

[Shri R. Ramakrishnan]

the industrial policy statement which he has re-stated, is Avial. It is very tasty; at the same time, it is not as good as Pulao or some other dish which many of us would like to have. Sir, briefly, the main objectives of any industrial policy statement should be, stepping up of productive employment opportunities with stress on labour-intensive technology, without sacrificing productivity, and secondly in a large country like our, stepping up output of consumer goods with a view to avoiding shortages and bringing down prices of essential goods. These are the two objectives of any industrial policy. An academician like Dr. Chanana will definitely support me in this. But Sir, para two of this industrial policy statement starts with a generalisation of the take-off stage. It was many many years ago when Mr. W. W. Rostow wrote a book on economic growth where ultimately, after the take-off stage, he dreamt of a stage of high mass consumption. Whether India will ever reach that stage with this sort of policy, I do not know. But at the same time, I think, he has made a beginning. Now, coming to the most important item, point number four, a very bold statement has been made that industrialisation is a sine qua non of economic progress Sir, what is stated is very laudable. All these policy statements should be translated into action. But the means of doing this have not been spelt out as clearly as one would like.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BISHAMBHAR NATH PANDE): Mr. Ramakrishnan, you may resume your speech after the Half-an-Hour Discussion.

**HALF-AN HOUR DISCUSSION ON  
POINTS ARISING OUT OF THE  
ANSWERS GIVEN IN THE RAJYA  
SABHA IN THE 7TH AUGUST, AND  
THE 27TH NOVEMBER, 1980, TO  
UNSTARRED QUESTIONS 936 AND\***

**962 RESPECTIVELY REGARDING  
AUDIT SYSTEMS OF THE WORKING  
OF MINISTRY OF DEFENCE**

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): Sir, the Half-an-Hour Discussion is not half-an-hour discussion as such, as we have seen in previous discussions. I think, I need to start from where the genesis of this half-an-hour discussion is. There were two sets of questions asked. I think, the hon. Minister has gone into them. Hence, in the Business today, when it talks of audit systems, let it not be misunderstood. One is not talking of audit systems, one is talking of the total systems of management audit. You look very worried. Well, I -would if I were you. The fact is, it is an 'Alice in Wonderland' kind of situation. It was the Eaglet who said "Please talk English. I do not understand half the words you use. I am sure you do not either". You have two options, hon. Minister. Either you can lie back and enjoy what is coming or you can continue to look as worried as you are doing now.

We are talking of total management systems audit. We are talking of the total working of the Ministry of Defence. The arrogance lies in the reply which came to me saying that no such audit has been carried out and that it is not necessary to carry out such an audit. That was the beginning of this whole debate. If I had received a reasonable enough reply, the need for such an half-an-hour discussion would not have arisen. To be on the same wavelength, it is necessary for me to talk about what one is implying when one is talking of management. I will have to be very brief. The functions of management would be to lay down the parameters, to lay down the objectives, to fix targets, to make people result-oriented, to achieve a certain professionalism in the functioning of the Ministry of Defence, to have accountability, to have a resource-management system. What would this imply? This would imply induction of a method. Planning, attempts

at achieving efficiency and achieving economy. Audit is to investigate, to check, to find out, whether what we are doing is right or not. That is the parameter. For the Defence Ministry to assert, firstly to admit that they have not done any audit and secondly to assert that they do not need to do it, is incredible and almost unbelievable. We are talking here of inducting a system of management in the Ministry of Defence and its functioning. What are some of the essentials? There has to be a process of decisionmaking which will help in arriving at a decision. There has to be a scientific attitude of mind in managing the working and the functioning of the Ministry of Defence. We have to have a proper attitude because it is from attitudes that the technique will evolve. We have to have the concept of productivity of resources and the resources are man-made. They do not come from nature and the biggest resource we have is man himself. From this generality, what is the idea which the Ministry of Defence should aim at? Of course, without doubt, it is civilian control. But more than that, equally important, is quick and timely decisions. Finally, an inbuilt capacity to grow, should there be a demand placed on it, by an emergency, by the requirements of a national peril etc.

What do we actually have? I have a very interesting quotation. I would like to quote it here, which says:

"A fresh evil has been growing up in the shape of excessive notings and criticism in the Military Department on the purely military aspects of proposals with the weight and authority of the C-in-C, whereby much delay is caused and the main issue is frequently obscured by a mass of irrelevant criticism. The evils of this system are palpable. All the work has to be done twice over."

Now this is the quotation which is dated 1889. It is a report by Field Marshal Roberts of Kandhar. He is talking about the functioning of the

Defence Department then. It is staggering almost 100 years later. If one were to talk about the functioning of the Ministry of Defence, one would have to change a single word, that is, instead of the word "twice" we have to change it that the work has to be done 'thrice' over. I will explain 'how'. How is our Ministry of Defence functioning? How are we really functioning in the Ministry of Defence? You have an apex, you have five components and you have three tiers. The apex, theoretically speaking, is the President who is the Commander-in-Chief. The five components are the three service headquarters, the three Service Chiefs and then you have the Cabinet and the Minister of Defence. What are the three tiers of functioning? No other Ministry is functioning like this. In the three tiers you have the service component, you have the Ministry for Defence and you have a Defence Finance Department. Then you have a strange anomaly again, i.e. there is the Committee system. I do not want to go into the system as the attendance in the House is thin, but let us see how the committee system broadly works. There are two basic committees functioning in the Ministry of Defence. The one is the Minister of Defence Committee. It is the civilian component of the service committees and the service committees are statutory bodies. They are only recommendatory bodies. They cannot decide. There are various committees which come under the Ministry of Defence. The important ones are perhaps the Committee for Defence Planning, possibly the Defence Minister's Committee. Where did we get this jumble from? Mr. Vice-Chairman, in September 1947 Lord Ismay, Staff Officer to Lord Mountbatten, devised a system for the functioning of the Defence Ministry. Since September 1947, except for minor modifications, no changes have been made in the functioning of the Ministry of Defence. We are continuing to work with this anomalous inheritance which Lord Ismay has given us. Surely in the past 33 years the world has not stood

[Shri Jaswant Singh] still, the defence requirements of the country have not stood still. What have we done? Lord Ismay gave the outline, the structure and we have perfected it by adding on to it the refinements of bureaucracy, indecision and nothing else; no more than that, has been done. On top of that the Ministry of Defence in answer says: We have not carried out the audit and we do not feel the need to carry out the audit.

Now let us see how the plans are prepared. The Service Headquarters prepares a plan which goes to the Committee of Defence Planning. Then, upon the recommendations of the Defence Planning Committee, it goes to the Minister of Defence. Then it goes to the Cabinet Committee for Political Affairs which puts a seal of approval and sends it back as an approved plan. Now starts the game. Having got an approved plan, thereafter the Service Headquarters place their requirements upon which the elephantine movement of flies start. It must then go to the Ministry of Defence—that is the bureaucratic organisation—which then sends it to Defence Finance who naturally do not know what is taking place, and therefore a query is made. The file makes its ponderous way back to the Service Headquarters and this lobbying keeps on taking place, by which time the original requirement has changed and, therefore, there has to be necessarily a modification made. When that modification is recommended, somebody in this maze—whether it is the Defence Ministry or whether it is the Defence Finance—says that the modification is equal to something new; therefore, go back to the CCPA—the Cabinet Committee for Political Affairs. And so the whole game starts again. And the Service Headquarters go back to the CCPA. We started by defining what we were looking for in management and we have come to a situation that we have perfected a system for not arriving at a decision. Hon. Minister, I would like to put it

across to you that we are talking about defence, we are talking about the security of the country and for the Ministry to say that they do not need to see how they are doing it is an incredible assertion.

