

[^][Shri C. R. Pattabhi Raman]

I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following papers:—

(i) Annual Report of the National Instruments Limited, Calcutta, for the year 1962-63 along with the Audited Accounts and the comments of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon, under sub-section (1) of section 619A of the Companies Act, 1956.

(ii) Review by the Government on the working of the above company. [Placed in Library, See No. LT-2558/64].

REPORT OF GANGA BRAHMAPUTRA WATER
TRANSPORT BOARD FOR 1963

The Minister of Shipping in the Ministry of Transport (Shri Raj Bahadur): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of Report of the Ganga Brahmaputra Water Transport Board for the year 1963 (Hindi and English versions). [Placed in Library, See No. LT-2559/64].

12.22 hrs.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS—contd.

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE—contd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will take up the discussion and voting on the Demands for Grants under the control of the Ministry of Defence, for which 10 hours have been allotted, out of which 5 minutes have been taken already.

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Mandsaur): May I make one request about the cut motions of which notices were given yesterday? Actually, the discussion on these Demands begins only today..

Mr. Speaker: As a lawyer, the hon. Member should know that he should not argue on that now, but he may only ask me to condone the delay.

There is delay in this case, and I shall condone it and consider the case of these cut motions, and treat them as moved, if otherwise admissible.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: The delay may be condoned.

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: They may be taken as having been moved.

Mr. Speaker: I have already said so.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I beg to move:

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

[Lack of effective steps to meet the menace of Pakistani raids on the borders of India (73)].

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

[Failure to meet effectively the obvious menace arising out of the collusion between Pakistan and China (74)].

"That the Demand under the head Defence Services, Effective—Army be reduced by Rs. 50,00,000".

[Need for economy in expenditure under sub-head Transportation—hired transport (75)].

"That the Demand under the head Defence Services, Effective—Army be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Inefficiency of the recruitment officers in proceeding with recruitment (76)].

"That the Demand under the head Defence Services, Effective—Army be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Waste of money on hired transport (77)].

“That the Demand under the head Defence Services, Effective—Army be reduced by Rs. 100”.

[Expenditure on military attaches to Indian Embassies abroad (78)].

“That the Demand under the head Defence Services Non-effective be reduced to Re. 1”.

[Non-inclusion of the service of the Canteen Stores Department under this head (79)].

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty (Barackpore): Last year, when we were discussing the defence budget, we debated on it against a background where there was the big Chinese attack and there were the disastrous NEFA reverses. There was a concerted attack on the policy of non-alignment. And in those dangerous days, we were thankful for the aid which we got whether in small arms or in any other form of airlift from the USA, UK as well as for all other help coming in the form of a promise to build up our defence potential. The country was united and our resolve, which this Parliament had stated in a pledge was that we shall wipe out our defence weaknesses, and it was also pledged to us that there would be an inquiry into the NEFA reverses, and this House, without a division, voted for huge allocations for the building up of the defence potential of our country.

The entire idea behind that huge allocation which the Parliament gave to Government was a declaration of self-reliance, a declaration that we shall rely on our own resources first and foremost and we shall not enter any military blocs. It was a difficult decision for us to take, for a poor country like ours, but we did.

Today, after one year, when we are debating upon this Ministry's

Demands for Grants, what is the background? The Chinese cease-fire has come, but there has been no consolidation of that cease-fire. There has been no acceptance of the Colombo proposals. Huge armies still stand across the frontier. We hear from time to time talks about the Chinese wanting to talk with us on the basis of the Colombo proposals; at the same time, we hear, when they go to Pakistan that they have a new idea about SEATO and CENTO being defensive alliances.

One of the biggest factors, and I should say, a somewhat new factor since last year has been the bellicosity encountered from Pakistan. There was hatred to a certain extent, but not bellicosity to the extent that we have experienced during the last one year, since the attack on Kashmir several years ago. There have been constant raids and attacks, firings across the western and eastern borders. We have as the latest scare an incident where they came right 20 miles into our territory on the western sector and killed some of our people, which has shocked our country. There has been construction of bunkers and concentration of troops along the Tripura border, which is near my State, in the West Bengal border and in the Assam border. There have been dangerous military incursions and deaths inflicted in the Jammu and Kashmir border.

This is the background against which we are discussing these Demands. There has been a stepping up of the cold and hot-war in Kashmir. There has been a stepping up of the cold war in the Security Council. There has been whipping up of communal riots and the squeezing out of the minorities in East Pakistan to find a cause or excuse for urgency of the Security Council debate. Even today, when the Security Council is going to meet and discuss, there has been flaring up of communal riots right throughout India, Raigarh and Belghoria in West Bengal; in Jamshedpur the situation is very serious. The

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

situation is very serious in Jarsaguda. This is what has happened. Most significant of all, is the support which Pakistan has received in the past, and still receives, from the United States of America and the United Kingdom.

I was reading Prof. Ranga's speech last year. He said—after all the US and UK want us to be friends with Pakistan; they want Pakistan and ourselves to be friends. I think most of us in this House have always wanted to be friends with Pakistan. We have gone to the farthest extent to be friends with Pakistan, and we would be one with Prof. Ranga if it was only a question of bringing about friendship between ourselves and Pakistan. Prof. Ranga said—should But our quarrel is this—on what basis has the friendship to be brought about? The basis which has been put forward by the US and UK has been the question of Kashmir, that is, unless we solve the question of Kashmir according to their wishes!

I remember very clearly what the London Times said on the 28th November 1962, when our country was in great difficulties. They were then giving us some arms; even at that time, the London Times told us in that very article, that the real thing hinged on the fact whether we accepted the condition relating to Kashmir, the solution which they were putting forward before, whether that would be accepted or not; otherwise, arms and arms aid would not be given. I could quote to you the actual words, but I have no time to do so.

We have had during this last year the question and the idea of the division of Kashmir coming every now and then, and then the question of mediation. We have seen Sir Patrick Dean's performance in the Security Council. As a matter of fact, when some of us went to meet the High Commissioner for UK here recently to protest against Sir Patrick Dean's speech in the Security Council,

he told us—'after all, you should not misjudge us because we gave you arms when you were in difficulties.' We are thankful to them for the aid. But because we are grateful to them for some small arms and an airlift, it does not mean that we shall agree to give up our sovereignty and compromise our territorial integrity.

As a matter of fact, in the last year, what has been our experience? A whole series of British and US missions have been here and our missions have visited their countries. As a matter of fact, when Shri Chavan spoke last year in reply to the debate, I think it was on the eve of Shri T. T. Krishnamachari's visit to the United States. We know that our ambassador in the US has made efforts, sometimes not always to our liking, in this direction. How much has he been trying to tell us: 'Don't do this, don't do that; otherwise we shall not get aid, we shall not get military equipment'.

We have seen during the last year our newspapers flashing headlines, in the whole of July last year—on July 8, 'UK-US Blueprint for India's Air Defence Soon'; on July 22 'India Accepts Anglo-US Defence Plan'. What has emerged out of all this? Joint air exercises for testing highly sophisticated radar! We were told they were very necessary for us. We did not have supersonics; we had one or two MIGs coming to us from the USSR—they had just started coming, one or two. We were told that we would have our own HF-24, and therefore, it was necessary for us to have the radar equipment.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hosangabad): Six MIGs.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I am sorry—six MIGs. Even today we have no supersonics. Our Deputy Minister, Shri D. R. Chavan, told the Lok Sabha on 16th March that the Government's

efforts to obtain F-104 aircraft as part of military assistance from abroad had not yet met with success. Pakistan has got F-104 aircraft, but with all our beseechings, and the beseechings of the Finance Minister, they are not with us.

Now, we have had our training in radar, we have even had foreign planes flying over our border territory, because they were going to allow us to use their supersonic planes, but the funniest thing—at least in West Bengal this is what we feel—is that after all that, we had two helicopters landing within two minutes of each other,—not a supersonic plane—they came, they landed, saw everything and went away, and we are told they took photographs. I do not know whether they really took photographs, but the whole fantastic thing is that, having had radar exercises, they have taken away the radar, they have promised to give us radar, and now helicopters can come with impunity and do what they like.

On 19th July last year, in Washington Gen. Chaudhuri had a long meeting with the United States Defence officers, and it was stated in our papers—I am quoting:

"The United States will probably not be able to give us supersonics because of Pakistani displeasure. It may be got in Moscow.... Most modern weapons are not available, but what has been received to date has been mortars, guns for mountain warfare wireless, mountain warfare clothing, small arms."

We are grateful for even that. After all, these things help, every little thing helps, but the really important point which we want our Defence Minister to tell us today is this. At that time we had pointed out that there were political conditions attached, but the thing was not so serious at that moment because we were facing Chinese aggression. We had seen them in the papers, and we know they were attached. Firstly, even these

arms or assistance could not be used against Pakistan. Secondly, the United States has the right to inspect and observe the use of arms given by the United States military missions and have their observers here. We cannot use these arms against Pakistan, but at this moment, that is one of the biggest difficulties we are facing, and there is every chance—whether it is collusion or joint plan, or with the direct or indirect help of America and Gt. Britain, whatever the reason—that we will be attacked. When we are actually attacked by Pakistan, which God forbid, shall we be able to use them? That is the question we would like to ask.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): I think we can use them in defence.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: We also want to judge the quality of the military aid which has been given to India, and that which has been given to Pakistan. Last year the question of the Navy was brought up by my hon. friend Shri Raghunath Singh. That is his special pet.

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): Thank you.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I find that not only supersonics have been given to Pakistan, but submarines have been given. One has been given, I do not know how many more. After all, I am not in the know of military intelligence of Pakistan, but that is what is given in our papers. As far as I know, we have got an aircraft carrier, I do not know whether we have more than one. I do not know what we are going to do with it. It is very expensive too.

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): It demonstrates every year on the 26th January.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: My hon. friend Shri Nath Pai says that it is meant for demonstration to us, but it is much better that we demonstrate something against those whom we will have to fight if we have to defend our

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

country. Therefore, the entire question of these air exercises which we have held, the type of arms, the quality of the arms which we are getting, the political strings which have been attached with regard to the use of those arms against Pakistan, all these, and even the question of the Seventh Fleet, have to be examined. I would like to ask a question but our Prime Minister is not here. We were told: after all, they can come, what can we do about it? Even Mr. Talbot, after all that has been asked on the floor of this House, when he goes away from Pakistan, says: we are very satisfied with our relations with Pakistan. If that is the situation, then even the Seventh Fleet might be used against us and not against others. I say these are very serious points which I want the House to consider, because we have decided last year, and we hope that we shall continue to stick firmly to the decision that we must be able to build our own defence potential, our own military strategy and our own operational methods.

The Defence Minister last year stated something with which I would like to associate myself fully. He said:

"Your army cannot be made to depend upon the arms and ammunition to be supplied by somebody. The rate of combat consumption is so heavy; it is just not possible to think of fighting any defensive action without having your own defence production base. In the case of the Air Force, and in the case of air production too, naturally, we shall have to depend upon our own.... We must have some clear ideas in our own minds about certain basic principles about our defence effort. And there is no doubt that we must continuously and watchfully and energetically make efforts to see that we try

to broaden and deepen and strengthen the base of our own defence production."

The question is, are we doing this? Before I proceed further, I would like to pay my tribute to the performance of our ordnance factories. The excellent results of these factories are there for everybody to see, especially, the pride of our ordnance factories, the Ishapore Rifle Factory, which has produced semi-automatic rifles.

An Hon. Member: Your constituency!

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: It is not only a question of my constituency. It is a question of the whole country being proud of. Those who know about the background in which the ordnance factory workers and their DGOF proceed with it, will appreciate this. They fought for it to put it in the public sector. There was a great pull to take it to the private sector. I must pay my tribute to the DGOF, Shri Shahaney, who has done an excellent job of it, and also the workers who have worked round the clock and especially the Mazdoor Union which has its excellent President, who, in spite of the fact that he lost his job during the last strike, always tried to explain that it was a question of challenge to the public sector. He said, if the private sector take away, let us take it as a challenge and let us, in the public sector, show to them that we can make it. And we have made it. Actually the entire House should greet those workers of the ordnance factories and the authorities and the Defence Minister for having shown what the public sector can do by way of producing these semi-automatic rifles.

Then, the HAL has entered into a project to produce the Alouette helicopters. I do not know at what stage it is there. We have just read and we came to know a little while ago—

Shri Raghuramaiah, the Minister of Defence Production in the Ministry of Defence, also mentioned about it—that the young scientists have been doing excellent work in respect of electronic and radar development. Only the other day, I read about mountain warfare problems, and it was very clearly stated by our Defence Minister that the problem of operating internal combustion engines in the sub-zero temperatures of northern borders is something that no country in the world can solve for us. It has to be solved by us. Even in the most advanced countries in the world, it is stated that these equipments were designed for use only up to altitudes of 8,000 feet or a little more. But it is a problem for us, where we have to fight at heights far, far in excess of that, to solve. It is a problem for our scientists, and it has to be solved entirely by our scientists and engineers. Therefore, this is something which our young men are engaged in, and it is quite clear that systematic research yields quick results at the LRDE, and this is something about which we should be proud.

Then, I must point out that the DMRL organisation has now been shifted from Ishapore to Hyderabad. If there is something very special about it, of course we should be told about it. Then I will be the first to support it. But I feel that since it is a research organisation, associated with the question of steel factory and the rifle factory, I do not really realise why we are spending so much money on shifting it all the way back to Hyderabad. Of course, there are electronic factories in Hyderabad, and similar other things. It is very good. But I do not quite see why this is being shifted. I hope the matter will be enquired into.

