

12.44 hrs.

STATEMENT RE : ACCIDENT TO
I.A.C. FOKKER FRIENDSHIP
NEAR KHULNA (EAST
PAKISTAN)

THE MINISTER OF TOURISM AND CIVIL AVIATION (DR. KARAN SINGH) : It is with deep regret that I have to inform this Honourable House that...

SHRI HEM BARUA (Mangaldai) : On a point of Order. We tabled Calling Attention Notices on this particular thing and we were told by your Secretariat that they are under consideration. Now the Minister comes and makes a statement on his own.

MR. SPEAKER : Call attention notices were given yesterday and they came before me today. But is he to wait on serious matters like this for those call attention motions to come up, tomorrow. Here a 'Plane has crashed and some people have died. Should he not come before the House immediately to give the information? Is this not an urgent matter needing immediate attention? Not only Parliament, but the whole country is waiting to know what has happened.

SHRI HEM BARUA : This is an urgent matter of course.

DR. KARAN SINGH : It is with deep regret that I have to inform this Honourable House that Indian Airlines Fokker Friendship aircraft (No. VT-DOJ) operating flight No. IC-260 from Agartala to Calcutta has met with an accident. The plane left Agartala at 7.16 p. m. Indian Standard Time on Monday 21st April, and was expected to land at Dum Dum at 8.17 p. m. Late last night Indian Airlines office at Dum Dum was informed by Pakistan International Airlines that a plane had crashed at Dumria near Khulna in East Pakistan territory, about 70 miles from Calcutta, at 8.25 p. m., and that

there was no evidence of any survivors. Another message received this morning from Civil Aviation authorities at Dacca has confirmed this.

According to our information the area in an eighty mile radius around Calcutta developed extremely bad weather yesterday evening, and it is likely that the plane was caught in weather turbulence commonly known as a norwester. At about the same time a Pakistan International Airlines Boeing 707 bound from Karachi to Dacca was forced to divert to Calcutta on account of bad weather.

On board the ill-fated Indian Airlines plane were 40 passengers and four crew consisting of two pilots Capt. R. Ghosh and First Officer M. M. Singh, one air hostess Miss Pushpa, and one steward Shri Digman. As soon as the passenger list is confirmed the next of kin will be informed. We have received a list, but it has not been confirmed. Therefore, we would wait. An Indian Airlines plane is leaving Calcutta for Jessore shortly, after obtaining necessary visa clearance, with officials of the Corporation and the Directorate General of Civil Aviation.

SHRI HEM BARUA : We are extremely grieved to hear of these deaths of the accident. We convey our feelings of sorrow on behalf of this House to the members of the bereaved families.

MR. SPEAKER : Yes, the Minister will please convey the feelings of House to the members of the bereaved families.

DR. KARAN SINGH : Yes, Sir.

12.48 hrs.

* DEMAND FOR GRANTS
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE—(Contd.)

MR. SPEAKER : The House will now resume discussion of the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of Defence. We took 3½ hours yesterday and about 4½ hours

* Moved with the recommendation of the President.

remain. I think the Minister will need half an hour or 40 minutes.

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SHRI SWARAN SINGH) : Yes, about that.

MR. SPEAKER : He will be called upon to reply near about 5.30. We will have to dispose of these Demands today and then begin the other Demands next on the order paper, not more than that. Shri Kunte was on his legs yesterday. He may now continue his speech.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (हापुड़) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, अगर आप आज्ञा दें तो मैं आपसे यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि सदस्यों के हितों की रक्षा का भार आप पर और आपके कार्यालय पर है। मेरी अपनी सूचना यह है और मैं आपके कार्यालय से जानना चाहूंगा और वह सारे सदन को इससे अवगत करावे कि हमारे इस सदन की सदस्या श्रीमती सुशीला नैयर की हालत कैसी है? सुन रहे हैं कि उनकी हालत बहुत खराब हो गई है। तो आपका कार्यालय यह जानकारी लाए और सदन को इसके विषय में बताए ?

MR. SPEAKER : This is not proper. This was raised yesterday. Today I have a letter from Shri Hem Barua, but he was good enough not to raise it now. When it was raised yesterday, I had said that the hon. Minister might inform the hon. Members about it. I am also equally anxious about the hon. members who is on fast. But sometime ago when two hon. members were on fast and Shri Banerjee and some other hon. members wanted to raise it here, I said that it was a matter of deep regret that an hon. Member should undertake a fast, but that if every time an hon. Member were to fast the matter was to be taken up in the House, it would not be proper.

SHRI PRAKASH VIR SHASTRI : Her condition is very serious.

MR. SPEAKER : Will it be possible to raise a discussion on that ignoring

what is in the order paper? Therefore, I said this yesterday. Shri Patel wrote to me. He was very anxious and worried. All of us are. It is not as though I am not worried about an hon. Member of this House, a senior member, who was associated with Mahatmaji. But for Shastriji to get up and raise it in this manner after I called Shri Kunte to resume his speech is not proper. I am sure he would not do it again.

Shri Kunte.

SHRI DATTATRAYA KUNTE (Kolaba) : Yesterday when the debate was adjourned I was referring to the development of our armed forces in the border areas. I want to make the point that it is not enough merely to deploy the armed forces in the border area. They stay away from their families for a long time. It is necessary that we create an atmosphere in the border area whereby those people living in the border areas feel that they are properly integrated with the whole nation. There are two ways to do this. One way is that when the army people go there, they mix freely with the local people and fraternise with them. An hon. Member from Kashmir mentioned that our armed forces behaved very nicely with the local people and gave them all facilities and help. There is another way; to ask the retired men of the armed forces go and settle there and also ask other persons to go and settle there and create a sort of a cultural affinity between those people and ourselves. I am afraid that the mere deployment of armed forces in the frontier is not going to help us. There is this tendency in modern times not only in our country but in other countries as well. In Canada inspite of French and English being the two languages in their legislature, very recently there was a flare up by the French against English. In Britain also, demand for local autonomy is growing in Scotland and Wales. In Telangana and Vidarbha we see this tendency. Why does it happen? Because with the use of modern means of communication, it is easier for a person far away from his native locality to keep in touch with the local movements, get local literature and all

[Shri Dattatraya Kunte]

that. He does not try to assimilate himself in the area where he is staying. Looking to these conditions, it is necessary to settle some people in the border area so that they mix up with them and the people living in those areas feel that they are part of the nation; properly integrated. Border incidents with China took place many times. There is a place near Bara Hoti having something to do with the word Chin and there was a feeling that if the word Chin was there it must have belonged to China. This is because we have not properly integrated; we have no proper idea of what is happening. For instance, people's idea of persons living in NEFA and Nagaland is that they must all be junglis not educated and all that. When we actually find that they were all properly educated and all that, a different feeling is created. This is necessary because we have a big border. In our customs and traditions, we are so exclusive. Even in this city, we shall have a Marathi element or a Bengali element. We have the habit of being exclusive. It is necessary that conditions should be created in the frontier whereby the local people are properly integrated. If that is not done, mere deployment of defence forces is not going to be a great help; if at all it is going to aggravated the situation.

I should like to refer to another matter. This department is greedy about acquiring land but when it comes to releasing lands because they are not properly used or not used at all, they take years and decades. From the records they can find out when they acquired the land and taken possession of it; after decades till now they have not decided to use that land, nor have they decided to release the land. This is really a hardship to the people to whom those lands belong. I cannot understand this. There are lands in the city of Bombay and other places which have been taken possession of by the defence authorities. Not only this. What is happening in this Ministry is this. I have to narrate my own personnel experience which is not very helpful. As early as August, 1967, I wrote a letter to the Minister of Defence. It took

him a few months to acknowledge that letter, and it is almost a year since that acknowledgement and I have not received any reply from the Ministry at all. In my letter, I have stated the facts very clearly, that within a stone's throw from Bombay, where this department has established a naval armaments depot, they have acquired hundreds of acres of land for the use of the Navy. The land is not yet being used. Part of it is being doled out to the people to cultivate the land as tenants, and the rest has been levelled down as a foot-ball ground. This is the kind of use that the naval depot has put the land to. At the same time, the Air Force asked for acquiring more land; notices were issued. It was suggested that if the land which has been acquired by the Navy was made available to the Air Force, the local people will not be inconvenienced in anyway. What has been happening today? The whole of the sea-cost of this place is acquired by this department, and the people have been displaced.

There is another thing about the naval depot itself. I do not know why this naval armament depot was located at that place. We already have in the Bombay harbour, the oil terminal. But next to that, there is the atomic energy reactor at if safety and defence are being looked into at the same time! On the top of it, on the one side, there is the Santa Cruz aerodrome. There is the oil terminal in the harbour and then there is the atomic reactor. Then in this peninsula the naval armament depot is established. And what security was looked into when this naval armament depot was established there? We will be told that it was nearer the Bombay city where the navy is there, and we will be also told that because the armaments and other things could not be landed, they are doing this; they have constructed this jetty at a cost of Rs. 1.75 crores. When the project was approved by this House or by the department, the idea was that frigates and other big ships which will need a draft of 20 feet or more will be very easily able to touch the wharf. What is the position now? If a little care was taken to look into this matter, they would

have found that because of the silting which is taking place there, this jetty could not come there. But after the expenditure of Rs. 1.75 crores, what does one find? The draft is below six to eight feet, and they are now hoping to do a certain amount of drilling. I do not know how they are going to dredge it. If you look at the low tide, the rocks are visible below, and to excavate the rocks in the sea-bed is a very difficult proposition. Therefor, while locating this armament depot at this particular place, this was not taken into consideration.

Yesterday, reference was made to security risk because of which the Government and the department refused to give information on the land acquired for this naval depot. Next to that, the only partition wall being the barbed wire, there are foreigners staying there. Who are those foreigners? They are contractors doing some work in the Bombay dock. do not know why they have been allowed to camp there.

MR. SPEAKER : I hop he will conclude within two or three minutes.

SHRI DATTARAYA KUNTE : I have hardly taken five to seven minutes.

MR. SPEAKER : Yesterday also you have spoken.

SHRI DATTATRAYA KUNTE : Yesterday, I began to speak at the fag-end. After all, I am making a very relevant point. If you want to adjourn the House at 1 O'clock, I am prepared to continue at 2 O'clock.

MR. SPEAKER : You can take two or three minutes now.

SHRI DATTATRAYA KUNTE : I will not be able to finish it within that time.

MR. SPEAKER : You have to finish, Mr. Kunte.

SHRI DATTATRAYA KUNTE : Sir, in the whole of the budget session,

this is the first lime that I am speaking. I am only requesting you—

MR. SPEAKER : Go ahead. Do not waste time.

SHRI DATTATRAYA KUNTE : I was referring to the foreigners there. They are contractors in the Bombay dock. Was it necessary to ask them to have a camp there?

13 hrs.

It might be that they are quarrying stones from a quarry nearby. Was that the only quarry available for the contractors working in the Bombay Dock who are foreigners and there is no other quarry nearby from where they could have got the stones? Taking that this was the only quarry where the best stone was available, is it necessary that their camp should be there. We will be told that there is a security risk and therefore people will not be able to go and visit the camp. But these people are living there, they have their cameras, loudspeakers and everything. One does not know whether they have a transmitter or anything like that on the location of the armament depot which is supposed to be a sort of secret thing. It has the security risk across the Bombay Harbour when foreigners are staying there. I know they are going to stay there for three to four years, as long as the Bombay Dock is completed.

What precaution is the department taking when it is trying to exclude the public of this country from getting vital and relevant information? Why should they allow them the used of this quarry which is on the land acquired for the naval armament itself? This is one qestion which I would like the Minister to answer. If he does not answer it will only mean that they want to shut out the public of this country from vital information while they have utter disregard whether foreigners use the land acquired for the naval armament depot.

I would like to know whether while allocating this depot here all the facts

[Shri Datta traya Kunte]

were taken into consideration. I am referring to the oil terminal, the atomic reactor, the Santacruz Airport, which is an international airport, and this Naval Armament Depot. Was the port properly examined as to whether the jetty which is built there could at all give a draft of 20 feet and more to allow ships to come safely all along the line? It is not necessary that one must go to Khadakvasala station to find out what sort of silting is taking place. It is evident, patent to the ordinary eye. If these things are not taken into account it will only mean that all the expenditure incurred on this jetty is infructuous expenditure, it is all a waste. Now to correct it a few more crores will have to be spent to dredge the solid rock which is there. Sir, these are some of the matters which I wanted to place before the House.

13.03 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha adjourned for Lunch till
Fourteen of the Clock.*

*The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch
at six minutes past Fourteen of
the Clock.*

[SHRI GADILINGANA GOWD in
the Chair.]

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE —(contd.)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Dhillon.

SHRI G. S. DHILLON (Taran Taran) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, before I support the Demands of the Ministry of Defence, one thing is very satisfactory this time is what we have been pressing all these years, about the re-employment of the Emergency Commissioned Officers. I must congratulate the Minister that he has been able to solve this problem to a large extent.

SHRI INDER J. MALHOTRA (Jammu) : Not all of them have been absorbed.

SHRI G. S. DHILLON : I have got the figures. Out of 4900 and odd,

he has been able to accommodate on the permanent list about 1852, and about 1752 have already been absorbed in various cadres, I. P. S., I. A. S., etc. and some of them in public undertakings also. It is only about 896 persons who are still on the pending list. The other day, he was good enough to assure that they too will be accommodated very soon and, I do hope, that with the assurance given by him, this problem which has been engaging our attention all this time will be solved.

There are other problems which purely do not relate to the fighting side or weaponry or combatant side and one of them is about the presence of ex-servicemen in the civil life of the country. I think, so far, if I may remark, nothing substantial has been done for the ex-servicemen, about 5 million of them, and every day we see various organisations in the name of ex-servicemen meeting, putting forward their demands and writing to Members of Parliament also. I am told that there is an official organisation to look after their interests, the Ex-servicemen, Soldiers and Sailors Board. But I have come to know recently that there is a more representative body, the Ex-Servicemen Soldiers Association which held its meeting only a couple of days back. But if their demands are put forward to the authorities, they are always shown the demands as made through the official organisation like the Sailors and Soldiers Board. Mainly their demands are reemployment, aid to their families, aid to their children's education and revision of pensions. About revision of pensions, we all know that, at various times, they were revised. But still there is a lot of dissatisfaction because of the rising cost of living every day. And those pensions were fixed long before and the revisions have not been to the satisfaction of ex-servicemen. I would suggest to the Minister that this should be tackled once and for all by appointing some Pensions Commission or some equivalent body which could go into the question or revision of pensions from the beginning upto this day, what they have got, what are their demands, what are the circumstances under which they are asking for more,

and all that. I have met very senior officers of the Army and they do feel that the demand is very much justified in spite of the increase allowed off and on.

As for the other difficulties, I would suggest that a committee of senior officers of all the three wings should be appointed—a sort of permanent arrangement should be there—to whom all the problems of ex-servicemen with administration, what sort of treatment they are receiving at the hands of civil officers, what sort of difficulties they are facing in resettlement and re-employment and so on could be referred.

I would also make another suggestion. So far as employment is concerned, it may be very difficult to employ all ex-servicemen, but some sort of a training may be given—some period before they are going to be released may be reserved for training—in transport services or in radio mechanism or repairs or in manufacture of agricultural implements, repair shops, etc., or even in more advanced and progressive farming, so that when they come out they may be equipped with some sort of a background which will enable them to adjust themselves to the civil life. I hope, the hon. Minister will shed any prejudice against non-official ex-servicemen organisations, will meet them, and will try to understand their viewpoint, because most of the ex-servicemen are organized in non-official organisations. It is no use telling them that they will consider only the demands that come from their regular, officially-recognised boards which, to my great disappointment, are not functioning satisfactorily; sometimes the Minister himself has admitted that the Soldiers and Sailors Boards at the district level or at the divisional level are not functioning satisfactorily because the officer or the retired officer at the head is not a very senior officer. He is at the most an honorary Lieutenant or Subedar Major and he suffers from some sort of inferiority complex when he sits in the meeting with IAS and IFS officers. In order to have a sense of equality and superiority, the Chairman of the Soldiers Board should be of a higher status. Even in

the case of the official organization, the rule should be that he should be a senior officer so as to create confidence and also demand respect from his colleagues in the civil services. He should at least be a Major or Lt. Colonel. Those times are gone. They are not available. I enquired about the emoluments that could satisfy them. They are not demanding much. There will not be much difference in the scale demanded by the Subedar Major or the Lt. Col. There is very little difference but it will create confidence and respect for them.

I want to say a few words about the NCC. The House is aware that when the NCC was started, it was started mainly on considerations of broad national interest though it was a part of the educational programme. I had the experience of 1965. My place is just on the border and as Minister in Punjab I had to tour all the border areas as I was put in charge of border districts for co-ordination between the civil and the military authorities and I found that excellent work was being done by the NCC cadets. I do not know what is the position about ACC. These young lads, the NCC people did commendable work at the time of aerial invasion, at the time of black-out in the cities and also services in the areas overrun by the enemy, and also at the time of resettlement. But when I heard that the Vice-Chancellors' meeting at Ahmedabad had unanimously decided to give up the compulsory aspect in training, deciding that they should relax it, I was not happy. I happened to enquire from some of the Vice-Chancellors as to what are the reasons behind it. They said that there were no reasons behind except that they were afraid of the students. Now I fail to understand if they have declared it as a voluntary service. Had it been a national service corps and also national sports organisation, they must take either of the three. What difference does it make to the students? They will have to take either of these three. But the advantage that was present in the military training that these young boys get and the merits of it which they displayed at the time of the Indo-Pakistan conflict, that will not be available if they are sent

[Shri G. S. Dhillon]

either to the National Service Corps or to these sports organisations for which there may be a separate arrangement. I would suggest to the Minister that he may keep it as a matter of voluntary training and declare it as a policy but not in the case of border areas where we always demand some services from these young men, some sort of services as they rendered in 1995. I would like him to reconsider it in consultation with the experts on education. So far as NCC is concerned, that must be compulsory at least in the border districts. On this issue I think the students will not at all be found recalcitrant. I met a number of them. They say that they would welcome it as a compulsory training in the border areas. But at the same time if it is going to be kept as an optional subject in the matter of voluntary training, one thing must be seen that whatever be the number of students in the NCC, that training must be essentially a defence-oriented one. It should not be a stereo-typed training just a little bit of weapon training, drill and handling of 303, map reading and all that. It must be defence oriented so that in case there is invasion they must be equipped with the latest training and trends for defence and offence. It is to be taken as a broad national policy and not mere academic policy. I am of the view that if any decision had ever to have been taken, it should have been taken at the level of this House and not at the suggestions of a few principals or vice-chancellors because when we introduced these Services we were guided not by academic interest but by national interest. Even now I would request the Minister to bring this matter up before this august House so that there could be some definite policy on it and it can be judged whether it is purely academic or it is a national policy.

I personally would like to bring some matters to the notice of the hon. Minister. Last time he promised that he would expedite compensation to be paid to the farmers whose lands were taken over by the Defence drains. Perhaps some of the Members of the House

may not have known that I live in border areas. We have a number of defensive canals like Ichogil canal on our side also. They were all built at the cost of the farmers. It is also now more than 2 years. They have not been paid any compensation for the land taken over nor any bridges built. These villages are divided into two. Half the land is on the other side. Half the land is on this side. People do not have access to the piece of land on the other side. I hope the Minister would be good enough to assure that necessary things will be done at the earliest in this regard.

The great inconvenience caused in this regard is not only caused to the farmers, but it may also lead to the loss of food production also because of non-access to the areas on the other side of the defence drains and canals. I hope he will take immediate action to see that these compensations are expedited.

In Khem-Kharan area, at the time of the invasion they paid certain aid and compensation to the shopkeepers and farmers. 2 or 3 years have passed. The Government is now pressing them very hard for repayment. It is only Rs. 500 or Rs. 600 or at the most Rs. 1,000 in some cases. Repayment should be remitted, or, if the Government is not prepared to do it, it should be deferred for at least 10 or 15 years till they can fully stand on their own legs.

SHRI GIRRAJ SARAN SINGH (Mathura) : I have very few words to say. Most of what has to be said has been said by the Public Accounts Committee and by others who spoke on the Ministry's demands and by my predecessor. It has been said that this year's expenditure will be enhanced by over Rs. 50 crores over the last year's. We are told that this increase is mainly due to raising of the pay and allowances of the armed forces. However I am not satisfied with this explanation as the rumbblings and grumbblings of the junior officers and men of the other ranks have in no way lessened; morale is not only deteriorating, but is badly affected; and this leads very definitely to a danger to the country's security. I am talking about housing, schooling, etc, and

immediate postings in respect of families so that no undue hardship is caused in these areas. These are the things that the Minister must consider if he wishes to keep the morale of the Army Officers and men upto the point.

I have seen a grandiose plan drawn up by the Defence Ministry for long years to come. This is completely vitiated and its proposals are completely vitiated by the Audit Report and the Public Accounts Committee's reports on the Ministry. These reports state without equivocation, without hesitation whatsoever, that bad planning, faulty execution, erroneous manufacture and inefficiency have led to a huge loss. I would beg the Defence Minister to carry out a complete house cleaning in his Ministry and all its Departments so that instead of asking for more money he could proudly come to this House and say that he has cut the defence estimates without endangering the sovereignty or the safety of India. It unfortunately happens to be the habit that whenever indents are presented for defence requirements, they are almost always sanctioned and the implementation is left to corrupt and inefficient officers and only the nation suffers. I can only hope that the Defence Minister will take drastic measures so that this kind of failure is not repeated. Now, I have some specific suggestions to make to the Defence Minister.

Sir, I am one who has advocated for a long time that senior appointments in the Services should be announced well in advance, so that the new incumbent can understand the policy and the day-to-day working of his new post before he takes over. Also this will give less opportunity of politics and factionism raising their dreaded heads and causing disruption in our Armed Forces. I am also against what has now almost become a precedent that retiring Heads of Services will be given high diplomatic posts. This, in my opinion, makes the officer subservient to the Government and because of his future prospects he will not disagree with his masters, and as a consequence matters of strategy are often left to gentlemen quite incompetent to maket hem. We, the nation, have had bitter

experience of this and it is certainly time that we learned our lesson.

I would like now to come to our defence production. Until now we have put all our faith in the USSR who by giving arms aid to Pakistan, have not only violated the Tashkent pact, but have made us very nervous about what their reaction would be, should there be a new confrontation either with China or with Pakistan. We, Sir, have at the moment a large army supplied mostly by the ordnance factories run by the Government of India. This is adequate in peace-time, when for training purposes a limited amount of stores and ammunition etc. are required. However, as you know, in war time the wastage is colossal and the ordnance factories could not possibly begin to meet the demand. I, therefore, suggest to the Defence Minister that the major industries in the private sector be asked to have a plan to switch to defence requirements, if and when required. I quote an incident that happened not very long ago at the Avadi tank factory where the links for the tank treads were found faulty and it was only on a friendly basis that these links were produced by a factory in the private sector. This sort of thing is going on all the time and unless the private sector is given a definite role and firm orders so as to justify their expenditure on research and retooling, you will find in times of emergency a complete break-down of essential supply.

The other thing that I want to point out is that the Indian Army has the highest ratio of Teeth to Tail of any army in the world. It is something like 24, whereas the UK, Germany, France, etc. keep a ratio of about 14. You can imagine the saving in money and manpower if we did the same thing.

There is no doubt that there are a great many jobs which have to be done by non-combatants, etc. which increase this ratio. But I feel certain that the Hon. Minister will look into this factor and reduce this Teeth to Tail ratio considerably, without decreasing the efficiency of the defence forces.

[Shri Girraj Saran Singh]

The Air Force has now reached its peak of 45 squadrons. How many of these are equipped with obsolete planes is anybody's guess. I know that the transport squadrons must be equipped and that the bomber squadrons are vastly outdated. There is talk of giving our fighter units new aircraft. How long this will take only God and Sardar Swaran Singh know.

I have heard disturbing rumours about our producing a fighter aircraft called the Jaguar under Anglo-French collaboration. I have from past experience become a little sceptical about this form of advancing our own aircraft industry. We had the sad tale of Prof. Tonk and even the sadder tale of the Avro 748 where India was used as a guinea pig for prototype manufacture and the so-called collaborators themselves did not manufacture these planes. A little serious thinking is needed before we take any firm decision on these matters.

I know everyone realises the dangers confronting this country. I have said many times before that it will be the task of the armed forces to hold and stem the tide while only the people of India can defend the nation. Hence I feel that though a certain augmentation of the Navy is vital, the undue priority given to it at the moment is like putting the cart before the horse. We have no aggressive motives and we are incapable of having a Navy in the near future, guarding our immense sea borders; therefore, to go in for submarines etc. is, I think, a little far-fetched. Should there be the near impossibility of a sea-borne invasion of any part of our coast, it is not the Navy but the Air Force ferrying troops to the site that is going to hold our coastline. Therefore, I would suggest a slow-down on naval build-up and an increase in the transport squadrons of the Air Force.

