel sure that this money would be enough. My hon. friend the Communist spokesman was wondering whether we were not placing too much money at the disposal of this Government.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: I never said that.

Shri Ranga: It is quite possible. Well, that is the import of what he said as I thought. I am subject to correction. But, anyhow, one thing is clear that it is quite possible that the Defence Ministry may not be able to spend all this money within the particular one year usefully and efficiently without wasting anything at all. Therefore, they cannot be too sure about it. That was the reason why I ventured to make that suggestion to you and through you to the Government that they should think of appointing a high-powered committee whose duty should be to examine from

[Shri Ranga]

time to time not only their estimates but also the manner in which they would be incurring this expenditure so that then and there the suggestions could be given to them to enable them to avoid any wastage. One per cent of wastage out of this sum of Rs. 870 crores or Rs. 880 crores comes to Rs. 8.8 crores and 2 or 3 or 4 per cent of wastage till now has been taken to be, more or less, normal. If that was to be indulged in now, then it will be a very serious matter indeed for our national economy because some of those new taxes that my hon. friend has come to impose now again over which there is so much righteous indignation and dissatisfaction in the country are expected to yield nearly Rs. 25 crores and the 3 per cent of wastage would come to that amount. Therefore, the Defence Minister cannot be too careful about it. Having said that, may I ask, have they got the necessary organisational equipments to spend this money efficiently and satisfactorily during this particular period? If I am to judge the achievement of the Defence Ministry from what has happened during the last three or four years, I cannot feel quite so sure about it. There were the 'Shaktiman' and there were the Japanese trucks. The former Defence Minister told us that he was going to produce all these things at a great speed and we know their failure. It was only five or six crores of rupees that were involved in it. Here we are placing at the disposal of the Defence Ministry hundreds of crores, more than what they had last time. Therefore, may I know, would it be possible for them to spend it efficiently and satisfactorily? I am glad my hon. friend, the Finance Minister happens to be here and I hope he will try to go into the kind of the Finance Minister that we used to have before the Planning Commission had come and begin to exercise those powers not in order to inhibit proper expenditure but in order to see that this expenditure is incurred in a satisfactory, efficient and useful manner.

Then, there is the question of leadership for the army. I am told—and I speak subject to correction—that in England they have an Army Council consisting of the Chiefs of Staff and he disposes of almost all problems of discipline, organisation and internal management and the Defence Minister is not expected to interfere and he does not interfere. It is only when his advice is sought or when the Chiefs of Staff are not able to agree amongst themselves, or when high matters of State are involved, the Defence Minister's interference is invoked or is indulged in. I would like a similar practice to be developed in this country. Maybe, it used to be there some years ago but the earlier Defence Minister had started monkeying with it and, therefore, there is all the greater need for the present Defence Minister to adopt this practice.

In regard to the recruitment of these officers and their training, not only greater speed has got to be followed but also the training period has also got to be shortened. They have themselves agreed in principle. Now, I would like that to be gone into very carefully so that more and more people can be trained and more frequently, more rapidly and what is more, till now if anybody were to examine the manner in which all these various Generals have come from various parts of the country and also other ranks, one would find there is a great imbalance. We would like an assiduous efforts to be made, a conscious effort to be made and sincere effort to be made by the Defence Ministry to see that from every part of India as many people as possible are encouraged to come and join the army and the defence forces so that the whole of India will be taking part in the defence of our country.

Will this money be enough? The answer that is given by what we learn from the press about the talks that our Ministers are having with various representatives of America,

England and various other countries, is that it is not enough. This is not the amount that will have to be spent during the next year in developing our defence equipment. So much more would be needed. How much more, we do not know. We would like the Defence Minister to give us some idea as to what we are now providing for would go half-way or one-third way, or one-fourth way, or three-fourths way. How much more we would have to depend on other countries? Certainly we have got to depend on other countries in order to make ourselves completely self-reliant, to use that word in another way, as against the Chinese. We do not know, when the Chinese are going to come. The Chinese themselves have been talking in a very warlike manner and they have been attributing to us a warlike spirit which we do not seem to exhibit that we are starting our own military stations on the borders of Sikkim on their side, that we are having reconnaissance flights and the rest of it. Here is our Prime Minister who says, and he has been saying so, we would not touch Longju although it once belonged to us just because we have given word that we are not going to interfere with it today. That is the Prime Minister we have, peace-loving as he is. Yet, the Chinese go on making these accusations as it has become their habit. They accuse us of things which they try to do themselves, which they have already begun to do or which they are going to do. That is how they are going to trouble us. If they are going to trouble us, we do not know when the invasion is likely to take place? Is it likely to take place in the manner in which it took place last time? Did our Ministry know that it was going to take place in that manner? I cannot ask them for enlightenment now because they may not possess it.

But, one thing is clear. The Prime Minister and some other people have given to understand during that crisis that Delhi is one of the nearest places to their jumping off places

from Tibet, for their planes. May be 1 hour or 1 hour and 30 minutes. Most of our cities are in danger of being destroyed. The British were at one time wiser when they did not build the multi-storey buildings in Delhi. Now, we thought we have become wiser and we have built all these things and spent all the money and taxed the people. What is going to happen to all these things? The Prime Minister was himself in jitters. So were we, because we do not wish to lose all these things. So we want air protection. Whether you call it air umbrella or air armada or anything you like, we need it. Have we got any equipment in our country? They themselves have said that we do not have more than a few hundred. Everybody says that the Chinese have got thousands. Who supplied all these things to them? My friend says that these M. I. Gs. are going to start a new chapter for us. Two have come. Twelve are to be in our possession in some time to come. But, the Chinese have got hundreds of them.

An Hon. Member: Thousands.

Shri Ranga: Whether it comes to thousands or not, anyhow, hundreds they have got. Who supplied them? My friend wants us to be warned about America and England, that England is likely to send Skymasters to China. Here is Russia which has been building up all these equipments for China for all these years.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: They are building it for you also.

Shri Ranga: Yes. They have built for us. They have built these friends also for us. We cannot afford to be complacent. (*Interruptions*) We must be self-reliant. I agree. That is why my friends, I think, have become self-reliant by asking all those people who are pro-China for the time being to take leave from their party and themselves have become self-reliant now. That is not the kind of self-reliance that we want. We want self-reliance here in our country by strengthening ourselves, not

[Shri Ranga]

only with our own equipment, but with all the equipment that all other countries including Soviet Russia, are willing, are good enough, are sensible enough to provide to us. If Russia is going to give all that, we have not said No. Indeed, the Americans themselves have not said No; the British or anybody else.

In fact, my friends the Communists and also those friends from the Congress benches are so much in love with their dogma of nonalignment. So are the Americans. So are the British. They think that they are going to be partners with us in this terrific fight that we have got to wage with the Chinese in order to liberate our country. If they are to be partners in this common fight, they would not like us to be fighting on two fronts. That is why they want some kind of a settlement,—that these two countries are sensible enough to have a settlement between themselves, India and Pakistan. Not because they want to impose it on us. If we do not want to be friends with Pakistan, we are welcome. Only Pakistanis are suffering from the suicidal mania that they have begun to behave in such an inhuman and indecent manner. They have made it absolutely impossible for us to think about them in a friendly manner because of their cussedness. It is no fault of England or America. Then, again, they do not want us to be on unfriendly terms with Soviet Russia however closer Russia is with China. Their New Year Message is there. In spite of that, my friends have the temerity to think like this and give sermons. The New Year Message was given by Khrushchev. He warned the whole country, the whole world lest they should think that China and Russia might possibly fight among themselves. They would never do so, he said. They were blood brothers.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): In case of attack, they would go to their aid.

Shri Ranga: In case of attack they would go to their help. I have no

objection. The only trouble is, China has picked up a quarrel with us. That is why we have to see who are our friends and who are not. There are some people who would be neutral. Soviet Russia may be neutral; may be somewhat friendly; more friendly towards China. We cannot forget that. Here are countries which are friendly. They have given us support last time. Hundreds of crores worth of stuff has been flown into our country. It is extraordinary for anyone who has got a proper sense of gratitude and grace to begin to throw doubts in the face of the fact that every day an aeroplane came filled with armaments. They were rushing to our rescue. If all these things had not come, we do not know whether the Chinese would have declared cease fire at the moment that they declared it. We want that support to come.

If these people were to come, we want them to come as friends, not as masters. There, we are one with the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister is one with the country. I am sure these people have got the sense enough not to think in terms of any kind of strings at all. They have displayed that statesmanship even earlier. When they went to Korea, did they occupy Korea? They prevented the Chinese from occupying the whole of Korea. After they had liberated Korea up to the particular parallel, did not the Americans go back? We do not want the Americans to come in that manner also into our country: not even in that manner. We want the Americans, the British—we make no bones—we want all the other countries, Canada, Australia, West Germany, France and all the democratic countries who want to help us to come into common comradeship with us in order to fight against Chinese communism.

Shri Tyagi: Comradeship means becoming communists.

Shri Ranga: No, no. I do not want to give the monopoly of the use of that word to the communists.

We want a victory plan into which development also will be dovetailed. We do not want a distinction to be carried on as the Prime Minister wants us to accept between development on the one side and war preparations on the other. Priorities there must be. The very first priority should be given to defence, to victory. To this end, let there be development. In the course of the development, we certainly do stand for the State alone undertaking the responsibility of producing armaments in this country. That is not enough. They have had their experience of the ordnance factories. They say they are working overtime by paying so much more. That is a wastage. I want more ordnance factories to be started. They say that they are starting 12. How long are they going to take? I think my hon. friend the present Defence Minister will not be so erratic as his predecessor by changing his orders every month, every three months, every four months, as it happened in 1962 and 1961. Ordnance factories could not be brought into existence and covered accommodation could not be created. Even the initial steps could not be taken. I hope he will learn from all that experience. He is going to start 12 ordnance factories. How soon, where, in what areas, all these things will have to be tested. It is going to take a long time, if they are not going to be dynamic. Twelve will not be enough. Twenty-four would be needed. Every State has got to be provided with one or two ordnance factories. New people have got to be taken in, those people who have not been touched, singed and catapulted into an ideology which is barren of patriotism and which is alien to patriotism. That is very necessary just as we have found it necessary to recruit our own people in order to man our own trawlers which are playing in the Brahmaputra instead of having to depend on Pakistan. Similarly, we have to develop our ordnance factories. With this end in view, these ordnance factories will have one motto and one motto only,

to produce more and more to be placed at the feet of our Mother India.

Then, lastly, I am anxious that so much more has got to be done for our jawans. No opportunity should be given for any to give—what should I say—brain-washing to them. Our jawans have to be paid more, so much more. The country is ready. In fact, the money given that way will not be wasted in any way. Their allowances have got to be stepped up. Better equipment has to be provided for them. Welfare services also have to be stepped up. After having done all this, accommodation has got to be provided. The Minister of Housing was bewailing that he had not enough money. I would rather money were taken away from that Ministry and given over to this Ministry in order to provide accommodation for our officers and defence personnel. There should also be covered accommodation for the equipment. In all these directions, dynamic steps will have to be taken.

I would like this Ministry to be reorganised so that it can become much more compact. At the same time, let them have, if they want, any three of the best Ministries to go and aid the Defence Ministry. Let not the Defence Ministry feel jealous of the Ministry of Economic and Defence Co-ordination. Let it not make the Ministry of Economic and Defence Co-ordination feel unhappy because it has not got any work or anything like that. Both these Ministries are needed, and they have got to be dovetailed into each other; the military production has to be dovetailed with civilian production. The private enterprise, the people's enterprise, and the peasants and workers are also only too willing to place as much of their own production as possible at the disposal of the Defence Forces provided the Defence Forces will have statesmanship and dynamism enough to welcome their co-operation and stimulate their co-operation and provide the necessary incentives.

In this manner, I would like the Defence Ministry to be reorganised

[Shri Ranga]

and strengthened. I wish well of the Defence Ministry and also of our country with all the money that we are placing at their disposal. Let me hope that when I come back again next year to deal with the Defence Ministry's Demands, India will be in a happier position and a better position, and it would not be necessary for me to take the same stand that I had taken yesterday that such and such a Ministry should be dismissed.

Mr. Speaker: According to intimation since received from Members, the following cut motions are desired to be moved to Demands for Grants relating to the Ministry of Defence. Hon. Members may move them subject to their being otherwise admissible:

Cut Motion Nos. 1 to 4, 6 and 10 to 14 as shown in List Nos. 1, 2 and 3.

Shri Yashpal Singh (Kairana): I beg to move:

(i) "That the demand under the head Ministry of Defence be reduced by Rs. 100".

[*Unsatisfactory arrangements in NEFA and Ladakh before or after the Chinese Aggression. (1)*]

(ii) "That the demand under the head Defence Services, Effective be reduced by Rs 100".

[(i) *Need for reorganisation of army, (ii) need to strengthen the air-force and navy, (iii) need for conscription in the country, (iv) need to strengthen the intelligence department in army, (v) method of promotions in the high ranks of the army personnel, and (vi) method of awarding the medals to the army personnel who fought in the NEFA and Ladakh in 1962-63. (2)*]

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I beg to move:

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

[*Failure to make a thorough probe into the political and military aspects of the recent reverses suffered by our army. (3)*]

Shri A. V. Raghavan: I beg to move:

(i) "That the demand under the head Defence Services, Effective be reduced to Re. 1".

[*Discrimination between Officers and Other Ranks in the matter of annual increments. (4)*]

(ii) "That the demand under the head Defence Services, Effective be reduced by Rs. 100".

[*Need to (i) increase the pay and allowances of Jawans, (ii) allot more funds to the State Post War Reconstruction Fund Committee, (iii) provide better service conditions for the employees of the various State Soldiers, Sailors and Airmen's Boards, (iv) ensure employment facilities to ex-servicemen, (v) provide funds for starting ex-Servicemen's Co-operative Societies, (vi) reserve 25 per cent of vacancies for war service candidates, (vii) provide family quarters for married Jawans, (viii) provide dearness allowance to Jawans at the same rate as allowed to civilian employees of the Defence Ministry, (ix) relax regulations to enable better opportunities of promotions to higher ranks. (6)*]

Shri Vishram Prasad: I beg to move:

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

[*Failure to (i) maintain adequately-equipped army on the border, and (ii) guard the North-East frontier border of the country. (10)*]

Shri Sivamurthi Swamy: I beg to move:

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

[*Need for immediate action to remove the Chinese from Nefa and Ladakh on Northern border of our motherland. (11)*]

Shri Vishram Prasad: I beg to move: "That the demand under the head Defence Services, effective, be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to (i) reorganise the army for guarding the North-East and Ladakh border areas of the country, (ii) increase the strength of the Army, (iii) equip the Army with modern weapons used for fighting at high altitude, (iv) open more recruiting centres, (v) reorganise training at various Command headquarters, (v) train officers of the Army in foreign countries in modern warfare, (vii) increase welfare activities of the Naval personnel, (viii) strengthen the Air Force, (ix) strengthen the Navy, (x) increase the number of training centres for Pilots and Ground Engineers, (xi) intensify the efforts concerning increased production through Defence Production Organisation, (xii) re-organise Armed Forces Information Centre, (xiii) provide accommodation to the Army personnel recruited during the emergency, (xiv) expand Territorial Army Units, (xv) expand and increase Lok Sahayak Sena Camps, (xvi) establish National Volunteer Rifles, (xvii) expand the activities of the Indian Navy, and (xviii) equip the Naval Research Group with modern instruments. (12)]

Shri Sivamurthi Swamy: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head Defence Services, Effective be reduced by Rs. 100".

Need for effective steps to strengthen Defence Services to meet the challenge of Chinese aggression (13).