Then, what about the six new ordnance factories about which the hon. Minister has told us at the last budget debate? I think that on this account the bulk of the shortfall was Rs. 58 crores. If we take away the excess

of about Rs. 10 crores which we have spent on the Air Force, it will come to about Rs. 48 crores or Rs. 43 crores. The main reason, it is stated, is that in spite of Government's best efforts it is not possible to secure foreign aid needed to set up the six ordnance factories envisaged in 1963-64 Budget. Only one of the proposed six factories for the manufacture of ammunition is in an advanced stage. We were to have a factory for the manufacture of shells; another for high explosives. One factory is to be in the South Indian town of Trichinopoly. These are still in preliminary stages and it is a very serious matter because unless we set proper priorities and go all out to get the know-how, allocate the money and exert all our energies to this end, I am afraid we shall not be able to go further. We are told that a US firm of consultants Arthur D. Little Inc. has come for formulation of expansion of defence production, phase II. I feel that this is a dangerous position. Not only in this Ministry but in the other Ministries, there is this inferiority complex that we are not able to do many things. I know that many of our engineers are capable of doing these things, both in the private as well as in the public sector. Actually when the first phase of the expansion programme for setting up these six new ordnance factories was there, they were doing it so well: our engineers and scientists have been doing it so well. It is only a question of how much energy, priority and effort we put in getting the know-how. We should not allow the whole planning of defence production to go to a foreigner, especially in these difficult times when the politics of these things have to be gone into. Last year my colleague, Shri Indrajit Gupta wanted a three-year plan for defence production. Have we any? From the report, it is a fairly better report than the earlier one—I fail to find this spelling out of the three-year plan. At least let a two-year plan be given, setting out priorities.

~[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

Have we laid down priorities? The most important of all is our plan of production of supersonic aircraft. We are happy that after such a long time we have at last set up Aeronautics India. It has been a long and tortuous process to my mind, if we calculate the number of months. The whole country has been waiting for it. It is an important thing. Was this delay due to diffidence on our part? There has been a constant propaganda, even in sections of this House that the deal was bad and was off. When British or US delegations come here, *Hindustan Times* and other papers tell us: the MIG deal is off. Somebody else questions that. I wonder if there is some political hesitation. If that is so, let us be clear about it. As far as I know, even last year, my hon. friend Shri D. C. Sharma could not say whether China has got MIG 21 factory; whether they have got other MIG factories. We have taken a very peculiar position. What is that is holding it up? Are there not such rumours? Are they correct? Has there been some sort of horse-trading. When the Americans go away we again start talking about MIGs and try to boost it up. I want to know whether or not a definite effort is being made by very highups in the Government to turn over more and more of armament manufacturing capacity to the private sector and to slow down public sector. What should have been given the highest priority is being slowed down. If it is a question of using idle capacity in the private sector for components or things like that, it is all right. We should have some sort of a co-ordinated plan for that. I myself have written; the unions have written, for instance, about the DMC factory producing strategic goods; they have got the machinery from which they could make defence production. Actually, the electronics section of the Defence Ministry came forward to inspect it but nothing else happened. In my

own area itself certain companies can manufacture certain equipments for the Air Force—Veegal Engineering Co., for instance, can do these things. Experienced and surplus employees of non-scheduled airlines could be taken to HAL. We are not opposed to that sort of thing. But we are totally opposed to permitting the private sector to enter the field of armaments and weapons. We do not want any subversion of the industrial policy resolution under the excuse of that word 'public interest'. There is a word, there is a sentence and everything hangs on that particular sentence. We want a public assurance that we will not permit private armament kings of the type that we see operating in certain western countries to develop in our country with disastrous results, political and military.

This brings me to the Lockheed Mission that was here recently. We did not know very much about it. But we know that a delegation came and I think it was led by its Vice Chairman, Mr. Polton. Some have come under different names also, I am told. They met the Finance Minister, Mr. L. K. Jha and Boothalingam, all from the Finance Ministry, very early in the morning, at a very peculiar time and the only person who from the Ministry of Defence could have been directly concerned with it, Mr. P. V. R. Rao. I hope that our Defence Minister also met them. There was a discussion. Shall we be buying some F 104? Have we got the money for it? Shall we use it against Pakistan? If we buy it, have they agreed to allow us some know-how so that we can set up a factory? These are things we want to know. If they have agreed, let us go ahead; if not we have to be very careful.

About this MIG deal, Aeronautics India has been set up. MIG 21 has guided missiles. We have to manufacture them. They are all highly sophisticated and intricate electronic

equipments. Last year, my hon. friend Shri Indrajit Gupta had stated this. We have to think of the entire structure of the Air Force. The question is: when will it come up? Are we going to build them up in the course of the next two years? Then again, where is the location? Are the locations fixed and firm ones? Are we going ahead in all the three locations? Are we going to have a separate electronics factory to take up this very sophisticated electronic machinery? These are the points we have to know. At least we must be assured that we have a plan and within that plan period we shall be able to produce our own supersonics. F-104 has already attained supersonic speed, I believe. We shall be able to have a substantial number of these in a short time. This should be our priority No. 1, according to me. How far has the Defence Ministry agreed upon it? That is something that we should like to know. We have got our engineers, and defence factory personnel, our HAL technicians and others and with their help and nation's goodwill, we shall be able to build up our defence potential and have our supersonics in the Air Force.

The other point which I wish to refer to now is the NEFA enquiry report. All things seem to have gone down. At that time the question of military intelligence loomed very large in the minds of the people. I would like to be told what has happened to the question of military intelligence. At that time, the Defence Minister told us, "It is a difficult thing. We are looking into it, but it cannot be built up in a day." We all know that it cannot be built up in a day. But certainly in such periods of emergency, we would like to know, specially when certain other things have happened in the meantime, how far we have really improved that intelligence. There have been air crashes. We have not known anything about it. The press and radio in Pakistan as well as the international press have flashed it; but we have not known it.

The worst thing is we have had aeroplanes and helicopters flying in and getting down on our territory and flying off. We have had an Illyushin which has just disappeared and we have not been able to locate it. We do not know whether it has crashed. What has really worried me is this—that this Illyushin might have been lured away to Pakistan through some radio-signal station. I do not know how our military intelligence works, but by common sense, I would say this. Surely we would like to know whether we do not have our own code as far as military bases are concerned, or do we have the common code of the ICAO? Surely we do not follow that. If we have our own code, does it mean that that code has become known to Pakistan and it can radio-signal that code to us and give us false directions? All these things really worry us and we want to know the position.

I was surprised when I got a sort of information—I do not know how far it is correct—about the MRA—Moral Rearmament Assembly. Even in this House the hon. Prime Minister has said that it is under the blessings of the American State Department. We are told that when the MRA Group was in Bombay, the band of INS Vikrant was in attendance not only at the Chowpathy Rally, but also elsewhere. Secondly, an MRA drama was staged on board INS Vikrant. Even that I can understand that the group were entertaining them. Whether that is correct or not is another matter. Thirdly, INS Vikrant officers received instructions from above to give all facilities to MRA people and also to provide accommodation. In fact, some MRA people stayed with INS Vikrant officers on board the ship. We must know whether these things are true. I would like the hon. Minister to look into these matters.

The last point which I want to make, which the hon. Minister had accepted last time—in fact, anybody will accept it—is that if we are to fight we have to fight with the full healthy

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

morale of the jawans and the relations between the jawans and the officers have to be at the very best. That is one of the most important things. That is the socialistic approach—I use the word 'socialistic'—that is the 'stick' approach. If that is the approach which the Congress has accepted, they have to give up the class brass hat approach, which we have had.

Dr. M. S. Aney: What is the difference between socialist and socialistic?

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: That is the word they like, with the 'stick' in the end. That is why I am using that word too. I am not very clear as to the socialism of the Congress but one point is true and that is that we have got to learn certain things from the Chinese soldier and the Chinese officer. There is no doubt about it. Let us give up the old class brass hat approach. It still remains with us and we have to root it out ruthlessly. There is an uppish snobbery and class segregation which still remain with us. We have made a mistake in making that synonymous with discipline. As a matter of fact the Khadakvasala Academy is a very fine academy. When I meet the young men who go there, I really feel very happy that these young men are going for the army. But what pains me is their aping of western habits—dinner dresses, eating with forks and spoons, which they have not seen before, because they come from ordinary middle-class families. But at the end of it, of course, they come out as pucca sahebs. All this is supposed to be part of discipline. As an educationist, I feel that ragging also is not the way to discipline. I had seen British universities and also public schools and there this is what has been imparted to them. I hope even Mr. Anthony will not try to synonymise ragging with discipline. It is very bad. I see it as a mother, as a politician, as a citizen. I hope that this House would be one with me in seeing that we root out this ragging not only from the

Defence Academy, but from other universities and colleges also. It is something bad which has come into our body politic and we have to root it out.

About the mess and clubs, everything is separate. Why should it be so? I am shocked that there is discrimination even in the battlefield, for there is separation allowance only to officers and not to OR. While living at the same altitude, there are different high altitude allowances to officers and OR. Why should it be so? There are different para-troops allowances for doing same duties. There are different special compensation allowances in the field. There are special rations, cost free, to officers and not to other ranks. Surely some rations should be issued to ORS also. While doing exercises in plain, officers get disturbance allowance. Why not this be given to ORS also? My friend Shri Tyagi has got a very nice smile on this face; that shows that I am not far wrong. Other ranks are not authorised to purchase goods from CSD(I) at cheap rates such as cheese, butter and fish. Of course, I will leave out transistors and scooters because the poor fellow cannot buy scooters. There are officers' shops established to supply them with articles at very cheap rates, but there is no such provision for ORS. OR families are kept at arm's length from officers' families even in social gatherings and they do not mix with each other. Why should it be so? They belong to our own families. One brother happens to be an officer and another brother happens to be OR. Why should we continue with these Sandhurst traditions, I want to know.

There is the question of leave requests. The second speaker from my party, Shri Raghavan, will deal with all that. Lastly, I want to say that the relations between the workers and the authorities must be one based on confidence and not on the attitude of arrogance. Fortunately during the

last one year, we have had the best relations. I do not know Mr. Chavan very well, but I have read in the papers that when he was Chief Minister of Maharashtra, he was able to bring about that relationship and I hope he will bring it again. He should bring a new approach and there should not be that brass hat approach which means, one something is done, it cannot be reopened, because it is a matter of prestige.

Even some of our OCS behaved in a manner which really creates unnecessary trouble for us. There is the case of the Kankhana Engineering Stores Depot where Rs. 300 was collected by the unit and he was asked to forward it to the National Defence Fund. But he said he would not do it, because there was some quarrel going on between the workers and the officers. These things should be enquired into. The way the transfers of union officers is made should also be enquired into. They wanted a co-operative store and even that has not been permitted. It is the same brass hat attitude. The Defence Minister, with his experience with labour in the past, should look into these things.

13 hrs.

The times are serious. We have to be wise, but determined. We have to guard our independence and our territory. We have to defend it. For this, we shall take help wherever help is necessary. We shall take the necessary help for know-how, but we shall not sell ourselves to foreigners. We have to build a free and socialist India. We can do so only if we fight for this independent defence policy and give up our complex regarding foreign experts. Let us take their know-how, but build our own public sector. Let us have confidence in our own defence personnel, in our scientists and in our engineers. We shall fight in this way, and it is such a fight that can be a resolute fight. If our Defence Minister is able to build that up he shall have not only the good

wishes of this House, but he shall have the support of the entire country.

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): Mr. Speaker, Sir, from the manner in which we have had the benefit of experience and contacts that our Communist friends have of the working of our ordnance factories and all other installations and establishments which are associated with the Defence Ministry and the defence departments, we can see who, in an indirect way, is running the Defence Ministry and who, in an unauthorised manner, in an unacknowledged manner, is the real Defence Ministry in this country. This is a warning which, I am sure, my hon. friend, Shri Chavan, must have already noted for his own benefit and the benefit of the Ministry of which he is in charge after he has taken over charge of the Ministry.

I have had the honour of visiting quite a large number of our ordnance factories, and I found that the Defence Ministry was not having as much control over them as could have been expected. There was no such thing as totalitarian control by the Defence Ministry over the defence installations. There is a kind of diarchy going on there. It is an unseen one in a way an unacknowledged one in another way. I do not know whether it would be possible for some time to come for the Defence Ministry and the Defence Minister to gain real control and then say that all these defence installations can be depended upon completely, under all circumstances, whoever may be our allies, whoever may be our enemies.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): What control do you want?

Shri Ranga: Last year also we had these speeches, like the one we had just now, from our Communist friends who are so very well informed, possibly better informed than what many of the hon. Members can claim to come to possess even on the Congress side.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: They do not read papers.

Shri Ranga: I do not regret the information they possess or their knowledge. But I am surprised at the vehemence with which continuously they pursue the same line of exhorting our country to pursue the patriotic line of being entirely independent of all other countries in the world not only in regard to the three arms of our defence forces but also in regard to their equipments, in regard to the ordnance factories, in regard to the science and in regard to the research behind them and all the rest. What would have happened if Soviet Russia had pursued that line when she was attacked by Hitler? What would have been the fate of England during all those turbulent times if she had not sought and welcomed the support of her allies including Soviet Russia in the later stages? One would only have to think about it to be warned properly in regard to the advisability or otherwise, the political tenability or otherwise of this "very brave and patriotic advice" that our Communist friends are giving to us. They would have no objection if we could get more and more from Soviet Russia by way of armaments, experts, know-how and also political advice. They would have no objection, I am sure. But, unfortunately, it is not forthcoming however anxious they may be that Soviet Russia should barge in taking advantage of this extreme opportunity they have of our need for support from which ever side it may come.

Shri Tyagi: Is it forthcoming from the United Kingdom?

Shri Ranga: I am coming to that.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Bring in F-104; we have got no objection.

Shri Ranga: I have never raised any objection to Soviet Russia coming in and helping us.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: who craves for your objection?