I will proceed further. What happens because of this kind of maze? There is firstly an absence of a total defence concept and defence environment. There is an absence of integration of the three Services. You have three Service plans. There is no integrated Defence plan. The three Services are acting on tandem, independently. Don't shake your head. That is a fact. That is how it is. You can deny it by arguments. You can convince me by arguments. I will be perfectly ready to be convinced if you can convince me. It is no good saying that we have got an integrated plan. In fact, there are three separate Service plans which are lumped together and the formality of having an integrated plan is gone through. You have an absence of perspective. You can't have perspective if you feel, "we don't have to look at how we are doing things". Decisions are never arrived at. When they are arrived at, they are not timely. There is the concept of economy of time. Answering a question the other day in this House, you talked about time's importance. Please implement it. Those were your own words in connection with a defence question.

After the inevitable delays, whatever then comes is invariably inadequate for the original requirement. By the time it comes, it is out-dated by the changes that have taken place. I ask a specific question—, how much time elapses between an approved plan being put up for execution and its actual execution? You don't have to answer it just now. You carry out a research into it by yourself and you will come to a staggering fact that it is between 3 to 5 years that it takes for any decision of major nature for the Defence Ministry to execute. And inevitably, if you work in that kind

of time-frame, it is more costly. We started at the original criteria of "quick decision and growth capacity". Please apply this criteria of "quick decision and in built growth capa-^ city" and answer whether the organisation of the Defence Ministry has the ability to arrive at quick decisions.

What happens in concrete terms, I will illustrate. That is the question which is in our minds—the question of tanks. It was known in 1972-73—deny it if you can—that in the indigenous development of a main battle tank for India, we were going to face a gap in the '80s. We came to know that there was going to be a gap—I am repeating it So that I get a specific answer from you Mr. Minister—in 1972-73, we came to know that there was going to be a gap in the indigenous development of a main battle tank for India. Today we still do not have it. We do not have a main battle tank. It is on the drawing board. Do not confuse the Vijayanta tank with the main battle tank. We do not have it. That is because we did not arrive at the right conclusions at the right time and we did not because the whole setup is mainly indecisive. On the question of Sher-e-Iran, there came a period when, to fill this gap, India could have picked up Sher-e-Iran. Orders were cancelled following the Shah's overthrow. Of course we did not act, because we did not arrive at a decision. Now if you want to ask for these tanks we may not get them and even if we do get them, they will cost three times the amount.

There is the question of product improvement. It is a classic example of how the Defence Ministry is not only indecisive but has no perspective planning. Any indigenous product that we develop must be so developed that the development process must be a continuous process so that it eventually meshes into a new generation of equipment. What have we done with Vijayanta? We took the right decision to develop Vijayanta as an indigenous tank. And now we are talking in terms of doing away with Vai-

jayanta. By the middle of this decade we are thinking in terms of doing away with Vijayanta and we have not thought of the alternative. In between we went into aberrations like the T-55, a totally new concept of equipment. We are not purchasing groceries. It is not *sabun* or tel or *dant manian* which one is purchasing. One is trying to develop the defence capability of the country.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BISHAMBHAR NATH PANDE): Please put your questions.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: No, Sir I will take time. We have had precedents of this. We have had Half-an-Hour discussions. The original mover is granted half an hour. Please do not bully me, I beg of you, because this is a very important question and it is with great difficulty that one has been able to raise it.

There was also the question of refurbishing of the Centurion tank. I know it for a fact that in the late sixties the question was raised whether we should refurbish the Centurion or do away with it, and we took the wrong decision again. We did not decide to refurbish the Centurion. Now we are talking of refurbishing the T-55. We sold the Centurion. We gave it away. Others are making use of it.

I will take one example of each service. Take the example of the Navy. We are involved in a pointless debate about the Harrier and the aircraft carrier. Here is this great virility symbol—I do not know what else to call it. Whenever we have hostilities, three quarters of the Navy is to be deployed to protect INS Vikrant. The first thing that it has to do is to seek shelter in a port and it is so large and identifiable target that, heavens forbid if something should happen to it, please calculate the loss in morale that is involved. The basic question which we are not debating and which, I wonder if the Defence Ministry would debate—because I do not think it is functioning to debate

[Shri Jaswant Singh]

such things—is, why should the Navy think of an air strike or defence capacity when the same can be done by a shore-based air facility? But we have gone ahead and started debating the question about the Harrier. And there was this endless debate about it. DPSA which continues in the concept of the Air Force. I won't waste time. Now which country in the world—the hon. Minister might like to answer it—today can afford a full-spectrum air force? He is a country like India. We are talking in terms of a full-spectrum air force. We must have reconnaissance flight. The other day a news item appeared—as if it is a great achievement—that we must have MIG-25 and the Jaguar. There would be an enormous lead that you would place on the infrastructure of the administrative side of the Defence Ministry.

I am asking specific questions. How long has the proposal of inducting bridging systems in the Army been waiting? How long has the question of combat engineer tractor been waiting for arriving at a decision? When did the proposal first come up? For how long have you not arrived at a decision and why? For how long are you now continuing to sit on the important question of sophisticated control equipment for our tanks. When was the proposal first mooted and what stopped you from arriving at a decision as early as yesterday? We have the anomaly—I do not know whether any other country has it—of three different air defence systems for three different Services. The Air Force has its own air defence system; the Army has its own system; the Navy does likewise. Why don't you have an integrated system which is going to cost less and which is going to be more effective and more efficient? Please answer each of the questions and don't cloak them in the usual phrase. "It is not in public interest". The press gallery is also vacant...

AN HON. MEMBER: That does not matter.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Here is the question of Army helicopters, Army Aviation Corps. To my knowledge, the original proposal was mooted as far back as 1968. Correct me if my figures are wrong. Is it a fact that 80 per cent of the Army helicopters are in any case manned by the Army men and that 75 per cent of the usage of the helicopters is in any case for the Army functions? If that be so, why do you continue it as a part of the Air Force and not of Army? Is it a fact that a committee of Secretaries sat on it and has unanimously recommended for the induction of an Army Helicopter Wing? From 1968 this has been there and two years ago a committee of Secretaries sat on it. What steps you from arriving at a decision now?

There is the question of transport aircraft. We have been debating the question of transport aircraft decades now. We get into by-lanes, we get side-tracked. We talk of medium tactical aircraft. Where in the world are para-troops still being used? In independent India, except for 1948—a minor operation in it; that was also not a para-drop it was landing of troops by air and in Tangail in 1971, when have they been used? Can you give me one or two examples where they have been used? Because we achieved a kind of air supremacy, they are capable of being used. Would the Minister like to explain the concept under which they are basing their requirements of medium tactical aircraft? There is a complete chaos which is taking place in defence research and development.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BISHAMBHAR NATH PANDE): You should conclude.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: All right. I will.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BISHAMBHAR NATH PANDE): I may point out the rule. The Member who has given notice should make a short statement and the Minister will reply shortly. There is no ques-

tion of half an hour being taken by the hon. Member who has moved.

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी (उत्तर प्रदेश) : श्रीमन्, मेरी अर्ज सुन लीजिए,। यहीं पर, इसी जगह पर. . .