"That the demand under the head Defence Capital Outlay be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Need for building up our defence factories for production of modern arms. (14)]

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह: अध्यक्ष महोदय, यहां पर बहुत जोरों के साथ कहा गया है कि जनता के ऊपर ह्यूज बर्डन है, एनामर्स अमाउंट है। मैं जरा सा अपने बजट के ऊपर आप का

ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूं। पीस टाइम का बजट एक होता है और वार टाइम का बजट दूसरा होता है। भारत वर्ष पीस टाइम में अपनी नैशनल इनकम का कुल २.५ परसेन्ट डिफेंस पर खर्च करता था जब कि यू० के० अपने बजट का ६.५ परसेन्ट, यू० एस० ए० ६.५ परसेन्ट, साउथ कोरिया ७.४ परसेन्ट, मलाया ३ परसेन्ट, इंडोनीशिया ४.६ परसेन्ट, इजराइल ६.३ परसेन्ट और पाकिस्तान ३ परसेन्ट खर्च करते थे। इस प्रकार से आप देखेंगे कि पीस टाइम में हिन्दुस्तान दुनिया के सब देशों से कम अपनी सुरक्षा व्यवस्था पर खर्च करता था। अगर वार टाइम के बजट को आप देखें तो यू० के० में उस की नैशनल इनकम का ५२ परसेन्ट खर्च होता था, यू० एस० ए० में ४५ परसेन्ट खर्च होता था, लेकिन आज जो हमारा बजट है उस में हम कितना खर्च करते हैं? हम अपनी नैशनल इनकम का सिर्फ ५ परसेन्ट खर्च करते हैं। उस के लिये भी हमारे यहां कहा जाता है कि यह ह्यूज बर्डन है, एनामर्स अमाउंट है। मैं इस चीज को नहीं समझ पाता कि जब भारतवर्ष के ऊपर विपत्ति आई हुई है तब हमारा बजट कितना होना चाहिये।

13.33 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

जब हम ५ परसेन्ट खर्च करते हैं वार टाइम में तब छोटा सा कंट्री इजराइल पीस टाइम में ६.३ परसेन्ट खर्च करता था।

हमारे दोस्त ने यहां पर कुछ आंकड़े दिये, लेकिन वे आंकड़े ठीक नहीं हैं। मैं सेंट्रल बजट से पढ़ कर आप को बतलाना चाहता हूं कि सन् १९५७-५८ में जब कि हमारे पूर्व डिफेंस मिनिस्टर थे उस समय हमारे बजट का ट्रेड क्या था। उस समय से हमारा बजट घटता चला गया। सन्

[श्री रघुनाथ सिंह]

१९५७-५८ में हम ३५ परसेन्ट डिफेन्स पर खर्च करते थे, सन् १९५८-५९ में ३१ परसेन्ट खर्च करते थे, सन् १९५९-६० में हम २६ परसेन्ट खर्च करते थे, सन् १९६१-६२ में भी २६ परसेन्ट खर्च करते थे, सन् १९६२-६३ में हम २३ परसेन्ट खर्च करते थे। इस प्रकार से जैसे जैसे भारतवर्ष की सीमा पर चीन और पाकिस्तान का जोर बढ़ता गया वैसे वैसे हम अपने डिफेन्स बजट को सिकोड़ते चले गये और वह स्थिति आ गई कि भारतवर्ष पर आक्रमण हुआ तथा हम भारतवर्ष की रक्षा करने में असमर्थ हुए।

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: In terms of money, what was the amount?

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : इस में अमाउंट भी दिया हुआ है। वह भी इसी प्रपोज़न से हुआ है। इस प्रकार से आप देखेंगे कि अब जो हमारा ४१ परसेन्ट खर्च हो रहा है वह सन् १९५७-५८ से सिर्फ ६ परसेन्ट ज्यादा है।

श्री त्यागी : किस चीज़ का परसेन्ट ?

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : सारे बजट का। हम सन् १९५७-५८ में जो खर्च किया करते थे उस से यह सिर्फ ६ परसेन्ट ज्यादा है।

दूसरी बात मुझे नेवी के बारे में कहनी है। श्री इन्द्रजीत गुप्त ने उस को थोड़ा सा स्पर्श कर के ही छोड़ दिया। अगर हम चीन की जल शक्ति को देखें तो पायेंगे कि आज से पहले उस के पास केवल २५ सबमैरीन्स थीं, लेकिन आज वह दुनियां की चौथी शक्ति है। वह चौथी शक्ति इस प्रकार है कि यू० एस० ए० के पास सब से ज्यादा सबमैरीन्स हैं। उस के बाद रूस आता है, उस के बाद ब्रिटेन आता है और चौथा नम्बर है चीन का। आज से दो वर्ष पहले मैंने कहा था कि हिन्दुस्तान में सबमैरीन्स बनाने की व्यवस्था होनी चाहिये क्योंकि हिन्दुस्तान के पास एक भी सबमैरीन

नहीं है। उस वक्त कहा गया कि सबमैरीन अफेन्सिव वेपन है। और चूंकि वह अफेन्सिव वेपन है इस लिये हम उस को नहीं बनाना चाहते। मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि सबमैरीन अफेन्सिव वेपन नहीं है, वह डिफेंसिव वेपन है। आज दुनियां की स्ट्रैटेजी १८ वर्ष बाद बहुत बदल गई है। जो हथियार या जो युद्ध नीति हमारी १८ साल पहले हो सकती थी वह आज नहीं है। आज वारशिप बिल्कुल बेकार हैं, डिस्ट्रायर बिल्कुल बेकार हैं। आज सबमैरीन का स्थान पहला और एअर-क्राफ्ट का स्थान दूसरा है।

आप लोगों ने अभी थोड़े दिन पहले पाकिस्तान की एक खबर पढ़ी होगी कि माल द्वीप में पाकिस्तान अपना जल अड्डा बनाने जा रहा है। साथ ही साथ सबमैरीन बेस वह ईस्ट, और वेस्ट पाकिस्तान, दोनों परफ बनाने के लिये तैयार हो रहा है। इस का मतलब यह है कि हिन्दुस्तान की जो सामुद्रिक सीमा है वह पश्चिम में पश्चिमी पाकिस्तान से, पूर्व में पूर्वी पाकिस्तान से और दक्षिण में मलक्का द्वीप से घिर जाती है। आज हमारे पास अदन नहीं है, आज हमारे पास सिंगापुर नहीं है और हमारा इंडियन ओशन घिर गया है। अगर हमें हिन्दुस्तान की रक्षा करनी है तो हमारी शक्ति भारतीय समु में इतनी ज्यादा होनी चाहिये कि कोई भी अटैकिंग आर्मी आये, हम उस का सामना कर सकें।

एक माननीय सदस्य : आर्मी ?

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : हां, अटैकिंग नेवी।
I do not come from a maritime State, as my hon. friend does.

अब आप चाइना की शक्ति को देखिये। जैसा मैंने कहा चाइना सबमैरीन के मामले में आज दुनियां की चौथी शक्ति है। उस के पास पेट्रोल वेसेल्स २४ हैं, मोटर गन बोट्स

५५ हैं मोटर टारपीडो बोट्स १३६ हैं, लैंडिंग शिप्स ३० हैं, लैंडिंग क्राफ्ट्स ३५० हैं। इन आंकड़ों के विरुद्ध हिन्दुस्तान के पास एक भी जहाज नहीं है। यह किस बात का द्योतक है? यह इस बात का द्योतक है कि चाइना ने जो अपनी शक्ति बनानी आरम्भ की है वह इस आधार पर आरम्भ की है कि अगर हिन्दुस्तान के कोस्ट पर हमला करने की आवश्यकता हो तो वह बड़े सुभीते से हमला कर सके। इस से हमें जरा होशियार रहने की आवश्यकता है। अगर हम थोड़ा होशियार नहीं होते तो इस का फल यह होगा कि जैसी हमारी अवस्था नेफा एरिया में हुई वैसी ही अवस्था हमारे कोस्ट की भी होगी। आप इस को जरा देखिये तो सही हमारा लैंड बार्डर ६४२५ मील है, कोस्टल लाइन ३५३५ मील है। अर्थात् हमारी सीमा का २७ परसेन्ट कोस्टल लाइन है। लेकिन हम ने अपने डिफेन्स बजट में जो नेवी के लिये रक्खा है वह डिफेन्स बजट का सिर्फ २.५ परसेन्ट है, इस साल दिया गया है। इस में यह लिखा गया है कि पहले से ३६ लाख ३१ हजार ६० और ज्यादा दिया जायेगा। केवल ३६ लाख। इस प्रकार से आप देखिये कि हम ने नेवी के वास्ते कोई खास बात नहीं की। हम ने सन् १९५६-६० में १४ करोड़ रक्खा, सन् १९६०-६१ में १८ करोड़ रक्खा, सन् १९६१-६२ में १६ करोड़ और सन् १९६२-६३ में भी १६ करोड़ रक्खा, और सन् १९६३-६४ में उस के पिछले साल से केवल ३६ लाख ६० ज्यादा रक्खा है एफेक्टिव सर्विस का। अगर इस में नान-एफेक्टिव सर्विस का २ करोड़ ६० और मिला लें तो ज्यादा से ज्यादा २३ करोड़ ६० होता है। अगर आप समझते हैं कि इतने छोटे से बजट में आप अपनी समुद्री सीमा की रक्षा कर सकेंगे तो आप ऐसा करने में अपने को असमर्थ पायेंगे। आपके पास काफी जहाज नहीं होंगे और अपनी रक्षा करने की व्यवस्था नहीं होगी, तो उस अवस्था में आप अपनी समुद्री सीमा की रक्षा करने में असमर्थ होंगे।

शायद हमारा सुरक्षा मन्त्रालय इस प्रकार से सोच रहा है जैसे कि सैंकिड बल्ड वार के समय चर्चिल और रूजवेल्ट सोचा करते थे कि आधुनिक युद्ध में नेवी की कोई आवश्यकता नहीं है। लेकिन जब यू बोट का मिनेस उनके सामने आया तो रूजवेल्ट साहब के दिमाग में और चर्चिल के दिमाग में यह बात आयी कि नेवी का बहुत बड़ा स्थान है।

आपको मालूम होगा कि दूसरे विश्व युद्ध में इंग्लैंड की रक्षा कैसे हुई? वह केवल नेवी के कारण हुई। जर्मनी के पास ११६२ यू बोट थे। इनका उपयोग वह अटलांटिक और भूमध्यसागर में जोरों से करता था और इन यू बोटों के द्वारा उसने २१५ लाख टन के जहाज डुबोए थे। आपके पास क्या है। आपका तीसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना का मरचेंट नेवी का टारजेट है वह कुल जमा पूंजी में १२ लाख टन के करीब है, और उधर दूसरे विश्व युद्ध में २१५ लाख टन के जहाज एलाइज के डुबोए गए थे। मैं पूछता हूँ कि अगर आज से आप के ऊपर हमला हो और दूसरे से आप सहायता लेना चाहें तो कैसे लेंगे। आपकी अवस्था पोलैंड की सी अवस्था होगी। जब पोलैंड पर वार डिक्लेयर हो गयी तो चैम्बरलेन साहब ने कहा था कि हम पोलैंड की सहायता करेंगे। लेकिन उसे सहायता कैसे की जाती। पोलैंड तो चारों तरफ से बन्द था। अगर आपके पास मरचेंट नेवी नहीं होगी, और कनवाय को प्रोटैक्ट करने के लिए नेवी नहीं होगी, तो बाहर से सामान कैसे आएगा। आपकी अवस्था वही होगी कि जो बिल में चूहे की होती है और वह मारा जाता है। आपको सहायता देने की इच्छा रखते हुए भी और देश आपको सहायता नहीं भेज सकेंगे। आप कह सकते हैं कि हमारे पास हवाई जहाज से टैंक आ सकते हैं और दूसरा सामान आ सकता है। मैं कहता हूँ कि यह असम्भव है। इस वास्ते मैं बहुत विनम्र निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि अगर हिन्दुस्तान की रक्षा करनी है तो आपको नेवी की तरक्की करनी होगी क्योंकि आपके दूसरे देशों से मुख्य मीन्स आफ

[श्री रघुनाथ सिंह]

कम्यूनिकेशन समुद्री जहाज के जरिए से ही हो सकते हैं। रेलवे से आप दूसरे देशों से सामान नहीं ला सकते, हवाई जहाज से भी भारी चीजें नहीं आ सकतीं। इसलिए अगर आपके पास स्ट्रांग नेवी और भरचेंट नेवी होगी तो दूसरे देशों से आपको सहायता मिल सकती है।

आप देखें कि पाकिस्तान क्यों ईस्ट में और वेस्ट में अपने नेवल बेस बनाने पर इतना जोर दे रहा है। शायद हमारा मन्त्रालय सोचता है कि लैण्ड ही लैण्ड से काम हो जाएगा लेकिन आज लैण्ड बेस की बहुत ज्यादा आवश्यकता नहीं है। पोरिस के आविष्कार के पश्चात् लैंड बेस का महत्व समाप्त हो गया है क्योंकि सबमैरिन से मिसाइल और राकेट लांच किए जा सकते हैं सबमैरिन एक ऐसी चीज है जिसको आप देख नहीं सकते। हवाई जहाज आएगा तो वह ऊपर से आएगा। उसको आप देख सकते हैं और मार सकते हैं। लैण्ड फोरसेज से आप लड़ सकते हैं। लेकिन सबमैरिन का आप क्या करेंगे। वह तो पानी के अन्दर से आएगा। इसलिए जब तक आपके पास अच्छे सबमैरिन चेजर नहीं होंगे तब तक आप अपनी रक्षा करने में असमर्थ होंगे।

हमारे सामने कहा जाता है, अखबारों में भी यह बात आती है, और हमारे भूतपूर्व डिफेंस मिनिस्टर साहब ने भी कहा था कि पहाड़ में लड़ाई होने से क्या होगा, जब वे मैदान में आयेंगे तो हम उनसे लड़ लेंगे।

एक माननीय सदस्य : दैर इज दी स्ट्रेटजी।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : मैं कहता हूँ कि यह स्ट्रेटजी बिल्कुल गलत है। अगर आप उनको पहाड़ में नहीं रोक सकते तो उनको मैदान में भी नहीं रोक सकेंगे। आप हिन्दुस्तान का इतिहास देखिए। जब भी हिन्दुस्तान की सेना

विदेशियों को बाल्हीक में या हूंडस पर या खैबर में रोक सकी है तभी हिन्दुस्तान की रक्षा हो सकी और जब जब भी कोई विदेशी सेना इंडस को पार करके हिन्दुस्तान में घुस आयी तो वह सीधे ढाका तक पहुँच गयी है। तो हमको भी दुश्मन को पहाड़ में ही रोक देना चाहिए। अगर हम उनको पहाड़ में आ जाने देंगे तो उनका वहाँ पाकेट हो जाएगा और हमारा शत्रु वहाँ बैठ जाएगा। फिर उसको वहाँ से कैसे हटाया जाएगा और कैसे हम उससे अपनी रक्षा कर सकेंगे। आपके सामने बहुत अच्छा उदाहरण है। आप राजस्थान को लीजिए। साढ़े सात सौ वर्ष तक राजस्थान वाले अकबर से भी लड़े और उन्होंने फीरोज शाह तुगलक और औरंगजेब से भी मोर्चा लिया क्योंकि उनके पास पहाड़ थे। वे पहाड़ में बैठ कर युद्ध करते थे। शिवा जी को लीजिए। उनके पास पहाड़ था। पहाड़ में बैठ कर उन्होंने युद्ध किया और अपनी स्वतन्त्रता की रक्षा कर सके।

श्री त्यागी : इसीलिए तो मराठा के सुपुर्द यह काम किया गया है।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : हम से कहा जाता है कि हम माउण्टेन वारफेयर नहीं जानते। मैं तो कहता हूँ जमुना से लेकर ढाका तक तो हमारे यहाँ मैदान हैं। बाकी तो सारे हिन्दुस्तान में पहाड़ ही हैं। दिल्ली के चालीस मील दूर से लेकर आप कन्या कुमारी अन्तरीप तक चले जाएं आपको पहाड़ मिलेंगे और इधर हिमालय पहाड़ है। तो हमको यह बुजदिली का विचार अपने मन में नहीं लाना चाहिए कि हम पहाड़ में नहीं लड़ सकते। हमको मैदान में लड़ना है, पहाड़ में लड़ना है और हर जगह मजबूती से लड़ना है।

बहुत बार कहा जाता है कि हम एटमिक पावर को पीस फुल परपोजेज के लिए इस्तेमाल करेंगे। मैं कहता हूँ कि एटमिक पावर का पीसफुस उपयोग आप तभी करेंगे जबकि

