

[Prof. V. K. R. V. Rao.]

I would like to take a minute to express my hope that with this reconstitution of the composition of the UGC and the reformulation of the function and scope of the UGC, a new chapter would have been opened in the history of University education in this country. The University education in this country has been expanding by leaps and bounds. As a matter of fact the rate of growth of University education in this country in terms of the number of institutions, number of Universities, number of Faculties, strength of the Teaching Faculty and the number of students has been much faster than the rate of growth of increase either in the national income or agricultural production or industrial production or in population. This in turn casts a very serious responsibility on the country because along with this very rapid expansion in number, there has been certain deterioration also in standards in a number of places. Partly of course it is a matter of financial constraints but finance alone does not determine the standards of education in our country. There are things like co-ordination, exchange of personnel, experience, facilities for the different Universities to take advantage from one another and the UGC, with the power that it also has to make some financial grants and consisting as it does of education experts of known calibre and being in a position to draw upon other educational experts for helping it, is in a position to give directions and impetus to the healthy development of University education in this country. It is with that objective that the Commission was set up and the Bill which I am now moving along with the amendments which have been passed by the Lok Sabha for acceptance, will, I hope, enable the UGC to discharge these functions.

The question was proposed.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AK-BAR ALI KHAN): I have no doubt that you have the blessings of the House in the successful working of the measure in which we are all very deeply interested.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AK-BAR ALI KHAN): The question is:

"That the amendments made by the Lok Sabha in the Bill be agreed to."

The motion was adopted.

DISCUSSION ON THE WORKING OF THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

SHRI R. T. PARTHASARATHY (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am very grateful to you and to the Government for having provided an opportunity for the Defence Ministry being discussed in this House and this being the first occasion, I deem it a privilege when I am called upon by you to make my initial remarks. The report on Defence has been circulated to the Members of the two Houses of Parliament and I read it twice over but I consider that the report on Defence to be dull, dreary and defenceless and I shall come out with my reasons a little later but the first thing I would like to impress upon the House is that the foundation for a sound Defence policy should be primarily the security of the country. Only if our country is basically and inherently strong and self-reliant, can we work out not only a sound Defence policy but also a sound foreign policy. Reliance on our own strength should be the badge of our pride. It has been accepted not only in this country, but throughout the history in all the democratic countries of the world, that there has been a close tie-up and interlinking between the defence and foreign policies of the democratic countries. This has been an accepted maxim or principle which the democratic nations have followed in the past and are following even today. The truth has been overwhelmingly seen in the actions of two prominent statesmen of the world, Bismark of Germany and Winston Churchill of Great Britain. In their hours of trial and tribulation they put up their country very high because there was an interlinking of the foreign and defence policies of their country. And we know how, through the course of history, they stood the test of times and how great they became in various fields of activity, particularly in the international field. I would very much like the Government of India to make a happy blending, a useful blending, of the defence and foreign policies of our country and at the same time see that our country is made strong and self-reliant. That is the first point that I would like to make to begin with my initial remarks.

In India our position would be well realised if we could make an honest attempt to view the entire picture impartially. Our minds are overwhelmingly exercised by what I would call the

Chinese menace and the Pakistani enmity. While it is necessary for our country to be prepared to meet the external aggression from whichever quarter it might come, it is a moot point—and I make a very humble submission in this direction—whether we should surpass or equal all the others in the matter of space and nuclear development. I shall deal with this subject at a little length. But you will pardon me if I say that today this has achieved what I would call a radical turn in one quarter and a conservative turn in the other. At the moment the launching of the Chinese satellite, that too following the nuclear explosions in China, has raised a fear in this country that this is directed against India, and a very legitimate fear it is. We should draw a distinction here and now between the knowhow of space research and nuclear explosions and the need to build up deterrent forces based on these. Let us be quite candid that economically our strength does not visualise in the immediate foreseeable future an ability to develop and sustain the nuclear forces. Only two countries in the world, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, are in a position to do both. They can manufacture nuclear weapons and also they have the delivery system in both the countries. Though they are in a position to do both, these two countries would not part with their scientific knowledge in manufacturing nuclear and deterrent weapons to other countries. So, now how are you going to produce these weapons? How are you going to sustain these weapons? What is going to be our nuclear policy? The possession of a few nuclear weapons alone will not enable us to win a victory where large areas of our territory are concerned. Therefore, if there should be a threat from China which we expect any moment and which we are bound to counter, the way China is working not only in the near east but also in the far east should be a lesson thrown open to us and the reflection of the Chinese working we have seen and we are seeing today in the Naxalite activities and the activities of the fellow-travellers. The Defence Minister should apply his mind basically to this question as to what China is aiming at towards India and whether she has any territorial ambitions with reference to India and whether the Naxalite activities are the forerunners of such events. In India, particularly in recent times, and also in the last week when a convention of Members of Parliament was held, there

has been a general demand that we should manufacture nuclear weapons. The people also seem to be saying that they would like the Indian Government to be in the race. If we are going to manufacture nuclear weapons, the first question is how we are going to use it for defence, whether we are in a position to manufacture these nuclear weapons of defence and offence and whether economically it would be possible to manufacture them. I would like to take your mind and the minds of the honourable Members of this House to the basic factor that our national income is only 1 per cent of the national income of the United States of America. Whereas the United States of America's national income is 750 billion dollars, ours is only 8 billion dollars—300 billion rupees or Rs. 30,000 crores. Can our economy stand and sustain itself in producing nuclear and deterrent weapons as such? It is a question to which this House should apply its mind and take a decision. I am only placing the bare facts before this House.

I have a complaint against the Government, particularly against the Prime Minister as well as the Defence Minister, that their statements on the floor of Parliament have not given the true picture of their own mind to the people and to the Members of Parliament. The Government's nuclear policy is ambiguous, if not confusing. The Government has no clear-cut thinking on this. The Chinese enmity to India is patent. France can help India, but not in the delivery system. All the nuclear countries are primary members of the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty and they would not divulge their secrets to help India in the manufacture of nuclear weapons or in the delivery system. In the face of this picture, what is the policy of the Government of India particularly with reference to the defence of our country when China has exploded its nuclear weapons? The ICBM might affect India's security. That is why I would very much like to know what the policy of the Government of India would be with reference to the manufacture of nuclear weapons. The Government of India should have a clear thinking on this and place its views on the Table of the House. I charge the Government in this vital thing that it has kept the people of India in the dark with reference to its nuclear policy. I make bold to demand on the floor of this House that the Government, particularly the Defence Minister, should

[Shri R. T. Parthasarathy.]

come out with a white paper on its nuclear policy and take the country into its confidence. It is also important to note that in order to meet the Chinese and the Pakistani menace, conventional measures of building up a strong economy, a strong conventional Defence force and a strong sense of nationality with faith in the country's destiny, are all that are required to be supplemented by effective secondary Defence measures on the peripheral area by the settlement of the released Defence personnel. This should be treated as part of the Defence expenditure. The released Defence personnel should be well advised to settle in areas like NEFA, Rajasthan Canal Border and also Kashmir. I wonder why the Government is not thinking on these lines. This will be a wise move to carve out and keep a first class second line of defence. I do hope that, when the hon. Defence Minister intervenes, he will be able to give out his mind and Government's thinking on this humble suggestion of mine. By developing the conventional weapons we are giving a lift to our own economy because in the manufacture of defence weapons as well as offensive weapons our own industrial development will be accelerated. Though we have made a correct beginning on this, there is a lot that remains to be done and before it is too late I do hope the Government will kick up—if I could use that expression—and see that the defence production units are accelerated in their productive methods.

One other important aspect of defence which I would like to place before the House is about the border areas. The security of the country is largely reflected on the security of the border areas, how we protect them. The lengthy mountainous terrain from Ladakh to NEFA is of permanent significance to India's defence. The Government, I am sorry to say, has not employed adequate mountain divisions in those hilly areas to cope up with our defence of the borders. If there is a sudden conflagration in those areas, we might be exposed to the danger of an attack by the enemy. So, mountain divisions should be increasingly employed in the border areas, particularly in the North, North-west and North-east. Guerilla warfare technique is at a low ebb with reference to our Indian Armed Forces. It should be developed and intensified. There is a slackening of progress, I find, in the Armed Forces with particular

reference to guerilla warfare. The Defence Ministry should insist on a disciplined nationality in the border areas, fomented and maintained with vigour, vitality and vigilance. To annihilate the fifth column activity should be a basic part of our defence strategy. The safety of the nation, everyone will agree with me, is our prime concern. The Defence and Home Ministries have not co-ordinated their activities with reference to the quelling of fifth column activities in the border areas of the country and I do hope that in quelling this no quarter will be given to legalistic quibblings.

Sir, when I speak about the border areas I would like to mention the importance of the helicopter fleet that we keep for our defence measures in the border areas. I am sorry to say that the Government's helicopter fleet is appallingly poor. The vast and distant terrain of the hilly regions in the northern border particularly necessitates the employment of an efficient helicopter fleet. This is a vital organ not only with reference to air-borne supplies, but in critical times it will also help in the defence personnel being transhiped in the quickest possible time from one place to another. I say this because I had been a member of the parliamentary delegation that visited two years back the Sikkim-Sino border, 15,000 feet in elevation, namely; Nathula, Jalapla and other areas. I visited this area and I thank the Government for sending me as a member of the delegation. I found the morale of the Jawans in those areas very high and I would like to take the opportunity of paying my tribute to the Jawans who are in that hilly region, in an ice-cold region, discharging their duties by the country with great patriotism and devotion to their work. I would like to take this opportunity not only to pay my tribute to the Jawans, but also to the men of the Armed Forces, the officers of the Armed Forces and particularly to the Chiefs of the Army, Navy and Air Force for the exemplary manner in which they are discharging their duties by India. I would like to salute them standing on the floor of the House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AK-BAR ALI KHAN): Mr. Parthasarathy, I am sure the House joins you in this.

SHRI R. T. PARTHASARATHY: Thank you. I am grateful to you. When I speak about the Jawans, I must place before you the result of my talk with

a number of them both at the height of Nathula and elsewhere. Though they are very unhappy with their salary conditions they are discharging their duties without grumbling. Their salary conditions deserve a reassessment by the Government, under the changed economic conditions in India.

SHRI PITAMBER DAS (Uttar Pradesh) : The House may join you in this demand also.

SHRI R. T. PARTHASARATHY : Thank you. Let it not be forgotten that a contented Army is an asset to the nation. I am sure that the Defence Minister will agree with me that to make the Army contented, to make their families live in peace and happiness, their salary deserves revision and I request the Government to do something about it. When I make that appeal to the Government, it will not go out of my mind—the fact that, in spite of such an excellent Army, doing their duty by the country, the Defence Ministry has not done anything to make the country and the people defence conscious, particularly among the civilian population of this great country. There is a general fear among the people or if fear is not there, there is continued apathy amongst them. This is a very bad sign. If we turn the pages of our history, we will find how India was one of the greatest martial countries in the world. Though we achieved Swaraj through non-violence, if you turn the pages of history for the last one thousand years, you will find the greatness and the valour of the people of India. So, the youth of India should be educated to be defence-conscious. NCC should be made compulsory for everyone. Here the Defence Minister may not agree with me, but the present method of bifurcating N.C.C. education from social services and allowing the students to take one or the other is not going to deliver the goods to you. I would say that NCC should be made compulsory to every student in the country. A more effective and larger observance of discipline should be enforced and no State should be allowed to get away with the non-implementation of the national defence programme.

Sir, I would like to say a word about defence science. Without defence science no country can have a successful defence policy. In India today, the hon. Home Minister knows that there are 37 defence science laboratories with a director

for each of them, but there is no co-ordination between them. They receive orders not from a scientific expert sitting in judgment over them or controlling them, but from the Defence Ministry officials who are often unqualified to give such orders to the directors of the defence laboratories. What is the result? They are found to be slow in their progress on research and often they are delayed achievements. A second look at and a deeper look into the whole structure of defence science laboratories should be made by the Government and the colossal wastage should be avoided. All the national research centres should be made to contribute vitally to the growth and progress of defence science in general.

Sir, I would like to deal at some length, if not at great length, with the feeder to defence. I mean defence production. I am happy that the Minister in charge of Defence Production is here. The Defence Production Department today is not properly mobilised, for the production therefrom is not commensurate with the investment. I cannot be contradicted on this. I am on firm grounds when I am making that accusation against the Government.

THE MINISTER OF STATE (DEFENCE PRODUCTION) IN THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE (SHRI L. N. MISHRA) : It is contradicted. Production is commensurate with investment. With an investment of one crore, the production is one crore per annum.

SHRI R. T. PARTHASARATHY : We will come to that later on. I will stand corrected if you convince me. Sir, Government's vigilance on these units is very poor. If these units are successfully to function, I will suggest the Defence rules and regulations should be made applicable to these Defence Production Units. Para-military discipline should be made obligatory in all the Defence production departments, particularly factories, and ordinary labour laws should not be made applicable to these Defence production units. If the responsibility of the workers is not properly harnessed and the secrets are leaked out, it will result in a national calamity. I will again illustrate this point with one example. I am happy I am bringing this to the notice of this House. It relates to the Cossipore Factory where cartridges are made. The Defence Minister knows that lot of human hand work should be employed there and so

[Shri R. T. Parthasarathy]

they have a margin of 10% for human error. But what is happening in Cossipore Factory? To my consternation, I learnt that more than 50% of the cartridges are wasted not by human error but by deliberate human error because of a particular ideology very near to the core of Naxalites and their fellow travellers. They have a good grip over the labourers working in the Cossipore Factory and as a result we find that more than 50% of the cartridges produced either disappeared or they are condemned because they are not according to the specified standards. Is it not a national calamity? And the Government is watching this sabotage from within in a passive way. Has the Government any answer? I would like the Government to answer. I am on a very firm ground here. Therefore, I would say that para-military discipline should be brought in not only in Cossipore but other factories too. Sir, I come from Tamil Nadu and I know intimately about the Avadi Tank Factory. When the agreement was signed and the factory was started was, it not the intention of the Government that within two to three years the production should be at least 10 tanks per month and what is it that we are doing? Are we rolling out a single tank per month? What is your performance and what are the reasons? Why are you not sticking to your programme and is it not a national waste? The Minister says that our target capacity is 1 crore and we are producing $1\frac{1}{2}$ to 2 crores of rupees worth of goods. He may be correct, but is it true in the case of Avadi? I would like the Minister to come out with the facts.

In the past we depended on other countries for technical know-how, but now we are depending solely on Soviet Russia. I am grateful to the Soviet Union that they have helped us with particular reference to Defence but I do not like our country to be entirely dependent on one country. It must be seen that in international affairs there are no permanent friends. But even at present we seem to be—I am very sorry to make this remarks—on the outer periphery of the Warsaw Pact Powers in many matters because of our allegiance to the Soviet Union when it is necessary for us to be really non-aligned and not to reduce our independence but to see that we do not rely on one benefactor, viz., the Soviet Union. Sir, let us take the case of aeroplane manufacture.

Formerly, France and Britain gave us a helping hand.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh): When and in what form? Was it before 1947?

SHRI R. T. PARTHASARATHY: Why are you so allergic to France and Britain? It was in the form of thin aluminium, which was essential for the manufacture of aeroplanes.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: I want the speaker to give the date when the French and the British helped our Air Force. Was it before August 15, 1947? If it was so, none of us should be proud of that.

SHRI R. T. PARTHASARATHY: After 1947. If you want I will give you the date. Sir, this point is very material that even today India cannot produce the thin aluminium used for aircraft manufacture. It has got to be imported from other countries and if we are going to be dependent only on the Soviet Union for that, they would naturally like to dictate terms to us on how our Defence should be looked after and naturally we should be subservient to Soviet Union. If you depend upon yourself, I have no objection. But depending upon one country is the wrong policy of the Government.

I would like to pay a compliment to one Dr. Gadge of the Hindustan Aircraft Factory, Bangalore. But for him, many of the aircrafts developed by our country would not have seen the light of the day and at the same time I would accuse the Defence Production Department for their tardiness, slowness and inefficiency. But for that, our production would have gone much ahead. So I appeal to you and, through you, to the House to see that the entire Defence Production Department should be toned up to meet the challenge of the time and see that our country's defence production is placed on a solid and sound footing.

There is one thing more, about coastline defence. The inordinate delay in setting up radar equipment and radar observation centres all over India to watch the 2,000 mile long coastline has harmed our defence. Let us learn a lesson from Japan and The United States of America who have lengthy coastline defence systems. We can take

out some lesson from them with advantage, and work out our own defence strategy. In this connection, I would lay a charge upon the Government again, whether it is the Defence Ministry or the Civil Aviation Ministry. With Italian collaboration a number of radar equipment units have been imported in order that they may be planted in the various coastline areas and their guarantee period is 18 months and that period has lapsed. Still our Government has to plant those radar equipment units in the respective areas. I wonder again why the Government is playing so slow with defence. I would like the Defence Minister to look into it and take up the matter with the Defence Production Ministry and see that appropriate action is taken in the matter.

I am afraid this Government is not interested in the Navy. That is my conclusion. They are not interested in enlarging their submarine fleet: they are not having their regular naval exercises as Japan or the United Kingdom is having. I do hope that this kind of apathy would be overcome and that Government would take more interest in naval activities.

The last point I would like to emphasize is that the budget of Rs. 1151 crores could be better utilised provided there is an accent on the development and harnessing of manpower. The report on Defence deals at length with manpower but a lot of manpower in the form of multiplicity of orderlies is wasted, and they will do well to discharge their duty in the front line and forward area. The House knows what is called the teeth-to-tail ratio in the Army. It has been brought down from 11 to 9. If there is one man in the front, 11 men are kept behind for various other works. It has been reduced from 11 to 9. I hope that the Defence Ministry will go deeper into the question and bring about a still further reduction in this because, if they do it, there will be a saving of army personnel. They will be better employed in the forward areas and other places.

I would like to make only one comment following the criticism of the Public Accounts Committee about defence expenditure. There is a lot of wastage. This wastage is due to inefficiency and waste also contributes to inefficiency; in turn it weakens the army. I would very much like that economy should be observed in the use of staff cars and in

the colossal use of trucks by the Defence Ministry. Crores of rupees could be saved. Defence economy can be regulated with prudent spending and avoidance of waste. This will result in national benefit.

I would like to conclude, after a few random thoughts that I placed before this hon. House, by paying a tribute to the Defence Forces as being true to the country and true to their masters. The country is their master. Being far away from politics I am confident that they will save India whatever may come. Thank you.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, the relation between a sound foreign policy and a sound defence policy has always been a problem in this country. Some people are critical of the foreign policy, others are critical of the defence policy.

SHRI BALKRISHNA GUPTA (Bihar): We are critical of both.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: He is critical of everything, excluding himself.

I personally feel that our foreign policy has been and is sound and it has paid us big dividends. Similarly our defence policy, based on indigenous production of as many defence items as possible, is also sound. What is important is the objectives that a country follows. If a country follows a policy of annexation, if a country follows a policy of picking up quarrels with its neighbours, its foreign policy and its defence policy will be different. But our country does not follow a foreign policy of annexation...

SHRI BALKRISHNA GUPTA: It allows others to annex our territory.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Others do not need your permission. You do not speak without the permission of the Chair.

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (SHRI S. N. MISHRA): In the President's Address you had implored that China should allow you to live in peace.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Everyone implores everyone else to allow him to live in peace. Only warmongers threaten others, which I know Mr. Mishra

[Shri Arjun Arora.]

is not. Mr. Balkrishna Gupta may be one. It is the objectives that a country follows which are material. This country follows a policy of friendship with its neighbours and peace all over the world, and once these objectives are taken as correct, our foreign policy and our defence policy are both bound to be sound. I am glad that Mr. Parthasarathy in his 40 minutes' speech said one correct thing and praised the effort at self-reliance in defence which is the most important part of the defence policy followed by the Government. As a matter of fact efforts at increasing defence production made in this country since 1957 have been highly praiseworthy, and during the last 13 years almost wonders have been achieved.

SHRI BALKRISHNA GUPTA. What wonders have been achieved?

SHRI ARJUN ARORA. Mr. Parthasarathy mentioned the Avadi tanks. Then we have heard of the MIG planes. We have also got factories in the country producing small arms.

SHRI BALKRISHNA GUPTA: In the Arab-Israeli war MIG planes have been proved out of date.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: In the Arab-Israeli war the Arab pilots may have been proved out of date, not the planes they were flying.

SHRI K. P. SUBRAMANIA MENON (Kerala): The hon. Member will remember that in Vietnam the Phantoms have also failed.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA. He has not heard of Vietnam.

Mr. Parthasarathy was very critical of the help that we get from the Soviet Union in the matter of defence production, and he said, why take help only from the Soviet Union. He is sane enough not to condemn the Soviet Union for helping us in defence production. Mr. Parthasarathy is sane enough not to condemn us for taking what we can get from the Soviet Union. But he does not like the Soviet Union, he does not like the Government of India. So he must say something critical...

(Interruption)

SHRI R. T. PARTHASARATHY: I said in my speech that I thank the Soviet Union for the help it is giving us. Let him not misrepresent. I said, why only from the Soviet Union and become subservient to them. Let him answer that point.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Nobody has become subservient. Only Mr. Parthasarathy is subservient to Mr. Kamaraj..

SHRI R. T. PARTHASARATHY. Neither Mr. Kamaraj nor Mrs. Gandhi is my leader.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: I thought Mr. S. N. Mishra was his leader. In the matter if Soviet help in increasing our defence production we have to remember one thing. The Congress Government of this country on every occasion tried to get help from the United States, United Kingdom and France, the so-called western powers, in increasing our defence production. Only when the United States, the United Kingdom and France refused to give us help...

SHRI R. T. PARTHASARATHY: Why did they refuse?

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: You ask them.

Only when they refused to give us help, we went to the Soviet Union as a last resort. Take the submarines, for example. We asked the Government of Britain to lend us submarines for training our crew. They refused to give us. After months of pleading with the Government of Great Britain we went to the Soviet Union and the Soviet Union gave us not one but two submarines. Mr. Parthasarathy says, why do you take it only from the Soviet Union. We take it from the Soviet Union because the Soviet Union is the only country which is prepared to help us in increasing our defence production. Take the case of the Migs.

3 P.M.

(Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): No interruption, Mr. Parthasarathy.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Take the case of the Migs. Mr. Balkrishna Gupta does not like them. He would like to take the Boeings, luxury liners, instead

of fighter planes. Were the Government of the USA or the Government of Canada or the Government of Britain or the Government of France prepared to give us a factory like the Mig factories to produce fighter, bomber planes? Sir, I remember—when the Chinese attacked us, an Air Vice-Marshal was sent round the western world to buy planes. The western powers talk so much of anti-Communist Chinese (*Interruptions*) If you have a little patience, I will give Mr Balkrishna Gupta the answer. Do not allow your blood pressure to rise to a great height. I keep it under control, you do not. When the Chinese invaded this country and an Air Vice-Marshal of India was sent round the western world, even after weeks of negotiations he could get no planes. The Soviet Union during that gloomy one month from October 20 to November 19, sent us at least four Mig planes, as a token of their solidarity with us. During the Chinese aggression, the western powers offered us equipment for four ordnance factories. Has that equipment arrived in India so far? Sir, I am only repeating what is well known to everyone that much of the Government of the USA and it was on the high seas when our war with Pakistan began and that equipment was ordered back. The ships which were approaching the harbour of Bombay—they were within 20 or 30 miles of Bombay—were called back by the Government of the USA and the equipment of those four ordnance factories which the Government of the USA promised us in 1962 is yet to arrive at the destination. It will never arrive. So, how can we blame Sardar Swaran Singh or Mrs Indira Gandhi for taking Soviet help?