I have seen the Defence Minister's report and his future aspirations. But what perturbs me is that he has no plans to meet an emergency before the enemy is good enough to allow for some of his plans to fructify during the next five years.

Before I conclude, I come to my annual theme, for the liberalisation pay,

housing and other facilities of the Junior officers and the other ranks and the lessening of their tenure of posts in hardship areas.

I have one suggestion which could be followed up: when a battalion or a brigade or division moves from an advance area, it should leave all its heavy armament and transport *in situ* so that the new brigade which takes over could move only with side arms and could take up its positions immediately. This would save an enormous amount of money in transport and wear and tear of material.

With these few remarks, I earnestly hope the Defence Minister will take into consideration and pay heed to the few points I have made.

SHRIMATI SHARDA MUKERJEE (Ratnagiri) : I would like to express my appreciation to the Defence Minister of the report circulated to MPs. We are indeed thankful because it has given us more information than on previous occasions.

However, I would like to say that it has some basic and essential omissions and discrepancies. As long as these omissions and discrepancies are there, the credibility of the report remains much in doubt.

In the matter of omissions, I would like to mention the question of equipment.

As far as equipment is concerned, three important points have been left out: import content, foreign exchange involved and from what countries we are getting the equipment under what terms and conditions of payment for this equipment. There are of course some exceptions where these details have been given, namely, Praga tools and Bharat Earth Movers Ltd. These are not defence items but they have found a home in the Defence Ministry; the Defence Ministry gives a home to many things from mosquito nets to other things. Vital information which Parliament should have has not been given in respect of other things.

One wonders why it is so. Is it a question of our non-alignment? Is it not an accepted practice in modern democratic countries? May I ask the Minister to refer to a book which has been circulated to most Members of Parliament recently and that book is the official book, 'Britain 1969' and on pages 117-118 it is given clearly with what countries Great Britain is collaborating for defence equipment. When I was in London some months ago I was invited to visit some airforce stations and I met some Government Ministers and I met the Director of the Institute of Strategic Studies. I am ashamed to say that I did not know what they knew. I was ill equipped to tell them what they could tell me. Who are we hiding this from? The people of this country are not concerned; they are concerned about the basic requirements of their own lives; they do not stand in the way of your getting equipment from any country, X or Y or Z. Is it your foreign friends and enemies that you are crying to delude? Obviously you have not succeeded. Is it Parliament that you wish to delude? We are in the initial period of our democracy and no Government is eternal. The conventions we lay today are going to be the forerunners of the future and therefore in a free-democratic society where checks and counter-checks must act to safeguard the security of the country, it would be better if basic information is shared with the House.

We know our man-power strength. There is plenty of man-power strength in our country; there is no shortage. Is it fully utilised? Are our service personnel properly equipped? We should be told about these things because we have suffered in the past by trusting too much too readily. As Members of Parliament we owe a duty to those young men of the Armed Forces to see that they have the sort of equipment they require under combat circumstances. There is not much time and I shall give only one example of which I have some little background knowledge. The Ministry's report mentions that the Air Force has 45 squadrons and it gives the list of squadrons. We knew that the MIGs and gnats are used; there are the fighter squadrons, communi-

cation squadrons, trainers, helicopters, miscellaneous, etc; everyone knows about these things. Everything tallies. But again from foreign information we hear that there is an aircraft SU 22 Soviet fighter bomber and the remark against it is: "delivered but not yet in operational service." Then there is mention of Hunters from UK. This comes from the Institute of Strategic Studies available in Parliament Library. I have not got any secret source of information. What is really shattering is that 45 squadrons are going to be equipped with only 500 combat aircraft. I ask you: does it make sense to say so? We know that by any reasonable and rational standards, a thousand aircraft would be required to cover wastage, repairs, etc. Even children play as hamley's with squadrons; now-a-days they know what aircraft are used and what the squadrons are. But the Parliament in India is not given this information. We are told 45 squadrons are equipped with 500 aircraft...*(Interruptions.)* You have seen how thinly attended the House has been. If Parliamentary control becomes ineffective as it was in the past, you will have to pay a heavy price. We shall have failed in the most sacred duty to our people and to our country, because, defence is not a matter which concerns this party or that party. When there is an enemy on our frontiers, he is not going to find out whether a boy is your son or my son, and therefore in the interest of national security Parliament must insist that basic information is shared with it and that we do not wait too long till it is overdue and mistakes are committed. I request the Minister to tell us whether the squadrons are properly equipped, whether there are adequate missile and radar installations particularly in our eastern sector where we face the Chinese threat most imminently. In the last Indo-Pak war we know that gnats had to fly low so that they could escape Pakistan radar system. We know that we had no night fighters. That was four years ago and today surely the country has a right to know whether those deficiencies had been fully remedied.

The fighter pilots' active life is of a short span-five years or at the most ten years. By the time he is 26 he has finished being a fighter pilot. He may go

[Shri Girraj Saran Singh]

on till 30 if he is lucky. Has the Ministry made any assessment from the log books of officers that the squadron leaders and below have put in enough flying hours? Or are we having all these young-men waiting in frustration because they just do not have the planes to fly? We have got fast aircraft and fast modern Migs which have a short flying span. Without radar cover what use are they? I was happy to hear yesterday from the Minister of State, Mr. L. N. Mishra, that we propose to have missiles. I only hope that vested interests do not dispose of his proposals.

I want to refer to the totality of the defence expenditure.

The Defence Ministry's budget estimates come to Rs. 1,110 crores. The demands are Rs. 1,143 crores, plus the supplementary demands of Rs. 58 crores. In all, it comes to Rs. 1,243.54 crores. On the other hand, we have ancillaries like the para-military forces. The border Security Force alone accounts for Rs. 35 crores. There are other things like the border roads which are charged to the Ministry of Shipping and Transport; they are managed by a Major-General and governed by the Ministry of Defence. In all, I would say that the total defence expenditure today, all together, is Rs. 1,300 crores. And it is not possible to assess the entire complex, because like in any industrial complex, they have been tacked away all over the place. Parliament will give sanction for Rs. 1,300 crores this year. The Finance Ministry's allocation for the Plan is only Rs. 1,737 crores. For defence, it is Rs. 1,300 crores. Out of that Rs. 250 crores are deficit financing. The time has come to see whether any economies can be made in defence.

In defence production, the amount which we have put is about Rs. 500 crores. There is a report on some Important Information on Projects, which say that the MIG division alone has an investment of Rs. 100 crores, so that the total investment would be Rs. 500 crores. It is time that we went into this and saw whether, first of all economy cannot be effected. And secondly, whether the defence

production units cannot be so used as to strengthen the economy of the country. I think it is possible.

When the Defence Ministry came to give evidence before the public Accounts Committee, it was said that after all,...

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please conclude; you have had 17 minutes.

SHRIMATI SHARDA MUKERJEE: Just five minutes more. We are voting crores of rupees and you say talk for five minutes!

MR. CHAIRMAN : The list is given to me by the Whips. We have 17 more names here.

SHRI JAIPAL SINGH (Khunti) : Let her have my time.

SHRIMATI SHARDA MUKERJEE : The Defence Ministry has said while giving evidence before the PAC that about 40 per cent represents the cost by way of pay and allowances. I take them at their word, and the Defence Ministry's demands put it down to Rs. 456 crores or something, as pay and allowances of the armed forces officers. If you count transportation, etc. in all, it comes to Rs. 500 crores. The immediate thing that I can see, where economy can be effected, and economy could be effected, is to the extent of Rs. 75 crores, with my limited knowledge. If somebody takes the trouble of going into it more deeply, I am sure he will be able to make a more thorough analysis.

Now, has anyone made an assessment of the utilisation of staff-cars? I know that there were much stricter regulations in the old days than there are now.

Secondly, there is the system of orderlies. There are about 8,25,000 men and I estimate that there are about 35,000 to 40,000 officers. We are told that only on active service they are given orderlies. Let us take the official explanation that only on active service—people, in operational stations—are given orderlies. That

means that one-third at least are in operational stations: 11,500 or 12,000 officers, plus JCOs, who are given orderlies. In all it is 15,000 people. Some of the top officers get three to four orderlies. So, you will be having 30,000 men working as orderlies or one and a half divisions.

What would be the cost? The cost, I believe, would be not less than Rs. 15 crores on orderlies. I do not think that the cost per orderly comes to less than Rs. 1,000 a year. Not that I do not want them to have orderlies, but there must be some control over it. Such a poor country as India is, can it afford it? I see that the Defence Minister tells us that the defence expenditure is 3.46 per cent of the Gross National product, which is an illusory thing. When the average income of a man in India is less than Rs. 1 a day, and out of that he has to give 3.5 per cent, we have to consider the background of these conditions. Can you justify this kind of thing? Surely, there must be some review of this.

Then I come to the question of employment of civilians in the armed forces. I know there is stiff resistance to it from the service personnel. But I do not see why the store keepers, clerks and so on should not be civilians. After all, it costs twice as much to maintain service personnel. Why don't we do this?

I think the estimated savings under these three heads, namely, staff cars, orderlies and replacement by civilians of the service personnel in some posts will bring about a saving of not less than Rs. 75 crores.

Then, the perquisites of the senior officers have increased so much that there is growing discontent among the other ranks. The benefits of the lower rung officers and the jawans have not been increased with the result that the disparity has grown. There is also a disparity between the three services. Army has the highest perquisites. Navy would probably come next. I know in Dhaula Kuan there is a Major and a Squadron Leader living side by side. While the Major is getting so many perquisites,

the Squadron Leader is getting nothing. Do you not think that this disparity will create discontent?

Before concluding, I want to make a reference to defence production. The Minister of state made a statement yesterday that the out put for 1968-69 was Rs. 107 crores. When your invested capital is Rs. 500 crores, even to have a break even you would require a production of Rs. 500 crores. Now that is not possible. So, this figure of Rs. 108 crores is not something that we can be proud of. When plenty of markets are coming up in the South East Asian region, why can we not increase our production?

Then, every defence production unit is now managed by a defence service officer, who is deputed from the services. He is a loss to the service and not again to that unit; He has neither managerial nor design, nor production experience. If you want to make room for somebody, surely you can accommodate him somewhere else.

Finally, is there any system of operational research, any system for a review of the structure of the armed forces, a proper review of inventory control, logistic control, dependence on civil sources during war? Has any system been established for that even after two conflicts?

In conclusion, I would say that if these economies could be effected, you could have a saving of ten per cent in the overall expenditure, which would mean Rs. 130 crores per year. Over a plan period it would come to round about Rs. 700 crores. In these Rs. 500 crores defence production units you have got today a source of economic strength for our country. They can give an opportunity to the young men who are trained scientists, engineers and technicians to render some national service to the country. One thing alone is needed. Defence production would have to be divorced from Defence Ministry. I am sorry to have to say that, but it will have to be divorced from the Defence Ministry. It has grown too large now and the economic strain on the country is too heavy.

[Shrimati Sharda Mukerjee]

Lastly, with regard to the Indian National Army personnel, an assurance was given on the floor of the House about their pension. This has not been fulfilled. The Minister should take care of that. Here I would like to add my voice to that of the members who have spoken before me with regard to ex-servicemen, to whom we owe very much more than what we are giving them today.

SHRI JAIPAL SINGH : There is on quorum in the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN : There is quorum in the House.

SHRI JAIPAL SINGH : I challenge it. There is no quorum in the House. The count must take place.

MR. CHAIRMAN : There is quorum in the House. Please resume your seat. Shri George Fernandes.

श्री जार्ज फर्नेन्डिस (बम्बई-दक्षिण) : सभापति महोदय, सुरक्षा के मामले में कितनी लापरवाही होती है वह इसी से मालूम होता है कि कल और आज इस सदन में 1200 करोड़ रुपये प्रतिरक्षा मंत्रालय के वास्ते अर्थात् संरक्षण के वास्ते मंजूर कराने की इस बहस में कितनी ही बार कोरम की घंटी बजानी पड़ी है। अभी इस समय भी मेरे मित्र श्री जयपाल सिंह ने जो हाउस में कोरम न रहने की बात उठाई वह बहुत ही दुरुस्त बात थी। असलियत यह है कि आज दोपहर से इस सदन में जितने माननीय सदस्य बोले उनकी बातों को सुनने की बात नहीं बल्कि मैं कहूँगा कि संरक्षण के बारे में विचार करने के इस मामले में इस सदन में 50 लोगों की भी हाजिरी नहीं रही। इस से बड़ी शर्म की चीज इस सदन के लिए और कोई दूसरी नहीं हो सकती थी। एक तरफ यह लापरवाही दूसरी तरफ देश के संरक्षण के बारे में जो अज्ञान हमें दिखाई देता है उसका भी यहाँ जिक्र करना बहुत आवश्यक है।

अभी थोड़े दिन पहले मध्यावधि चुनाव हुए थे। उन चुनावों के समय पता नहीं

लोग क्या क्या हमेशा बोलते रहते हैं? संरक्षण मन्त्री भी यहाँ अपने संरक्षण की तैयारी के बारे में बोलते रहते हैं लेकिन अब की बार उपप्रधान मन्त्री श्री मोरारजी देसाई संरक्षण के बारे में बोलने लगे। किसी एक चुनाव प्रचार सभा में वह यहाँ तक बोले कि चीन और पाकिस्तान यह जो हमारे दो बड़े शत्रु हैं इन दोनों का एक साथ मुकाबला करके दोनों को हराने की हमारे में शक्ति है। आखिर किस आघार पर यह बातें कहने में आती हैं? वह कौन सा ज्ञान है जिसके कि आघार पर इस तरह की बातें आती हैं मैं नहीं जानता?

प्रतिरक्षा मंत्रालय ने जो रिपोर्ट पेश की है अभी अभी श्रीमती शारदा मुकर्जी ने उसके बारे में कहा कि कोई भी आंकड़े विशेष कर हमारी पलटन की ताकत के बारे में, संख्या के बारे में उस में हमें देखने को नहीं मिलते हैं। श्रीमती शारदा मुकर्जी ने ठीक ही कहा कि भले ही इस देश की संसद को इस देश के प्रतिरक्षा मन्त्री महोदय ने पलटन के बारे में आंकड़े और जानकारी देने से इंकार कर दिया हो लेकिन लंदन के इंस्टीच्यूट आफ स्ट्रैटिजिक स्टडीज से पूछो या इस मुल्क के जो पड़ोसी शत्रु हैं उन से पूछिये या जो अन्य देश हैं विशेष कर वह देश जिनसे कि हम लड़ाई की सामग्री खरीदते हैं, जैसे रूस, इंग्लिस्तान अथवा अमरीका हैं, यह सभी लोग हमारी पलटन के बारे में पूरी जानकारी रखते हैं। इस के विपरीत इस प्रतिरक्षा मंत्रालय की रिपोर्ट का यदि मैं जिक्र करूँ तो उस रपट के आधे हिस्से में पलटन के लोगों की क्या तनख्वाह है, क्या भत्ता है और उन्हें हम और क्या क्या पैसा देते हैं इसी का हिसाब आप ने इस में दिया है। मेरा कहना है कि अब अगर कोई भी अक्लमंद आदमी हो तो वह थोड़ी मेहनत करने के बाद आप को यह आप की तनख्वाह आदि से हिसाब लगा कर जरूर बतला

सकेगा कि दर असल आप की पलटन की क्या शक्ति है ।

जहाँ तक मैं जानता हूँ आज दुनिया के देशों में हिन्दुस्तान की पलटन की शक्ति चौथे नम्बर की कही जाती है। अमरीका, रूस और चीन के बाद हिन्दुस्तान चौथे नम्बर का मुल्क कहा जाता है। 9 लाख जवान और अफसर इस मुल्क की पलटन, वायुसेना और नौवी में इस समय शामिल हैं। इस 9 लाख की ताकत के ऊपर दोनों शत्रुओं का एक साथ मुकाबला करने की जो बात कही जाती है यह आखिर किस आधार पर कही जाती है यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है ?

एक तरफ तो इस रपट के अन्दर मंत्री महोदय ने बताया है और इस सदन के अंदर कई बार हुई चर्चाओं के दौरान बतलाया है कि सन् 1965 में जिस समय पाकिस्तान के आक्रमण के फलस्वरूप हमारी और उसकी लड़ाई हुई थी तो उस लड़ाई के बाद पाकिस्तान अपनी शक्ति को दुगना कर के बैठ गया है। अमरीका या पश्चिमी यूरोप के राष्ट्रों से जो उन्हें युद्ध सामग्री सहायता के रूप में मिलती रही है उस आधार पर पाकिस्तान अपनी शक्ति को जैसा कहा दुगनी बना कर बैठा हुआ है। दूसरी तरफ हम देखते हैं कि जो बाहर के देश पिछले कई वर्षों में हिन्दुस्तान को युद्ध सामग्री और दूसरे मामलों में सहायता व सहयोग दिया करते थे, जैसे कि रूस, तो आज उस रूस का भी समर्थन पाकिस्तान के साथ है। चीन समर्थक रहा ही है। चीन ने रूस तथा पश्चिमी यूरोप के और देशों की मदद से अपनी पलटनी शक्ति को 1965 के बाद दुगनी की है। चीन और पाकिस्तान दोनों को एक साथ ले कर लड़ने का विधान हमारा उप-प्रधान मंत्री, संरक्षण मंत्री या कोई और जिम्मेदार व्यक्ति कैसे कर सकता है, यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता ।

15 hrs.

दूसरी तरफ मैं इस का सबूत भी दूंगा कि आप की स्थिति क्या है। अभी अभी एक किताब निकली है जो श्री खेरा की लिखी हुई है जो आप के पुराने डिफेंस सेक्रेट्री और कैबिनेट सेक्रेट्री रह चुके हैं। मैं खेरा साहब को संरक्षण के मामले में कोई बहुत ज्यादा अक्ल रखने वाला आदमी नहीं मानता क्योंकि सन् 1962 में जब हम पीछे हटे थे तब वह अपने कैबिनेट सेक्रेट्री, प्रिंसिपल डिफेंस सेक्रेट्री और न जाने क्या क्या थे मुझे नहीं मालूम, लेकिन किसी ऐसी जगह पर जरूर थे। नौकरी से हट जाने के बाद जब लोगों में अक्ल आती है, तब मैं उसकी कद्र नहीं करता, फिर भी उनकी जो किताब है उस के बारे में बतलाना चाहता हूँ क्योंकि उन की किताब के लिखे जाने में सरकार की ओर से मदद मिली है और 1962 में, तथा उसके पहले और बाद के संरक्षण के मामले को वह कुछ जानते हैं। मैं उनकी बात को संरक्षण मंत्री और सदन के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। अभी-अभी उन्होंने जो किताब छपवाई है उस में वह कहते हैं कि अगर कहीं पाकिस्तान हम से लड़ाई करने आये तब हम जिस तरीके से सन् 1965 में उस का मुकाबला कर पाये वैसे ही हम को अगली बार मुकाबला करने का मौका मिलेगा ऐसा वह उम्मीद और हिम्मत से नहीं कह सकते हैं। इस समय यह आप के एक अफसर की राय है।

दूसरी तरफ हम भले ही अपनी पलटन के बारे में अपने लोगों को जानकारी नहीं देते, लेकिन चीन अपनी पलटनी ताकत को छिपाता नहीं है। चीन का यह कहना है कि उस की जो भूमि सेना है वह 27 लाख है, उस की जो नौ सेना है वह डेढ़ लाख की है और जो वायुसेना है वह एक लाख के लगभग है। उस की पैरा-मिलिटरी फोर्स 3 लाख की है। वह खुद ही कहता है कि जो उस

[श्री जार्ज फर्नेन्डीज़]

की पीपल्स मिलीशिया है, क्योंकि चीन ने अपने हर एक नौजवान को चाहे वह लड़का हो या लड़की, बन्दूक चलाने का शिक्षण दिया है,— उस में बन्दूक चलाने की जानकारी रखने वाले 20 करोड़ लोग हैं। हो सकता है उस ने कुछ ज्यादा संख्या बतला दी हो, आप उस का आधा कर दीजिए, या और भी काट दीजिए, लेकिन जिस देश में करोड़ों की संख्या में बन्दूक चलाने वाले नौजवान रहेंगे, जब उस देश से मुकाबला करने की बात आती है तब जरा जिम्मेदारी से इस सदन में और बाहर बात करनी चाहिए। यह वही चीन है जिसने पिछले तीन चार वर्षों में सिर्फ अपनी पल्टनी शक्ति को ही नहीं बढ़ाया है, बल्कि अणुबम तैयार किये हैं, इंटर-कांटिनेंटल बैलिस्टिक मिज़ाइल्स तैयार किये हैं, और हमारे देश के ऊपर टेस्ट करने का काम किया है, हमारे इण्डियन ओशन और वे आफ बंगाल में इस किस्म के बैलिस्टिक मिज़ाइल्स की टेस्टिंग का काम किया है। जब हम उसे विरोध-पत्र तक नहीं भेज सके हैं तब हम चीन का मुकाबला कैसे कर सकते हैं ?

फिर सिर्फ पल्टनी शक्ति की ही बात नहीं है, सिर्फ अणुबम की या आइ. सी. बी. एम. की शक्ति की बात नहीं, बल्कि दोनों देश जो हमारे विरुद्ध संकल्प कर चुके हैं— पाकिस्तान मजहब के आधार पर इस देश के खिलाफ अपने देश को भड़का कर रखता है, और चीन जो महत्वाकांक्षा में दुनिया का सब से बड़ा देश बन गया, उस महत्वाकांक्षा को ले कर अपने देश के लोगों को भड़का कर एक किस्म का दिमागी परिवर्तन करने में उसने कामयाबी पाई है, यह दोनों देश हमारे मुल्क के मुकाबले में खड़े हैं। मैं श्री खेरा का एक जुमला पढ़ कर सुनाना चाहता हूँ, इस लिए नहीं कि मैं उन के विचारों की कोई बड़ी भारी कद्र करता हूँ, बल्कि इस लिए कि सदन इन चीजों से अवगत हो और

हमारे वक्तव्य देने वाले लोग इस से कुछ जानकारी हासिल करें।

वह अपनी किताब में कहते हैं कि :

“It will be difficult, and probably impossible, for India to overtake China's military build-up. The Indian industrial and productive effort has been increasing; but the rate of increase, starting from a base line somewhat ahead of China, has been far slower than the Chinese; and is only a small fraction of what would be required to enable a full military engagement with China.”

“Furthermore, the gap is increasing, for, Communist China is racing ahead in an allout effort to catch up with the United States of America and with the Soviet Union. Her sights are set differently and higher than those of the Indian Government.”

इस सरकार की नीति के बारे में सरकार की नीति बनाने वाले और उस में मदद करने वाले एक अभसर की राय है।

जहां तक चीन के मुकाबले का मामला है, मैं यह भी कहूँगा कि चीन के बारे में सोचते वक्त जरा उन के यहां की संकल्प और शक्ति की बात ही नहीं, उन के यहाँ के नेतृत्व के दिमाग को भी हम लोग समझ लें। माओ के विचारों के बारे में, माओज थाट्स का हम लोग मजाक करते हैं, मगर यह सिर्फ मजाक कर के उड़ा देने वाली बात नहीं है। उन के विचारों पर उन का देश चलता है। वह सिर्फ इतना ही नहीं कहते हैं कि :

Power flows from the barrel of a gun.

उनका विचार यहां तक ही सीमित नहीं रहता है, बल्कि वह ताकत का इस्तेमाल कैसे करें जरा इसके बारे में आप माओ के

विचार सुनें। माओ साहब का कहना है कि :

“Weapons are an important factor in war, but not the decisive one; it is man and not material that is decisive. The contest of forces is not only a contest of military and economic power, but also one of the power and morale of man. Military and economic power must be controlled by man.”