हिन्दुस्तान आजाद रहेगा । जब हिन्दुस्तान में किसी दूसरे देश की सेना आ जाएगी तो आपकी एटमिक पावर खत्म हो जाएगी, आप बना ही न सकेंगे । लिहाजा आज हमें दृढ़ता और निर्भीकता से कहना चाहिए कि हम एटमिक पावर का उपभोग अपनी रक्षा के लिए करेंगे, सेना के लिए करेंगे ।

अभी कहा गया कि चाइना ने अपनी एटमिक पावर में काफी प्रगति कर ली है । मैं तो समझता हूँ कि अगर चाइना सबमैरिन में फोर्थ पावर दुनिया में हो सकती है तो उसके पास एटमिक सबमैरिन भी है । आजकल के जमाने में अगर आपके पास एटमिक सबमैरिन नहीं होगी तो आप सफल नहीं हो सकते । लिहाजा मैं बड़ी विनम्रता से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे पास जो एटमिक पावर है उसका हम अपनी सुरक्षा के लिए उपयोग करें ।

आखिर में मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे रक्षा मन्त्रालय का शुरू से यह दुर्भाग्य रहा है कि इसमें मन्त्रियों के जल्दी जल्दी परिवर्तन होते रहे हैं कि किसी को गम्भीरतापूर्वक विचार करने का मौका नहीं मिला । अब हमारे वर्तमान प्रतिरक्षा मन्त्री जी आ गए हैं मैं कहता हूँ कि वह एक योजना बनाएं । और प्लान के साथ सुरक्षा की व्यवस्था होनी चाहिए । अभी तक हम सिविल सैक्टर के लिए और प्राइवेट सैक्टर के लिए प्लानिंग करते रहे हैं, लेकिन जब भी मैंने यहां डिफेंस के लिए प्लानिंग का सवाल उठाया तो हमारे ऊपर लोग हंसते थे । लेकिन अब समय आ गया है कि डिफेंस के मामले में भी हम प्लान के अनुसार आगे बढ़ें । अगर हम प्लान के अनुसार अपनी सुरक्षा व्यवस्था को आगे नहीं बढ़ावेंगे तो हमको अफसफलता प्राप्त होगी । हमें हमेशा यह याद रखना चाहिए कि अगर हिन्दुस्तान आजाद रहेगा तो आपके प्लान भी चलेंगे और सब चीजें चलेंगी, लेकिन अगर हिन्दुस्तान में विदेशी फौज आ जाएगी तो ये सब प्लान आप से आप समाप्त हो जाएंगे । इसलिए विदेशी शत्रुओं के प्लांस चलने के पहले प्लांस को आप चलाइये । वह प्लांस इस दृष्टि से होने

चाहिए कि किसी भी कीमत पर देश की रक्षा की जायगी, चाहे एटमिक बॉम्ब से हो, चाहे मिस्साइल् से हो और चाहे राकेट से हो । ७०० वर्ष की गुलामी से निकाल कर हमने इस देश को आजाद किया है और हम इसको फिर से गुलाम बनने देने के लिए कदापि तैयार नहीं हैं । लेकिन अगर हम इस दिशा में ग्राफ़िल रहे और हमने इस देश को पुनः गुलाम बन जाने दिया तो आने वाली सन्तानें हमारे मुंह पर थूकेगी और हमारे माथे पर कलंक का टीका लगाया जायेगा कि जहां हमने हिन्दुस्तान को आजाद किया वहां हम उसकी आजादी को कायम नहीं रख सके और हमारे जिन्दा रहते वह फिर से गुलाम बन गया । भगवान् करे ऐसा समय न आये और हमारी आने वाली सन्तानें यह कहें कि हमारे पूर्वजों ने हिन्दुस्तान को आजाद कराया लेकिन मिली आजादी को उन्होंने रक्षा भी न की ।

Shrimati Sharda Mukerjee (Ratnagiri): At the outset I would like to welcome Shri Yashwantrao Chavan to his new office, and I wish him well in his new appointment and the new responsibilities which he has to bear.

I confess this Report of the Ministry of Defence is somewhat beyond my comprehension. I should think it requires some extraordinary quality of thought reading or some kind of deduction to be able to understand the ramifications of this wordy and, may I say, very comprehensive Report. But it deals with all sorts of trivialities. It tells you about the foreign visitors who have been here, the big plan of the NCC, but if this Report is meant to be either explanatory or is supposed to give some sort of reassurance at this time of national emergency, I am afraid it gives just the opposite impression, because it creates the impression that there is no defence planning whatever, that there is no real estimation of the needs of defence at the moment and that there is no plan to reorientate the structure of the armed forces in

[Shrimati Sharda Mukerjee.]

the context of the present emergency. If it is not in the public interest to divulge these defence matters, then I would say that to produce a lengthy and confused Report like this is an open admission of chaotic thinking. Besides, I fail to understand the logic of it

Here we have in this country missions which have come from America, Canada, England and Australia. They are supposed to be here to advise us, and I presume that if they are here to advise us, they are apprised of our defence needs, that they have visited our defence installations, that they have some idea of our defence potentialities, the sort of equipment we can absorb etc., and, needless to say, when these missions go back, they are at liberty to utilise this information in any manner they like.

I would quote here an extract from a pamphlet by an American economist. He has obviously been here as he has been to some of the other backward countries. This is an extract from *Defence and Development in less Developed Countries*, by a man called Charles Wolf, who belongs to the Rand Corporation, California, and it was printed in December, 1962. He says:

"...New countries tend to be zealous about protecting their independence, and sometimes even militant about projecting it on to their weaker neighbours. The Sino-Indian border situation is illustrative of both points. New countries are also likely to have internal security problems of considerable proportions as a result both of their own initial weakness, and of the stimulus provided to factionalism and dissidence by the achievement of independence itself....."

Mr. Kingsley Martin has been writing in the *New Statesman and Nation*. I have not got the quotation with me, but I remember vividly reading a passage where he says that the Indian Army is finished. He says

there is unlimited effort for a limited project.

All these things are said, and what does the Government do about it? Does it take the trouble to explain to Parliament what its plans and policies are? No. I consider that producing a Report of this nature is an outrageous example of mistrust of Parliament by Government.

In a democratic country, the function of examining and challenging Government policies is reserved to Parliament as a whole. What is more, in Parliament is vested the supreme authority. I realise that in this time of crisis the Defence Ministry is necessarily limited, restricted, by what it can give, but I would like to request the Defence Minister, when replying to the debate, to at least give us some idea of things like our defence commitments. I would like to know and the country would like to know, what our reaction would be if tomorrow China were to invade Bhutan or Nepal or Sikkim. Does our defence plan today include liability for defence of these small border States on our frontiers?

Secondly, I would like him to give us at least some broad idea of the defence plan. I hate to use the word "strategy". I am not a military strategist, but I do think that if democracy is to function successfully with the co-operation of the people, it is the duty of Government to explain these things to Parliament. All such matters as I have mentioned require to be clarified, so that the country can take up the challenge of standing up to the enemy with courage and confidence.

Rumours and speculations are about the worst things for public morale. So, what I am trying to say is this, that a democratic system cannot work on a basis of mistrust. Any attempt to do so can only bring about inefficiency and chaotic conditions.

To elaborate the point further, this very element of mistrust, I am sorry to say, has crept into the armed forces. It has undermined the authority of commanders and affected their ability of leadership. There is nothing so damaging to the morale of the armed forces as the breaking down of discipline and solidarity of the services. One must remember that discipline and team work are the two main factors of the fighting forces. If you are going to tamper with this, you are going to break the entire fabric of the armed forces. You are going to have an unreliable, indisciplined army that is not going to be able to stand up to the test of battle. On the battle field it is not all these ideas of patriotism and other considerations which work with a soldier. There is only one thing that matters, that he is a trained and disciplined soldier, that he will follow his leader, obey him and work as a member of his team. This is not very difficult for an ordinary person to understand. You do not have to be a military strategist to understand the importance of discipline.

I recall that sometimes when I flew with the Air Force and we went through rough weather or through frightening terrain, the thing that mattered was that the pilot did not panic. You can well understand it is only a disciplined individual who in a time of crisis does not give in to panic and fear.

The armed forces comprise the largest organised force in the country. I know that there has been a lurking fear in the minds of politicians and in the bureaucratic circle also in the country, to some extent, that some adventurous commander somewhere will exploit his position and utilise his command to gain political power in this country. (Interruption).

An Hon. Member: No possibility.

Shri Inder J. Malhotra (Jammu and Kashmir): Nobody thinks so.

Shrimati Sharda Mukerjee: I am sorry this has been not only publicised but it has been circulated in a most insidious and pernicious manner. I say it with some confidence. This has undermined the morale of the army because it has undermined the commander's ability, his leadership.

Shri Sham Lal Saraf: Who does it?

Shrimati Sharda Mukerjee: You may not do it. This is a very serious charge to make. I know it. I make it with a full understanding and full responsibility. If the hon. Member would go through some of the press—

Shri Inder J. Malhotra: The only press is the *Current*.

Shri Ansar Harvani (Bisauli): And the *Birla Times*!

Shrimati Sharda Mukerjee: I charge some of the press. Not all. I do not say that everybody does it. I say that there is a tendency to do it. I do say that this tendency is very damaging to the armed forces.

Apart from this, the two things which count in the armed forces are loyalty and integrity. Unfortunately, a tendency has crept in which, to some extent, has brought about favouritism. Postings, promotions, even sometimes, I dare say, the award of decorations, have been done on the basis of favouritism. So, if such tendencies are not eradicated, immediately, if some dishonesty, however small, is not punished immediately and drastically, then I am afraid that you will not be able to keep up a high standard of either ability, efficiency or morale in the armed forces.

Now I would like to refer again to the NEFA incident. A certain jawan said to me:

“साहब, अगर हम छोटी सी गलती करें, तो हम को अठ्ठाइस दिन की फंदीन

[Shrimati Sharda Mukerjee.]

मिलती है। जब इतने बड़े बड़े भ्रष्टिस्त
ने गलती की है, तो उन का क्या होगा ?”

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द (करनाल) : उन
को अठाइस दिन की दुगनी क्यों न हो ?

Shrimati Sharda Mukerjee: The point at issue is that the enquiry should be completed as soon as possible and there should not be any suspense. It is not necessary to publicise its findings but some suitable action should be taken, and the enquiry should be completed. It is four months since it started. I put a question about it during the Question Hour. I mention it again. We must be prompt so far as these military aspects are concerned, and you cannot let things hang fire.

I quote here to illustrate my point.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member's time is up.

Shrimati Sharda Mukerjee: I must quote a little bit here. In the final analysis, our friends will help us, with equipment, and whatever inadequacies we have, we may be able to overcome them. But the thing that counts in the armed forces is the soldier, the man. To illustrate this, I quote from a very illustrious soldier of the last war, Field-Marshal Montgomery. This is what he said:

“Man is still the first weapon of war. His training is the most important consideration in the fashioning of a fighting army. All modern Science is directed towards his assistance, but on his efforts depends the outcome of the battle. The morale of the soldier is the most important single factor in war.”

I have not much time. So, with your permission, I will take just a few more minutes. I would like to

speak a little on recruitment. One other thing is—I am not sure because I have not got the data—is wastage. I understand that there is a great deal of wastage even after the selection is done. Particularly in the Air Force the boys are taken and in the first stage, there is a wastage, and later on, in the flying stage even, there is a wastage. There is less wastage in the army. The point at issue is that we must make some changes in the conditions of service and provide some insurance in the case of accidents, if you want to attract the right type of personnel. If you do not have the right leadership in your army, the whole army falls. So, at the moment, two things are of very great importance. The army is like a pyramid. After you reach a certain stage, there are very few vacancies. At 40 or 45 years of age, a Lt.-Col. may have to leave the army. In our country, there are not the same opportunities for re-employment as there are in countries like England. Unless some arrangement is made so that those men who are to leave the service at the age of 40 or 45 can be re-employed, I am afraid you are going to have trouble with recruitment.

Similarly, unless you can provide some kind of compulsory insurance to which the officers can contribute so that in case of death there is some provision for their wives and families, you are not going to be able to recruit the right type of persons. I do not say that it is only the monetary considerations which attract men to the armed forces. I know it for a fact that there are people to whom this is a life of dedication, it is a career, it is a calling. But, nevertheless, this is a very important thing which worries them: the fact that if they are killed, their wives and families are left without sufficient funds. I thank you.

Shri Manabendra Shah (Tehri Garhwal): **Mr. Deputy-Speaker,** Sir, the defence of our country has to be effected in two ways: we have to solve the immediate problem as well

as form a long-term defence policy, including the training and carrying out of the policy. The steps that the Government have taken—as we are made to understand—according to me, relate only to the immediate defence problem, because, a mere increase in the strength of the armed forces or a mere increase in or improvement of equipment or a mere changing of or improving the system of training does not solve the long-term problem, but it only helps us to face the immediate problem. Therefore, though my hon. friend Shri Indrajit Gupta gave certain important pointers, I would say that they really relate to the immediate problem more than the long-term policy.

If our defence policy is based on this pattern, then I fear that we may again see the NEFA calamity in the future, because the Chinese policy is to develop those projects which are conducive to a successful war, while ours is for defence as well as economic development. Therefore, they are definitely to develop faster, their method of approach is far quicker than ours where preparedness to take off is concerned. So, it becomes necessary for us not only to look into the defence problems which are of an immediate nature, but also to the long-term defence planning.

Professor Ranga has also mentioned about giving priority to the defence at the expense of economic development. I beg to differ, because economic development is also an important aspect of defence. The very thing that he does not want to have, the very thing that he wants to prevent, is the disgruntlement in the country itself, and if economically we go poor, then the something will happen, which has happened in South-East Asia. Economically they are not so well off. Therefore, the very party that he wants to avoid coming into the power or getting the people under them—he will be helping them and abetting them. Hence, the economic Development has to go hand in hand with the defence development. That

is the only way to present that danger.

If I might copy the term used by Shrimati Mukerjee, if we do not have a long-term policy in a scientific way, in a more mature way and in a more serious way, then we would be again starting in a chaotic manner our country's defence. The House may be told perhaps that the Government has already set up such an organisation. I concede that the Government has set up varied and multi-organisations, but I still hold that none of these organisations can do the work of the type that I have in mind. Some of them are only decorative, some are impotent and most of them, I hold, are non-coordinated. If we had an appropriate organisation, we would have been able to assess in time the importance of the increasing population of China, the expansionist policy of China, the importance of Tibet as a base for military build up, the necessity of road for Chinese through our land to the patrol Singkiang and the maintenance of law and order there, the importance of salt lakes of Ladakh, the importance of NEFA as backdoor to the rice bowl of South-East Asia and many such other important matters. Therefore, if we had an organisation of this sort before, then the Government would have been in a position to take positive and adequate steps effectively, but because we did not have such an organisation, we had to face the debacle of last year.

Now, probably it can be argued that such an assessment may only be of academic interest. But, Sir, things never stay stagnant. We have not only to plan to upset the advantage the Chinese have gained by absorption of Tibet, road into Singkiang and occupation of other parts of India, but we have to assess the political and economic needs of all our likely aggressors and do so continuously. We have to assess and study their potential to achieve it in their own country, how we are helping them in that, how other countries are helping them in

[Shri Manabendra Shah.]

that and whether and how we are an obstruction to the achievement of their goal. For that purpose, I have to suggest very strongly, a whole-time high-powered body consisting of military strategists, economists, scientists and other experts on the same lines as the J.I.B. in England should be created for integrated operational planning.

This brings me to the immediate problem. I am very glad to learn that more Divisions are being raised, modern equipments are being introduced and the Commands have been further divided. But I, who come from a danger area, namely, the hills, would like very much an assurance from the Government that the Chinese would be help in the hills and that the Government does not subscribe to the view, erroneous as it is, that the Chinese can really be taught a lesson in the plains. Such an assurance is necessary. Such a policy is necessary and is possible, as otherwise, the Government would be leaving us at the mercy of the evils of occupation I am sure neither this House nor the Government would like to see us in that position. It may be different in Ladakh where we have very little population. It may not have been possible in NEFA, because we were not prepared, but now there would be no reason why a proper defence cannot be done in the hills itself.