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री विश्वम्भर नाथ पांडे) : इसीलिए मैं कह रहा हूँ रूल में ऐसा नहीं है।

श्री जसवंत सिंह : मैं रूल की बात नहीं करूंगा। मैं अपने स्पेसिफिक क्वेश्चन्स पूछना चाहता हूँ। मैं मंत्री महोदय से निवेदन करूंगा कि वे उनका जवाब दें।

Would you introduce an audit of the system of mangement in the Ministry of Defence now? Would you review it? That is Q. No. 1. Would you review the total systems of management of the Ministry of Defence now, following this debate and my request? Would you restructure the Ministry of Defence to make it more professional to achieve greater integration? In 1955, Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru, talking to Parliament had spoken of integrating the Services, the Defence Headquarters, and had Spoken of the introduction of Service Councils. In 1958, the Public Accounts Committee in its report had spoken of what we are talking on now. Would you take into account what Panditji said in 1955 and introduce the system of Service Councils now in 1980? It is a specific question, Mr. Minister. Would you consider it. We have the Chief of Air Staff, the Chief of Naval Staff and the Chief of Army Staff. There should be one Chief of Defence Staff. The Commander-in-Chief is not the Chief of Defence Staff. Would you consider having a Chief of Defence Staff? Otherwise. Would you stop calling these service heads las chiefs of staff because they are in fact Commanders-in-Chief of the various services? The Chair does not permit me to go into the merits and demerits of the Chief of Defence

Staff. If you have Chiefs of Staff, it is logical to have the Chief of Defence Staff if you accept integration and professionalisation. „• You should answer that. Would you like to order a Committee to go into the total reorganisation of the Defence Headquarters? Would you like to consider presenting this House with a White Paper on defence? I cannot go on. There is so much to go on about. Please understand, Mr. Minister. Through you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, to the House I would like to submit, the defence of the country does not lie in cloaking in opacity.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BISHAMBHAR NATH PANDE): Please Mr. Minister.

श्री जसवंत सिंह : मैं खत्म कर रहा हूँ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री विश्वम्भर नाथ पांडे) : आप तो इतना वक्त ले रहे रहे हैं और दूसरे लोग भी तो हैं।

श्री जसवंत सिंह : मैंने जनाब अभी आधा घंटा भी नहीं लिया।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री विश्वम्भर नाथ पांडे) : यह तो पूरा डिबेट हो गया, इस तरह से इसका स्कोप वाईड हो गया है। यह हाफ-एन-आवर डिस्कशन नहीं रहा।

श्री जसवंत सिंह : मुझे कितना वक्त दिया गया है। (Interruptions)

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री विश्वम्भर नाथ पांडे) : नहीं अब आप खत्म करें।

श्री जसवंत सिंह : ठीक है, जैसे आपकी मर्जी।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BISHAMBHAR NATH PANDE): Mr. Minister.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE (SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL): Sir, ...

SHRI NARASINGHA PRASAD NANDA (Orissa): Hon. Minister, may I suggest you to call Mr. Jas-want Singh to your Ministry and take his very good counsel, avail of his specialised knowledge on the defence audit systems?

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL:  
I do not know how much time is available for me. If I understand the procedure correctly, Half-an-Hour Discussion has to take place within half an hour's time.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BISHAMBHAR NATH PANDE): That is what the rule says.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL:  
The first mover speaks and then an answer, reply, is given. If there are any questions, they are put and answers are given. But the hon. Member was probably interested in telling this House how much he knows about defence ....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BISHAMBHAR NATH PANDE): Not at all.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL:  
... and not getting the information.

SHRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM (Tamil Nadu): Do not treat a Member so lightly.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: If the hon. Member really wanted. . .

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: There is no need for the Minister to impute motives to me. He does not live with me. I live by myself. I have no intention to advertise how much I know. Even if it is implied I do not want that to be raised.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BISHAMBHAR NATH PANDE): Please do not waste further time. Let the Minister reply.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: The question that was raised here

was about the system analysis and the management audit. A half portion, of the statement related to this,\* and the remaining half portion was utilised in raising certain questions as if it was a Question Hour. I am equipped with all the detailed information, and I would be required to answer those specific questions.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Will you please lay them on the Table of the House?

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATEL: I would like to answer both these points to the extent it is possible for me.

Sir, it is said that the decisions should be taken quickly. Then, we should have a machinery to assess results of the actions we took. Probably it is not realised that we do have a machinery for taking decisions and for reviewing our results and our achievements. I may point out that we have so many committees. There is a Cabinet Committee on Political Affairs. This is a Committee which takes into account as to what has to be done for strengthening our forces. It takes into account the general economic conditions of our country which will be useful for strengthening our defences. It takes into account our relations with foreign countries also so as to see that our country is properly defended. Here is a committee which is at the apex and this committee has to take into account all these factors. We have a Defence Minister's Production and Supply Committee. We are interested not only in purchasing the things from outside, but we are interested in producing the things in our own country also. That is going to be our mainstay that is going to be our main strength. If we for all time really depend upon foreign countries, we may not be able to defend ourselves. So we at times, wherever it is necessary, whenever it is necessary, assess as to what is required by our Forces and what can be produced here. And that is done by the Defence Minis-

ter's Production and Supply Committee. Not only that, we have a Defence Research and Development Council. Present day defence does not depend on the numbers. It depends on scientific development and technology. This is becoming **very** sophisticated. It is not possible to win wars by having more numbers. It is necessary to have sophisticated technology also. And to achieve that kind of sophisticated technology, to develop that, we have so many laboratories and so many scientists working over here. And that is supervised and directed and controlled by the Defence research and Development Council. Then we have other committees also—the Defence Electronics Committee, the Joint Intelligence Committee, the Committee on Defence Planning, the Defence Research and Development Organisation. These are the committees which are looking after different aspects of the defence of our country. We have a Committee in which the Chiefs of Staff met regularly and they assess as to what is required by their Forces—what is required by the Army, what is required by the Air Force, what is required by the Navy—what are the threat perceptions, what is to be done at a given moment, etc. They discuss between themselves. They meet the Defence Minister, sometimes regularly, sometimes once in a week whenever necessary; everyday also sometimes meetings are held. And then they formulate the requirements of the Armed Forces, what is to be done, all those things. We have a Defence Plan Coordination and Implementation Committee also. Now probably it is thought that we do not have a perspective plan. We do have a perspective plan. The concept of plan is accepted in our country—plan for every development, plan for the development of our Defence Forces also. It is not that we are groping in darkness. We know what is to be done and we know what is not to be done, We know what our resources are and how those resources are to be utilised for strengthening our

Defence Forces. Everything is clear before our eyes and we are marching in that direction.

Then, it is said that we take a lot of time for taking decisions. It is said that by the time we take decisions things become very costly and things become outdated also. Probably the honourable Member wanted to say that. Yes, Sir. Sometimes time is taken for taking decisions. But crores and crores of rupees are involved. Not only money is involved, there are different views also. Talking about management:—I am sorry to say—he<sup>1</sup> was blowing hot and cold. My friend said, let us have an integrated air-force. Why should the Navy have a air-force?—he asked. At the same time he said that helicopters should be made available to the army. These are two contradictory views—...

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: They are not. The Minister has not understood what I said.