यह माओ साहब के विचार हैं जिन को ले कर उन्होंने अपने देश की पलटनी शक्ति को, देश की आर्थिक शक्ति को, देश की लड़ाई की शक्ति को बढ़ाने का काम किया है। यही वह विचार हैं जिन्होंने 1965 में चीन की पलटन के अन्दर अफसरों और जवानों के बीच में जो भी अन्तर थे उनको मिटाया। 1965 के मई महीने से चीन में अफसर हो या जवान, सब एक साथ हैं, एक अनुशासन से चलते हैं, एक किस्म का खाना खाते हैं और एक साथ सोचते हैं, हमारे देश से मुकाबले के बारे में और चीन के बारे में सोचते हैं।

कभी-कभी जब रूस और चीन का झगड़ा होता है या जब अमरीका चीन को धमकाने का काम करता है तब हम लोगों की तबियत खुश होती है, लेकिन मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस गलतफहमी में हमारा देश न रहे क्योंकि कोई नहीं जानता कि चीन कहां अमरीका से लड़ने का काम करेगा और कहां रूस के साथ लड़ने का काम करेगा। वह लोग बड़े अकलमन्द हैं। एक और अमरीकी पलटन के मुकाबले में वियतनाम आखिरी सैनिक लाने की बात करता है और अमरीका के खिलाफ लगातार रोज प्रचार करता है और दूसरी ओर वार्सा में पिछले बीस वर्षों से अमरीका की सरकार के साथ बात चीत चलाने की बात करता है।

इसी तरह से आप अमरीकी लोगों के दिमाग की बात भी सोचिये। जब श्री निक्सन राष्ट्रपति बन गये तो उन्होंने सब से पहले यह बात चलाई कि हम चीन के साथ बात-

चीत करना चाहते हैं, चीन के साथ बिगड़े हुए रिश्तों को हम सुधारना चाहते हैं। क्योंकि ताकत का आदमी ताकत को पहचानता है। चीन जो हिन्दुस्तान से भी पिछड़ा हुआ था बाइस साल पहले, आज तीसरे नम्बर का देश बन गया है और पहले नम्बर का देश बनने के लिए बहुत तेजी से आगे बढ़ रहा है। अमरीका के राष्ट्रपति भी इस बात को जानते हैं और रूस के नेता लोग भी इस बात को जानते हैं। चीन की यह शक्ति है और उस के मुकाबले में हमारी क्या तैयारी है? हमारी पलटनी तैयारी क्या है, हमारे जवानों और अफसरों के मन की ताकत कहाँ तक है और सब से बड़ी बात मोटे तौर पर यह कि हम लोगों का जो राष्ट्रीय संकल्प वाला मामला है वह कहाँ तक है?

असल में देखा जाय तो जितना दिमागी कम्प्यूजन हम लोगों के बीच में है अपने देश के संरक्षण के मामले में, शायद उतना दुनिया के किसी भी देश के नेताओं में नहीं होगा। एक तरफ प्रधान मंत्री कहती हैं कि हम चीन के साथ बातचीत करना चाहते हैं। किस बात को ले कर बातचीत करना चाहती है? कितनी जमीन छोड़ने के लिए बातचीत करना चाहती हैं, कौन से चीन के साथ बात चीत करना चाहती हैं? एक तरफ प्रधान मंत्री का यह बयान और दूसरी तरफ हमारे वैदेशिक-कार्य मंत्री जब उन से प्रश्न पूछा जाता है कि हमारे समुद्र के अन्दर जो हमारी नौ सेना की ताकत कम पड़ती है उसको दूर करने के लिए क्या वह कोई कदम उठायेंगे तब कहते हैं कि हम यह मानने के लिए तैयार नहीं हैं कि इण्डियन ओशन बोलने से इण्डियन ओशन हमारा हो जाता है। यह उन का विधान हो गया। हमारी नौ सेना के बारे में इस किस्म के बिगड़े दिमाग का प्रदर्शन हो जाता है।

[श्री जाजं फर्नेन्डीज़]

हमारे संरक्षण मंत्री ने रिपोर्ट में एक अजीब सी बात कही है, जिस का मैं चाहूंगा कि खुले तौर पर खुलासा हो। वह कह रहे हैं कि अभी हम एक-पंचवर्षीय योजना बनाने जा रहे हैं अपनी प्लटन के लिए। असल में यह पंचवर्षीय योजना की बात आप ने 1966 से 1971 तक के लिए कही थी। 6 हजार करोड़ रुपये की आप की पंचवर्षीय योजना थी। लेकिन इस रपट के अन्दर ऐसा लिखा है, यह जरा देखिए आप :

"Therefore, when the rephrasing of the Fourth Five Year Plan over the period 1969-74 is being undertaken, a new Defence Plan to cover this period is also being formulated."

कौन सी यह पंचवर्षीय योजना है ? इज बीइंग फारमुलेटेड -- कहां है वह योजना ? कितने करोड़ रुपये की योजना है ? क्या करना चाहते हैं उस योजना में ? 6 हजार करोड़ रुपये का जिऊ किया। उस का मतलब यह हो गया कि हर साल आप 12 सौ करोड़ से 15 सौ करोड़ रुपया संरक्षण के कार्य में लगाना चाहते हैं। कौन से काम में खर्च करेंगे ? जो बजट आप यहां पेश करते हैं, जो पैसे की मांग यहां करते हैं, यही आप की योजना है या उस के बाहर जा कर कोई योजना बनाने जा रहे है ? अगर नहीं, तो फिर काहे के लिए गब्दों को ले कर इस किस्म का मजाक करने और देश को गुमराह करने की बातें चलती हैं, यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है। अब सरकार की जो यह रपट हम लोगों के सामने है, कल मैंने श्री एल० एन० मिश्र की बात सुनी, स्वतन्त्र पार्टी के सदस्य भी बोले सभी लोगों की मांग है कि प्राइवेट सेक्टर की तरफ देखो और प्राइवेट सेक्टर की मदद करने का काम करो। प्राइवेट सेक्टर को अब भी मदद हो रही है, आप देखिए इस रपट में, आर्डिनेन्स कारखाने के अन्दर :

The value of issues in the past 6 years has been as follows: (Page 22)...

आप देखेंगे कि आर्डिनेन्स कारखाने से जो माल तैयार होता है उस की रकम घटती जा रही है। प्लटन बढ़ती जा रही है, सैनिकों की संख्या बढ़ रही है लेकिन आर्डिनेन्स फ़ैक्ट्री के अन्दर जो माल बनता है उस की कीमत घट रही है। उसका कारण एक ही है कि न बताते हुए, न बोलते हुए, न पूछते हुए, आज निजी क्षेत्रों को कांट्रैक्ट देने का काम चल रहा है। मंत्री महोदय कितना भी इनकार करें, लेकिन इस बात का खुलासा उन को करना होगा कि आर्डिनेन्स फ़ैक्ट्री के अन्दर प्रोडक्शन क्यों घट गया ? कृष्ण मेनन की बदनामी करने पर तो आज लोग जरूर निकले हैं, आप उन से मतभेद जो रखते हैं जरूर रखिए लेकिन आर्डिनेन्स कारखाने के जरिए हिन्दुस्तान के डिफेंस प्रोडक्शन को बढ़ाने का जो काम उन्होंने किया है कभी उस की तारीफ करना भी सीखिए क्योंकि उन्होंने यह काम तो जरूर किया था जिस से निजी क्षेत्रों की ओर से उन का सिर लेने की मांग हो गयी थी। और आज रपट देखिए, हमारे आर्डिनेन्स कारखाने का प्रोडक्शन घट रहा है।

दूसरी बात—एक और रपट सरकार ने रखी है। यह है आडिट रिपोर्ट—डिफेंस और दूसरी है एप्रोप्रिएशन एकाउण्ट्स-डिफेंसेज। एप्रोप्रिएशन एकाउण्ट के पहले ही पन्ने को देखिए, अष्टाचार में कितना पैसा जाता है, इस का पता चलेगा। एक एक पैराग्राफ भरा पड़ा है कई-कई बातें बस में हैं :

In an advance base ordnance depot, petrol, oil and lubricants were indented from the Supply Depot very much in excess of actual requirements.

और हो गई चोरी वहां पर डेढ़ लाख की।

In a Military hospital the figures in Daily ward requisitions for patient's rations were tampered with by Ration accounting branch of the hospital and patients' rations were charged off from the books in excess of the quantity intended by wards.

एक एक इस किस्म का वाक्य आप को इस में पढ़ने को मिलेगा जिस से मासूम होगा कि किस ढंग से संरक्षण खाते के अन्दर पैसे की बरबादी और चोरी होती है। दूसरी तरफ आडिट रिपोर्ट को देखिये। कितने कितने मामलों के अन्दर पैसे की चोरी हो रही है। एक साबुन वाला मामला है जिस में 7 लाख रुपये की चोरी की बात है जिस में श्री एल. एन. मिश्र का नाम भी लोग ले रहे हैं, श्री एल. एन. मिश्र यहां बैठे हैं, मैं उन से कहना चाहता हूं, लोग गलत ढंग से आप का नाम इस में ले रहे हैं। मैं चाहता हूं इस के बारे में आप कुछ निश्चित कदम उठाएं। अध्यक्ष महोदय, 7 लाख रुपये के साबुन के नाम से पत्थर को डिफेंस में सप्लाई करने का काम हो गया बाद में चोरी पकड़ने में आ गई। डेढ़ साल हो गया लेकिन अभी तक उस कम्पनी के खिलाफ मुकदमा नहीं चल रहा है। लोग मन्त्री महोदय श्री एल. एन. मिश्र का नाम लेते हुए शहर के अन्दर घूम रहे हैं।

शारदा जी ने अभी यहाँ पर कैसे पैसे की बचत कर सकते हैं, यह बतलाया। खेरा साहब की जो किताब है उस में वह कहते हैं कि सौ करोड़ रुपया सिर्फ प्रोडक्शन के डिपार्टमेंट में और सप्लाईज ऐण्ड प्राविजन में अगर आप अपनी एकोनामी को चलाएँ, तो कम कर सकते हैं। मैं तो यह भी कहूंगा कि अगर भ्रष्टाचार को मिटाने का काम करें और उस पर काबू पायें तो और 200 करोड़ रुपये का खर्च और बचा सकते हैं। 300 करोड़ रुपये कम में डिफेंस खाते को चलाने का काम हो सकता है। लेकिन मैं यह नहीं

चाहूंगा कि पैसा ले कर आप और मामलों में लगायें। डिफेंस फोर्स में जो तनखाह की बात है, मधु लिमये जी ने एक पत्र परसों उस के बारे में मंत्री जी को लिखा है, मंत्री जी उस के ऊपर सोचें। सिर्फ ऊपर के अफसरों के बारे में ही न सोचें। आज जो जवान 24 घंटे काम करते हैं, जब वह पल्टन में भर्ती होते हैं तो अपनी मौत पर हस्ताक्षर कर के आते हैं, उन की तनखाह एक मामूली चपरासी की तनखाह से भी कम हो, एक जूनियर कमीशन्ड आफिसर और नान-कमीशन्ड आफिसर की तनखाह उसकी बराबरी के सिविलियन ड्यूटी वाले से आधी कम हो, उन को मँहगाई भत्ता 80 प्रतिशत मिलता हो, 24 घण्टे उन से काम लिया जाय, उन को कोई यूनियन बनाने का अधिकार नहीं, कोई अपने हकों के लिए लड़ने का अधिकार नहीं, कोई उन के लिए अपना मां बाप नहीं, इसलिए चाहे जो करते चले जाय, यह ठीक नहीं है, इसलिए मैं चाहूंगा कि पैसे की एक तरफ बचत कर के जवानों की तरखाह, उन की पेंशन और अन्य चीजें बढ़ाने के ऊपर भी कुछ ढंग से सोचें।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, चन्द दिनों पहले देश भर में एक वहस चली कि हिन्दुस्तान की पल्टन का सेनापति कौन रहेगा जब कुमार भंगलम साहब का समय पूरा हो गया। हमारे मित्र नाथ पं जी ने परसों एक बयान में कहा है कि किसी विदेशी देश के नेता ने हम लोगों की सेना का अधिकारी कौन रहे इस के ऊपर अपना एलान किया है, वह तो नाथ पं जी उसका खुलासा करेंगे। मगर मैं एक बात और कहना चाहता हूं। सभापति, जी, भूमे बड़ा अफसोस है कि आप उस दल के सदस्य हैं लेकिन आप जानते हैं कि स्वतंत्र पार्टी के श्री लोबो प्रभू नाम के एक सदस्य हैं, उनका एक अखबार चलता है जिसको पति-पति दोनों मिलकर चलाते हैं। उस अखबार में श्री लोबो प्रभू ने क्या लिखा है,

[श्री जार्ज फर्नेन्डोज]

यह जरा सुनिये :

How serious the internal threat can be from those who take democracy to the streets cannot be estimated, particularly because the threat is contained by the army's capacity to meet it by being in reserve for the Central and even the State Police. That the Army is available is an insurance not only in physical, but in the psychological terms that the Police are not indispensable, and therefore are not worth seducing. This, in fact, is the Army's greatest justification and if we had no disputes with Pakistan and China, it would have been necessary to invent them to keep the Army available against internal disturbances.

यानी ऐसे सदस्य हैं जो यह सोचते हैं कि पल्टन का इस्तेमाल सिर्फ इस देश के मजदूर आन्दोलन के खिलाफ, इस देश के जन आन्दोलन के खिलाफ इस देश के गरीब लोगों के खिलाफ किया जाय। यह सिर्फ लोबो प्रभू की राय नहीं है, उन के अखबार की राय नहीं है, मैं आपको इस बात से आगाह कर देना चाहता हूँ और आप के सामने एक बात रखना चाहता हूँ जो आस्ट्रेलिया की लेबर पार्टी की शैडो केबिनेट के एक सदस्य ने अभी कुछ महीने पहले मुझे बताया था। पिछले साल 1967 में अप्रैल महीने में, पालमा-डे-मेलोरा, स्पेन में एक जगह है वहाँ पर इंटर पार्लियामेंट्री यूनियन की एक कान्फरेंस हुई थी, उसमें काँग्रेस पार्टी के दो प्रतिनिधि गए थे जिस में एक तो श्री वीरेन राय थे जो राज्य सभा के सदस्य हैं। उनसे आस्ट्रेलिया की लेबर पार्टी के नेता की बातचीत चली, उन्होंने पूछा कि आपके देश में काँग्रेस पार्टी की पिटाई हो गई आम चुनाव में, अब क्या होगा तो वह क्या कहते हैं यह जरा सुनिये वीरेन राय का उत्तर रहा कि चिन्ता मत कीजिए, हम लोग जानते हैं कोई बाम पंथी या कोई भी काँग्रेस विरोधी शक्ति हो, उस को कैसे खत्म किया जाय। पल्टन का सम-

र्थन हमारे साथ है। वह बोले कि आज जो हिन्दुस्तान की सेना के सब से बड़े अफसर हैं, उनके ऊपर हमारा विश्वास नहीं है क्योंकि इन अफसर के परिवार के लोग कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के हैं। लेकिन जो नये कमांडर-इन-चीफ आएंगे मणिक शाह, यह आदमी हमारे विश्वास का है जब मौका आयेगा जब जरूरत पड़ेगी तो यह हमारा साथ देंगे और पल्टन का स्तेमाल कैसे करना है प्रजातंत्र को हिन्दुस्तान से कैसे मिटाना है, यह उन्हें कालूम है। यह वीरेन राय के मुंह से निकली हुई बातें हैं जिस का सबूत मैं यहाँ या जहाँ चाहें वहाँ देने को तैयार हूँ। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस चीज के बारे में मंत्री महोदय कुछ सोचें...

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SHRI SWARAN SINGH): Is the Hon. Member mentioning this for the first time ?

श्री जार्ज फर्नेन्डोज : मैं ने इस सदन के अन्दर इस को एक साल के पहले कहा था लेकिन आप लोगों ने उस को दबाने का प्रयास किया। इसलिए आज जानबूझकर मैं इस को फिर कह रहा हूँ।

SHRI SWARAN SIKGH : Was this not mentionud before ?

श्री जार्ज फर्नेन्डोज : इस सदन का रेकर्ड आप देखिए, अगर नहीं मिले तो जो चाहे सजा दीजिए।

मैं इसलिए इस मामले को फिर रख रहा हूँ, क्योंकि मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि देश की बदलती हुई परिस्थिति में पल्टन का क्या स्थान हो, पल्टन का क्या काम हो, इसके बारे में लोगों का दिमाग साफ रहे। काशीपुर में यह मामला शुरू हुआ है, काशीपुर के बारे में आज सुबह यहाँ पर क्या हुआ, यह हम लोग जानते हैं। पल्टन और जनता के बीच में कभी तकरार न आये, इसकी खबरदारी आपकी और हम सब लोगों की हैं। जो प्रजातंत्र में विश्वास करने वाले लोग हैं, हम सभी लोगों की यह जिम्मेदारी है।

15.20 Hrs.

of India in China, 11th September 1967 :

[श्री उपाध्यक्ष पीठासीन हुए]

इस बात का हम लोगों को ख्याल रखना चाहिये कि पलटन का न राजनीति में बुलाने का काम हो और न राजनीति के बारे में उन से कोई इस किस्म का ताल्लुकात रखना चाहिये।

अन्त में एक बात और कहना चाहता हूँ—चीन और पाकिस्तान के बारे में मैंने यहां पर जिक्र किया, चीन और रूस की सीमा के बारे में जो घटनायें घट रही हैं, उनका भी जिक्र किया। चन्द दिन पहले जब यह मामला इस सदन में आया या—तब ये दोनों देश अपनी ज़मीन के साथ कैसे प्यार करते हैं, इस के उदाहरण मैंने दिये थे। अभी परसों रूस में जो नया क्रमलिनि स्लोगन बनाया गया है—मैं दिल्ली के एक अखबार से काट कर लाया हूँ—यह ता० 19 के अखबार में निकला है—इस को पढ़कर सुनाना चाहता हूँ—

Another not included in the previous list issued last October for the November 7 revolution anniversary read :

“Glory to the valiant Soviet border guards bravely defending the holy frontiers of our native land.”

यह रूस अपनी घरती के लिये कहता है—अपनी घरती से उनको कितना प्यार है, वे इस को होली-फ्रांटीयर्स कहते हैं। इसी तरह से चीन के सम्बन्ध जो व्हाइट पेपर आपने पिछले साल हम लोगों को दिया था, नये का हम अभी इन्तज़ार कर रहे हैं, चीन और आपके बीच में जो पत्र-व्यवहार होता है, वह साल में एक बार आप हम लोगों को दिया करते हैं—उस नोट में चीन ने आपको लिखा था—

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs speaking to the Embassy

यह आखरी नोट है जो आपकी तरफ से मुझे मिला है।

“The Chinese Government hereby serves a serious warning to the reactionary Indian Government : do not misjudge the situation and repeat your mistakes of 1262. For the defence of the sacred territory of their motherland, the brave Chinese people and the Chinese People's Liberation Army will certainly deal crushing blows at any enemy that dares to invade us.”

उनकी घरती उनके लिए ‘सैक्रेड टैरिटरी आफ देअर मदरलैंड’ एक तरफ होली-फ्रांटीयर है और दूसरी तरफ सेक्रेड टैरिटरी है—लेकिन आप अपनी घरती के लिए क्या कहते हैं—एक प्रधान मंत्री कच्छ के लिये कहते हैं वहाँ दलदल है। हिमालय के लिये आपके सबसे बड़े नेता—प्रधान मंत्री—कहते हैं—Not a blade of grass grows there, not a man lives there. कच्चातीवू के बारे में आपकी वर्तमान प्रधान मंत्री कहती हैं कि वहाँ तो पानी भी नहीं मिलता—यह आपका घर्ती प्रेम है। जहाँ तक संरक्षण की बात है, इस 1200 करोड़ रुपये को मंजूर कराने की बात है—किसी भी राष्ट्र के सामने राष्ट्र-अभिमान होना चाहिए, अपनी सीमाओं के बारे में, अपनी घरती के बारे में अभिमान होना चाहिए, अपनी घरती के साथ इस तरह का प्यार होना चाहिये, जैसा रूस और चीन को अपनी घरती के साथ है। मैं एक और उदाहरण आपको देना चाहता हूँ—400 वर्ष पहले अमरीका नाम को कोई राष्ट्र नहीं था। वहाँ पर हम कई मजहब, कई जातियों और कई भाषाओं की बात करते हैं, लेकिन उस देश में 400 वर्ष पहले लोग इंग्लिस्तान से, पूर्वी यूरोप, पश्चिमी यूरोप से गये और वहाँ बस गये, आज उस भूमि

[श्री जार्ज फर्नेन्डीज]

से उनको प्यार है। आज इस देश में जरूरत इस बात की है कि आप जनता के अन्दर एक नये संकल्प का निर्माण करें, एक नई जागृति पैदा करें और हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों के सामने कहें जो हमारी खोई हुई धरती है, उसको हम अवश्य वापस लेंगे, इसके लिये चाहे हमें चीन से भी लड़ना पड़े तो हम लड़कर उसको वापस लेंगे। आप चाहे पाँच साल की योजना बनाइये या 10 साल की योजना बनाइये, देश की जनता के सामने जाइये, इस जागृति को पैदा कीजिये और इसके लिये चाहे हमें कुछ भी करना पड़े, हमें पूरी तैयारी करनी चाहिये। तिब्बत के सम्बन्ध में एक स्पष्ट नीति बनायें, अगर रूस का समर्थन जरूरी हो तो उसको भी हम हासिल करें, अगर अणु-बम बनाने की जरूरत है तो हम अणु-बम बनाने का काम भी शुरू करें, सीमा पर रहने वाले लोगों के साथ नये रिश्ते जमायें—इस तरह का संकल्प और दिशा आज राष्ट्र के सामने रखने की जरूरत है, फिर संकल्प और दिशा को लेकर देश की संरक्षण की नीति को एक नया मोड़ देकर सारे देश को हमारे जवानों के साथ खड़ा कर के और माओ का जो वाक्य है—मैं यह नहीं कहता कि माओ की नीति को मानिये, लेकिन अगर वह कोई अकलमन्दी की बात कहता है तो उसको आप उठाइये—उस को लेकर देश के संरक्षण के काम को कुछ नई दिशा देने का काम करें।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आपने मुझे पाँच मिनट अधिक समय दिया है, इसके लिए आपका शुक्रिया अदा करता हूँ।

श्री सीताराम केसरी (कटिहार) : उपध्यक्ष महोदय, रक्षा मंत्रालय की माँग किसी दूसरे देश की हमारी स्वाधीनता पर बुरी नजर है या कुदृष्टि है, बल्कि रक्षा मंत्रालय की माँग काइसलिए समर्थन करता हूँ कि आज का मैं इसलिए समर्थन नहीं करता हूँ कि हमारे देश की आजादी खतरे में पड़ गई है। विशेषकर 1962 में चीन ने हमारे साथ

जो विश्वासघात किया, हमारी सीमाओं पर जो विश्वासघातपूर्ण आक्रमण किया, उसके बाद हमारी सरकार ने यह समझा कि हमारी आजादी की सुरक्षा के लिये हमारी सैन्य शक्ति में—वायु शक्ति, जल शक्ति और थल शक्ति में—बढ़ोत्तरी करनी चाहिये। हमारे दोस्त जार्ज फर्नेन्डीज साहब ने अभी जो अोजपूर्ण भाषण दिया, इसमें सन्देह नहीं कि बहुत सारी बातें उन्होंने आलोचना की दृष्टि से कहीं, लेकिन जिस तरह से उन्होंने हमारे सामने चीन का चित्र उपस्थित किया, एक तरह से उन्होंने इस देश में आतंक पैदा करने का प्रयत्न किया है। यह गलत बात है कि चीन के पास 20 करोड़ सैन्य शिक्षा प्राप्त लोग हैं, हमें भी खबर है, हमारे पास भी कुछ इस तरह की सूचनायें आती हैं, मगर मेरे दोस्त ने चीन के सम्बन्ध में कुछ इस तरह से कहने की कोशिश की है जिससे हमारे अन्दर कुछ भय की भावना पैदा हो...

