

संविधान में जो आश्वासन दिये हैं उन को कार्यान्वित करने का प्रयत्न करें। प्रश्न समय पा गया है कि प्रायः कुछ ठोस कदम उठाये। केवल शब्दों में काम नहीं चल सकता। Fine words do not butter parsnips. प्रायः वे शब्दाडम्बर में हमारा कोई फायदा नहीं हो सकता।

मारी गलिस्तां पढ़ गये मतलब न
पाया बाग का

घोर अधिक समय न लेते हुये मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार इस प्रस्ताव को स्वीकार कर ले।

Shri Nanda: I have to say that I accept the last suggestion of the hon. Member about the working groups making a continuous study. I hope with that assurance he will withdraw it.

श्री म० सा० डिबेदी : यह ख्याल करते हुये कि प्रायः एक कमीटि नाम करने जा रहे हैं और एक वर्किंग ग्रुप बिठाना चाहते हैं, मैं अपने प्रस्ताव को वापस लेने की धन्यमति चाहता हूँ, लेकिन यह ख्याल रहे कि तृतीय योजना में इन चीजों का उल्लंघन न हो।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : जिन माननीय सदस्यों ने संशोधन दिये हैं क्या वे भी वापस लेते हैं। क्या हाउस की आज्ञा है कि वह संशोधन घोर यह प्रस्ताव वापस लिया जाय ?

कुछ माननीय सदस्य : जी हाँ।

The amendments were, by leave, withdrawn.

The Resolution was, by leave, withdrawn.

18.03 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE: ESTABLISHMENT OF VARIOUS DEFENCE COUNCILS

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now Shri Patnaik might move his Resolution and speak for 20 minutes.

Shri U. C. Patnaik (Ganjam): I will require a little more time than that. I will not take even a minute more than what is necessary.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Twenty minutes should be enough.

Shri U. C. Patnaik: I am prepared to cut short the whole debate.

I beg to move that—

"This House is of opinion that Army, Navy, Air Force and Production Councils be established together with an over-all Defence Council to co-ordinate and control their activities."

With China occupying portions of our territory and taking advantage of our military weakness here and there and with Pakistan sabre-rattling with American aid, I submit that the defence of this country is the most important problem today. The defence of the country requires a very strong organisation, well-equipped and prepared for any contingency in defending our frontiers. In this view of the matter I request this House, the hon. Prime Minister as well as the hon. Minister of Defence to take a very impersonal view of the proposal that I am making. I too forget, on my part, that X is the Defence Minister or A, B and C are the Service Chiefs.

I beg to propose that our system itself be changed to suit modern requirements, to improve the efficiency of the defence organisation, to make us equipped for defence and to support our hon. Prime Minister's foreign policy through a strong defence organisation. That is all that I want. I have here absolutely nothing to discuss on party lines. This discussion, I appeal, must cut across all party lines and we and the Government must take a very impersonal view of this proposal to see that we have the best system possible, that we have a fool-proof system where there will be the maximum efficiency and the maximum economy and that there will be no loophole for weaknesses, for frustration, for corruption and so on.

[Shri U. C. Patnaik]

Therefore, I beg to move this resolution, and I do so with reading a part of the speech of the Prime Minister on the 25th March, 1955 when the Commanders-in-Chief were re-designated as Chiefs of Staff. The Prime Minister assured the House that the Council system would be ultimately introduced in India. I am reading from his speech. This is what he said:

"In some countries where they have got these Commanders-in-Chief in this manner—in fact in most democratic countries—they have some kind of Defence Councils; in England, for instance, there is the Army Council, the Air Council and the Admiralty, which perform the functions of the Commanders-in-Chief. No doubt, it may be desirable for us also to form these Councils. We shall look into this matter. We cannot, of course, produce a Council suddenly. A Council represents a great deal of experience and accumulated knowledge on the part of our senior officers. But we are going into this matter and hope gradually to develop these Councils for each of these services."

This is what the Prime Minister assured the House five years ago, and I believe that five long years have been adequate to give our senior officers the necessary training to man these Councils.

Then, Sir, I come to Dr. Katju who within a few months succeeded the Prime Minister, and for reasons best known to him, or according to the brief that he got from the Defence Ministry, in reply to a Starred Question from the hon. Member, Shri M. R. Krishna, on the 7th September, 1955, stated that we have a Defence Minister's Committee and a Committee for each of the three Services, which were replicas of the Council system in other countries. He said that Government would activate these Com-

mittees for the present, see how they work, and then if there is any lacuna, he assured the House that Government will have the Councils.