Thank you for the courtesy of giving me the floor. There is nothing contradictory when one is talking of an army helicopter wing; it is not contradictory to have an integrated air defence cell. It is not contradictory to have a shore-base facility for the navy: Please don't confuse yourself and confuse the House.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: That is what exactly I was saying, that you wanted to tell us how much you know about military. This is what I wanted to say. All the time you are telling us, do this thing, do that thing. What I am trying to say is there are different views and different opinions. There are different theories put forth. According to one theory something has to be done; according to a different theory something has not to be done. It is not only money that is involved. There are different points of view. The Army has a point of view, the Navy has a point of view, the Air force has a point of view. And if we want to have an integrated plan, if we want to utilise these opinions, it is necessary to take into account all aspects. Simply by having one gentleman to look after all the three forces the problem-



[Shri Shivraj V. Patil]

will not be solved. We do have a Defence Minister who looks after all the three forces; we do have committees which are responsible to all the three forces. The problem is not solved simply by having one gentleman to look after them. And if we accept that today the world is specialising and it is not possible for a man coming from one discipline to understand the difficulties and complexities of other disciplines, if we have accepted that the problem cannot be solved by appointing one person. On the contrary, even in the Army, even in the Navy, even in the Air Force, we have different departments. And it is not possible for one gentleman to understand in entirety the complexities of a department which is in the Navy or in the Army. Therefore, simply by appointing one gentleman to look after all the three forces the problem is not solved. What I was trying to say was this: when the defence of our country is involved, when the financial constraints are there, when the question of science and technology is also involved, not only that, over and above that when there are differing points of views, we do take time to take decisions. We do not want to rush and take a decision and then say, well, here we committed a wrong. On the floor of this august House different views have been expressed, one honourable Member saying that this has to be done, another honourable Member saying that this has not to be done. Now we have views of same kind outside also. So, after weighing the pros and cons of every aspect and every angle of the problem we take a decision. Probably for that we do have to take a little time. We are, of course, trying to see that decisions are taken quickly but taken in such a manner as to make us spend less than what we would do otherwise, so as to rely upon ourselves, so as to see that our Defence Forces are very strong. As things stand today, I do not find any difficulty in planning, and I do not

think our forces are weak forces; our forces are strong forces and we are going in the correct direction. Wherever it is necessary for us to modify or change a little here and there, we would certainly change; we have, in fact, changed also. But it is wrong to say that we have not assessed our systems. It is wrong to say that we have not reviewed our management... (*Interruptions*) That is why I said you have been quoting history and the books. If you want that the Army and the Navy and the Air Force systems should be reviewed by one gentleman, well, you are wrong. Now, we have the Chief of the Army staff, we have the Chief of the Naval staff and we have the Chief of the Air Force. They are given the responsibility of assessing and when ever there has to be a collection of information they come together in a meeting they meet and discuss. Over and above that, we have the Defence Ministry where there are civilians also. Please do not think that defence means only sailors, soldiers and airmen and weapons and that we will be able to defend our country with them. We have very brave soldiers. Generals and officers and we are proud of them. If we think that only by having them we will be in a position to defend our country, probably we are committing a mistake. Of course, in defence bravery is required, sagacity is required and acumen is required. At the same time we require economic development and other things. These things are also considered when we sit in the Cabinet Committee on Political Affairs. There are opportunities for different views coming together and we weigh them and assess them and then come to the correct conclusions.

Now, so many questions are put. This is the first part of it. Other questions are put to me, are we going to give helicopters to the Army, are we going to have one person for all the three forces . . .

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Did you hear my question?

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: If you want to say, let me know it.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH; Thank you . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BISHAMBHAR NATH PANDE): I will not allow. I have to conduct the business of the House.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: He has given me permission. He has given the floor to me.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BISHAMBHAR NATH PANDE): Does not matter. I have to conduct the business.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: When the Minister has given the floor to me, where does the Chair come in?

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: If you object, then I will continue.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I ap.  
predate your courtesy. But the  
Chair is pulling me up. He has  
given the floor to me.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Some specific questions are put. It is not the Question Hour. Here I am not expected to answer all the questions. I am not an encyclopaedia having all the information with me. If you put a question, I will collect the information, analyse it and give the answer. Today we are on system analysis and management audit. Probably the hon. Member thought that we are not in a position to understand what he meant. We try to understand and we try to answer. As far as the specific questions are concerned, whether we are going to give helicopters to the Army or whether we are going to have one gentleman to look after the three forces, etc. what I have to say is that these are specific questions and are not related to the principles involved in the system analysis and management audit. They are specific questions. I hope the hon. Vice-Chairman would not ask me to answer these questions which are specific. It is not necessary for me to answer these questions.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BISHAMBHAR NATH PANDE):

Shri Shiva Chandra Jha. Kindly put the questions straightway.

**श्री शिव चन्द्र झा (बिहार) :** मेरा पहला सवाल है उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, कि यह जो डिफेंस विंग के लिए खर्च की मांग होती है उसमें आडिटिंग होती है, तीन-चार स्टेज से गुजर कर मामला जाता है और उसमें देरी होती है, काम वक्त पर हो नहीं पाता है। मैं जानता हूँ युद्ध के वक्त में, लड़ाई के वक्त में भी यही सिलसिला आपका चलता है इसलिए मैं पूछ रहा हूँ, थोड़ी-बहुत मेरी अपनी जानकारी है परन्तु लड़ाई के वक्त में एक खास कार्यक्रम रहता है इसलिए वह रेडटेपिज्म जिसको कहते हैं, या टाडिनेस वगैरह यह सब कुछ नहीं होता है और बहुत तेजी से काम आगे बढ़ता है। यदि यह कैं है शांति के वक्त में और युद्ध के वक्त में, तो जिस तरह से युद्ध के वक्त में एफिशियेंसी वार-फूटिंग पर वहां होती है क्या शांति के वक्त में भी वही क्राइटेरियन आप लागू करेंगे ?

दूसरा सवाल है : यह बात सही है कि डिफेंस का डिस्प्लिन बड़ा कड़ा है और उस में छोटी-छोटी मांगों की पूर्ति के लिए बहुत देरी होती है जब तक कि ऊपर से आर्डर नहीं आता है। जैसे कि मोहर के लिए, साइन बोर्ड के लिए, उसको बदलने के लिए, वीसा खर्च करना है उसमें आफिसर्स को डिस्क्रेषनरी पावर नहीं है उतना खर्च कर सके, वह हैड आफिस को लिखता है, उसमें बहुत देरी होती है। तो मैं जानना चाहता हूँ, आपके काम की एफिशियेंसी बढ़ाने के लिए, जिससे काम के संचालन में देरी न हो, क्या आप आन् दी स्पार्ट के जो आफिसर हैं उनकी डिस्क्रेषनरी पावर को बढ़ाएंगे ? क्या यह बात सही नहीं है कि नेवी विंग ने आप को लिखा है कि एक और विक्रान्त बनाया जाये—एक विक्रान्त की अभी मरम्मत हो रही है—नेवी विंग ने कहा है कि जरूरत को देखते हुए एक और विक्रान्त बनाया जाये ? वह आप के यहां जांच में है या खटार्ड में है या रेड-टेपिज्म में है, क्यों उसमें देरी हो रही है ?

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA (Karnataka): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, there are a few questions which I would like to raise in connection with the subject which has been mentioned in detail by the honourable Member earlier.

Sir, there is this question which has come up repeatedly and it is about self-reliance in defence production. I think this was the aim which Pandit Nehru as well as Mr. Krishna Menon had emphasised right in the early days and detailed plans for self-reliance in defence production had been worked out. Well, you may correct me if I am wrong. Now my information is that not even 40 or 50 per cent of utilisation is there in our ordnance factories and other facilities, and that is all that has been achieved. And, Sir, our reliance on imported arms, spares, as well as defence technology is literally overtaking us. I would, therefore, like to know, first of all, what the Defence Ministry is doing to see that this aim which was set as the national goal, the goal of self-sufficiency in defence production, is achieved and what you are doing to upgrade our units and see that indigenous production is increased.