श्री जार्ज फर्नेन्डीज : चीन के साथ लड़ाई की तैयारी करो—हम तो इस बात का समर्थन करते हैं।

श्री सीताराम केसरी : आपने लड़ाई की बात नहीं कही, आपने यह कहा कि चीन में सैन्य शिक्षा प्राप्त 20 करोड़ लोग हैं जबकि हमारे यहाँ 10 लाख लोग भी नहीं हैं। इसका स्पष्ट यह अर्थ निकलता है कि हम लोग तैयार नहीं हैं या हम लोगों में इतनी शक्ति नहीं है कि हम चीन का मुकाबला कर सकें।

उपाध्यक्ष जी, एक बात की ओर मैं आपका ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ। हमारे देश की सेना का साहस, वीरता और शौर्य आज से नहीं है, आपने देखा है—अंग्रेजी राज्य के समय में जब हम दास्ता की बेड़ी में आबद्ध थे, हमारी फौजों ने अफ्रीका में हमारे शौर्य को दिखाया, चीन के आक्रमण के समय जब उसकी आँखें खुलूँ पर लगी थी, हमारे बहादुर सैनिकों ने आगे बढ़कर 18 हजार फुट की ऊँचाई पर जिस बहादुरी के साथ चीनी फौजों का मुकाबला किया—

वह आज इतिहास के अन्दर स्पष्ट है। मैं इस मांग का समर्थन करते हुए दो तीन बातें कहना चाहता हूँ। हमारे यहाँ जो सैनिक प्रोडक्शन हुआ है, जो टैंक का निर्माण हुआ है और अक्टूबर, 1968 में नीलगिरि नामक युद्धपोत मजगांव में बनाकर आपने जल को समर्पित किया है वह हमारी सैनिक शक्ति के उदाहरण हैं। मैं आपके द्वारा यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी सैन्य शक्ति की बढ़ोत्तरी होनी चाहिए क्योंकि हमारी जो सीमायें हैं वहाँ पर हमेशा चीन का और विदेशियों के आक्रमण का खतरा रहता है। हमारी सीमायें तीन हजार मील लम्बी हैं। जो हमारी पर्वतीय सीमा है, उसके लिए मैं रक्षा मन्त्री से निवेदन करूंगा कि शिक्षा प्राप्त पर्वतारोही सेना को वहाँ पर रखा जाये जिससे कि यदि हमारे ऊपर चीन का आक्रमण हो तो उसको रोका जा सके।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, चीन के आक्रमण के पहले हमारे रक्षा मंत्रालय का जो बजट था वह 400 करोड़ का था लेकिन चीन के आक्रमण के पश्चात् इस देश में जो परिस्थिति पैदा हुई उसके कारण आज वह बजट 1102 करोड़ का हो गया है। इसको बढ़ाने का मुख्य कारण यह है कि हमारे देश की अखंडता और आजादी जब खतरे में पड़ी तब हमने फैसला किया कि हम अपनी सैन्य शक्ति—जल, थल और वायु शक्ति में बढ़ोत्तरी करेंगे। उसी के फलस्वरूप आज 1100 करोड़ रुपये का बजट हुआ है। यह ठीक है कि चीन 5000 करोड़ रुपया अपनी रक्षा पर खर्च कर रहा है, उतना हम नहीं कर सके हैं लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारा जो 1100 करोड़ का बजट है वह कम है। इस देश की आजादी के लिये हर देशवासी को व्यक्तिगत कुर्बानी करनी होगी क्योंकि सर्वोपरि चीज इस देश की प्रभुसत्ता और अखंडता को बरकरार रखना है।

एक चीज मुझे यह कहनी है कि रक्षा

उत्पादन विभाग का कार्य कम प्रशंसनीय नहीं है सात सार्वजनिक संस्थाओं में जहाँ पहले 61 करोड़ का उत्पादन था वह अब बढ़कर 111 करोड़ का हो गया है। इसमें प्राफिट भी बढ़ा है। पहले 61 लाख का डिविडेन्ड प्राप्त हुआ था लेकिन अब 93 लाख का डिविडेन्ड प्राप्त हुआ है।

मुझे दुःख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि हमको जो अपनी सैन्य शक्ति बढ़ानी पड़ रही है उसका कारण यह है कि पाकिस्तान और चीन दोनों तरफ से हम पर आक्रमण करने को तत्पर हैं। मैं आपका ध्यान नागालैंड की ओर भी ले जाना चाहूंगा। सन 60 से लेकर आज तक पाकिस्तान और चीन नागालैंड में मिजो लोगों को सैनिक शिक्षा दे रहे हैं और शास्त्रास्त्र भी सप्लाई कर रहे हैं जिससे कि इस देश की सीमा सदा ही डिस्टर्ब रहे और खतरे से खाली न रहे। इसके साथ ही मैं आपका ध्यान हिन्द महासागर, समुद्र के कछार की ओर भी ले जाना चाहता हूँ। वह भी हमारी सीमा है। आपको मालूम होगा कि ग्रेट ब्रिटेन ने यह फैसला किया है कि वह साउथ ईस्ट एशिया से अपने अड्डे विदड़ा कर लेगा। इसके साथ ही अखबारों में यह भी खबर निकली है कि अगर ग्रेट ब्रिटेन विदड़ा कर लेता है तो चीन उस क्षेत्र को अपनी शक्ति से जल सेना से, पनडुब्बियों से भरना चाहता है, यद्यपि चीन इन्डोनेशिया में बुरी तरह से फँस हो चुका है, लाओस में बुरी तरह से फँस हो चुका है और साउथ ईस्ट एशिया के देशों में उसका प्रभाव खत्म होना चला जा रहा है क्योंकि उसकी प्रवृत्ति दूसरे देशों पर अपना आधिपत्य जमाने की है और इसी नीति के कारण ही वहाँ पर चीन बुरी तरह से परास्त होता जा रहा है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, रूस हमारा परम मित्र रहा है। यू० एन० ओ० में कश्मीर के मामले में उसने हमेशा वेटो पावर का इस्ते-

[श्री सीताराम केसरी]

माल किया लेकिन आज रूस पाकिस्तान को फौजी सहायता दे रहा है। रूस के डिफेंस मिनिस्टर, मि० ब्रेचको ने पाकिस्तान में अपने वक्तव्य में कहा कि हम पाकिस्तान को इसलिए मदद करते हैं ताकि पाकिस्तान अपने दुश्मन से मुकाबला कर सके। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि वे तो हमारे मित्र हैं, क्या वे पाकिस्तान के दुश्मन को नहीं समझते हैं। पाकिस्तान आज हिन्दुस्तान को दुश्मन समझता है। उन्होंने पाकिस्तान को शस्त्रास्त्र देने में वही तर्क दिए हैं जोकि एक दिन अमरीका ने, हमारे विरोध के बावजूद—पाकिस्तान को शस्त्रास्त्र देते हुए तर्क दिए थे, उन्होंने यह कहा था कि पाकिस्तान तुम्हारे खिलाफ शस्त्रास्त्र इस्तेमाल नहीं करेगा। लेकिन सन 65 की लड़ाई में क्या हुआ? पाकिस्तान ने उन्हीं अमरीकी शस्त्रास्त्रों को हमारे खिलाफ इस्तेमाल किया। शस्त्रास्त्रों के पकड़े जाने पर इस बात की पुष्टि हो गई थी कि वे अमरीका के थे।

मैं मन्त्री महोदय से कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी साढ़े 8 लाख की जो सेना है—चीन और पाकिस्तान दोनों देशों से मुकाबला करने की दृष्टि से उसको बढ़ाया जाय। पर्वतारोहण की ट्रेनिंग पाये हुये सैनिकों की भी संख्या बढ़ाई जाये। बजट को पढ़ने से मालूम होता है कि ऐसे चार हजार सैनिकों को तैयार किया गया है जबकि मैं समझता हूँ कम से कम दो लाख ऐसे सैनिक होने चाहिए जोकि हमारी पर्वतीय सीमा की रक्षा कर सकें। साथ-साथ में यह भी कहना चाहना हूँ कि ऐसी खबर मिली है कि तिब्बत में चीन ने अपनी डेढ़ लाख सेना का जमाव कर रखा है। मैं आपसे आग्रह करूंगा कि हमारे लिए जो वहां से खतरा है उसका मुकाबला करने के लिए कोई ऐसा प्रबन्ध किया जाये ताकि उस खतरे का हमपर कोई असर न पड़ सके।

अन्त में एक बात और कहना चाहता

हूँ कि ताशकन्द वार्ता में आप भी थे, आप उस समय फारेन मिनिस्टर थे। आप पाकिस्तान से एक बार पुनः संधि वार्ता करने का प्रयास करें। सरकार को चाहिए कि पाकिस्तान से संधि वार्ता करें। एशिया और उन देशों में डिफेंस लाइन बनाये जिन देशों को हमेशा चीन के आक्रमण का खतरा रहता है, अमरीका के आक्रमण का खतरा रहता है या किसी भी बड़े राष्ट्र की कुदृष्टि लगी रहती है। ऐसे छोटे-छोटे राज्यों की एक रक्षा पंक्ति बने जिससे कि चीनी कुदृष्टि का हम मुकाबला कर सकें और हमारी आजादी, अखंडता और स्वाधीनता सुरक्षित रहे। इन शब्दों के साथ मे अपना भाषण समाप्त करता हूँ।

SHRI NATH PAI (Rajapur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker. Sir, never during the twelve years that I have been in this House have I seen such disturbing lack of interest bordering on apathy and indifference as we are witnessing in discussing the Demands of the Defence Ministry. I see two reasons for this mood of the House. One is perhaps the typically Indian habit of going from one extreme to another extreme—either we are panicky or we develop apathy. Where defence is concerned we do not know how to develop a very cool assessment of the grave problems that we have to face and consider evolving a viable defence policy. Because Pakistan is involved in internal turmoil and China is engaged in a major encounter a confrontation with the Soviet Union, I think there is a feeling in this country that since both the potential aggressors are engaged this way, we do not have to bother much about our own defence. I think this is a dangerous self-complacency which is unfortunate being reflected even in the House. Arya Chanakya has given four kinds of dangers to a country, four possible combinations and I find all the four possible combinations are available here—external with internal complicity, external with external complicity, internal with external danger and internal danger with internal complicity. All these four possible sources of danger to India's security are present. Somehow we tend to be complacent in spite of the maximum danger that seems to be developing.

Another disturbing feature of this year is the glaringly different and diametrically opposite assessments and estimates of the international situation given by the Ministry of Defence and the Ministry of External Affairs. In this context, not that there is anything novel in it, but in his highly readable book *Guilty Men* of 1962. Shri D. R. Mankekar, says very cogently something which is of course commonly accepted, what is common knowledge, what is known to us about the co-relationship between defence and foreign policy of a nation. He says :

“Foreign policy without a coordinated defence capacity to back it is impotent. A defence capacity unrelated to foreign policy is pointless.”

The author further says after assessing what we have done beginning with 1947 and ending with 1962 :

“A realistic foreign policy has therefore, to be rained even trimmed. to measure with the country's defence resources. Then again often the defence priorities may have to be stretched to meet the needs of the country's foreign policy. The two must always keep in step if a country has to avoid disaster.”

We do not see such kind of coordination between the defence policy and the foreign policy of the country. But I think the Defence Ministry is showing a more realistic assessment than the Ministry of External Affairs.

Although I am not very satisfied with the improvement in the Annual Report, I would like to say that there has been some definite progress. Looking at the old reports, to which we were accustomed in the past, there is a positive improvement, though I think we need not be burdened with all these manuals ; they can be separately circulated. An assessment of the requirements of defence can be more cogently made available. Something analogous to the White Paper produced by the United Kingdom and other countries.

In this context, the first two pages are a very candid admission of what is happening to the defence of this country. At page 2 the Defence Minister has summoned enough courage to tell this country a new factor which has arisen during the past war and that is the possibility of supplies of military equipment to Pakistan from the Soviet Union.

“Such supplies in addition to those coming from other countries at concessional prices including China are bound to move Pakistan towards a posture of even increased intransigence and would certainly make normalisation of relations with us more difficult.”

In reply to a debate which was raised in this House by Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta, the Defence Minister also said, “This wretched Agreement and the shift in the Soviet policy”. We must make one basic assumption regarding the behaviour of the so called super-powers, whether be it the United States of America or be it the Soviet Union. We have failed so far in seeing the imperatives under which the super-powers will be acting. There is one unwritten agreement, a tacit understanding between the two super-powers which does not seem to have dawned on the policy-makers in this country. But there is a small beginning at least in the Defence Ministry. This tacit understanding between the two super powers is to do everything they can to prevent the emergence of India as a potential rival major super-power. All their efforts, all their diplomacy, all their moves, are bent towards this.

In this context, the strange response of the Government of India is amazing for anybody who looks at the defence of the country. When, in 1954, the first news came of the decision of the United States to supply hardware to Pakistan. I think. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru pointed the triple dangers of the decision and, as befits the representative of a free country, he reacted against this. The President of the United States tried to mollify the fears of the Indian leaders. What did President Eisenhower tell us ? What did we say ? How are we reacting today when a very similar situation has

[Shri Nath Pai]

been created by the second of the two super-powers? I would like to read the assurance which was then given by President Eisenhower to the Prime Minister of India. President Eisenhower told Mr. Nehru in his special message on February 24, 1964 as follows :

"I am affirming publicly that if our aid to any country, including Pakistan, is misused and directed against another in aggression, I will undertake immediately, in accordance with my constitutional responsibility and authority, appropriate action both within and without the U. N. to thwart such aggression."

When similar explanation was given by the then Prime Minister of Pakistan, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru summed up the Indian reaction in these words in reply to Mohammad Ali's explanation. I am quoting from Mr. Russel Brine's book :

"The total difference over our outlook is exemplified when you say that such aid given to Pakistan will add to the security of India."

After giving this aid, we were being assured that arms aid given to Pakistan was likely to enhance the security of India. When this insult was added to the injury, India rightly reacted very sharply. But, in 1967, when such aid was made available—I am going to give you the details of the aid—when we tried to alert this Government, the Rip Van Winkle of this Government, when the first news of the supply of Soviet helicopters came, the then External Affairs Minister seriously tried to ridicule us by saying that these were civilian helicopters. We said, "Yes. Certainly, the helicopters are being sent to Rawalpindi but not for any military use against India. If at all, they will be used against China by Pakistan. That is why they are being supplied. But basically the helicopters were supplied by the Soviet Union to Pakistan for flying children from school to home, from home to school or for distributing milk bottles." This is what we said. The Government did not take it very seriously. Now, in the latest issue of the professional magazine *Flight*

the details are given of the kind of aid Pakistan will be receiving.

May I, at this stage, read to you only one paragraph :

"With the entire Pakistan defence budget pegged to the equivalent of some 514 million dollars....."

and not the figure given by you; here again, you could have taken more deniable figures to quote in your Annual report.

"...514 million dollars for 1968-69. The Mirage purchase will not easily be repeated, but there is ample evidence that the Soviet Union is willing to take over the aid programme where the U. S. left off."

This is very important. And what an irony! It had been the policy of Imperial Britain and the U. S. A. to try to maintain a parity between India and Pakistan. Today it is the Soviet Union. We have no less an authority than the Deputy Chief of the defence of Soviet Union telling in Rawalpindi, "We want to see a strong Navy"; the Defence Minister of the Soviet Union thundering in Rawalpindi, "We want you to be strong to defeat your enemy. When Pakistan says that there is only one enemy in the world, *i. e.*, India, here is the Defence Minister of all going and telling, 'in defeating that, we will give you all aid, assistance and guidance'.

These are the further details :

"Pakistan is likely to receive....."

This again is from *Flight*, January 1969 :

"Pakistan is likely to receive 100 MIG-19s and 60-70 MIG-21s, plus 30-40 II-28s, from the Soviet Union in the near future. The USSR will also probably supply spares for the MiG-19s which Pakistan has already received from China."

I am not blaming the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union is only following its

enlightened self-interest which is the duty of the Soviet Union. Instead of going on acting sycophantically towards the Soviet Union, if only the leaders of India try to learn some lessons in patriotism from the Soviet leaders, how much different the picture will be! When there was a minor skirmish on the banks of the Ussuri River.—I think, this is an ancient Sanskrit word from 'Asur'; I think, it probably had some connection with India in the ancient past of the country... (Interruptions) I am not going to lay any claim. Let us get what is our legitimate. 'Ussuri' is a significant word; you will agree with me that it is from the word 'Asur'...(Interruptions) Indian adivasis but not Chinese adivasis—when a minor skirmish took place, a great poet of the Soviet Union, Mr. Yeveto Shenkov, gave a stirring call to Soviet patriots—it is called 'Rad Snows'. Mr. George rightly pointed out an aspect of it. This is something that we can learn from them. We completely ignore that aspect of it. I am constrained to say this looking at the attitude of this Government. When the Defence Minister said that there had been a shift in the Soviet Union's policy, the next day, clandestinely almost, the External Affairs Ministry gives a pathetic explanation which a daily publishes, in order to white-wash, because an objection was taken by the Soviet Union, "How dare you say that there has been a shift? Of course, we supply arms, we give tanks, we give guns, we give planes and we might give something else to Pakistan, but that is only to increase the defence potential of India that we are arming Pakistan." This country had fallen so low that this Government prevented the Parliament of India from expressing even a regret at this. We were not condemning them. We do want friendship with the Soviet Union. But sycophancy cannot be a substitute for equality which alone can be the basis of friendship with any country. Mutuality of respect, mutuality of interest, mutual trust—that alone can be the basis. But this kind of sycophancy which the Government of India practises in no substitute for that.

You were taken to task, I do not know whether in the Cabinet or publicly. You were brought to ridicule by your

colleague who gave an explanation that what Mr. Swarn Singh said when he talked about shift in the Soviet policy was this that there is a shift not *vis-a-vis* India but it is a shift *vis-a-vis* Pakistan. I do not understand this geometry, I do not understand this mathematics. But this was the explanation that your colleague thought fit to give.

I think, the Soviet Union will learn to respect this country much more, if the country can be persuaded to show a degree of self-respect. Let us remember what they said when we were attacked by China. Mr. Khrushchav, a blunt man, said: India is a friend and China is a brother' And what did he do? He asked us to settle the dispute peacefully. I do not blame him for that. Here, we are, I do not know, at what stage. The Soviet Union asked for India's sympathy. Parliament has not been told. I do not know at what stage the Soviet Union asked for our support. We have not been told. If there is a confrontation between them, Indian must see that such disputes are settled peacefully as we were asked at Taskent to solve international disputes peacefully and under the Directive Principles of this Constitution this Government is obliged. Instead they were going on bended knees offering their support. Give the support but let there be a mutuality of interest. Let us not forget if there is a confrontation between the Soviet Union and China..... I do not wish such confrontation... it will not be good for any country. Let us realise that the Soviet Union needs India's friendship as much as India needs the friendship of the Soviet Union. This aspect of policy this Government never realises and therefore it cannot bring the courage to protest when a step is taken against its legitimate interests.

Having told the disturbing aspect of this foreign policy of this country and its co-relationship, may I now turn your attention to one aspect? That is what is going to be our attitude to this new kind of alignment that is emerging in this part of the world. I think, Sir, these two super-powers will see to it, will strive, will use every strategem and design to see that we remain eternally a

[Shri Nath Pai]

second-class power. Are we to accept this position? This is the crucial, cardinal problem of India's defence policy. It is in this context we have to define our attitude to the non-proliferation treaty. It is in this context we have to gain ourselves the freedom of getting our choice in deciding what kind of weapons we should have.

We are told about the grand performance of our ordnance factories. There has been a slight improvement but we asked categorically in this House if the recommendations of the Mulgaokar Committee with regard to modernising the ordnance factories have been fully implemented. I want to submit to him that they are not implemented. The ordnance factories remain what they were and it is the super-fine dedication of our young men working there patiently day and night that is yielding good results. It is not the modernisation which remains far from the targeted capacity that we had set as a goal before us. But the disturbing feature, the alarming feature is that proportion of what we produce indigenously to what we are importing is declining and this, I think, is a very disturbing factor. I do not want to go into statistics, but I repeat because yesterday the hon. Minister has already replied that the proportion of what is being indigenously produced in this country is declining to what is being imported and there lies the danger to this country. Those countries which are giving us equipment and arms—I for one am ready to be grateful to them, thank them and not of course as obsequiously as this Government does. I am prepared to thank them and acknowledge it, but these countries are seeing to this that you remain dependent on them for every single spare part. and you are accepting this position. In the event of a major conflagration or major conflict—and here I want to talk about the point which was raised by another colleague of mine—is one of them prepared to take both?

Is it seriously suggested that the present defence capacity of this country and capability is at a level or order where we can meet the double challenge from China

and Pakistan? It may not be of course our choice if they decided to act against us in collusion. I agree with that. Is it serious politics, is it serious strategy? From the military point of view can we take both China and Pakistan simultaneously? I do not think this is a very serious kind of thinking. May I quote? Somebody was trying to quote Mr. Khera. I am glad that civil servants, even after retirement may write books. It is a good beginning. There is a dearth of literature in this country. We must encourage our civilian officers, must encourage our Minister if they can write something. We must encourage our civil servants to write memoirs. It is a healthy thing. I would welcome it. I would not have passed any judgment about the quality of the book that we are getting. But here is a good soldier. Gen. Thimayya in this book writes about an interview which he had given in a seminar and later on in his official position.

“Whereas in the case of Pakistan I have considered the possibility of a total war, I am afraid I cannot do so in regard to China. I cannot even as a soldier envisage India's taking on conflict with China on its own.”

16 hrs.

He was not a sycophant towards China. He was giving a realistic assessment. I want this country to be prepared? That is the basic question. Sir, one can talk with very great confidence. with a certain amount of personal knowledge, I can say this MIG 21 is a good thing and we appreciate the Russian gift of the MIG 21 but you know how limited its flight range is, how little it can remain, how utterly useless in the matter of the security of the region in which it is stationed it is. It was all right to meet the challenge in Eastern Europe on flat terrain. But this is not so in the case of India which is trying to defend itself against China.

Here we come to this very vital question of India's defence. We talk somewhat lightheartedly about taking both China and Pakistan simultaneously. China cannot take India by surprise. People may

be surprised to hear such a statement from me. If China is to think of making a confrontation with India we can get at least one month's to six weeks' notice because its logistic support comes not from Tibet but from bases nearly 2,000 miles away from the Indian border and if we have the necessary reconnaissance and intelligence—I am saying 'if we have' because I am going to read out to you something damaging about our intelligence—if we really have the necessary degree of modern intelligence in this country, what is it that will happen? In this connection, MR. Khera said something very important and I do not know whether this particular urgency has been felt by the hon. Defence Minister. Mr. Khera said :

"There appears to have been very little information and what little there was who very scrappy, about the intentions of the Chinese, their objective,

their plans, and their preparations".
Again he said :

"Intelligence was amazingly poor and deceptive as regards the strength of the Chinese build-up their method of waging battle, their system of logistics and communication, about almost every-thing of significance that might have helped the Indian forces. The consequence was that there had been little or no planning or preparation worth the name against the kind of threat posed by the Chinese forces."

We did not make realistic estimate and there are various reasons for that. The kind of atmosphere that was there at that time was one thing and I want to know whether it has since been rectified. This is the position of Intelligence in India. Between the war with China which we have to wage on the mountains and the possible war with Pakistan which is to be waged on the plains, there is a lot of difference. Therefore, the defence capabilities are totally different which have to be raised by this country. I have no evidence of it, except in the statement where he has said that we are prepared to take it.

We know that Britain is withdrawing. We know that USA is withdrawing. They will be compelled to withdraw. Is the House aware that when USA withdrew from China they left behind according to conservative estimate hardware of the value of 1700 million dollars? When they withdrew from Vietnam they were annually spending more than 30 billion dollars, that is nearly, Rs 17,000 crores—near about the entire third five-year plan—and that is the amount annually left in the shape of hardware left behind in this region. Are these taken into consideration when we talk of the defence requirements I am certainly conscious of the shortage in our defence preparedness. I would like to read out another portion regarding what was happening in our Defence forces.

He said :

"In this situation there was little sharing of the common tasks in the face of the danger to the national security. There could be no meeting of minds, not even the essential minimum flow of information. The internal lines of communication in the highest echelons of the country's Defence apparatus were clogged with mutual dislike and suspicions. There was a grave weakening of the foundations upon which a cogent defence apparatus could be planned, assembled, organised and deployed."

Sir, any display of new initiative was peremptorily and summarily dismissed. Has it changed? Has this atmosphere in the higher echelons of our Defence, and has this sycophancy, gone?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to raise an issue. We took the blame when Parliament was to be blamed, Courageously we faced it. We blamed the political leadership. The time has now come to talk about our Generals also. We give them credit. All credit to our jawans and junior officers. A basic change in the thinking of Indian highest command is called for. I do not think that they bother to know the kind of enemy we have. As I said at an earlier stage, it should be made obligatory on

[Shri Nath Pai]

their part to read about Mao Tse-tung's thinking of war strategy. I do not think it is being done. It is no use going with a procession in the Connaught Place beating our breasts and declaring our determination to beat any enemy. For more important is to understand the enemy. China will not be fought with hatred. China, first, has to be understood by us before we make a worthwhile effort to contain her in the Himalayas. That is only the beginning. Here, one of the difficulties is the kind of attitude Indian Generals have. We are trying to abolish distinction from the country. We are trying to abolish caste system from our country. The Indian hierarchy in the Defence Forces is extremely caste-ridden not in the sense of Rajput, Jat or Kayastha, but there is a kind of feeling between the lower officers and others. We want to see that this kind of attitude goes. We want to see that a new spirit is introduced among them. One can go on talking about that. We have tried to glorify all. Let us admire where there is good quality. When this kind of thing is happening, it is the duty of a good Commander to put down his view and be ready to resign if it is not accepted. We did not produce Commanders who would have stood up like that. That was one of the reasons why we have blamed politicians for their failure and for the debacle in NEFA in 1962. We have not shown sufficient courage to have Defence Commanders who will share the responsibility. Defence Commanders who will act as sycophants to political leaders are not Commanders who can be trusted with the destiny of a nation and we have too many of them. I hope the Defence Minister will see that a new spirit is introduced into them whereby they will be ready to share all risks and all glories with the jawans.