We must realise that if we are independent, if we want to follow an independent foreign policy, an independent economic policy, a policy of independent economic development in the country, the Government of the USA, the Government of Great Britain, the Government of France and the Government of West Germany will not help us, only the Soviet Union will help us. If you are so much enamoured of the help from these western countries in the matter of defence production, the help which is not coming, which is only a promise but which is withdrawn, you have to reverse our foreign policy, you have once more to become a colony or a semi-colony which, I am sure this country is not prepared at all to become

I then, Sir, there is so much talk about the Government's nuclear policy. I am sorry that Mr Parthasarathy said that the Government's nuclear policy is confused. I feel that if Government is clear on any aspect of its policy, whether you like it or not, the clarity is there, and that aspect of policy is the nuclear policy. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Mr Lal Bahadur Shastri and Mrs Indira Gandhi, our three Prime Ministers, have repeatedly declared that this country will not make an atom bomb, that it will develop nuclear energy only for peaceful purposes. The policy is clear. If you do not agree with it

SHRI R. T. PARTHASARATHY I agree. I said the Prime Minister's and the Defence Minister's statements on the floors of both the Houses are confusing and ambiguous. Let them make it clear.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA I am glad that Mr Parthasarathy agrees with at least one sane thing, apart from cricket. But he is wrong when he calls it confused or ambiguous or anything like that. The policy is clear. We will develop atomic energy, we will develop atomic potential, only for peaceful uses. Sir, I am one of those who believe that the first and the last atom bombs against human beings were used against the Japanese people at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Nobody will use them again. Now, it is not one country.

SHRI BALKRISHNA GUPTA What guarantee have you?

SHRI ARJUN ARORA That is my view. I am not giving any guarantee. He may be a guarantee broker. I am not.

श्री नेकी राम (हरियाणा) सभापति जी, यह बार बार उठ रहे हैं, मालूम नहीं इनको कहा दर्द हो रहा है। मैं आपके द्वारा प्रार्थना करूंगा कि यह डाक्टर के पास जाय।

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही (उत्तर प्रदेश) नेकी राम जी के सिर में दर्द हो रहा है।

SHRI ARJUN ARORA I am of the view that the first and last atom bombs were used in 1945 when the Americans had the atomic monopoly. Their monopoly has been broken. It was broken long ago, it is now being repeatedly broken. Now, the Americans dare not

[Shri Arjun Arora.]

use atom bombs against anybody. Similarly, the Chinese dare not use atom bombs against anybody. As a matter of fact, let us be fair to the Chinese, though some of us are too much pre-occupied with the Chinese. The Chinese Government has declared that it will not be the first to use atom bombs.

Sir, I take you to the 1930s when Fascist Italy of Mussolini used the poison gas against the Abyssinian people. But during the Second World War, neither Hitler nor Churchill used the poison gas because both had it and both knew that the use of the poison gas would be something which would be retaliated, and nobody used it.

SHRI BALKRISHNA GUPTA: But we have no power of retaliation. We have no bombs.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: We are not living in isolation; Mr. Gupta lives in an isolated house, we are not living in isolation. We are living in a world which is day by day becoming more and more conscious of international responsibilities. There is a thing like conscience, a thing Mr. Gupta does not have; there is a thing like international conscience which will not allow atom bombs to be used.

Anyhow, Sir, I take you to another aspect of the atom bomb cry. The people who cry for an atom bomb are also the people who every time oppose the development of our engineering potential. They are the people who every time oppose the expansion of the indigenous petroleum, chemical, steel and other industries. They oppose every effort at industrial development and cry for the atom bomb. Their cry is like the cry of an infant who asks for the moon but does not know how to go to the moon. They do not realise that it requires a highly developed engineering and technological base for the atom bomb or similar equipment. The fact that the same people who oppose industrial development of the country demand the atom bomb is something which makes me feel that their cry should not be taken seriously.

SHRI BALKRISHNA GUPTA: Nobody is opposing industrial development.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Mr. Balakrishna Gupta, for example, is one of them.

I am all for discipline, and I am a very disciplined person but...

SHRI R. T. PARTHASARATHY: Since when?

SHRI ARJUN ARORA:... I could not understand Mr. Parthasarathy's plea that civilian workers in our Defence establishments should be brought under military discipline.

SHRI R. T. PARTHASARATHY: I did not say military discipline. I said para-military discipline. You must know the distinction between the two.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Whether military discipline or para-military discipline I am opposed to them. In an industrial enterprise, in a defence production unit or in any production unit, the willing co-operation of the workers should be available. The workers should be made to feel the importance of the items that they are engaged in producing. They should be made to feel the significance of defence production. If I understood him correctly, he said that labour legislations should not be applied to civilian workers in defence production units. That also will be a grievous mistake, and I am sure the Defence Minister will, not accept it.

Sir, the labour laws in the country provide the industrial workers certain minimum amenities, certain minimum facilities and certain minimum rights. Why should those facilities, those amenities and those minimum rights be taken away from the workers engaged in defence production? I must pay my compliment to the Government for giving workers engaged in defence production a little more than the legally necessary minimum that they are already getting. The talk that the labour laws should not apply to them is futile.

Sir, many youngmen joined our Armed Forces in times of crisis in 1962 and 1965. They were called Emergency Commissioned Officers. Their tenure having come to an end, they have been demobbed. In this House, Sir, we have repeatedly brought their problem to the forefront. I am sorry to say, Sir, that in spite of this House repeatedly expressing itself in favour of immediate energetic steps to rehabilitate those who

accepted the Emergency Commission in the Armed Force, during the emergency nothing much has been done. We still get demobbed Emergency Commissioned Officers rotting and running from office to office. When the second World War ended in 1945, very senior officers were put in charge of rehabilitation of people who were demobbed. Similar steps should be taken for these people. They are not many. They are educated youngmen who sacrificed their career and accepted Emergency Commission. Now that this period of their service is over, they must be rehabilitated. As a matter of fact, rehabilitation of all ex-servicemen should get much greater attention than it does.

With these words, Sir, I commend the Defence policy and I congratulate the Defence Minister and the Minister of Defence Production for increasing defence production in the country which alone is the best guarantee of our defence. Thank you.

श्री सुंदर सिंह भंडारी (राजस्थान)

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, रक्षा मंत्रालय के कार्य-करण पर आज चर्चा है। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह सदन के सदस्यों को एक अवसर प्राप्त हुआ है, जिसमें हम अपनी सुरक्षात्मक परिस्थितियों का विवेचन कर सकें। यद्यपि कई बार विश्व में ये आशाएँ प्रकट की गई हैं कि हथियार समाप्त होने चाहियें, बार-बार इसकी कोशिशें भी हुईं लेकिन अब घूम फिर कर लोग इस नतीजे पर आ गये हैं कि हथियार तो रहेंगे। दुनिया की कल्पना बिना हथियारों के नहीं की जा सकती और बड़े-बड़े ज्यादा मार करने वाले हथियार या अणु बमों के संबंध में भी पिछले दिनों में एक सम्मेलन हुआ और दूसरे देशों को भी जिनके पास अणु बम नहीं हैं, उनको भी शर्तों में बांधने की कोशिश की गई कि वह कम से कम न्यूक्लियर पावर को गिनती में न आएँ, परन्तु देशों में इस बात को भी होड़ रही कि जिनके पास आणविक हथियार हैं, वे इसके ऊपर काबू कैसे करें और यह अभी तक इस झंझट का भी कोई हल नहीं निकाल पाए कि पहले इस पर बाबू पाएँ या पहले एक दूसरे के पास कितने हैं यह देखें। इन्स्पेक्शन और कंट्रोल यह भी एक विवाद का सवाल बना हुआ है,

जिसका कोई नतीजा नहीं निकला। मैं समझता हूँ, इस परिस्थिति में हमें अपनी सुरक्षा का विचार करना चाहिए।

विदेश नीति का जैसा कि कहा गया, सुरक्षा के साथ बहुत संबंध है। आज अगर इस सारे विवाद के अवसर पर हम एक तथ्य को स्वीकार कर सकें कि हमारी विदेश नीति सुरक्षा की समस्याओं को घटाने में समर्थ नहीं हुई है और चाहे विदेश मंत्री और सुरक्षा मंत्री आपस में कुलीज हो, लेकिन अपने अपने कार्य क्षेत्र की जिम्मेदारियाँ भली प्रकार समझ कर कम से कम सुरक्षा मंत्री विदेश मंत्रालय पर ज़रूरत से ज्यादा भरोसा न करें। हम इस समय के विदेश मंत्रालय के द्वारा या देश के अंदर अपनाई जाने वाली विदेश नीतियों से, यह एक कटु सत्य है, अपना सकट का नहीं कर पाएँ, हम अपने दोस्तों की सख्या नहीं बढ़वा सकें और चारों तरफ से सकट अधिक घिर रहा है। पाकिस्तान का केवल हथियारों के साथ चीन से सीधा संबंध था और पिछले दिनों में पाकिस्तान के साथ हमारी लड़ाई के बाद भी, जब अमरीका ने उस समय हथियार देना बंद किया था, लेकिन आज वह हथियार अमरीका से आ रहे हैं, खुले रास्ते से आ रहे हैं, मीधे और इजाजत से आ रहे हैं और शायद इस भी इस दौड़ में पीछे नहीं पड़ना चाहता। वह इस डर से कि कहीं चीनी प्रभाव ज्यादा न हो जाय, इस दौड़ में बारबर है और आज हमारी सीमा पर हथियारों का ढेर बढ़ता जा रहा है, भूल चूक से भी उसके अंदर लगने वाली चिनगारी से उसका परिणाम अपने देश को भी भुगतना पड़ सकता है।

एक नयी घटना जो पिछले 2 वर्षों से भारत के क्षेत्र के चारों तरफ हुई वह है हिन्द महासागर की बदली हुई परिस्थितियाँ। अंग्रेज अभी तक हिन्द महासागर के सही अर्थों में मालिक थे। यह कहना कि खुला समुद्र किसी के आधिपत्य में नहीं, यह सिद्धांत तार्किक रूप से सही होगा। लेकिन इस बात को हमें स्वीकार करना पड़ेगा कि हिन्द महासागर के दो घुसने के मार्ग, सिंगापुर

[श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी]

और स्वेज नहर, इन दोनों पर अंग्रेजों का कब्जा रहा। अफ्रीका, ईरान और बाकी की सब जगहों पर वह काबिज थे, हिन्दुस्तान पर वह काबिज थे और इस कारण यह सत्य है कि जब तक अंग्रेजों ने हिन्द महासागर से हटने का फैसला नहीं किया, हिन्द महासागर लगभग उन्हीं का समुद्र बन कर रहा। भारत को पहले जो एक खतरा था इस खुले समुद्र से और जिसका फायदा अंग्रेजों ने उठाया इसमें संदेह नहीं, लेकिन अंग्रेजों के शासन काल में अंग्रेजों के अतिरिक्त कोई दूसरी शक्ति हिन्द महासागर में नहीं रही। यहाँ से अंग्रेजों के हटने के बाद अब यह होड़ लगी है कि इस महासागर पर किसका प्रभुत्व रहे। अमरीका बहुत जगहों पर मौजूद है। अफ्रीकी तटों पर, आस्ट्रेलिया के तट पर और हिन्द महासागर में उसके युद्ध पोत, उसकी पनडुब्बियाँ आज विचरण कर रही हैं। रूस भी आज वहाँ मौजूद है और अपने तैरते हुए अड्डों से उसने वहाँ सब व्यवस्था कर रखी है, जहाजों के सुधार की, उनकी रीफिलिंग की और उसने वहाँ अपना काम शुरू कर दिया है। चीन ने भी इस क्षेत्र में प्रवेश करना आरम्भ कर दिया है यद्यपि उसको ठिकाने की जगह अभी तक मुश्किल से मिल पाई है, लेकिन यह बात साफ है कि हिन्द महासागर एक ऐसा खुला हुआ समुद्र है कि जो दुनिया में लामिसाल है। जिस समुद्र का नाम देश के नाम के साथ जुड़ा हो, वही आज हिन्द के लिए उसकी सुरक्षा को नहीं चुनौतियाँ उपस्थित कर रहा है, इस स्थिति को अस्वीकार करने से काम नहीं चलेगा। मैं चाहता हूँ कि सरकार इस परिस्थिति का सही जायजा ले और बजाय इसके कि हम इधर उधर के देशों पर निर्भर करे, सुरक्षा मंत्रालय को इस देश की सुरक्षा की जिम्मेदारी इन बड़ी हुई परिस्थितियों के सदर्भ में स्वयं को स्वीकार करनी चाहिए। वैसे तो भिन्न-भिन्न मुझाव आते हैं और उनके साथ ही एशियन सिक्योरिटी का भी एक उडता हुआ मुझाव आया। मालूम नहीं कि उसके डिटेल्स क्या हैं और उस में से कितनी चीजें अभी सोची गयी हैं। सेटो और सीटो का अनुभव हमारे सामने है और कितने ही सैनिक गठबंधनों का अनुभव हमारे सामने है।

मैं समझता हूँ कि किसी भी प्रकार के छोटे सैनिक गठबंधनों या दूसरे देशों के आश्वासनों पर अपने को नहीं छोड़ना चाहिए और अगर कहीं भी इस बात की जरूरत है तो उसके लिए हमें सयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ और सुरक्षा परिषद् के फोरमको इस्तेमाल करना चाहिए इन्टरनेशनल क्षेत्र में जिसमें कि किसी भी प्रकार के छोटे मुल्कों को, मदद चाहने वाले मुल्कों को उस फोरम से सुरक्षा और शक्ति मिल सके और वहाँ शान्ति कायम करने के लिए हमें उसे बल देना चाहिए। छोटे दायरे में किये गये सैनिक समझौते या सुरक्षा की कोई अन्य व्यवस्था एक प्रकार से इस देश को किसी न किसी प्रकार की सैनिक मजबूरियों की परिस्थिति में ही ला कर खड़ा करेगी, जिस को हमें पसंद नहीं करना चाहिए। मैं समझता हूँ कि इसलिए और भी जरूरी है कि हम अपनी सुरक्षा नीतियों को अधिक व्यवस्थित रूप से बनाये। यहाँ पर जिस आधार पर वह गठित की गयी है, उस पर मैं थोड़ी चर्चा करना चाहूँगा।

यहाँ पर कबिनेट की एक डिफेंस कमेटी है, सुरक्षा मंत्रालय है और सेना के ओर लोग हैं नीचे के स्तर पर, वह उससे सबधित हैं। मैं यह चाहूँगा और इसमें कोई शक नहीं कि सेना के तीनों अंगों के प्रमुख उसके साथ जुड़े हैं। लेकिन उसके साथ ही मैं आग्रह करूँगा कि उसमें हमको कोई न कोई एक टेक्निकल एक्सपर्ट ऐसा रखना चाहिए कि जो सम्यक रूप से सारे देश की सुरक्षा के सबध में हमको सलाह दे सके। उसे वहाँ रखने में हमको कोई आपत्ति नहीं होनी चाहिए और हम कबिनेट के स्तर में भी किसी आदमी को एसोसिएट करे सलाह देने के लिए। वक्तन-फक्तन हम उसकी टेक्निकल सलाह प्राप्त कर लें, इसमें भी हमें कोई आपत्ति नहीं होनी चाहिए। कम से कम डिफेंस मिनिस्टर को सलाह देने के लिए तो एक टेक्निकल एक्सपर्ट हम को जरूर रखना चाहिए। मैं नहीं कहता कि चीफ आफ स्टाफ टेक्निकल आदमी नहीं है, लेकिन एक को-आडिनेटर अगर उनके बीच में हो तो अच्छा है। हम जानते हैं कि केवल सैनिक दृष्टि से किसी

भी राष्ट्र को होड़ नहीं करना चाहिए, लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर हम इस टेक्निकल एक्सपर्ट को अपनी डिफेंस की पालिसी बनाने के साथ संबद्ध कर दे या अपनी सभी नीतियों को निर्णय करने में अगर हम उसकी मदद लें या विभिन्न देशों के साथ जो हमें मजबूरी तौर पर अपनी सुरक्षा की आवश्यकताओं के लिए निर्भर रहना पड़ता है, उनसे कुछ चीजें लेनी पड़ती हैं, उनसे किसी प्रकार के समझौते करने पड़ते हैं या यहां के डिफेंस प्रोडक्शन के लिए हमें कुछ चीजें पुरस्थापित करनी होती हैं, इन सब में वह हमें अपनी सलाह के द्वारा मदद देगा ऐसा मैं समझता हूँ। यह सारी चीजें देश के आर्थिक ढांचे के साथ जुड़ी हुई हैं और इस कारण प्लानिंग कमीशन भी पिक्चर में आता है। लेकिन प्लानिंग कमीशन में इस प्रकार की मिलिटरी एडवाइजर अभी तक नहीं है। अच्छा हो अगर एक मिलिटरी एडवाइजर प्लानिंग कमीशन के साथ भी संबद्ध हो ताकि देश की सुरक्षा में लगे उद्योग के लिए प्लानिंग कमीशन द्वारा प्लान्ड प्रोग्राम में जो रकम दी जा रही है, उसको तय करते समय उसकी मदद ली जा सके।

हमारे देश में एक मिलिटरी इंटेलिजेंस का विभाग है, परन्तु उस मिलिटरी इंटेलिजेंस और सिविल इंटेलिजेंस में कोई कोऑर्डिनेशन नहीं है। जिसका कि उल्लेख किया गया, यहां भी फिफथ कालमनिस्ट्स एक्टिविटीज इस समय चल रही हैं उन को अगर हम प्रभावी तौर पर रोकना चाहते हैं, तो इन दोनों में कोऑर्डिनेशन होना चाहिए। मुझे अच्छी तरह से मालूम है कि पिछले पाकिस्तान के युद्ध में राजस्थान के क्षेत्र में ऐसे कई वाक्ये हुए जहां पर मिलिटरी इंटेलिजेंस का सिविल इंटेलिजेंस के साथ मेल नहीं ठम पाया और उसके कारण हमें नुकसान उठाना पड़ा है। इसी लिए मैं यह चाहूंगा कि इन तरह की कोई व्यवस्था की जाय।

उसके साथ-साथ एक बात यह कि यह सरकारी काम है और सरकार की मशीनरी

दूसरे मंत्रालयों में इस वकन नजाकत से चलती है। सुरक्षा के क्षेत्र में, मैं समझता हूँ कि यह धीमा-पन फैसला लेने में देरी और उसके इम्प्लीमेंटेशन को राम के उपर छोड़ देने की नीति अब समाप्त होनी चाहिए। यह इस प्रकार की बातें हैं जिनके उदाहरण कई स्थानों पर मिले हैं। प्रोडक्शन की मिनिस्ट्री में भी जहां पर कई स्कोमें आयी और वे सरकार की टेबिल पर और मंत्रालय के स्तर पर पड़ी हैं। या तो उनके लिए साफ कह दिया जाय कि हमारा उनको आगे बढ़ाने का कोई इरादा नहीं है या फिर अगर देश की सुरक्षा के लिए उनको माना गया है, तो उनके ऊपर जल्द आप फैसला ले ले और जल्दी फैसला ले कर उनको चालू करें। तो डिजीजन लेने में और उसके इम्प्लीमेंटेशन में अधिक सावधानी और जल्दी की आवश्यकता है और इस पर हमें विचार करना चाहिए।

न्यूक्लियर पालिसी के संबंध में उल्लेख किया गया। श्री पार्थसारथी और श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा ने दो विचार सामने रखे हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह बात बिल्कुल स्वीकार करनी चाहिए कि इसमें भ्रान्तियां बढ़ायी गयी हैं और इन भ्रान्तियों के कारण यह पता नहीं लग रहा कि वास्तविक स्थिति क्या है। बीच बीच में खंडन प्रकाशित हो जाते हैं, आज भी एक खंडन निकला है कि अध्ययन के लिए जो सेमिनार गठित करने की खबर आयी है वह गलत है। पता नहीं ये सारी बातें आपके द्वारा ही न शुरू की जाती हों, लेकिन यहां पर जो एक सेमिनार हुआ उसमें कई तरह की बातें कही गयी और उससे यह इंप्रेशन निर्माण हुआ कि हम फिर वही पर आकर खड़े हो गये हैं। पुन मूषको भवः वाली बात चरितार्थ हो रही है। मैं समझता हूँ कि चीन के द्वारा पैदा किये गये संकट के सामने जो स्थिति है, उसे हम डिप्लोमैटिकली डील कर लेगे, यह कह कर हमें डिटरेंट बनाने की इस समय जरूरत नहीं, इससे काम नहीं चलेगा। आज यह स्वीकार किया जा चुका है कि अणु बम का जवाब भारत के पास नहीं है।

[श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी]

जैसा कि श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा ने कहा कि हीरो शीमा और नागाशाकी पर इसका प्रयोग जो हुआ है वह पहला और आखरी हो जाना चाहिए। हम भी चाहते हैं कि वह पहला और आखरी हो, परन्तु हम सबकी आश्वास्ती नहीं दे सकते और कम से कम इस मुगालते में न रहे कि यह जो आणविक रेस हो रही है, वह केवल देखने के लिए है और मुसीबत पड़ने पर, डेस्परेट होने पर वे इनका इस्तेमाल नहीं करेंगे। अगर डेस्परेट होने पर भी हम इस्तेमाल करवाने से उनको डराना चाहते हैं तो जब तक हम स्वयं उस शस्त्र के धनी नहीं होंगे, हम ऐसे देशों को बुद्धि के दायरे में रहने के लिए मजबूर नहीं कर सकते। इस पर भी हमें विचार करना पड़ेगा।

इतना बड़ा बजट डिफेंस का हमने बनाया है और डिफेंस में अनेकों काम हो रहे हैं। बार्डर सिक्युरिटी और बार्डर रोड्स पर भी काफी धन व्यय किया जा रहा है, इसको मैं स्वीकार करता हूँ। लेकिन केवल यह बता कर कि हम बार्डर रोड्स पर इतना खर्च कर रहे हैं, सतोष नहीं कर लेना चाहिए। मैं सरकार का ध्यान कल राजस्थान की विधान सभा में राजस्थान की बार्डर रोड्स के बारे में उठाए गये प्रश्न की ओर फिर से दिलाना चाहता हूँ, क्योंकि बहुत सम्भव है कि वहाँ पर उठने के बाद भी आप उसके सम्बन्ध में अज्ञानता का तर्क दें। इस कारण मैं उसे दोहराना चाहूँगा। वहाँ पर 26 करोड़ रुपये राजस्थान की सीमावर्ती सड़कों के निर्माण पर खर्च हुआ है, लेकिन वहाँ पर यह आरोप लगाया गया है कि कम से कम 3 करोड़ रुपये का उसमें गोलमाल है। वहाँ पर कान्ट्रैक्टर्स को जो सरकार की तरफ से कन्स्ट्रक्शन परपेजेंट के लिए मशीनरी दी गई है, उसका किराया दिया गया। उसके फ्रेड बिल्स बना कर एक करोड़ रुपये का पेमेन्ट रिपेयर्स के नाम पर उनको दिया गया। यह जो स्कैंडल है, उसके बारे में सब डिटेल्स राजस्थान की विधान सभा में रखे गये हैं। मैं चाहूँगा

कि गृह-मन्त्रालय इसके सम्बन्ध में विचार करे और वह एक ऐसी चीज पर इन्वेस्टिगेशन होना चाहिए।

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE,
STEEL AND HEAVY ENGINEERING
(SARDAR SWARAN SINGH).
Who made those statements?