That was about six months after the Prime Minister's assurance to the House. Then nothing happened.

The Estimates Committee went into the matter, and in one of the best reports of the Estimates Committee, the Twenty-sixth Report on the Ministry of Defence, they pointed out the lacunae in the present system. They pointed out that our Committee system is not the same as the Council system in U.K. and they suggested that our Government should try to study the system prevailing in other countries, particularly U.K., U.S.A. and other countries, and adopt the same, or place before Parliament a legislation for changing our present system. The Estimates Committee stated that while bringing in such a resolution, Government must prepare a memorandum showing what is the state of affairs in other countries, what is the advantage or disadvantage of the respective systems and bring a legislation for statutory reorganisation of the Defence Services. That was placed on the Table of the House in July, 1958, about three years ago. In spite of that, our Defence Ministry seems to be particular that there should be no councils of the kind in India. They seem to hold the view that the present committees, the Defence Minister's committee and the three service committees, are adequate for the purpose, that they are more or less replicas of the council system of the U.K., and therefore there is no need to go in for any change.

Before I give details of our system and their system, let me make a sort of comparison of their system with ours. Our Lok Sabha Secretariat has produced another nice book, "Defence Matters in the British Parliament". It is a very interesting book, and, in spite of the great expert and specialised knowledge possessed by our

Defence Minister and his colleagues, I would request them to go through the book produced by our Research Department, which shows the position in U.K., how they treat Parliament, how they bring everything before Parliament and so on.

In that book, they have given a sort of picture of the U.K. organisation. First, they have the Defence Committee at the top. Then you have the Minister of Defence. He has two organisations under him. One is the Defence Board, and the other a newly created organisation, the Chief of Defence Staff Committee presided over by the Chief of Defence Staff. The Defence Board has the Defence Minister himself as Chairman, and the members are the three Service Ministers, the Minister of Supply, Chief of the Defence Staff, the Permanent Secretary of Defence, the three Chiefs of Staff and the Chief Defence Scientist. This is the constitution of the Defence Board. The post of Chief of Defence Staff was created in 1958. Air Marshal Dixon was the first Chief of Defence Staff, and now it is Lord Mountbatten. He has got the Defence Board. Under this organisation, there are four other organisations. One is the Supply Department under the Minister of Supplies, the others are the service organisations—the Army Council, Admiralty and Air Council, presided over by the three Service Ministers, corresponding to our Deputy Ministers. In these Service Councils the members are: chief of the particular service.—Chief of the Army Staff, First Lord of the Admiralty or Air Marshal as the case may be—the Deputy Chief of Staff and the principal staff officers of the respective services, the Parliamentary Under-Secretary, the Permanent Secretary and the Accounting Officer. The Principal Staff Officers are the Chief of General Staff, Adjutant-General, Quartermaster General, MGO, Engineer-in-Chief and the Military Secretary. These military specialists are in the council, each one of them specialising in some particular subject, each one of them res-

ponsible for some particular subject, and they have their place in the council statutorily, that is according to law. Not only the Chief of Staff, but all the Principal Staff Officers are members of the Army, Navy or Air Council. On the civilian side, you have the Secretary for that particular department or Ministry, and you have got the accounts officer for that department or Ministry. These all sit together with the service Minister, corresponding to our Deputy Ministers here, in the chair. Under the overall direction and control of Government, and according to the overall directives of Government, this service committee is for all practical purposes the government for that particular branch. It is responsible for training it is responsible for organisation; it is responsible for discipline, and it is responsible for that entire service. So, in the English system, with a Service Minister, corresponding to our Deputy Minister in the chair, you have got all these people there with the statutory power of arriving at decisions.

In our system, we have got, no doubt, as I said earlier, the Defence Minister's committee, of which the Defence Minister is the chairman, and the two Deputy Defence Ministers are members, and the three service chiefs are members, and the Defence Secretary and the Financial Adviser are also members.

18.16 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

They are the members of the Defence Minister's committee.

Then, there is another committee—called the three services committees, one of them relates to the Army, another relates to the Navy, and the third one relates to the Air Force. Here also, it is the Defence Minister himself, and not his Deputy, who is the chairman of all these three committees. There, he is the chairman of the Defence Ministers' committee; here also, he is the chairman of the three services committees. And who

[Shri U. C. Patnaik]

are the members of these service committees? They are the chief of the concerned service, the Defence, Secretary and the Financial Adviser, a very small group that sits together and does it.