Lin Piao is the new Head of China. I do not know how many of us have studied that life of this man. I do not like him. But I do admire him. This man has risen from the lowest rank sharing everything common, sharing the same kind of life, sharing the same food and the same rations. It is this that inspires his men when he goes to the field. But

here, this kind of superior-class attitude and leading the forces from behind are things we should get rid of. That kind of officer is not the officer we will be needing. It is this kind of officer who was responsible for the debacle in 1962. It was this mentality which deprived India of the prize of victory which we could have got at Sialkot and Ichogil Canal. It is this same kind of mentality which I went to be rectified.

Now there is another point, which is so much talked about. Modern defence means basically science-oriented or science-based defence. I know that we are having some scientists in the Defence organisation. But they are more a decoration or ornament than an integrated part of our thinking and planning on defence. We made a beginning about fifteen years ago and we get some junior scientists. Those junior scientists may have become senior now. I want to ask the Defence Minister one question. In the first place, the tragedy, I think, is that we have three defence empires, three science empires in this country. What we need is this. The scientist, the technologist and the soldier should act as an integrated team, under a single matrix. It is only when they have this kind of integrated approach, that science and technology will be able to play the kind of role. If we utilise the available talent of the Indian brain, which is called 'software' by McNamara, there is nothing to be afraid of in this world. When they were asked about the tremendous achievement about going to the moon, McNamara said—and I hope that the House will be made familiar with the book by Ben Shriever, *the American Challenge*—that it is not the hardware, it is the software that matters. It is the software of the Soviet brain that is responsible for the success of the sputnik; it is the software of the Russian brain that has raised that country to their present status in space technology. But it is the software of the Indian brain that is being completely neglected.

I want to know whether we do not have three kinds of scientific empires, one Defence, another the CSIR and the third the Atomic Energy Department.

In the latter two, there are first-class talents, but they are not being used for the defence of the country. Also, there is tremendous talent in the universities of the country, but nothing is being done to encourage the young scientists, professors and technologists, be they in any factory, firm or in university campuses, to use their talents and initiative for building up the defence apparatus.

I will give some choice examples about what is happening and who is advising this country in defence science matters. There are 10,000 Indian technologists and scientists helping to build the defence apparatuses of other countries. Why don't they come here? Because they cannot be fitted into the straitjacket of this country.

After the initial mistakes made by him, Stalin—with whom you and I may not agree—brought young men to shoulder positions of responsibility. You know he got rid of a whole generation of military leaders and technicians, but then he began to trust the younger men. Basically, he began to depend upon the younger scientists. It was these young men who helped him to build up. Russia's hydrogen bomb was made by a young man of 32, a brilliant man of 32.

But what is our position here? We have 10,000 scientists, according to an estimate of the Education Ministry, who are working abroad. They cannot come here because they are asked to work, under what conditions? While once returning as a student from abroad, I met two young Indians holding the finest degree and the best academic attainments. They expected to get a job here on Rs. 150 per month and wanted to give of their best to the country. They tried for two years. Then they were offered Rs. 5,000 in a private company. With tears they accepted, because red-tape would not accommodate this kind of brilliant minds.

Is it not a fact that the Scientific Adviser to the Chief of the Army Staff

was a biologist for some time? He was a biologist basically. You know, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, that it has never been the practice with me to criticise individuals. I will never take advantage of the fact that the unfortunate men involved cannot reply here, because it hurts me basically to do so. But I want to ask whether the Scientific Adviser to the Western Command is not an agricultural scientist?

Again I want to ask: Is it not a fact that the Scientific Adviser to the Chief of the Air Staff has no background of any kind of aeronautics? Does he have any background?

Further, I want to ask: Is it not a fact that a junior scientist, who was basically a wood chemist, was being groomed to become the Chief Scientist?

Finally, I come to the Scientific Adviser to the Defence Ministry, a good man a very brilliant man. But so far as I know, he is basically a spectroscopist (*Interruptions*). This is a new branch—I take sufficient interest in these matters.

Now I want to know whether the Chief of the R & D Organisation and the chief of the BEL and HAL should be the same person, The R & D is the evaluation branch. Now the man who heads it evaluates what he produces in BEL and HAL. Is this a very healthy practice?

One last point—it is about the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. Arm-twisting will go on for some time. Government have taken an attitude on this for which I give them credit. But arm-twisting will go on to make them sign the so-called Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, which is basically a division of the world between the two super-powers and the rest between the colonial powers of the atomic age and the rest. Government go on resisting, but let them show a little courage. May I know why the Kalpakam project is not being hastened? The reason is very simple. Because in that project we are not tied down by treaty obligations to a foreign

[Shri Nath Pai]

power. If we go ahead with it in Tamil Nadu—the DMK's young men should press for its implementation—then we can go ahead with the scheme which was already available to us for peaceful exploitation of atomic energy which not cost much, according to Dr. Bhabha's estimate—Here I must say that I am yet to be convinced that Dr. Bhabha really died in an accident. We are not yet convinced because there is some historical evidence to show that within three months this country would have reached a certain degree of capability and certain powers came to know of that. There is a lingering doubt, though not conviction in my mind, that death may not have been altogether an accident. It has happened before in international affairs. We know how the plane going to the first Bandung Conference was destroyed by a certain power. Let us not rule out completely that Dr. Bhabha's death was also possibly engineered.

Finally a word about the tubs called the Indian Navy. They are bath tubs. Most of the ships are leaking and I have seen some of them. It is time that those bath tubs were scrapped. Most of them are more than thirty years. Do not go on, for Heaven's sake, striking this posture of Viswamitra again and again; we have nothing to do with the Indian Ocean. It is a duty cast on you by history and geography. India cannot go on talking all the time, pretending that we are a strange kind of virgin and we do not have anything to do with it; history demands, our national interests demand, the force of geography demands that India plays its necessary role. I hope he will be able to give a reply whereby he will at least give an indication of combat readiness—this is not only heroics that we are indulging in and say that a purposeful, meaningful and dependable combat readiness in the light of developments that are taking place is being considered.

Finally, an appeal. Shall I make an appeal about those heroes who fought for you in the INA. Their voices had been raised by so many people and so many times. So many times you gave

assurances. A country which does not know how to honour its soldiers is not the country which is likely to inspire confidence among those who are in uniform today. I therefore say that the assurances should be faithfully implemented and I demand from him an assurance that he will implement faithfully the assurances that were given about the INA.

SHRI MANABENDRA SHAH (Tehri Garwal): In the time available to me, I can only confine myself to the broad aspects of Defence. I should like to take up three points which I think are of vital importance. On those aspects of defence, I am disappointed to note that the hon. Minister of Defence has either chosen not to exert; or chosen to be silent; or not thought them to be important or necessary. The first point is the question of fronts. How many fronts do we have? The report on the Defence Ministry for 1968-69 begins thus :—

“India's defence policy is principally directed towards safeguarding the sovereignty and territorial integrity. Though we have no designs on any territory outside our borders and wish to live in peace and friendship with all, two of our neighbours continue to maintain an attitude of hostility towards us.”

I am sure that they refer to Pakistan and China. These are the two recognised fronts that we have got.

Perhaps as matters stand today China, more than Pakistan. What role Pakistan will play will depend mostly on what role China wants her to play. Added to that is the withdrawal of the check on China; it is a matter which has added to our problems.

It is understood that the Nixon Administration has taken a decision on gradual withdrawal of their forces from South Viet-nam. It is also stated that the decision to withdraw the forces is based on the fact that even among Asian nations not subscribing to the communist ideologies there has been—in some

countries—criticism of the United States involvement in Viet-nam war. It is further said at that the Asian Powers have failed to realise as to why America is spending huge amounts both by way of man-power and financial resources in halting the emergence of communism in Viet-nam and in putting an end to the increasing Chinese influence.

Nixon administration is supposed to have further clarified that in that region it is primarily for the benefit of such Asian nations as stand in the danger of being immediatly affected by Chinese ove-running Indo-China.

Whatever may have been the reason for the Americans to go into Viat Nam war or now for withdrawal, the fact remains that it did help to halt the increasing influence of China, and it also helped to correct the adverse balance of power that may have cropped up if China was left unchecked. And in this development our political ego outweighed our defence interests, and we openly criticised the American stand in Viet Nam. The Defence Minister, has, therefore been silent and allowed the political emotionalism to sway the Government policy in this arena. This is a serious development, as there is very danger of the Chinese zone of influence extending to South East Asia. The Chinese danger will no more be in the Himalayas ; there is every chance of its extending to our seas. The Pakistan-China axis will not only be connected with the link of ideology, namely, anti-Indian link, but also by land and sea. This is an added danger and I would call this as a third front that we have to safeguard.

That is not all. A fourth front has also taken berth. So many efforts are taking place inside our country which are weakening our defence potential. My reference is to the fact with the changing political conditions at home, it cannot be denied any longer that we are not politically as stable as we were before. I am not criticising in anyway the emergence of non-Congress Governments in the States nor am I referring

to the reduced majority of the Congress in this House. I am only trying to make an assessment. Even if the non-Congress Governments in various States had been stable, and they had followed the policy of India as one, I would not have been disturbed. In the Central level, we are supposed to safeguard the integrity of this country against China, whereas, in some of the States there is a definite emergence of political power backed by the authority of the State which is openly pro-Chinese. The Centre is supposed to be responsible for the defence of India as a whole against external aggression, and to a limited extent against internal subversion. It is a matter of recorded history that internal subversion can do much more harm to the political and territorial integrity of the country than even external threats.

Now, how can we then expect proper co-operation and effective functioning of our defence forces which is a Central subject in such States which are openly pro-Chinese, in the event of an attack from China or even for our defence preparedness against China ?

We also see the emergence of linguism, tribalism and religious fanaticism and we find them gaining ground. These three 'isms' may be nationally Indian but factually 'isms', and therefore, from the defence point of view, we have to prepare ourselves against them also.

On the other hand, regional aspiration on economic grounds and administrative efficiency is completely ignored unless it becomes a tool to be exploited by the politician or it becomes a question of law and order. We know fully well that at some stage or the other, on the question of law and order, the armed forces have to come into the picture, and therefore, this home front is the fourth front that I think the Defence Ministry has to consider.

While considering all these fronts we have to consider the deployment of our armed forces especially keeping in mind the question of Home Front. The deploy-

[Shri Manabendra Shah]

ment of the armed forces has to be considered in this aspect and only when this deployment is considered we will get the correct picture as to what is our fighting strength against our enemies across the border. Then only can we make a proper defence Plan.

Hence I was disappointed in the Report of 1968-69 when the proper assessment of various fronts was not mentioned. It is because of this that I started in the very beginning by blaming the hon. Defence Minister that he had chosen not to exert. I am disappointed that the Minister has not chosen to give in the report the danger of South-East Asia developments. I am disappointed that the Minister has not given due importance to the effect of the situation prevailing in the Home Front. As Defence Minister he was expected to exert that natural aspirations of regions were fulfilled before those aspirations became a law and order problem, thus avoiding involvement of the Armed Forces if not actively at least by standing by to help the civil authorities in need

Sir, the fiscal and foreign policy of our country has to be guided by our defence requirements and, therefore, I expect the Defence Minister and the Ministry he presides over, to even now take cognisance of the danger of the shift in the American policy in Viet Nam and to remove and solve the danger of the fourth Front—the Home Front.

14.27 hrs

[SHRI GADILINGANA GOWD in the Chair]

Coming to the second point I that want to dilate upon, is the assessment of our firing power which is an important part of our defence preparedness, I was very happy to learn yesterday from the Government that we are going into the manufacture of some sophisticated arms like missiles. Even then, the advance in strategic fire power amongst the developed countries of the world is so rapid that we cannot keep pace with this developing power within our own means. Whatever be our economic capacity, we cannot reach that stage where we can match in

our defence fire power with the advanced nations of the world.

According to Indian Institute of Strategic Studies, 85 per cent of the defence expenditure of the world is shared by eight countries in between themselves out of 133 countries. Amongst these eight countries China is one of them. The rest of the nations, in which we are also there, have the capacity of spending only 15 per cent of the total expenditure on defence throughout the world. We do realise our limitations in so far as our self-sufficiency in strategic fire power is concerned. We do have our limitations in so far as sophisticated elements of fire power are concerned. The natural corollary has been that we are at the mercy of the foreign powers for modern arms and equipments. We call them 'modern' from our point of view but they are obsolete from their point of view. We have had to accept their terms knowing that they are to our disadvantage. For example, we are not supposed to be able to repair the MIGS when they are grounded or make spare parts indigenously. We have to depend on Russia for that.

There cannot be respect amongst unequals. The respect has to be amongst equals. While we may not vie with USA, USSR and even with China in our defence build up, that should not deter us embarking upon limited adventures like that of manufacture of hydrogen bombs. We must add this to the armoury of our limited defence power if we have to account as anything by way of even defence preparedness in Asia.

If this step is taken then only we will command respect from our foes and friends and then only we will be able to dictate better terms when we negotiate for arms or ammunitions from abroad.

• The third point that I would like the hon. Minister to consider is the set-up in the defence forces. After fully weighing the pros and cons some foreign powers have integrated their services. This is the mood or fashion or trend these days. USA began it, Canada which has no threat from foreign aggression has adopted and UK, whose pattern was the basis of our set up here, is also moving in this

direction. Therefore, I support the proposal that we also integrate our three wings of the defence forces. According to me the advantages are the following. Firstly, there would be avoidance of inter-service rivalry; secondly, it would permit well-planned, effective and quick defence plans and operations; thirdly, it would cut out wastage and duplication.

It is well known to all of us that there exists rivalry amongst the three wings. Each wing of the defence forces tends to be an empire unto themselves. Rivalry in seniority and jealousy amongst officers exist because of their separate identity. The Chinese and Pakistani aggression showed clearly the lacuna that is there in the existing set up. Field commanders and officers were unconditionally praised but at the higher level praise was not so freely forthcoming as at that level rivalry existed, bad coordination, bad planning and disorganisation was felt, Integrated approach is the answer, which can only take place if the services are integrated.

Economy would be achieved by the merger of the inter-lapping services, e. g. Medical Services, Provost Marshall Department, Signals and Engineering services. I fully realise that this change cannot take place overnight and it will, therefore, have to be phased. Keeping this in mind, I have to suggest that for purposes of integration the following steps are indicated. Firstly, the post of the Chief of the Defence Staff should be created. Secondly, similar integration at subordinate echelons of command should be introduced. Thirdly, merger of various services as one unit like the Medical Corps, Legal Department, Signals etc. should be planned and implemented. Fourthly, one common Armed Forces Act should be legislated. Fifthly, common badges of rank and, as far as possible, common nomenclature should be introduced. For purposes of integration such steps would be necessary and their result would be positive and tangible. Defence Services Staff College or National Defence College or the Joint Committee of the three service chiefs as is in vogue, are merely the steps towards the right direction.

I know I have broached today very controversial matters and matters on which many in this House are touchy about. But I strongly felt that the time has come to speak out, if we have the interest of our country and nation at heart.

श्री मोहम्मद इस्माइल (बैरकपुर) : सभापति महोदय, डिफेन्स बजट के सम्बन्ध में दो-तीन बातें मुझे डिफेन्स मिनिस्टर साहब के सामने रखनी हैं। मुझसे पहले जितनी भी स्पीचें यहां पर हुई हैं, जो वक्तव्य यहां पर रखे गये हैं उन से यही मालूम हुआ कि कोई भी आग बुझाने वाला नहीं है, आग को बढ़ाने की कोशिश की गई है। मगर आज दुनिया की जो हालत है, और हमारे देश की जो हालत है, तीन-तीन प्लान यहां पर हो चुके हैं 1962 में जो डिफेन्स बजट 78 करोड़ रुपये का था, वह आज करीब 1000 हजार करोड़ रुपये का हो गया है— इसका बोझा 1962 से आज तक देश की जनता के ऊपर पड़ा है, हमारी अर्थ नीति पर पड़ा है। तीन-तीन प्लानों के होने के बाद भी आज यह नौबत आ गई है कि हम को भीख मांगनी पड़ी है, कर्ज ले-ले कर हमको अपनी देश की उन्नति करने की कोशिश करनी पड़ी है, हमको कर्जदार बनाया गया है, एक तरफ जनता की गरीबी बढ़ी है, दूसरी तरफ देश पर कर्जा बढ़ा है और जितनी योजनायें हम ने बनाईं, उनमें कामयाबी भी हासिल नहीं हुई है—इन तमाम चीजों को सामने रख कर हमारे भाइयों ने जो भी वक्तव्य यहां पर दिये—हर एक का यही कहना था— हमारे सामने चीन हमारा दुश्मन है, पाकिस्तान दुश्मन है, उससे हम को लड़ना है। किसी ने यह नहीं कहा कि हमारे देश के साथ जो पड़ोसी देश हैं, उन के साथ हम दोस्ती की बातें, भाइचारे की बातें करें— किसी ने एक लफ़्ज भी इस के बारे में नहीं कहा। हर एक ने यही कहा—चीन से लड़ना होगा, पाकिस्तान से लड़ना होगा, रुपया बढ़ाइये, बजट बढ़ाइये,—इस तरह

[श्री मोहम्मद इस्माइल]

से देश की गरीबी को बढ़ाओ और देश को जमना में फँक दो—इस के यही मायने निकले हैं।

आज जब कि दुनिया में तबदीली हो रही है—यहाँ पर भी ये बातें उठनी चाहिये थीं कि चीन के साथ हमारा झगड़ा था, हमें उसके साथ बातें करनी चाहियें आज वहाँ भी तबदीली हो रही है, उन की नीतियों में भी तबदीली हो रही है। हमारी प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहबा ने भी इस तबदीली का इन्डिकेशन दिया था—अभी कुछ दिन पहिले जब विदेशी अखबारवालों ने इन से सवाल किया तो उन्होंने यह कहा था कि चाइना की फौरन-पालिसी में तबदीली हो रही है—लेकिन हमारे देश के अखबारवालों ने बहुत छोटे अलफ़ाज ने उस खबर को शायी किया था। इस सदन में भी हम उस की आलोचना कर सकते थे—लेकिन वह भी नहीं हुआ। आज हमारी फौरन-पालिसी के आधार पर हमारा डिफेन्स डिपार्टमेन्ट चलता है, इस लिये जहाँ तक हमारी फौरन-पालिसी का ताल्लुक है—कम से कम इस चीज का जिक्र करना चाहिये था कि हमारे बगल के जो देश हैं, उन से हम बातचीत करना चाहते हैं, बातचीत से मामलों को तय करना चाहते हैं, दोनों देशों के लोग अमन और शान्ति से जिन्दा रहना चाहते हैं, इस लिये हमारे देश की जो नीति है, जो फारन-पालिसी है, अगर उसमें तबदीली की ज़रूरत पड़ेगी तो हमें उस में तबदीली करनी है। पाकिस्तान में साहया साहब के आने के बाद, उन्होंने क्या कहा था—उन्होंने कहा था कि हम हिन्दुस्तान के साथ अच्छे ताल्लुकात रखना चाहते हैं, भाइयारे के सम्बन्ध रखना चाहते हैं। लेकिन जहाँ तक हमारी पालिसी का ताल्लुक है, हमारी प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहबा एक तरफ़ कहती हैं कि चीन की फौरन-पालिसी में तबदीली आ रही है, दूसरी तरफ़ हमारे इस सदन के भाई-लोग दूसरी तरह की बातें

कहते हैं—इस तरह से कैसे चलेगा। जब तक फारन-पालिसी में दुनिया में होने वाली तबदीली के आधार पर तबदीली नहीं होगी, डिफेन्स डिपार्टमेन्ट को हम कैसे ठीक रास्ते पर ले जा सकेंगे। इसलिये ज़रूरी है कि फौरन-पालिसी में तबदीली की जाय ताकि चाइना के साथ बातचीत करके मामले को हल करने की कोशिश की जाय, उन के अन्दर जो तबदीली आ रही है, उसको देखते हुए हमारी नीति में भी तबदीली आनी चाहिये। हमारे देश की हालत को देखते हुए, देश की गरीबी को ध्यान में रखते हुए, देश की उन्नति के लिये हमारे लिये ऐसा करना ज़रूरी हो गया है। अगर आप इस तरफ़ गौर नहीं करते हैं तो हमारे संकट और ज्यादा बढ़ते जायेंगे—जो चौथा प्लान हम बनाने जा रहे हैं, आप देखते हैं कि उस में कैसा संकट उपस्थित हुआ है, हजारों करोड़ रुपया हम को डिफेन्स पर खर्च करना पड़ेगा और प्लान के लिये भोली लेकर हम को विदेशों में जाना पड़ेगा, उधार पैसा लेकर हम प्लान को चलायेंगे—यह कैसी मुसीबत है, कैसा अपमान है हमारे देश के लिए। शान्ति की बातें न कर के, मेल की बातें न करके, लड़ाई की बातें कर के हम अपनी गरीबी को और ज्यादा बढ़ायेंगे, हमें पहले ही भिखमंगा बनना पड़ा है और आगे भी भिखमंगा बनना पड़ेगा। हमारी चौथी पंचवर्षीय योजना विदेशियों की कृपा पर चलेगी—इस प्रकार की स्थिति हमारे देश में पैदा हो गई है। इस पर हमें गम्भीरता से विचार करका चाहिये। जहाँ तक डिफेन्स पर्सनैल का ताल्लुक है, एक सिपाही की तनख्वाह दो सौ रुपए है जबकि उसके ऊपर अफसर की तनख्वाह एक हजार रुपए है। इतना ज्यादा डिफेन्स है। जमीन और आसमान का फर्क रखा गया है। इस बात को भी देखना पड़ेगा। इसके अलावा देश की जनता के साथ हमारी सेना का जो सम्पर्क होना चाहिए उसकी तरफ भी आपका कोई ध्यान नहीं है। आज

डिफेन्स फॅक्टरीज में जो वर्कर्स काम कर रहे हैं जोकि डिफेन्स के लिए औजार तैयार कर रहे हैं उनकी तरफ सिम्पैथेटिकली नहीं देखा जा रहा है बल्कि इस तरह का बर्ताव किया जाता है कि तुमने इन्डिसिप्लिन किया है, तुम को सस्पेन्ड किया जायेगा, तुमको चार्जशीट दी जायेगी—इस नज़र से ही आज उसको देखा जा रहा है।

काशीपुर में जो गोली चली उसका वाक्या क्या था ? वहां पर 7.30 पर हाजिरी होती है। 19 सितम्बर से पहले 15 मिनट का टाइम और मिलता था कारखाने में जाने के लिए लेकिन उसके बाद यह आर्डर हो गया कि ठीक साढ़े सात बजे हाजिर होना चाहिए वरना लेट फाइन किया जायेगा और फॅक्ट्री के अन्दर घुसने नहीं दिया जायेगा। इस तरह का जो दस्तूर निकाला गया उसको वह प्रोटेस्ट कर रहे थे।... (व्यवधान)... कभी ट्रेन लेट हो गई या बस लेट हो गई तो उनको घुसने नहीं दिया जाता था। 19 सितम्बर के बाद से ही वे कर रहे थे। जिस दिन घटना घटी उस दिन क्या हुआ ? 7.20 तक उन्होंने गेट पर मीटिंग की और उसके बाद खत्म कर दिया। कई दिनों से वे यही कर रहे थे लेकिन दस मिनट के बाद वे उस चीज को भूल भी जाते थे। लेकिन उस दिन यह हुआ कि सेक्योरिटी के लोगों ने जबर्दस्ती गड़बड़ की और कहा कि घुसने नहीं देंगे, तुम लोग रोज मीटिंग करते हो, आज नहीं घुसने देंगे। वह झगड़ा करते रहे। इसमें दस मिनट हो गये। उसके बाद जैसे ही सात बज कर 30 मिनट हुए, उन्होंने गेट बन्द कर दिये। एद आदमी घुस रहा था तो उसका सर भी फट गया। लोगों ने प्रोटेस्ट की कि ऐसा क्यों किया तो सेक्योरिटी गार्ड ने कहा चले जाओ, वरना गोली मार देंगे। लोगों ने कहा कि मारो तो उसने मार दिया। वहां पर पांच आदमियों का खून कर दिया गया। इसके बाद कहा जाता है कि अशांति