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी : यह रिपोर्ट सारी हमने दी है। अगर हम ऐसा समझते हैं कि केवल राज्य सरकार पर आप यह डाल दे।

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH No, I am asking you

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी : एक बगला हुआ है। This is for you to investigate. It has been brought to the notice of the Rajasthan Government as well as the Central Government. If you want to sleep over that, I have no objection (Inter-*caption*) I have objection to the Government itself. Why on this particular item? मेरा यह कहना है कि सुरक्षा के फंड का पैसा अधिक अच्छे प्रकार से उपयोग में आए, इस पर आपको ध्यान देना चाहिए।

पिछले दिनों हमने दूसरे देशों से माल खरीदा, सैनिक सामग्री खरीदी, रूस से भी खरीदी और वक्त पड़ने पर खरीदी, लेकिन हमें इस सत्य को स्वीकार करना चाहिए। पर इन मुल्कों के इक्विपमेन्ट स्टैंडर्डिज्ड नहीं हैं। जान-बूझ कर यह कोशिश की जाती है कि स्टैंडर्डिजेशन न हो। इस कारण एक एक सामान जो हम खरीदते हैं, उसके स्पेयर्स की या सप्लाय-ट्यूशन की एक बहुत बड़ी प्रॉब्लम है। हम ने सब-मैरीन्स रूस से ली यह ठीक है, लेकिन जो उसके बल्ब हैं, वे भी स्टैंडर्ड के नहीं हैं, स्पेसिफिकेशन उनका अलग है और बल्ब जैसी छोटी सी चीज का भी निर्माण हम यहाँ पर नहीं कर पाए हैं, आज उस सब-मैरीन की आवश्यकता के अनुसार हम यहाँ पर बल्ब मैन्यु-फैक्चर नहीं कर पाए हैं। इस छोटी सी चीज के न होने के कारण सब-मैरीन नहीं चल सकती है। सब-मैरीन्स कोई अंधेरे में तो नहीं चल सकती और न उनको अंधेरे में रखा जा सकता

है। इस विषय पर विचार करना चाहिए और इसलिए इस बात की बहुत ही आवश्यकता है (Interruption by Shri Neki Ram) मैं कुछ और रूप धारण करूँ तब आपकी बात समझ पाऊँगा। तो मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि हमें इस सम्बन्ध में विचार करना चाहिए। हम यह माल इधर ऊपर से खरीदें।

हमने रूस से स्कूयेडन लिये, एयर-फ्लीट के, लेकिन जब हमने रशियन प्लेन्स लिये थे तो 4 स्कूयेडन तक ही रूपी पैमेन्ट की बात मानी गई थी। मैं सरकार से स्पष्ट पूछना चाहता हूँ कि चार स्कूयेडन के बाद क्या हमें अब रूपी पैमेन्ट करना पड़ रहा है या गोल्ड में पैमेन्ट करना पड़ रहा है और अगर गोल्ड में पैमेन्ट करना पड़ रहा है, तो हम और देशों से क्यों न खरीदें। और देशों से भी मिल सकते हैं और अच्छे मिल सकते हैं और उनके यहाँ "फार सैल" है। हम वहाँ स्रोत न जाएँ। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि आज परिस्थिति बदल जाने के बाद भी क्यों उस पर टिके रहे। आज हम क्यों न फ्रान्स के मीराज पर जाएँ। पैसा देना है तो कहीं भी दें। सोना देना है तो कहीं से खरीदें। हम स्वीडिश प्लेन्स पर क्यों न जाएँ? हम उनको खरीदने की क्यों न कोशिश करें और हम सिर्फ रशियन प्लेन्स पर ही क्यों अपने आपको बाधे रहे। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि वास्तविकता वे आधार पर हमें इस पर विचार करना चाहिए और अगर हम इस बात पर विचार करेंगे, तो मैं समझता हूँ कि देश की सुरक्षा के हित में हम इस चीज को अधिक उपयोगी कर सकेंगे।

मेरा निवेदन यह भी है कि हमको एयर-फ्लीट में "बढ़ोतर" करने की आवश्यकता है, इस फ्लीट को किसके साथ टैंग करके न रखें। एक बात यह भी है कि देश की आवश्यकता-नुसार जो चीजें हवा अभी तक तैयार नहीं कर पाए हैं, उनको तैयार करने के लिए हमें विचार करना चाहिए। क्या यह बात सच है कि 1962 के बाद हम किस नये प्लेन को मैन्युफैक्चर अभी तक नहीं कर पाए हैं? हम अभी तक

नेट और मिग्स पर ही हैं। यह तो हमने 1962 के पहले चालू कर दिये थे। उस डिजाइन के बाद और दूसरी सब चीजों के बाद कोई नया डिजाइन, नई चीज हम मैन्युफैक्चर नहीं कर पाए हैं। आज मैन्युफैक्चर के क्षेत्र में हम पिछड़े हुए हैं। आज हम जो माल बाहर से ला रहे हैं, उसके स्पेयर्स भी यहाँ पर नहीं बना सके हैं। इसके बारे में माल खरीदने के बाद हम वार्ता चलाना चाहते हैं। बाद में उनको इसके लिए कोई जल्दी नहीं होती है और वे इस मामले में स्लीप ओवर करना चाहते हैं और हमारी मजबूरी उस पर बढ़ाना चाहते हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि इन बातों पर पहले हमको विचार करना चाहिए। बजाए इसके कि हम एकदम से अन्धे हो कर उसको खरीद लें। जो सामान मिल रहा है, उसका मैटीनेन्स और उसकी रिपेयर्स भी बहुत जरूरी है। केवल कोई चीज के आ जाने मात्र से समस्या हल नहीं होती। इसलिए मेरा यह कहना है कि हम इन सारी चीजों को देखें।

पिछले दिनों में आपको पता है कि हमें टेस्ट्स में दो मेजर एयर एक्सीडेंट्स का दुर्भाग्य उठाना पड़ा विड इन ए स्पेस आफ फाइव मंथ्स। अब यह काफी चिंता की बात है। एक्सपेरी-मेंट्स में तोड़ फोड़ भी हो सकती है, लेकिन मैं यह जानना चाहूँगा कि हमारे पास कोई एयर रेस्क्यू ऑर्गेनाइजेशन या पैरा टूप्स हैं? मैडिकल कोर भी हम चाहते हैं जोकि उनकी मदद कर सके। हमको इसको डेवलप करना पड़ेगा। हमारे पास एक्सीडेंट इक्वायरी के लिए कोई मशीनरी है? और अगर नहीं है तो जैसे जैसे हम प्रोडक्शन के क्षेत्र में जा रहे हैं, हम लोगों को यह सारी मशीनरी इन्वोल्व करनी पड़ेगी। नहीं तो हमें एक के बाद एक और ज्यादा खतरे इस क्षेत्र में लेने पड़ेंगे।

मैं आपके सामने अब भूतपूर्व सैनिकों के बारे में जो विचार आपके सामने रखे गये हैं, उन्हें फिर से दोहराना चाहता हूँ। एक्स-सर्विस मैन के प्रश्न को हमने और अधिक चिन्ता करके विचार करना चाहिए। 50 हजार

[श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी]

लोग हर साल रिलीज होते हैं। 30 और 40 साल का एज ग्रुप इनका है। इनकी काम करने की क्षमता है, इनमें टेक्नीशियन्स हैं, साधारण रैंक्स में हैं और काश्तकारी करने वाले लोग हैं।

हमें उनको बसाने का विचार करना चाहिए। इसके बारे में हमको एक पालिसी लेनी पड़ेगी और पब्लिक सैक्टर में जहाँ पर कि एप्लायमेट की गुंजाइश है, इनके लिए हमें कोई न कोई प्रायोरिटी तय करनी पड़ेगी। जो बाडर के एरियाज हैं, जहाँ पर इनको बसाना है, वहाँ के विकास के लिए, वहाँ के कालोनाइजेशन के लिये हमको स्पेशल स्कीम लानी पड़ेगी। मैं राजस्थान कैनल का इस सम्बन्ध में उल्लेख करना चाहता हूँ। मैं डिफेंस मिनिस्ट्री से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इस राजस्थान कैनल प्राजेक्ट का उन्होंने डिफेंस के सिक्वोरिटी प्वाइंट आफ व्यु से और डिफेंस पर्सनल के रिहबिलिटेशन के सवाल के लिए भी कोई सीरियस स्टडी किया है या नहीं? इस सम्बन्ध में कोई स्कीम भारत सरकार के सामने प्रस्तुत की है या नहीं? यह प्रश्न एक बहुत बड़ी समस्या का समाधान कर सकता है।

श्रीमन्, हमारे जो जेट पायलट्स हैं, डिफेंस के ट्रांसपोर्ट विभाग में वह धीरे-धीरे इंडियन एयर लाइंस में जाना चाहते हैं या एयर इंडिया में जाना चाहते हैं। दोनों के पे-स्केल्स में बहुत बड़ा अन्तर है, एक तरफ जहाँ 1,200 रुपया है, वहाँ दूसरी तरफ 3,000 रुपया है। दोनों में इतना फर्क है और ट्रांसपोर्ट प्लेस का जो जाब है, उसमें कोई बहुत अन्तर नहीं। मैं बाम्बर्स की बात नहीं करता, मैं फाइटर प्लेस की बात नहीं करता, लेकिन ट्रांसपोर्ट में जो डबल इंजिन जेट्स काम में ले रहे हैं, उनके पायलट्स जो सिविल साइड में हैं जो ट्रांसपोर्ट में हैं इनका कोई इंटेग्रेसेशन या कोऑर्डिनेशन या कम से कम पे-स्केल्स के बारे में किसी न किसी प्रकार का समान स्तर बनाने का हम विचार करेंगे तो उसका लाभ होगा।

मैं केवल अब एक सुझाव सरकार के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ कि वह हमारी इन रैंक्स के बारे में कोई रेशनल बेसिस का इस्तेमाल करे। लैंड फोर्स में 10 रैंक है, एयर फोर्स में 8 रैंक है और एक ही समान काम करने वाले अलग-अलग सर्विसेज में अलग-अलग नामों से पहिचाने जाते हैं। जो हवलदार है वही आम्ब कोर में हों तो दफादार है, एयर फोर्स में हों तो सारजेंट है और नौवी में हों तो एनसाइन है। तो क्या हम इनके बारे में कोई निश्चित परिभाषा निश्चित नहीं कर सकते? क्या हम इनके सम्बन्ध में कोई युनिफार्म पैटर्न नहीं लगा सकते? अनेसेसरली हम इन छोटी-छोटी चीजों में क्यों मल्टीप्लिसिटी का निर्माण करे। हम इन सारी व्यवस्थाओं पर क्यों अनावश्यक खर्च बढ़ावें? इसके बारे में विचार करना चाहिए।

डिफेंस रिक्वायरमेंट्स की नीड्स ज्यादा हैं, परिस्थिति को देखते हुये हम जानते हैं कि हमारे उपर बजट की कई मजबूरियाँ हैं, लेकिन जिन क्षेत्रों में रेशनलाइजेशन की बेसिस पर एकानामीज की जा सकती है, जिन आधारों पर जबरदस्ती के भेदभाव समाप्त किये जा सकते हैं, हमें उसका विचार करना चाहिए और विभिन्न प्रकार के खर्चों में जो घोटाला हो रहा है, कर्प्शन हो रहा है, उसकी हमें जाँच करनी चाहिए ताकि वही पैसा हम अधिक अच्छे प्रकार से प्रोडक्टिव परपोजेज के काम में ला सकें और हमें जिस बात की अधिक आवश्यकता है—इसको कहने में हमें शय नहीं लगता—यानी हमें डिफेंस एक्सपेंडीचर का 10 परसेंट न्युक्लियर टेक्नालाजी पर खर्च करने के लिये इयरमार्क करना चाहिए, यह आज की परिस्थिति के लिये अनिवार्य है, इसमें किसी प्रकार की गफलत अगर बनी रही, तो इस देश की सुरक्षा को बहुत बड़ा नुकसान उठाना पड़ेगा।

मैं चाहूंगा कि सुरक्षा मंत्रालय इन बातों पर ध्यान दे। यही मेरा उनसे आग्रह है।

SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA (Rajasthan) Sir, we are very grateful that this opportunity has been provided to this House to debate the working of the Defence Ministry. As a matter of fact we are discussing other Ministries also, which seems to be a new procedure in our House and it has to be welcomed all the more. It is fitting that the Defence Ministry should have been chosen as one of the Ministries about which we have a discussion here. It is very necessary that there should be the widest possible awareness among the people of our defence needs and the readiness of our Armed Forces to meet them and with that end in view all the facts, whether they are in this House or outside in the academic bodies or in the press, are most welcome and I would urge upon the Government to give more facts and figures to the public so that the discussion that ensues will be more meaningful and that all these complicated problems would be given due importance in all the quarters of our country.

Well, Sir, the problem of defence and its administration is a very complex one. The relationship that the Service Chiefs should have with the civil administrators is really a very delicate matter and I think some very healthy and useful convention should be established so that there could be a meaningful administration at all levels. We are very happy that we have the Defence Minister who is regarded in the highest esteem by the people and he and his eminent junior colleagues form a team which is dedicated to the welfare of the Services and the defence requirements of our nation. I think we should give them all possible strength in the good work that they are doing so that they may be able to improve the working of our vast and variegated defence forces to make them better instruments of our national security.

Well, Sir, Shri Bhandari just now mentioned that the working of the Defence Ministry should be a little different from other Ministries and there should be some methods by which quick decisions should be taken. I think this need should be kept in view. When civilians are posted in the Ministry, they should not be rotated as is done in the other Ministries so that a certain expertise develops at the civilian level, with the result that they may be able to understand and master the intricacies of the Armed Forces and their administration

may become more meaningful. Fortunately the present Defence Secretary who is a very able civilian has been there for a long time and I hope the same tradition will be maintained in the matter of other officers and the whole Ministry would work in close co-operation with the Service Chiefs and all other military officers.

Well, Sir, many new methods are being evolved for keeping a close touch between the Minister and the Army Chiefs or the Service Chiefs, which is very useful, weekly meetings are held in which all the Service Chiefs, the Minister and other civilians are present and they discuss all the important problems. It may not be amiss to say that our able Defence Minister has started an innovation, it might appear a small thing but it has very great significance. He gave a farewell party to the retiring Army Chief of Staff, it is something which has never been done. It is a small thing but it shows that we are getting more and more attuned to the needs of a meaningful defence policy.

Well, Sir, Shri Bhandari mentioned about diplomacy and our foreign policy and Armed Forces. He said that we should not rely on the Ministry of External Affairs for defence and the Ministry of Defence itself should take upon itself the responsibility of defending the country. I beg to differ with him there, because the two things are very much related. The possibilities that diplomacy offers for avoiding an armed conflict should never be lost sight of. After all these avenues which are open to us should be made use of at all levels and in all possible circumstances, subject of course to our self-respect and our national needs. But just to say that we completely rule out all diplomatic avenues for settling our disputes with the people around us would be a very wrong approach to defence as well as foreign policy. Therefore we must have a very correct balance of approach and we should know where the possibilities of diplomacy cease and where the use of arms should come into play. The most outstanding feature of our Defence scene is the tremendous growth in our defence production. This is a feature about which our country can be greatly proud of and for which the Ministry deserves all our congratulations. I need not go into details because they are well known but we have made a tremendous march towards self-sufficiency in defence production, an area

[Shri Ram Niwas Mirdha]

of ever changing technology. The most satisfactory feature in our Defence set-up is our self-reliance with respect to defence production, whether it is in the case of arms and ammunition or guns or Naval Forces or Air Force, in every respect we are making advances and I would urge upon the Government to keep up this pace particularly so far as the R & D is concerned, we should invest more and more money in that so that our Armed Forces and their equipment could be up to date and it does not become obsolete and our state of preparedness is kept at the maximum possible height at all the time.

Another good feature of this year's Defence Budget is the reliance which we are placing on the expansion of the Naval capabilities. This is a very welcome feature and I think it is much long overdue because we have a vast coastline, a vast area which we call the Indian Sea and other commitments of that nature and we must strengthen our Naval Forces so that we might be able to protect our national interests on the high seas as well as the coast. One thing I would say at this point is that sometimes we feel that whatever we spend on Defence is something of a waste or in the nature of non-productive use.

SHRI N. G. GORAY (Maharashtra): Who has said it?

SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA: Whenever we make a statement that we have 2000 crore or 10,000 crore Plan, we say that it is a non-development expenditure or this is something which does not contribute to the development of our country. Probably it does not do in that sense but if you see our defence production programme, the way it has strengthened our industrial base, the way it has trained our technical manpower in all these new techniques, that by itself is a great asset from the economic or social or technological point of view. Therefore, this pace should increase and we should not regard that anything spent or any accelerated pace of expenditure on Defence is something that may lead to non-productive use of our resources but it is something which we must not grudge our Armed Forces and any expenditure done in this respect is an investment from every point of view.

Now sometimes we plan in a way that it looks as if we are in a state of perpetual mobilisation. It is true that we should be in perpetual mobilisation but the type of mobilisation we have should not be of a nature that is geared to meet a short time danger which is probably what we are doing. Whatever dangers we have to our national security is of a long-term or continuous nature. So we must have a long-term perspective of our Defence needs and possibilities and the way we would use our resources to increasing the capabilities of our Armed Force and for that respect, a long-term perspective should be taken and along with our big standing army we must explore ways and means of increasing the branches of Armed Forces like the Territorial Army, the Reserves and the other ancillary methods of Defence preparedness. I would go to the extent of saying that we must have some type of National Military Service in our country. There is a vast gap between the Armed Forces and the public as such. Even in the case of a conflict, there seems to be a big gap between the way of thinking and working of the civilian and the Military Wing. So that there must be a greater involvement of the masses which is very necessary in any democratic set-up for our national Defence, it is very necessary that we must have a total involvement of our public into military preparedness and one way would be some type of National Service. In what way it could be done I would not go into details but I have some idea which I can throw up right now and may be we can discuss it later on. At least the doctors and engineers, of whom there is a shortage in the Army and on whom the country invests a lot of money to train, they owe it to the country that they should serve in the military sphere at least for some years. So rightaway we can make the engineers and doctors undergo compulsory military service for two years in the Army before taking up a civilian job. Then we can go forward and use it with people with other technical ability of which there is shortage in the Army and even if there is no shortage there should be some method by which the general public should be involved in this adventure of Defence. Some positive way must be found out of doing this in a purposeful way.

We heard something about discipline. It is true that discipline is very necessary in any aspect of national life and

in our Army we have the best and the most disciplined group in our national life. The concept of discipline also changes with time and the old type of discipline was, you must spit and polish, you must click your heels when an officer comes about and a certain relationship came to be developed between an Officer and a Jawan. I would say, with very great humility, that this is outmoded in the present context of our society and our national position. There has to be—I do not have any other way of putting it—a democratic approach to discipline. I maintain that there is something like democratic discipline—a discipline which arises not merely out of the relationship of superior and inferior persons in the service rank but out of mutual respect and a sense of camaraderie and that type of discipline is more enduring, more purposeful and more in consonance with our national aspirations and objectives as they obtain to-day. About the institutions like bat boy and orderlies, I would not like to go into that because it is a delicate subject but I think particularly the senior officers should be some rethinking on the subject to see what relationship they want to have with the Jawans or the service people.

About salaries and emoluments also there is such a vast gap between the jawan's emoluments and that of the officer. Probably that is inevitable in view of the national circumstances we have in our country but something should be done to do away with that so when you go to the field of war in defence of our democratic country, there should be more sense of equal participation than the question of high and low. Therefore I hope some serious thought would be given to this and the Officers would rise to the occasion and find some way in which this state of affairs would improve.

We are talking about the nuclear policy. Particularly after the Chinese satellite, the whole country has started thinking on this subject. Firstly I think this is not the time when we should really get all muffled up. When the Chinese had the first explosion, it was expected that they would go on with their nuclear programme and will come to a stage at which they have come now. So we are not surprised that they have reached that stage but it does not behove us as a mature nation that every time such a situation comes, you get

yourself into a state of frenzy. We should calmly discuss the whole thing as on now, take a long-term decision, try to arrive at a national consensus on the matter so that we have a long-term perspective so far as our nuclear policy is concerned. On this I have a submission to make. The Government has been saying that it will develop nuclear energy only for peaceful purposes and it will rely only on conventional weapons so far as national defence is concerned. This concept of conventional and non-conventional weapons is also very confusing. There was a time when gunpowder was a non-conventional one and all combatants thought that the entire world would crash if large-scale gunpowder was used by the armies of the world in a conflict but nothing of the kind happened. In the same way what is non-conventional now would become conventional in a few years as is becoming apparent. More and more countries are getting into the nuclear fold and they are developing nuclear technology for defence purposes. We as responsible representatives of the people, have to take a serious note and decide about them. No Government, least of all the present one, can pre-empt for all future generations the nuclear option. What I mean is the present Government may not go in right-away for military use of atomic weapons or development of atomic weapons for defence purposes but it must launch on a serious and accelerated programme of nuclear energy development so that when the future generation comes and if they opt out of this option and want to have a military weapons like the atom bombs they may be in a position to take the decision and do something right then.

[MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]
4 P.M.

We cannot tie down the hands of the future generations, I think it will be most irresponsible if we did so. If the situation does not warrant let us not right now take a decision in this respect, let us watch the situation as it develops but our development of nuclear technology should go apace so that the future Government or the future public opinion if it chooses to go on a course of atomic weapons they might be free to shift from one to another and they may not be handicapped considerably at that time. So we not only owe it to the present generation but to the future generations also that our competence in this field should increase.

[Shri Ram Niwas Mirdha.]

and we must go apace with all the programmes of nuclear energy development. I would also say that on an important matter like this an attempt should be made to have a national consensus and a very serious dialogue should start right now with all of sections of public opinion so that some concrete consensus could be evolved on this matter which is of vital importance to this generation as well as the generations to come.

Sir, I would say a few words about ex-soldiers about whom so much has been said. I think we ought to do a little more than what we have been doing for our ex-soldiers, particularly because they are retired at a very early age. They can still do very useful service to the country. We have many sources like the Border Security Force; many States have their armed constabulary; we have the Railway Protection Force and then we have the new Industrial Security Force. I think instead of retiring our jawans and other officers we could straightway absorb them into these services because in such a case he is a trained man and he can be made use of immediately and he can be paid whatever he was being paid there and he can serve till the time he can give useful service. I think we could do that instead of just throwing him on the street without making any provision. Of course it is necessary that he should be retired from the armed forces because in the armed forces they have a way of working; they want to maintain a particular age group and they want to maintain a particular level of readiness. They cannot keep men after they have passed beyond a limit of physical efficiency and other efficiency. That I can understand. We do not want that the armed forces should be saddled with people whom they do not want but after they are retired these people could be useful in the various services that I have mentioned like police and other forces. Probably they are much better stuff than what we are getting at present. There should be some such system by which at least the bulk of them after retirement from the armed forces could be absorbed rightaway in these services and they can be allowed to work till they reach their age of retirement in the normal course. In this way I think we would have done something to them for the great sacrifices they have made for the country.

In the end I will take this opportunity of paying a tribute to our jawans who are the basic sheet anchor of our national security. They are making tremendous sacrifices and they are serving us in very difficult positions where we would not even like to go. They are doing a tremendous service to the country and whatever emoluments we might give them would not be enough to match their sacrifices. So we must pay due respect to them and we must have their welfare in our mind all the time and whenever occasion arises we must try to do something for them, not that it will matter very much for them. Whatever little we might be giving them, they are there for the love of the country, because they are brought up in certain army traditions, because they are prepared to work and even sacrifice their lives for the country. They are our greatest assets; they are a trained force, a disciplined force, of which the best possible use should be made and for whom all possible amenities should be given while they are in service and whose welfare after retirement is as much our responsibility as when they are serving.

Sir, we once again thank you for this debate and for giving us this opportunity to discuss this matter which is of very great national importance.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Sir, what is the time table like?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are a large number of speakers.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I know but I thought there was some time limit, three hours or three and a half hours or whatever it is.

AN HON. MEMBER: At least four hours.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: We started at quarter past two. I only want to have some idea.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You might be called at... but how long will you take for reply?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I am entirely in your hands but I think it will take at least about 40 to 45 minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Then he can reply at six o' clock or quarter to six?

SHRI SUNIDAR SINGH BHAN-DARI: You look at the list before you. We started practically at 3 P.M.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We have allotted only four hours.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: We started at...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We started at 2.10; so we can call him at quarter to six so that he can have 45 minutes for reply.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Deputy Chairman, in the short period of eight years that I have been in this House I have seen the defence expenditure rising steadily. When I came to the House it was about Rs. 500 crores and now we have reached Rs. 1100 crores out of a total Budget of Rs. 3144 crores. It is a proportion to the general expenditure which exceeds almost that of any other country in the world.