I have also suggested before that the Government should also plan what may be called a proper operational plan for the evacuation of the civilian population and their rehabilitation if vagaries of war force our armies to withdraw. This is very essential, because in the first place, along with the planning to fight, we must also look into the question of civilian population. If civilian population has to be withdrawn for some reason or other, there should be a proper plan for their withdrawal. They should not be left to come out on

their own or be left there at the mercy of the occupiers. Therefore, I have to request that the Government should also look into this aspect of the defence of India.

The other point which I had raised previously is the utilisation of the local people. The local people can be utilised in two ways, specially in those areas where you are already recruiting people for the armed forces. I am to suggest that firstly the Government should create, at least in my State in Garhwal Hills, Scouts like the J and K Scouts of the Garhwalis. They would be useful both as a second line of defence and later they can be changed, if so required, into proper regular armed forces. They would also be useful if you have to go in for guerilla warfare. On all these grounds, I strongly suggest the creation of Garhwal Scouts on the same lines as the J and K Scouts. Along with this, "Labour Corps" should be created from the local people there, because the labour there is already scarce and so a labour corps would be useful.

Before I sit down, there is one important matter which I would bring to the notice of the House and that is the impact of the present taxation on our armed forces. We all know that three years ago, Government had appointed an experts committee to consider the pay and allowances of the armed forces. After mature consideration, they came to the conclusion that the pay should be increased. I have tries to study the impact of the taxation and I have come to the conclusion that it has adversely affected the armed forces. I do not want to take all the ranks. I will just take the example of Major. The first revision in April 1960 fixed an amolument of Rs. 1200 per month to a Major in the 24th year of his service; in the second revision it was raised to Rs. 1300. But the present taxation will reduce this to Rs. 1100 or Rs. 1150. In 1960 the Committee found that the pay was less and they increased it to Rs. 1200.

Subsequently they found that even Rs. 1200 was less and so it was raised to Rs. 1300. Now the impact of the taxation is that the Major will actually be getting about Rs. 1100. Over and above this, there are certain compulsory donations or subscriptions that they have to pay. Actually their pay comes to far below what it was before now comes to far below what it is to Rs. 1200. Therefore, I feel the Heoues will agree with me that specially when the emergency is there, our armed forces do not deserve this treatment. Also, this will affect their efficiency and this will not be conducive to bringing in the right type of officers into the armed forces. Therefore, I would request the Government seriously to consider this matter. Either the present taxation should not be applicable to them or if that is not possible due to some constitutional hitch, there should be an appropriate increment in the allowances given to them.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Sir, I pay my tribute and homage to the martyrs and soldiers who fell on the battle field and I also pay my greetings to all those who have been engaged in this task of liberating our country from the Chinese hands. In this emergency, defence is not only the duty or concern of the armed forces, but it is the concern of the whole country. Defence is no longer a matter that is the responsibility of the Government, but it is a national defence today. The responsibility is as much of the defence forces as the people as a whole. It is the most non-controversial problem so far as the country is concerned. We are happy that at this juncture we have a person to head this Ministry who is also a non-controversial person. We wish him well. We feel that he will be equal to the very great task and onerous responsibility that falls on him.

Sir, the report that is before us is rather scrappy. It does not give much information. It merely mentions about the deficiencies. Probably, the Minister or the Defence Ministry did

not want to give the details of the deficiencies of the past, because the past is a very disgraceful chapter. The speakers who have preceded me have just referred to. Probably there is a feeling, why beat a dead horse. But, Sir, if I offer any criticism about the past, it is not because I want to blame anybody, it is not because I want that somebody should be punished. But I want that there should be a thorough probe so that we may plan for the future against the treacherous action, against the difficulties that were created deliberately in our defence preparations and defence policies.

At present the Defence Ministry is concerned with two enquiries. One is regarding the Tusker. The Defence Minister, in the course of a reply, gave the allegations against the Tusker Organisation. I hope that enquiry will be completed as soon as possible. One result of this enquiry has been that the Border Road Development Organisation has been re-constituted by making a person, who would be perhaps responsible for many of the misdeeds, as the only non-official in that body—the ex Defence Minister has been made a member of the Border Road Development Organisation. And what position has been given to the present Defence Minister? There was a post of Vice Chairman. That post has been abolished. So Shri Chavan is just a member. That is the only outcome, perhaps, of the probe that is under way.

Then, the Defence Minister has promised to us that there will be an enquiry about the military reverses. But the terms of reference, which after great pressure he gave to the House, are, I will say, hopelessly limited in nature. It only refers to the military operation, and that also it does not cover fully, not even to all the areas. He has stated in his reply that this investigation on the military reversals would take place only in regard to NEFA, particularly in the Kameng sector. What about Ladakh? There

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy]

were also initial reverses as has been admitted even in this report. Are you not going to enquire into the military reverses there? What about the problem of supplies? Even after we had more facilities for air and road supplies to the Ladakh region, it is on record that 50 per cent of the supplies could not reach our personnel there. What about an enquiry into this matter? There is one other thing. When the Prime Minister at long last made this declaration that the Chinese should be thrown out and he declared before he went to Ceylon that he had ordered our army to throw out the Chinese, I want to know whether that order was passed with the full knowledge and the responsibility of the military action that would follow after that. When we prepared ourselves, have we ever done that? Was our full military force engaged to stop the Chinese? Why is it that the Air Force was not used? If full military action was to be taken, I want to know who prevented our Air Force from being used. I want to know—and it is necessary that this should be gone into—whether there was interference at a higher level even in regard to deployment of our military in NEFA. All these matters are very serious. The country wants to know at what level, at what stage the responsibility lies. We do not want to be merely told that the training, equipment and other things were lacking. If you have not permitted your army to do its job fully even with the machinery at your disposal, if the machinery at your disposal was not fully utilised, then it is no good blaming our army saying that they lacked the necessary training or the necessary equipment.

Some complaint has been made that more money was not provided to the Defence Ministry. It is all wrong. From the records it would appear that from the year 1959 the allotment of money to the Defence Ministry has been increasing. But there have been many shortfalls. The money was not

fully utilised and we did not get the equipment necessary. This is the sad story of the whole affair. The defence image was build up in this country slowly and deliberately keeping anything and everything was kept terest. Not even the Parliament could know anything. Nobody could know anything and everything was kept secret in the public interest, and the only interest that was served was the interest of the enemy. And, the Prime Minister always came to the protection of the ex-Defence Minister, probably basing his conclusions on the information that was given to him by the same Defence Minister who wanted to create a deliberate misleading atmosphere in this country saying that everything was O.K. so far as the defence of the country was concerned.

Therefore, it is very necessary that this problem should be enquired into. It is not correct to say that what the Prime Minister has agreed and the Defence Minister has promised to have a probe into the military reverses that we suffered is the same thing. We are agreed that we would not raise this question. If it is for this limited nature it is all wrong. I think the scope should be widened. The scope should be extended. Unless we know the overall position, unless a full probe is made, we will not be in a position to plan for the future.

Coming to the question of secrecy, so far as Parliament is concerned I want to know one thing. The hon. Members who preceded me have also spoken about it. In a democracy, what is the responsibility of the people? How can they discharge that responsibility and give you full co-operation unless the Parliament is also taken into confidence? We do not demand that you give us operational secrets, movements of armies and other things. Nobody has ever demanded that. The Parliament is prepared to give you funds as much as possible so that we may have a strong defence organisation in the country. To see that our defence forces do not suffer from

any kind of disability, even in regard to the matter of salaries and emoluments, the Parliament is prepared to go to any length and the country is also prepared to do it. At the same time you must give us figures and information at least to have understanding of the whole situation and to convince the Parliament that what you are doing is on proper lines, on right lines. I do not understand what this secrecy is when foreign countries and even our enemies know every detail about what we are doing. Sir, you may remember that President Ayub Khan made a statement saying that India was not fighting because her army was engaged here, her army was engaged there etc. He went on saying as to how much army we have got. If they are in a position to know it, is the Parliament here not entitled to know about our production and other things, how far we have progressed, what are our defects and difficulties, what are our needs etc? These are very necessary. If it is not possible to give it in full, why not have a Defence Parliamentary Committee as such where the Defence Minister can take into confidence selected people and where more information could be given? There is no secrecy, so to say, and it should be given, as far as possible, so far as Parliament is concerned.

Then, I would again ask, before I go into any other question, what is our defence policy today. What is the war policy today? Are we fighting a defensive war? What are we fighting? Are we still addicted to that policy that unless the enemy attacks, or even if the enemy attacks us we will not attack them? That has been our policy so far. Even in the posts where we had the army they refrained from firing because as a peaceful, non-violent nation we wanted them to function that way. So what is our strategy today, that is what I want to know. Unless this strategy is specifically and clearly made, I do not think the preparations can be made properly.

And then, defence against whom? We say that we are building up our strength. Building up our strength cannot be done just in the air. You cannot build up just against the entire world. It is not possible. No country can ever do it. As we are all defence-oriented today, as the entire economic thinking is defence oriented today, defence also must be oriented towards something. And what is that thing? Have you now decided this policy that so far as our present requirements are concerned, and so far as our present organisation is concerned, our defence is mainly against China, the northern border? You should reorganise your defence in that manner, so that the entire planning follows out of that.

I would also suggest, and I want that the Defence Minister should make it clear—there is no secrecy in this matter—whether we wait to attack the enemy only when they attack us again? Is that our position today? We are not sending our army even to the area which has been vacated by the Chinese. That means that those areas, for all practical purposes from the military point of view, are in their hands, and we must therefore wait. It has been stated by no less a person than the Prime Minister in the course of an article in *The Foreign Affairs Journal* that an enemy who is aggressive has always an advantage. So, are we going to give this initiative to the enemy in our defence preparations also today? Or are we prepared to say that our defence policy today also includes not only stopping the enemy, attacking the enemy, resisting the enemy, but also that our army will be able to have pinzer movement wherever necessary, to see that the enemy does not come into our country. Their weak points must also be guarded and our army must have the freedom to fight.

I think these are very necessary preliminaries that are required when we are discussing our defence preparation for the future.

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy]

Sir, I would again say this, because I have a feeling that if at Sela we were defeated it was not because equipment was lacking. By that time the equipment had reached there. It is again this, that the whole affair, if anything, has happened because of a few things, because of a few defects in this policy. We have no anticipation we had no strategy; we had no military intelligence. There has been much criticism about military intelligence, but I am told on good authority that even the military intelligence people at an early stage gave reports of the concentration of the army in large numbers in the northern borders. Yet nothing was done. This anticipation was not there. There was bad Generalship. It is admitted. And why is it? Our army, our Generals who in the past had a very brilliant record and who could match anybody in the world, at that crucial juncture, none of them were given the responsibility of operating in that region but were just shunted to some factory here and some there, and so on. I want to know how far that policy has affected this and whether that question of promotions on favouritism, which was raised by this Parliament, whether that has any thing to do with this tragedy. I hope after Mr. Chavan has assumed responsibility, no longer those constant differences amongst the armed forces or between the administrative head and the military organisation exist in the defence organisation.

Sir, the next question that we have to consider is both short-term and long-term. Government has come out with many things about their policy, how they are going to meet this emergency. We are thinking of long-term programmes. We are inviting foreign mission to come and discuss with us and give us actually what are our defence requirements. It is all to the good. But what is going to happen in the interregnum? That is most important today. The Chinese are not going to wait till two years—as it is said,

we well take one year or two years. They are not going to wait till we get American help and other help and prepare ourselves or, as my friend suggested, till we stand on our own legs. He was suffering from a misconception when he was speaking about non-alignment. We all stand for non-alignment. But so far as China is concerned, China is not a non-aligned country so far as India is concerned. That has been made very clear by the Prime Minister. And that is our policy. Therefore, this short term programme is also very important.

What about our equipment? We have said that in small arms we will be self-sufficient. In how many years, I want to know. It is not a fact which has come out very clearly from the audit reports and from other that even at present the equipment that we have in our ordnance factories are very old; some of them, they say, are even eighty years old. Can we just increase our production without some provision, at some time or the other, to replace them? Even that was not done. That being the position, you must plan it in such a manner as to show that these are our immediate needs, this we can do under circumstances that we are placed, for the others we have to depend on friendly countries. That must be made very clear.

In this connection I would also say this. I do not understand the plan of having only six divisions. What is this six divisions? If during the British time, within fifteen months they could double the strength — we were not free then—if they could do that, now the entire defence science has developed like anything. Even in 1963 is it not possible for us to have a larger programme so that we can have a larger army than six divisions, which means probably it won't be more than fifty per cent of the strength of the army that we have?

In this connection, the more important thing is the air force. It is

very important from all point of view, and therefore we want to know what are the concrete plans. Is it possible ever for us to manufacture all that we need? If not, to what extent? And for what do we have to depend on others? And how are you going to assure and ensure supply? I may tell you in the country not only the people but the armed forces themselves will feel greatly assured if we today, without any inhibition, tell them that even for certain needs like air equipment we will get in plenty and we have concluded this. Therefore I would like that these Commonwealth air missions which still have to submit the report to you, that these talks should conclude as soon as possible. The talks seem to be going on, missions after missions are being sent as if the Defence Minister — he will excuse me, but that is the feeling that grows in me — as if the Defence Minister has many masters. Probably he is not the master of his own Ministry. Otherwise I do not understand, it is beyond my imagination how when the Defence Minister exists with assistants, with such a big machinery, even then it is necessary to get persons to advise, and not only to advise, but persons must be sent abroad to negotiate about all these matters. What is their role, I want to know. These are very important things. Probably, the Defence Minister, or the Defence Ministry's responsibility today is divided between the External Affairs Ministry and the Defence Ministry. Might be. It is said that a Civil Air Guerilla Force is being organised. For this task, one Chief Minister — I am proud of the fact that he comes from my own State — is being sent to America because, according to the Prime Minister, he is the only person in India today who has some knowledge, unusual experience, in this matter because he was a pilot.

An Hon. Member: Once upon a time.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: He is brought here or he comes here. When the budget was being discussed in the State Assembly, he was absent; he was negotiating with America. For what?

Something which even the Defence Minister does not know. What is that Civil Air Guerilla Force, we would like to know. We have been hearing much about him and he has been given a room in the External Affairs Ministry. Am I to understand from the Defence Minister that, so far as the guerilla force and other allied matters are concerned, it is the responsibility of the Prime Minister? I am asking this question because he is now doing it through the External Affairs Ministry and the Defence Ministry has nothing to do with that. Is that the purpose for which he was sent? Am I to understand that he had discussions with the Defence Minister about our needs and requirements and only after that he was sent to negotiate with America? I do not also understand when this Parliament is denied bare facts how is it that a person who is not a Minister who has taken oath here, who is not even a Member of Parliament or the Chief of Staff, in fact one who is nowhere in the field, is being sent to a foreign country to negotiate on behalf of us to get us some secret weapons. The Prime Minister has said here that he knows as much about defence as we and he has discussed the matter with the Chief of Air Staff. I want to know whether a similar opportunity would be given to any Member of Parliament. I know there are many Members of Parliament who take great interest in this subject, who have varied experience about defence and flying, who can give valuable advice. Otherwise, if the service of a person is needed, bring him and make him a Minister. If Shri Chavan is not equal to the task in the Defence Ministry, let him come, as many comrades and colleagues have come. We have no grudge against him. Probably, he may do better. If necessary, that can be done. But what is this arrangement? We must know what his position is and where he stands. I hope some reply would be given on this point. We know what utter confusion this country felt at one time which was removed after the removal of Shri Krishna Menon. Now

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy]

that confusion has again crept into the Defence Ministry at a very high level. This is very bad, so far as the future defence of the country is concerned. Therefore, I would like to have a specific answer on this point.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): who will answer this question?

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: The Defence Minister will answer it. If he cannot answer it, let the Prime Minister do it. I want an answer from the Government; it does not matter from whichever quarter it comes. We want to know his position and his responsibilities.

Then, I feel there is more confusion in the name of co-ordination, especially in the Defence Ministry. The Defence Ministry has the onerous task of producing equipments within a very short period of time for which he has to answer this Parliament.