Then, of course, there is the chairman of the Chiefs of Staff Committee; he is not the Defence Minister at present, you have the Air Marshal as the chairman; the other two chiefs are there.

But, then, one very important difference between their committee and our committee is that our committee is more or less an advisory committee with no statutory powers, where the PSO's, that is, the senior officers of the particular service have no statutory right to be present. That is to say, if it is an Army committee, if the Army chief wants two or three of his PSO's or he wants anybody other than the PSO's to come and help him and to brief him, then, according to military phraseology, that particular officer will be in attendance; he will be in attendance to advise his Chief of Staff who will represent the matter to the chairman or to the committee.

As you know, Sir, in an Armed Force, the Chief of Staff is not perfectly acquainted with all the different branches of activity. He is a specialist in only one branch. If he has been an infantry man, he does not have anything to do with the other services, whereas in U.K., each man who is in charge of a particular organisation, who is called the PSO is a specialist in that branch; he is responsible for that particular activity of the Army or the Navy or the Air Force as the case may be. The PSO is a very senior officer, or rather the seniormost officer. These PSO's are generally Lieutenant-Generals or Major-Generals; they are the right-hand men of the Chief of Staff. In U.K. they are there by a statutory right with equal powers, so that each PSO can say, well, my service requires

this, unless this is done, my service will not be able to face the Chinese aggression or the Pakistani aggression, these are the things which you are going to purchase, my service does not require these things, more important than all these things are these other things, and so on. That statutory right of each senior officer of the Armed Forces is a very important check on various things; it is a check on corruption; it is a check on inefficiency; it is a check on unpreparedness for war. In our country, we have not got it. We are told that our system is a replica of theirs. Our system is a replica of theirs in the sense that there are a few committees like they have with the Defence Minister in the chair with two or three Service Chiefs sitting with him, with his Financial Adviser by his side. That is all. Does the Defence Minister get the advice of half a dozen PSO's? Whatever the Chief of the Army in the Army Committee or the Chief of the Navy in the Navy Committee or the Chief of the Air Force Committee says, that is final because the Defence Minister with all his pomp and splendour is, after all, a non-technician, a layman like many of us. So he will not be able to put his foot down if the Army Chief or the Navy Chief or the Air Force Chief tells him that a certain thing is required.

For instance, when Pakistan threatened us across the border, what happened? We purchased Rs. 100 crores worth of Mysteres, Ouragons, Canberras, Hunter Hawks, a dozen varieties of fighters and bombers without having the necessary ammunition or bombs for use with them. That is what happened. Whenever there is a panic somebody says that we have to make Rs. 400 crores worth purchase of this or that. There will be a supplementary demand brought forward or it will be purchased by deferred payment system, the payment being made in three or four years. We will go in for things which are useless.

So from every point of view, what I suggest is necessary. It is not only necessary but absolutely essential. There is also another aspect to be considered. As I said in the beginning, let us forget that we have the hon. Shri Krishna Menon as the Defence Minister or that we have got General so and so as the Chief of the Army Staff. Let us take an objective view. There is one thing which I feel. When we analyse what happened in countries all round India where you do not have the Council system to check the military authority of the Chiefs of Staff, we can come to our conclusions. On the other hand, in U.K. and other countries, it does not happen like that. That is because at every level, you have got committees with Army specialists, Navy specialists and Air Force specialists on the one hand and accounts specialists and Secretariat specialists on the other with the Defence Minister, or a service Minister in U.K., in the chair. They arrive at decisions and generally one man does not become all powerful. Under our system, every soldier, every jawan, every rating, every airman, looks to the Chief of the Particular Staff for his promotion, conditions of service and everything else. He is all in all as far as our system is concerned, whereas there the Council is there. So he will look to the Council and not to an individual officer at the top. That is why in those countries where you have the Committee system or Council system, you do not have these Army coups or other coups which are happening all round us. This is another aspect from which the question should be viewed.

Then there is another factor. In those countries where you have the Council system, all the senior officers are there. It conduces to less corruption, because nobody will say, 'I will go and purchase Rs. 100 crores worth of this or that'. It is the Council that must decide.

There is still another factor which I would appeal to the Defence Minister to consider. In U.K., between the

Defence Minister and the Service Chiefs, there are two objective layers. The Army Chief, Navy Chief or the Air Force Chief does not have direct access to him officially except through the lower committee or through the Defence Minister's Committee. That is why in those countries, you do not have incidents. Here I may be permitted to refer to persons by name; we had an incident between Sri Krishna Menon and General Thimayya which has created so much trouble.