Shri Ranga: That is true. When these two big parties are in alliance

with each other, they can afford to be indifferent to the attitude of other opposition parties in this House. That is quite obvious. But should we not welcome and continue to welcome whatever assistance the democratic countries are capable of and are willing to give to us in spite of whatever other difficulties they might have, in spite of whatever other differences they might be entertaining between themselves and ourselves in regard to our own political situation in our country and also in regard to our political as well as other attitudes towards our neighbours? That is the most important thing.

It is true that America and England are pursuing a line now in regard to Kashmir which we do not like. They have said so. But when our Communist friends and some of our other friends also went to the U.K. High Commissioner what did he tell them? He told them: "You did not agree with us on so many occasions. You abused us, you condemned us and you attacked us there in the United Nations in no uncertain terms almost bordering on hostility. But we made no complaint about it. We took it in our stride." Did they not say so? They told our friends like that and our friends were tongue-tied.

Shri Sham Lal Saraf (Nominated—Jammu and Kashmir): All the same, the ball was left in his court.

Shri Ranga: I do not know in which court it was—it may be in the Kashmir court of my hon. friend. But I know only one thing. That is what he said. He told them: "Why do you raise all these things now? When we differ from?" Yes they have differed from us. We deplore it. We are not happy. But is that any reason why we should not welcome the support of those people, coming from those quarters in other spheres? That is our point, and I am sure they will agree with us in regard to that.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: They should put a limit.

Shri Ranga: They should not put a limit? Is it the idea that they are not a separate country, they are a part of us and therefore, they should not put any limit? They are a separate country. They have their own liability. They have their own feelings, friendships, enmities and all sorts of things. In spite of that they have come forward to give us some support. If that is not enough we have got to think about it. An occasion will arise when we discuss the international affairs. We have to think as to what we can possibly have between ourselves and those countries in order to improve our mutual relations to such an extent that we can make them maximise their support to us to such an extent as would be enough or adequate for dealing with the problems that face us today.

Having said that, I want to make it perfectly clear that we also, in the Swatantra Party, are in favour of the State itself being completely responsible for the defence, not merely the defence forces—of course, that is taken for granted—but also the defence production. To the extent that they want their efforts to be supplemented from time to time, according to their needs, seek the support of various other private entrepreneurs. They are welcome to do so. The primary thing is that the Government should take up their primary responsibility of defence production. That is common ground, I think, among us all, among all the political parties here.

But the most important thing is, how they would organise these ordnance factories, how they would run them, whether they would try to become the real masters of these ordnance factories and prevent political elements from playing any kind of mischief inside them and in their running or whether they would allow them to go on as at present in such a diarchical fashion. I do not

wish to go into this particular matter in detail any more. I hope the hon. Defence Minister would be able to see the trend of my thought in regard to this particular matter.

They had promised to develop six ordnance factories and they wanted us to sanction them the necessary amount. We did that. We sanctioned all that they asked for last year, Rs. 90 crores and odd. This time they come forward and say that they have not been able to spend Rs. 50 crores out of the sanctioned amount they have not been able to develop six ordnance factories, and they have given us some reasons. I wish to know whether they expect Parliament to be satisfied with their performance and whether they are themselves satisfied with this performance. If there had been any insuperable difficulties, either from the democratic countries or from Soviet Russia, or any other country which can be expected to be friendly to us, we would have liked the Defence Minister to take some of us into his confidence before he came to us with this confession of failure. This I consider to be one of the major failures of the Defence Ministry.

Secondly, there is the failure of the Ministry to develop and manufacture in large enough scale of our own Avro 748. I was assured almost by chance by some people who have had something to do with the manufacture of it that the Government in its various ramifications is not so very keen in developing its manufacture. I do not know why. For a long time it has been an open secret that the Transport Ministry was not prepared to be co-operative. Why should it have been so? Then, recently we were told that the Transport Ministry had made up its mind to place some trial orders, I speak subject to correction. How long are they going to take cooperate with the Defence Ministry?

[Shri Ranga]

We were told that there is a Defence Sub-Committee at the Cabinet level, with a number of Cabinet Ministers, presided over, I suppose, as is usual with all Cabinet Sub-Committees, by the Prime Minister himself. He seems to have been helpless, as also the Defence Minister and the Sub-Committee. This prevention of the development or manufacture of this aircraft is one of the major failures of the Defence Ministry.

13.12 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair].

Thirdly, they wanted to raise 6 Himalayan divisions, mountain divisions as they call them. A suggestion was made that at time, including by some of eminent members of the Congress benches, that preference should be given as far as it is possible to people who live in those high altitudes. My hon. friend, Shri Chavan, did not like the idea of preference but we urged that every possible effort should be made to recruit to as large an extent as it is humanly possible those people who live in those areas in high altitudes. Why? They themselves have mentioned copiously in this book *India Prepares* and also in the various explanations in their own Report, how many things have got to be built in in order to make any one capable of remaining at those high altitudes of 14,000 and 15,000 ft. and, at the same time, be capable of offering effective resistance and defence for our country, in regard to food, drink, hot water, living accommodation or small tents, clothing, capacity to breathe at that high altitude, fighting frost and various other things. They have been obliged to spend quite a large amount of money on research and also on experiments and on taking different sections of people to those high altitudes and getting them acclimatised. All these built-in apparatuses, rather most of them I should say, are already there for

these Himalayan people. In addition to that, we can supplement their equipments. We can also send people from other parts of India and got them acclimatised to that altitude but primary preference should have been given to the utilisation of these people. But Government has not accepted and has not implemented that policy. That is another failure of the Government.

There was the NEFA report by General Henderson Brooks. The country was reminded of it the other day when he was rightly rewarded by the Government. We are glad that he was rewarded. But what happens to that reports? At that time, may be, there was some justification for my hon. friend to keep it strictly confidential and secret. Why is it that he has not published it till now? Since more than one year has passed, why should the country be kept in ignorance about it?

Then, what is the progress that has been made in the light of the recommendations made by that committee and in the light of the revelations that were contained in the short summary that my hon. friend, Shri Chavan, has placed on the Table of the House, in regard to military intelligence, subversion and so on? Who in our country can confidently say that in the Communist Party of India there is not that China lobby? We have got the Soviet lobby too, but we are no longer afraid of it because they have become the unofficial Defence Ministers, as I have said. But what about the China lobby in this country? It is there; it is a fact. Among them some are brave and courageous and some of them are perhaps members, I do not know, of either this House or the other House—I speak subject to correction. What is the policy that the Government has been following or pursuing? My hon. friend, the Defence Minister, may say that it is for the Home Minister and Prime Minister and not for him, but he cannot

absolve himself completely of all responsibility in regard to this matter because it is for him to take the initiative and reach the Cabinet Sub-Committee and, later on, the Cabinet and see that proper policies are pursued in regard to the China lobby in our country.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: What about the American lobby?

Shri Ranga: The American lobby, just like the Russian lobby, has to be tolerated.

Shri Raghunath Singh: He is in the American lobby.

Shri Ranga: I think my hon. friends of the Congress benches ought to know better than throw a sling like that at me. They would only be stultifying themselves by indulging in such cheap jibes at my cost, because I am no smaller patriot than any one of them, including the Prime Minister, and it would be wrong for any one, it would be foolish for any one to begin to entertain any such idea about me, about a person who had been a freedom fighter for 35 years, who had been their colleague till the other day, who had to differ from them not because he had disobeyed them, not because he had asked for a job or position and it was refused—as I said earlier. I repeat it that there was not a position which it was in the power of the Prime Minister to give and which he was not prepared to offer to me—and yet why did I leave then? I left them for definitely known purposes, for protecting the peasants. Therefore, I would like to tell my hon. friends that it would be high time for them to begin to see who are their friends and who are their doubtful friends in patriotism. I do not wish to go beyond that and I do not want to be deflected from the course of my speech today.

Then come to the question of the Defence Council. Before my hon. friend took charge of this Ministry.

the Defence Council was formed. It was formed on a very narrow basis. It was formed on almost, what should I say, Congress Party plus extension basis. It is high time now that it should be re-constituted in such a manner, either in a non-political manner or on all parties basis; it should be reconstituted in such a way that it would be capable of giving proper advice to the Defence Ministry. It should be a truly National Defence Council.

That would not be enough. My hon. friends in charge of the Defence Ministry cannot claim to be any greater experts than anyone of us here in this House and certainly not greater experts than my hon. friends to my right because they are also laymen like me, like everyone of us. They have got to be guided and advised by their experts. But then how can we be sure that the advice given to them is the right one? To check it up, air exercise must have helped them and the recent naval exercise also must have given them some useful information. I do not see any reason why my hon. friends of the Communist Party should be complaining about these exercises and saying, "Oh! the Americans have gained so much information at our cost" as if the Americans did not have that information. It is for us to gain something from the proximity of their own exercises. That is exactly what the Government has done. I am glad, the hon. Prime Minister, in spite of the Soviet influences which are all the time tugging at his apronstrings, has mustered sufficient courage to allow these two exercises to go on here in this country in spite of the other two mistakes that he made by not allowing the transmitters (V.O.A.) to be brought over here and about that umbrella idea.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: You want the umbrella.

Shri Ranga: Not being unfurled in the country.

[Shri Ranga]

Therefore, how are we to check or strengthen the kind of advice that is being given by the Chiefs, I am not going to suggest that foreign experts should be brought in here in order to check and countercheck and in that way advise us properly or help us to come to proper decisions. But fortunately for us we have our own patriotic retired Generals and retired Chiefs of Staff. Four of them—General Cariappa, General Thimayya, General Thorat and General Shrinagesh—are still with us. There are other Generals also who have fought for the country, who had risen to be Generals in our Army and who gained so much of experience. The services of all these people should be invoked and utilised.

At one time, just at the time the Chinese were at our throats, it looked as if the hon. Prime Minister was quite prepared to yield to the demands made not only from our Benches but also by quite a large number of our friends on the Congress Benches that the advice of these Generals should be taken advantage of. But somehow, barring one or two instances in one or two committees, they have all not been utilised and have not been invited for consultation. Therefore, I suggest that there is this need for a committee. How they would constitute it is to be left to them: it is their freedom. But we would like to suggest at least this much, namely:—

“a Committee including a few retired Generals, to study the possibilities of eliminating wastage in the Defence expenditure and to suggest ways and means of tightening control.”

I have not added the other one, that is, advising them also in regard to policy. That part of it will be taken up by the Denfec Council. Here also I would like these retired Generals, that is, the Chiefs of Staff and other Generals, to be invited along with the representatives of all

political parties, as I said, or non-political know-how that we possess in our country.

Then there is the question of expenditure. This is very important thing and I raised it last year. They themselves indicate in the Report that my hon. friend has placed before us—and I must congratulate him on the very popular manner in which they have explained the whole set-up of the management of the Defence Ministry in this year's report of theirs—that they usually reserve 5 to 10 per cent of the allotted sum without being offered for expenditure to their various departmental heads, Commands and so on. If by any chance they are able to save 10 per cent on almost all these demands, they would be able to save easily Rs. 80 crores to Rs. 90 crores out of Rs. 800 crores—just at 10 per cent; otherwise, they would be able to save at least Rs. 50 crores. Last year I said this and I venture to repeat the same thing this year, namely, what steps are they taking in order to see that wastage does not take place? They have given some explanations, “The emergency has come; therefore we have got to spend and we cannot observe the usual rules of procedure and all the rest.” but even then I would like them to pay some attention to what the Audit Report has said. There are so many wrong things that have been going on for so many years without any proper action being taken. On page 8 the Audit Report cites a case of a factory and the production of some units which was to be taken up in 1950 and then again in 1953 and the whole thing is hanging fire till now.

Then there is the case of accumulation of repairable stores. It is staggering to think what must be the position today—with all these new orders coming in, thousands and thousands of these military trucks, lorries and vehicles coming and out of them hundreds going in for re-

repairs—as to where should be the repair facilities. What is happening to all these things is not possible for us to imagine. Paragraph 13—accumulation of repairable stores—deals with what happened years ago but this is a sample of what is happening now.

It says:—

"In one depot, 204 aircraft, of which 50 had been received more than four years back were held in repairable condition on the 31st March, 1963. It was reported by the Ministry of Defence that out of these, work on 80 aircraft was not taken up as the overall line was full."

Then, further—

"During the years 1961 and 1962, only 50 per cent of the target fixed by the Ministry of Defence was achieved."

In regard to other aviation items in another depot similar things had been happening since 1950 and it says:—

"During the three years 1960, 1961 and 1962, only items representing 52 per cent of the target, were actually repaired."

In regard to the Shaktiman trucks also similar things are happening. Then, there was a water supply scheme where the contractor had in some cases deviated from the specifications—there was some mischief or the workmanship was not up to the standard. In how many of these construction works this kind of a things is happening, God only knows. Their construction works are going on to the tune of Rs. 30 crores.

Then, in one case because the budgeted sum was going to lapse as the 31st March they placed Rs. 1 crore to the credit of the Bombay Port Trust for the construction of a project about which the Port Trust had not decided. The Port Trust as well as the Government were to go into shares about it; they had to be partners in

it. The Port Trust had not decided but the Government said, "Please keep this Rs. 1 crore deposit". They have kept it there. For how many years? For many years. Rs. 1 crore are given just in a jiffy, just in that fashion. And we are placing Rs. 900 crores at the disposal of our friends on trust! We trust their patriotism. We trust their ordinary policy also. But how can we trust that the control that we ought to have over the Defence Ministry's various methods of utilising all this money is satisfactory?

It is true, they have got a very big department, called, Inspection Directorate. They are spending a little more on it than in the past. That is welcome; but that has got to be further strengthened. We have got to see whether anything more has got to be done to strengthen it in order to enable it to control the Defence expenditure in such a way that economy would be achieved while efficiency would be ensured.