There is another point that I should like to note about the Defence Budget and that is the relation between the expenditure on personnel and the expenditure on equipment. The expenditure on personnel is Rs. 459 crores whereas the expenditure on equipment is only Rs. 419 crores. I think this proportion is not one that can be justified because in a modern war it is equipment, weaponry which is more effective than the number of persons engaged in battle. I think the Defence Ministry would be well advised to spend some time and attention on this question as to whether the equipment could not be so increased and so improved as to dispense with a part of the personnel which is very costly. One way of reducing the expenditure on personnel I would suggest is to reduce the number of civilian personnel which costs I believe as much as Rs. 60 crores. This substitution of military personnel for civilian personnel wherever possible would not only increase the efficiency of work in the Defence Department because the men by becoming military personnel would be put into the uniform, they would be subject to military discipline and there would be much more work, punctuality, fidelity to work, fidelity to the programme, but it would also considerably reduce the numbers and the cost of personnel.

I will not be as critical of defence production as some Members have been. They have done good work, creditable work; they have invented clothing and packets of food that could be used at high altitudes and many minor improvements but I must say that there is nothing striking, nothing revolutionary in our Defence Production Department. They have not been capable of any invention as revolutionary as say radar or even as revolutionary as the invention of the tank, some invention that would reduce the cost of war. I imagine that if the Defence Production Department put before our scientific and technological personnel in our defence science departments and laboratories this goal of finding out something, of inventing something that would radically reduce the cost of defence, I think they would take up the challenge and try to do something in the years that are left to them, to make some striking invention that would reduce the number of personnel employed in the Army. It is no doubt very encouraging to find our men on the Ladakh frontier or on the North-East Frontier keeping solitary watch over the border. That looks romantic. The Germans also indulged in that kind of romanticism when they sang the famous Watch on the Rhine song: "DIE WACHT AN RHEIN". The watches on the frontier are out of it. We are simply wasting our men on these lonely border stretches. Sometimes they get bored, they do not know what they are there for. They do not even see the enemy across the frontier. This is not good for the morale of our troops on the frontiers. Therefore, I would suggest to the Defence Production Department that they should put before our defence science personnel and our defence technologists this grand objective of making some striking invention that will avoid the necessity of having thousands of troops rush along the frontier, and reduce the cost of our defence.

Then, I would like to join my friends from the South who have deplored the backwardness of coastal defence. I should like to begin by congratulating the Defence Department on the acquisition of four more submarines, but I do not like this idea of depending upon one single power for the supply of submarines. That power has come only recently into naval eminence. The Russians have always been a land power and have distinguished themselves in

[Shri M. Ruthnaswamy.]

land battles, but they have not yet distinguished themselves in naval warfare. The last time they tried to do it was rather disastrous when the whole of the Russian fleet was sunk at the battle of Tsushima by the Japanese. This having still to cut its teeth, their naval prowess has still to be proved and before what is done we have become solely dependent on them. I do not know the details of Mr. Arjun Arora's charge that the Western powers refused to come to our help, to our military aid by way of supplying weapons, submarines and other equipment that we wanted. I should like the Defence Minister to go into the details and the causes. Was it any condition that we placed which they could not fulfil? Was it any condition in regard to the payment in rupees or in pounds, which the Western powers would not accept? What was the exact reason why the Western powers refused to give aid to us?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Generally it is because we did not join any pacts.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: Then, I would like to point out the uselessness of some of our coastal defence equipment, especially the aircraft carrier. Of what earthly use is it to us? An aircraft carrier is a weapon of offence. It is only when a nation goes to war against other nations in distant parts that an aircraft carrier is useful. Somebody sold the thing to us. It was a regular "sell". Somebody wanted to get rid of a second hand aircraft carrier and we were vain enough to buy it. It is not only the initial cost. It is also the maintenance cost that is terrific. I believe the cost of that aircraft carrier was something in the region of Rs. 50 to Rs. 60 crores. The actual maintenance cost comes to Rs. 9 to Rs. 10 crores. This could be well spent on acquiring more submarines, more small naval craft which would be useful to us.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: It I may say so, you are completely off the mark. How can it be Rs. 9 to Rs. 10 crores a year?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat): Tell us what it is.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: I would like the Defence Ministry to explore the possibility of selling this junk

this aircraft carrier. There must be some people, much vainer than me, who would like to acquire this sea craft and with that money we can buy more submarines and at least avoid the annual maintenance cost of Rs. 9 to Rs. 10 crores.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): He is not agreeing with your figure.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: Then, what is it? Give us the real cost. That is the trouble with all these Reports of the Defence Ministry. They do not take us into their confidence, although I must congratulate the present Defence Minister on giving, in his Report, much more information than his predecessors. This is a thing which we would like to know. What is the annual cost of maintenance of the aircraft carrier? The defence of our coast, I must say, is absolutely neglected. We want small sea-craft, small naval craft.—Winston Churchill, in one of his most expressive forms, called it a mosquito navy—small torpedo boats, patrol boats, gun boats. These will make mincemeat of any of the big sea-craft or naval craft that may be brought against the defence of our sea coast.

Then, we want more Intelligence in our Defence—Intelligence' with a capital 'I'. Now, 'intelligence' with a small 'i' the Defence Minister has and the Defence Ministry has, but 'Intelligence' with a capital 'I' is conspicuous by its absence.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH. Professorial intelligence.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: As the last two wars have shown, we were caught unprepared. Either our Intelligence was very poor or the information given by our Intelligence was not made use of by the then Defence Minister. In the Pakistan war also we were caught unawares. The Pakistan army had entered Kashmir before we were able to take notice of it. There again, either our Intelligence was not good or it was not made use of.

Lastly, I come to the vexed question of nuclear weapons. Morality need not come into this because this is a political question. It is a military question. It is an economic question. Can we afford it? In our present state of economic development we simply cannot afford it.

We would have to spend a thousand crores or two thousand, three thousand, four thousand or five thousand crores in order to make atomic bombs and especially to equip ourselves with the delivery system that would be required. We simply cannot afford it and it is not necessary for our defence. Do you think that China would wait for nuclear weapons in order to attack us, in order to inflict damage upon us? They can do it with their conventional army and conventional arms. The balance of terror that now exists between the various nuclear powers shows that nuclear weapons are not at all necessary for the defence of the State. Nuclear weapons are there only to give some kind of confidence, some kind of satisfaction. But we in our present state of economic development would not be able to afford it. No one would be gladder than China if we resorted to the manufacture of atomic weapons because it would put not only a fullstop but deny us all hope of economic progress for generations to come. Therefore, for purely pragmatic reasons I would suggest that India has no need of nuclear weapons. It should depend only upon its conventional weapons, on increasing its strength by its weaponry and efficiency of its forces and also by wise selection of alliances in the foreign field. Alliances are no challenge to the self-respect of any nation. The most powerful nations have to resort to alliances. Has not the United States of America got others alliance? Has not the Soviet Union got alliances with all the satellite powers around it? No power on earth can do without alliances and more especially a country like ours which is so backward in economic development and, therefore, backward in military equipment. We should not be allergic to alliances. A wise selection of alliances need not align us to one set of powers. Choose your ally according to your needs. For your land defence, choose one ally and for your sea defence choose another ally and thus ensure the integrity of your country without resorting to the costly and doubtful resource of nuclear weapons.

श्री भोला प्रसाद (बिहार) : श्रीमान्, उप-सभापति महोदय राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा के मसले पर सरकार की ओर से जो प्रतिवेदन पेश किया गया है, उसमें मेरा खयाल से राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा के हर पहलू को सम्पूर्ण रूप से और सर्वांगीण दृष्टिकोण से देखने और उसके लिये जो कर्तव्य

निर्धारित करने की कोशिश होनी चाहिये, उसमें कमी नजर आती है। मसलन हमारे देश को चीन और पाकिस्तान से खतरा मौजूद है। निकट भविष्य में, पांच साल या 10 साल के अन्दर कहना मुश्किल है कि उन देशों के साथ हमारे सम्बन्ध में सुधार होंगे। ऐसी सभावनायें नजर नहीं आती। इसके बावजूद भी हमारी यह कोशिश होनी चाहिये कि हमें जब भी और जहाँ भी मौका मिले उसका इस्तेमाल इन देशों के बीच अपने सम्बन्ध को सुधारने के लिए करना चाहिये। लेकिन फिर भी उन देशों की जो पालिसी हैं, जो मौजूदा नीति है उसको देखते हुये निकट भविष्य में उन देशों के साथ शत्रुता का उनसे खतरा बना हुआ है। पिछले वर्षों में हमारी राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा की ताकत को बेशक काफी मजबूत किया गया है और आज हमें फ़क़ है कि हमारा देश दुनिया की बड़ी फौजी ताकतों में एक चौथी ताकत बन गया है और यह इसलिये हो सका है कि हमने पिछले वर्षों में जिस हद तक सम्भव हो सकता था अपने कुछ बुनियादी उद्योगों और खास तौर से हथियार तैयार करने के उद्योगों को खड़ा किया है और कंवेन्शनल वार मैटीरियल्स जो हम अपने मुल्क में आज तैयार कर रहे हैं, उसमें काफी प्रगति की है और उसकी वजह से हम आज एक हद तक आत्मनिर्भर हो गये हैं। फिर भी जरूरत है कि हम और भी आधुनिक हथियारों से अपनी राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा को मजबूत करने के लिये उन देशों के साथ अपने सम्बन्ध दृढ़ करें जो कि सिर्फ़ लड़ाई के वक़्त में हथियार देने का वायदा न करें, बल्कि इन आधुनिक हथियारों को तैयार करने में मदद करें, जैसे कि सोवियत रूस ने एक हद तक किया है। हम दूसरे देशों के साथ भी चाहते हैं कि हमें आधुनिक हथियार तैयार करने, आधुनिक युद्ध के सामान तैयार करने के अपने मुल्क में सनअटें खड़ी करने, कारखाने खोलने में हमें मदद मिले, उनसे हमें ज्यादा मदद मिले लेकिन दूसरे किसी देश ने अभी तक इसमें मदद नहीं की है। सोवियत रूस ने ही मदद की है। अगर कोई भी दूसरा देश मदद करने

[श्री भोला प्रसाद]

के लिये तैयार हो तो उसको हमें लेना चाहिये, क्योंकि इसकी जरूरत अभी भी हमारे सामने है ।

लेकिन हम जिस बात की तरफ, अध्यक्ष महोदय के जरिये, सरकार का ध्यान दिलाना चाहते हैं वह यह है कि एक तरफ जहाँ कि चीन और पाकिस्तान से हमारी सुरक्षा को खतरा है, वहाँ दूसरी तरफ जो अंग्रेजी अमेरिकी साम्राज्यवादी ताकत है, उसकी जो पालिसी हमारे देश के प्रति रही है, हमारे देश की सुरक्षा के मामले में दखलदाजी करने की उसकी पालिसी रही है, उसकी तरफ हम विचार करें । काश्मीर के मामले में दखलदाजी करने की आज तक जो पालिसी रही है, गोवा के मामले में दखलदाजी करने की आज तक जो पालिसी रही है, आज तक अमेरिका और ब्रिटेन ने काश्मीर को और गोवा को भारत का अंग नहीं माना है, तो इसको हम देखें । जब भी हमने चाहा है कि हम अपनी राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा को मजबूत करें, तो कहने के लिये वह हमारे मित्र देश है, लेकिन जब भी राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा को मजबूत करने के लिये, राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा के साधन को अपने देश में तैयार करने के लिये, उनसे हमने मदद मांगी है तो उनकी ओर से मदद नहीं मिली है और मदद ही नहीं मिली है, बल्कि उसमें बाधाएँ खड़ी की गई हैं और सबसे बड़ी चीज यह है कि उनकी कोशिश बराबर यही रही है कि हमारे देश की जो स्वतंत्रनिरपेक्ष नान-एलाइनमेंट की पालिसी है, उसको बदल कर अमेरिका खेमे में, अमेरिकी युद्ध के खेमे में ले आये, अपनी पालिसी की ओर हिन्दुस्तान को ले आये और उसका इस्तेमाल करें । हम जानते हैं कि जब भी पाकिस्तान ने हमला किया चीन ने हमला किया, उस मौके पर जब भी उसने मदद की बात की तो उसने अमेरिका की छतरी के नीचे ले जाने की कोशिश की और हिन्दुस्तान की सुरक्षा नीति को बदलने की कोशिश की और आज भी यह कोशिश उसकी बरकरार है । वह कोशिश बरकरार ही नहीं है, बल्कि एशिया

वालों को एशिया वालों से लड़वा कर अमेरिका की यह नीति आज दक्षिण पूर्व एशिया में युद्ध के खतरे को बढ़ा रहा है, जिस खतरे की तरफ खुद पिछले दिनों प्रधान मंत्री ने ससद् का ध्यान दिलाया है कि अमेरिका की इस नीति से एशिया में युद्ध का खतरा बढ़ गया है । वह खतरा वहाँ पर मौजूद है और दूसरी ओर उसकी यह पालिसी है जिस तरह से कि उसने कम्बोडिया में सिहानुक को हटाकर के—इसलिये कि उसकी पालिसी नान-एलाइनमेंट की थी, उसकी पालिसी गुट-निरपेक्षता की थी, स्वतंत्र पालिसी थी और अमेरिका सरकार की दखलदाजी नहीं चलती थी तो उसको अपने एजेंटों के जरिये हटा कर के—अपनी गुडिया सरकार, अपनी सैटेलाइट हुकूमत वहाँ पर कायम की । अगर आज सिहानुक को हटा कर उसने कम्बोडिया में आक्रमण किया है तो फिर आगे भी अपनी आक्रमण की पालिसी को बढ़ायेगा । तो हिन्दुस्तान को उससे सबक लेना चाहिये खास कर के तब जब कि हमारे मुल्क के अन्दर भी ऐसी ताकतें काम कर रही हैं । साम्राज्यवादी ताकतें चाहती हैं कि हमारी स्वतंत्र गुट निरपेक्षता की पालिसी को बदले और हमें अपनी युद्ध की पालिसी में खिचें । हमारे देश के अन्दर भी ऐसी प्रतिक्रियावादी शक्तियाँ मौजूद हैं, चाहे वह स्वतंत्र पार्टी के रूप में हो या चाहे जनसंघ के रूप में हो या चाहे जिस भी रूप में हो, वह वक्त बे वक्त अपनी इस पालिसी को खुलेआम रखती रही है । वह आज हमारे देश की पालिसी को तब्दील करना चाहती है, अमेरिका की ओर ले जाना चाहती है और इसलिये वह यह भी चाहती है कि जो हमारी मौजूदा हुकूमत है, जो हमारा मन्त्रिमंडल है, उसको, इन्दिरा गांधी की हुकूमत को हटा कर उसकी जगह पर एक ऐसी हुकूमत कायम की जाय जो कि हिन्दुस्तान की स्वतंत्र पालिसी को बदल कर अमेरिका की ओर ब्रिटिश अमेरिका साम्राज्यवाद की ओर, हमारे देश की पालिसी को मोड़ सके, बदल सके । तो यह खतरा हमारे लिये मौजूदा है । ऐसी हालत में हम इस बात का अंदाजा किये बगैर

नहीं रह सकते हैं जो कि हमको अपने इस प्रति-
बेदन में अंदाजा करना चाहिये । दूसरी
ओर हम सिर्फ फौजी ताकत पर ही
अपने देश की रक्षा नहीं कर सकते, क्योंकि
किसी भी मुल्क के पास फौजी ताकत के साथ-
साथ उसके पीछे जनता की ताकत, जनता
की एकता की ताकत जनता की देशभक्ति की
ताकत होनी चाहिये । और उसके पीछे देश
की एकता होनी चाहिये, राष्ट्रीय एकता होनी
चाहिये, हमें स्मरण है जब पाकिस्तान ने हमला
किया, स्वर्गीय लाल बहादुर शास्त्री ने देश के लिये
जय जवान, जय किसान का नारा दिया । जय
जवान के नारे पर हमारे देश के जवानों ने मोर्चे
पर अपनी कर्तव्यपर पणता का पार्ट अदा किया
और उस नारे के चलने ही कैप्टन हमीद ने
देशभक्तिपूर्ण मिसाल पेश किया, जिसने कि
देश के नौजवानों का देशभक्तिपूर्ण का जजबान
देकर आगे बढ़ाया, देश की रक्षा के लिये तैयार
किया, देश के अन्दर राष्ट्रीय एकता की जबर्दस्त
भावना को मजबूत किया । आज महाराष्ट्र
में...

श्री उपसभापति : अब समाप्त कीजिए ।
आपका समय समाप्त हो गया ।

श्री भोला प्रसाद : ... देखा जाये, या
भिवंडी के अंदर जो कुछ आज हो रहा है, उसे
कैप्टन हमीद की गहादत, उसका सपना,
उसके अरमान और वह जय जवान का नारा
जो देश के फायदे के लिये, राष्ट्रीय एकता के
लिये पैदा किया था वह आज चकनाचूर हो
रहा है और इसके लिये मौजूदा हुकूमत ही
जिम्मेवार है । सांप्रतिकता के बारे में कहने
के लिये भी हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने कहा कि यह
कम्युनिज्म, फैमिस्ट ताकत सर उठा रही है, यह
मजहब के नाम पर दंगे को बढ़ा रही है, लेकिन
उसको रोकने के लिये अभी तक कोई कारगर
कदम नहीं उठाया गया, इसलिए कि शासक
दल के अंदर भी ऐसे तत्व मौजूद हैं जो उसको
बढ़ावा देना चाहते हैं...

श्री उपसभापति : बंद आइये । आपका
समय खत्म हो गया है ।

श्री भोला प्रसाद : दो मिनट ।

श्री उपसभापति : अब नहीं ।

श्री भोला प्रसाद : मैं नया मेम्बर हूँ जो
खड़ा हुआ हूँ ।

श्री नेकी राम : अरे, कल से पुराने हो
जाओगे ।

श्री भोला प्रसाद : तो जय किसान के नारे के
पीछे जो भावना थी, वह यह थी कि एक
तरफ हम आजादी की रक्षा के लिये लड़ते हैं,
दूसरी तरफ हमें अनाज के लिये दूसरे देशों पर
निर्भर होना पड़ता है । हमें खयाल है कि
जिस वकत पाकिस्तान ने या चीन ने हमारे
ऊपर हमला किया था, तब भी हम अनाज के
लिये दूसरे देशों पर मुहताज थे और इसीलिये
स्वर्गीय लालबहादुर शास्त्री ने जय किसान का
नाम देकर किसानों को ललकारा कि हम देश
को स्वायत्त में आत्मनिर्भर बनाएं । लेकिन
आज हमारे देश को 9 करोड़ एकड़ भूमि
परती पड़ी हुई है, जो किसानों को जतना चाहता
है, देश की खाद्य में आत्मनिर्भर बनाने के लिये,
देश की रक्षा व्यवस्था को मजबूत बनाने के
लिये, जिसमें जवानों तक अनाज पहुंचे और
देश के नौजवान लड़ सकें, लेकिन सरकार ने
वह सत्कारी परती जमीन भी किसानों को
देने के लिये कोई कारगर कदम नहीं उठाया
है । और जय किसान का नाम कागज पर
बना रह गया है । मैं थोड़ा कहना चाहता हूँ कि
आज रक्षा के मामले में, सामरिक रक्षा के
साथ जनता का सहयोग, जनता की ताकत
आर देश की एकता जरूरी है । यह बहना
गलत है कि हमारी हुकूमत की पालिसी हम
बाहरे में एक सही जनताविक पालिसी, देश भक्ति-
पूर्ण पालिसी है । हम उसी आधार पर राष्ट्रीय
सुरक्षा को मजबूत कर सकते हैं ।

श्री उपसभापति : श्री जोकीम आल्ता ।

श्री राजनारायण (उत्तर प्रदेश) मैं जानना चाहता हूँ आपकी व्यवस्था कैसे चल रही है। देखिये, पार्थ सागरी जी बोलें, उसके बाद कांग्रेस पार्टी, उसके बाद जनसंघ, फिर कांग्रेस पार्टी, फिर स्वतंत्र पार्टी, इसके बाद हमारी पार्टी का नम्बर आ गया। आपने एस० एम० पी० को कैसे काट दिया ?

श्री उपसभापति स्वतंत्र पार्टी के बाद सो० पी० आई०, सी० पी० आई० के बाद आपकी पार्टी आती है।

श्री राजनारायण : सो० पी० आई० हमारे बाद आती है। वह हमसे कम है। देखिये न यहाँ गोडे मुराहर बैठते हैं, उसके बाद भूपेश गुप्त हैं, उसके बाद . .

श्री उपसभापति : ठीक है, बाद में चान्स मिल जायेगा।

श्री राजनारायण : मैं आल्वा साहब की ईज्जत करता हूँ। उन्हें बोलने दीजिए।

श्री उपसभापति देखिये, आप दोनों पार्टियों का नम्बर इक्वल है।

श्री राजनारायण : इक्वल है, तभी तो हमको मिलना चाहिये। जो सत्य है उसको करिये। अनावश्यक बातें क्यों करते हैं। जब हमारी बारी आती है . .

श्री उपसभापति : सत्य यह है कि दोनों पार्टियों का स्टेटस समान है। (पुनर्निरीक्षण करने के बाद) नहीं, सी० पी० आई० के 9 मेंबर हैं, एस० एस० पी० के 8 हैं।

श्री राजनारायण : देखिये, आपके कोई फिगर हम नहीं मानेंगे। फिगर को फिर वेरोफाई कर लिया जाय। पहले आप कहते हैं इक्वल है, फिर कहते हैं 10 है या 9 है। चलिए उनको बुलवाइये। अब समय नष्ट न करिये।

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN. I am telling CPI 9 and SSP 8 after final verification

SHRI BALACHANDRA MENON (Kerala) We are 9, they are 8

श्री राजनारायण : कैसे मालूम हुआ।

श्री उपसभापति : यहाँ नाम दिये हैं। यह आफिशियल लिस्ट है I am telling you are 8, 8 does not mean 10 Mr Alva.

SHRI JOACHIM ALVA (Nominated). Mr Deputy Chairman, may I join my esteemed friend, Mr Mirdha, who spoke in terms of high praise about our hon Defence Minister? I think he has done an excellent job in a very well regulated manner and conducted it with nearly 1 million fighting people. They are not a million people yet, but it is a big army. He has carried on his duty very well indeed during the last few years. We should also like to congratulate the men of the Armed Forces and officers who have contributed towards reaching such an end. I am sorry only one gentleman from the other side cheered when the jawans were praised. My friend of the Jan Sangh. The whole House joins him to congratulate the jawans

I want to speak one point especially about a letter which appeared in the 'Times of India'. I am concerned about the safety of our young men, about the young men who die, whose wives do not see them again. We must be concerned about their welfare and it is our duty to see what happens to them. There was a letter on the 15th January, 1970, immediately after Group Captain Das died. He escaped the Pakistanis when he landed there but he went down in a crash of HF-24 during the development of that plane. There was a long and well-written letter in the 'Times of India' of 15th January 1970. The writer is one Mr J. P. Chawla who, I am told, is a former Air Force man. I do not know much about him but his letter deserves our congratulations. I am concerned about one paragraph of it:

"Internationally accepted procedures have been passed in allowing this officer to develop this engine. This was done against the technical advice of people like Dr Tank, Designer of the HF-24, Mr P M Reddy,

former General Manager of HAL, Dr. Ghatge, Chief Designer and General Manager of HAL, and Directorate of Technical Development and Production (AIR). Unfortunately all aeronautical development in the Ministry of Defence has taken place for the past 15 years on the advice of the Scientific Adviser who was never schooled in the rudiments of aeronautics or aircraft design.

When I was a representative of Parliament on the Indian Institute of Science at Bangalore, I thought that Dr. Bhagwantam had not done a good job there. When I came to know about it, I did not say anything in Bangalore. Here is an attack about him as to how it is done. He is gone and a new officer has come and we welcome him, and Government deserves congratulation for having appointed Dr. Nag Chowdhury in the capacity of Cabinet Secretary and also in charge of Defence Development, to be on a par with other highest officers, so that he may do his own job well indeed. What we are concerned is, every Air Force officer sacrifices his life for the sake of the country. A specialised IAF officer whom I met in London said, "I cannot get married. Who will look after my wife?" He was a pilot. He was 33 and till then he was not married. This Parliament has to be concerned about the safety of these men; otherwise we cannot get things done.