फ़ैलाई। मैं पूछता हूँ कि अगर पहले का जमाना होता, और उन वर्कर्स में जरा सी भी पैट्रिया-टिज्म न होती तो क्या नतीजा होता। चार-पांच हजार वर्कर्स अन्दर थे, आफिसर्स अन्दर थे, आफत मच सकती थी, कितने ही खून हो जाते और न मालूम क्या-क्या हो जाता। लेकिन कुछ नहीं हुआ। वे शान्त रहे, पीस-फुल रहे। लेकिन इस बात का कोई जिक्र नहीं किया जाता है। इतने वर्कर्स के सामने 5 आदमी मरे हुए पड़े थे।... (व्यवधान)... मैं फॅक्ट्स बतला रहा हूँ। मैं वहां पर खुद गया था। लेकिन आप जिस दृष्टि से डिफेन्स को देख रहे हैं, जिस दृष्टि से फाइव इयर प्लान को देख रहे हैं उसी दृष्टि से इन वर्कर्स को भी देख रहे हैं। मैं आप से पूछना हूँ क्या उन लोगों ने किसी आफिसर को मारा ? किसी भी आदमी को मारा ? मैं आपको चलेंज करता हूँ। पांच आदमी उनकी आंखों के सामने खून हो गए लेकिन उन्होंने एक पत्थर तक नहीं मारा—एक कांच भी नहीं टूटा। फिर इसका क्या मतलब है ? आपकी बात कौन मानेगा ?..... (व्यवधान)..... कहते हैं कि अपमान हुआ। 8 हजार आदमी जो काम करते हैं उनकी आंखों के सामने गोली मारी गई लेकिन वे सब किए हुए खड़े रहे। लेकिन इस बात पर उनको कोई भी ट्रिव्यूट देने वाला नहीं है। आपके लड़के को अगर कोई गोली मार दे तो क्या आप चुपचाप खड़े रहेंगे, नहीं, आप नोच खायेंगे। लेकिन वहां पर पांच आदमी मरे पड़े रहे, उन्होंने कुछ भी नहीं किया। क्या इस बात का रिक्निशन नहीं होगा ? यह बात कोई नहीं कहता। यह बात कही जाती है कि सी. आर. पी. भेजना जरूरी है प्रोटेक्शन के लिए क्योंकि वह सेण्ट्रल गवर्नमेंट की प्रापर्टी है। इसी काशीपुर फॅक्ट्री में 19 सितम्बर की हड़ताल के बाद 54 आदमियों को सस्पेन्ड किया गया था, डिस्चार्ज किया गया था। उन्होंने दर-स्वास्त भेजी, डेपुटेशन भेजा लेकिन एक आदमी को भी नहीं रखा। कोई भी सुनवाई नहीं हुई। मिनिस्टर ने हाउस में एलान किया

[श्री मोहम्मद इस्माइल]

लेकिन फिर भी नहीं लिया गया। इच्छापुर गन फैक्टरी में सिटी एलाउन्स मिलता था लेकिन वह काट दिया गया, जिससे 60, 70 और 80 रु. तक तनख्वाह कम हो गई। डीयरनेस एलाउन्स मर्ज कर लिया गया। वहां के 14 आदमी डिसमिस कर दिए गए थे। उनकी लिस्ट भेजी गई—एक ही चार्ज में 9 आदमियों को लिया गया लेकिन पांच आदमियों को नहीं लिया गया। इसका क्या कारण है? यह कोई नहीं बताता। यह वर्कर्स की जिम्मेदारी है या आपकी जिम्मेदारी है। इसलिए मैं समझता हूँ डिफेंस मिनिस्टर साहब को इन तमाम चीजों पर ध्यान देना होगा। आज जो डिफेंस प्रोडक्शन करते हैं, जो जवान लड़ाई लड़ते हैं उनमें और आफिसर्स में आपने कितना फर्क रख छोड़ा है? आज डिफेंस बजट बढ़ता जा रहा है फाइव इयर प्लान संकट में पड़ता जा रहा है और भीख मांगने की आदत भी बढ़ती जा रही है। मैं समझता हूँ अपने पड़ोसी चीन और पाकिस्तान से शान्ति की बातचीत करने के लिए हमको अपनी पालिसी चेंज करनी चाहिए। जब तक यह नहीं होगा तब तक हमारा संकट और बढ़ता जायेगा और उस संकट में पड़ कर रूलिंग पार्टी खत्म हो जायेगी जैसा कि अभी भी हो रहा है।

श्री रणधीर सिंह (रोहतक) : चेयरमैन महोदय, मेरे से पहले मेरे भाई ने शान्ति की दुहाई दी। उनसे पहले मेरे भाई पाकिस्तान पर पिल पड़े और उनसे पहले भाई ने चीन की बखिया उधेड़ दी। इनमें एक खयालात नहीं, जितने साज हैं उतनी ही अलग अलग आवाजें हैं। लेकिन यह देश का सवाल है, देश की इज्जत का सवाल है, देश के 55 करोड़ इन्सानों का सवाल है। देश की एक एक इन्च भूमि कितनी कीमत रखती है, इसका बयान नहीं किया जा सकता है। सन् 62 में जा लापरवाही की गई उसकी वजह से आज तक सरकार को, सारी पार्टीज

को और इस देश को सारी दुनिया कोस रही है। इसलिए हमें लापरवाही नहीं बरतनी चाहिए। डिफेंस का जो मसला है उसको पार्टी की निगाह से नहीं देखना चाहिए। बल्कि देश के मुक्ते निगाह से देखना चाहिए। मेरे भाइयों ने अलग-अलग अपनी-अपनी पार्टी की ढपली बजाई। मुझे इस बात से खुशी होती है कि जो भी सही बात है वही कही जाये। जहां कमजोरी हो उसके लिए गवर्नमेंट की आलोचना भी की जाना चाहिए।

जहां तक हमारी फौज और हमारे जवानों का सवाल है, हमारी फौज दुनिया की बेहतरीन फौज है और हमारे जवान दुनिया के बेहतरीन जवान हैं। हमारे फौजी अफसर दुनिया के बेहतरीन फौजी अफसर हैं। पिछली चीन और पाकिस्तान की लड़ाई में हमारे बहादुर अफसरों ने इस बात को जाहिर कर दिया है—जहां पर हमारे जवानों का पसीना गिरा, वहां पर हमारे फौजी अफसरों का खून गिरा। हमारे कुछ भाइयों ने अपने जजवात में आकर हमारे...जेनरल्स को भी खींच डाला। लेकिन आपने देखा कि हमारे जेनरल्स भी शाना ब शाना जवानों के साथ पाकिस्तान और चीन की लड़ाई में लड़े। मेरे अपने इलाके का ब्रिगेडियर होशियार सिंह था जिसका जब नाम लिया जाता है तो लोगों के रोंगटे खड़े हो जाते हैं। वह बड़ा भारी जनरल था। मैं उसी व्यक्ति का क्यों नाम लूँ, जितने भी हमारे ब्रिगेडियर, जनरल कप्तान हैं, चाहे वह जनसंघ के टिकट से ही चुनकर क्यों न आये हों, मैं उनकी इज्जत करता हूँ। जो हमारे देश की इज्जत हैं हमें उनकी सराहना करनी है। सब से पहले तो मैं पूरे हाउस की तरफ से अपने फौजी जवानों और अफसरों को जो 15, 20 हजार फीट की ऊंचाई पर नेफा, लहाख और कश्मीर में तैनात हैं, जहाँ आदमी सांस नहीं ले सकता आधा घंटे भी, एम० पी० डेली-गेशन ऐसे एरियाज में गया था इसलिये मुझे मालूम है, कितनी मुश्किल हालात में वह

देश की रक्षा कर रहे हैं, उन सब को मैं इस हाउस की तरफ से सलाम भेजता हूँ।

इसके अलावा मुझे अपने जवानों की तनखाह के बारे में भी कुछ निवेदन करना है। यहाँ दिल्ली के एयर कंडीशन्ड दफ्तरों में जो पट्टा लगाकर एक मेज से दूसरी मेज को कागज ले जाते हैं उन्हें तो दो सौ ६० मिलते हैं तनखाह के जब कि हमारे फौज के सिपाही को अगर उसकी मेहनत देखी जाय, मैंने देखी है एम० पीज० डेलीगेशन में मैं गया था नाथू ला और चोला में, वहाँ के फौजी अफसर और जवान दरिन्दों की तरह से रह रहे हैं। वह भी किसी माई के लाल हैं, किसी बहन के भाई हैं, उनकी तकलीफ का खयाल न अब तक था और न आज किसी को होता है। मैं सरकार से कहना चाहता हूँ कि 50, 60 ६० में आजकल की मंहगाई में क्या होता है? एक महीने की सूखी रोटी भी नहीं चलती है। वह जवान जो देश की इज्जत हैं, मैं तीनों विंग्स के बारे में कहता हूँ, उनकी तनखाह कम है। उसको बढ़ाया जाय और उसके लिए सारा देश, गरीब देहात का किसान, मजदूर और हरिजन, जो भी टैक्स लगायेगी सरकार जवान की तनखाह बढ़ाने के लिए उसको हम बरदास्त करने के लिये तैयार हैं। माननीय बनर्जी और माननीय फरनेन्डीज का लाल झंडा और नीड बैस्ड वेज का नारा यह सब बेकार की बातें हैं। जिन आदमियों की वाकई तनखाह बढ़नी चाहिए, जो देश के लिए हथेली पर अपनी जान लिए रहते हैं, दो-दो साल जो घरों को छुट्टी पर नहीं जाते हैं, जिनकी जवान औरतें और बच्चे इन्तजार करते हैं, उन आदमियों की एक-एक दिन की एक-एक हजार रुपये की तनखाह लगाई जाय तो वह थोड़ी है :

दूसरी बात में फौजी जवानों को सुविधायें देने के बारे में कहना चाहता हूँ। जब लड़ाई होती है तो जय जवान जय किसान

चिल्लाते हैं, वोट लेना होता है तब यही कहते हैं, लेकिन बाद में उनको भूल जाते हैं। मैं सरकार से कहना चाहूंगा कि जो फौजी जवानों के बच्चे, मां-बाप उन के घर पर होते हैं उनके साथ ठीक सलूक नहीं होता है, उनके घर पर मनी आर्डर ठीक समय पर नहीं पहुँचता है, मैं तजुबों की बात कहता हूँ, मां बाप भी तभी पूछते हैं जब उनको पैसा मिलता रहता है, वरना कोई नहीं पूछता। वह अफसर या जवान जब मुलाजमत से आता है और अगर पैसा ला कर देता है तब तो ठीक है वरना जिस आदमी ने 20 साल मुल्क के लिए खून पसीना एक किया और अगर उससे पैसे की उम्मीद न रहे तो बाप भी उसको अलग कर देता है। उन के साथ जो लिटिगेशन होता है, उसके लिए जो आजकल सुविधायें हैं वे थोड़ी हैं। उनको ज्यादा प्रोटेक्शन दिया जाय और तमाम जो दुनियां भर के इंसेन्टिव्ज, किसी को पोलिटिकल वर्कर के नाम से, किसी को हरिजन या बैंक-वर्ड के नाम से दिये जाते हैं, उससे ज्यादा जो सिपाही देश की खातिर मर रहे हैं या जो ऐक्स-सर्विसमैन हैं, उनको तथा उनके बच्चों को मिलने चाहिए। उनके बच्चों के लिए तालीम की तथा अन्य सुविधाएं दी जाएं। अंग्रेज बड़ा सयाना था, वह जमीन दिया करता था, यह बन्द हो गया। आदमी जान देता है देश के लिये उसको कुछ जो कुछ किसी न किसी रूप में कमपेन्सेट करना पड़ेगा। मुसलमानों के वक्त में जब अरब सारी दुनिया में छा गये थे, वह भी कहते थे कि अगर लड़ते हुये मरोगे तो बहिस्त में जाओगे, सारी दुनिया तुम्हारी है, तब सिपाही लड़ता था। सवाल यह है कि जो खून बहाता है वह देखता है कि उस के पीछे उसके मां-बाप, बीबी बच्चों का क्या होगा। वहाँ पहाड़ पर या तो भगवान याद आता है या देश आता है, बच्चे भी याद नहीं आते हैं। तो उसकी तरफ सरकार को और मुल्क को ध्यान देना पड़ेगा।

[श्री रणवीर सिंह]

तीसरी बात यह है कि बौर्डर रोड पर जो काम हमारी फौज कर रही है वह बेहद सराहनीय है। छान दिया है सारे पहाड़ को और एक-एक चौकी मिला दी है। और वहां पर जो सिपाही और मजदूर काम करते हैं इस हाउस की सराहना मिनिस्टर महोदय उन तक पहुंचा दें।

एक बात जो मैं खासतौर पर कहना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि फौज को एक खिलवाड़ नहीं बनाइए। जो वाकई लड़ना जानते हैं उन्हीं को फौज में भेजिये। अगर मुझे कोई दुकान पर भेजे मुझको क्या तोलना आयेगा, या किसी किसान को कहें कि जाकर लड़ू बेचिये तो वह क्या करेगा। जो आदमी जिस काम को जानता हो उससे वही काम लेना चाहिए। मैं यहां मार्शल या नान-मार्शल का जिक्र नहीं करता हूँ। जिनकी रगों में लड़ने की आदत है उन्हीं को फौज में भेजा जाय और मैं महसूस करता हूँ कि हरिजन सबसे ज्यादा लड़ने वाला होता है। बहुत से लोग नाराज होते हैं हो जाएं। मेरा क्या बछड़ा खोल लेंगे। तो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हरिजन और अहीरों की जो माँग है कि उनकी एक पलटन होनी चाहिए, वह जरूर होनी चाहिए।

फौज तो आपने बढ़ा दी दुनिया भर की लेकिन फेमिली क्वार्टर्स वही के वही जो अंग्रेज के वक्त में थे। वह भी इन्सान हैं। दो, तीन साल पहाड़ों पर रह चुके हैं, माओ-से-तुंग या यहिया खां की तोपों के आगे आपने उन को बांध रखा है, उनको भी अगर दो, तीन साल में किसी पीस टाइम स्टेशन पर भेजा जाय तो उनके ठहरने के लिये कम से कम एक कोठरी ही दे दें। पीस टाइम स्टेशन पर रेजीडेंशियल अकामोडेशन बहुत थोड़ी है उसको बढ़ाया जाय और उन जवानों के लिए पीस टाइम स्टेशन पर रेस्ट करना कम्पलसरी किया जाय। बड़े जोशीले जवान हैं, जानबूझ कर नहीं आते। लेकिन

कोई हद होती है थकावट की। दो, तीन साल बाद मैं चाहूंगा कि यूनिट तब्दील होती रहे। मैं जानता हूँ कि इसमें काफी खर्च होगा, लाखों की तादाद में फौज को नीचे लावो और ऊपर ले जावो इसमें खर्च होता है। लेकिन फिर भी एक थकावट की हद होती है और अगर आप उनको आराम नहीं देंगे तो वह लोग फौज में जाना बन्द कर देंगे। तो फौज में कुछ आराम भी उनको दो, चार साल बाद मिलना चाहिये, उनके बच्चों को मिलना चाहिए।

16.58 Hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

छै: हजार जो नौजवान अफसर हैं मैं उनकी तारीफ करता हूँ। उनमें से कुछ लड़के आई० ए० एस०, आई० पी० एस० और आई० एफ० एस० में सरकार ने लिए हैं। लेकिन यह आटे में नमक के बराबर है। क्या हुआ उससे ?

उन 6000 लड़कों में से अंग्रेजी बोलने वाले लड़के ही लिए गये। हिन्दी बोलने वाले घाटे में रह गये। अब मेरे हरियाणा इलाके के लड़के ज्यादा अंग्रेजी नहीं बोलते वह हरियाणवी बोलते हैं या वह टूटी-फूटी हिन्दी बोलते हैं और वह हिन्दी वाले जैसा मैंने कहा वह बेचारे आउट हो गये।

17 Hrs.

इस तरह से हिन्दी बोलने वालों को सजा मिलना कहाँ तक इंसाफ की बात है? जो लोग अंग्रेजी बोले और सूट-बूट और हैट धारण करें वह ले लिये गये और यह बेचारे हिन्दी बोलने वाले रह गये तो यह कोई मुनासिब बात नहीं है। यह हिन्दी बोलने वाले जोकि दो, चार साल में कुछ जमातें पास कर लेते हैं वह सारे आउट हो गये। लेकिन मेरा कहना है कि जो आउट किये गये वह लड़ने में बड़े तेज व माहिर है। मेरा कहना है कि फौज के उन जवानों

में से आप हवलदारों और सूबेदारों में से, कप्तान मेजर और जनरल बनाइए और 50 परसेंट ऊँची पोस्ट्स इन फौजी जवानों और सिपाहियों में से लेकर फिल कीजिए। मुझे यह कहने के लिए माफ किया जाय कि यह आपके इस तरह के मेजर और लेफ्टिनेन्ट्स ने इन सारे अंग्रेजी बोलने वालों ने टा, टा करने वालों ने फौज का भट्टा बिठा दिया। जरूरत इस बात की है कि जो लड़ाई में लड़ते हैं, उन्हें मेजर, जनरल और दूसरे फौजी अफसर बना कर भेजो क्योंकि उनका पेशा लड़ाई लड़ना है और मैदान जंग में सीना तानकर दुश्मनों से लोहा लेना है। लड़ाई जिनका पेशा है उनको आप फौज में अफसर बनाइए। यह कहां लिखा है कि हमारे फौजी जवान हवलदार और रिसालदार तो अच्छे हो सकते हैं लेकिन वह कर्नल और ब्रिगेडियर अच्छे नहीं हो सकते हैं? मेरा कहना है कि वह ऊँची पोस्ट्स पर भी अच्छे व काबिल हो सकते हैं। मेरी गुजारिश है कि नीचे से फौजी जवानों में से, सिपाहियों में से लेफ्टिनेन्ट, कप्तान और दूसरी ऊँची जगहों के लिए लेने के लिए 60 परसेंट का कोटा रिजर्व कीजिए।

मेरे एक भाई ने बतलाया कि लिन प्याओ जोकि अब माओत्से तुंग का सक्सेसर बन गया है वह एक साधारण सिपाही था। जब वहाँ पर एक साधारण सिपाही माओत्से तुंग का उत्तराधिकारी बन सकता है तो हिन्दुस्तान की आर्मी में लैफ्टिनेंट आदि अफसर बनने के लिए कोई एक दम से अंग्रेजी का एम. ए. होना चाहिए यह मेरी संमत्त से बाहर है। मैं चाहूंगा कि मंत्री महोदय इस पर खास तौर से ध्यान दें।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य का समय समाप्त हो रहा है।

श्री रणधीर सिंह : मैं बहुत जल्दी-जल्दी एक, आध बात कह कर बैठ जाऊंगा।

आई० एन० ए० की बाबत मैं बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि पेंशन आदि मामलों को लेकर उनके साथ भेदभाव बर्ता जाता है। ऐसे हमारे आई० एन० ए० के बहादुर सिपाही जो कि देश की आजादी के परवाने हैं और जोकि देश की आजादी के खातिर अपनी जानों पर खेलें और जिनकी कुर्बानियों की वजह से इस देश में आजादी आई और उस के फलस्वरूप हम और आप सब लोग एम पीज और मिनिस्टर्स वगैरह बने बैठे हैं और इस देश के लोग आजादी का सुख भोग रहे हैं यह कितने अफसोस व शर्म की बात है कि आज उन आई० एन० ए० के बहादुर लोगों को वह पेंशन नहीं मिलती है जोकि एक आम आर्मी के रिटायर्ड हवलदार को, सिपाही को या दीगर अफसर को मिलती है। आप यह आई० एन० ए० के लोगों में और दूसरे आम आर्मी के लोगों में इस तरह की तमीज क्यों करते हैं? क्या इस वास्ते तमीज करते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी की लड़ाई उन्होंने क्यों लड़ी या हिन्दुस्तान को आजादी उन्होंने क्यों दिलाई? मेरी समझ में कम से कम यह बात नहीं आती है। उनको तो आप को कुछ ज्यादा देना चाहिए था, ज्यादा इज्जत उन लोगों को बख्शनी चाहिए थी लेकिन वह तो होना दूर रहा जो पेंशन उनके वास्ते रक्खी है उसमें आम आर्मी के मुकाबले उनके साथ डिस्क्रिमिनेशन किया जा रहा है। मैं चाहूंगा कि उनकी पेंशन की भी बेसिस वही हो साथ ही जैसे फौज के दूसरे आम लोगों को प्रमोशन मिलता है वैसे ही उन्हें भी फौज में प्रमोशन दिया जाय।

एक बात मैं और कहना चाहूंगा कि जैसे इंग्लैंड और अमरीका में यह चीफ़ आफ़ आर्मी, नैवी और एयरफ़ोर्स से रोटेशन में लेकर बजाते हैं उसी तरह से मैं चाहूंगा कि यहां की तीनों फ़ोर्स में इस तरह का इंटरप्रेशन हो अर्थात् आर्मी के जनरल को पहले फी आफ़ दी स्टाफ़ बनाया जाय,

[श्री रणधीर सिंह]

फिर नौवी के ऐडमिरल को चीफ दी स्टाफ बनाया जाय और ऐयर फोर्स के मार्शल इन ऐयर को उसी रोटेशन के हिसाब से चीफ आफ दी स्टाफ नियुक्त किया जाय । मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि इन तीनों बिबस के बड़े अफसरों को इस पद के लिए रोटेट किया जाय । यदि ऐसा किया जायगा तो अभी जो उन में एक इस चीज के कारण हार्ट वर्निंग होती है और आर्मी का जनरल जो अपने को पहले नम्बर पर समझने लगता है और उसको लेकर जो एक आपस में उन में एक मुकाबला होता है और जैसा कहा हार्ट वर्निंग होती है वह जनरली आर्मी के लिए एक नुकसानदेह चीज है । इतिहास साक्षी है कि इस से हमें नुकसान हुआ है । नेफा और दूसरी जगहों में हमें इस कारण नुकसान उठाना पड़ा है । इसलिये मैं चाहूंगा कि जो इस बारे में अमरीकन या इंग्लिश पेट्रन है वह यहां भी अमल में लाया जाय । इस से तीनों विंग्स में एक इंटरेशन आयेगा और उन में एक ऐक्टिव सहयोग का भाव भी बढ़ेगा जो कि अभी लैकिंग है ।

हमारी फौज में ऐसे जनरल मौजूद हैं जो कि हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर ही नहीं अपितु एशिया भर में वह बेहतरीन जनरल हैं और मुझे अफसोस होगा कि ऐसे योग्य जनरल को आप इस तरह से महीने या दो महीने बाद रिटायर करने जा रहे हैं । आप इंटरेशन करें और उस जनरल को प्रमोट करके सुपर जनरल बनायें ।

एक शब्द मैं आर्मी इंटीलिजेंस के बारे में कह कर खत्म करूंगा । हकीकत यह है कि हमारी आर्मी इंटीलिजेंस कमजोर है । हमारी आर्मी इंटीलिजेंस के कमजोर होने के कारण ही हमें चीन के मुकाबले मुंह की खानी पड़ी । इसी तरह पाकिस्तान के विरुद्ध लड़ाई में यह हमारी आर्मी इंटीलिजेंस की ही डैफी-शिएंसी थी कि हमारी फौज लाहौर की तरफ बढ़ रही थी और हमें पता नहीं था कि

इच्छोगिल कैनाल की क्या स्ट्रैटिजी है ? वहां उन के पिलबोक्सैज हैं या नहीं वह हमें पता नहीं चल पाया । बाद में हमें पता चला कि पाकिस्तान की ऐसी तैयारी थी । जरूरत इस बात की है कि हमारी आर्मी इंटीलिजेंस ऐसी हो कि मुखालिफ स्कीम बनायें उस का हमें एक महीना पहले पता चल जाय कि यह स्कीम बना रहे हैं ताकि उस के हिसाब से हम अपनी आर्मी स्ट्रैटिजी प्लान कर सकें लेकिन जैसा मैंने कहा हमें दुश्मनों की इस तरह की गतिविधियों का पहले पता ही नहीं लग पाया और हमें उस के कारण नुकसान उठाना पड़ा ।

ऐटमिक रिसर्च और दूसरी इसी तरह की रिसर्च के बारे में हमारा ध्यान जाना चाहिए । चीन जो कि हमारा दुश्मन है उस ने ऐटम बनाया है तो जाहिर है कि हमें अपने देश की आजादी की हिफाजत के लिए और दुश्मनों का कामयाबी के साथ मुकाबला करने के लिए ऐटम बम बनाना चाहिए । ईट का जवाब पत्थर से दिया जाना चाहिए । चीन के ऐटम बम का जवाब हमें अपने ऐटम बम से देना पड़ेगा । चीन सारे साउथ ईस्ट एशिया को खा रहा है, चीन पाकिस्तान को खायेगा लेकिन चीन का अगर कोई खूनी जबड़ा तोड़ेगा तो यह हिन्दुस्तान ही तोड़ेगा । हिन्दुस्तान नहीं चाहता कि अमरीका अथवा रूस आदि देश एशिया में चौधरी बनें और चौधराहट करें । इसलिए यह जरूरी है कि हिन्दुस्तान मजबूत बनें और अपने पैरों पर खड़ा हो और सब के साथ एक बराबरी के वसूल पर उस का भाईचारा कायम हो । पाकिस्तान का दिमाग ठीक करने के लिए, चीन का दिमाग ठीक करने के लिए मैं चाहता हूं कि हिन्दुस्तान ऐटम बम जरूर बनाये क्योंकि उस के बगैर कोई चारा नहीं है ।

बस एक आखरी बात कह कर मैं बैठा जा रहा हूं...