Then, there is the question of recruitment. They said that they have been making some salutary changes. They are not going to restrict their choice only to the few four or five traditional groups of people from whom they had been recruiting. We have no prejudice; we are not allergic to the traditional people who have been offering their recruits. All glory to them. It is good that we have some sections of our population who are always brave enough to place some members of their families at the disposal of the nation and except them to risk their all. We are grateful to them. But it is not always advisable to restrict our choice to them alone. Therefore, the Government, ever since we have become free—thanks to the lead given by Sardar Patel—has been pursuing the right line, the correct line, of extending the scope and of throwing its net far and wide over the entire country so that recruitment would be free for every section of our people in the country. Good. But they are not pursuing this policy effec-

[Shri Ranga]

tively, vigorously, satisfactorily and there are not sufficient number of recruiting centres in the south, in the west and in the east. They have done a little. It is always possible to say, there were only two centres in the past and now we have got five centres. But that is not what would satisfy us. In what percentage more and more of those people have come and joined the defence forces? It is in this direction that quite a lot has yet to be done. They have developed training centres. Yet they are closing some of the training centres. Why? They say, just now they are not needed. But should we not have any reserves and if we have to have reserves, why should we weaken the territorial army recruitment or training? That is what is being done. I would like the Government to give a second thought to this aspect of the problem.

Then, there is this question of China and Pakistan. Are we quite sure that there is not much of, to a serious degree, sabotage in our country—saboteurs who have either come here or disguised themselves as Indians or some from our own people who have sold their own souls to others? Last time, we simply said, there was the China lobby. But there is the other lobby also, the Pakistan lobby. What is it that the Government is doing? High-powered military officers and airforce officers were lost the other day. We all mourned their death. They were patriots and what is more, by their death, the country has suffered so much. Not in a day can a general be produced or a Brigadier be produced. And they were lost. Why were they lost? Till now, we have no information, Sir, about the fate of that Ilyushin and we are told now—I speak subject to correction—that Government also knows the fact that there is a ghost aerodrome, radio signalling, which has been misleading our planes and it is quite possible that this ill-fated Ilyushin might have been misguarded in

that manner. We would like to have more information about this. We would like to be assured that the Government, whatever might be in the past, is now capable or is trying to be capable of checking and controlling these evil forces, these dark forces. Do they belong to the political party. I would like them to study? Do they belong to certain social circles, I would like them to study? Why have they arisen and how far they have spread their tentacles, in what strength and in what sphere? Could we be assured that their presence would not be Kashmir frontier? Could we be assured that their presence would not be found in the North-East Frontier. It is in this direction that some real, genuine, effective effort has got to be made by the Defence Ministry in co-ordination with the Home Ministry.

There is also one other thing. The frontier between India and Pakistan on the east is much bigger than the frontier on the west. That frontier has been subjected to so much pressure from Pakistan forces, also in the west, and all these frontiers. Only the other day, my hon. friend Mr. Tyagi was patriotic enough to rise above any party demands or responsibility and loyalty and warned the Defence Ministry, "Either you defend the country properly, strengthen our borders effectively, keep a clear and close watch over what is happening on our frontiers, or get out." Now, that proposal I would like to place not merely before the Defence Ministry but before the whole of this Cabinet. I personally feel that this Cabinet has been remiss in this regard, that this Government has been sleeping over it. It is most unfortunate for our country that just at this juncture.....

Shri Tyagi: My purpose was not to see they get out; actually I wanted to goad them into action.

Shri Ranga: I am saying the same thing. It is most unfortunate that even at this juncture....

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I hope they have been goaded.

Shri Ranga: Our common friend—I am sure he is the friend of all the groups in this House—the Prime Minister has fallen ill and has not been able to give just that much of leadership as could have been expected. I do not know whether it is because of this enforced rest that he was obliged examine, “Yes, we must be prepared to do something effectively and if necessary, to cross over that red line or the black line that was drawn in order to protect our interests, but not to aggress. I want the United Nations people, and everybody to take note of the fact. I cannot claim to speak for the Prime Minister. But I do claim to say—what I have understood from his statement the other day—that it is not the intention of our Government and our people to aggress on anybody, that we do not want to go to Pakistan merely for the sake of going that we do not want to wage war against them. We have already made this clear to the rest of the world repeatedly that we are prepared to offer and accept and agree on a ‘no war’ pact with them. Therefore, all that was hinted, I think, by the Prime Minister’s remark the other day was that if those people were to continue in this mischievous, unwise and suicidal policy of coming into our territory, attacking our people, planting various guns and time-bombs and various other things and in that way upsetting our social economy then the time would come when we would not mind telling them, “Look here, you are not the only people who go on giving kicks and you must also be prepared to receive kicks.” I am glad they are supposed to have reached that position. But what is the good of making brave declarations? The Prime Minister made similar declarations when he was going to Ceylon not so long ago and we know the consequences. Therefore, it is no good making declarations. What we want is, equipment and capacity to

stand. aggression from Communist China as well as Pakistan and others also. What are we doing on the Communist China front? The Prime Minister has quietly told the Prime Minister of Ceylon and through her, the P. M. of China without the knowledge of his own officers, without the knowledge of his own colleagues, I suppose, at that particular moment, that it is not the intention of India to go up to the Macmohan Line. We have been claiming our right that all this land up to Macmohan Line has been India and is India and we would not allow, we would not tolerate, China to come and trespass into that area. All the trouble has arisen over that. Yet he said so. Why? He might say when we are not strong enough to go upto that line and why annoy them and irritate them. But then would it not be possible for them to turn round and say, “We have occupied so much of this area; we have placed so much of our claims there; it is ours and it is no longer yours.”? Have we not had the bad example, bad precedent, set up by our own Prime Minister by simply saying, Longju belongs to us. But we are not occupying Longju. Even when the Chinese left Longju, we are not going to re-occupy Longju.

Shri Tyagi: For the present.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: ‘For the present’ is the important thing; ‘for the future’ is of no importance.

Shri Ranga: That is the Prime Minister and his political liability that we have got to carry, unfortunately, here in our country on our shoulders and that is why I take very strong objection to the assurance that the Prime Minister has given. If anyone else had given it, we would have called him a traitor. But because the Prime Minister with all his sense of responsibility has done it, we abstain from throwing that ap-

[Shri Ranga]

pellation at him in his face. But, surely, I would like him to know that we take the stongest possible objection to this and we would consider this as one of those very bad and very unfortunate and unpatriotic things which we consider him to have been responsible for.

Why is it that with all this growing equipment and strength that we have been developing during the last year and a half, our Defence Minister has not been able first, to be advised by his own Chiefs of Staff, and next, has not been able to advise the Prime Minister that we should be able, and we are in a position, to go and stake our claims, with the civilian administration to start with and then military occupation also in a few places, so that we could always claim later on before the international world that we had never accepted or allowed the Chinese occupation or non-occupation or evacuation or control over those areas, and that we have never treated them as no-man's-land? Why has that not been possible? I count that as one of the major points against the Defence Minister.

In conclusion, I would like to say that last year I wished well of the Defence Minister and I hoped that he would be able to come to this House by this time with a record of achievement which could be accepted by us as good or, if that is not possible, as tolerable. I am sorry to have to say that I cannot say that my hon. friend has succeeded in the primary responsibilities that have been placed on his shoulders by the nation.

Shri Sham Lal Saraf: I have heard two speeches so far, one from the representative of the Communist Party and the other from the Swatantra Party on the Demands for Grants relating to the Ministry of Defence for the year 1964-65.

When we were in the freedom movement our conception of defence, I would say in very simple language, was more of an idealistic nature. After

grappling with the situations that had arisen from time to time, our leaders and our Government had become gradually realists or had to take the role of realists.

I am reminded of the fact that till 1957-58 or even till 1961, my hon. friends on my side of the House as well as on the Opposition would wax eloquent over the matter whenever Government wanted to make a little effort to strengthen its defence base and to spend a little more on defence. I am very happy to see that for the last one year, everybody, irrespective of party affiliations is united on this issue namely that the country must have a good strong defence, a well-prepared defence system so that we are able to protect the integrity and defend our country as best as we can.

Things have to be considered in this perspective namely that soon after we became free, we had inherited the defence system, the defence plan and defence pattern that the Britishers had handed over to us. Was that in conformity with the aspirations of the people and with the needs of the country? I would say that it was not. At that time, our Government had to face a number of problems, external as well as internal. Perhaps, it may have been due to that also that earlier much better attention could not be paid to matters concerning the defence of our country.

Lately, we have seen that right from 1947 onwards, when the Pakistan areas were separated from our country, Pakistan has been creating problems of an multifarious nature, for us, and as such the problem of defence has become a very important one, both in relation to Pakistan and also in relation to China.

The old perspective has changed very much, after these two things have happened on the borders of our country. In view of that, our Government and our leaders have to keep in view the defence of our land borders where

our aggressors have come down upon our heads, so to say. As far as the defence of coast line is concerned, I shall leave that aside for the moment.

On our borders, new things have come up. Till that time, the Himalayan borders were supposed to be impregnable and invulnerable. But, now circumstances have changed, and we find that even those very heights, those highest heights have become hot for us, and, therefore, the entire pattern, and the entire training and the entire set-up of the Army have had to be changed.

I am very happy that in spite of the fact that new problems have cropped up and are cropping up, the Defence Ministry has been looking into everything. For instance, there is jungle warfare which is a new thing which I myself witnessed when our troops were in operation in Kashmir, and I saw how they had to equip themselves for the new conditions and the new situations that had faced them. Then, there is also the case of mountain warfare, warfare on high mountains and also fighting in snow. These things have created a number of problems. But I am happy to find from the report of the Ministry that considerable research has been done on the armaments, weapons, equipment, battle dresses, and the food etc. that our troops have to carry, and a number of these things have been got manufactured to suit the present day requirements of the Army. I was very happy to find when I met the rank and file from the Army that they were very much satisfied with what they were getting now.

Then, I come to the question of training and recruitment. I am happy that the new recruitment policy is in keeping with our Constitution and the aspirations of the nation and the people as a whole. Today, I find that the recruitment base has been widened and it has been given elasticity, and everybody in the country, in whichever part he may be, has got an

opportunity to join the Army and be recruited. The system of recruitment today is not what it was in the past, and it is no longer confined to the martial races only. I do not mean to say thereby that I have anything untoward in my mind about those who come from the martial races, I wish that they should continue to be recruited, but at the same time, all others also should get opportunities for recruitment in the Army, and I am happy that that is being done.

Besides, I would also like to submit that our recruitment base should be dependable, should be perennial and further, it should have also some elasticity in it. For instance, whenever the need arises, whatever be the nature of that need, our Government should be in a position to make recruitment of that type of people qualitatively as well as quantitatively. Therefore, I feel that a little more streamlining may be necessary with regard to the creation of a proper recruitment base.

So far as training is concerned, I would not be able to explain in detail the training courses that are now made available for the rank and file, in the Army, the Navy and the Air Force, but I would say that I am happy to find that Government are proceeding in the right direction in this regard. I congratulate the hon. Defence Minister on the fact that during this short period that he has been in charge of this Ministry, what has been done with regard to these training courses is really laudable. I hope he will go ahead with that so that in a very short time we would be able to compete with any progressive or militarily strong country in the world.

Then I come to the question of research and co-ordination. There is a parliamentary science committee consisting of Members of Parliament, wherein scientists of repute in the country who are working on research problems attend and give lectures. A number of things have come up in the

[Shri Sham Lal Saraf]

course of discussion, and we have been able to know from the experts of the Army who have been participating in those discussions quite a number of things. While we may sometimes have not felt happy about the way our scientists on the civil side were working, yet, as far as the work that is being done on the defence side is concerned, it is going on very well, and I hope that more vigour would be brought into it, and there will be many more achievements to their credit and to the credit of the Defence Ministry and Defence establishments of our country.

Another point is with regard to the intelligence set-up. Now that every-time we will be kept bothered and worried about what is happening on our frontiers, the intelligence organisation, particularly the one that concerns our Army, should, I personally think, be improved. Much needs to be done with regard to that. I am not in a position to suggest myself how it should be done. I would only say this that Army Intelligence requires to be first-rate. Their organisation, set-up and functioning should be first-class. As to in what way it has to be done, I leave it to Government to decide. But when the hon. Minister replies to the debate, I hope he will tell us something about his thinking with regard to our army intelligence organisation.

Government have given a reorientation in respect of thinking on our defence plans and defence matters, and finalisation of decisions at all levels in matters concerning defence. They have the Cabinet Committees, inter-ministry committee, Defence Minister's Committee, Secretaries' Committees, Committee of the Chiefs of Staff of the three Services; I am very happy they have given these a shape, that will certainly facilitate taking decisions with least delay and in a manner that all concerned are consulted, so that nothing is left out that might tomorrow create difficulties or leaves a feeling among cer-

tain sections that they were not consulted when certain decisions with which they were concerned were taken. I think these strides have been taken in the right direction. I wish godspeed to them and feel that decisions arrived at this way will certainly be helpful to all concerned.

After the Chinese aggression, our defence budget has swelled, two-fold, I would say three-fold. I was just going into the figures. In 1963-64, from Rs. 500 crores it jumped to over Rs. 800 crores. It is really gratifying to see that even this year a number of things have been done. Prof. Ranga and Shrimati Renu Chakravartty touched on two points to which I would reply. But one thing I would like to say. I personally am very happy to find that in spite of a number of odds the Ministry had to face—I mean the Minister and his colleagues and comrades in all the services—they have been able to spend almost the entire amount, leaving only a small gap of about 5 per cent unspent. In 1963-64, the budget was over Rs. 800 crores. Now there is a shortfall of Rs. 58 crores noticed. The reasons are very obvious. Firstly—my hon. friends who spoke before me have also corroborated to this—for the setting up of six ordnance factories capital goods had to be imported. I understand the machinery and equipment for this purpose has to come from foreign countries. I do not know the details of the agreements, but this much is certain that that machinery has not arrived in time, whether it is to be had from the western countries, US or UK or from Russia. This has occasioned the shortfall.