I may say here, Sir, that it is a known fact that many of your retired army officers have become arms agents and pedlars after retirement and I ask you what you are going to do to stop this. I ask this question because this is a dangerous thing if your own officers get involved in the sale and purchase of arms because they build up self-interest even when they are in service in order to be acceptable later on. I would bring to your notice, Sir, one thing. I have got it with me and this is only one example.

A proposal was put up on the 22nd April, 1977, for upgrading some of your tanks. It was in May 1977. Now, on the 2nd May of 1979, a routine reply is sent that the proposal was considered and was found not feasible and was rejected. You have an R & D Department. You have a whole set-up and you have your

workshops and everything which are supposed to look into this question. What are they doing? Does it take two years to go through a routine proposal for upgrading your own existing equipment? Or, is it that there are people in the Ministry itself or outside who have an enlightened self-interest in selling away things against your national interest? I have given one example of the spares earlier. We have been told repeatedly that this was junk, unwanted. Let me correct you, Mr. Minister. You have come only recently. But I know something of what was happening there even before you became a Minister. Many of these spares were in original paper packings. They were examined by the Metal Scrap Corporation and their report should be placed on the Table of the House. Out of the 5,000 tonnes, you allowed an international agent to pick up 3,000 tonnes. I am saying that the other 2,000 tonnes of that is junk, as they are barrels and are useless materials. But you have sold this good material for nothing and let me tell you—I can give you information from your own Ministry's reports:

"Spares of the AMX 13 tanks which are old and useless compared to the Centurion spares were sold at four times the value of the Centurion spares.",

Then, let me tell you, an objection had been raised, the Ministry of Finance had told you to better sell this as junk in the country, if necessary, even at a slightly lower price. I am quoting from the noting of the Finance Ministry and I can give you the date also. It is on the 3rd of June.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Are you putting a specific question?

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: No. I am just mentioning the objections that were raised and how you are functioning. Here is an objection from the Finance Ministry wherein, it is said:

"We have examined the Ministry of Defence proposal for the sale of

the Centurion spares independently of the main equipment and in this connection, we would like to invite attention to our views recorded earlier while considering the sale of the Centurion tanks. It will be recalled that we had on that occasion suggested, as per the Finance Minister's advice, that the Ministry of Defence may consider, pending disposal of tanks, until the question of sale of equipment, in militarised *versus* demilitarised condition, has been examined. In the light of this ..." SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN (Tamil Nadu): Sir, on a point of order. Excuse me. The Defence Minister says that in public interest so many things cannot be disclosed. The hon. Member is in possession of so many secret . . . (Interruptions).

SHRI NARASINGHA PRASAD NANDA: No secret files. These are all . . . (Interruptions). These are all before the Public Accounts Committee.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: I will ask you to look into the Eighty-first Report of the Public Accounts Committee. There is Mr. Stephen's statement before the PAC about end-user certificate is not necessary, I Opposition . . . (Interruptions) It is a part of the PAC Report. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, it is stated that end-user certificate is not necessary. I would like to ask the Minister, is there any specific case when you have sold Defence parts or spare, or equipment without the end-user certificate, except in the case of these spare parts. There is one case where you sold 200 rounds of ammunition without a proper end-user certificate. This is the only case for your record. This is how the Ministry works. I am not sitting in judgement. I do not claim to know more than you know. After all, we women are not sup-nosed to know so much about Defence, you will say. (Interruptions). The Minister of Defence is a woman; I have, therefore, dared to stand up and tell you this. We also know something. We also take the trouble of learning. I would, therefore, also

bring to your notice, whatever you may say, that there has been a controversy in which I have been involved. But let me ask you specifically whether or not in your Defence files there are two letters— I will give you the dates.. (Interruptions.)

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: How do I know?

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: I would like to know from the Minister whether our Ambassador in Spain told us that the Spanish Government has objected to the role of Mr. Michael and his association in the earlier Centurion deal with the country. Secondly, there is also in your file a report from the British High Commission that his credibility is rather low. You deny this to me, and then I shall produce the copies to you. But these are the things you say you do not know, while these things are happening. I am, therefore, asking you what is the control you have? How often the Defence Minister does not know about decisions being taken? And very often, the Ministers take decisions without consulting the so-called Inter-Disciplinary Committee, which has been quoted earlier. I would like to know who are the members of this Inter-Disciplinary Committee which takes these decisions? Has it a particular quorum or particular representatives or is it the whims and fancies of the Minister, because there are occasions when the Minister of state has taken decisions when the Defence Secretary was out of India and there was no Secretary of Defence Production, and he takes decisions and records them. I, therefore, want to know what is the system of functioning? When the audit comes, where does the audit stop in Defence? Most of the decisions are political. The Political Committee takes them. Where is the control, and where is the awareness of what is happening as far as Parliament is concerned? How much comes before us? Therefore, I would like to know from the Minister, what steps he intends to take to see that the in-

[Shrimati Margaret Alva]

terests of the nation are placed before the interests of retired Generals or retired officers, or agents and where you expect to draw a line to see that instead of depending more and more on imported technology and imported arms, you will make this country self-reliant, so that all this might be eliminated once and for all?

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री विश्वम्भर नाथ पांडे) :  
कृपया प्रश्न ही पूछें ।

श्री हुक्मदेव नारायण यादव (बिहार) :  
उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मैं सरकार से केवल यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि प्रतिरक्षा विभाग के संबंध में जितनी बातें देश के अन्दर फैलती हैं और कही जाती हैं, जैसे अभी माननीय सदस्या टैंक के बारे में कह रही थीं, कुछ दिन पहले जगुआर विमान के बारे में सारे देश में हंगामा खड़ा हुआ था, उससे पहले और किसी बारे में हंगामा खड़ा हुआ था, तो प्रतिरक्षा विभाग के अन्दर किसी तरह से भी छोटी सी भी शंका की गुंजावश न रहे और देश के लोगों को केवल आप कह दें कि हाँ, इसमें गलती नहीं हुई है, यह भ्रष्टपूर्ण नहीं है, बल्कि देश के लोगों को विश्वास भी हो कि इसमें किसी तरह की गड़बड़ी नहीं हुई है यह विश्वास देश की जनता को दिलाने के लिए आपके पास कोई जांच पड़ताल करने का संगठन बगैर है या नहीं जो इसकी जांच करके देखे कि यहाँ क्या हो रहा है ।

[Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair.]

श्रीमन्, पोलिटिकल कमेटी जिसको वह कह रहे हैं वह तो केवल राजनीतिक निर्णय लेने के लिए है और कभी-कभी राजनीतिक निर्णय के खिलाफ हंगामा खड़ा होता है तो फिर जो राजनीतिक निर्णय भी लिये जायें या जो पोलिटिकल कमेटी या कैबिनेट के जरिये निर्णय होता है उस निर्णय को भी राष्ट्र के सामने कोई चुनौती कभी दे कि राष्ट्र के लिए गलत काम किया गया है तो उसको भी सही बता सकें और राष्ट्र के लोगों को सही विश्वास हो जाए, इसके लिए कोई प्रावधान है या नहीं ?