Shri Tyagi: He can answer only so far as expenditure on defence is concerned.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: The defence expenditure is to the tune of Rs. 900 crores. Is he not responsible for every item of production? Is it not his responsibility to give us equipments as soon as possible? If that is to be done, I would like to know what this Co-ordination Ministry is doing in the matter? What is the function of the Ministry of Economic and Defence Co-ordination? Where does it come in? There is a Defence Minister and a defence production branch. Are they not equal to the task? What was wrong with the Defence Ministry or the ordnance factories? Have those defects been remedied? What are their present needs?

I have another question to ask. Has the Ministry of Economic and Defence Co-ordination been able to contribute anything or has it brought in further confusion?

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Jalore): I asked a question on this subject today.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: You asked a question but you did not get an answer because there was no answer. We read in the papers some time back that the Minister of Economic and Defence Co-ordination called a conference of about 100 industrialists. It is a necessary step because we want that our civil industrial production machinery should also be oriented for the defence needs. Therefore, co-ordination is very necessary and essential. But we do not know what has happened in that conference. Now they are all going, the entire Ministry is going, to America because they have nothing to do here. When they go there, the whole lot of them will go on talking.

Then there is another thing. We have seen that in every country, at least during war time, the Supply Ministry is strengthened. Even during the last invasion we saw it to our cost that because of some defect or other the supplies could not reach the proper places in proper time. As this is a big task, especially in an emergency, there must be a full-fledged Supply Ministry. I could understand it if Shri Krishnamachari had been given that one task in full, because that itself is a very great responsibility. But, that is not so. He is burdened with everything, every little thing. The result has been that he is seeing wrongs and mistakes everywhere and feels "what is it that co-ordination can do". In that way, he is bringing in more confusion, instead of co-ordination. That is my complaint. I feel that it is highly essential that these industries in the civil sector and the defence sector should be organised in such a manner that there is complete co-ordination between the two. Otherwise, if it is divided responsibility, if a question is put to Shri Raghuramaiah, Shri Chavan's colleague, about defence

production, he will immediately say: "What can I do? You ask this question to the Minister of Economic and Defence Co-ordination." If we ask the Minister of Economic and Defence Co-ordination, he will say, as he said today during the question hour in reply to questions. "What can I do? The Defence Ministry ought to write to me." If the Defence Ministry writes to him, then he will co-ordinate. This is utter confusion. If the Prime Minister has not complete confidence, or still some doubt about the capacity, efficiency or ability of the Defence Minister, he must give full responsibility to some other person. For one mistake in the past, the country has paid heavily and thousands of people have died. That is a shameful chapter of our country. We do not want that to be repeated. We want this responsibility to be put on one person, and one person alone, who can be taken to task by this country and by this House. Planning and other matters cannot do much unless Parliament is enabled to go through most essential things like the one I mentioned.

I will now refer only to two small points before I conclude. I am told that the Auxiliary Air Force Squadron whose number would be about 90 which after the invasion has been taken into the regular air force, was giving its members some flying bounty, family pension in case of fatal accident, disability pension, gratuity and other benefits. Now they are not being given to them. I am told that in Delhi itself in 1961 each member of the squadron resigned as a protest against this but yet nothing has been done. This is very bad. There are some accidents taking place and some people dying. I also hear that thousands of rupees have been accumulated in this fund. If that is so, it should be made available to them. There is no point in making it available to the members of the family after death. I feel that this matter should be looked into.

Coming to recruitment, it is admitted that so far we have got only

3,500 officers though we want 8,000 officers. The recruitment to the army is not very promising today because there is no real attraction. Why? This is a matter of concern for all of us. Even though people are anxious to join the army, still the proper climate has not been created. So far as the fighting personnel is concerned, it seems only people with low income, people who need money, they alone go and people coming from rich classes do not join the army. What has happened in previous years? We have seen sons of the ruling families, of aristocratic families, coming forward and joining the army.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): Not daughters.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: In several cases daughters also come—help the army, entertain them. There are so many works. If there is enough work for each of them, they come in thousands. Therefore in the country itself an atmosphere is created that everybody, every section, high or low, must join the army. That is how morale is created in the country and an atmosphere is created. But today—I want to know—how many sons of our leaders, or even of Ministers . . . (Interruption).

Shri Tyagi: Leaders have no sons.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: You and I do not have; that is a different thing. But how many of them have opted for the army? Have we encouraged them to come forward for recruitment in the army? Unless that is done, I do not think, there will be attraction and a proper atmosphere in the country for recruitment upto a satisfactory number.

Shri Sham Lal Saraf (Jammu and Kashmir): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the Demands of the Ministry of Defence that are before the House at the moment. Let me, to start with, congratulate the hon. Minister for placing before this House

[Shri Sham Lal Saraf]

a Budget that, I feel, is commensurate with the need of the hour. I particularly welcome his taking over this Ministry or portfolio at a moment when we need a person of his drive, dash and ability. I am equally happy that he is assisted by his two energetic colleagues in the person of his Minister of State and the Deputy Minister.

I am very happy that a certain re-organisation has taken place at the Army Headquarters and also that the defence production organisation has been separated, in a sense, so that they are enabled to pay more attention to its organisation and to manufacture and so on and so forth. Also, I am very happy to find that some of our engineering branches that had been taken away from the Engineer-in-Chief's charge and have been handed over to him. I think, that also is a need of the hour and they have done it. I am very happy that that has been done.

Three of our Service Chiefs, I am told, meet in a sort of a committee or a board or whatever it is. Though with regard to that much of the details are not known to us, what I find is that matters of detail are being handed over to them on which they deliberate and decide. I would wish that a unified command to frame the policies is comprised of our Service Chiefs and then they devise the policies and get the okay of the hon. Minister or of the Government. I personally feel that unless all the three Commands are fully in the know of what is happening in the other branches, it will be difficult to know the exact position of the defence of the country as a whole.

I am also happy to find that today our defence budget, which till now we had been producing or we had been dealing with mostly as idealists, is full of realism. Therefore not only do I thank the hon. Minister and the Government but also this whole House for having expressed itself not once but a number of times which has urged the Government perhaps to look

into the matter in such a manner that a realistic Budget is placed before us.

A number of things are to be kept in view when we talk or think about our defence with regard to recruitment, training and equipment which are very important matters. Then alone we may be in a position to give a proper shape to our army. With regard to recruitment I am happy with the policy that is being followed now. People are being recruited in all the ranks all over the country and opportunities are created in order to educate young men to take to military education by opening Sainik Schools and by organising NCC, ACC and such other organisations. That certainly creates a sort of a climate that my hon. friend has just now mentioned among our youth which is very necessary now-a-days.

This is the time when we are at an undeclared war with China because of the aggression that she has resorted to against our country. With the situation that is on now, a number of things have to be attended to and a number of things have to be gone into in such a manner as to enable us not only to withstand or meet this aggression squarely but also to bring up our army equal to a modern army, as is found elsewhere in the world. As has rightly been said by some of my hon. friends—my hon. friend, Shri Raghu-nath Singh, said that—in the past we had been fighting wars in India and it was possible that we could save our country from aggression only when we could stop the enemy at our gates, that is to say, on the heights of the mountains. Once they came into the plains it was difficult to stop them. That is how it happened that they overran our country many a time in the past. That may be correct. But, at the same time, the whole country had been under this impression for the last so many centuries that the Himalayan frontiers are impregnable. Today we find that this is now the

weakest point of our defence. Therefore, naturally, a number of things have cropped up towards which immediate attention has to be paid.

I am happy that as far as warfare on snowcapped mountains or mountain warfare is concerned, some little attempt was made already, as I know it, when our army was fighting in Kashmir. They had to face such situations; but what attempt was made was, I should say, just a partial attempt. Today attention has to be paid to it in order to enable our army to train itself fully well for snow warfare as well as for mountain warfare.

Another thing which I find is that when our army went to the great heights of Ladakh and other areas a number of vehicles would not work because of the height. Also, I have come to know that even our automobile vehicles, armament, machine guns and what-not, could not work because of great heights and because the lubricants and oils will freeze. Now, I am told, by research and attempts that our army has made, it is in a position to fight at any height without any harm coming to our armament that it may be using. For that also I congratulate the armed forces and those gentlemen who are in charge of research for army warfare.

My hon. friend, Shri Ranga, mentioned about the Jammu and Kashmir Militia. Permit me, Sir, to say a few words about that Militia. You know, Sir, in 1947 when we had the first aggression on the part of Pakistan on our land in Jammu and Kashmir State—it was quite an unprovoked aggression that took place and we were absolutely undefended; nothing was with us—we spontaneously raised an unarmed militia which did wonderful work for some time. Later, it was just developed into a sort of a semi-army. During the last so many years they have safeguarded our borders

in that part of the country and have done wonderful jobs. It has been the demand of the Government of Jammu and Kashmir, every now and then we have been requesting the Central Government that this Militia also may be given the position of the army. But for what reason, I cannot say that could not be agreed upon in the past. Now, the world has seen and we are happy to say that our militia in Ladakh area did a wonderful job there and we see that the Government, or the Defence Ministry, have themselves given them the status of the army by converting them into Ladakh scouts. I would submit to the hon. Minister to very kindly consider the giving of equal status to the rest of the militia in that part of the country not only because they are now working for the last 14 or 15 years but they did a wonderful job that enabled them to get better arms—they were better equipped—and also they were in a position to fight the enemy who is always lying low and whenever he finds a chance, he comes and harms us. Therefore, my submission would be that militia is given the same position as it is given to the army.

15 hrs.

I would also pay my compliments, in an equal measure, to the Assam Rifles. They did a wonderful job in spite of the fact that they had some handicaps.

I am happy to find that the Ministry of Defence have delegated the necessary powers to all the Commands at all levels. It would certainly enable them to take speedy decisions without waiting to go to higher-ups as to when the orders would come, when the agreements would come and what not. Therefore, my feeling is that by taking this step, it would certainly help to build up the morale a great deal. Lok Sahayak Sena and the Territorial Army are also doing a

[Shri Sham Lal Saraf.]

good job. I hope the Minister of Defence will pay more attention to these two organisations and that will be very very helpful in strengthening our armed forces and increasing our fighting strength as my hon. friend Mr. Dwivedy has said just now.

As far as our border areas are concerned, I hope, the Government is paying full attention to the construction of roads. I know a number of roads have been built, but I feel that much more attention needs to be given to that. Also, full attention should be given to aerodromes. The net-work of aerodromes, airstrips, all over the northern borders of the country will afford us necessary protection and help us.

Now, my hon. friends Mr. Ranga, Mr. Indrajit Gupta and Mr. Dwivedy have said certain things about our unpreparedness. I feel that this is the time when we must plan properly, not only plan properly but also build our armed forces and our armaments too. I am reminded of the budget of USA of 1944-45. An amount of Rs. 45,000 crores was the defence budget in 1944-45. Compared to that, what is this amount of Rs. 800 crores or 900 crores that is budgeted for defence this year? What I feel is it is not easy that you will get all the equipment in no time and then it can just be supplied to our army. We have to build it up.

Then, about these friendly countries that have come to our help, apart from idealism, apart from these shibboleths I would certainly say that we should get the best out of it today and this is the time for us to organise and set up our defence industry more particular attention being given to metal cutting and metal formation. If that is done,

I do not know how much more time it may take for us to manufacture our own armaments and other necessary weapons.

Another thing is, we must not feel shy of getting foreign investments, foreign scientists and foreign technicians. That will help us a lot. As far as the private industry is concerned, my feeling is that if there too most important industries are to be galvanised, I think, this is the time that should be done, so that we are in a position to manufacture our defence requirements which will be very necessary for the army.

I would say one thing in the end. I would submit that we should not rake up the past and have these inquiries and these probes. Our men have gone to NEFA to fight with all their might and make all the sacrifices. They have done their best. They have given the greatest performance. But the inquiry that may be needed is certainly whether we lacked in certain equipment and whether we lacked in certain training that could have been given to the army. As far as the army personnel is concerned, it should not be involved in such an inquiry. My submission is that it will at this hour of grave crisis demoralise our armed forces. I would appeal to the hon. Minister to kindly see that no such thing happens that may bring demoralisation in the whole of the army.

With these words, I support the demands for grants of this Ministry.

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय,
मेरे समय का क्या हुआ

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : कल मिलेगा।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : सब बोल चुके हैं।
कांग्रेस वाली बोल चुके हैं, स्वतन्त्र पार्टी वाले
बोल चुके हैं, हमारे द्विवेदा जी बोल चुके हैं,
जनसब का समय कहाँ गया ? क्या यह ऐसे
ही चला जायेगा ?

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : कांग्रेस वालों ने
उतना समय नहीं लिया है जितना प्रोजेक्शन
वालों ने ले लिया है। इस वास्ते पहले कांग्रेस
वालों को मौका मिलना चाहिए।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : इस कुर्सी पर बैठ
कर आपको न्याय देना चाहिए।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : यह कुर्सी हमेशा न्याय
करती है।

Dr. Melkote (Hyderabad): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the demands for grants of the Ministry of Defence. While saying so, may I say, that the first and the foremost thing in the country is to build up an adequate morale of the people and on that one subject we can speak a lot. If things have happened in the past and the morale of the people went down, the causes were many which need not be enumerated here today.

Sir, may I say, it is my first duty to pay a homage to those who fell in the recent Chinese aggression and to pay a tribute and congratulate the jawans who put up a very valiant fight. This factor that the people today got united, backed up the jawans and were prepared to give any amount to support the defence needs is to show that the nation has not forgotten the past, that we have not forgotten that we have been invaded by treacherous enemy and we have also not forgotten that National unity is the essence of the situation today. Therefore, if the morale has got to be built up again, that morale could be built up if the Defence Ministry could tell us that in the future war with the

Chinese, we as a nation will put a very valiant fight and would win. Towards that end, whatever amount may be necessary, whatever sacrifices may be necessary, whatever young men and even women may be necessary to join the forces to put up a strong fight, the country is prepared to sacrifice in every manner and help the Defence Ministry.

In the recent few months, the morale is again being built up by the Defence Minister himself who has come in and taken charge of this portfolio; a person who has built up bold tradition of good leadership. Therefore, the morale is being built up by, first of all, the Defence Minister himself and secondly foreign powers reorganising his quality of leadership have offered all the help that is coming in from various friendly countries from all over the world. We thank all such countries.

We have also got to pay a tribute to the people themselves for all the support they have given to this Ministry. Apart from this, the workers in the ordnance factories were imbued with a sense of responsibility. They have been doing work round the clock and doing work for more than the number of hours than is usually called for. They do not want any rest. They took a voluntary decision not to make any demand on the Ministry but to work round the clock and they have been doing so all these months. It is a tribute to them that many of them have increased production both in quality and quantity—150 to 200 per cent—and the Defence Ministry itself has said this several times. I pay my tribute to these workers. Apart from other workers in other industries, they have been doing a magnificent job. This again is building up the morale of the people. This morale could be built up tremendously by increasing the numerical force of our Defence, all fighting forces in the country on land, air and sea. But, it is not merely a question of numbers. People have been talking that the Chinese have crores of population and that they have numerous soldiers among

[Dr. Melkote.]

them and that India is slow in building up. May I put it to you, Sir, that history reveals that often times, it is the quality of the people that counts, it is not merely numbers. Numbers do count. But, a smaller number of people have often times won over large armies. This depends upon the quality of the people themselves. Recently, there has been re-organisation of the training of officers and our jawans. I hope that if at all another conflict should arise, our fighting forces will give a fitting reply.

Then, it is necessary that people should not be made to sway this side and that side at this juncture by loose Government policies. Defence policy is a very important thing. If the people Government policies. Defence policy is something wrong either in the policy of the Government or in the Defence Ministry itself, that creates a very wrong impression. It demoralises the people. The Chinese are very shrewd propagandists. They want to get us defeated by ourselves by causing confusion in our ranks. That is one of their strategic policies. Therefore, if we do not create a proper morale in the people that we are strong and we can fight if sufficient backing is given to the defence personnel, this morale would again go down. We have, therefore, to create the morale by proper co-ordination of the policies of the Government, whether a statement in the shape that emanated on the Patnaik incident or co-ordination in the Ministry, we are not concerned with that. We are concerned with the policy of the Government. Anything that the Government does to demoralise the people is a thing which goes against the grain of the people at this juncture.