Then, Sir, about the bomb. I am glad that my friend talked about the bomb. We cannot have that bomb with the present social order. The anti-cow slaughter, the Birla enquiry and the bomb cannot go together. We should have a different kind of bomb under different circumstances. Unless the economic system is radically changed we cannot have the bomb. The bomb means a lot of business for the private sector. In the United States, President Eisenhower warned against the military complex of America. He got into serious trouble. He warned against the big manufacturers who were making money out of the war. We do not want to fall into that kind of trap. This is the kind of thing that we want to avoid. We shall no doubt go on progressing regarding the atomic energy. Those who want to use the bomb, they want to be nearer the man who makes it. I think China perhaps may not use it against us because we are too near them. Whatever that may be, again I refer to the one point of Dr Jagdish

Chawla in the Ministry of Defence Research who was at Harvard along with Dr. Tsien who invented the bomb. I referred to this matter on a previous occasion that he is the maker of the bomb in China. Somehow or the other, we do not appreciate the real people who get things done. But he was summarily sent away by our Defence Research by Dr. Bhagvantham. How does Dr. Bhagvantham stand as the Defence Adviser upto the standard of Sir Zolly Zuckermann who was the British Defence Research Adviser in the last war.

Now, Sir, with regard to the Navy. The Navy is in a very bad shape. We have given it only Rs. 40 crores when the Air Force has got Rs. 170 crores. When we have a budget of Rs. 1164 crores for Defence, it is time that the Navy also gets a big budget. We have been reminding in this House that the Navy should be given more chances of development because in the next 30 years we have to develop it in a bigger way and we should find more money for it. No doubt the frigate manufactured by the Mazagaon Docks in Bombay is very good. But one is not enough. More must be manufactured. One is not enough for a big country like ours. With all the things that we have got in this land, we cannot yet find funds for this.

Now, with regard to the question of defence. Defence does not get enough. They should get enough. I have often asked Acharya Kripalani in the Lok Sabha whether he took any interest about the officers who were living in the Delhi messes and houses in a wretched way in New Delhi, the Princess Mess and other Messes. We do not see to their comfort. Something must be done about them. We are not concerned about them. Well, we do not do anything about them.

Getting back to HAL, I would like to say that the HAL, sooner or later, in the next 30 years, should become very big. After the seven public sector undertakings, the amount of money spent on HAL is Rs. 65 crores out of Rs. 133.70 crores, in 1969-70. It must be said to our credit that most of the public sector concerns belonging to the defence forces are getting on well, and we are proud of them, just as we are proud of the other wings of Defence. And HAL is something to be much proud of; the men and the Air Force running it are very efficient. And it

[Shri Joachim Alva.]

is time that in the next 30 years we built it up in such a way that it is the biggest in Asia and Africa. We should look forward to it. In the last War, the Japanese were producing so many Z-fighters that the Americans got frightened and panicky beyond their conscience. We have to produce machines. The Britishers are able to produce the Rolls Royce Engines and they are able to produce them so much that they send them abroad and make all the money for themselves. We have got so many first-class engineers and good workers. When we have so many people amongst us, it is time that we put HAL on the top of the world and make it something to be much more proud of. We are glad that on account of the last wars against us, we were able to put HAL into four different sectors in the country and make it something very, very big indeed. It is time that we did many more things.

I want to come to another point, about Gen. Cariappa (Retired) Generals do not want to put their names as (Retd.) There was a General who used to write for my paper the 'Forum' with out putting (Retd.) The Defence P. R. O. told me you are not putting (Retd.), let him stop writing. It is a curious way. When we go out of Parliament, we are all ex-MPs. Now, Sir, in the matter of the Chiefs of Staff, we must see that for the next three years after they retire, they should keep quiet, silent. Otherwise, it is time that their pension is put off.

SHRI K. CHANDRASEKHARAN (Kerala): They not only speak but also write.

SHRI JOACHIM ALVA: He writes and speaks. I am sorry, my friends in the RSS, give General Cariappa shelter, and the man is lost. This gentleman was under British duress, under British influence, when the great fighters of our nation were in jail. Now, I am afraid, even Gen. Kumaramangalam has said something after retirement under Tata's auspices. All these things are not very happy for us. The moment they retire they develop great potentialities. They are not able to yield power as they would like, as before, in their heart of hearts because most of them are just like us, nothing less, nothing more. Their character, their nature, remain the same.

They are not able to shake it off. Otherwise, the Army might have done something like the British Army or any other Army. The British Army, of course, is the best, although it is small. They have got one hundred thousand men for their Police Force. Their police force is one hundred thousand men but we have not even a million people, for the whole country, in our Armed Forces, which is something to be thought over. Whatever it may be, we do not want talking Cariappas and Kumaramangalam. I do not know what kind of tribe we are going to have. It is time that we thought about it. I was a pioneer in demanding that the Reserve Bank Governor shall not take up any job in the private sector after retirement. The moment you make him the Reserve Bank Governor, you give him the highest job. These ICS men, they want to get the highest jobs after retirement. I remember one man in the ICS took up a big job—he was in the Economic Ministry—and when he told me that he would take up a job. I said, there is a lot of difficulty between you and me. I will not mention his name. He passed off recently immediately after he took a job! Most of the ICS men want only big jobs after retirement, unlike Nethaji Subhas Bose and Kamath and R. K. Patil. When millions of people die for our country, our scientists want big jobs. Hundreds and thousands of our people have no jobs and homes. But some of our scientists want to go to England or America and settle down there.

I beg of the Defence Minister to give special opportunities to the Members of Parliament to come in contact with the Defence Forces and not keep them far away. We have no time for talk with them. We just learn about the Army etc. from the books. We do not go anywhere near the Army, as we ought to do. It is time that they become not Chairman, but at least important men in many other defence establishments so that we can have a better chance to build up our country. We have done nothing of the kind. Sir, I only find that the retired Generals want big places and want to have power in their hands. This cannot be done. All our unrecognised communities like the Scheduled Castes and Harijans must be given their proper place. I want to know which Harijan has become a General in the Army. Are they not able to fight? I was not taking much interest in Harijans. As a Christian I felt that it was not my business to interfere in communal

affairs. But when I found their real condition, I took interest. Mr Mavlan-
kar who used to call me unfailingly on
every question whenever I started to
put questions about the Scheduled
Castes, used to pull me up. It is a very
important thing and we want all of them
to get into the Army so that we can
build up a great Army.

What we have done is not good
enough for making our country strong,
for making our Army, Navy and the Air
Force strong. We have got the men
ready to die. We must remember all
those who died here in NEFA. We can-
not forget them. We have to remem-
ber their sacrifice. When they retire we
must do everything for the jawans and
then only we shall have done some-
thing.

Thank you very much

श्री उपसभापति : राजनारायण जी, आपकी
पार्टी के आठ मिनट हैं, आपको बोलना है।

श्री राजनारायण : कहिये तो न बोलू। आपने
आन्वा साहब को 25 मिनट का समय दे दिया
और हमको 8 मिनट। अगर हम असत्य बोले तो
बात दूसरी है, नहीं तो 8 मिनट में खत्म नहीं हो
पायेगा। आप चाहें जो करें।

श्री उपसभापति : तो कितना समय लीजियेगा?

श्री राजनारायण : मैं जानता नहीं हम बोलते
चलेगे। 3 मिनट तो आपने इसी में ले लिये।
हम क्या करें।

श्री उपसभापति : तीन मिनट? खैर, आठ की
जगह 10 मिनट हो जायगा, लेकिन 10 मिनट
में खत्म कर दीजिये।

श्री राजनारायण : हमारे लिए और ज्यादा
समय रखना चाहिये।

श्री उपसभापति : आप अपनी पार्टी की
ताकत बढ़ाइये ताकि आपको ज्यादा समय मिल
सके।

श्री राजनारायण : ताकत तो बढ़ जायगी।

श्री उपसभापति : खैर, तो बोलिये।

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, मैं चाहता हू कि
जब प्रतिरक्षा विषय पर इस सदन में चर्चा हो तो
शान्ति के साथ और गंभीरता के साथ हो। संपूर्ण
प्रतिरक्षा की संपूर्ण तैयारी के लिए किन-किन बातों
पर हमें ध्यान देना है, पहले मैं उनको ही प्रस्तुत
करूंगा। पहला है, हमारे पास एक के बाद एक
आघात करने की समस्या या जीतना या जीतने
के लिए भर जाने की आकांक्षा। दूसरा है, भारत
की दृष्टि में और वातावरण में अहिंसा का अर्थ
और उसकी समिति। तीसरा है, भारतीय सेना
के दोष और कमियाँ और गुण। चौथा है, जन-
मानस और उसके अनुरूप अपेक्षित परिवर्तन।
पाचवा है, एक बृहत रक्षा योजना का निर्माण
और विश्व के अन्य देशों के साथ सबंधों से उसका
तालमेल। छठा है, अपनी रक्षा के लिए किस प्रकार
की तैयारी की जरूरत है और लक्ष्य के लिए प्रभाव-
कारी ढंग से कार्यवाही करने की क्षमता और
विकास के लिए क्या क्या कदम उठाने चाहिए।
इन छ बातों की रोशनी में यदि हम देखेंगे तो
प्रतिरक्षा के लिए जो प्रथम काम हमको करना
है, वह यह है कि हमको अपना मन बनाना है कि
हमारी इच्छा शक्ति क्या है, हम क्या चाहते हैं,
प्रतिरक्षा का मन है या नहीं? दूसरी बात जो
प्रथम मैं प्रतिरक्षा के लिए महत्वपूर्ण मानता हू वह
है हमारी इच्छा शक्ति। दूसरे नम्बर का महत्व मैं
उद्योग और कृषि के विकास को देता हू और
तीसरे नम्बर का महत्व मैं देता हू युद्ध में कुशलता
और चौथे नम्बर पर मैं जोर देता हू हथियारों
को। अभी तक जितने भाषण हुए हैं उनसे उल्टा
ही हमारा चलेगा। हथियार पर जो हमारा जोर
है वह चौथे नम्बर का है। तीसरा नम्बर हम देते
हैं युद्ध की कुशलता को। दूसरा नम्बर है उद्योग
और कृषि का और पहला नम्बर है इच्छा शक्ति
का। अगर हमारी इच्छा ही नहीं है कोई काम
करने की, मन ही नहीं है कोई काम करने का,
तो सारे हथियार रखे रह जायेंगे। हम आगे बढ़
नहीं सकते। पलायनवादिता के चक्कर में फस
जायेंगे और अगर हमारे आंतरिक उद्योग और
कृषि का विकास नहीं होगा तो भी हम अपनी
प्रतिरक्षा नहीं कर पायेंगे। दुनिया का इतिहास
साक्षी है, श्रीमन्, कि जिस देश के पास औद्योगिक

[श्री राजनारायण]

गिक और दूसरी शक्ति है उसी देश के पास आधुनिकतम हथियार हैं, उसी देश के पास एटम और हाइड्रोजन एनर्जीज हैं। जो देश अपने अंदर उद्योग और कृषि से परिपूर्ण है, उसी के पास आधुनिकतम हथियार हैं। आप अमरीका को देख लीजिए, रूस को देख लीजिए। आज उन को अन्न के लिए दूसरे देशों का मुखापेक्षी नहीं होना पड़ रहा है। आज उनको हथियार के लिए दूसरे देशों का मुखापेक्षी नहीं होना पड़ रहा है। क्यों? क्योंकि उनके यहां उद्योग विकसित हैं, उनके यहां कृषि विकसित है, उनके यहां कोई भूखा नहीं है, कोई नंगा नहीं है। इसलिए वे आज अपने देश को प्रतिष्ठा के लिए सजग हैं और सबल हैं। अगर हम यह समझे कि हमारे पास हथियार बन जाय, अच्छे और बड़े हथियार बन जाय तो उससे हमारी सुरक्षा खो जायेगी यह नहीं है। उस देश की जनता की स्थिति क्या है, उस देश का जनमानस क्या है, जब तक इसको अच्छे तरीके से देखा नहीं जायगा तब तक देश की प्रतिरक्षा असम्भव है।

अब इन बातों के बाद बहुत सी बातें हमारे मित्र श्री पारथसारथी कह चुके हैं और दूसरे लोगों के भाषणों के बीच में भी बहुत सी बातें आ गई हैं। मैं उनकी पुनरावृत्ति नहीं करूंगा। जो बातें उन से छूट गई हैं, उन बातों की ओर ही मैं आना चाहता हूँ। हमने मिर्जा साहब को सुना। उन्होंने श्री एन० एन० मिश्र की तारीफ की। दूसरे लोगों को भी सुना। आज हमारे कुल मित्रों की रूस से एक मुहब्बत सी बढ़ती चली जा रही है, रूस से सहायता लेने के बारे में या रूस के सम्बन्धों के बारे में। मगर अभी हमारे परीक्षा काल दो हुए, एक हुआ सन 1962 में और दूसरा हुआ सन 1965 में। ज़रा हम खोले कि सन 1962 में जब चीन का हमला हुआ तो रूस कहा था? जब परीक्षा की घड़ी आई तो रूस की गतिविधियाँ क्या थीं? रूस ने कहा था कि भारत हमारा मित्र है और चीन हमारा भाई है। हम मित्र और भाई के सम्बन्ध को ले कर चलेंगे, लेकिन इससे ज्यादा कही कुछ नहीं कहा। अगर कुछ है तो हमको स्वर्ण सिंह भाई बताएँगे। और जब मई 1965

आया तब भी अभी हमारे एक मित्र बोल रहे थे कि मैं नया हूँ, उसके बारे में मैं कुछ नहीं कहना चाहूँगा क्या हुआ। मैं आज फिर कहना चाहता हूँ कि काश्मीर के बारे में आज रूस की पालिसी क्या है, अमेरिका की पालिसी क्या है? इसकी भी चर्चा हो गई। मगर रूस की पालिसी क्या है? अमेरिका और रूस की पालिसी में फर्क क्या है? दोनों दरिन्दे हैं। हम दोनों से बचना चाहते हैं। दोनों एक प्रकार के साम्राज्यवादी, प्रसारवादी हैं। हम दोनों से बचना चाहते हैं। दोनों भारतीय राष्ट्र को अपनी पूर्ण युवावस्था में आने नहीं देना चाहते हैं। हम दोनों से बचना चाहते हैं, दोनों से बचना चाहते हैं और यदि कहीं इतनी बड़ी गलती हुई कि एक का सहाय ले कर भारत राष्ट्र को समुन्नत का खयाल किया जाएगा तो बहुत बड़ी गलती हो जाएगी और हम धड़ाम में गिर जाएँगे। मुझे वह दिन याद है जब 20 अक्टूबर को चीन का हमला हुआ, तो अमेरिकी प्रेसीडेंट रात भर टेलिफोन अपने पास रखे हुए था और वह चाहता था, वह सुनना चाहता था कि भारत का प्रधान मंत्री हमसे क्या चाहता है। वह दिन और वह घड़ी मुझे याद है। इसलिए बहुत बड़-बड़ का बात करने की कोई जरूरत नहीं है। जितनी हैसियत है, उसी पर बात करो। तो मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज हमारे प्रतिरक्षा विभाग किमी ढग से चल रहा है। सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह जी हमको सफाई के साथ उत्तर दे कि जब उर्वेजियम, उत्तर पूर्व सीमावली पर आफत आई और जब सम्पूर्ण राष्ट्र को शर्म का कलक लगाया भारत की सरकार ने, तो उससे आगे अब कहा बड़ा गया है, कितना बड़ा गया है। हमारी जो सुरक्षा, रक्षा व्यवस्था है..

श्री शीलभद्र याजी (बिहार) : आप जा कर देखिये।

श्री राजनारायण : नाथू ला में क्या हुआ इसकी जानकारी हमारे मित्र श्री शीलभद्र याजी को नहीं है, सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह जी को जानकारी है कि 14 लाख हमारी लाटाईं तो चीनियों ने लौटाईं। अभी भारत को वह गौरव प्राप्त नहीं हुआ है कि चीनियों को एक लाख भी लौटाई हो। यह सब सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह जी जानते हैं।

श्री शीलमन्न यात्री : आप वहाँ जा कर देखिये।

श्री राजनारायण : हम देख कर आए हैं। खैर मैं ऊँधर जाइंगा तो हमारा बहुत ज्यादा समय चला जाएगा। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि प्रतिरक्षा पर हमारी संसद का कोई नियंत्रण है या नहीं, किसी जन-तंत्रीय व्यवस्था में जहाँ जनता का शासन हो, वहाँ पर संसद का नियंत्रण होता है या नहीं, संसद के प्रति प्रतिरक्षा की जिम्मेदारी है या नहीं, मगर अब संसद में कोई इस पर प्रश्न होता है, तब एक टा रटाया उत्तर मिल जाता है। यही एक उत्तर मिलता है।

श्री शीलमन्न यात्री : बहुत सी बातें बताने योग्य नहीं होती हैं।

श्री राजनारायण : मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह देश के साथ गद्दरी है, यह राष्ट्र के साथ धोका है। (Interruptions) फिर यह कहना कि सार्वभौम सत्ता है और यह कहना कि हमारी पार्लियामेंट में सर्वोच्च सत्ता है, यह सही नहीं है, क्योंकि सारी बातें जो देश को जाननी चाहिए, वह देश की जनता जानती नहीं है।

5 P. M. बल्कि बाहर के लोग जान जाते हैं। श्रीमन्, मैं बताना चाहता हूँ कि 1965 में अमेरिकी अखबारों को तो बताया कि हम तब केवल लाइन सीधी करना चाहते थे, लेकिन भारत के लोगो को नहीं बताया और आगे यदि देखा जाय तो यह जो रटा रटाया उत्तर होता है, उस उत्तर से हमारा कोई काम चलने वाला नहीं है।

मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह जो लंदन का इस्टीमेटेड फार स्ट्रेटिजिक स्टडीज है, इसको खबर कौन देता है? भारत की कौन सी गोपनीयता है जो कि इसमें प्रकाशित नहीं होती है? केवल हम लोगो से छिपाया जाता है। मगर भारत की सैनिक शक्ति के आँकड़े यहाँ प्रकाशित होते हैं और भारत के सरकारी अफसरान देते हैं, भारत के सरकारी मंत्री देते हैं, विदेशों को देते हैं और देश से छिपाते हैं, कितने हैं कि इस बारे में हमको नहीं बोलना है, क्योंकि यहाँ तो मामला चलेगा।

मैं यह बताना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे पास यह जल, थल और नभ तीनों सेनायें हैं, कहीं भी पब्लिक एकाउंट्स कमेटी में या कभी भी यह बताया कि इनके अलग-अलग क्या आँकड़े हैं। श्रीमन्, श्रीकृष्ण मेनन और उस समय के जो आडिटर जनरल श्री ए० के० चन्दा थे उनमें डेटा के सवाल को लेकर तकरार हो गई, यह नहीं चाहते थे कि यह सब चीजें प्रकाश में आयें और तब से जो चीजें पहले मालूम भी होती थीं कुछ बजट की पुस्तकों द्वारा और आडिटर जनरल के द्वारा और पब्लिक एकाउंट्स कमेटी के द्वारा अब वह भी धीरे-धीरे छिपती जाती है। अपने देश की जनता के सामने सारे तथ्य प्रकाश में नहीं आते। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि नभ में कितना खर्च होता है, स्थल में कितना खर्च होता है, वायु में कितना खर्च होता है, किस-किस मोटे-मोटे मुद्दे पर खर्च होता है, कहा अनियमितता है और कहा नियमितता है, इसकी कोई जानकारी हम खोजने लगे तो हमको नहीं मिलती। परेशानी हो जाती है। इसलिये हम कहना चाहते हैं कि संसद है क्या? हम हैं क्या? हमारा देश है इसकी आजादी के लिये हम लड़े और हमी से छिपाया जाय और विदेशों को उन आँकड़ों को दिया जाय? यह हमारी सरकार की प्रतिरक्षा की नीति है?

मैं इसके बाद यह भी कहना चाहूँगा कि भारत की सरकार जरा अच्छी तरह से देखे कि अगर हम चाहते हैं कि भारत की प्रतिरक्षा ठीक हो, तो प्रतिरक्षा के लिये जो उचित कदम उठाना चाहिये क्या एक भी कदम उठा है? क्या भारत के पड़ोसी राष्ट्रों के साथ भारत के सम्बन्ध आज अच्छे हैं? या जो पहले भी सम्बन्ध थे वह कायम हैं। मेरा उत्तर है नहीं। तो भारत की सरकार राष्ट्र की प्रतिरक्षा की दुश्मन है। यह प्रतिरक्षा को चबा रही है। यह प्रतिरक्षा कर सकती नहीं। श्रीमन्, नेपाल को देखा जाय। आज नेपाल हमसे दूर है। आज हमारे मित्र विनेश सिंह जी भूटान को कहते हैं कि तुम यू० एन० ओ० में एक सदस्य की तरह बैठो, हम तुमको ले जायेंगे। क्या लानत है हम कहा से कहा जा रहे हैं? उसी के साथ यह है कि पाकिस्तान के साथ हमारी मैत्री हो या सम्बन्ध

[श्री राजनारायण]

मधुर हो, लेकिन उसके लिये हमने क्या किया? याद रखिये भारत और पाकिस्तान के सम्बन्ध को ठीक करने के लिये भारतवर्ष के अन्दर हिन्दू और मुसलमानों का सम्बन्ध ठीक करना ही है। हिन्दू और मुसलमानों में सद्भावना, भाईचारा बढ़ाना ही होगा। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि भारत की सरकार ने भारत के हिन्दू और मुसलमानों में भाईचारा बढ़ाने के लिये क्या किया? वहाँ करवाओ दगा और यहाँ जवान से कहो कि माइ-नार्गिटि की हम सुरक्षा चाहते हैं। आज भारत में साम्प्रदायिकता का विष-वमन कोई कर रहा है, तो भारत की प्रधान मंत्री श्रीमती इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी। इनसे बढ़ कर साम्प्रदायिकता के वातावरण को फैलाने में कोई दूसरा है नहीं। यह साम्प्रदायिकता का वातावरण फैला रही है और मजे में फैला रही है। अज्ञानता में फैलाती हो या ज्ञानता में फैलाती हो, मगर वोट के लालच में आज हमारे देश को तबाह और बर्बाद कर रही हैं। मैं आज एक किताब पढ़ रहा था। श्री पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने इंडियन आर्मी को इंडियन-नाइज करने की बात लिखी है। भारतीय सेना का भारतीयकरण हो, यह पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू का वाक्य है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो अंग्रेज सेना का ढाँचा छाड़ कर गये थे, उस ढाँचे में आज कौन सा परिवर्तन है? कौन सा मौलिक परिवर्तन है? इसकी जानकारी सरकार हमको दे।

श्रीमन्, स्विटजरलैंड में बड़ी चर्चा चली कि हमारी सेना के जवानों और अफसरों की तनख्वाहों में फर्क नहीं होना चाहिये, उन्हें ईकवल, समान तनख्वाह पानी चाहिये। भारत में समान तनख्वाह न हो, लेकिन तो भी विषमता कितनी है? आज भारतवर्ष का जवान कितना रुपया पाता है श्री एल० एल० एन० मित्र साहब, श्री स्वर्ण सिंह जी?