Another thing that has come to light in this connection concerns recruitment of the mountain divisions. The pattern had to be changed under which there would be better training given to them, which would also result in saving some more money. Because of that, some amount has not been spent.

On the other hand, in respect of the Air Force, they have overspent by about Rs. 10 crores. Keeping that in view, the shortfall remaining is nothing much over which anybody should feel concerned. Therefore, I would tell Prof. Ranga and Shrimati Renu Chakravartty that this is a performance for which the Ministry can really take credit. Personally, I have a little experience of these matters. I know what it means when you have to depend on foreign exchange, when you have to depend on capital goods coming from abroad, and especially when politics comes into the picture. I would ask the hon. Minister, when he replies, to say whether, as has been pointed out, this shortfall is because of certain political strings being attached to the machinery etc. that has come from friendly countries. As far as I know, when these offers were originally made, they were without any strings. Shrimati Renu Chakravartty put it in one way, Prof. Ranga in another,—one saying that there have been strings and another denying it. But if there are any strings, the hon. Minister will kindly tell us what the position is when he replies.

Another thing is with regard to the army services. Here a number of things have happened. With regard to the engineering services, there is the border roads organisation. Last year, some of my hon. friends were sceptical about certain things connected with this organisation. They were also talked about. Personally, I must thank the Ministry for having afforded us an opportunity to go round the border areas to see things for ourselves. As far as my part of the country is concerned, namely Jammu and Kashmir, and also NEFA, I know in detail what has been done and have also spoken about it several times in this House and said that we are absolutely satisfied with colossal job that had been done, opening up these communications particularly border roads, setting up other communications like telegraphs and telephones. I have seen the work and I would say that

it is really laudable. I would congratulate our army and engineering services on what they have done against heavy odds, very difficult terrain and very difficult time.

Supplies and services for the army are a very tedious job. I have personally been seeing what has been done thousands of feet up in mountainous regions, negotiating ravines, jungle and what not. Keeping all these things in view the work that is being done is marvellous.

Last time, when I spoke on the budget demands, I had pointed out one or two things which needed to be corrected. These things have now very much improved. I saw at some places petrol from the army vehicles was being sold by our personnel last year. But I am happy to tell you that for the last 8 or 10 months, I have not heard a single complaint on this score. I am very happy that these things which I had pointed out in the presence of the Prime Minister were immediately attended to and rectified.

Sometime back, the Ministry planned for the first time in the history of our army, for the provision of quarters to our army personnel, both officers and other ranks, at different places. In Ambala, there was what was called the 'Amar' project; in Ferozepur, a number of things have been done. The same is the case in the State from which I come, Jammu and Kashmir. It is for the first time that officers, JCOs and jawans can stay with their families in those areas. I had asked a question the other day about this, but I could not get full details in answer. May I ask the hon. Minister to tell us when he replies as to how far these programmes have proceeded, and by what time they will be in a position to provide quarters for our army personnel stationed at such forward areas, so that

[Shri Sham Lal Saraf]

they can live with their families in the same way as Prof. Ranga, Shrimati Renu Chakravartty and I live.

Now I come to defence production. When the Britishers were here, they had organised it in a certain way. Now all that is being given a new shape. As the first bell has already been rung, I would not be in a position to go into details. But one thing I will say. In 1962-63, they had planned a production upto Rs. 58 crores but it actually produced worth 64 crores. Since then many things have happened. The progress has been very smooth and rapid in the matter of defence production. Even then, production went up in 1964. The State Minister of Defence Production and his organisation deserve congratulations for that. Against a production of Rs. 63.9 crores in 1962-63, in the first six months of 1963-64 production came to Rs. 51.71 crores, which means the year's production will exceed Rs. 100 crores. That is really laudable, and the Ministry deserves congratulations for that.

14 hrs.

For the first time we see that the civil sector is being harnessed to help in defence production, but not in the manner pointed out by Shrimati Renu Chakravartty or by Shri Ranga, particularly in the matter of melting and metal-cutting required for our intricate arms and ammunitions, which is not a small thing. I hope in his reply the Defence Minister will indicate to what extent qualitatively and quantitatively we have gone ahead in this respect, because that will be a very happy piece of news for us to know.

There are also programmes of training technicians and supervisors. These are not ordinary times, and therefore, it is very gratifying that we are doing it.

The tempo of production in the other establishments run by the Defence Ministry like Bharat Electronics, Aeronautics India Limited, Hindustan Aircraft etc., is continuing; rather, the production is a little more than was expected.

Our defence will not mean much unless and until we have calm and peace within the country. Our defence forces may be as strong, as equipped, as anything, but behind the fighting lines if things are not peaceful, it will be difficult to defend our country. Therefore, I submit, though it may not concern the Ministry of Defence but the entire Government, that they have to keep the peace. What are the conditions today? On the eastern border, hundreds and thousands of refugees are pouring into the country, creating unsettled conditions, while many others who have come in the garb of refugees are really spies. I read in the papers what is happening in the jungles adjacent to Garo Hills. They come and settle down and create conditions of chaos within the country. How can our defence forces fight when they are on our frontiers?

Again, in my part of the country, what is the position? Even if one man raises a slogan or does anything which goes against the basic things for which this country stands, I would say that would jeopardise our defence. Therefore, may I ask our Government to take courage in both hands and let everybody know that nothing which is against the integrity and interests of the country will be tolerated? The organisations and elements which indulge in such things should have no place in the country; those who think in terms of other countries beyond our borders, and indulge in talk which does not help us but our enemies, should be allowed no room. That is very important.

Shri Kashi Ram Gupta (Alwar):
What are those organisations in your area?

Shri Sham Lal Saraf: That is known. Only two months back, there was enough provocation in Kashmir. but, I wish to tell the hon. House and the Defence Minister, that the behaviour of our armed forces there was exemplary. Similarly, in the eastern frontier, their behaviour has been exemplary, and we congratulate them. Therefore, their needs should be treated as our own. It is not enough to take the names of one or two Generals. I respect them, but the jawan who is defending the country at great heights is equally lovable and respectable.

With these words, I wholeheartedly support these Grants. If the Defence Minister feels there are some difficulties, he can speak out in the House, and I am absolutely sure the entire House will support him.

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, श्रीमती रेणु चक्रवर्ती ने दुर्गा की शक्तिमयी वाणी में

श्री श्रीकार लाल बरवा (कांटा) : पहले कोरम पूरा हो जाने दीजिये ।

कुछ माननीय सदस्य : है ।

श्री श्रीकार लाल बरवा : झूठ कैसे बोलने हैं ? ३५ केवल माननीय सदस्य हैं । चूँकि कांग्रेस पार्टी के नेता हैं, इसलिए कोरम का होना जरूरी है ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The quorum bell is being rung. Now there is quorum. The hon. Member may continue.

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : मैं कह रहा था कि श्रीमती रेणु चक्रवर्ती ने दुर्गा की शक्तिमयी वाणी में अपना भाषण आरम्भ किया लेकिन उस में सरस्वती का विवेक आ गया और अन्त में उन्होंने अम्बिका की तरह से उस की समाप्ति की ।

उन्होंने इटेलीजेंस के विषय में एक मवाल उठाया है और कहा है कि डिफेंस का इटेलीजेंस नहीं है । मैं बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि जिस मुल्क में १५ लाख पाकिस्तानी इन्फिल्ट्रेट्स मौजूद हों और ५६,४६१ पाकिस्तानी नेशनल आर्वर-स्टे कर रहे हों, उस मुल्क का इटेलीजेंस कैसे चल सकता है, ईश्वर ही जाने ।

दूसरी बात उन्होंने यू० एस० ए० के संबंध में उठाई है । मैं उनकी इस बात से थोड़ा सहमत हूँ । क्यों सहमत हूँ यह मैं आप को बतलाता हूँ । पाकिस्तान की नेवी में १८ यूनिट हैं उसमें से ११ यूनिट तो अमरीका ने पाकिस्तान को दिये हैं । दो इंग्लैंड ने पाकिस्तान को दिये हैं । दो क्रूजर कहा जाता है कि इंग्लैंड ने पाकिस्तान को ट्रांसफर किये हैं । एक तरफ अमरीका हम से यह जरूर कहता है कि वह हिन्दुस्तान की सहायता करना चाहता है, लेकिन दूसरी तरफ सन् १९६४ में जबकि भारतवर्ष के पास एक भी सब-मैरीन नहीं है उसने पाकिस्तान को सब-मैरीन दिया है ।

आखिरकार यह पाकिस्तान की तैयारी किस के खिलाफ है ? पाकिस्तान अपने सीमान्त देश अफगानिस्तान पर हमला करने वाला नहीं है । चीन के साथ उसकी संधि है, बर्मा के ऊपर वह हमला नहीं करेगा । तब पाकिस्तान अगर हमला करेगा तो किस के ऊपर हमला करेगा ? हिन्दुस्तान के ऊपर ही तो करेगा । अमरीका के राजनीतिज्ञों को थोड़ा समझना चाहिये । उन्होंने पाकिस्तान की पूरी की पूरी नेवी को बनाया है । उसे उन्होंने बनाया है हिन्दुस्तान के खिलाफ और भारतीय जनता पर इस का प्रभाव अच्छा नहीं पड़ेगा ।

मैं आप का ध्यान इस तरफ आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ चाइना के पास केवल ६३६ यूनिट हैं, पाकिस्तान के पास २३

c [श्री रघुनाथ सिंह]

यूनिट हैं। और हिन्दुस्तान के पास, जैसा कि आंकड़ों से प्रकट है, नेवी के ५१ यनित्स हैं। इस प्रकार से हमारे शत्रुओं के पास ६५६ यूनिट नेवी के हैं जबकि हमारे पास कम हैं। अगर परसेन्टेज देखा जाये तो हमारे पास उन की सिर्फ १२ परसेन्ट नेवी है। इसी प्रकार से अगर परसेन्टिल और आफिसर्स को देखें तो चाइना के पास ७६ हजार रेगुलर आफिसर्स और रेटिंग्स हैं, पाकिस्तान के पास ७७०० हैं। इस तरह से पाकिस्तान और चाइना की सम्मिलित शक्ति हो जाती है ८३७०० जबकि हिन्दुस्तान के पास आफिसर्स और रेटिंग्स दोनों को मिलने के पश्चात् संख्या केवल १५५०० होती है। इस का मतलब यह है कि उन के रेशियों में हम सिर्फ १७ परसेन्ट हैं।

इस के बाद आप और आगे चलें और देखें कि हिन्दुस्तान के विरुद्ध पाकिस्तान ने चाइना से क्यों संधि की। इसलिये कि पाकिस्तान के दो हिस्से हैं। पूर्वी पाकिस्तान और पश्चिमी पाकिस्तान। पूर्वी पाकिस्तान को पश्चिमी पाकिस्तान से कैसे मदद पहुंच सकती है। हवाई जहाज से तो पहुंच नहीं सकती। वहां आर्मी पहुंच सकती है केवल नेवी के द्वारा; लिहाजा पाकिस्तान ने अपनी नेवी को मजबूत किया है। हिन्दुस्तान के पास तीन डिस्ट्रायर्स हैं और पाकिस्तान के पास सात हैं, जिस को कि एफेक्टिव नेवी कहा जाता है। एक क्रूजर हमारे पास है और एक क्रूजर पाकिस्तान के पास है। इसलिये अगर हम अपनी नेवी को मजबूत नहीं बनायेंगे तो हम पाकिस्तान का सामना करने में असमर्थ रहेंगे।

मैं आप का ध्यान प्रेजिडेंट श्री अय्यूब खां अथवा उन के किसी एक मंत्री के एक वक्तव्य की ओर दिलाना चाहता हूं। जब कुछ महीने पूर्व पूछा गया कि जब चाइना

ने हिन्दुस्तान पर हमला किया तो क्यों हिन्दुस्तान पर हमला नहीं किया गया तो इस का उत्तर दिया गया कि अगर हम हिन्दुस्तान पर उस वक्त हमला करते तो ईस्ट पाकिस्तान हमारे हाथ से निकल जाता। इस का क्या मतलब है। श्री अय्यूब एक मिलिटरी मैन होते हुए इस बात को समझते हैं कि वह ईस्ट पाकिस्तान तब उस समय तक अपने हाथ में रख सकेंगे जबकि उन के पास एक एफेक्टिव नेवी होगी। लिहाजा उन्होंने अमरीका से सबमैरीन लिया। सारी उन की नेवी अमरीका और यू० के० की दी हुई है जिस में उन का एक पैसा भी इन्वेस्ट नहीं हुआ। आप हमारी नेवी के बजट को देखिये। सन् १९६१-६२ में १६ करोड़ रु० लगाये गये, सन् १९६२-६३ में २० करोड़ रु० लगाये गये, सन् १९६३-६४ में २२ करोड़ रु० लगाये गये और सन् १९६४-६५ में सिर्फ २३ करोड़ रु० रखे गये, अर्थात् केवल इस में ४७ लाख रु० और बढ़ाये गये, जिस ४७ लाख रु० में एक छोटा जहाज भी हम नहीं बना सकते। मैं सुरक्षा मंत्री से कहना चाहता हूं कि आप के पास तीन तीन आंखें हैं, आप त्रिनेत्र हैं। जब यह त्रिनेत्र शिव का खुलना है तो शत्रु भस्म हो जाता है। इसलिये आप इस नेवी की तरफ ध्यान दें। एक दिन सुरक्षा मंत्री को अपना यह त्रिनेत्र खोलना ही होगा क्योंकि जैसी स्थिति चल रही है उस में इस त्रिनेत्र का बन्द कर के रखने से कोई लाभ नहीं है। इस कारण मैं आप को बतलाना चाहता हूं