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं कई मर्तबा घंटी बजा चुका हूँ। माननीय सदस्य बैठ जायं।

श्री रणधीर सिंह : उधर के एक माननीय सदस्य को आप ने तीस मिनट दिये। मुझे एक मिनट और दीजिये। मुझे पूरा कर लेने दीजिये।

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Please resume your seat. If I give time to any hon. Member that is not your look out. Why do you raise that issue? This issue should not be raised.

श्री रणधीर सिंह : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, केवल एक मिनट का सब कीजिये। इस तरह से आप गुस्सा मत होइये। मुझे भी गुस्सा आ जाता करता है। बराय मेहरबानी मैं जो बात कहने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ उसे बैठने के लिये पूरा कर लेने दीजिये।

हैंडरसन बुक्स की रिपोर्ट को शायद किया जाय। खेरा कमेटी की रिपोर्ट में जो यह सिफारिश की गई है कि बगैर एफिशिएंसी को इम्पेयर किये हुए 10 परसेंट किया जा सकता है, उसे लागू किया जाय। उस में जो सुधार सुझाये गये हैं और खामियां बतलाई गई हैं उस पर मंत्री महोदय ध्यानपूर्वक गौर करें और जरूरी कार्यवाही इस बारे में की जाय।

चूंकि उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आपका हुकम है इसलिए मैं इतना ही कह कर बैठ जाता हूँ हांलाकि मुझे अभी बहुत कुछ कहना रहता था।

SHRI VIKRAM CHAND MAHAJAN (Chamba) : There was a general complaint from the SSP members that there was poor attendance in the House and when I now look on their side, even they are missing... (Interruptions.) I am not criticising them; I only say that it is easy to give sermons but difficult to practice them.

SHRI JAIPAL SINGH : I repeat ; there is no quorum.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Let the Bell be rung—now there is quorum.

SHRI VIKRAM CHAND MAHAJAN : India's defence policy is principally directed towards maintaining and safeguarding the sovereignty and integrity of the country... (Interruptions.) I must here compliment the Defence Minister that he has sufficiently strengthened the defences of our country. We find the mobility and the effectiveness of the army has been increasing with the passage of time. We find that the armed forces are being equipped with the latest sophisticated weapons and guns. Not only this. The Navy which is meant to safeguard the coast and the harbours, there also the submarine arm is developing fast.

Similarly, what we find in the Air Force is that obsolete planes are being phased out and newer and better aircraft are being introduced, now, I would like to make a few suggestions also. What we find is that in spite of our best efforts so far as Pakistan and China are concerned, they are still hostile.

Now, there are two ways to meet that danger. One is to increase the regular armed forces, that is, raise more resources and build a bigger army, and increasing the army, the navy and the air force. That would put a great strain on our economic resources. I think I could give an alternate suggestion. My submission is that we should take the border people into confidence and train them and arm them and we should give them guidance in the defences as to how to meet the danger of the enemy. Not only this. We should inject the retired armed personnel on our borders, so that wherever we have the weaker regions, we introduce such colonies of retired army personnel which will strengthen those regions. Just like injecting cement and mortar into the weaker sections of the mountain around the dam in order to strengthen the dam, similarly, on our borders we should inject the weak areas with such personnel so that in times of need we can rely on them and we will not have a repetition as we had in Kashmir, where we did not know, in 1965, the enemy who had entered up to Srinagar. In spite of our best

[Shri Vikram Chand Mahajan]

intelligence, we had knowledge of the raiders. Therefore, I submit that we should take into confidence the border people and build up such strong villages which can act as fortresses and strengthen our defences.

But the entire burden should not be on the border people, even in the interior is the rest of the country should also share the burden. Here, I would submit that it is time that we introduced compulsory military service. What I mean by this system is that for two years every Indian should be made to undergo military service. What we find is that we cannot raise a regular army to the extent that when a joint attack by Pakistan and China comes, we cannot meet it because resources we do not have. Therefore, it is in the interests of the country that we have a second strong line of defence and the best way of building up such a defence line to introduce compulsory military service. That is, after a young man studied up to eight or 10th class, you give him the training during the time when he studies, and then, at the age of 16, 17 or 18, you put him in the military service as such for two years. He goes to the borders and serves the country there. And then he comes back. Like this, you will have a tremendous reservoir of trained, regular army which can be utilised at the time of need.

Here, we must learn from many other countries including China, because in China, as reports show, there is a trained, regular army of citizens which numbers over 20 crores. Here in India we have hardly a regular army, if I mistake not, of seven to eight lakhs. It is very difficult for such an army to meet such a strong enemy. Therefore, it is high time that we also learnt to build up a second line of defence which can only be built up by the introducing a compulsory military service.

There is a peculiar fate which normally a retired army personal meets. He goes out of service at a very young age. The normal retirement age varies from 35 to 50 years depending on the rank. At that stage it is very difficult to adjust oneself. Therefore, what I submit is

that the first priority on the civil services should be given to the armed forces. First they should be absorbed and only whatever surplus is left should go to the civilians. This will have a two fold advantage. We will have trained and disciplined persons to man our civil services and, secondly, we will be rehabilitating persons who have served the nation. At the same time, Sir, you will be making service in the armed forces more attractive. What is happening now is, to the newer generations a career in the armed forces is becoming less attractive. If provision is made that on retirement they will be absorbed in the civil services it will act as an additional attraction because then they will have security of service which is very essential at least for their families. Therefore, I submit that security of service should be provided for the army personnel by declaring that they will get jobs in the civil services when they retire.

There are one or two more suggestions that I would like to make. What we find is, those soldiers who retired before 1962 are getting a pension, if I am not wrong, of hardly Rs. 22. It is too low a pension with which they can maintain their families. Even the present pension is only Rs. 35. Therefore, a Pay Commission should be constituted to look after this aspect and revise the pension rates.

There is another aspect which I want to bring to the notice of the hon. Minister. Lately on the borders there is expansion of contentments going on. What happens is, whichever land comes first is acquired irrespective of the fact whether it is irrigated lands which are less in area are acquired and taken away from cultivation. I submit a regular committee should be appointed by the Defence Minister which should look into the aspect. Before acquiring any land they should call for objections from the agriculturists and if they have alternate sites to suggest they should be seen before the land is acquired.

Finally, I would request the hon. Minister to reconsider the manufacture of atom bomb because it is necessary as a deterrent. We need not use it, but it is

necessary for the morale of the country to manufacture such a bomb.

With these few words, Sir, I thank you for giving me this opportunity.

SHRI JAIPAL SINGH (Khunti) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I regret I have to repeat my hardy annual complaint against the Treasury Benches for not attending on an important matter like defence. The Finance Minister is not here, neither is the Prime Minister—she has just disappeared. Every one of them should be here. Half the budget is on defence, and I am shocked that even the Opposition is also missing.

Sir, before the next session of Parliament, Air Chief Marshal Arjan Singh, Distinguished Flying Cross, Padma Vibhushan, will be retiring from the Indian Air Force. We all know that he is an air-man, not just an Air Chief Marshal but an actual air-man from beginning to end. I would like this House to accord our grateful thanks for the wonderful service he rendered particularly when the Indo-Pak conflict was on. His successor, Air Marshal P. C Lal, is also equally good an airman. For a while he went into private service. Now he is at Hindustan Aircraft, Bangalore.

AN HON. MEMBER : That is also the Defence Ministry.

SHRI JAIPAL SINGH : What I was trying to say was that in the Air Force you do not pay them very well. They will get much more outside. But he chose to come back and he is going to be our next Air Chief Marshal.

Similarly, if you will give me two more minutes extra—I do not know to how much I am entitled; half an hour or forty minutes; I do not know...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Ten minutes.

श्री हुकम चन्द कडुबाय : एक घन्टा ।

SHRI JAIPAL SINGH : Thank you, Shri Kachwai.

I would like to pay my tributes to the army also. General Kumaramangalam will be retiring before we meet in the next session. One who is succeeding him is General Sam Maneckshaw, a great soldier who showed his guts and mettle when we were fighting the Chinese. The notorious Defence Minister, Shri Krishna Menon, tried to get rid of him and, in that process, Shri Krishna Menon very nearly ruined our land forces. I am personally happy that the present Defence Minister and his colleagues in the Cabinet have recognised his martial merit are giving him a post he richly deserves.

Coming to Indian Navy, I do not have time to talk about it now. Also, there is not going to be any recent change in the navy. All the same, I would say this. I would never grudge any increase in the Defence demands. I certainly would agree with Shrimati Sharda Mukerjee that there are avenues for economy. There is no doubt about that. There are avenues for economy in the other Ministries also. Every Minister, I think, could spend less. In fact, I would like to see that Shri Satya Narayan Sinha's Ministry's Demands are reduced so that more can go Defence. There are other Ministries also where it could be done. Unfortunately, it has become the fashion in this country that the moment anything becomes governmental, it becomes very expensive; a department like CPWD becomes Central Public Waste Department.

I agree with the Maharaj of Tehri Garhwal that we better think again as to whether we cannot go back to what obtained during the British regime when we had only one Commander-in-Chief. Of course, I do not agree with the insinuation that there is rivalry between the three wings; I do not agree because it is not true. They do co-operate with each other. But the fact is, that I think integration would be in the right direction.

For the last twenty years I have been pleading for the second line of defence. I have pleaded before that civil aviation should be part of the Defence Ministry and the flying clubs should come under the Defence Ministry. I would like the

[Shri Jaipal Singh]

Minister to think seriously about it. It is not on grounds of economy that I am suggesting this. What is civil is military and what is military is civil also. We have to take that into account. What is happening today? Go to any flying club you like; there you have A. C. C. which is financed by the Ministry of Defence. Why should it come under Civil Aviation? Discipline will also improve if it comes under the Ministry of Defence. Admittedly, I accept the fact that civil flying is different from military flying. I accept that fact. But the more important thing is that it is the second line of defence. We are on the edge of a volcano all the time.

My friends here talk of giving military training to all. I am afraid that is a fantastic plea. You will give training to 500 million people?

AN HON. MEMBER : All of them are not adults.

SHRI JAIPAL SINGH : Very well; let us put it at 250 million people. You have to remember that you have to train women also, not only men. When we talk of defence services, we forget the women who are doctors, nurses and Mr. Krishna's friends...

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE (SHRI M. R. KRISHNA) : I do not agree with Mr. Jaipal Singh. He may have his own friends.

SHRI JAIPAL SINGH : I am not ashamed of women friends. Whether they are in uniform or they are in ordinary saris, they are all welcome as far as I am concerned.

I fully agree with Chowdhuri Sahib from Haryana and although he howls and shouts, his argument can be accepted. The fact is that jawans are giving their lives for our country. They are in most extra-ordinarily out of the way places. You see a Madras in a place at 14,000 ft. high, not used to these heights, but there he is. He wants to know what you and I in the Lok Sabha think of him. What are we doing for him? Are we only bothered about our

own pay being increased or our allowances being increased? What are we doing about them? This is rather an important thing. I must congratulate the Ministry that in the last three or four years, they have been improving communications. As far as jawans are concerned, they can get in touch with their families much more quickly than they used to do before. I think, here is still room for improvement there.

Finally, the Haryana fellow talked about the E. C. Os. I have had plenty to do with them. I was in the Services Selection Board for many years. But the point is that when we talk of employment we should not forget there are other people also who need employment, not only E. C. Os. I accept that fact the E. C. Os. are disciplined people. I think, they should get some better consideration. I will not give them priority.

AN HON. MEMBER : Why?

SHRI JAIPAL SINGH : That is my business. The E. C. O. means only an E. C. O. You must remember that. If he is a regular commissioned officer, yes, certainly, you give him priority but not an E. C. O. because we have to think of employment problem as a whole. It is a national problem. If there are 6000 E. C. Os, whatever they are, you have got to think of 6000 other people who will be left out of employment. That is the point. I am not saying that they should not be given an opportunity. Certainly, yes, because they are better disciplined than the university students of Haryana. Certainly, they are better disciplined men and they are in demand, I know that.

AN HON. MEMBER : Let them be in the Lok Sabha also.

SHRI JAIPAL SINGH : I say, if there were more E. C. Os, here, we would have better men in this House.

With these words, I have no mental reservation whatever in supporting all the demands of Sardar Swaran Singh.

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SHRI SWARAN SINGH) : Mr. Deputy-

Speaker, Sir, I am grateful to the hon. Members who have participated in this debate. I have listened with very great care and attention to the view-points that have been presented. In a subject of this nature and of this magnitude, it is quite natural that the hon. Members who have given particular attention to any specific problem have got some suggestions to make. It was heartening to hear the various suggestions for improvement, for strengthening our defence, for stepping up our production effort and above all, for giving cheer to the members of our armed forces jawans and others—who are undergoing a great hardship. This has been the general tone of the speeches which I greatly welcome.

On the question of the threat that we face, we had almost a debate some days back and I tried to spell out as best as I could the dual danger that our country faces from two of our unfriendly neighbours, and I tried to put in proper perspective the task that we in the country, we in the Government, and the hon. members of this House as leaders of public opinion, have to undertake to meet that danger and to face that risk with confidence and with courage. I have nothing to add on this aspect to what I reported to the House some days back. That danger continues and all our preparations in the defence field have to take into consideration these dangers that we face.

17.31 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*] At the same time I would like to assure those hon. members who thought, in my view, not correctly that there is some complacency in our mind because of the internal situation in Pakistan or the present Sino-Soviet rift which has actually erupted into armed clashes, that we do take into consideration all these events because it will not be realistic to ignore what happens to our neighbours, but at the same time, there is not the slightest element of complacency on our part after having carefully studied and assessed the internal situation in Pakistan and also the present postures of the Chinese.

I would also like to add that, in a debate of this nature, it was quite natural for hon. members having different view points about international situation to give their own prescription as to what should be our attitude in this complex situation, and there was a wide spectrum of opinion, understandably. I am not trying to criticise; it is a hard reality that we face in Parliament—, there was a fairly wide spectrum of opinion about the assessment of the situation in the South-East Asian region in relation to China in the context of China's relations with its neighbours, China's relations with the super powers and also Pakistan's attitude to us and Pakistan's attitude to certain other countries. This, I think, is not the occasion where I need analyse these various differences of opinion and approach on the subject. A great deal has been said by me when I participated in the very fruitful discussion some days back, and much more has been said by the Minister of External Affairs when the foreign policy was being discussed. I would like to dispel if there is any feeling either in this hon. House or outside that there was any difference of opinion between me as Defence Minister and the Minister of External Affairs who is mainly responsible to this hon. House and Parliament for the conduct of our external affairs and external relations. It was only presentation; may be in slightly more precise terms of the implications that we have to face as a result of arms supplies from various sources to Pakistan. This aspect, obviously when the foreign affairs debate was on, did not come up in any specific form and when this matter was specifically raised during the two hour debate which the Speaker had permitted, specific issues were raised. Then I had to say something in more specific terms. I would like to assure my hon. friend opposite that there is no question of any one differing with me what to talk of stronger expressions that he used as if somebody actually questioned the correctness of the stand that I had taken. Whatever I said was the stand and is the stand of the Government and there is no question of any difference of opinion or difference of approach on that aspect. I want to make that position absolutely

[SHRI SWARAN SINGH]

clear because I also got this impression from certain comments that have appeared in the newspapers and it has been voiced by some hon. Members on the floor of this House. I would repeat ; what I said is Government's policy and is based on Government's assessment and our approach is what I stated on this question of supply of arms to Pakistan from various sources. I would like to reiterate that irrespective of the intentions of any supplying country who undertakes the supply of armaments and military hardware to Pakistan, we have to see the effect of that on Pakistan's attitude in their relationship with us. We are not concerned about the *bona fides* of the countries in the matter of their taking this decision to supply arms but if supplies of armaments and military hardware are made to Pakistan, whatever may be the supplying country, the effect is the same and the intentions of the supplyin country are not material at all. Ony that issue we have to be absolutel clear. What does this mean ? This means we have to take into consideration in assessing our capacity, to keep a good look at the various sources that make supplies to Pakistan. This was the key note of my speech I made the other day.

SHRI NATH PAI : If both of you agree, why should there be the clandestine explanation given the next day that what Sardar Swaran Singh said was not a shift in the Soviet Policy towards India but there is a shift in the policy to Pakistan. This explanation the National Herald, a daily appearing in Delhi has given and it originated from the external Affairs Ministry. This was following your courageous and forth right statement.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I do not think anything clandestine in that. If something was not correctly reported that was pointed out. I had put forward my formulation. There is no question of this being done in a clandestine manner. I would request Mr. Nath Rai to go through what I said, the original text. Mr. Nath Pai should know enough of me and he should also, I think, know that I which my words particularly on

such occassions and it will be good for him to go through my speech again and he will find that there is very little difference. There is no difference at all on any matter. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI RABI RAY (puri) : Between you and the External Affairs Ministry.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I am glad that you are seeing these differences. I would request you not always to look at these things with the view you like to look at these things. If you had looked at this difference of presentation and also of formulation in correct perspective with a view to understand the problem, I will appreciate it. But I am sorry sometimes when you indulge in this type of hairsplitting. It is done with some other object which I resent, namely, to create differences among the various members of the Treasury Benches That you should never do. There can always be some difference. Complicated matters are presented and formulated. I was not reading from eny script. One has to depend upon one's capacity to put forward in as best a language as possible the correct state of affairs. This should not be read as any difference between various spokesmen of the Government and it does not do any credit to us as country to highlight anything as a difference where no difference exists. It is not fair to the Treasury Benches. It is not fair to say that.

Hon Members from different sections fo the House expressed their anxiety about the need for adequate scrutiny of the texpenditure. There are ways of looking at it. For instance some hon. Members have put forward a brief summary of what Audit Report or Public Account Committee have put forward. They are entitled to do that. That is the functioning of the Audit and the Public Accounts Committee to highlight financial irregularites so that Government may benefit by the observations and take corrective measures to tighten up various financial contrlos and also it is quite helpful and it halps Government to have a look to several cor:ers which may remain dark and we do get great benefit out of them. I wel-

come that. But, to pick up certain paragraphs from the Audit Report or pick up certain recommendations from the Public Accounts Committee and to build the entire speech around them and to make them as central theme, I am afraid, is not doing justice to a department which has to handle very complicated problems, in respect of defence preparedness, in respect of equipments, acquisition of military hardware and also in respect of the manufacturing programme.

Vast financial outlays are involved and large number of contracts have to be entered into, some of them directly by us and others through the DGS & D and when several transactions are there in the ordnance factories or in the State Undertakings which are all engaged in manufacturing vital equipments for the defence forces they are bound to be certain matters which are financially irregular. There can be matters where there is scope for improvement, where there is scope for economy also. We have to benefit by all that.

I would like to assure the House that it is in that spirit that the officers in the Defence Ministry at all levels have regarded the various points that are mentioned in the Audit Report or by the P.A.C. It could not go unnoticed and one of the Hon. Members actually made a reference to it that it mentioned in the PAC report itself that various measures undertaken by the Ministry have resulted in a saving of over Rs. 52 crores. That is the figure given there. What is further suggested is that we should continue this process so that we could effect more economy. I would like to assure the Honourable House that this is precisely our approach to this problem and I do not want to go into specific points that have been pointed out in the PAC or Audit Reports. The House is fully aware of the very elaborate process that is set in motion after the Audit Paragraphs are published and after the PAC makes their recommendations. We want to take benefit out of that. I would not like to enter into a debate and try to put forward the Defence Ministry's point of view

with regard to those various points that might have been put across either in the Audit Reports or in the PAC Reports. We would like to derive the maximum benefit out of their scrutiny so that financial control might be tightened and we should be able to get the best return for the money we spend.

Besides this, there are certain specific things in this sphere of economy which I would like to mention.

As already reported by the Public Accounts Committee, economies to the extent of Rs. 52 crores had been achieved in 1967-68. During the year 1968-69, further economies were achieved to the extent of about Rs. 20 crores. These economies were achieved by adopting the following steps :—

- (i) Continuous review of establishments with a view to achieving economies without affecting efficiency. Here, the ceiling which we have imposed on the manpower to be employed by the Army, has been of help. 'Whenever new requirements arise, Army Headquarters have themselves been able to find the additional manpower by corresponding economies elsewhere.
- (ii) Periodical review of the scales of rations.
- (iii) Rationalisation of POL supplies and other stores.
- (iv) Rationalisation of issue of stores by Ordnance Depots.
- (v) Rationalisation of military farms.

These are continuous processes. Apart from the standing arrangements which we have within the Ministry, we also identify from time to time important sectors for detailed examination and here we take the advice and assistance from specialist consultants. For instance, we have recently decided to set up a Study Group to study the scale of spares, provisioning and repair of equipment and stores for the Army. A

[SHRI SWARAN SINGH]

consultant in Materials Management will work with this technical group under the overall direction of a high-level team in the Ministry. With a view to achieve economies and improve efficiency, we have also recently decided that the provisioning responsibility for the spares for aircraft and aero-engines which are manufactured in HAL, would be transferred to HAL. We thought that if HAL is entrusted with the responsibility of procurement, we would get better results and economy. To make sure that this arrangement would work satisfactorily, a detailed Study is being undertaken by HAL with the help of a team of consultants from the Inian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad. These are illustrations of the measures which we adopted with a view not only achieve economies but also improve efficiency.

I wish to emphasize this aspect of economy in Defence expenditure, which has a wider content. To me, economy in expenditure connotes greater security for a given investment. That was the key-note of my colleague, Shrimati Sharda Mukerjee also. Defence management is becoming increasingly a technical problem. Before major equipment can now be introduced, they have to be preceded by detailed studies of systems and cost effectiveness. These concepts have been practised successfully in the United States, but it would be wrong to assume that they would find a ready application to our situation. The dimensions of our Defence problems are different. The techniques have to be developed by us and these have been done for some years in the existing organisations. The Directorate of Scientific Evaluation in the Defence R & D Organisation has evolved some of these techniques and produced useful studies. With a view to enlarge the effort in this direction, we have decided to commence schemes of training systems analysis. The first batch of officers would be trained in Services Headquarters, Ministry of Defence, Ministry of Finance, etc. commencing from October 1969. After their training, they would be absorbed in responsible positions in services headquarters where the training would

be put to use. This is an illustration of the technique and methods we are adopting, and I am sure that by pursuing these means in a relentless manner, significant economies would be achieved.

To illustrate this, I would like to allude to the teeth-to-tail ratio which was given by one hon. Member, I think Shri Ranjit Singh. I do not know whereform he got it; unfortunately, he is not present here.

SHRI S. K. TAPURIAH (Pali) : Then do not mention it.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : He gave a ratio which is extremely incorrect.

AN HON. MEMBER : What is the figure ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : The fact is, than as a result of these various measures, that is, reducing the tail and improving the teeth, increasing the fire power and effectiveness, we have over the years successfully improved our teeth-to-tail ratio. Whereas it was 48 to 52, it is the other way round now; it is 58 to 42.

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY (Nominated-Anglo Indians) : Last year. he said it was 62 to 38.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Now that a doubt has been raised, I will check up and give the correct figure in a moment.

The point is that as a result of the various measures we have taken, there has been a significant improvement in the teeth-to-tail ratio. That is the direction in which we must move. We have, as I indicated earlier, put a seiling on manpower particularly in that direction. Improvement in the teeth-to-tail ratio can be effected if we cut out the frills, the batmen, orderlies and followers who are not combatants. It is by improving this ratio that we can achieve better results. That is precisely the direction in which we are moving.

Shri Frank Anthony was correct.

SHRI S. K. TAPURIAH : Members on this side are always correct.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I wish I could give that compliment, because the figure quoted by Shri Ranjit Singh was completely off the mark.

SHRI S. K. TAPURIAH : He does not know himself. It is his job to remember that.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : My young friend does not know that I am not on a memory test. I think he oversimplifies, which is a sign of immaturity.

In the last five years by reducing services and other frills, we have improved the teeth-to-tail ratio from 58 to 42 to 62 to 38. This is the correct figure—I am glad Shri Anthony reminded me about it,

But figures apart, this is precisely the direction in which we are moving, both by taking steps to improve the teeth-to-tail ratio and also by trying to see that we effect economies where they can be effected.

One hon. member opposite—I think it was Shri Fernandes—quoted hesitatingly from some book. He was saying that it had become a custom in the country for many people when they leave active life, whether it is service in the army or in civil or may be active politics, to suddenly become very wise and with great pleasure write about various matters. At the same time, he wanted to rely upon what was written in this way by someone. He was quoting from that very book which he sought to castigate. It is very difficult for me to deal with that kind of argument, when you do not rely upon the veracity or correctness of a particular thing and still you want to quote from it in order to prove a point against the administration. It is not quite easy to deal with that kind of thing.

श्री जार्ज फरनेंडीज : आज भी यही लोग आपकी नीतियों को बनाते हैं, इस बात का आप रुजाल रबिए ।

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : You are not aware of how policies are formulated; none of the civilians are concerned in the

formulation of policies: it is this House which ultimately decides policies and guides in its formulation.