श्री ललित नारायण मिश्र : कहा जायगा।

श्री राजनारायण : मगर हमारी जानकारी है कि 55 रुपये पर इनका स्टार्ट होता है।

पाकिस्तान के जवानों का स्टार्ट होता है 78 रुपयों पर। जो मैं फिगर दे रहा हूँ उसका लो, हमको तो आपसे फिगर मिलेगी ही नहीं। फिर सूबेदार 173 रुपया पर स्टार्ट होता है और पाकिस्तान में सूबेदार 250 रुपये से स्टार्ट होता है। अफसरान भारत और पाकिस्तान के करीब-करीब बराबर पाते हैं, अगर कैप्टन का रैंक देखा जाय तो भारत में 1,000 रुपया और पाकिस्तान में 1,100 रुपया, करीब-करीब बराबर है। लेकिन मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि भारत के जवानों को क्यों 55 रुपया पर स्टार्ट किया जाय? माग सब्जी का भी अगर महीने भर का खर्चा लगा ले तो उसमें नहीं आयेगा। श्री ललित नारायण मिश्र के घर में कितने की माग सब्जी बनती होगी, इसका हिमाब लगा ले तो पता लग जायगा कि हमारे भारत के जवानों को भारत की सरकार क्या देती है?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH But they get free rations

श्री राजनारायण और मैं कह देना चाहता हूँ कि यदि भारत की भूमि में भारत की सेनाओं का भारतीयकरण नहीं हुआ और नवीन ढाँचा नहीं बना, उसी अंग्रेजी ढाँचे का संचालन होता रहा, तो इसका बुरा नतीजा फिर भोगना पड़ेगा। मैं कतई इसको कहने के लिये तैयार नहीं हूँ कि हमारी सेना के जवानों का मनोबल नीचा है। वह बहुत उचा है। व्यक्तिगत तरीके से हम बहुतों को जानते हैं, देश के लिये, मुल्क के लिये, उनमें मरने की, कटने की तमन्ना है और मौका आया तो काफी लोग कटे और मरे भी हैं, मगर जो सर्वसाधारण व्यवस्था है उसकी मैं चर्चा कर रहा हूँ। इसका यह अर्थ न लगाया जाय कि हम यह समझते हैं कि हमारी संन्य शक्ति बिलकुल ही निकम्मी है, सैन्य शक्ति निकम्मी नहीं है, निकम्मा है प्रशासन और शासन।

श्री उपसभापति आप खत्म कीजिये, 17 मिनट हो चुके।

श्री राजनारायण श्रीमन्, मैं आपके द्वारा यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि जब पाकिस्तान का हमला हुआ तो भात के पाम मैप में क्या था नहीं ? क्योंकि प्रतिरक्षा का एक सबसे बड़ा गुण होता है कि प्रतिरक्षा विभाग के पास सारे विश्व के स्ट्रेटेजिक प्वाइंट्स के मैप्स जरूर हों। भारत के पाम भी इसका विभाग होगा मैप्स बनते होंगे, मगर मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि छम्ब और जौरिया में जब पाकिस्तान ने हमला किया तो भारत के पाम उसका मैप था ? यह पता था कि पाकिस्तान हमला कर सकता है, तो छम्ब और जौरिया के रास्ते असमकता है? मुझे जानकारी है और अच्छी जानकारी है कि 19७० ई० में मैप बना था और उस समय यह बात थी कि पाकिस्तान इस रास्ते में हमलावर हो सकता है। जब पाकिस्तान उस रास्ते से हमला कर सकता है और इसका मैप बना था तो उसको रोकथाम की तैयारी क्यों नहीं की गई। आज हमारी सरकार प्रतिरक्षा विभाग इसके बारे में कितनी मजबूत है, इसकी भी जानकारी होनी चाहिये।

श्री उपसभापति ठीक है अब आप बैठिये।

श्री राजनारायण श्रीमन् हम दो, तीन मिनट में खत्म कर रहे हैं, आप घंटी मत बजाइये। हमारे मित्र मिर्धा माहव को मुझे मालूम नहीं कि आजकल उनको क्या हुआ है, पहले तो कुछ ठीक से बोलते थे, लेकिन अब जब खड़े हो कर बोलते हैं तो सरकार की बड़ा प्रतिष्ठा का भाषण देने हैं। उन्होंने उत्पादन विभाग का तो ऐसा चित्र दिखाया जो कि बिल्कुल असत्य है। उत्पादन विभाग प्रतिरक्षा का जितना भ्रष्ट है, उतना भ्रष्ट कोई है ही नहीं। श्री एल० एन० मिश्रा हमारे मित्र हैं, मैं उनकी व्यक्तिगत बात इस समय नहीं कहूंगा, मगर चले जाइये कानपुर में, यह मिलिटरी के लिए जूता खरीदते हैं निजी कारखाना 18 रुपये का जो जूता देता है, वह इनके कारखाने में 35 रुपये का बनता है। निजी कारखाना का 18 रु० का और इनके कारखाने का 35 रु० का। इसकी जानकारी कर लें। तो इनको लोग

खरीदते हैं, टेन्ट्स, कपड़ा इसमें कितनी खासलतें होती हैं और उस खायल को लेकर ऑफिसरों में कितनी चर्चा है, इसकी जानकारी नहीं है सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह जी को, इसकी जानकारी नहीं है हमारे मित्र श्री एल० एन० मिश्रा को ? मेरा खयाल है होगी; क्योंकि उनके पास खबरें आती होंगी, जब हमारे पास आती है तो उनके पास भी आती होगी। तो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि भ्रष्टाचार प्रतिरक्षा का सबसे बड़ा दुश्मन है। ईमानदारी राष्ट्र के लोगों में आए, सदाचारी हों, देशभक्त हों। यह प्रतिरक्षा की सबसे बड़ी आवश्यकता है।

श्री बाक बिहारी दास (उड़ीसा) नदा जी

श्री राजनारायण न नदा जी का जानता हूँ, न डडा जी को जानता हूँ, न गदा जी को जानता हूँ। नदा जी जब घर मंत्री थे, वे कहते थे भ्रष्टाचार को खुद मैं खाना चाहता था, अब भ्रष्टाचार मुझे खाने लगा है। अब उनकी बात मैं नहीं कहूंगा। मैं इतना कहना चाहता हूँ श्रीमन्—हमारे मित्र हमारा ध्यान कहा मैंने कहा ले गये . . .

श्री उपसभापति कोई बात नहीं। समाप्त करने में ध्यान लगाइये।

श्री राजनारायण अभी मैं खाली एकगजाम्पल के तौर पर दे रहा हूँ, क्योंकि यह प्रतिरक्षा का सबध सभी मंत्रालयों से है। प्रतिरक्षा का सबध सारे देश से है, इसलिये सभी मंत्रालयों से उसका एक न एक प्रकार से सबध होना चाहिये। जब हमारे देश के मंत्रालयों में भ्रष्टाचार की सीमा टूट जायेगी तो प्रतिरक्षा कैसे होगी—इसके बारे में ही उत्तर दिया जाय। आज चलते समय हमें अफसोस है कि हमारे मित्र जार्ज फर्नेन्डेस ने 16 मार्च, 1970 को एक चिट्ठी लिखी हुई है, जो लंदन से उनके पाम आई हुई है। उस चिट्ठी में उन्होंने लिखा है कि उन्होंने मिस्टर हक्सर, मिस्टर कौल और मिस्टर मॉन्ट 3 आदमियों के लिये चिट्ठी लिखी कि भा सेंट्रल बैंक है, उसका मैनेजर

[श्री राजनारायण]

गड़बड़ कर रहा है। श्री फर्नांडेस ने 18 तारीख को श्रीमती इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी के पास इस चिट्ठी को भेजा

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH How is it relevant?

श्री राजनारायण मैं उसी पर आ रहा हूँ। दिस इज मोस्ट रिलेवेंट।

श्री उपसभापति अपने पहले 2 मिनट कहा था। अब 5 मिनट हो गये हैं।

श्री राजनारायण तीन दूना छ कर दीजिए। 18 मार्च को उन्होंने चिट्ठी लिखी, लेकिन आज तक प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने जवाब नहीं दिया, फिर उन्होंने एक दूसरी चिट्ठी उनके पास भर्जा और उस चिट्ठी में लिखा कि जो 6 अप्रैल को लिखा है—जिस 6 अप्रैल के दिन दिल्ली में जनतंत्र और समाजवाद पर सबसे कड़ा प्रहार इंदिरा सरकार का हुआ—तो उसन कहा जार्ज साहब मैं बम्बई गया तो आप दिल्ली में और मैं दिल्ली गया तो आप बम्बई गे। सारी बातों को कहना चाहिये था, मगर जो चिट्ठी हमने हकसर का भेजी थी वह चिट्ठी उस आदमी के पास पहुँच गई है जिस आदमी का नाम उन्होंने लिया था रमन। वह रमन कोई गुजरात का रहने वाला है, बड़ा आदमी है, इस विषय पर इस सदन में कल चर्चा हुई थी, 2 करोड़ २० के घोटाले के बारे में।

तो जब प्रधान मंत्री के मन्त्रिवालय का आदमी प्रधान मंत्री का सेक्रेटरी जो उनके नाक के नीचे रहता हो वह इतने बड़े भ्रष्टाचारों के कामों में फसा हुआ है तो इस देश की सुरक्षा हमारे भाई स्वर्ण सिंह जी चाहते हो तो कैसे होगी। यह हमें बताएँ। प्रधान मंत्री जो प्रशासन की गगोत्री है, वही भ्रष्टाचार के कीचड़ से भर जाय प्रधान मंत्री का कार्यालय, प्रधान मंत्री का सचिवालय तमाम भ्रष्टाचार से भरा हुआ है वहाँ कीचड़ भर गया है इसी लिये सारा समाज गढ़ा हो रहा है, सारा मन्त्रालय दा हो रहा है प्रतिरक्षा विभाग भी गढ़ा हो

रहा है। यह हमारे देश की प्रतिरक्षा के लिये सबसे बड़ी सकल की घड़ी है, इसीलिये मैं चाहता हूँ मंत्री जी जवाब दे तो मक्षिका स्थाने मक्षिका न करे, तोड़मरोड़ के जवाब न दे। वह बताये अंग्रेजों के जाने के बाद हमारे सैन्य शक्ति ढाँचे में क्या परिवर्तन हुआ।

श्री उपसभापति मैंने श्री मान्याल को पुकार लिया है।

श्री राजनारायण आध सेकेंड में बता दगा।

श्री उपसभापति आध सेकेंड में कोई बात हो सकती है?

श्री राजनारायण जब तक फौजी अफसरों के रहन सहन से अंग्रेजीयत और अंग्रेजी भाषा नहीं जायेगी, तब तक देश की सुरक्षा नामुमकिन है। “इन्डियन एयर फोर्स उसको लिखो, भारतीय वायु सेना मत लिखो” एक बड़े कमान्डर साहब ने ऐसा कहा। उसने हुकम दिया मिठाओ इसे। मिटवा दिया और नागरी लिपि में इन्डियन एयर फोर्स लिखवाया। यह तो है उनकी अंग्रेजी के प्रति भक्ति। तो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ अंग्रेजी भाषा के प्रति भक्ति रख कर सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह जी, चाहे दिल आपका कितना ही उज्ज्वल हो, हमारी प्रतिरक्षा सुरक्षित नहीं रह सकती। हम चाहते हैं कि भाषा के सबंध में, तन्हावों, सहूलियतों, विषमता के सबंध में पूरी तरह से विचार करके सरकार पूरा और समुचित उत्तर दे और सैन्य शक्ति में क्या परिवर्तन करने जा रहे हैं, अंग्रेजी राज टूटने के बाद क्या परिवर्तन हुए हैं, उनके बारे में पूरे आकड़े सदन में प्रस्तुत हो। केवल मुँह से कहना कि डिफेंस होगा, सुरक्षा होगी, इससे हमारे मन में विश्वास नहीं होता कि जब कोई सकल की घड़ी आयेगी तो यह हमारी सरकार क्या सुरक्षा करेगी।

SHRI SASANKASEKHAR SANYAL (West Bengal) Mr Deputy Chairman our good friend Shri Parthasarathy opened the debate with his persuasive delivery that a contented army is a great asset. I wish he had gone a little

farther and said that a contented and confident people are the greatest and the central asset of a country. This is not a question of mere philosophy or theoretisation. Look at Cambodia. Who is fighting there? It is the fighting spirit of the people. Look at Vietnam where all the mighty arms and armament of the American forces have been practically sterilized. It is the fighting spirit of the people. So, it is the morale of the people which counts in an effective and long-drawn resistance to aggression by foreigners and that is the fundamental concept of defence in the modern days. In the middle of April in the Calcutta edition of the Statesman I read a staggering report that 70 per cent of our people are below the absolute poverty level. These are the people who have to be summoned for behaving themselves as the second line of defence behind the army. Is it not a Utopian concept? In the lower rungs you find that there is disparity in subsistence. Some people are starving more and some people are starving less. Unemployment is rampant and there is no intelligent scheme to remove unemployment and these are the people who in the last resort have to be our fighting forces. A note of admiration I am putting and I am making a present of it to the honourable Defence Minister. I hope many of our friends have been to Calcutta. If they go around after 10 in the night, they will find that families and individuals live on pavements. They are pavement-dwellers. I have seen wedded couple hugging each other and concealing their children there on the pavements. I have seen children being born on the pavements in Calcutta. Are these the fighting forces? These have increased. Look at the last two wars. We had a confrontation with China. We had a confrontation with Pakistan. What was the result of these confrontations? The high financial magnates have become richer and prices have soared high up to the eternal agony of the low-range consumers. War materials and war industries have added to the black money with the inevitable annexure of inflation behind it. And today the proposition of defending the country looks to the man in the street like defending the bastions of high finance and not defending the future of the people. Sir in these two confrontations there was loss of territories according to Government's admission. The real loss was the loss of friendship with these two neighbouring countries. We have closed our doors for entering into negotiations either at our counter or at their

counters in order to make good our loss. Whether this banning of negotiations has been bad for China or Pakistan, it is very difficult for us to say but on our side we have really suffered a lot. Therefore we must see that proper morale is injected into the minds of our people so that they may feel that it is not the country of the Birlas, the Tatas or big money which they are defending but they are defending their own country. This atmosphere has to be brought about.

So far as the avenues of employment are concerned, the Army occupations or allied employments, these are welcome. I would be very glad if the Defence Department absorbs the jobless engineers who have turned Naxalites in my part of the country. I would even be glad if the university students are given some military occupation. But more than that I would like that the money which has rolled into the coffers of these big combines that must be taken back either by conscription or by confiscation or by some other methods. That would give a new hope to the people and the new generations who will then think that it is worth while fighting for their country and for their generations. Sir, we are scrapping the privy purses. That is all very good. But can't we collect this concealed and hoarded money? Can't we confiscate these big immovable properties, so many houses that have been acquired by these people? Can't we go to the hidden vaults in their houses and recover the hidden wealth? Can't we seize their foreign accounts? Unless we do that, we cannot enthuse our young generations, and they will not think that they are fighting for their own country. Now they are giving the slogan "The Chinese Chairman is our Chairman". They are raising this slogan because they find that in this country there is no Chairman. They have been misled into this hysteria. How can we stop this hysteria? They do not feel that they are fighting for their own country but for the skyscrapers from where these tycoons throw the orange skins which fall upon their bodies when they are sleeping on the pavements. (Interruptions) There are some people who are agents of the CIA and there are others who are agents of some other countries. Therefore Sir I am not saying this in a spirit of bravado but in a spirit of practical approach that the Ministry or the Government should go the whole hog and demonetise its currency giving notice to these people that in the course of 6 months they will have to exchange their present currency notes with the new currency notes.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: That they will never do because most of the money is with them. (*Interruption*) I am supporting you.

THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE (SHRI K. K. SHAH): I do not want to interrupt, but I think the demonstration proof is on the other side.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: I only support it but you are opposing it by demonstrations.

SHRI SASANKASEKHAR SAN-YAL: Therefore I was suggesting that there should be demonetisation of the currency of all denominations. That will really bring out the hoarded wealth and the hidden money and that will be the money to be taxed, to be earned and to be distributed among the people. Therefore, Sir, do not think that protection in the matter of geography is the only defence proposition but giving encouragement and inspiration to the people is the real protection, and that is the proposition which I am suggesting you to adopt. Thank you.

SHRI THILLAI VILLALAN (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Deputy Chairman, within the short time at my disposal, before discussing about the working of the Ministry of Defence, I want to discuss about the concept of defence and at the same time the Ministry of Defence itself. Sir, war and civilisation are inseparable. As civilisation progressed over the centuries, so also have the wars increased in magnitude. While there are strong nations and weak, rich and poor, warlike and peaceful, the possibility of war between nations cannot be ruled out. Nations should be conditioned to face war rather than avoid it. Let there be disarmament, mental or otherwise, but history shows that only those nations have survived who had the will to fight. Therefore, Sir, the first and foremost prerequisite in the preparedness for war is to build up the nation's will to fight.

[**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BANKA BEHARI DAS)** in the Chair]

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal): Sir, I take this opportunity of congratulating you for occupying that Chair.

SHRI THILLAI VILLALAN: Sir, we also congratulate you on behalf of our party. Sir, history and circumstances

create nations, time, troubles, tribulations and war makes or breaks them. There are both stronger and weaker nations. The balance of power maintained by the countries of the world is keeping all the nations survive. A nation confused, isolated and vacillating between the will to fight and exist or appease and subsist cannot expect others to come to its aid in war.

The second requisite is the preparedness for war. A nation must be prepared to fight for its integrity. It must not depend on diplomatic manoeuvring or others to fight for its survival. We cannot expect aid from others for the security of our country. In any war for our survival the major burden should be borne by us, the people of the country. Therefore, Sir, we must imbue the nation with a will to fight and the determination to stand on our own feet rather than depend on wishfully hope that others will come to our rescue.

The next point is about the material armaments. It implies the building up of finished products in men and material required to meet the military commitment of a nation. To be militarily strong and economically weak will surely ruin the nation. No democratic developing country like ours can afford a perpetual state of armed readiness. In time of peace it is a matter of meeting both the ends of the essential requirements for armaments and the maximum resources that can be allotted towards it without impairing national economy. In war economic considerations have no place. Now there is the Ministry of Defence for making all these things fruitful and successful. We are going to spend Rs. 1151 crores for Defence in 1970-71. The Budget for 1970 is Rs. 1151 crores constituting an increase of Rs. 46.77 crores, about 4.3 per cent. over the revised estimates for 1969-70. The Army's Budget estimates for 1970-71 is at Rs. 16.89 crores which is Rs. 5.51 crores above the revised estimates.

In this connection I want to mention some points for the consideration of the Minister of Defence. About the recruitment of personnel for the Army, people are called for preliminary tests to certain centres and they are sent back to their homes. Afterwards the same persons are called to come to big cities like Bombay, Madras or Calcutta for final selection. They may or may not be selected but my request is that both the selections should be done in one

place at the same time because otherwise this will amount to harassing the persons who come forward to serve the nation by joining the Army.

Then the soldiers in the Army were once treated as slaves during the days of British imperialism. That should not continue in our democratic country. That should be stopped. The soldiers join the Army only to serve the nation and not to serve the military bureaucracy there. There must be happy, satisfied personnel in the Army. Discontentment is not a healthy sign for a strong Army.

It is really heart-rending to note that the food supplied to the Army personnel in their camps and hospitals is not good in quality. This should be checked immediately and I would request the Minister to ensure that they will be supplied with good quality food and also plenty in quantity.

Then we must find out ways to make the Defence outlay effective by making it a national development as a whole. The expenditure on the Armed Forces should be viewed as a social investment and steps should be taken for the nation to get adequate return from it. The Armed Forces should be treated as a major training institution for the nation as a whole.

Now I pass on to the question of ex-servicemen. There are 3 million ex-servicemen now in the country and every year there is an increase of 40,000 people to this. It is high time that we appoint a High Power Commission for enquiring into the question of resettlement of the ex-servicemen and their dependents. The present pension is only Rs 20. This is very meagre. It should be raised. Then priority should be given to the ex-servicemen in the matter of disposal of vehicles and if there is any surplus vehicle the first priority should be given to the ex-serviceman.

Then I wish to make some observations about our production of Defence weapons. We have been talking of self-reliance for decades together. Our Minister, Shri Mishra said that we are fast moving towards that goal. We must produce our own war weapons in our Ordnance Factories except the acquisition of the new Naval Vessels and building up to the full strength the Sukhor-7 Squadrons, no major development

in regard to acquisition of new equipment by the Forces is found. There is mention of getting anti-tank missiles and rocket boat but we have not got it. A number of new projects have been indicated for the year including manufacture of medium and light armoured vehicles in Avadi Tank factory and modernisation of the Cordite Factory, Aruvankadu. The three Forces are now moving into the field of missilery, highly sophisticated electronic equipments, jet propulsion special alloys metallurgy, etc. But still we are depending on the foreign knowledge of technology. We should put an end to it. This is in the case of Mach 2 aircraft, infra-red air-to-air missiles, helicopters and tanks. In the same way anti-tank missiles and radar equipment. We must spend in the field of research and development. Allotting Rs 30 crores is not at all adequate for developing R and D base to meet our requirements and to develop the next generation of weapons. In this country we have to-day an excess of engineers as well as science graduates and therefore, this problem is capable of solution provided proper procedures and incentives are provided.

In Asia, China is the only nuclear power. We have to face this enemy which is a border-menace of our country. What is our answer to the ICBM? We do not know. Some Members stated that China or any other country will not use the atom bombs, and they will keep it with them but mere possession of the war weapon itself will settle so many things. They need not use it for any purpose but if they are in possession, that itself is a big strength. Conventional strength will not be sufficient. If we want to possess this nuclear weapon, we have to start making even to-day. If we start making it today, it will take 10 years to have the atomic weapons which are in the possession of the Power Blocs of the world. For these purposes, we have to revive the National Defence Council which is defunct now or form a separate one. With these words I conclude.

SHRI DEV DATT PURI (Harvana). The nation, Sir, has security if it does not have to sacrifice its values, the values it holds dear, and its interests to avoid a war and is able, if challenged to maintain those values and those interests by means of an armed conflict. That Sir in the last analysis is the only criterion by which we shall judge whether our armed forces are discharging their

[Shri Dev Dutt Puri.]

duties adequately or not. Sir, we hold in the Indian way of life certain values very dear. We hold the democratic way of life, socialist economy and non-aligned foreign policy as dear. These are some of the values that we hold as extremely dear to us. They are parts of our life and we inviolably hold on to them. We have to see if any nation by an overt act or by a direct attack chooses to subdue our values and our interests whether our armed forces are capable of defending our values and our interests. Briefly glancing over our record in this respect over the last 23 years or so, Pakistan has made repeated efforts, once even leading to a full-fledged war, to subdue our values and, Sir, I am very happy to say that our armed forces gave an extremely good account of themselves. I would even go so far as to say that they covered themselves with glory in the fight they put up in defence of our country, in defence of our values and in defence of our interests. I wish I could say the same thing in connection with China. China attacked us in 1962 and she continues to be in possession of vast areas of our territories. In 1962 we learnt some bitter lessons. We were outarmed; they were better equipped and also their intelligence was better. The point I am making is that after that the lessons that we learnt from China have been well learnt. We are assured that in so far as conventional weapons are concerned we have learnt those lessons well and we shall give a very much better account of ourselves should there be an occasion for it. But the question we have to ask ourselves is whether we have learnt any lesson from 1963 when China exploded the first atomic bomb. We have to ask ourselves whether we have learnt any lesson in 1970. In 1963 when the bomb was exploded by China there was a sense of complacency. We were shocked a little but we were assured that after all they did not have the means of delivery; what is a bullet without a gun? In 1970 they have demonstrated the gun and we must not forget that we are dealing with a nation which finds ethics, logic and morality in the barrel of a gun. We all know that the whole country is well within the range of that gun. Sir, the question is, what are we going to do now. In 1962—I do not want to go into the details because the time at my disposal is short—we sought outside help, we sought an umbrella, we sought some outside forces,

air force etc. to defend our cities. We should know now, after what has happened in Vietnam, after what has happened in Cambodia, that foreign help by armed intervention is probably worse than defeat. If we still feel that some power will come to save us from an atomic attack or will come to our aid or will give us an umbrella, they may or they may not but if they do, I think it may well turn out to be far worse than abject defeat. That is a lesson which we must learn today. Then what is the alternative? Hope for the best? I maintain, and the point I am making is, that nuclear self-reliance or alignment, are the only two alternatives that we have before us. We cannot be non-aligned unless we are self-reliant in the matter of nuclear armaments.