श्री इन्द्रा त लाल राहोत्रा : (उम्मी तथा काश्मीर) : इस त्रिनेत्र को बन्द हो रखिये।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : श्री मल्होत्रा ने बड़ा अच्छा प्रश्न उठाया। आप हिन्दुस्तान का इतिहास देखें।

श्री रामसेवक यादव (वाराणसी) : तीसरी आंख खोलने के लिये किसी और को आप भेजें ।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : वह समाजवादियों से नहीं खुलेगा, वह कांग्रेसियों से ही खुलेगा जिन्होंने देश में रेवोल्यूशन किया है और आजादी की रक्षा की जिम्मेदारी ली है ।

श्री ओंकार लाल बेरवा : आंख खोलने के लिये जन संघ की जरूरत है ।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : उस की जरूरत आंख फाड़ने के लिये है, खोलने के लिये नहीं । मैं आप से कह रहा था कि आप हिन्दुस्तान के इतिहास का देखिये । हिन्दुस्तान ही एक ऐसा मुल्क है जिस ने कभी किसी मुल्क के ऊपर आक्रमण नहीं किया, हिन्दुस्तान की फाँज किसी दूसरे देश में नहीं गई, लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान की आर्मी, हिन्दुस्तान की सेना जब अफेन्सिव रही है तो वह सेना जीती है और जब हिन्दुस्तान की सेना डिफेन्सिव रही है तब वह हारी है । यह हिन्दुस्तान का तवारीख है । हूण आये, शक आये । पाटलिपुत्र हमारे देश की राजधानी थी, वहाँ पर वे रुक नहीं सके । भारत ने अफेन्सिव वारफेअर शुरू किया । हम बाहलीक तक गए और वहाँ लड़े । हूणों को परास्त किया और आजादी की रक्षा की । आप मराठों का इतिहास देखिये । शिवाजी ने सदा अफेन्सिव लिया । वह बाहर निकल कर लड़ते थे, शत्रु का सामना करते थे, उन के घर में घुसते थे । जब तक मराठों ने अफेन्सिव लड़ाई की उन की इम्पायर चलती रही । लेकिन जब पानीपत की बात आई तो वे सोचने लगे कि अहमदशाह अब्दाली आ जाय, तब हम सङ्गे । नतीजा यह हुआ कि वहाँ वे हारे । एक पानीपत ही नहीं, भारत ने तीन पानीपत की बेटल्स हारीं । हम यह सोचते थे कि शत्रु मैदान में आ जाये तब हम सामना

करें । यह हिन्दुस्तान का इतिहास है । दूसरे लिये मैं अपने सुरक्षा मंत्री जी से कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो हमारी डिफेन्सिव पालिसी है उस को हमें छोड़ना पड़ेगा, हमें अफेन्सिव पालिसी अपनानी होगी क्योंकि पाकिस्तान उस शब्द को नहीं समझता, उस भाषा को नहीं समझता जो भाषा सेकुलरिज्म पर आधारित है, जो भाषा डिमाक्रेसी पर आधारित है । पाकिस्तान की वह भाषा नहीं है, चीन की वह भाषा नहीं है । हम को उन की भाषा में बात करनी होगी । जब हम उन की भाषा में बात करेंगे तब हिन्दुस्तान की रक्षा करने में सफल होंगे ।

इस के पश्चात् एक बात और आप देखिये । जैसा काश्मीर असम्बली में जवाब दिया गया, एक वर्ष के अन्दर काश्मीर में ६०० से ज्यादा रेड्स रहे । जिस मुल्क की सीमा को तोड़ कर ६०० से ज्यादा रेड्स हों एक साल में, जिस मुल्क की माँ और बहनों पर अत्याचार किया जाये, पच्चीस चोरी किए जायें, उस मुल्क की जनता कब तक आप के भरोसे बैठी रहेगी । जनता की आज मांग है । जनता चाहती है कि हिन्दुस्तान की सीमा के अन्दर कोई भी विदेशी सैनिक न आये । उस की रक्षा हो । उस के बार्डर की रक्षा हो । आज प्रातःकाल आप ने अखबारों में पढ़ा होगा कि पाकिस्तान ने राजस्थान बार्डर पर जो हूर लोग हैं उन को गुरिला वारफेअर की ट्रेनिंग देना शुरू किया है । और यह भी कहना शुरू किया है कि जो हूर लोग पाकिस्तान की तरफ हैं वे राजस्थान के मुसलमानों के साथ शादी विवाह करें ताकि इस तरफ की बात उस तरफ पहुँच जाये । मैं सुरक्षा मंत्री जी से निवेदन करूँगा कि यह जो आन्तरिक बात है उसकी तरफ भी वे ध्यान दें । वे मंत्रिमंडल के सदस्य हैं । केवल डिफेंस ही उनकी जिम्मेदारी नहीं है । उन की जिम्मेदारी सारे देश की है और आन्तरिक द्रोह मिटाना भी उन की जिम्मेदारी है । आन्तरिक द्रोह का

[श्री रघुनाथ सिंह]

सामना करना कठिन होता है, बाहरी द्रोह का सामना तो आप अपनी फौज से कर भी सकते हैं।

इस के बाद मैं थोड़ा प्रोडक्शन के बारे में भी जरूर कहना चाहता हूँ। हमारे डिफेंस की एक प्लैनिंग होनी चाहिये। हमारे डिफेंस की प्लैनिंग होनी चाहिये लांग रेंज की। हम ने थर्ड फाइव इअर प्लैन बनाई, चौथी फाइव इअर प्लैन बनाने का रहे हैं। इसी प्रकार से डिफेंस के बारे में भी हमारी लांग रेंज प्लैनिंग की पालिसी होनी चाहिये कि अगले पांच वर्षों में हम क्या करना चाहते हैं। जब भी सुरक्षा मंत्री जी इस सदन के सामने आये हैं और जितना रुपया उन्होंने मांगा है उतना सदन ने दिया है, देश ने दिया है। इस अवसर का लाभ उठा कर हिम्मत के साथ, साहस के साथ, वे हिन्दुस्तान का एक इतिहास बनाने की चेष्टा करें। वे देश को एक प्लैनिंग दें इस के लिये ताकि देश की जनता समझ सके कि वह उन के हाथों में सुरक्षित है। दो बरस के अन्दर चाइना वालों की ट्रेन लहासा तक हो जायगी।

अब जरा सा आप उन की आर्मी की तरफ देखिए। इस वक्त चीन के पास बीस लाख तो रेगुलर आर्मी है। इस बीस लाख के अलावा १ करोड़ २५ लाख पीपल्स मेलीशिया है जोकि पुरुषों की है और ७५ हजार पीपल्स मेलीशिया स्त्रियों की है। इस प्रकार से उन्होंने करीब दो करोड़ नर वारियों को ट्रेन किया हुआ है, और इस वास्ते ट्रेन किया है कि अगर किसी वक्त रेगुलर आर्मी काम नहीं आती, थक जाती है, या समाप्त हो जाती है, तो इन दो करोड़ लोगों को जो कि ट्रेन हो चुके हैं फ्रंट पर भेजा जा सके। मेरा निवेदन है कि आप को इस बात पर भी ध्यान देना चाहिये। हमारे यहाँ भी एन० सी० सी० और लोक सहायक

सेना ट्रेन हो रही है, लेकिन उसमें बहुत ज्यादा प्राण और शक्ति नहीं मालूम देती। हम को उसे दूसरे आधार पर आधारित करना होगा।

एक बात मैं और कहना चाहता हूँ। हम को न्यूक्लियर वैपन्स से घबराना नहीं चाहिये। यह ठीक है कि हिन्दुस्तान की शान्ति की नीति है, लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान में शान्ति रहेगी कैसे? हिन्दुस्तान में शान्ति तभी रह सकती है जबकि हिन्दुस्तान आजाद रहेगा। अगर हिन्दुस्तान आजाद नहीं रहेगा तो हम यहां पालियामेंट में बैठ कर क्या करेंगे। देश की शान्ति की रक्षा के लिए हमें आधुनिक ढंग के हथियारों का उपयोग करना चाहिए। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर एक सांप हम को काटने के लिए आ रहा है, तो उस को मार देना अहिंसा है, और उस को छोड़ देना हिंसा है, क्योंकि उस को छोड़ देने से वह और लोगों को काट कर मार सकता है।

महात्मा गांधी की अहिंसा की नीति थी, लेकिन जब काश्मीर पर हमला हुआ तो महात्मा गांधी ने कहा कि हमले का सामना करने के लिए फौज भेजो। अहिंसा का अर्थ यह है कि हम में शक्ति हो। अगर कोई हमारे एक गाल पर तमाचा मारे तो हम उस को हंस कर बरदाश्त कर लें। लेकिन अगर हम कमजोर हैं और दूसरे के तमाचा मार देने से गिर जाते हैं तो हम बुज्जदिल हैं, और उनको सहना हमारी कायरता है। अहिंसा में ज्यादा शक्ति होती है। लेकिन उसका उचित समय पर उपयोग होना चाहिये। अतएव मैं आप से कहना चाहता हूँ कि अब हमें नींद से जागना चाहिये और हमें न्यूक्लियर वैपन्स को एकत्र करना चाहिए, खरीद कर मिलें तो खरीदिए और अगर खरीदने से न मिलें तो अपने यहां बनाइए।

हमारी रेणु बहिन और रंगा जी बंले । किसी ने रूस का नाम लिया तो किसी ने अमरीका का नाम लिया । लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी कमर में ताकत दबा खाने से नहीं आयगी, हमारी कमर में ताकत किसी की लकड़ी ले कर चलने से नहीं आएगी । हमारी कमर में ताकत तभी आयगी जब हमारे अपने पैरों में ताकत आयगी । आज वह समय आ गया है कि हिन्दुस्तान को अपने पैरों पर खड़ा होना है । और अगर हिन्दुस्तान अब हथियारों के सम्बन्ध में स्वावलम्बी नहीं होता, तो हमें दुःख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि हिन्दुस्तान की स्वाधीनता भी सुरक्षित नहीं रह सकती । इस सम्बन्ध में मैं आप को इतिहास का एक प्रमाण देना चाहता हूँ । लार्ड वेलजली ने हिन्दुस्तान में सबसिडियरी एलाएंस की पालिसी शुरू की । जैसे आज अमरीका पाकिस्तान को भी हथियार देता है और हिन्दुस्तान को भी । इसी तरह से लार्ड वेलजली ने हिन्दुस्तान के सब राजाओं को सहायता देना शुरू किया । हमें याद है कि जब हिन्दुस्तान के अन्तिम पेशवा ने सबसिडियरी एलाएंस की सन्धि पर दस्तखत किए तो सिंधिया बहुत बिगड़े और उन्होंने कहा कि इस ने सारे मराठों को खत्म कर दिया । फिर हिन्दुस्तान को खत्म कर दिया । और महाराजा सिंधिया की यह बात बिल्कुल सही निकली, क्योंकि अगर हैदराबाद से लड़ाई हुई, तो उधर भी आर्मी का कंट्रोल अंग्रेजों के हाथ में, और अगर पेशवा से लड़ाई हुई तो उधर भी आर्मी का कंट्रोल अंग्रेजों के हाथ में । और इस सबसिडियरी एलाएंस का परिणाम क्या हुआ ? हिन्दुस्तान दूसरों का गुलाम हो गया । जिस आजादी को मराठों ने हिन्दुस्तान में बहुत दिनों के बाद कायम किया था वह चली गयी ।

अब मैं अपने मुसलमान भाइयों से एक खास बात कहना चाहता हूँ । मैं उनसे कह देना चाहता हूँ कि आज उनके लिए परीक्षा का

समय है । अब वह नीति नहीं चल सकती कि एक भाई हिन्दुस्तान में और दूसरा भाई पाकिस्तान में रहे और इधर की बात उधर जाए । कोई मुल्क इसको बरदाश्त नहीं कर सकता कि उसके अन्दर ७० हजार पाकिस्तानी और स्टे करें गवर्नमेंट की पालिसी इसके विरुद्ध होने के बावजूद भी । ऐसा यहां कैसे होता है ? अगर आप हिन्दुस्तान की रक्षा करना चाहते हैं, तो घर में भी आपको अपने को मजबूत करना होगा, और घर में अगर मजबूत नहीं होंगे तो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि कहीं ऐसा समय न आ जाए कि भारतीय जनता को सिक्यूलरिज्म की नीति को त्यागना पड़े जैसे कि बर्मा ने उसको त्यागा, थाई देश ने त्यागा है । अगर यही अवस्था रही तो वह समय आ सकता है कि हमको भी यह सिक्यूलरिज्म की नीति छोड़नी पड़े । हम सिक्यूलरिज्म में विश्वास करते हैं, लेकिन सिक्यूलरिज्म का यह तकाजा है कि हमारे यहां का एक एक नागरिक हिन्दुस्तान के लिए लड़ने के लिए और अपनी जान देने के लिए तैयार रहें । सिक्यूलरिज्म हिन्दुस्तान के सारे रहने वालों के लिए आवश्यक है । अतः मैं हिन्दुस्तान के सभी लोगों से कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर हिन्दुस्तान में इस धर्म निरपेक्ष राज्य को रखना है तो हमारी मनोभावना वैसी होनी चाहिए । हममें उदारता होनी चाहिए, हममें सहिष्णुता होनी चाहिए और मातृभूमि के प्रति हममें भक्ति भी होनी चाहिए ।

मैं अपने सुरक्षा मन्त्री जी से यही निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि बड़ी आशा के साथ इस सदन ने और इस देश की सरकार ने आपको सुरक्षा मन्त्री बनाया है । ये जो हमारे देश पर रेड होते हैं, और ये जो हमारे हवाई जहाज गायब होते हैं, और ट्रेस नहीं हो पाते, इससे भारत के गौरव को ठेस लगती है । भारतीय जनता इस को कब तक सहन करेगी • यह कहना कठिन है । क्योंकि हमारे यहां डिमाक्रेटिक स्टेट है । हमें तीन बरस के

[श्री रघुनाथ सिंह]

बाद जनता के सामने बोट लेने के लिए जाना पड़ेगा। जनता हमसे सवाल करेगी कि आपने क्या किया। इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि आप हिम्मत के साथ, मरदानगी के साथ, बहादुरी के साथ अपने पैरों पर खड़े हों। दुनिया की तरफ मत देखिए कि कौन हमारी सहायता करता है और कौन हमारी सहायता नहीं करता। हिन्दुस्तान का मनोबल, हिन्दुस्तान का आत्मबल, हिन्दुस्तान के नौजवान, हिन्दुस्तान की जनता आपके साथ है। यह पार्लियामेंट आपके साथ है। जिनका रुपया आप नागेंगे आपको हम देंगे लेकिन हम भी आपसे इतनी गारंटी चाहते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान का एक भी निवासी रेडम की गोलियों से नहीं मारा जाएगा।

Shri Iqbal Singh (Ferozpur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, we are faced with a situation today when we should have full defence preparedness. Today, the situation is far more difficult than in 1962 or before. We are facing Pindi-Peking axis; both have got their treaty. What will come out of that nobody knew. But we may have to fight on one front, on more than one front, on two fronts, on the right and on the left; nobody knew. Today, the situation is far more complicated and difficult and even dangerous than one year ago.