Scientific personnel have got to be sufficiently built up. We have got numerous scientific laboratories—National laboratories. Private scientific bodies are also doing plenty of research work. This is a time when all this research work done both at the governmental level and in the

national laboratories and private agencies are to be co-ordinated and utilized to the maximum. Apart from this, if necessary, we should, as was done in the Second World War, go to our friendly countries if we are not able to tackle some problems immediately and take the help of other scientists of other countries to help us at this juncture. All this has to be done.

In the industrial sector and the agricultural sector, everything has got to be done. People loosely talk that a change is taking place. Some people talk that the Kanpur factory where Avro engines and other things are manufactured or even the H.A.L. should go to the private sector. It is necessary to enlarge the scope of the Defence Ministry to have a larger number of industries in this sector. While all this is conceded, I do not think that these should be handed over. Let more industries be started. Let all that is already going on, go on. More efforts should be put in both by the Government sector and as well as the private sector. This kind of feeling that something is being done here and there, creates confusion in the minds of the people which should not happen.

If all this has got to take place, may I say that Parliament itself has got a duty to perform? There is a Scientific committee attached and Members of Parliament are taking keen interest. They should take a keener interest, invite scientists and understand their problem. Many of us offer suggestions to the Defence Ministry which is a technically competent body to deal with most of these things. Whether they should drag the enemy to the plains and fight or fight on the hills is not a matter on which we can or should have a say. It is for the Defence Ministry to understand and do what is right. They are prepared and fit to understand and do it. It is for us to understand where the difficulties lie and how to remove the difficulties. Personally I feel that Members of Parliament should take a keener in-

terest in the Scientific committee and try to understand these things better.

The question of recruitment is there. We have various types of recruitment taking place in the country. We have got the N.C.C. Students are being trained in several fields; there are home guards, village volunteer force, etc. I feel that while we must have all these numerous things—it is all to the good because it will build up a larger force—the question is whether the Army is getting the right type of personnel. The first priority should be given to the defence personnel. If there are rejections at the Defence level those people may then offer themselves to the other services. I understand, for the defence, numerous people have offered themselves but the rejection comes up to about 80 per cent. I cannot understand why. It is said that nearly 50 per cent of the people are not medically fit. This is a slur and the nutrition of the people has got to be built up. Why is this not being done? It is also said that a good deal of the rejection is taking place and people, who are medically fit are rejected just because they do not happen to know the English language knowing regional languages only. In India, there are numerous States where people can join the Army. Lack of knowledge of English itself should not be a sufficient reason. Rejection for such a cause is outmoded and is not proper.

One word more with regard to the workers and I shall conclude. I have prepared a note containing my suggestions regarding technical personnel. I am prepared to take it as read and place it on the Table. There are a few points, with regard to the personnel in the lower level. Many of them were recruited in World War II and they have put in a service of 10 or 15 years. They have reached the maximum of the scale more than 10 years ago. There is no further scope for them at all. There are thousands of them. Many of them are graduates. They can be shifted to the civil side

of the Government. If encouragement is not given, they will get demoralised. This is a time when every kind of encouragement has to be given to every sector of the population.

Then, again, in the ordnance factories, there are T.B. patients. The State health insurance scheme has been extended to the other sectors. Here, the people are given leave without salary whereas in the ordinary industries, they are given salary also during their illness. It is necessary to extend the State health insurance scheme to the workers. This is absolutely necessary.

The only other point that I have got to mention is in regard to some kind of a negotiating machinery for the National Federation of Defence Workers—the INDWF. The Government has been considering the introduction of such a scheme in other sectors so that the Government personnel might negotiate with the Government with regard to their difficulties. The defence personnel in the ordnance factories have not got such a negotiating machinery. I feel it should be extended and adequate measures taken so that their grievances might be redressed.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri D. C. Sharma.

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आप का समय देने का नियम क्या है ?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. Please sit down.

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : मैं आपका आर्डर माने लेता हूँ, लेकिन मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि समय देने का नियम क्या है ?

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : आपको कन समय मिलेगा, आज नहीं मिलेगा ।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : आप ने जो हमारी पार्टी को समय नहीं दिया इसका कारण क्या है ? क्या यह आप का न्याय है ?

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : आप बैठ जाइये ।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : आर्डर ही आर्डर है या न्याय भी है कुछ ?

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : कल मिलेगा समय आपको ।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : हमें बुलाया जाना चाहिये । मैं कोई भिक्षा नहीं मांग रहा हूँ । यह क्या बात है ? हमें कोई अधिकार है या नहीं ?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : मैं कोई भिक्षा नहीं मांग रहा हूँ ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : मैं और कुछ नहीं कह रहा हूँ । हमें पार्टियों की दृष्टि से समय मिलना चाहिये । कांग्रेसियों को तो वही कहना है जो कि एक सदस्य ने कह दिया । लेकिन हमको समय दिया जाना चाहिये ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have got the time taken by the Opposition parties. They have taken 1 hour and 49 minutes while the Congress party has not taken more than 1½ hours.

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : वह समय आप ने दिया । क्यों आप ने इसमें सब अपोजीशन पार्टियों को समय नहीं दिया ?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order; please sit down.

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : वह समय आप ने दिया है, मैंने तो नहीं दिया ?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : मैं आप की बात समझ रहा हूँ लेकिन जो मैं पूछ रहा हूँ उसका जवाब दीजिये । आप गद्दी पर बैठे हुये हैं और सबको समय वांट रहे हैं ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : स्वामी जी, आप आज समय नहीं मिलेगा, कल मिलेगा ।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : मैं पूछता हूँ कि आप समय उचित रूप से क्यों नहीं बांटते ?

एक माननीय सदस्य : कल मिल जायेगा ।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : मैं कोई भिक्षा मांग रहा हूँ ? हमारे साथ क्यों अन्याय किया जाता है ?

श्री श्रीकारलाल बेरवा (कोटा) : कायदे की बात यह है कि पहले तो कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी का नम्बर है, दूसरे स्थान पर स्वतंत्र पार्टी आती है और तीसरा नम्बर हमारा है इसलिये हमको भी समय मिलना चाहिये था ।

एक माननीय सदस्य : सब को मिलेगा कल ।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : कैसे कल मिलेगा ? यह कोई न्याय है ? मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि टाइम देने का नियम क्या है ?

श्री श्रीकारलाल बेरवा : हमारा नाम आज ही पुकारना चाहिये था ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The Congress Members are nearly 350 whereas the Opposition is about 100. I have to distribute the time equally between all parties.

श्री श्रीकारलाल बेरवा : लेकिन हमारा प्रतिनिधि नहीं बुलाया गया ?

श्री त्यागी : टाइम जो तकसीम करते हैं तो यह देख कर करते हैं कि अपोजीशन के मेम्बरों को और जो पार्टी इन पावर है उसके मेम्बरों को बराबर मौका मिलता रहे ।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : हमको तो समय मिलना चाहिये था । वह दो दो बार बोल चुके और हम एक बार भी नहीं बोले ।

एक माननीय सदस्य : हमारा लीडर होता तो क्या न बोलता ?

श्री त्यागी : स्पीकर साहब ने ऐसा इन्तिजाम कर दिया है कि...

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : अध्यक्ष महोदय को कुछ आता नहीं, आप हमको समझाने लगे हैं। मैं पूछता हूँ कि हमारा नम्बर आना चाहिये या नहीं।

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh (Parbhani): I may submit that the words

"अध्यक्ष महोदय को कुछ आता नहीं" may be expunged.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): My first duty this afternoon is to congratulate those jawans and officers who were the victims of Chinese aggression, nay, Chinese imperialism. As in the days of the British we had our martyrs among freedom-fighters, so, in free India, we celebrate the glory of those persons who have been the victims of Chinese expansionism and imperialism, which, I dare say, is worse than British imperialism, because it is authoritarian, repressive, ruthless and prone to the exploitation of the highest type.

I have been listening to the speeches that some of my hon. friends have made, and I have failed to understand one thing. What do these Opposition Members want us to do? What do they expect the Government of India to do? What do they expect the Defence Ministry to do? I feel that the only answer to these questions is this that we have to plan for victory at all levels, at the level of the Defence Ministry, at the level of the people and also at the level of the soldiers and officers who are going to fight this fight.

I believe that this budget which has been proposed this time is a budget orientated for winning victory over the Chinese. It is a victory budget.

But I think that it is not going to be the last budget. Our Prime Minister has been telling us that we have to meet the Chinese challenge for many may years, and, therefore, we may have similar budgets in the years to come, because unless the Chinese aggression is vacated, we cannot breathe freely in this country and we cannot rest any sense of the word.

We are not face to face with China only. In these defence debates, I used to refer to the intentions of Pakistan. We are negotiating with Pakistan about Kashmir, and, therefore, I do not want to say anything that may jeopardise those negotiations, though I know what those negotiations mean, and what the outcome of those negotiations will be. But I can say that India has never been more vulnerable in its history which extends over thousands of years than it is today.

Shri Raghunath Singh told us about our coast-line, and if the Pakistani people are bulding up their bases, I think that we have to take that thing seriously. Our northern frontiers and other frontiers also are not safe, and I think that we are face to face with a total challenge, and that total challenge requires total mobilisation of the people in every sense of the word.

From *The Statesman's Yearbook*, 1962, I have got some figures about the Chinese Army. The Chinese Army consists of 30 to 35 armies, each the approximate equivalent of a European army corps. Each army consists of or comprises 3 infantry divisions of 12,000 to 17,000 men. There are also 3 armoured and 2 airborne divisions. The estimated total strength is 2 million. As regards the Navy, their present strength comprises 4 destroyers, 25 submarines, 19 frigates, 24 patrol vessels, 55 motor gun-boats, 28 minesweepers, 136 motor torpedo-boats, 50 landing ships and landing craft and 350 service craft. It is true, of course, that there are no naval bases in China.

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

As regards the Air Force of China, in 1961, it was estimated at 3,000 front-line aircraft, organised in 40 to 50 regiments of fighters and 15 to 20 regiments of tactical members, plus reconnaissance, transport and helicopter units. Each regiment is made up of 3 squadrons, and 3 regiments form a division.

As regards their equipment, the equipment is entirely Russian in design and includes MIG-19, MIG-17 and MIG-15 fighters, 11-28 jet bombers, TU-4 piston-engined maritime reconnaissance bombers, 11-14 and AN-2 piston-engined transports, and MI-1 and MI-4 helicopters. The MIG-17 and AN-2 are built under licence in a national factory there.

This is the strength of the Chinese Army. I read also an article in the *Foreign Affairs* of October, 1960, which was entitled 'Every citizen a soldier'. We have also to take into account the Chinese militia. It is true that the people say that the Chinese militia is a kind of labour force. But that is not so. The Chinese militia is claimed by the Chinese authorities to have a strength of 125 million men and 75 million women. It is, however, a conscript labour force rather than a military establishment. More than this, there is conscription in China. Conscription was introduced there in February, 1955. The service lasts 3 years in the Army, 4 years in the Air Force and Coastal Service, and 5 years in the Navy. The yearly intake is about 4,50,000 men of 18 years of age.

I do not know much about defence as my hon. friends know, but I think that the first principle of defence is that we should understand our enemy, and we should understand his strength, and we should understand his disposition. Unless we understand the strength of the enemy, I do not think that our planning can be very fruitful and very effective. Now, what is the moral of this story? The

Chinese nation is a war-like nation. The Chinese are a militant people. The Chinese economy is geared to a war-like economy. And here was my hon. friend saying that we should not go to the US or the UK or the Soviet Union or any other country in order to get help from them but the Chinese should be left free to get such help as they can from other countries. I fail to understand the logic.

How are we going to meet this challenge of numbers, untold numbers, numbers which are staggering in proportion? How are we going to meet them? Do you mean to say that by raising six divisions, we shall be able to fight the Chinese? I welcome those six divisions. But we are mistaken if we think that we can push back the Chinese by raising these divisions. I know that our Government are making very good efforts in regard to recruitment, in regard to training etc.; they are establishing new Sainik schools, and they are increasing the strength of the military academies and so on. But if we think that by doing all this we can fight the Chinese, I say with my limited understanding that we are utterly mistaken. The only answer to the Chinese menace is this. . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shall we sit for half an hour and give chance to two more Members today?

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then, we shall take up the non-official business at 4 P.M. And the House will sit till 6.30 P.M.

Shri D. C. Sharma: The only answer to this Chinese danger is to have conscription. I think that our Defence Minister should not hesitate and should not be afraid of introducing conscription in this country. It is no use tinkering with the problem. I know that we are going to have

NCC in all the colleges for the college students; I know that we are going to have the ACC in the schools, and I know that we are having the National Discipline Scheme. All these things are there, no doubt, but I think that if we have to be prepared to meet the Chinese danger, we must have conscription. I would request the hon. Minister to devise ways and methods to have this conscription. I think the time is ripe when we as a nation will respond to this call. The psychological preparation has been made, and all other kinds of preparations have been made for this emergency. If we miss this opportunity, I am sure posterity will not forgive us; we shall be written down in the comity of nations as a people who did not rise to the occasion and who proved to be utter failures. Therefore, I think the only answer to this challenge is that we should have conscription. Unless we have conscription, I think the Chinese menace will be hanging over our heads like a Democles' sword all the time, and the preparations we shall make will not be of great avail.

I come to my second point. Much has been made about our reverses in NEFA. Of course, our reverses there are deplorable. They make me unhappy; they make every citizen of India unhappy. But no one has referred to what we did in Ladakh, in Chushul. It is a strange irony of fate in my country that while we are talking about defence, we always highlight the weaknesses but are not trying to pay due attention to whatever good we have done. Why don't we match Ladakh against NEFA? Did we not keep the Chinese back there? They were superior in numbers, in fighting power, in everything. They were as prepared there as they were in NEFA. Yet our jawans, our commanders and our fighters beat them back. They did not let them in.

Therefore, while we want a probe in the case of NEFA, I think we do not want a greater probe than that.

The Defence Ministry should also try to tell us what was the difference between Ladakh and NEFA. In Ladakh, we wrote a glorious chapter in the history of our army. In NEFA we were not able to do that. I think they should give a complete picture so that we can place things in proper perspective.

I do not want to go into details. I would tell the Defence Minister through you that the five points listed already in the probe are enough. But I want that the findings we get about NEFA should be applicable not only to the NEFA sector but they should be a yardstick for us to measure the defence forces in our country. They should give us an overall picture of the defence forces of our country. We should see whether the defence forces are adequately trained, adequately equipped, whether our system of command is fool-proof and whether the physical fitness of our troops is such as to stand any kind of strain, whether our commanders have the capacity to influence the men who are under them. I think these five things are comprehensive and omnibus and they should be looked into.

Another point. Let us take the case of our ordnance factories. It is true that they are giving a better account of themselves than before. But I also know that ultimately we have to depend upon the products of our ordnance factories. We may get a few aeroplanes or some other arms from abroad; but ultimately the brunt of the battle is to be borne by our country. So a great part of this budget should go into the building up of more ordnance factories so that we need not depend on others. I know we have been manufacturing small arms, big arms, fighter planes and so many other things, but this tempo has not only to be kept up but increased.

Another point. The School of Foreign Languages must be strengthened

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

because we have now to confront people who know our languages much more than we do. Therefore, the strength of the School of Foreign Languages should be increased so that we are able to cope with the demands being put up from all parts.

Another point I want to make is about pensions. I think our jawans and officers must have better pension scales. It is no use saying that they have had enough. I think the emergency requires that the pension scales should be revised upwards so that the jawans have that feeling that whatever may happen to them, their interests are adequately taken care of.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He should conclude now.

Shri D. C. Sharma: Much has been said about atomic power. I think we are wedded to peace and no doubt we want to utilise everything for peaceful purposes. But what is this peace worth if we are not to live to enjoy it? If you want peace, you should prepare for war. I would say that we should have no scruples in gearing up our atomic energy establishment for the purposes of war. The Chinese are threatening to explode—or have already exploded—an atomic bomb. They are threatening to build atomic armaments. I do not think we should lag behind in this competition.

Another point . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Another, another, another.

Shri D. C. Sharma: You give them 40 minutes but when our turn comes, you go on ringing the bell.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: You are in the governing party.