Sir, I will make a very brief observation about what my friend, Mr. Alva, said about the Birlas and the bomb. The only point that I am making is there are five atomic powers today: the USA which is the first to send a man to the moon, the USSR which is very close if not actually ahead of USA, France, Britain and now China. Now, is there anything in common in the economic systems of these five powers? The point is to maintain that we should wait for our economic system to reach a certain level before we will even think of the bomb, is I think only deluding ourselves and nothing else. The nuclear arms, I maintain, are offensive in the absolute. There is no defence against nuclear arms except deterrence. They are the concept of offensive in the absolute. As has been stated here we must face this matter of deterrents; we must examine it closely. Look at the 1914-18 war when the Germans used poison gas. In the 1939-45 war it is not as if Hitler had any compunction about the use of gas in warfare. Hitler did use gas against the Jews in order to exterminate them. Not that he was suddenly overcome with human considerations and all that. It is not that; it is only that he found that if in 1939 war he used poison gas the enemy would also unleash poison gas, bacteriological warfare etc. The point I am making is that the only reason why these things were not used in World War II was because both the parties had them. I therefore maintain that if India developed nuclear power it would deter other people from involving us into a nuclear holocaust and that to my mind should be included among the peaceful uses of atomic energy. After all what is more peaceful than having

the strength that would prevent an atomic conflict? There can be nothing more peaceful than that. Now, we are parties to the Test Ban Treaty, we have signed it. What is this Test Ban Treaty? The Test Ban Treaty says that those who have nuclear power will continue to have it, will continue to make more and will continue to stockpile them. They will even continue to test them, only they will not test them in the atmosphere. The point I am making is that the Test Ban Treaty is an act of municipal sanitation rather than of disarmament. That is all that they want to do by it, they want to keep the atmosphere clean and even in that Test Ban Treaty there is an escape clause that if the national security is threatened signatories can go ahead and make more bombs.

Sir, I have only two more points. Now take resources. We have thorium in the form of monazite sand. What is needed to be done is to develop the gas centrifugal process—I do not mean the gaseous diffusion plant. We have enough resource of scientific manpower and the industrial infrastructure can be built up and I maintain—I do not want to go into the details, I have the figures here—that 90 to 95 per cent of the cost of nuclear development is common to both peace and war. In the last analysis what is more valuable than liberty? Is there any monetary value that we can give to our liberty? If we have to tighten our belts if we have to make sacrifices we should be prepared to do that.

SHRI JOACHIM ALVA I do not want to interrupt my hon friend but

SHRI DEV DATT PURI If you do not want to interrupt then please do not interrupt.

Sir, I will make my last point. What is the opinion in the country? Recently I had undertaken a whirlwind tour of my constituency or what was formerly my constituency. I come from Haryana and as you know Haryana and Punjab have made a very large contribution to the armed forces and I do maintain that people in the remotest villages are seriously perturbed. The people in our defence forces are perturbed that we are doing nothing. We are only talking politics, we see the bomb being exploded in the air, we see the carrier system being developed and all that we do is talk, talk talk and talk. I would say

that what we are able to do, if we are called upon to do, depends more upon what people believe we can do than our actual fire-power. There is a belief—I say so from personal knowledge—that we are letting them down, that we are not doing what we can do. I salute our Armed Forces. The Jawans and their Commanders have done their duty splendidly by us. All I say is let us back them. Let us not let them down. Our enemy—I have no hesitation in calling China our enemy—is going ahead surefootedly inexorably and remorselessly. We must see the dangers and realise their implications and do our duty by the country. Posterity will condemn us for not having seen them, for not having realised them and for not having acted. Let them not say there are none so blind as those that will not see.

SHRI N. G. GORAY Mr Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am grateful to you for giving me an opportunity to participate in this debate. I would like to express hope that the Defence Minister must have noticed that in this debate, barring a few exceptions, everybody had to say something which was constructive in its approach. Everybody had applauded the work and the sense of duty of the Jawans and their officers. Everybody had congratulated the efforts so far made to equip our army with better weapons. At the same time everybody had to offer some criticism or other. I hope that the Defence Minister taking into account the anxiety of hon. Members of the House about the defence of our country will treat it as a national question and not as a party question. He should be equally frank and tell us what they are doing to secure the sovereignty and integrity of the country. From that point of view I must say at the very start that the Report of the Defence Ministry has disappointed us. In the opening paragraphs I find instead of giving a picture and the background of international relations and the problems that have cropped up a very humdrum sort of approach is made, as if nothing has changed after 1965 that is, after the Tashkent Declaration. Only regret has been expressed that in spite of the Tashkent Declaration Pakistan is not ready to observe the terms of the agreement or the spirit of the agreement and that China and Pakistan are still in collusion. I would have liked the Defence Ministry to tell us how they view the situation in the entire area. It is not only Pakistan on one side and

[Shri N G Goray]

China on the other side. They have been our enemies for a long time, but even the Indian Ocean is now threatened. There is a regular competition between the USA and the USSR. If the Defence Ministry wanted to give a complete picture of the situation, I should have thought that they would have given us all the facts, the claims or the ambitions entertained by Russia and the USA. The British are withdrawing from Singapore in 1971. There will be no British fleet or British forces. Then, what will happen? How do we look at the situation? How do we react to it? All these ought to have been part of this Report, but unfortunately, as I said, hardly any mention has been made of the post-Tashkent Declaration period.

Having said that, Sir, I would move on to the next point. The three Services have been dealt with in separate chapters, but again I would like to point out, very cursorily while dealing with the Army, it would appear that we have got our forces stabilised at about 8,28,000 personnel. We must not forget the fact that this Army really consists of two armies, one committed to the Himalayan border and the other committed to the Pakistan border. These are two armies. That means we have got only half the army on one side and the other half of the army is on the other side or frontier. These cannot be exchanged. Their equipment is different. The enemies they face are different. Their tactics are different. The atmosphere or the terrain in which they are functioning or expected to function is different. If something happens on the Punjab side, you cannot bring down the Army from the Himalayan heights and use them on the maidans of Punjab. Therefore, we must understand it very clearly that there are two armies. If somebody is thinking that we have a huge Army, about a million—it is not a million at all but only 8,28,000 as has been mentioned in the Report—we really have a very small Army. I would say that we must raise it to at least to a million, five lakhs on one side and five lakhs on the other. That is very necessary. We have been told that Pakistan is transferring some of their very good divisions to East Pakistan. So the danger may be on three sides, viz., on the Western front, on the Northern front and on the Eastern front. In this connection I would like to mention one thing. The Defence

Ministry Report says that China has posted about 1,50,000 men, but we are not taking note of the other people who are likely to help China, the invisible divisions of Mao that are operating in the Naga Hills, in the Mizo Hills and in West Bengal. I really fail to understand why mention was not made of these elements. There is some mention only to the effect that both Pakistan and China are equipping and training the Naga Hill people, etc. The danger from that quarter is not small. All these people are waiting for an opportunity and if a crisis develops I will not be surprised if a major part of our Army gets bogged down in West Bengal, the Naga Hills and the Mizo Hills. Extensive training in sabotage, sniping, guerilla warfare is being given. I would like to ask the Defence Minister whether he has got a guerilla wing in the Army where they are being trained for that purpose whether they are making a special study of their tactics. I hope they are doing it, but if they are not I would insist on having a separate wing which will try to understand their technique, propaganda methods, their approach, etc. Let it be frankly admitted here that however much we may be hating Mao, Mao is the only man in this world who has given a new dimension to guerilla warfare, which has proved that against the mightiest enemy the guerillas can fight and fight for a long time and sometimes successfully too. So, I would like to say that so far as the Armed Forces are concerned, this wing is very necessary.

(Time-bell rings)

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore) He has spoken only for five minutes. He must be given more time.
6 P.M.

SHRI N G GORAY I thought that I had something to contribute.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS) All right. The Minister has to reply.

SHRI N G GORAY Well, Sir, about the Navy I would say very briefly. The Navy has been a neglected child in our Defence Plan. Well, Sir, then the Navy again I would say only briefly has been a neglected child of our Defence forces ever since Independence. In 1957 I had an occasion to speak about it in the Lok Sabha and I had said that we were neglecting the Navy. Of course,

there has been a certain advance. I still feel that the allocation made for the Navy is too small and just as I have said that there should be two Armies, I would like to say that there should be two Navies also, one on the Western Coast and one on the Eastern Coast because the danger from both these areas is very great. India will have to depend in the time of crisis for all our supplies on these sea lines which ought to be protected.

Then, Sir, about the Air Force, I would say that the key word in all our strategy seems to be defence. If somebody attacks us, then we react to that. At least, so far as the Air Force is concerned, I would say we must have an Air Force which should be able to command the skies. If the enemy is likely to attack, we must be able to invade the enemy air space and it should be possible for us to destroy their bases and equipment and whatever it is.

Sir, lastly, because the time is very short, I would only say a few words about research and development. I am really pained to see that so far as research and development is concerned, all our research and development seems to be confined to imitating the weapons that we have bought from others. There is no independent development. Sir, I would like to point out only two things from Israel. You must have read in the newspapers that against the Russian missile *Sam*, only recently the Israelis, on their own, have developed a new sophisticated missile *Gabriel* and that it is said it is so sophisticated that they can meet the challenge of *Sema*. Another thing that they have done is a gun boat which travels 40 k n.s. an hour. I would like our research and development programme to include such items, which would be a contribution to the technique and strategy of war. Well, Sir, thank you.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh) : Intervening in this debate, I want to express my very warm appreciation of the stewardship of Defence by my Hon'ble friend Sardar Swaran Singh, who has taken the defence expenditure from Rs. 300 crores to Rs. 11,000 crores. Sir, I would also like to mention here that the nucleus for defence production was created by Mr. Krishna Menon and defence production has focussed itself rapidly during the years after 1962, but I must say that the results are not as

satisfactory as one would have expected in the circumstances. We are not yet in a position to manufacture a mountain gun and in this connection I want to quote an Audit Report which speaks about the failure to build up the production of a weapon to more than six or seven a month as against a target of 25, which necessitated the import of 150 units.

We are also hopelessly dependent on foreign know-how. We are dependent on SU-7 fighter bombers and 130-mm medium guns. I want Sardar Swaran Singh to tell us when he replies to the debate when he expects the Army to be 75% self-sufficient in regard to defence production equipment. This is a matter on which the future of the country depends and I hope that the Defence factories will be in a position to turn out our own armaments and lessen our dependence on foreign know-how.

I would like to make two points about the Navy. I do not want to reveal the figures about the submarines, though the Institute of Strategic Studies in London, have published it. I feel that the Andamans and Nicobar Islands are now in a very grave danger because the Indian Ocean area, as Sardar Swaran Singh said somewhere, is going to be an area of a triangular contest among three powers. If the Andamans were attacked at any time by a power, which is hostile to India, e.g. China, how are we going to defend the Andamans? We have got one submarine which has been gifted by the United States and two submarines which were purchased from France. I would like to talk again of India going nuclear to start with the Navy. It is possible for the Defence Ministry to equip our submarines with nuclear missiles so that they may be in a position to defend the Andaman and Nicobar Islands which, I see, are in great danger of the Chinese intervention in the near or distant future.

The other point is about the future of the aircraft carrier *INS Vikrant*. Now it has been established that the *INS Vikrant* can accommodate only the American Sea Hawk type of aircraft and that they are not in a position to accommodate any other aircraft except what has been made by the Douglas Company. If we are going to be so hopelessly dependent on American help, we will have to pledge our political independence for getting the military supply from the United States and for that

[Shri A. D. Mani.]

reason I would like the Hon'ble Minister to tell us whether he proposes to replace the INS Vikrant which has become a little out-dated because the Canadians are now experimenting on a vertical-lift plane and the Australians are utilising helicopters on aircraft carriers. I hope that our aircraft carriers' strength will be increased and we will be in a position to discharge our duties in defending the Indian Ocean in the Bay of Bengal area.

The third point is about the question of research and development. My Hon'ble friend Mr. Puri mentioned that we are not spending enough money on Research and Development Organisation. According to the budget figures, in 1969-70 we spent Rs. 13.45 crores and in 1970-71 we expect to spend Rs. 17.57 crores. This is a very pitiful sum. I would rather say in regard to Defence and in regard to research and development that as long as we do not spend much money on research and development, we will be more and more dependent on foreign imported ammunition and materials and we want that to cease.

I would also like to ask the Defence Minister why he has not filled up the post of the Scientific Adviser to the Defence Ministry. I understand from the newspapers that the Scientific Adviser of the Defence Ministry is going to have the Cabinet Secretary's rank. We are always thinking in terms of ranks only in regard to such appointments. We want a good Scientific Adviser of the Defence Ministry. When Dr. Bhagwantam retired in the month of October the Minister should have made a forthwith appointments. Why has this post not been filled?

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: They have removed Mr. Kartar Singh and appointed Mr. Nag Chaudhury, on political grounds.

SHRI A. D. MANI: According to the papers this post has not been filled finally. I do not know whom they have appointed. I know Dr. Bhagwantam very well and I do not share my friend Mr. Alva's views. He is a very good scientist.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: He is only an M.Sc.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Dr. Radhakrishnan was not a Ph.D. of any University. He has taken 40 LL.B. Degrees. Dr. Bhagwantam has 150 scientific papers to his credit. I am not pleading for Dr. Bhagwantam.

I am only asking for a competent man to be appointed in the place of Dr. Bhagwantam. I would like to know why there has been delay in regard to this appointment.

I would also like to ask the Defence Minister to tell us whether he is developing a cadre of scientists among defence personnel to man this Ministry or whether he is going to get scientists from outside to work in this Ministry. It is possible for him to take up young men who show a scientific bent of mind, who are in the Armed Forces, and induct them into this Research and Development Organisation, so that they may have practical experience to back them up in regard to academic work in connection with research and development.

I would like to go on to one final point before I close and that is the Territorial Army. According to this report the Territorial Army's strength has been fixed at 50,000. It is a good number, but for a country which is going to face many difficult problems in defence, particularly in the east and in the north, I would like the strength of the Territorial Army to be brought up to 100,000. It is also necessary that the Territorial Army should be expanded because the expansion of the Territorial Army will strengthen indirectly the forces of integration in this country. When once people know that they belong to the Territorial Army, they have a sense of pride. They think that they are taking part in the defence of the country. I hope that the Defence Minister will not put a mechanical limit of 50,000 and say, "We have reached 50,000 limit and we are not going to spend more money on the Territorial Army".

I do not know whether I have got more time.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS): One minute.

SHRI A. D. MANI: I would like to raise the question of retirement age for the armed forces. I find it very pathetic to see Brigadiers going round big industrial houses, asking Birlas and Dalmas, to employ them as security officers. They are in very fine condition.

They can pass a medical test but they are retired because they have reached the age of 52. I find from the report that the Defence Ministry has raised the age of retirement of certain categories of armed personnel, particularly the electrical engineers and medical officers. I would like the Minister to consider the fact that the longevity of the country has risen, that there are a number of army people who are in a good condition and who can serve up to the age of 60, subject to physical fitness. I would like all the officers ranks to retire at the age of 55 because cutting of a man's career at the age of 50 or 52 is not fair to him and it lowers the quality and standard of service when the man concerned roams about Delhi and other place for some job in industrial establishments. I hope that the Defence Minister will not be weighed down by the so-called professional opinion which wants European and British practices to be followed in India. We must develop our own practices and allow our armed personnel to retire as Government servants do at the age of 55.

SHRI N. R. MUNISWAMY (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am afraid I do not have adequate time. I think you have given me about ten minutes. . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS): Seven minutes.

SHRI N. R. MUNISWAMY: I have to rush up in seven points with some of my points. I have now to pinpoint four or five points here and concentrate on defence production. I hope I shall not be mistaken in case I am critical about our achievements in the field of defence. There are several weaknesses which I am not going to narrate, very many weaknesses, but two or three I will state.

In 1963-64 the Defence budget was about Rs. 816 crores. Now in 1970-71 it is Rs. 1151 crores. At the rate of Rs. 50 crores every year it has increased. I am not grudging it. We can even give Rs. 2000 crores; but we must see whether we are spending the money to assure ourselves that there is some profitability out of such spending, and we must also see that our jawans are given the right tools. Given proper tools our jawans will certainly do a good job. In these circumstances I say that as India is surrounded by hostile neighbours, we

must spend more than what we have already allotted, and from that point of view I can only point out some of the weaknesses in the production programme.

Mr. Mishra has stated that if we spend Rs. 1 crore, the production is also about Rs. 1 crore worth. I must say that though we are happy with regard to self-sufficiency about small arms production, still with regard to the major items there are several failures. You would have seen some of the reports that have been given by the statutory Committee. They have brought forward many items. I will narrate one or two.

About defence production, about 37 to 38 per cent of the total outlay we are spending on pay and allowances; about 30 per cent on stores, equipment and provision; about research and development we are spending about 1½ per cent. We all depend very much on research and development. Other Members have already stated that we have to spend more money on it; otherwise many of the items we get from foreign countries will become outmoded. The points which I am going to highlight are one or two in number. We had started manufacturing a weapon for use against aircraft as early as 1959 with foreign collaboration. We are now in 1970 and eleven years have passed and the rate of production was supposed to be at least 8 weapons per month. What we produce is not even one weapon per month. What has happened now is that even the collaborating countries themselves have given up that weapon because it has become outmoded and they have switched on to surface-to-air missiles. The Defence Ministry has set up a Committee to investigate the matter because what we have done is not satisfactory. Again for examining the project as to whether it will be useful to us or not another Committee has been appointed. So Committee after Committee has been appointed to examine the project.

There is one other manufacturing agency which has been set up to manufacture ammunition, possibly anti-tank ammunition. It was commenced in 1962-63, and the ammunition is defective in the sense that it has neither rocket power nor even dispersal power; in both it is a failure. Again about Rs. 3 crores worth of ammunition has been bought from foreign collaborators and they have been defective.

[Shri N. R. Muniswamy.]

The third point which I wish to say is as regards production of ammunition which was undertaken in 1957 in the hope that some western country would come and help us. What has happened is that nobody has come to help. Thirteen years have passed and we are still in difficulty. So, these three cases indicate that, whether it is know-how or other things, we have to depend on other countries, and the other countries are not giving their know-how; they want to get into production themselves and reap their own benefit. Therefore, several steps have to be taken. The first step is in research and development efforts will have to be stepped up. Ordnance factories have to concentrate on vital and critical items and leave other items to be produced by the civil agencies. No country has so far developed its industrial base for sustaining defence production programmes with only public sector undertakings; they must have the co-operation of the private sector also. This will help us to have a proper base. Having known that other countries are not coming to our help we must see that we take up some tasks immediately. One of the first tasks recently has been given by the Aeronautical Committee, and they suggested sophisticated, advanced technological aircraft as a ground attack fighter. The Defence Minister has now to clarify whether it is going to see that this comes into the lime-light, when it is going to get off the drawing board of the HAL. I think he has not taken adequate steps to see that it fructifies. As far as the past performance of the aircraft is concerned it is dismal. We are only going on developing the airframe at HAL without even an engine to power it. Prof. Galbraith, former U. S. Ambassador, has sarcastically remarked in one of his journals that in defence production the money is being wasted and nothing happens. He says critically that the Defence Production Department has developed a supersonic plane which unfortunately does not have a motor to propel it; also the transport aircraft which flies is already obsolete and is of little military value. Sir, we tried to develop an engine first with British and then with Soviet collaboration. There we tried an ingenuous marriage between our airframe and an Egyptian engine. The marriage unfortunately never got beyond the proposal stage, though there were a few expensive pre-marital excursions. We spent money in going here

and there but nothing fructified. Therefore, some steps have to be taken if you want self-sufficiency.

The last item which has been exercising the mind of every one of us is the nuclear programme. About the nuclear programme the Government has already decided not to go in for that. Sir, these lofty and sentimental ideas will never shield us from anybody having aggressive action against us. We must have nuclear weapon with us. It will act as a deterrent. I do not wish to say that they should make a declaration. If they have got that in their mind, at least they must see to it that it is done.

The third point which I wish to make out is with regard to the field of missile technology. Facts have got to be taken into account. If you do not take the aeronautical reports and supersonic aircraft into consideration, we do not think we will run a race with any country.

Sir, you are looking at me as well as the time. I do not want to stand in your way. But the last thing which I wish to say is this. Many of our friends have already offered their tributes to the magnificent job that our jawans, Generals Colonels and Lieutenants have done. Let us not belittle them. Even in the last war they have done a magnificent job. If they had been given adequate tools, I think they would have justified their existence. Even in 1962, when the Chinese were invading us these people had to back out, not that they were afraid of China. But the only snag was that we did not have adequate tools to eject them out. The Chinese knew that in the plains they could not fight the Indian jawan. So they withdrew. This speaks of our ability to fight at a particular terrain.

With these words I offer once again my tribute to the magnificent services rendered by our jawans.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS): Dr. Talwar. Only five minutes.

DR. (MRS.) MANGLADEVI TALWAR (Rajasthan): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the recommendations of the Aeronautics Committee headed by Shri C. Subramaniam have revealed some major shortcomings in the decision-making process in the field of national security. According to these recommendations

the most important finding of the Committee is the need for long-term planning in the defence area. This requirement has application in all the three Services and is of larger significance to the Air Force.

The formulation of long-term requirements should be based on a long-term assessment of the threat. The present arrangements for long-term assessment of threats and formulation of long-term requirements need strengthening. The Committee has suggested that these arrangements need to be reviewed. Our decision-making structure in defence was originally formulated by Lord Mountbatten and Lord Ismy. Since then there has been very little revision in the structure or procedure. It was obvious that this decision-making structure could not cope with the Chinese challenge of the late fifties and early sixties. Mr Y. B. Chavan, the then Defence Minister, while summing up the results of the enquiry conducted by General Henderson Brooks, stated in the Lok Sabha on September 3, 1963 that even the largest and best-equipped armies needed to be given proper policy guidance and major directives by the Government whose instruments they were. Thereby he implied that such guidance was not available in the period before 1962. The Aeronautics Committee's report read with the information available on intelligence estimation and planning would show no significant improvement in the decision-making structure and processes since 1963.

It is necessary to examine the reasons for this state of affairs. It is not the fault of any individual. It is inherent in the system of decision making we have adopted. When Lord Mountbatten prescribed the system of decision making the strategic environment in which India had to function was altogether different. The entire Indian equipment was British and so was the doctor. India did not have to face a major power like China as her adversary.

If the 1962 debacle had been gone into for its causes as was done by the USA after the Pearl Harbour, the inadequacies of this system would have been revealed. But unfortunately the nation could not afford to have an enquiry in the immediate wake of the 1962 humiliation. The late Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, wrote in his

letter to General Kaul, "A large number of people and perhaps just the circumstances were responsible for them."

The Brooks enquiry was only a very limited one. An active Lt General or the Indian Army did not have the necessary status nor the background to conduct a full-scale enquiry into the Governmental system of decision-making. Consequently till today the system has not given any significant change. The transfer of the Joint Intelligence Committee from under the Chiefs of Staff Committee to the Cabinet Secretariat cannot be regarded as a significant step in this direction.

Most of the permanent staff that constitute the defence-decision structure authority function on tenure system. According to this system officers serve for a limited period in various posts and revert back to their cadres or field appointments. In other words, an ICS or IAS officer who had nothing to do with defence before is brought in to fill up a post where he has to process decisions on the selection of most sophisticated equipment, management of some of the most advanced industrial complexes, logistical and inventory systems.

Apart from this, the present system also provides for a degree of diffusion of responsibility. The year 1962 provides an illustration of this type of diffusion of responsibility.

My submission, Sir, is that we should have a National Security Council in place of the present Defence Committee of the Cabinet. The Council may consist of the five Ministers of the present DCC, the three Chiefs of Staff, the Chief of Intelligence, the Cabinet Secretary and the Secretaries of the Ministries concerned. The Secretariat for this Council should be independently constituted under the Prime Minister.