दूसरे, प्रतिरक्षा के सवाल पर जो कमजोरियाँ हुईं, 1962 में जो लड़ाई लड़ी गई और हमारे देश के वीरों ने जी-जान से लड़ी थी उसमें हमारी जिन कमजोरियों के कारण हार हुई और 30-35 मील प्रति दिन की रफ्तार से जो आपकी पल्टन पीछे भागी थी, उसके क्या कारण थे, ये सवाल उसी समय से उठते रहे हैं कि इसकी जांच पड़ताल हुई कि नहीं और उसको सुधारने की दिशा में कोई कार्यवाही की गई या नहीं ? मुझे जहाँ तक जानकारी है, उसमें कोई कार्यवाही नहीं की गई । तो भविष्य में इस घटना की पुनरावृत्ति न हो, इसके लिए क्या किया गया है । जब तक आप अपनी कमजोरियों को दूर करने के लिए जांच पड़ताल नहीं करेंगे तब तक उससे कुछ नतीजा निकलने वाला नहीं है ।

आखिरी प्रश्न यह है कि प्रतिरक्षा के बारे में जो जसवंत सिंह जी ने प्रश्न उठाये कि जो व्यवस्था संचालित हो रहा है, उसमें डिफेंस के लोग भी हैं और सिविलियन भी रहते हैं । तो उनके बीच में किसी मुद्दे पर टकराव विचारों का होता है कि नहीं और जो डिफेंस सर्विस के हैं और जो सिविल सर्विस के हैं और डिफेंस डिपार्टमेंट में काम करते हैं तो उन दोनों के दृष्टिकोणों में फर्क होता है या नहीं और आप इसको दूर करने के लिए व्यवस्था करना चाहते हैं कि नहीं कि हिन्दुस्तान में जो नीचे की पल्टन, सीमा पर लड़ने वाले सिपाही हों उनके लिए भी यह आशा रहे कि कभी वह प्रगति पाकर हिन्दुस्तान की पल्टन के सबसे बड़े ओहदे पर पहुँच सकते हैं ? जब तक उनमें ऐसी आशा और विश्वास का कारण नहीं रहेगा तब तक नीचे का अपसर उतकी हिम्मत और बहादुरी के साथ अपना शौर्य नहीं दिखा सकेगा । जब तक आप उनको अपने शौर्य और बहादुरी के काम का प्रमोशन देने के लिए 75 फीसदी स्थान प्रमोशन देकर नहीं भरेंगे तब तक उन्हें आप विश्वास नहीं दिला सकते । आप 75 प्रतिशत स्थान प्रमोशन के द्वारा भरिए जिससे कि नीचे से लड़ने वालों का उत्साह रहे और वे आगे बढ़ सकें और

हिन्दुस्तान का सिपाही सेना का बड़ा प्रधान बन सके तो यह एक उदाहरण बन सकता है। ऐसा नहीं कि बड़े-बड़े घरानों से जो लोग आते हैं और ट्रेनिंग लेकर, ऊंची शिक्षा प्राप्त करके जो स्कूलों से वहाँ चले जाते हैं, उनको ही आप लें। उनको लड़ने का उतना अनुभव नहीं होता, मैदान में खटने का अनुभव नहीं रहता है तो उनके बदले में लड़ने वालों को ज्यादा अनुभव होता है उनको आप प्रमोशन देंगे तो देश की प्रतिरक्षा मजबूत हो सकती है।

श्री निबन्धन बः० पार्सल : उपसभापति महोदय, श्री शा साहब ने कहा . . .

श्री नरसिंह प्रसाद त्रिपाठी : जवाब भी हिन्दी में होगा क्या या थोड़ा थोड़ा दोनों में ?

श्री निबन्धन बः० पार्सल : मैं पूरा हिन्दी में बोलूंगा। . . .

(Interruptions)

श्रीमती आलदा हिन्दी जानती हैं तो उनके सवाल को जवाब भी मैं हिन्दी में दूंगा।

श्री शा साहब ने कहा कि लड़ाई के दिनों में भी आप ऐसे ढंग से काम करते हैं, ऐसा कुछ आप पूछना चाहते हैं। आप जानते हैं कि अपने देश में लड़ाइयाँ हुई हैं और हमारे शूर सैनिक किस प्रकार से लड़ाई लड़े हैं और किस प्रकार से निर्णय लिये गये हैं और लड़ाई का नतीजा क्या निकला है, यह आप जानते हैं। जब कभी हम कोई चीज बनाना चाहते हैं, कोई डिफेंस के लिए या और कोई चीज लेना चाहते हैं और उसमें बहुत ज़रा पैसा खर्च होता है तो उस समय सारी चीजों का विचार करके, आर्मी के लोग होते हैं उनके विचार साइंटिस्टों के विचार कि वह हमारे देश में ही बन सकती है या नहीं उसका विचार करके, दूसरे देशों से लेना ज़रूरी होता है कि नहीं, यह विचार हम करते हैं। उसमें थोड़ा सा टाइम कम ज्यादा लग सकता है। मगर यह भी जितना जल्दी हम कर सकते हैं, करते हैं, लड़ाई के जमाने में ऐसा नहीं होता है। लड़ाई के जमाने में हमारे जो सिपाही और फौज होती है

उनके पास जो भी हथियार होते हैं, जो भी आयुध होते हैं उन सारे हथियारों के साथ वे लड़ते हैं, वे सारे ज़रूरी होते हैं।

अभी एक सवाल उठाया गया कि उनके पास डिस्ट्रिक्शनरी पावर है या नहीं। मैं आपको बताना चाहता हूँ कि उनके रहन-सहन के लिये, उनके खर्च के लिये, पेट्रोल के लिये गाड़ी आदि का काम जो है वह उनके हाथ से होता है। उनके लिये पहले ही से इंतजाम किया जाता है। यहाँ हम कोई चीज बनाना चाहते हैं कारखाने के अन्दर या बाहर से कोई चीज मंगाना चाहते हैं तो उसके लिये हम को विचार करना पड़ता है। मगर यहाँ जो आदमी हैं, तार्र में, साइड में आदमी हैं, हर जगह पर उनके लिये पहले ही से इंतजाम होता है, उनके लिये पैस का इंतजाम होता है। उसमें डिस्ट्रिक्शन देने या लेने का सवाल नहीं होता है। जो रोज-द-रोज की चीजें होती हैं उनमें कोई अड़चन नहीं होती है।

आपने विक्रांत के बारे में सवाल उठाया। एक कहता है कि विक्रांत बनाना चाहिये, दूसरा कहता है कि विक्रांत नहीं बनाना चाहिये क्योंकि पैसा बहुत खर्च होता है . . .

श्री निबन्धन बः० पार्सल : आपके पास प्रोपोजल आई है ?