Shri D. C. Sharma: Then you should ask us not to come to the House and speak!

I was going to say that in universities, we should have schools of

Himalayan studies. We should also have schools for Tibetan and Chinese studies. The Ministry should try to subsidise those schools as much as they can. (*Interruptions*). I know my communist friends laugh because they do not mean what they say and they do not say what they mean.

Shri Vasudevan Nair (Ambalapuzha): We were saying that we would make you the Principal of that School.

Shri D. C. Sharma: I know you very well and you know me very well.

I was submitting very respectfully that our defence machine should be geared up to the maximum of its potential in terms of men, training, armaments, morale of the soldiers and also in terms of morale of the nation. Unless we do that, we cannot fight the Chinese. Besides the Chinese, we have another neighbour.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: His time is up.

Shri D. C. Sharma: You do not know him. I know him. He has now acquired a new friend in China. Therefore, there is going to be trouble from that front also. We should take care of that also.

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द (करनाल) : "ओं
आब्रह्मन् ब्राह्मणो ब्रह्मवर्चसि जायताम्, आराष्ट्रे
राजन्यः शूर इषव्यो अति व्याधि महारथो
जायताम् । दोग्ध्री धेनुर्बोद्धि अनडवान् आशु
सन्ति पुरंधिर्योषा जिष्णु रथेष्ठा समयो युवा
उस्य यजमानस्य कीरो जायताम् निकामे
निकामे नः पर्जन्योर्वर्षतु फलवत्यो न औषर्धयः
पचयन्ताम् योगक्षेमो न कल्पताम् ।"

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आपने बड़े संघर्ष
के पश्चात् मुझे जो समय दिया उसके लिये
मैं आपको धन्यवाद देता हूँ। परन्तु मुझे इस
बात का खेद है कि जब लोक-सभा में कोई

व्यवस्था नहीं है तो लोक-सभा से बाहर व्यवस्था रह सकेगी, मुझे ऐसी आशा नहीं है...!!

श्री शिव नारायण : (बांसी) : श्रीन ए प्वाएंट आफ आर्डर, सर । लोक-सभा में व्यवस्था के लिये अभी स्वामी जी ने जो कहा वह गलत बात कही है और उसको उन्हें वापिस लेना चाहिये ।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : सेना के बजट के संबंध में मेरी अपनी व्यक्तिगत राय यह है कि इसके लिये जितना भी अधिक धन दिया जाय उतना अच्छा है । इसका कारण यह है कि हम केवल पुलिस और सेना के सहारे जीते हैं । और जितन विभाग हैं, उनको जनता चला सकती है । गवर्नमेंट का काम यह नहीं है कि वह कल-कारखाने खोले और अपने सिर पर इस प्रकार की विपत्तियां ले । ये काम जनता के होते हैं और जनता इनको गवर्नमेंट से भी अच्छी तरह से चला सकती है । इसलिये मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि प्रतिरक्षा के लिये अधिक से अधिक धन दिया जाये, यह मेरी व्यक्तिगत राय है । परन्तु इस सरकार को तो कितना ही दे दो, इस सरकार ने तो उसको बस ऐसे ही खो देना है, जैसे कि रेतें में पानी बरसा दिया । पूर्व के उसके जितने कार्य हैं, उनसे यह बात सिद्ध है ।

अंग्रेजों के वक्त में यह भारतवर्ष चारों तरफ से सुरक्षित और अखंड था । दक्षिण की तरफ से समुद्र से कोई हमला नहीं कर सकता था । पश्चिम की तरफ से कन्नौजवाली लोगों को अंग्रेजों ने कुछ ले देकर अपने काबू में रखा था पूर्व की तरफ भी नेपाल, ब्रह्मा आदि को कुछ ले-दे कर अपने साथ रखा और उत्तर की तरफ उन्होंने तो तिब्बत को स्वतंत्र स्टेट ही नहीं रखा, बल्कि तिब्बत में ग्यांतसे और यातुंग इन दो जगहों पर भारत की सेना रहती थी । वहां पर हमारे सवह रेस्ट हाउस थे । डाक-तार और टेलीफोन विभाग आदि सब भारत सरकार के हाथ में थे । वहां की

जितनी मंडियां थीं, उन पर भारत के व्यापारियों का आधिपत्य था । यहां तक कि यदि भारतीय व्यापारियों का तिब्बत के व्यापारियों के साथ कोई कभी विवाद होता था, तो वहां की सरकार उसका निर्णय नहीं दिया करती थी, बल्कि वहां पर स्थित भारत के विशेष अधिकारी, रेजीडेंट, उसका निर्णय दिया करते थे और हिमालय से लगता हुआ तिब्बत का जितना भूभाग था, उस सब का शासन-भार भारत सरकार के ऊपर था । अंग्रेजों के वक्त भी यही स्थिति थी, और उनके पदचात् १९४९ तक भारत सरकार को वे सब अधिकार प्राप्त थे, जो कि अंग्रेजों के वक्त मिले हुये थे ।

इस के विपरीत तिब्बत में चीन का कोई भी हस्तक्षेप नहीं था, चीन का कोई नामो-निशान नहीं था । हम भी उन्हीं दिनों स्वतंत्र हुए थे और चीनी भी उन्हीं दिनों स्वतंत्र हुए थे । अन्तर केवल इतना था कि चीन, यह समझते थे कि हम ने जो स्वतंत्रता ली है, वह गोशियों से ली है और खून बहा कर ली है । हमारे देश के शासक यह समझते थे कि हमने जो स्वतंत्रता ली है, वह केवल चर्खा कात कर ली है, हम ने इस के लिए कुछ कुर्बानियां नहीं कीं । किन्तु ऐसा बात नहीं है । इस आजादी के लिए हमारे हजारों नवयुवक आन्तकार, फांसी की डोरी को चूम गए और मुभाप बोम जैसे बहादुरों और सेना के बहादुरों का कृपा से हम को आजादी मिला था । अगर कभी चर्खा कातने से आजादी मिलता, तो ब्रिटिशों कभी का महारानी बन गई होती । इस स्थिति में इस सरकार पर देश का सुरक्षा का बहुत बड़ा भार है ।

इस सरकार ने १९५४ में चीनियों के साथ मित्रता का हाथ बढ़ाया । उन के साथ मित्रता का हाथ बढ़ाने से हमको कुछ मिलना चाहिए था, लेकिन उस का परिणाम यह हुआ कि तिब्बत में जो कुछ भी अधिकार हम को प्राप्त थे, चीन को अपना भाई बना कर सरकार

[श्री रामेश्वरानन्द]

ने उन सब को छोड़ दिया और वहाँ से अपनी सभा आदि ले कर और डाक-तार तथा टेलीफोन के तारान को कोड़ों के भाव बेच कर चली आई। चली आई, सो चली आई, लेकिन अपने देश का सामानों का रक्षा तो उस को करनी चाहिये थी। १९४६ से लेकर १९५६ तक अपने देश को सामानों को रक्षा का भार इस सरकार ने कोई ध्यान नहीं दिया। अगर मैं भूल नहीं करता, तो जून, १९५४ को चाऊ-एन-लाई दिला आए और यहाँ पर पंचगोल पर हस्ताक्षर भी हो गए। उस के जाते ही जुलाई मास में ही चीनियों ने उत्तर प्रदेश के बाराहोता स्थान पर कब्जा कर लिया, जब कि उस समझौते की सियाहा भी नहीं सूखी थी। उस समय इस सरकार ने क्या किया? मैं यह नहीं कहता कि सरकार ने कुछ नहीं किया। उस ने लोकसभा में बहुत मोटे कागज पर बहुत गहरा स्याही से लिख कर चान को एक विरोध-पत्र बहुर भेजा। लेकिन चीनियों ने उस को उठा कर भंगठा में जला कर अपनी भंगठा गर्म कर ला। इस का सिवा उस का भार कोई प्रभाव नहीं हुआ।

इस के पश्चात् १९५५-५६ में चीनियों ने स्वातंत्र्य क्षेत्र, मुरनाक किले और अन्य कई क्षेत्रों पर कब्जा कर लिया। यहाँ तक कि अक्षयचौन में त्रिकियांग से लेकर, जो कि कबायलियों का स्थान है, तिब्बत तक एक सौ मील लम्बी सड़क भी उन्होंने भारत के क्षेत्र में से तैयार कर ला। उस वक्त भी सरकार का ध्यान नहीं खुली। वह देखता रहा। मैं उस वक्त लोक सभा में नहीं था। जब लोक सभा में सदस्यों को इस का पता चला, तो यहाँ गड़बड़ हुई और सरकार से पूछा गया कि क्या चीन भारत के क्षेत्र पर अधिकार करते आ रहे हैं। इस पर पंडित नेहरू ने, हमारे माननीय प्रधान मंत्री ने अपना पाछा छुड़ाने के लिये कहा कि वह तो बेकार जगह पड़ा है, जिस पर चानी लाग कब्जा कर रहे

हैं। यदि मैं होता, तो मैं पूछता कि चीनो क्यों बेकार पड़ा जमान पर कब्जा कर रहे हैं, उनका दिमाग में क्या खराबी है। अब तो सरकार को पता लग गया होगा कि वह कितना बेकार जगह थी। उस पर अधिकार कर के उन्होंने सड़क बनाई, पीछे का चीनियों से उन्हें मिलाया और उसी बेकार पड़ा जगह के कारण उन्होंने इस देश पर हमला किया।

एक देहाती व्यक्ति था। उस की छाती पर से काड़ा निकल गई थी जब काड़ा निकला, तो उस ने बड़े जोर से हाथ मारा। पास बैठे हुए लोगों ने पूछा, "क्या करते हो?" उस ने कहा, "काड़ा को मारा है"। उन्होंने पूछा, "काड़ा को क्यों मारते हो?" उस ने उत्तर दिया, "वह मेरी छाती पर से जा रहा था"। उन लोगों ने कहा, "अरे भले भादमा, तुम्हारा छाती पर से काड़ा ही तो जातो था, हाथ तो नहीं जाता था।" उस ने कहा, "जब काड़ा का रास्ता बन जायगा, तो फिर हाथी भी निकला करेंगे।" अगर सरकार ने उसी समय चीन को मजबूत चेखा दिया होता, अगर उस का मुंह रगड़ दिया होता, तो मैं विश्वास दिला सकता हूँ कि उस को शक्ति न होता कि वह इस देश पर हमला कर सकता। इस सरकार ने स्वयं रास्ता बनाया और चीनियों ने उस का लाभ उठा कर हम पर हमला कर दिया।

इस दिल्ली का कूड़ा-कबाड़ किस की कमर पर लदता है? मैं देखता हूँ कि गधों की कमर पर लदता है। क्या आप ने कभी शेरों का कमर पर भी लदते देखा है? क्या शेरों के चार पैर नहीं हैं? क्या शेरों की कमर नहीं है? लेकिन शेरों का कमर पर कभी कुछ नहीं लदता है। क्या बात है? इसका कारण यह है कि शेर कभी बोझ को सहन नहीं करते हैं और बेचारे गधे सहन करते जा रहे हैं, इस लिए उनकी कमर पर लदता है। जो व्यक्ति सहता चला जाता है, वह यह कह कि मैं मसार में जाँवत रह सकूँ, मैं इस

बात को नहीं मानता हूँ। सहनशीलता अच्छी है, लेकिन यदि कोई हमारे अधिकारों का प्रतिरक्षण करे, तो उस का प्रतिरोध करना आवश्यक है।

इसलिये यह आवश्यक है कि सेना के लिए ज्यादा से ज्यादा बजट दिया जाये और स के लिए बढ़िया से बढ़िया हथियार प्राप्त किये जायें। हमारे यहां तो वेद में लिखा है :

धन्वनागा धन्वना आजीम् जयेम्,

धन्वना तीव्रः समदो जयेम्।

धनशत्रोरपकामम् कृणोति,

धन्वना सर्वाप्रदिशो जयेम्।

बे बढ़िहीन हैं, जो कहते हैं कि हम हाथ जोड़ कर राज्य चला लेंगे। हाथ जोड़ कर राज्य चलता होता, तो ये साधू ब्राह्मण कभी के चलाते रहते। हाथ जोड़ने से कभी सरकार या शासन नहीं चलता है। जब कोई किसी तरह नहीं मानता, तो वह शासन के डंडे से मानता है। इस लिये हमारे यहां लिखा है कि शस्त्रास्त्रों के द्वारा बड़ों से बड़ी भूमि प्राप्त की जाती है, धन प्राप्त किया जाता है, शस्त्रास्त्रों से शत्रुओं की बड़ी बड़ों तीव्र सेना को कुचला जा सकता है, उन के मद को उतारा जा सकता है और हमारे राजा-महाराजा उतारते रहे हैं। मुझे कोई इतिहास बता दे कि क्या सृष्टि की उत्पत्ति से ले कर महाभारत पर्यन्त भारत पर कभी कोई हमला हुआ। भारतपर हमला होने का कारण केवल यह है कि जब से यहां पर शक्तिवादी लोग आए, तब से यहां पर हमले होने लगे। जब से हमारे देश में शान्तिवादी बौद्धों का समय आया, तब से इस देश पर भोग हमला करते रहे। इस सरकार ने अभी उसी रास्ते को अपनाया है, उस रास्ते को बसारा नहीं है। इसलिये हमारे देश पर हमला हुआ है।

15.49 hrs.

[SHRI THIRUMALA RAO in the Chair]

जब तक यह सरकार उस रास्ते पर चलती रहेगी, तब तक वह इस देश की सुरक्षा नहीं कर सकेगी। आज हम को बढ़िया से बढ़िया हथियार चाहिए और हथियारों के साथ साथ उनके चलाने वाले भी चाहिए। सरकार ने हथियार ले कर रख लिए हैं, लेकिन उन को चलाया नहीं जा सकता है :

मैं अपने प्रतिरक्षा मंत्री का ध्यान इस तरफ़ दिलाऊंगा कि दिल्ली बहुत पुरानी नहीं है। आप से पहले, एक हजार वर्ष पहले, एक चौहान पहले भी आया हुआ था और अब आप भी आए हैं। उस चौहान का भी इतिहास में नाम है और उन का भी इतिहास में नाम रहेगा। मैं उन को याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि वह अपना इतिहास किस रूप में देखना चाहते हैं। वह हमारी भावनाओं को समझते होंगे। कैसे लोग शासन कर सकते हैं ? वेद में एक मंत्र आया है

वश्यंतीव वेद। गनिगन्तीकणमप्रियं

सखायं परिवश्वजानः।

योपोव विगने वित्तत्राधिधन्वन् ज्यायाम्
समने पारयन्ति ॥

जिस तरह से नव-विवाहिता वधू अपने प्रिय पति के पास आ कर उस के कान में प्रेम भरे शब्दों से बात करती है और उन शब्दों को सुन कर जैते उस पति को उस से अत्यन्त प्यार होता है, उसी प्रकार से यह धनुषबाण की प्रत्यंचा डोरी का शब्द जो कान के पास टंकार करता है, उस से जिस को प्यार होता है, वह यद्ध को जीत सकता है। मुझे लज्जा आई जिस समय मैं ने प्रधान मंत्री जी का ८ नवम्बर और १४ नवम्बर का भावण पढ़ा। हम ने उस समय भी उन का ध्यान दिलाया था कि यह जो वह कह रहे हैं ठीक नहीं है। उस वक्त उन्होंने ने जवाब दिया कि लड़ाई की बात नहीं करनी चाहिए,

[श्री रामेश्वरानन्द]

इस से लाखों और करोड़ों आदमी मर जाते हैं। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ, श्रीमान् जी, आप हैं किस लिए। लड़ाई तो आप ने करनी नहीं है, तो फिर आप देश की सुरक्षा किस तरह से कर सकेंगे? मैं अपने देश के नेताओं के भाषण पढ़ता हूँ तो मुझे दुःख होता है। वे कहते हैं कि हम अपने देश की एक इंच भूमि भी किसी विदेशी के पास नहीं रहने देंगे। उस के साथ ही साथ वे कहते हैं कि हम लड़ेंगे नहीं। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि तब फिर आप टोपियां फेंक फेंक कर शत्रु को मारेंगे या चर्खा कात कर उन का मुकाबला करेंगे या सांस्कृतिक कार्यक्रम उन को दिखा कर उन से भूमि वापिस लेंगे, किस तरह से आप अपनी भूमि को उन के कब्जे से छुड़ायेंगे, यह तो आप बतायें।