श्री जार्ज फरनेंडीज : सदन को आपकी पलटन की संख्या भी मालूम नहीं है। सदन कैसे नीतियां बना सकता है ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I know that such interruptions do distract us but I have this advantage that these things do not side track me. Notwithstanding all the fire with which he wraps them, even his own arguments sometimes help in the formulation of policies. Why is he under-estimating his own capacity when I say that it is this august House where policies are shaped and formulated. I do not know why he is not prepared to take even that credit; sometimes he becomes a prisoner of his own slogans. He could not see clearly what is the direction in which I am trying to put forward a particular point of view.

These are matters which have been raised by several authors, after retirement. Every citizen has got the right in a free society to put across his own point; we do not grudge it. Whether it is an ex-civilian or ex-army man if he is of a particular view he is entitled to place it before the country. That also gives us an opportunity to put forward our point of view.

I should briefly refer to what has been mentioned by some hon. Members under the heading 'defence plan'. This expression has to be understood in a context different from our economic development plans, I agree. When we talk of development plan we make distinction between revenue expenditure and the actual expenditure. That is the broad division that we indicate when we put forward our economic development plan before the country. But the defence plan in a sense can be described as a sort of a rough estimate or budget for five years. Still there are definite directions in which we have to proceed.....(Interruptions) in our concept of planning on the economic side we have made a distinction of continuing responsibility in running the apparatus as we have got it today. With

[SHRI SWARAN SINGH]

regard to economic development activity there is the distinction between revenue expenditure and plan expenditure. On the side of defence we have the defence plan, the defence expenditure. One has to keep this distinction in view because when compared to the total of the economic plan expenditure the impressions that we shall get in our minds will not be correct.

What does our defence plan contemplate? What are our proposals? In formulating the plan for 1969-74 we have kept in view the changes that have taken place in the threat posed to the security of the country, the preparations our enemies are known to have made to build up their defence and the developments in the field of military technology. We have also taken in to account the changes in strategic requirements and tactical concepts and the progress achieved so far in the re-equipments of the armed forces.

18 hrs.

The salient features of the defence plan, 1969-1974 are as follows. The manpower for the army will be maintained at the existing sanctioned strength but increased efficiency will be secured by improving further the teeth-to-tail ratio and by equipment of the army with modern weapons and equipment which, to a very substantial extent, has already been achieved. In relation to the Navy, the objective is that the naval force would be considerably strengthened during this period and will be capable of discharging the task simultaneously on both the sea-boards. Development of base facilities on both the sea-boards to give flexibility in the deployment and maintenance of the naval fleet. In this category, where are various naval facilities that are being built on the eastern coast and also in certain islands.

With relation to Air Force, the continuation of the process of modernisation of the Air Force by phasing out of the older aircraft and augmentation of radar cover for air defence purposes to provide adequate coverage both at high and low levels, will be proceeded with. On the production side, there will be augmentation and modernisation of production fac-

ilities under the Department of Defence Production for weapons, equipment and ammunition. Establishment of new manufacturing facilities for specialised electronic equipment arising out of radar plan, aircraft accessories and other sophisticated equipment to achieve full value for the resources utilised, studies in systems analysis and cost effectiveness would be undertaken and programmes organised for the training of civilian and service personnel in these fields.

The major objective of this plan are that by the end of 1973-74, there would be increasing reliance on indigenous sources of supply for the main equipment and there would be almost complete self-sufficiency in maintenance of the equipment with the services with our own resources. This point had been mentioned by some hon. Members—about the maintenance facilities for some of our equipment.

An important new feature of defence plan is that it is a five-year blue print drawn from a long-term forecast spread over 10 years. Further, it has been decided that this would not be static plan, the requirements of the three services would be reviewed and updated every year, adjusted as necessary by the assessments that at any given point of time a ten-year forecast and five-year firm plan are available to the services. This is a slight difference.

श्री महाराज सिंह भारती (मेरठ)।

जो सवाल नाथ पाई साहब ने उठाया था, उसका जवाब दीजिये। इम्पोर्ट रेशो का प्रपोर्शन घटाने के बजाय बढ़ता चला जा रहा है।

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I have not yet finished my speech. Why is he so impatient? There is full recognition now that the planning process is basically a technical problem. At the military planning level, the tactics associated with military plans are studied for their effect on defence material requirements. The planning factors associated with one particular operational environment do not necessarily

apply to any other. The particular effects of the environment are studied to develop meaningful requirements and also to explore ways and means of securing these requirements by developing more efficient and effective tactics. Choices among competing weapon systems are made by quantitative assessments of the cost and effectiveness of these systems in that particular operational environment.

For this purpose, the Planning Organisation in the Defence Ministry is being strengthened. The Systems Analysis Group would be set up in the service headquarters and integrated with the planning systems in the Defence Ministry. Arrangements are being made for specialised training of the analysis in the services and in the Defence Ministry.

In this, we are trying to give very briefly the main objectives of the plan and the main direction that we have set for ourselves, I would reiterate that unlike other economic development, our defence plan and our defence requirements can vary from year to year and it is for this reason that we have adopted this technique of having every year a five-year plan for assessing our five-year requirements and also a 10 year perspective so that we have before us a clear picture of the direction in which we are proceeding.

I shall now try to touch upon some of the points that have been mentioned by hon. Members.

Shri Frank Anthony, whose speech I heard with great attention, has been, I think, supplied wrong facts, when he said that one Lieutenant Colonel Hayde was not decorated.

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY : For Dograi, I said.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : He was decorated for the 1965 conflict.

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY : On 6th September and not for Dograi. He got it for 6th September, he did not get anything for Dograi.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : When actual decoration was given for the 1965 conflict, he sought to create an impression on that occasion that whereas somebody has been decorated the man who actually commanded the regiment was ignored. That is not correct. He was decorated for 1965 conflict—for particular battle field is not relevant at all. It is surprising that an hon. Member of his experience should have picked up that point.

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY : But you are wrong and I am right.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : One or two points were mentioned by Major Ranjit Singh ; He is also not here. About INS Mysore he made a statement. I do not know where from he got the information. I got the impression that he was himself not present. I do not know who reported it to him. He said the gun did not fire for some time because there was something wrong with the gun. That is absolutely incorrect. Some exercises were going on and when the ship was about to fire there was a helicopter approaching and the fire was stopped. To say that there was something wrong with the gun is absolutely incorrect. These are small matters which should not be raised. If these are the matters which worry any hon. Member the best thing for him is to mention it to me so that, at any rate, the facts can be corrected. I can understand broad matters of policy being brought here, but on facts if there is any doubt in the minds of hon. Members the best thing is for them to check up facts from me and if they are not satisfied with facts they can raise it on the floor of the House. There was no point in raising that here. He tripped badly on that and also on the figure he gave about the number of tanks manufactured in our factory. The figure he gave is incorrect. We had revised it upward the target of production for Avadi Factory. Therefore, the impression that he gave about shortfall in production was unjustified.

SHRI S. K. TAPURIAH ; If the Major was wrong, what are the correct figures ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : The young man who has changed his sleeping suit today appears to be very very impatient. Why are hon. Members so anxious about various figures and the like (*Interruption*).

This matter has been mentioned by many hon. Members that we have on this occasion given more information in our annual report than is normally done. We have gone up to the maximum limit. You should appreciate the necessity of not giving information which can be of strategic value to those who are very much interested in getting authentic information.

AN HON. MEMBER : We get more information from them.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : If the hon. Members think that what appears in the journals or what appears in newspapers or what appears in the so called strategic studies is authentic, then all that I can say is that I have sympathy with them. But that information is not correct. Therefore, merely because somebody gives a rough estimate that does not mean I should rush at once and try to correct that figure. When something is not precisely known and someone indulges in mere kite flying and just says a particular figure a duty is not cast upon me to prove that what he says is incorrect. This is a very strange way of conducting the affairs of the country. I cannot accept the proposition that merely because in some newspaper, in some commentary, in some strategic studies or non-strategic studies, somebody says that I have got so many planes of this variety, or so many guns, or so many ships, or such and such strength, that a duty is cast upon me to get up here solemnly and to give all the detailed information which the neighbouring countries are yearning to get from us from time to time. So, let us realise the importance of this. When this point is urged here again and again, I would like to say very emphatically that on any point on which information can be of use to those who are anxious to get that information, and particularly to countries which want to know everything in every detail about us, any information which is of

value to them will not be supplied because it is not in the interest of our country; let us understand that position quite clearly. Within that, we are trying to give as much information as possible.

I would also like to confess very frankly before you, Mr. Speaker, that by withholding this information I am at a somewhat disadvantageous position, and I say this deliberately. Because, sometimes hon. Members, reading from newspapers or other reports, say that Pakistan has got so many things, they have got so many new tanks, so many aircrafts and so on that naturally a feeling is created in the country as if we have not got the matching equipment to face that threat. So, if you look at it purely from a public relations angle and purely from my own self, it is easier for me to disclose the figures, because they would tell in a telling manner the strength we have got. In spite of this, I am not giving the information because I feel that it is not in the interest of our country, it is not in the interest of our security to give these figures. But as I have said on a number of occasions, there are several spheres in which we would shed this complex of comparing our strength, either in the air or in the army, with Pakistan. I say so in all earnestness. Because, this is no longer the problem. The problem of defence that this country faced before 1962 or 1961 is not the problem that we face today, particularly after the Chinese hostility. We have to view this in this context. Even those who talk of balance, a theory which we have never accepted, they never say that we should be at par with Pakistan. There may be difference of opinion in their assessment about the ratio of our strength, but even those who are preaching to us this doctrine of balance, they always concede that our problem is greater, our problem is more and, therefore, there is no question of parity with Pakistan. In this background, if some hon. Members remain haunted with what Pakistan is doing, or what Pakistan is not doing, we cannot help them, but it is not proper that we should compare ourselves with them. Because, if we do that, we are not doing our duty to the country, because we have to view our strength in the context of the threat

that we face. So, I would appeal to the hon. Members that it is only that information which I feel should not be passed on to our neighbouring countries, only that information I do not give, and this is the policy which I intend to pursue.

Some hon. Members have said that other countries like United States or Soviet Union have lately started giving a lot of information about their might. I know that. I have a feeling that for some years past both the super-powers feel that they have become so strong that the world or at any rate the other side, should know how strong they are. That is a studied policy that they are pursuing. For instance, some of the visitors who have gone to the United States have been told the exact number of aircraft—15,823 or whatever is the figure—right to the last digit. The super-powers are doing it because they know that each side has more to over-kill the other. That is the formula that they are now applying. So, in a sort of studied manner they are trying to give information which should be passed on to the other side. Already, the dialogue has started about the fatal capacity of this type of missile or that type of missile. How a missile can be intercepted and how it is not possible to intercept because they have advanced so much that they can afford to do that. But situated as we are and with the situation that we face on our borders with two unfriendly neighbours—we have unfrindliness not of our making but it is a fact of history—and notwithstanding all our efforts to improve relations, we have drawn blank, and their hostility continues in this context, we have to be very careful in preserving the information which in the best interest of the security of the country should not be passed on in an authentic manner to the other side. The guesses may be made. Let another guess may be added to the numerous guesses that may be made. It is one thing to make a guess to say in a strategic paper study, but quite another thing for a responsible spokesman of the Government to say as to how many MIGs we have got, how many tanks we have got, how many various other things we have got.

SHRI NATH PAI : For example, you say in your Report that you are going to have 45 Squadrons, It is helping the cause of the enemy ? Who is asking you to give such information which may help the cause of the enemy ? You are misleading the House.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I have understood your point, Let me reply to it.

SHRI NATH PAI : You are afraid of giving an argument. Merely being secretive is different from giving secrets of the country. You need not give secrets of the country. For example, you have given the number of Squadrons, that you are going to have 45 Squadrons. Is it informing Pakistan ? Why did he tell us then? Just now, in replying to Mr. George Fernandes, he said, "All policies are made in this House, I want to take you in confidence," What we point out is that it has been our experience that this Parliament is treated with contempt by the Defence Ministry—not only he but his predecessor also. We do not know what we have. We have, therefore, to depend on all these kinds of journals published abroad. Our potential enemy knows what we have ; the Chinese know it ; the Pakistanis know it : the Americans know it and the Russians know it. The only people who do not know is the Parliament and the people of India.

This is our conflict. I do not want you to divulge secrets of the country. But intelligent estimates can be placed before the Parliament so that either we quarrel with you or support you on the basis of intelligent information. There is not an iota of information. There is a difference between being secretive and maintaining secrets. My objection is to the first.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I do not see how secrets can be kept without being secretive. I do not understand his argument either. He says that I have already given some information from which some intelligent guesses can be made. This is the concluding part of his observation. He says, "You give some information from which we can form some intelligent concept of it." I have,

[Shri Swarad Singh]

with that object in view, given some information. If I have given information, then the complaint is, "You have given this information from which some guess can be made. Why not give more information?", I do not accept that at all because we cannot compare, I repeat, ourselves with those highly advanced countries who do not face the type of problem that we have, who are well-organised in the matter of equipment, who are strong and who can afford to give information or divulge information. Sometimes, even they leak out information. But we cannot do that. It is wrong to say that other countries know it. It is interesting how does anybody here know that others know it.

SHRI NATH PAI : They publish it in the journals. Do you read them ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : It is something really contradictory in terms. I have tried to give in the Report as much information as possible about the Squadron strength. Some people said I have not given the numbers. I have given some numbers. I have also said that this number is the ceiling...

SHRI NATH PAI : We know it is not an exact number. It is a good estimate.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : This is the maximum that can be given. It is no use repeating the same argument over and over again. This thing was raised on two earlier occasions and I gave the reply. I am sorry, I cannot go beyond this.

Now, some points have been raised by my hon. friend, Shri Kunte, about the location of the Naval Armament Depot in Bombay. I have checked up. There is no security risk involved. He said that there was a quarry which was being worked there. It is not within the security area and I would like to assure him that there is no element of risk involved.

He raised another point about requisition of lands. That is a matter which we are examining very carefully. Regarding lands which have been under requisition for a long time, we are very carefully

examining and we are either de-requisitioning or paying adequate Compensation. In fact, there was a big backlog in this respect and from last year there is an annual provision of Rs. 5 crores which is utilised for acquiring lands which have been under requisition for a long time. And I think that this matter which has been hanging fire for a long time will be sorted out before long and we will either pay compensation or de-requisition and release the lands.

I know that within this short time—I have already taken about 45 minutes—it will not be possible for me to go into all the points. But I would like to assure the hon. House that the specific points that have been raised by hon. members will be gone into. Last year, I sent into many hon. members replies to the specific points that they had raised—I sent some letters to them. This year also I will do the same. Within this short time, if there are one or two points. I would like to touch upon them.

My esteemed friend, Shri G. S. Dhillon, made a special reference to the border situation in Amritsar district. We have constructed certain canals there, and all the bridges that were there in the original Plan have been completed. If there are any special difficulties that are being experienced by the residents of that locality in getting access to their fields for the purpose of cultivation, we will look into that aspect and we would try to remove those difficulties.

There is one point which has been mentioned by many hon. members, i. e., about I. N. A. personnel. I would like to take this opportunity to say that, consequent upon the statement that I had made that we would give them the emoluments for the period that they had remained in custody, we had invited applications, and we have already received applications from about 80 per cent of the I. N. A. personnel. Payments have also been made to a very large number of them and we are trying to expedite the payment in other cases also. I hope that will get all the dues to which they are entitled in accordance with the statement that I had made on the floor of the House.

Concern has been expressed about welfare of ex-servicemen. This is a matter which has been causing a great deal of worry to us also. In this respect, a great deal can be done by the co-operation from the State Governments and also from the industry. It is precisely in that direction that we are taking some concrete steps. I have already written to the State Governments and we are also in touch with the industry. We have addressed the Ministers concerned who are in charge of State undertakings at the Centre and in the States, and a fairly large number of persons have been employed. I cannot say that all of them have been employed, particularly the ECOs, about whom a special mention had been made, but it is a fact that a very large number of them have been employed.

About the general problem of ex-servicemen, the institution of district boards which reaches the remotest part of the country can do a great deal of service by strengthening that organisation, by manning it with persons of sufficient seniority, a place or forum can be provided where the grievances can be heard and they can be taken up with the administration. This is precisely the decision that was taken in the last meeting of the Board. The State Governments have agreed that they will upgrade the post of Secretary and they will appoint senior officers. They have got some difficulties about the existing incumbents, but I am sure that they will take some steps in that direction. Some non-official effort has also been undertaken and one hon. Member made a reference to this. We attach importance to all efforts whether they are official or non-official and if an integrated and concerted effort is continued to be made and the hon. Members also help us in this direction in the various States and in the various areas, a great deal can be achieved in that direction.

Two matters had been specially mentioned by more than one hon. Member. One was that a Commission should be appointed to look into the entire defence set up. This matter had been raised last year also at the time of the Budget debate and may be year before last year budget discussion also. I have given careful con-

sideration to this aspect and I do not see what purpose will be served and what will be the scope of functioning and what will be the object and advantage. In so far as general organization of the Armed Forces is concerned, it is on a well-set pattern. On the production side we have got the Defence Production Board and several other organizations which integrate the activities of these various organs. In the absence of any precise thinking, just to embark upon a sort of vague essay of that type and that Commission will go into something and the nature of and scope of it is not known, one does not know what to do. I cannot agree to the setting up of a Commission.

श्री सु. कु. तापड़िया : अगर हम डिटेल्स दें तो क्या आप कंसिडर करेंगे ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I cannot answer hypothetical questions. That is the elementary parliamentary practice. I do not see what purpose can be served by the type of Commission when one does not see any particular direction in which one wants to move. Generally we are accused that we resort to the system of commissions when we are hesitant to take a particular decision and somebody has said that constitution of a Commission is really postponement of a decision. I do not want to be accused.

श्री रवि राय : जब जरूरत होती है तब नहीं करते हैं, लेकिन जब जरूरत नहीं होती है तब कर देते हैं ।

श्री स्वर्ण सिंह : There should be a function.

जहाँ जरूरत हो वहाँ करना चाहिये और जहाँ जरूरत न हो वहाँ नहीं करना चाहिये ।

I feel that in this particular field there is no need of a commission.

Another suggestion has been made that a Committee of Members of Parliament can be appointed. The members of Parliament are supreme when they function

in this House. I greatly value their suggestions, but to function in a Committee and to institutionalise This. I do not see any advantage. I am always prepared to discuss with the hon. Members any point that might suggest to them, but to constitute a formal committee of Members of Parliament to go into the entire defence set up I do not think, is either justified or called for. This is a function which is constantly being reviewed by the Government.

I would like to say that a great deal of co-ordination between the three Services is ensured almost from day to day. Some countries have got an overall Chief of Staff for all the Services. Some countries have put the three services in the same uniform and some countries have given comparable grades to various officers and various arms of the Armed Forces. But we have to tackle this problem according to our requirements and according to the situation that we face. We feel that the same objective is being achieved by a high-power meeting which takes place at least twice a week at which the three Ministers, Secretaries and the Chiefs of Staff come and all those matters which may be of importance are discussed there and decisions are taken. There cannot be better coordination than functional coordination on day to day basis in a manner in which the 3 Service Chiefs and Secretaries to Government and Ministers meet and various matters are raised and decisions are taken. Somebody said that if anybody has appointed a coordination committee then you should carefully examine and see it ; there might be total lack of coordination so that there was the necessity of appointing a coordination committee like that. These committees do not solve all problems. But I may say that the day to day Coordination has been achieved in a very effective manner in the Defence Ministry.

Unlike many other Ministries here the problems are such that the Defence Minister, senior officers and also Service Chiefs have to sit together and review the situation and take decisions both of policy as well as on concrete matters and this coordination is achieved. At the Service-

level the Chiefs of the Services concerned go into the various aspects of these matters.

Certain other points, political as well as foreign affairs, have been introduced in the Debate. Some Members referred to South-East Asia and the Indian Ocean.

SHRI NATH PAI : You have not answered one major point either from your side or from our side. It is very disappointing. We expected better replies from you. We expected more forthright replies from you. You are beating about the bush all the time.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I am most straightward and if a person has a closed mind I cannot convince him.

SHRI NATH PAI : If you are convinced yourself, it is all right.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I will not say I am not convinced. It is very unfair that I should be expected to reply to each Member separately. That is not the way of doing it.

A large number of hon. Members have spoken. I have tried to group these observations under various heads, under Production, under Navy, under Army, Air Force and all that. And, I have tried to reply to all those major points. But, if reply means that I should accept whatever they say, I am sorry, I have to disappoint them.

SHRI NATH PAI : No, never.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : These were the main points which have been raised and I have attempted to reply to them.

श्री रवि राय : वीरेन राय के बारे में आप ने कुछ नहीं कहा ।

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I am not suppose to comment...*(Interruptions)*

I am not supposed to comment upon the statement made by another hon. Member in a foreign country. It is really amazing that I am called upon

to explain it. One of the points raised was that we are influenced by some extraneous considerations in the matter of selection of the Chiefs of our Armed Forces. I would like to contradict that with all the emphasis at my command. The two Service Chiefs retiring, both of them, General Kumaramangalam and Air Chief Marshal Arjan Singh, have done remarkable job. They have distinguished themselves in every manner and we are all proud, and the country is proud of them. We have, after careful consideration, after taking everything into consideration, announced the names of their successors and in doing this, we have not been influenced by any extraneous considerations from any source whatsoever. This is a decision which has been taken purely on merits. Therefore, I would like to repel any such impressions on the part of hon. Members with all the emphasis at my command.

Sir, I know. I cannot convince them on all the points. I would agree to differ them.

MR. SPEAKER : There are a number of Cut Motions.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : He has not touched upon one thing. There are so many hundred people outside ; he has not touched on that point.

MR. SPEAKER : Which Cut Motion Shall I put Mr. Banerjee's Cut Motion separately to vote ?

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Every Minister will reply to those points. The Minister of Defence Production has not answered. The hon. Defence Minister today has not answered it.

MR. SPEAKER : Now I will put all the Cut Motions before the House.

All The Cut Motions were put and negatived.

MR. SPEAKER : Now I will put Demands Nos. 1 to 5 and 103 relating to the Ministry of Defence for the vote of the House. The question is :

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts shown in the

fourth column of the order paper, be granted to the President, to Complete the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1970, in respect of the heads of demands entered in the second column thereof against Demands Nos. 1 to 5 and 103 relating to the Ministry of Defence".

The Motion was adopted.

[The Motions of Demands for grants which were adopted by the Lok Sabha, are reproduced below—Ed.]

DEMAND NO. 1—MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,47,58,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1970, in respect of 'Ministry of Defence'."

DEMAND NO. 2—DEFENCE SERVICES, EFFECTIVE—ARMY

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 6,45,45,54,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1970, in respect of 'Defence Services, Effective—Army'."

DEMAND NO. 3—DEFENCE SERVICES, EFFECTIVE—NAVY.

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 39,09,79,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1970, in respect of 'Defence Services, Effective—Navy'."

DEMAND NO. 4—DEFENCE SERVICES, EFFECTIVE—AIR FORCE

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,64,76,33,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray

[MR. SPEAKER]

the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1970, in respect of 'Defence Services, Effective—Air Force'."

DEMAND NO. 5—DEFENCE SERVICES, NON-EFFECTIVE.

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 27,33,33,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1970, in respect of 'Defence Services, Non-Effective'."

DEMAND NO. 103—DEFENCE CAPITAL OUTLAY

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,09,18,33,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1970, in respect of 'Defence Capital Outlay'."

The Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation.

MR. SPEAKER : Now we will take up discussion and voting of Demand Nos. 68 to 72 and 125 relating to the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation for which four hours have been allotted.

Hon. Members present in the House who are desirous of moving their cut motions may send slips to the Table before 7 P. M. indicating the serial numbers of the cut motions they would like to move. They will be treated as moved if they are otherwise admissible.

DEMAND NO. 68—MINISTRY OF LABOUR, EMPLOYMENT AND REHABILITATION

MR. SPEAKER : *Motion moved:*

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 70,60,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come

in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1970 in respect of Ministry of Labour Employment and Rehabilitation'."

DEMAND NO. 69—DIRECTOR GENERAL, MINES SAFETY

MR. SPEAKER : *Motion moved :*

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 48,57,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1970 in respect of Director General Mines Safety'."

DEMAND NO. 70—LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT

MR. SPEAKER : *Motion moved :*

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 13,70,32,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March 1970 in respect of Labour and employment'."

DEMAND NO. 71—EXPENDITURE ON DISPLACED PERSONS

MR. SPEAKER : *Motion moved :*

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 15,53,38,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March 1970 in respect of 'Expenditure on Displaced Persons'."

DEMAND NO. 72 — OTHER REVENUE EXPENDITURE OF THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR, EMPLOYMENT AND REHABILITATION

MR. SPEAKER : *Motion moved :*