श्री निबन्धन बः० पार्सल : यह दवेश्चन आवर नहीं है अब तो हम कुछ पालिसी के बारे में, मैनेजमेंट आडिट के संबंध में विचार कर रहे हैं। हर एक सवाल इसके अन्दर आप उठाते हैं तो उन सब का मालूमात मुझे करता होगा। उनके मालूमात लेने के लिये गहराई में जाना होगा, तल में जाना होगा। यह विक्रांत का सवाल है। इस संबंध में मैं बहुत ही अदब से कहना चाहता हूँ कि विक्रांत का सवाल मैनेजमेंट के सवाल से जुड़ा हुआ नहीं है। उसका सवाल अलग से हो सकता है।

[ श्री शिवराज वी० पाटिल ]

इस का जवाब देने की इस समय जरूरत है ऐसा मुझे नहीं लगता ।

श्रीमती आलवा ने एक सवाल यहां उठाया । आपने ऐसा कहा कि हम को सेल्फ सफिशियंट होना चाहिये । सेल्फ सफिशियंट होने की हमारी कोशिश है लेकिन हम सेल्फ सफिशियंट हो सकते हैं या नहीं यह सवाल है । सेल्फ रिलायंट और सेल्फ सफिशियंट इन दोनों में फर्क करना पड़ेगा । दुनिया में शायद कोई देश भी सेल्फ सफिशियंट नहीं है । किसी न किसी को छोटी-मोटी चीज दूसरे देश ने लेनी पड़ती है । किसी को हथियार लेने पड़ते हैं तो किसी को अनाज लेना पड़ता है । किसी को मोटी चीज लेनी पड़ती है तो किसी को छोटी चीज लेनी पड़ती है इसलिये सेल्फ सफिशियंट का सवाल नहीं है । मगर हमारा यह जरूर ख्याल है कि जहां तक हो सके हम सेल्फ रिलायंट रहें । हम अपने ऊपर मूक रहें । जहां तक हो सके हमारी फौज के लिये कितने हथियार आवश्यक हैं वे पूरा कर सकें यह हमारा ख्याल है । इस दुनिया के अन्दर तो तेजी से रेस चल रही है । साइंस टेक्नोलोजी की रेस चल रही है । हम एक चीज बनाते हैं तो दूसरा देश दूसरी चीज बनाता है और तीसरा देश तीसरी चीज बनाता है । डिफेंस का मामला आता है तब यह भी सवाल आता है कि जवान कितने शूर हैं, बहादुर हैं, कितने डिस्प्लिड हैं इसके साथ-साथ यह भी सवाल आता है कि उनके पास किस प्रकार के हथियार हैं, लेटेस्ट हथियार हैं या नहीं, नये बने हुए हथियार हैं या नहीं । इस रेस के अन्दर कभी हम आगे आते हैं तो कभी दूसरे देश आगे आते हैं । जब हम यह सोचते हैं कि हमें अपने देश की रक्षा करनी है, सुरक्षा करनी है तब उसके लिये हथियारों की

जरूरत होती है, नये-नये हथियारों की जरूरत होती है । जिस चीज की हम को जरूरत होती है और जिस चीज को हम यहां बना सकते हैं उसको हम जरूर बनाने की कोशिश करते हैं । जिस चीज की हमारे देश में साइंस या टेक्नोलोजी नहीं है उसको हम बाहर से लाने की कोशिश करते हैं । जब बाहर से चीज लाने हैं तो सिर्फ चीज ही लाने की कोशिश नहीं करते बल्कि वहां की साइंस और टेक्नोलोजी और नो-हाउ वगैरह भी लाने की कोशिश करते हैं । उसमें सेल्फ रिलायंट होने की कोशिश करते हैं । हमारी सरकार की, हमारे देश की यह नीति है कि जहां तक हो सके हम अपनी फौज के लिये, सारी चीजों के लिये अपनी आइनेस फैक्टरी को इस्तेमाल करें और पूरा इस्तेमाल करने के बाद अगर हम अपनी गर्ज, अपनी आवश्यकता को पूरी नहीं कर सकते तो हम प्राइवेट सेक्टर से मदद लेते हैं । इसके बाद भी अगर हम अपनी आवश्यकता पूरी नहीं कर सकते तो बाहर से चीजें लाने की जरूरत महसूस होती है देश की सुरक्षा के लिये तो वह भी हम करते हैं । ये हमारी नीति है ।

श्रीमती मार्षेट अल्पा : 40 परसेंट यूटीलाइजेशन होता है या नहीं ।

श्री शिवराज वी० पाटिल : मैं बतलाता हूं । यूटीलाइजेशन का सवाल आपने उठाया कि 40 परसेंट है तो मैं आपको बतलाता हूं कि हमारे यहां जो इंडस्ट्रीज हैं उनका आप एनालिसिस करेंगे तो आपको नजर आएगा कि यूटीलाइजेशन पूरा नहीं हुआ । न सिर्फ आर्मी की फैक्ट्रियों का नहीं है, दूसरों का भी नहीं है... (Interruptions) मैं एक एक चीज के बारे में आपको बतलाता हूं । यह जो यूटीलाइजेशन होता है, इसमें क्या होता है कि कभी-कभी यूटीलाइजेशन में हमारे पास इलेक्ट्रिसिटी नहीं

होती है, कभी-कभी स्ट्राइक भी हो जाती है और कभी-कभी ऐसा भी होता है कि जो चीज हम अपने कारखानों में बना सकते हैं उससे अलग तरीके की और अच्छे तरीके की चीज बाहर बन जाती है और वह चीज हमको लेने की जरूरत होती तो ऐसा भी हम करते हैं। सारी चीजों को मिलाकर युटिलाइजेशन होता है। मगर मैं यह जरूर कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी यह चेष्टा रहेगी, कोशिश रहेगी, हमारा प्रयत्न रहेगा कि जितनी भी हमारी केपेसिटी बनी है उसमें ज्यादा से ज्यादा केपेसिटी हम यूज करने का प्रयत्न करेंगे। उसमें कोई गलती हो गई हो तो उसको भी हम दुरुस्त करने का प्रयास करेंगे, इतना भी मैं जरूर बताना चाहता हूँ। टैंक के बारे में सवाल उठाये गये हैं। उसके बारे में बहुत चर्चा हो चुकी है और अगर उसके बारे में चर्चा करनी हो तो बहुत देर तक उसके बारे में चर्चा करनी पड़ेगी। गायद मैनेजमेन्ट को अगर थोड़ा सा लम्बा बना कर, खींचतान कर, लिया जाय तो मैनेजमेन्ट और आडिट को भी उसमें बैठाया जा सकता है। यह एक स्पेसिफिक क्वेश्चन है और उसके बारे में इतनी चर्चा हो चुकी है कि अब कोई जवाब देने की जरूरत नहीं है। इतना मैं जरूर बतला सकता हूँ कि ये जो स्पेयर पार्ट्स दिये गये हैं वे माइकल साहब को नहीं दिये गये हैं। मैं नहीं जानता कि ये माइकल साहब कौन हैं। उनको दिये नहीं गये हैं। इतना उसके संबंध में मैं बतला सकता हूँ, दूसरा कुछ बतलाने की जरूरत नहीं है।

श्री दुर्गा देव नारायण यादव जी ने यह प्रश्न उठाया है कि जांच पड़ताल करने की कोई कमेटी है या नहीं? मैं आपको यह बतला सकता हूँ कि जांच-पड़ताल होती है, इसीलिये कभी कभी