In U.K. you can never imagine such a controversy because the General and the Defence Minister do not have official contacts in minor matters. Of course, in social life they meet and discuss and do all that.

Shri Feroze Gandhi (Rai Bareilly): How do they meet Members of Parliament in Great Britain?

Shri U. C. Patnaik: I will come to that; there is no time for that, Mr. Gandhi.

There is another thing which we have got; but let us make an objective study. In our country the Defence Minister becomes a very hard worked man because he has to look into several minor details of administration and he has to look into small matters, personal matters and so on. His secretariat also is hard worked. So, from his point of view it is necessary that there should be committees to relieve him.

On the other hand, you must also see it from another point of view. In our country the Defence Minister has also the disadvantage of projecting himself into smaller matters, into minor details of administration with the result that the others lose initiative and feel frustrated. That is also another point of view.

I am just giving these different points of view for the consideration of the House. I am told that Government have already arrived at a decision and they are not going to support

[Shri U. C. Patnaik]

this. That is a different question. But I am presenting these facts before the House for a permanent need to consider it. It may be tomorrow or some other future day. Here is a recommendation of the Estimates Committee and they will look into it.

I look at it in relation to our present context. We say that we have an organisation spending more than 50 per cent. of our annual revenues excluding railways. Whatever we may say, we are not so prepared for war as we expect the country to be. I have my faith in the Armed Services. But I feel that we have not been able to plan for their proper equipment; we have not been able to plan for their contentment; we have not been able to plan so that our military expenditure will enure to civilian life and civilian expenditure will enure to military life as they do in other countries.

So, I place this Resolution before the House.

Shri Feroze Gandhi: You have said nothing about the Auditor General.

Shri U. C. Patnaik: Yes; as Shri Gandhi knows the Auditor General has given a lot of reports against the Defence Organisation. Not only this Auditor General but his predecessor and so on. They have given reports that hundreds of crores of rupees are going down the drain without any proper check and without any proper planning. Those reports of the Auditors General have been supported by the Public Accounts Committees formed by Members of this House. They have made recommendations from time to time. So, that is the audit side of it. That is the side checking unnecessary expenditure. Because the whole Defence is treated as confidential, there is scope for lot of wrong expenditure being incurred in this.

I find that the Estimates Committee, with the hon. Speaker as Chairman in

those days, and later on with Shri B. G. Mehta as Chairman, has given a number of reports which our Defence Organisation should study with due respect. It has recommended the Military Engineering Service to be so organised as in America where they have got a peace-time role which would make savings of crores and crores of rupees every year. It has made recommendations as to how the Army stores should be reorganised.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. All that may be very good; but how is it relevant to the resolution before us?

Shri U. C. Patnaik: I submit that in our country there has been no opportunity for the Defence Organisation to study the recommendations of the Parliamentary committees or to study the state of affairs in countries to arrive at some sort of new changes. That is why I submit that they have got to look into this and to reorganise our Defence affairs so that all these things are eliminated.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member must now conclude.

Shri U. C. Patnaik: It is an important subject and I am sure that our hon. Minister would be prepared to give some sort of patient hearing to it. They should not feel that simply because it comes from a Member of the Opposition, they have to put it down. You have to study it with the future of the country in mind, with the preparedness for war in mind, with the necessity of utilising this organisation, which is utilising half of our annual expenditure, for nation-building and national defence. Otherwise, our Prime Minister's policy will not have the support of the Defence. Unless our foreign policy is based upon our defence strength, we will talk very tall things but at the same time we will have to surrender our rights and our territories because our defence organisation is not strong. It is through committees, and committees alone, that we can with no difficulties,

with no frustration and with the least chance of corruption, reorganise our national Defence Services and give our country the best Defence Forces. I am sure that our men are the best possible. I really feel that we have got the best Army, best Navy and the best Air Force but no proper co-ordination, no proper organisation and no proper lead.

Mr. Speaker: I shall place the Resolution formally before the House, before we adjourn. Resolution moved:

"This House is of opinion that Army, Navy, Air Force and Production Councils be established together with an overall Defence Council to co-ordinate and control their activities."

There is an amendment also which will be treated as moved.

Shri Shree Narayan Das: I beg to move:

For the original Resolution, substitute—

"This House is of opinion that a Committee be appointed to consider the necessity, desirability and feasibility of establishing Army, Navy, Air Force and Production Councils together with an overall Defence Council to co-ordinate their activities."

Mr. Speaker: The Resolution and the amendment are before the House.

18.32 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Saturday, April 9, 1960/Chaitra 20, 1882 (Saka).