I congratulate the Defence Minister in the last one year or more than one year, we have created confidence in this country. It is a great thing for the country that there should be confidence in the leaders, in the army personnel and also those who control politically and militarily. This is a great advantage to our country in today's situation. But, as I have said just now, the situation today is far more difficult and also complicated. I hope that next time India will not suffer the kind of disgraceful defeat, which we had to suffer about one and a half years ago.

Coming to the situation that is prevailing after that, I would like to say that we have to face this situation and deal with it methodically. When we study the Report of the Defence Ministry for this year, first of all we see that there are so many committees. There is the Cabinet Defence Committee, then the Emergency Ad Hoc Committee, and then there are so many Committees of Secretaries and others. I may submit through you, Sir, to the hon. the Defence Minister that wars are not fought with committees. If he is a practical man he should see that there are as few committees as are necessary. Perhaps it may not be possible to function without any committee, but their work should be lessened. And there should be very few committees, and effective committees. To have so many committees sometimes creates difficulties as well as complications also. Because, in respect of committee decisions, nobody takes the responsibility; and, what is more nobody takes the responsibility of implementing those decisions. So, what is required today is to take decisions and to implement those decisions, so that effective work may be done.

I have to say a few words about the Chiefs of Staff Committee. It is the most important instrument to implement the military decisions of this country. That should come just after the Defence Committee of the Cabinet, and I do not think there should be a middle-way Committee of Secretaries. It may be helpful in implementing the decisions, but if an important committee like the Chiefs of Staff Committee is relegated to a lower position, the result may be that a situation may not be presented as it should be presented at a particular time, and this may create more complications and more difficulties. I do not know how the practical working is; still I think that the Chiefs of Staff Committee should have a close link with the Defence Committee of the Cabinet and it should be part and parcel of the Defence Department. I do not

know what good will come out of it when the secretariat for this committee is provided by the Military Wing of the Cabinet Secretariat. This way of working may even create more complications rather than solving the problems.

I have to say a few things about the border. Today the border is manned by the police, some police of the State Governments. They may be called the Central Reserve Police or Armed Police of the State or by some other name. But in my opinion the whole organisation of these police formations on the border should be reorganised in a manner just like a military formation. They should not be police formations, in view of the situation as it is prevailing today. It will be much more helpful if we reorganise them on the lines of military formations, because Pakistan has done likewise, and it will be beneficial for this country also to reorganise the police formation functioning on the border. Whether it is the border police of the State or the Central Reserve Police, their organisation should be on the military lines. Moreover, they should be much more co-ordinated and placed sometimes even under the military personnel. Why I make this suggestion is because a new Financial Commission is going to be appointed next year. All these States are grumbling that they cannot bear so much burden of defence on the border. That is why I am making this suggestion.

As far as preparations are concerned, we have created some new mountain divisions and other divisions. As far as mountain divisions are concerned, they will be ready by the end of this year. Whatever was the target of the Government of India, that target cannot be said to be a sufficient one, because at present about sixteen to eighteen divisions of the Chinese Army are in Tibet, and we cannot face that army with five or six divisions. We have to create more mountain divisions. At least nine to ten mountain divisions should be creat-

ed. Of course we can place more reliance on our fire power, on the bravery of our people, on their initiative and other things. Still, numbers do count, and numbers do play an important part. If eighteen divisions are to be faced by five or six divisions, no doubt they will give a good account of themselves, but still if more divisions are created they can be very effective. Of course, the question will be asked, from where the finances will come. Here I would like to endorse what the previous speaker has been saying that as much financial help as is required, whatever is required by the Defence Department, will be gladly sanctioned by this Parliament and will be gladly borne by this country.

The great lag was in the technical services, either engineering or medical, in their numbers. Whatever was the requirement, we have not made much headway. Some concessions have been given. I think the Defence Department will consider some more concessions, so that more people may join these services. But still, I would humbly submit to the hon. the Defence Minister, if the situation does not improve and faced as we are with the situation today, whether it is not possible that the Defence Department even comes to running its own medical and engineering colleges. Or some part in these medical and engineering colleges may be reserved for these persons who are selected, even before joining these colleges, or the pre-cadets or in some such way, so that all the assured quota is guaranteed to the Defence Department, and after two or three years they can start giving more concessions.

As far as communications are concerned, the mountain divisions and others require more mobility. If we have to give more mobility to our army we have to get more transport by air, by road, and by other means also. It is good that the numbers of the Shaktimans, Nissans and jungle jeeps have increased and the Indian

[Shri Iqbal Singh]

component of these has been increasing day by day. But for a field army of today, whose needs may increase greatly if the situation became more dangerous or complicated, the total number of these vehicles available today will not be sufficient. As we see from the report, a large number is still of the last war model, or models ten or fifteen years old. They cannot be relied upon in times of emergency. That is why either their expansion should be carried out or some new factories may be put up, so that the Indian Army may have greater mobility.

As regards air transport planes and planes which can come to the support of the Army in the operations, we are lagging behind in both these things. We have developed at Kanpur the transport plane, but the number of these planes and the production is still far below. We have to think over this matter. Of course we may purchase for the next few years. But to purchase for the next few years is only to fill up the gap. The need of the hour is to have a base from where we can expand. And, to have a base we have to rely more on our own production. I know, in respect of aircraft manufacture, to have a base and then to have a whole manufacturing programme, it takes many years. Still, if we can make a good base and a good start from now, it will be helpful not only in the near future but it will certainly be far more helpful to the country in the years to come, and it will be a strong base that can be relied upon.

Shri Raghunath Singh has spoken a lot about the navy. The immediate object of the navy is the replacement of the old ships and to create a balanced force. In today's context of technical advancement, Pakistan navy has got a submarine. We should purchase submarine from wherever it is available. I say wherever it is available, because it may be possible that the United States may not give us a submarine very soon, with so much of

their own commitments, political and otherwise. If it is not possible to get it from there, we have to purchase it from somewhere else. I hope the hon. Minister will try to have not only one, but even more than one submarine, if possible in the very near future, because without a submarine, the Indian navy, as constituted today cannot be said to be a balanced force in any way. After that, we should think over the purchase of rocket and missile ships. Even our old ships can be fitted with rockets and missiles, but in today's context of advanced development, we have to be far more ahead and make our navy a balanced force. We have to purchase all those things and have a phased programme for one, two and three years.

About the army, the NEFA report has given a few lessons, which are being implemented with great rigour and with great efficiency. Things have improved a lot; there can be no denial of that. But still we have to do more. We have to create new armies and also expand our army from today's base for the next year and coming years also.

I have to say a few words about the expansion of the army. There are the officers and other ranks. We are recruiting officers under the emergency commission and other commissions. But more personnel from the army have to be given promotion. I find that about 24 per cent of the personnel from the army are given officer's commission, but still we are not able to expand the army. We should expand it, because a person who is trained and who is given a proper opportunity can be much more useful to the army. There are some bottlenecks in the promotion in the army, especially in the case of Jamedars and Subedar-Majors. At present the Subedar-Major gets only 3 or 4 increments in the whole of his career. Can we not increase those increments and also increase the avenues of promotion, so that people who have got more experience and who are the

back-bone of our army with experience in the practical sense, may be given more chances of promotion? The percentage of promotion to commissioned officers can be increased from 24 to 33 or 40 per cent. It will prove more useful.

I have to say a word or two about the borders. We are having more roads in the border against China. We should also have more roads in the borders with other countries like Pakistan, including East Pakistan. We should have more roads in our portion of Punjab and Bengal in the border with West Pakistan and East Pakistan respectively, especially in the border districts. If the road construction in the border districts cannot be taken over by the defence department, liberal grants should be given from the road fund to these districts, so that more roads and more communications can be built in those areas.

The other point I want to mention is about the supply of rifles to the people in the border. I come from the border and I know that very few rifles are given to the border people. The situation may not be the same as that of Assam. It may be a different one. I admit it may not be advisable to give rifles to the border people at all places. But I still plead for the people living in the Punjab border where every peasant cultivates his land even upto the last inch of our country. He cannot have confidence if he is not given arms. The State Government have always been pressing for this and if this can be considered sympathetically, it will be in the interest of the country.

With these words, I commend these proposals.

श्री काशीराम गुप्त : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, सुरक्षा मन्त्रालय की मांगों के बारे में बोलने समय सरकार के ही शब्दों में हमें यह ध्यान रखना है कि इसका सम्बन्ध हमारी विदेश-

नीति से बहुत हद तक है। किन्तु हमें यह समझना चाहिए कि यह हमारी विदेश-नीति के पालन का फल है, उसकी गलतियों का नतीजा है, भयवा कोई और कारण है कि आज हमें चीन और पाकिस्तान दोनों की दुश्मनी का सामना करना पड़ रहा है।

अभी अभी माननीय सदस्य श्री रघुनाथ सिंह, ने बहुत आंकड़े देकर उन देशों की शक्ति के बारे में बताया। किन्तु वे दोनों देश किस प्रकार मिल गए, कहां हमारी गलती हुई और उस गलती के क्या नतीजे हो रहे हैं, इस पर उन्होंने कोई भी प्रकाश नहीं डाला। मैं तो यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी नीति कितनी भी सही हो, हमारे सिद्धान्त कितने भी सही हों, किन्तु उनके अमल में जो गलती हम कर रहे हैं, उसका ही यह नतीजा है, जो आज हमको भुगतना पड़ रहा है। अभी भी हम उन भूलों के बारे में सजग नहीं हैं।

मैं आपके द्वारा सुरक्षा मन्त्री का ध्यान इस ओर दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि आज काश्मीर में एक विस्फोटक स्थिति पैदा हो रही है। वहां पर अन्दर ही अन्दर इस तरह के हालात पैदा हो रहे हैं, जिनको वह केवल फौज के जरिये ही काबू में नहीं कर सकते हैं। वैसे तो हमारे माननीय शास्त्री जी वहां गए, और बहुत से साथी गए और जाते हैं। हमारे सुरक्षा मन्त्री जी भी वहां गए हैं। किन्तु जो कुछ घटनायें वहां रोज घट रही हैं, उनको देखने से ऐसा मालूम होता है कि वहां पर वे तबक़े, जो पाकिस्तान के साथ मिले हुए हैं और वे तबक़े, जो कि निहितस्वार्थ लेकर वहां काम करते हैं, एक ऐसा ख़तरा पैदा कर रहे हैं, जो एक विस्फोट के रूप में हमारे सामने आ सकता है।

ब्रिटेन और अमरीका जिस नीति पर चल रहे हैं, वह हमारे सामने आ गई है। उनका एक ही तात्पर्य है कि भारतवर्ष किसी प्रकार मजबूत न हो जाए और इसलिए वे इस प्रकार से चलते हैं कि पाकिस्तान को भी खुश रखें और हम

‘[श्री काशीराम गुप्त]

को भी थपथपाओ। इस नीति से जो निबलता हमारे अन्दर आती है, उसको देख कर बे खुश होते हैं।

किन्तु मेरा निवेदन है कि इस सब कम-जोरी की जड़ में जो हमारी खास कमजोरी है, वह है राजनीतिक दलों की कमजोरी। सत्ता-धारी दल इस बात में खुश है कि वह इस देश में हुकूमत कर रहा है और हुकूमत में रहने के लिए वह गलत से गलत कदम उठाने में भी नहीं हिचकता है। वह अपने गलत से गलत आदमियों को भी किसी प्रकार से सुरक्षित रखने के प्रयत्न करता है, जिन पर रोख आरोप और प्रत्यारोप लगते हैं। वह उनको जनता के सामने लाकर कोई सजा देने का प्रयत्न नहीं करता है। रोख अखबारों में यह बात आ रही है। इसका बड़ा भारी असर हमारे फौजी जवानों के ऊपर पड़ता है। इसका बहुत बुरा असर हमारे फौजी अफसरों पर पड़ता है। जब यह दशा हमारी सत्ताधारी पार्टी की हो तो फिर उनका सुरक्षा के कामों में लगे रहने का क्या मतलब होगा? आपको चाहिये कि इस पर आप गम्भीरता से विचार करें। पिछले वर्ष मैंने बहस में भाग लिया था तो मैंने निवेदन किया था कि हमारे विरोधी दल जो हैं, उनका भी इस विषय में एक अर्जाब रखा है। वे भी अपनी अपनी तृती और अपना अपना राग अलापते हैं और इस विषय में कभी-कभी एक होकर नहीं सोचते हैं। आखिर इतने दल क्यों हैं, क्यों न इनकी संख्या को कम कर दिया जाए? एक ही उपाय नजर आता है और वह सबसे प्रमुख उपाय है। लोक सभा का चुनाव स्वतन्त्र रूप से होना चाहिये, विधान सभाओं के चुनावों के साथ इसका चुनाव नहीं होना चाहिये। जब तक ऐसा नहीं होगा तब तक विचारधारा के आधार पर, पार्टी के प्रोग्राम के आधार पर यह देश चलने वाला नहीं है।