बकत भी ज्यादा लगता है। आर्मी के लेवल पर जांच-पड़ताल होती है, हमारे डिफेंस डिपार्टमेन्ट की तरफ से जांच होती है और अगर जरूरत महसूस हुई तो जो हमारा साइंस और टेक्नोलोजी का रिसर्च एण्ड डेवलपमेन्ट आर्गनाइजेशन है उनके द्वारा भी जांच पड़ताल होती है। हम सब बातों की जांच-पड़ताल करते हैं। मगर आप यह बात मानेंगे कि विचार अलग अलग हो सकते हैं। आर्मी का विचार एक हो सकता है, नेवी का विचार एक हो सकता है, एयर फोर्स का विचार एक हो सकता है। अलग अलग लोगों के अलग अलग विचार हो सकते हैं। मेरा एक विचार हो सकता है, आपका दूसरा विचार हो सकता है। विचारों में भिन्नता तो होती ही है। यह नहीं कहा जा सकता है कि जो मेरे विचार हों वही दूसरों के भी हों। अगर इतना मैं जरूर कहना चाहूंगा कि सारे विचारों को सामने रख कर और सारे विचारों के आने के बाद जो भी निर्णय लिया जाता है, मैं यह बात बड़े गर्व के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ कि उस निर्णय को आर्मी, नेवी और एयर फोर्स, सभी मान लेते हैं और उसको सभी लोग निभाते हैं। उसके लिए अगर मंत्रणा की आवश्यकता होती है तो हम जरूर मंत्रणा करते हैं। इसीलिए अलग अलग कमेटियां बनी हुई हैं। इन कमेटियों में डिफेंस प्रोडक्शन की, सप्लाय की और अन्य सारी चीजों की चर्चा हुआ करती है।

SHRI NARASINGHA PRASAD NANDA: Sir, I think Mr. Shivraj Patil will make a very successful Minister. He has talked for 40 minutes without giving anything to the House.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: Without any points.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is replying to all your points.



**SHRI NARASINGHA PRASAD NANDA:** I hope you have become wiser by his answers.

श्री शिवराज बी० पटिल : कुछ दूसरे प्रश्न भी उठाये गये हैं। मैं आनरेबल मेम्बर्स से इतना ही कहना चाहूंगा कि उन्होंने यह जो विषय उठाया है उसके संबंध में उनके पास जो भी सूचनाएं होंगी, वे हमको वैसे भी बता दें और लिख कर भी बता दें तो जो कुछ भी उनके संबंध में हो सकता है, हम जरूर करेंगे। इतना मैं जरूर बतला देना चाहता हूं कि डिफेंस के बारे में हम आपको बतलाते नहीं हैं तो इसका मतलब यह नहीं है कि वहां कुछ गलत चल रहा है। ऐसा नहीं है। हम जरूर बतलाना चाहते हैं और मालूमात करना चाहते हैं। मगर जिस सोसायटी में हम रहते हैं और एक ऐसी सोसायटी में रहते हैं जिसमें बताने में कठिनाई पैदा हो सकती है। हम आप पर पूरा भरोसा करना चाहते हैं और बातों को आपके सामने रखना चाहते हैं। लेकिन वह चीज आप तक ही सीमित नहीं रहती है। वह चीज न्यूज पेपर्स में छप जाती है। छापने का उनका अधिकार है। वह चीज सिर्फ न्यूज पेपर्स में ही नहीं रहती है, वह देश के बाहर भी पहुंच सकती है और उससे देश पर क्या असर हो सकता है, यही सोच कर बातें नहीं बताई जाती हैं। ऐसा नहीं है कि हम आपको बताना नहीं चाहते हैं। वे चीजें बाहर के देशों में चली जाती हैं और उनसे देश को नुकसान हो सकता है।

श्री शिवराज बी० पटिल : आप बाहर के देशों के ऐसे लोगों से डील करते हैं जिनसे ज्यादा नुकसान होता है।

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** We will not take up the discussion under Rule 176.

**SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY** (West Bengal); Sir, I want one thing to go on record under the Half-an-Hour discussion that was scheduled today. Mrs. Margaret Alva has raised very vital points which were not even touched by the Minister, and he says that it can be done in Question Hour. This Half-an-Hour Discussion arises out of the Question Hour and he should have come prepared instead of giving a social philosophy.

श्री शिवराज बी० पटिल : मिसेज आल्वा ने जो यहां पर कहा है वह यह कहा है कि सेन्चुरियन टैंक जो है...

(Interruptions)

**SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY:** She has given the names in the arms deal. How much did you sell and what are the conditions of sale? You did not touch those points.

श्री शिवराज बी० पटिल : मैडम मैंने बताया कि जो स्पेयर पार्ट्स बेचे गये हैं वे माइकेल को नहीं बेचे गये हैं।

श्रीमती मार्गरेट आल्वा : माइकेल किसने बोला। मैंने पूछा है कि...

श्री शिवराज बी० पटिल : सेन्चुरियन टैंक के बारे में आप कह रही हैं। इसकी पूरी इन्वेस्टिगेशन होने के बाद, आर्मी की रिपोर्ट होने के बाद, उनकी रेकमंडेशन पर, जो कुछ करना है, वह किया गया है। इस गवर्नमेन्ट के जमाने में नहीं, पहले जो गवर्नमेन्ट थी मैडम...

**SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA:** There had been proposals to make Centurion tanks useful and effective.

**SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY:** Mr. Minister, if you don't choose to reply, at least keep quiet. Don't give a clean chit for the whole.

thing. This is the kind of understanding.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We go to the next item now. Mr. Rama-knshnan will continue.

**DISCUSSION UNDER RULE 116**  
**Statement on Industrial Policy —contd.**

SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN (Tamil Nadu): I would like to remind Mr. Patil, the hon. Minister that at 4.45, our hon. Prime Minister said that she is all for the propagation of Hindi. Many Members here raised questions in English and the Minister has replied in Hindi. Half-an-Hour Discussion is for the benefit of the whole House and not for a few Members.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: They will take note of it.

SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN: Now on the socio-economic objectives of this beautiful Industrial Policy Resolution, I would like to compliment Dr. Chanana for having read all the text-books in Economics very well because from the first point of optimum utilisation of the installed capacity to consumer protection against high prices, they all look like having been taken out of the text-books. Nobody can find fault with these objectives in themselves. But the main objective should be to regulate investment and production according to some scheme of social priorities. Unfortunately^ Sir, in our society as it has developed, the inequalities in income and wealth have resulted in gross distortions in the investment pattern. We find that in the nonessential sectors, the investment has gone up whereas everyday we are faced with shortage of essential goods. The accent of the industrial policy should be on the investment pattern in sectors which are essential and to step up consumer goods.

Now, coming to consumer protection against high prices, unfortunately we in India do not have a Ralph Nadar who would take up the cause. Recently, after the Minister made some statement about high prices, we were very happy to see that some-tooth-paste companies had brought down the prices. Even the Minister said that it was going to be the beginning. But, unfortunately, after that, no prices, particularly in consumer goods, have come down. I would like to remind the Minister to take it up with these big consumer goods companies to see that prices are brought down to the lowest possible.

Sir, coming to the role of public sector which most Members here have talked about, I would like to state that the rehabilitation—and growth of the public sector will not come from platitudes. Para 6 is full of very pompous statement that the public sector should be an effective and operational one. But, unfortunately, what is it that we find in the country today? A sum of Rs. 20,000 crores p the investment in public sector and the return is ridiculous. Perhaps, it is even shameful to see that the return is minus 145 crores. I am very happy that in the latter portions of the statement, in paras 7 and 8 he said that the Government is proposed to take effective steps. I think the Minister should emphasise upon these people, these chief executives of the public sectors, to go ahead to see that production is maximised, to see that profit is maximised, to see that infructuous and avoidable expenditure is brought down to the minimum and that they should not give the excuses that the Ministry is interfering with their day-to-day affairs. This is what they come and tell the people later. So I would like the House as well as the Minister to take note of it. Now, I come to a very important and critical thing\*. This is in regard to the role of the private sector, point number nine. Sir, this is a very obvious thing. Although nobody likes it, today, despite the growth