मेरे ये शब्द आप को चुभने नहीं चाहियें। अब ये शब्द आप को चुभ जायें और आप चीन को निकाल बाहर कर दें तो भी मैं समझूंगा कि जिस प्रयोजन से मैं इन का प्रयोग कर रहा हूँ, वह सिद्ध हो गया है। मैं इन शब्दों को आप का अपमान करने के लिए प्रयोग नहीं कर रहा हूँ। यह मेरा कतई मंशा नहीं है। मेरे हृदय में आप के प्रति बहुत थढ़ा है। मगर सरकार को यदि शस्त्रास्त्रों से प्यार नहीं होगा तो सरकार कभी भी शासन सूत्र को सम्भाल कर नहीं रख सकेंगे।

भारत की स्थिति क्या है? भारत की कितनी सीमा चीन के साथ आज हमारी लगती है और कितनी पहले लगती थी, इस को आप देखें। १९४९ से प्रथम हमारी एक इंच भूमि भी चीन के साथ नहीं लगती थी, एक इंच सीमा भी चीन की सीमाओं के साथ नहीं लगती थी। चीन ने जब तिब्बत पर अधिकार किया उस के पश्चात् से अब हमारी २६४० मील लम्बी सीमा चीन की सीमा के साथ लगती है। वहां पर न तो कोई सड़कें

हैं, न कोई मकान बने हुए हैं। वही तो चौदह हजार फट ऊंची पहाड़ की चोटियां हैं और दूसरी तरफ इतनी ही गहरी खदकें बनी हुई हैं। ऐसी स्थिति किस ने बनाई है? आप ने ही तो यह स्थिति बनाई है, आप की शान्ति ने ही तो यह स्थिति बनाई है, आप के पंचशील के नारे ने ही तो यह स्थिति बनाई है। अगर ऐसा न होता तो यह स्थिति बन नहीं सकती थी। अब जब यह बन चुकी है, इस में से निकलने का कोई रास्ता आप को ही बताना होगा और इस विषय में से हम को आप को ही निकालना होगा। किस प्रकार से इस में से निकला जा सकता है, यह मैं पहले ही बता चुका हूँ।

आप देखें कि कैसे लोग आप ने रखे हुए हैं। आप ने कृष्ण मेनन साहब को रखा हुआ था, जनरल कौल को रखा हुआ था, उन जैसों को जनरल बना कर आप ने रखा हुआ था। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि ये मालदारों के लड़के जिन को आप बाल्यकाल से ही अफसर बना कर सेना में भेज देते हैं इन में और नीचे वाले सैनिकों में बड़ा भारी मतभेद अभी तक है। मैं इस को जानता हूँ क्योंकि मेरे साथ इन के बड़े सम्बन्ध हैं। पहले जितने अफसर बनते थे वे नीचे से बनते थे। अफसर एक सिपाही बनता था। उस को बड़े से बड़ा और ऊंचे से उंचा पद दिया जाता था। वह अंग्रेजों का वक्त्त था। अब आप ऊपर से ही लेने लगे हैं, मीथे अफसर लेने लगे हैं। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि ये अफसर महाशय जब तक नीचे से नहीं चलेंगे तब तक अफसर महाशय अफसर नहीं बर सवेंगे, ये क्या जानें कि किस तरह से लड़ा जाता है। कौल महाशय कहां बैठे थे, जब लड़ाई चल रही थी। मुझे जहां तक पता है हमारे सैनिकों के पास उस समय पूरे हथियार तक नहीं थे और उन की तादाद भी बहुत थोड़ी थी। उन्होंने ने कहा भी कि हमारे पास पूरे हथियार नहीं हैं, चीन का हमला होने वाला है, कृपा कर के या तो

हमें बढ़िया किस्म के हथियार दिये जायें या और सेना भेजी जायें जो हथियार से सुसज्जित हो। ऐसा न कर के महाशय जनरल ने कहा कि तुम को लड़ना होगा। मैं मानता हूँ कि भारत के लड़ाके जवान बड़े बहादुर हैं, बड़े वीर हैं, बड़े शूरवीर हैं, और उन की शूरवीरता के आगे हमारा श्रद्धा से माथा झुकता है। लेकिन बिना हथियारों के किस तरह से वे लड़ते और लड़ा भी किस तरह से जा सकता था? प्रधान मंत्री जी के १४ नवम्बर के वक्तव्य से भी यह चीज स्पष्ट है। उन्होंने स्वीकार किया है कि हमारे पास ऐसे हथियार नहीं थे, जैसे चीनियों के पास थे, हमारे पास दूरमारक हथियार नहीं थे, आटोमेटिक राइफल नहीं थीं। मैं मानता हूँ कि ये हथियार आप के पास नहीं थे। लेकिन मैं पूछना चाहूँ कि आप इन पिछले पंद्रह वर्षों में करते क्या रहे? क्यों नहीं आप ने आटोमेटिक हथियारों से अपनी फौज को लैस किया? लोग तो खेती करते रहे, जो दुकानदार थे, वे दुकानदारी करते रहे, दूसरे लोग अपने अपने कामों में लगे रहे, आप क्या करते रहे, यह मैं आप से पछना चाहता हूँ? आप का क्या उत्तरदायित्व था? आप ने अपने उत्तरदायित्व को निभाया क्यों नहीं? यह कह देने मात्र से काम नहीं चल सकता है कि चीनियों के पास बहुत अधिक फौज थी, उन्होंने बहुत अधिक आदमी अपने मोर्चे पर झोंक दिये। आप ने क्यों नहीं फौज की तादाद बढ़ाई, सड़कें क्यों नहीं बनाई, क्यों साधन तैयार नहीं किए?

बुढ़ापा कुछ अजीब किस्म का होता है। बुढ़ापे में स्वभावतः लोग सन्यास में चले जाते हैं। हमारे पुराने रीति रिवाज भी यही थे। हमारा रिवाज कहता है कि गृहस्थी आदमी को पचास वर्ष की आयु के पश्चात् वाणप्रस्थ में और उस के बाद सन्यास में चले जाना चाहिए —

श्री भागवत झा आजाद (भागलपुर) : आप यहां क्यों हैं?

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : मैं ब्रह्मचर्य से आया हूँ। यह नियम गृहस्थियों के लिए है। यह मुझ पर लागू नहीं होता है।

सभापति महोदय : अब आप खत्म करें।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : जब शर्मा जी बोल रहे थे तो आपने छः बार घंटी बजाई थी और तब वह बैठे थे। मेरे भाषण के दौरान मैं यह पहली ही घंटी है। अभी पांच घंटियां और बजनी हैं।

आप किस तरह से देश की रक्षा कर सकते हैं, इस को आप सोचें। आप नवयुवकों को आगे लायें, बूढ़े बूढ़े महानुभाव चले जायें। आप ने मानसरोवर और कैलाश पर्वत तो चीनियों को दे दिये और वहां तो अब आप जा नहीं सकते हैं। लेकिन इधर जो तपोवन है वहां जा कर भी माला जपी जा सकती है। नवयुवकों को आगे आने दो। लेकिन आज स्थिति यह है कि जो नेतागण हैं उन की हमेशा यही कोशिश रहती है कि उन के सिवा और कोई आगे न आने पाये। यह देश के लिए कोई अच्छी स्थिति नहीं है। प्रधान मंत्री जी आ गए हैं। उन से मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या कोई उन्होंने ने अपना उत्तराधिकारी तैयार किया है। उन के पश्चात् इस काम को कौन सम्भालेगा।

एक माननीय सदस्य : कोई नहीं है।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : क्यों आप तैयार किसी को नहीं कर पाये हैं। हर एक व्यक्ति इस बात की कोशिश करता है कि उस के बाद कोई काम को सम्भालने के लिए तैयार हो।

जहां तक कृष्ण मेनन साहब का और जनरल कौल का संबंध है, मैं आप से सच कहता हूँ कि जब तक इन को लाल किले के सामने खड़ा कर के दण्ड आप नहीं देंगे तब तक नीचे सेना की बहादुरी नहीं बढ़ेगी। यह मैंने पहले भी आप से कहा था और आज

[श्री रामेश्वरानन्द]

फिर कहता हूँ। जब तक आप ऐसा नहीं करेंगे कोई आगे नहीं आ सकेगा। इस ओर आप ध्यान दीजिये।

हमारे सर्राफ साहब कह रहे थे कि अभी हमारे पास काफी शक्ति नहीं है और दस पंद्रह बरस में हम शक्ति जुटा लेंगे। पंद्रह वर्ष जो बीत गए हैं, उन में आप ने नहीं जुटाई तो आगे क्या जुटावेंगे। पिछले पंद्रह वर्षों में हमारी जो हालत बनी है, उस को हम सब जानते हैं। अगर आप उसी तरह से अगले पंद्रह वर्ष भी हाथ पर हाथ धर बैठे रहे तो मैं पूछता चाहता हूँ हमारा क्या बनेगा ?

तिब्बत के साथ आपके जो संबंध थे वे टूट चके हैं। चीन के साथ हमारी बड़ी लम्बी चौड़ी सीमा लगती है और हम जानते हैं कि वह हमारा दुश्मन है। पाकिस्तान को हम ने बिजली दी, कोला दिया और अब पानी दिया जा रहा है। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने और महात्मा गांधी जी ने भी करोड़ों और अरबों रुपया पाकिस्तान को दिलवाया है। क्या पाकिस्तान की सद्भावना आप के साथ मौजूद है ? आप नेपाल को देख लें। क्या वह आपके साथ अच्छा बर्ताव कर रहा है —

सभापति महोदय : एक दो मिनट में खत्म कर दीजिये।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : पांच मिनट में जरूर कर दूंगा। इतना समय तो दे दीजिये।

ऐसी स्थिति में आप कैसे कह सकते हैं कि आप सुरक्षित हैं ? हम ने शास्त्रों में पढ़ा है कि किसी भी राज्य के ऊपर छः विपत्तियां आती हैं। इन छः विपत्तियों में अंतिम विपत्ति यानी पड़ोसी राज्यों का बिगड़ जाना, पड़ोसियों का विरोधी बन जाना, यह राज्य के नाश का अंतिम समय होता है राजनीति में। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि पड़ोसी देशों में से किस के साथ आप के सम्बन्ध अच्छे हैं ? चीन के साथ आप के सम्बन्ध अच्छे हैं ? चीन पड़ोसी देश है जो आप के साथ प्यार करता

है ? हम ने नीति शास्त्र में पढ़ा है कि सबस पड़ोसी राज्य अगर कोई है तो उस का कभी विश्वास नहीं करना चाहिये। आपने पड़ोसी चीन का विश्वास क्यों किया ? उसकी आबादी ७५ करोड़ है और हमारी ४० करोड़। वह समझता है कि अगर अपनी ४० करोड़ आबादी भी खत्म करके भारत पर कब्जा कर लिया जाये तो भी अच्छा होगा। अगर वह हम पर कब्जा न भी कर पाये और उसके सैनिक मारे भी जायें तब भी कोई बड़ी बात नहीं है और यह भी उसके हित में ही होगा। कम से कम उसकी आबादी घटेगी तो सही और जब आबादी घटेगी तो उसका खर्चा भी घटेगा। जनता को भर पेट खाना नहीं मिलता है, वह तो उसको मिल सकेगा।

अब आप अन्दर की स्थिति ले लें। उस के सम्बन्ध में मैं निश्चित रूप से कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे देश में करोड़ों चीन के एजेंट बैठ हुए हैं, पाकिस्तान के एजेंट रूपी काले नाग आज भी दूध पी रहे हैं। आप बतलायें कि चीन के अन्दर भारत के कितने हितैशी आप ने बनाये हैं ? पाकिस्तान के अन्दर आप के हितैशी कितने बैठ हैं ? आप के देश के लोगों की जो स्थिति है, पार्टियों की जो स्थिति है वह आप से छिपी नहीं है। मैं आप से प्रबल शब्दों में कहना चाहता हूँ कि जिस तरह से भी हो सके, भारत की सुरक्षा करो। जैसा महात्मा गांधी हम को देा दे कर गये हैं, आप भी अपनी श्रीलाद को उसी तरह दे कर जाइये। नहीं तो यह कलंक आप के माथ से कभी नहीं जा सकेगा। आने वाली पीढ़ियां आप को किस बुरी तरह से कोसा करेंगी यह आप लोगों से छिपा नहीं है। इसलिये मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि आप किसी तरह की ढील न करें। देश में ढील नहीं है।

16 hrs.

मैं ने देखा है कि हमारे यहां की जनता में कोई कमी नहीं है। जनता के लोग सेना में

भरती होने के लिये हजारों की संख्या में नित्य आते हैं। लेकिन आप के लेने वाले हजारों में से गिने चुने दो चार लोगों को लेते हैं। आप ने देखा होगा कि जनता के लोग दान भी बहुत देते रहे हैं और आप ने लिया। यह दुर्भाग्य देश का है और शासकों का कि वह उसे स्थिर नहीं रख सके। आप टैक्स लगा कर बैठ गये। टैक्स से ज्यादा तो जनता आप को दान के रूप में दे सकती थी, लेकिन आप ने किसी प्रकार से जनता से सहयोग नहीं किया है ?

मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि आप हमारे भाव को समझें। इस समय भारत की सुरक्षा आप के हाथ में है। अगर आप केवल यह सोचें कि आप कानून पास कर लें, तो कानून तो आप पास कर लेंगे जरूर, लेकिन उस से देश की सुरक्षा हो यह अनिवार्य बात नहीं है।

Mr. Chairman: The discussion on the demands of the Defence Ministry will be resumed tomorrow.

16.03 hrs.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

EIGHTEENTH REPORT

Shri Hem Raj (Kangra): Sir, I beg to move:

"That this House agrees with the Eighteenth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 3rd April, 1963."

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

"That this House agrees with the Eighteenth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 3rd April, 1963."

The motion was adopted.

MARINE INSURANCE BILL—Contd.

Mr. Chairman: The House shall now take up further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri D. C. Sharma on the 22nd March, 1963:—

"That the Bill to codify the law relating to marine insurance, as passed by Rajya Sabha, be taken into consideration."

Shri Dwarka Das Mantri may continue his speech.

श्री द्वारका दास मंत्री (भीर) : सभापति महोदय, मैं मरीन इंश्योरेंस बिल में जो कमियां रह गई हैं उन का जिक्र कर रहा था। आज कल शिपिंग ट्रांसपोर्ट बढ़ता जा रहा है और जितनी ज्यादा चीजें उस में आती हैं उतनी ही असुरक्षा बढ़ती जा रही है उन के मामले में। ऐसे समय चाहे कारपोरेशन कहिये, इंडिविजुअल कहिये या कम्पनी कहिये, जो कि इंश्योरेंस का काम करने वाली हैं, उन के सम्बन्ध में रजिस्ट्रेशन के कुछ तांत्रिक नियम बनाने की आवश्यकता रहती है। वह जो नियम हैं या जो कायदे कानून हैं वह इस बिल में कहीं भी देखने को नहीं मिलते हैं। व भी इस में सम्मिलित कर दिये जाते तो अधिक अच्छा रहता।

इस के साथ साथ, जैसा कहा गया है, अभी भी कम्पनियां अपने ऊपर इतना बोझ नहीं उठा सकती हैं। इसलिये रिइश्योरेंस सिस्टम बहुत कुछ ग्रमल में आता है। मगर मैं देखता हूं कि इस बिल में रिइश्योरेंस का कहीं उल्लेख नहीं है। यह एक लैकुना रह जायेगा। रिइश्योरेंस के सम्बन्ध में कुछ न कुछ सेक्शन इस में रखने आवश्यक हैं। अगर कोई घटनायें घट जायें तो उन के रिइश्योरेंस करने के सम्बन्ध में स्पष्टीकरण न रहने से बहुत कुछ यह बिल असफल रहेगा।

इस में ब्रोकरेज का भी कहीं उल्लेख नहीं है। यह कहा जाता है कि हमारे पास