प्रजातन्त्रीय प्रणाली के नाम पर जो कुछ चल रहे हैं जिस प्रकार हम चल रहे हैं,

वह शोभनीय नहीं है। कुछ दिन हुए मैंने अखबारों में पढ़ा था माननीय हिरेन मुर्जी का एक लेख। उन्होंने अपना विचार व्यक्त करते हुए कहा था कि एक पार्टी रूल अच्छा होता है। कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी की नीति के अनुसार, उसके सिद्धान्तों के अनुसार वह बात बिल्कुल सही है। किन्तु जब तक भारतवर्ष दो पार्टियों को चलाने की नीति अपनाता है, तब तक यह बात सम्भव नहीं हो सकती है। हमारे देश में दो ही पार्टियाँ हों, यह प्रयास हमारा होना चाहिये। इसका सम्बन्ध हमारी सुरक्षा से बहुत अधिक है। जो दशा आज राजनीतिक लोगों की होती है, उसको देख कर हमारे देश की जनता ऊब गई है। वह सोचने लग गई है कि सब लोग अपना अपना काम करने के लिए आते हैं और हमारा एक तमाशा बनाते हैं। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जब तक इस बारे में हम विचार नहीं करेंगे, गम्भीरता से इस पर नहीं सोचेंगे तब तक हमारी सुरक्षा लंगड़ी और लूली रहेगी। इसके लिए एक आचार संहिता की जरूरत है, पंचायतों में से राजनीति को निकाल फेंकने की जरूरत है, प्रदेश सरकारों को जहाँ तक भूमि सुधारों का सम्बन्ध है, उसके बारे में नीति बनाने का सम्बन्ध है, एक मत होकर चलना चाहिये। यह बहुत आवश्यक है। उसके बाद स्थानीय हालात के मुताबिक पार्टियों के कार्यक्रम बनाने की आवश्यकता है। अगर यह सब कुछ नहीं होता तो हम दुश्मन से नहीं लड़ सकेंगे।

हमारी फौज में अफसरों और जवानों के रहन सहन के तरीकों में, विचारों में तथा दूसरी बातों में एक बड़ा दरार है। मुझे से पहले जो माननीय सदस्य बोल रहे थे वह इस बात को बता रहे थे। जमादार और सुबेदार लोगों की बात मैं करता हूँ। अंग्रेज के जाने के बाद हमने सोचा था कि इनके रहने की जरूरत नहीं है। फिर हमने सोचा कि इनकी जरूरत है और आहिस्ता आहिस्ता इनका हम हटायेंगे।

फिर हमने सोचा कि इनको रखने की जरूरत है। आज उनकी क्या स्थिति है, इसको आप देखें। वे लोग जो अंग्रेज के जमाने में तनख्वाह पाते थे, उसमें मुश्किल से बीस या तीस रुपये की वृद्धि हुई होगी। आपको यह जान कर आश्चर्य होगा कि कितना उनको भत्ता मिलता है, डेली एलाउन्स मिलता है। रेल में सफर करने के लिए उनको पास तो फर्स्ट क्लास का मिलता है लेकिन भत्ता केवल दो रुपया रोज ही मिलता है। दो रुपया भत्ता रोज किसी जमादार को मिले और फिर हम गर्व करें कि अंग्रेज के जाने के बाद हमने उनकी स्थिति सुधारी है, हमने अपने फौजी अफसरों की शान बढ़ाई है, तो यह कहाँ तक उचित हो सकता है। जमादार और सूबेदार फर्स्ट क्लास में ट्रेवल करने के तो हकदार हैं, किन्तु डेली एलाउन्स उनको दो रुपया ही मिलता है। सिपाही को तो और भी कम मिलता है। केवल बारह आना ही मिलता है। जवान की तनख्वाह का जहाँ तक सम्बन्ध है, शायद महंगाई तो उसके लिए कोई बर्बाद ही नहीं है। महंगाई के साथ उसकी तनख्वाह का कोई सम्बन्ध है ही नहीं। हम समझते हैं कि हमने उसको राशन दे दिया, कपड़ा थोड़ा सा फौजी पहनने के लिए दे दिया तो हमारा कर्तव्य पूरा हो गया। लेकिन आप देखें कि जो महंगाई बढ़ी है उसके बाल बच्चों पर उसका क्या असर पड़ा है, क्या उन पर उसका असर नहीं पड़ा है? किन्तु वे फौज में हैं और मजदूरों की तरह से आन्दोलन नहीं कर सकते हैं और इसी का यह नतीजा है कि यह सब चीज फौजी आदमी को चुपचाप बरदाश्त करनी पड़ती है।

जो हालत चल रही है, उसका आप देखें। आप उसको कहते हैं कि हम तुम को जमीन देंगे। जब वह जमीन लेने के लिए जाता है तो जो पटवारी है वह उसको मुगालते में डाल देता है। ईमानदारी के साथ उसको जमीन नहीं दी जाती है। वह धबराता है, सोचता है कि जमीन मिलेगी या नहीं मिलेगी। यह जो

उसकी दशा हो रही है, इसका अन्त होना चाहिये।

अलवर में एक ए० एम० सी० सेंटर खुला हुआ है जिसका जिक्र इस किताब में भी है। जिस समय वह खुला था तो बड़ी खुशी लोगों को हुई थी। वैसे तो एक तरह से परेशानी भी लोगों को हुई। हजारों आदमियों के आ जाने से महंगाई बढ़ गई चीजें मिलनी बन्द हो गईं लेकिन आहिस्ता आहिस्ता वे सब बातें ठीक होने लग गईं, चीजें भी कुछ मिलने लग गईं। लोगों को रोजगार भी मिला और ट्रेनिंग भी मिली। किन्तु अब कुछ दिनों से उसका काम समाप्त कर दिया गया है, मालूम नहीं ऐसा क्यों किया गया है। शायद यह कहा गया हो कि आबोहवा ठीक मालूम नहीं होती है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी फौज में भी अब क्या यह तरीका बना दिया गया है कि जब किसी अफसर के मन में आया तो एक काम कर दिया और कुछ दिन के बाद फिर ख्याल आया तो उसको उलट कर दिया? इस तरह का फौजी तरीका तो नहीं होना चाहिये। बहुत सोच विचार करने के बाद ही किसी काम को शुरू किया जाना चाहिये। मैं निवेदन करता हूँ कि मन्त्री महोदय इस बारे में जानकारी दें कि क्यों उस सेंटर को कमजोर कर दिया गया है, क्यों तेजी से उसको नहीं चलाया जाता है, क्या उसको बन्द किया जा रहा है और अगर किया जा रहा है तो क्यों? उसकी जगह क्या चीज करने की बात सोची जा रही है?

उसी सेंटर में यह हालत है कि पहले तो ट्रक्स साधारण लोगों से किराये पर ली जाती थीं। लेकिन यह अब इसको मोनोपॉलिस्टिक ट्रेड बना दिया गया है। बहुत अधिक दर पर ट्रक्स किराये पर लेने का बन्दोबस्त किया गया है। ये जो तरीके हैं इनको कभी भी उचित नहीं ठहराया जा सकता है।

1 [श्री काशीराम गुप्त]

हम समझा करते थे कि सिविल एड-मिनिस्ट्रेशन में ही देर, अधेर और भ्रष्टाचार होता है। लेकिन वह सारी बातें यहां भी पहुंची हुई हैं। भ्रष्टाचार में सवा सवा बरस से जिन मकानों को किराये पर लिया गया था उनका किराया भ्रष्टा नहीं किया गया है। लोग मारे-मारे फिरते हैं, लिखते फिरते हैं कि कहां से किराया लें। कभी कहा जाता है कि दिल्ली से जवाब आयेगा तब मिलेगा और कभी कह दिया जाता है कि पूना से आयेगा तब मिलेगा। अभी तक यह तय नहीं हो सका है कि किराया कहां से आयेगा, क्या स्थिति होगी। मैं चाहता हूं कि इस और भी ध्यान दिया जाए।

जवानों को जो राशन दिया जाता है, उसके बारे में मैं एक बात पूछना चाहता हूं। क्या वह राशन उनको पी० एल० ४८० में से दिया जा रहा है? फड-एड एग्जिक्यूटिव मन्त्रालय को यह काम कैसे सौंपा गया है, इस पर प्रकाश डाला जाना चाहिये। इस मन्त्रालय के जरिये जब यह काम होता है तो वह यह जाहिर करता है कि वहां पर पी० एल० ४८० खिलाया जा रहा है। उसपर अगर हमारे जवान रहने हैं तो यह हमारे लिए बहुत ही शर्मनाक बात है। गम्भीरतापूर्वक सोचा जाना चाहिये कि राशन का वन्डावन्स किन आधारों पर किया जाता है और जिन आधारों पर वह किया जाता है, वे क्या ठोस आधार हैं या नहीं हैं।

डायरेक्टरेट आफ प्लानिंग को अब मैं लेता हूं। प्लानिंग की बात बहुत से साथियों ने कही है। पेज २४ पर लिखा हुआ है कि रिफ्यूजेंट जो है इसको स्लो डाउन किया जा रहा है और एमरजेंसी कमोशन कुछ दिनों में बन्द कर दी जाएगी। इसका मतलब तो यह हुआ कि जब आपको जरूरत हुई, आपने रिफ्यूजेंट शुरू कर दी और जब मन में आया बन्द कर दी। इसमें यह भी लिखा हुआ

है कि रिफ्यूजेंट की शर्तों में कुछ ढिलाई ला दी गई थी, जवानों की ऊंचाई, छाती आदि के बारे में कुछ ढिलाई ला दी गई थी, जिसको आपने अब हटा दिया है। यह तो सीदेबाजी वाली बात हो गई। कभी तो लोगों को बला लिया गया और कभी नहीं बुलाया गया। इस तरह के बर्ताव नहीं होनी चाहिये।

बीहिकल्स के बारे में मैं निवेदन करूँ कि अब आप एक नई बात रखने जा रहे हैं। आप कहते हैं कि जो बीहिकल ३०,००० मील चल चूके हैं या पांच साल चल चूके हैं, उनको नहीं रखा जाएगा। अब तक जो कुछ होता रहा है वह बहुत बुरे तरीके से होता रहा है और वह चोख देश की मर्यादा के लिए बहुत ही खतरनाक थी। इस नई नीति का मैं स्वागत करता हूं और मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि इस नीति को अब तक क्यों नहीं अपनाया गया।

आप कहते हैं कि इंजीनियर्स की कमी है। काफी सड़कें अभी हमें बनानी हैं। हम को चीन का एक तरफ मुकाबला करना है और दूसरी तरफ पाकिस्तान का करना है। ऐसी सूरत में इंजीनियर्स की कमी का क्या कारण है और क्यों नहीं इस कमी को दूर करने की कोशिश होती है। इसके बारे में रिपोर्ट में कुछ नहीं लिखा है। मैं चाहता हूं कि इस पर आप प्रकाश डालें।

जहां तक माउन्टेन डिवीजन्स का सम्बन्ध है, अकेले चीन का मुकाबला करने के लिए ही हम को उनकी आवश्यकता नहीं है, पाकिस्तान से मुकाबला करने के लिए भी है। कहीं भी इसका जिक्र नहीं किया गया है कि इंग्लैंड से या यू० एस० ए० से जो मदद हमें मिली है वह कितनी है और किस हद तक वह कारगर साबित हो सकती है उसके मुकाबले में जो कुछ

कि पाकिस्तान को मिला है। जो कुछ हमें मिला है और जिसका हम इस्तेमाल ही नहीं कर सकते हैं पाकिस्तान के साथ लड़ाई में, तो उसके लिए हमने किस हद तक तैयारी कर ली है और किन जगहों से कर ली है। अंग्रेजों को यह निश्चित सी नीति नजर आ रही है कि पाकिस्तान हमें परेशान करे और मौका लगे तो वह उसको हमारे साथ लड़ा भी दे।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य और बोलना चाहते हैं।

श्री काशीराम गुप्त : जी हां।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : तो आप कल अपना भाषण जारी रखें।

15 hrs.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

THIRTY-SEVENTH REPORT

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We will now take up Private Members' Business.

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

"That this House agrees with the Thirty-seventh Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 18th March, 1964".

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): Sir, could I make a submission?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Let me put it to the vote of the House.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Before that, could I suggest that the time allotted for the resolution which Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri is going to move might be extended? Now the time allotted for that resolution is 1 hour 15 minutes. My suggestion to the House is that it might be discussed

very well for 2½ hours or at least 2 hours.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We will see when we take it up.

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): It is a very important resolution. The subject matter of that resolution is the burning point of the day.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does he want to move any amendment?

Shri H. P. Chatterjee (Nabadwip): It is there in the sheet.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I suggest 2½ hours for the resolution of Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the House agree to the suggestion contained in the amendment that the time for the resolution of Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri should be extended to 2½ hours.

Shri Raghunath Singh: Yes, Sir: It is a very important matter. The refugee problem is the burning problem of the day.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question is:

"That the motion be accepted by the House with the amendment of Shri H. N. Mukerjee that the time for the resolution of Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri be 2½ hours instead of 1 hour 15 minutes."

The motion was adopted.

Shri P. R. Patel (Patan): Sir, on a point of order. I have given notice of an amendment.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We have not yet taken up the resolution.

15.03 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE: NATIONALISATION OF FILM INDUSTRY—contd.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now take up further discussion of