The JIC must be enlarged to include economists, political scientists and technologists. And there will have to be whole-time specialists with appropriate research staff. Very recently the Defence Ministry of Britain found it necessary to create a post of Economic Adviser to the Defence Minister. It is only with such an enlarged membership that the Committee will be in a position to attempt long-range estimation of threats. It is also necessary perhaps to draw the Chairman of this Committee from the

[Dr. Mrs. Mangladevi Talwar.]

Intelligence Community and refrain from the usual practice of appointing a civil servant who has no background in intelligence. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS): Defence Minister.

SHRI JOACHIM ALVA: Mr. Neki Ram is an ex-soldier. He may be also given three minutes.

SHRI K. P. SUBRAMANIA MENON (Kerala): The hon'ble Minister has been called.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS): It will not be possible. Defence Minister. Sardar Swaran Singh Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am grateful to the hon. Members who have participated in this discussion. This discussion is taking place for the first time in the Rajya Sabha and in all humility I would like to say that the discussion has been extremely useful. Shri Goray, the leader of the PSP, has rightly remarked that there is general support for the defence effort and the Defence Ministry. The hon. Members who have participated in this discussion have, while giving general support, also highlighted several important aspects. I am grateful for this general understanding and appreciation that is to be found amongst the hon. Members belonging to different political parties. One hon. Member said that we should regard defence as a matter which should not be viewed from any political angle and that we should regard it as a matter of national importance. I fully agree with that approach and it has been our endeavour to bring the various viewpoints and various suggestions that might be put forward from any quarter and utilise them for meeting our defence capacity and our defence effort. And I would like to assure this hon. House that in a vital matter like the defence of the country, we depend upon the support of the entire country and the chosen representatives of the people. If they broadly give the support, that creates a new enthusiasm and a new confidence in the country and it is in that spirit that I have been listening very carefully to the observations that have been made by the hon. Members. I would like to remind this hon. House that we are discussing the Report of the Ministry of Defence.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI: Not necessarily. We are discussing the whole Defence Ministry.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I know; I do not grudge that. I am not cutting out the description. But it was from a different point of view that I made this observation. One thing which could not have remained unnoticed is that if the Report of the current year is compared with some earlier Reports, the hon. Members cannot fail to notice that progressively over the years we have tried to give more and more information about the various points in which the House has shown interest, in which the country has shown interest. If the figures that have been given in the present report and the information which is given under various heads are compared with the information and figures that are to be found in the earlier Reports, the hon. Members will find that they are much more than have ever been given before. I would like to say that it has been my endeavour to disclose as much of information as possible and if I have not been able to give more information, I would like to assure this hon. House that it is not with a view to hiding it from the country or from the hon. Members of this august House, but it is because it is my painful duty on occasions not to give it; even though I would like those things to be known, I cannot make a present of ready-made authentic information to those who are very anxious to get that information. That is the only limitation to my giving more information. Otherwise I would like certainly to give more information. In this connection, I would also like to say that on the whole my temptation to give information is somewhat more as compared to the earlier years, because I feel, and I say that with knowledge and with experience, that our total defence apparatus to-day in the matter of organisation, in the matter of training, in the matter of equipment, in respect of our production is definitely much better as compared to the earlier years. Therefore, even those who are opposed to us should know—it is in our interest that they should know—about our capacity, though not the exact details. And if I may say so, that may ultimately prove to be a good deterrent. If those who are prone to embark upon an adventurous course of action know as to what they are in for if they embark upon such a course of action, probably that itself

will be an inhibiting factor and a deterrent. For that reason, I have been anxious to supply to the country and to the hon House more and more information and to a large extent now I find that there is greater awareness and greater appreciation of the defence effort and our capacity to defend ourselves.

Now having said that I would like to recapitulate what has been stated by several hon Members—the defence requirements of our country and the threat that we face. It is with that background that we can judge as to whether the various arrangements that have been made, the steps that we have taken, are reasonably sufficient, are adequate, to meet the type of threat that we face. In this connection, I am glad that there has been a noticeable maturity even in assessing the threat to us, as was evidenced by the debate to-day. There was a stage when we were prone to take a rather alarmist view, but by and by, the country is getting accustomed to the threat that is posed to us, that we face, and we view it in the proper perspective, we do not hit the roof on the slightest pretext. That, I think, is a sign of maturity, a sign of growth, a sign of development, a sign of strength also if I may add. The threat that we face is from our neighbours, Pakistan and China and we have tried to give that as objectively as we could in our Report. Shri Goray again said that this is mentioned in a rather humdrum manner. Maybe being in the Defence Ministry, our language has not got that polish and luster which should normally be in a presentation where external relations are involved.

SHRI N. G. GORAY: You were a Foreign Minister also.

SARDAR SVARAN SINGH: I am Defence Minister now. I have to be more precise, more direct. But I have in the introductory part of the Report tried to recapitulate the threat that we face from our neighbours. The leader of the Jan Sangh made a reference to the Indian Ocean and the withdrawal of the British from that area. That is a matter which has been discussed on the floor of this House and I have made statements and the External Affairs Minister has also made statements. And when I discuss that aspect, I will again re-state our position. But I would like to say that our coastal defences and

defence of our islands is a very essential part of our overall defence. The withdrawal of the British forces is one aspect, more, I think, a matter of external relations than defence. Our essential defence is defence of our coastal line, defence of our islands. In this connection, I would like to say that we have to approach this subject with a certain measure of confidence. Take, for instance, our islands, whether it is the Andaman-Nicobar group or whether it is the Laccadive group of islands. There are two ways of looking at it. You can say, as some honourable Members have said, that they are facing a grave danger from some outside force. We should, I would plead with this honourable House, view our islands as our greatest asset. They are the bases around which we can build our defence arrangements in such a manner that instead of being regarded as liabilities, they should be regarded as assets. And it is precisely on that basis that we are proceeding with our arrangements. We are making some development in that connection in these various groups of islands, notably in the Andaman-Nicobar group of islands. It is true that keeping the sea lanes open is an essential thing. I would at the same time like to sound a note of caution that this approach, which is essential, should I say, is the approach of a foreign country, a metropolitan country when they were controlling the colonies. This has to be distinct from the real defence of a big country with a huge population just as India is with its various resources, and we should not be guided by the same philosophy which guided the metropolitan powers when they were controlling the colonies. For them the sea lanes were the most important thing because it was by dominating the seas, that they were ensuring supplies all the time for the metropolitan army, whether they were the British or the French or the Portuguese or other metropolitan countries. Then also the economies had been so tight that they were greatly depending on the exports from the colonies and the imports from the metropolitan countries and for them the sea lanes had a special significance. And as it happens, unfortunately, many of our thinkers, even serious thinkers, on Defence are sometimes carried away by this type of approach. Take a country like India with a big land mass, with a huge population, with our vast resources. What are our requirements and what are our essential responsibilities with regard to defence? It is true

[Sardar Swaran Singh.]

for us trade is very important. But in case of a real emergency, when we are defending our country, we have to make a careful assessment as to what the minimum resources are in certain essential commodities. We are luckily more or less self-sufficient in food now. Most of our internal requirements we can look after ourselves. We can always have enough of stockpiles to keep our machinery going. Our POL in terms of production is such that for several months even if we do not import, we can continue the machines running and also we can meet our requirements. So these are some of the very important and basic facts which we cannot ignore. I am not underestimating the importance of sea lanes. A good naval presence is necessary in order to ensure the safety of what is called innocent shipping. Keeping the sea lanes open is one of the functions of the Navy. But the role of the Navy looked at from the Defence point of view, has to be viewed in a somewhat different perspective, regard being had to the various factors which I have mentioned. And it is from that point of view that some of the things which were very necessary perhaps at one time, on a careful analysis we find that they are not so necessary now. And in this category I would like to mention, for instance, the aircraft carrier. Well, some remarks have been made as to whether it is just a show-piece. It is not a show-piece. It is a good piece of equipment and when one has to operate at some distance from the coast, it is something which is very useful. It becomes a base which provides various types of offensive capabilities, and therefore, it is a good piece of equipment. But I think Prof. Ruthnaswamy was not properly informed of its cost of maintenance. Including everything, including the cost even of the personnel, it cannot strictly be regarded as high. The total expenditure that we incur over everything, its maintenance, fuel, personnel, their rations, etc. is of the order of between Rs. 2.75 crores and Rs. 3 crores a year which is very much different from the figure of Rs. 9 or Rs. 10 crores which had been supplied presumably by someone to Prof. Ruthnaswamy. I would like to say that for our country on the naval side, faster boats, larger in number and with capacity to operate, not very long distances, but sufficiently long distances of the order of anywhere between 500 to 600 miles,

appear to be an ideal set-up. It is precisely in that direction that we are taking concrete steps to strengthen our Navy. It has been rightly mentioned by some honourable Member that the cost of our Navy is somewhat less as compared to that of the Air Force or very much less as compared to that of the Army. It is correct and to understand the reasons for it, we have to have a look at our map and the geo-political situation. We have got borders, long borders, difficult borders, mountainous borders, separating us from Tibet which is in China. And then we have got the ceasefire line in the mountainous region which is a difficult terrain in Jammu and Kashmir. Then we have got a long border with Pakistan. Then again with East Pakistan we have got a border, plains and also mountainous region, a fairly long border and a long terrain. And these borders cannot be regarded as easy borders by any description. They are uneasy borders. Is it possible, when we are faced with such a geo-political situation, to ignore our borders? We can do it only at our peril. Therefore, we must of necessity keep a certain minimum number of forces on these borders. We have to guard against not only a major attack, but we have also to meet what may be described as a sort of creeping aggression and sometimes it is more necessary to guard against creeping aggression. It is, therefore, very necessary for us to keep a certain minimum number of forces all the time properly acclimatized, properly trained, properly equipped, on our borders. That sets a certain limit to our desire to reduce the number. This also answers the type of comparison that was sought to be made between the expenditure on the pay and allowances of the Army as compared to the expenditure on equipment. In the type of situation that we are faced with, we cannot reduce our man-power because it is a peculiar type of situation that we are faced with on our borders. So, whether it is in Jammu and Kashmir or in the plains of Punjab or Rajasthan or Gujarat or on the eastern side in Assam or Manipur or Tripura or West Bengal, there are a certain number of forces that we must keep on or near the borders so that we can defend our country, our sovereignty, our honour, in the face of the type of situation that we are faced with along the borders. And it is not always necessary or economic to equip all these fairly large number of forces with the highly sophisticated weaponry. If you look at it purely from

an arithmetical equation, it will not be a complete picture and we have to view the equipment pattern and the numbers in relation to the terrain, in relation to the problem, both short-term and long-term, that our Army has to face. And this explains the type of ratio that exists today between the expenditure on pay and allowances and the expenditure on equipment. It is obviously much higher in the other Services like the Air Force and the Navy where the equipment is much more costly. Therefore, the cost of equipment normally as compared to the cost of pay and allowances as a ratio is much more. It is much more in favour of the equipment in the Air Force and the Navy. That is inherent in the situation. Now, Sir, a very valid point has been made as to why we did not take sufficient steps to strengthen our Navy earlier. The answer is very simple. It is a question of priorities. When particular resources have to be utilised to build up our defence, our first thoughts would naturally go to the Army, to the Air Force, because of the long borders adjoining the country with whom our relations are uneasy. Navy is important but in this order of priorities it can wait. Now when we think that we are sufficiently protected in relation to our programme of equipment and training, etc., of the Army and the Air Force, our thoughts have now been directed to the Navy and of late we have acquired many types of new navalcraft with different types of roles including the submarines, fast boats and some boats which are equipped with very modern type of equipment, which is very useful. Now we are concentrating on Navy also and we are taking various steps to strengthen our Navy both by indigenous production as well as by acquisition from abroad.

In this respect I was really pained a little when it was sought to be made out as if we are trying to tie ourselves too much to one country and in this connection the name of the USSR was mentioned. I would like to say very categorically that in the matter of increasing our defence potential to meet our requirements I have no inhibitions of any kind whatsoever. I am prepared to get the equipment from any source, if it suits our requirements and if the terms are reasonable and it does not in any way affect our freedom of action. But as a realist I cannot ask for the moon. Countries who are not interested in supplying the equipment to me, I cannot enter into

any running arguments with them and I cannot say that they must give me the equipment because I do not want to go to one country. This does not cut any ice in this rather hot-headed international community. After all when they supply the equipment, they have to look to their own interests and commitments and also several other factors. But in a matter like this we should not try to be little the help that we are getting from any country. I would be quite frank in saying that I am grateful to the countries which have supplied equipment to us. We get equipment from any countries, many West European and East-European countries, not only the Soviet Union, but several other countries. Even in the matter of our production effort we have arrangements with various countries like the U.K., France, Belgium and several other countries. So it is a wrong impression that is sought to be made or created due to lack of information or something else that we are trying to go to one country. I think it is politically motivated to highlight that we are trying to go to one country. It is a matter of historical interest to know that the Soviet Union did help us with certain type of equipment when other countries were not prepared to help us and if they have helped us, we are very grateful to them. But that does not mean that there are any strings attached to it. After we get the equipment, we are the masters of it. We are also anxious that we should not depend on any other country, whether it is East-European country or West-European country, because it is not a happy feeling in the mind of any Defence Minister if he has to depend on outside forces. But when we are running against time, if there are any pressing requirements that face the country and certain sophisticated type of equipment is essential for the defence of the country, whether it is for the Army, the Air Force or the Navy then a decision has to be taken whether we should wait for 4, 5 or 6 years till our production source is developed or we should fill that gap and acquire it from abroad, from whatever source it is available. I think this august House will readily agree with me that when the requirements are pressing, howsoever it is desirable to arm your defence forces with the equipment manufactured in your own country, you cannot keep it without the necessary weapons if the indigenous production is likely to take time. For that interval, to tide over that difficulty and to reduce that deficiency it

[Sardar Swaran Singh]

is necessary to get the equipment from other countries, friendly countries. So it is from that angle that we have to view this question. Countries can change their attitude. At one stage even the United States or Canada perhaps were not prepared to give us a certain type of equipment. If they change their attitude and they are prepared to supply it, I can even now go in for it provided it suits me, because our country pays for all the equipment that we get and this expression of arms aid, etc. is a euphemistic way of describing it. The fact remains that some countries, if they are friendly and helpful, they can only defer the payment or there can be some sort of arrangement whereby we can repay in instalments but essentially our country has to pay for everything that it gets. That is our studied policy. If we get free equipment then that ties our freedom of action which is the last thing which we would like to tolerate. So we have to view these various additions to our equipment from that angle.

I should also like to point out that it has been our consistent policy that with any equipment that we acquire we always make it sure that we enter into proper arrangements for spares etc. We always make an assessment that over so many years this will be the minimum requirement of spares and we always make enough provision for spares. Some hon. Member said 'You first purchase the equipment and then negotiate about the spares.' He seems to be completely misinformed about that. We always make a proper assessment with regard to spares. I may even agree to have some more spares than necessary because for want of some spare the whole equipment may become ideal. There may be some PAC investigation later on or something like that. But after all there is such a thing as insurance and for non-availability of a particular spare the whole equipment which is hundred times its value remains idle and therefore it is always better to carry that extra piece of spare rather than to run the risk of the equipment remaining idle. So we always take care that along with the equipments that we get we also get the matching spares. At the same time it is our policy that we initiate action on the production front, to make that equipment ourselves. Take for instance the Soviet planes, both the MIG as also the later one type 22 as we call it or

7 P.M.

SU-7 about which everybody knows. It is our intention to make arrangements for its overhaul, for its maintenance completely in our own country. So far the MIG aircraft is concerned, the House is fully aware that we have already started the manufacture of this and now we are at a stage where we are manufacturing from the raw materials. We greatly value association with a country which not only supplies equipment but also is prepared to supply us the knowhow to enable us to manufacture that equipment. That is an ideal arrangement and it is precisely on that basis that we are proceeding. May be that if our requirements are not sufficient to justify production, we may continue to get it from abroad and if we can earn enough foreign exchange to repay that, that is also self-reliance.

It was mentioned by some Members that we got some consignment of aircraft from the Soviet Union on a rupee account and later on we are paying in gold. I do not know what is the source of information of the Jan Sangh leader. This is a matter for checking. He could always ask me. It is entirely incorrect. All the supplies we have got are entirely on the same basis that we make the payment in rupees and that they can make use of for making purchases in this country. That has been the normal pattern of all our purchases and I do not know why the Jan Sangh leader made this statement without verifying it from anyone. I cannot really find out the reason but I want to clarify that all these purchases have been made on a well-recognised method which has been explained to the House from time to time. We assess its value and we repay, may be over instalments or according to a deferred term of payment.

About production generally, judged by any standard, I think that we have done reasonably well. Both on the actual quantum of production as also on the economics of production, we have a record which is quite creditable. I would not like to burden this debate with any figures but perhaps it might be of interest to Members to know that in our public sector undertakings on the Defence Production side, our investment on 31st March 1969, which is the operative year, which will give us the production in 1969-70, the total is of the order of, share capital Rs. 65.80 crores and loans Rs. 64.35 crores, totalling Rs. 130

crores or Rs 130.15 to be exact. It is quite interesting that our total production in 1969-70, that is, the production for which the base investment was on 31st March 1969, gives you a figure which is also practically of the same order and the ratio of investment to production is almost 1:1. It is a few crores slightly more than the actual investment. So this shows that they are doing reasonably well. If you compare the value of production as compared to the investment, it is a very creditable figure.

SHRI MOHAN LAI GAUTAM (Uttar Pradesh) Does it include production by the ancillary industries also?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH This is the total production in the public sector undertaking. If ancillary is not a public sector undertaking it will not be reflected in this. For instance, Ordnance Factories are not included in this. This is only of those for which there are companies or Corporations, Public Sector Corporation and the figures regarding Ordnance Factories are also quite impressive. For instance, the total production of ammunition, vehicles, tanks, etc. during this year is about Rs 90.50 crores and another Rs 20 crores of clothing, general items, etc. So it is Rs 110 crores in the Ordnance Factories plus about Rs 130 crores in the State undertakings which is a good figure and this is meeting our essential requirements. My friend Shri R. T. Parthasarathy, I do not know why he got a little angry with our Defence employees in the Defence undertakings and he said that it is time that we do not make even the labour laws applicable to them and we should enforce some more rigorous discipline. I am all for discipline but in these undertakings the right approach would be to carry the willing cooperation, consent and a sense of participation by the labour and I am glad to say that by and large the employees in the Defence undertakings whether they are in the Corporations or Ordnance Factories, have generally been very cooperative. I do not want to deny them the normal trade union rights that they have of collective negotiation if they have any grievances. We should provide an answer to them and there is no use wielding the big stick against those who are day in and day out engaged in the rather strenuous difficult task of keeping our production apparatus going. So I do not share his concern when he says that I should take away

the normal trade union rights that they enjoy.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (West Bengal) I wish that you should have some words of praise for the Defence Services also.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH I thought I did it. He might have taken off his earphone. I said that they are doing good work, they are showing a great deal of discipline and whenever there was any occasion, for instance when there was the aggression, say at the time of the Chinese or Pakistani aggression, they were prepared to work overtime and then they produced even beyond our normal yardstick. That is the best praise that can be given. That is the word of praise that can be said that they did their duty to the country for which all of us are happy and we greatly appreciate their effort. It is true that in certain factories during the course of last year, there was some trouble but we should get accustomed to this type of trouble and we should be able to find a satisfactory solution by mutual negotiation, by discussion and this is a better way or approach rather than wielding the big stick as suggested by Shri Parthasarathy.

Having said all this in a general way, I am not sure whether some of the specific points mentioned require any special reply but I will try to touch upon some of the points that have been mentioned. More than one hon. Member has mentioned about the NCC and I would like to say that the present strength is in the Senior Division 7.30 lakhs and in the Junior Division 6.60 lakhs. Although the NCC now is available for the first two years of the Degree course and not in the final year, still the number has not fallen very much. In response to the request that had been made by several State Governments and several Universities we had to give this relaxation that it should be made optional. I was personally not very happy about it but it was pointed out to me that if we switched over to the voluntary aspect the reduction in the number was not likely to be much but at the same time discipline will be up and those who are not interested will drop out. They will go either to national service or sports and we will be left with those who are genuinely interested. And it is a good index of the response from the student community that notwithstanding the fact that we made it voluntary the number did not fall very

[Sardar Swaran Singh.]

much and they are taking better advantage of the training facilities that are provided.

In order to create defence consciousness among the people there are several steps that we have taken. NCC is one; encouragement of territorial army is another; then the organisation of the Institute of Defence Studies and Analysis is yet another. Sometime they put forward papers which are even inconvenient from my point of view because sometimes they give some information even though they do not have the entire information or they put across some viewpoint but I encourage that because it is better to have two viewpoints, better to have discussion and thereafter we can evolve something which is broadly acceptable to the country. Then as I mentioned earlier we are now giving more information in the Report itself and above all the level of discussion in Parliament itself makes the country more defence-conscious than I think any other single factor and the way these problems are now being dealt with by Parliament helps very much in making the people understand defence problems in a much more realistic manner.

Shri Bhandari has quietly slipped away and so it is not necessary for me to reply to all his points but I have already mentioned about the mode of payment for the planes that we acquired from the Soviet Union.

Mention has been made by more than one Member about standardisation of equipment. It is a desirable objective and we have more or less been trying to achieve this by reducing the number of various types of equipment, whether vehicles or even aeroplanes but there are certain limitations to this also which we must fully realise. Even in respect of the various types of equipment which are installed it is our effort to introduce a measure of standardisation in items which are not necessarily of defence nature, even in general things like batteries, bulbs, etc. It is the general objective to introduce standardisation as much as we can.

He also mentioned about the construction of border roads in Rajasthan. As I pointed out when he was speaking, we had entrusted this work to the Government of Rajasthan and they were constructing these roads through their PWD.

If anything has been raised in the Vidan Sabha of Rajasthan I am sure the Rajasthan Government will look into that. I will also make enquires because it will be my duty to see that if the money had been provided to them by us, it is properly spent.

Hon. Members have made mention about the Emergency Commissioned Officers. This is a matter which has been engaging our very serious consideration and I have been keeping the House informed from time to time about the factual position and I would like to take this opportunity of giving some facts in this connection now. Up to 31st March 1970 the total number of ECOs who have been released is 7991, 'released' means they had become due for release. As the House is no doubt aware we had decided that all these ECOs should go before a regular Selection Board and as many of them as can make the grade for permanent absorption should be given permanent Commission. It is true that these young men responded to the call of duty for which we are all grateful and I would be failing in my duty if I were not to mention that at the time when we had to recruit these large number of officers we had deliberately relaxed certain standards because if we had applied rigorously the normal standards then we would not have got the number that were badly required at that time. Whereas it is one thing to have them to meet an emergency but to have them all the time in the regular army particularly when it creates a huge age block is a very serious matter for any army and it was after a very great deal of thought and consideration that we came to the conclusion that in the long run it will not be proper to carry this large number of officers of a particular age group because problems of promotion, problems of bulk retirement etc. will arise and that will create more problems. So we had to take this decision and I would like to tell this House that they form practically one-third of the total strength of officers in the army. It is a very large number in one age group and you cannot carry them indefinitely. I am glad however to inform the House that out of 7991 as many as 3702, which roughly comes to about 40 per cent earned the right to the grant of permanent Commission and they have been granted permanent Commission. Another 2228 have either been rehabilitated in civil posts under

the Centre or the States, public sector or the private sector, or they have reverted to their civil appointments or they have been self-employed. So out of 7991 who had become due for release those who have still to be rehabilitated is 1576. It is a large number but if you compare it with 7991 you will appreciate the various steps that we have taken to consider them for grant of permanent Commission, to get them absorbed in the Board Security Force, in the Railway Protection Force, in the Industrial Security Force, in the Central Reserve Police and even in the higher posts on the civil side like the IPS, IAS, the Central Services, State Undertakings and so on. I would like to say here that the States have also cooperated. Their total employing capacity is limited but still they have reserved a certain number of posts for these ECOS. Where there is internal competition between the ECOS themselves if they qualify which they generally do, then those reserved posts go to them. This is the real problem and we continue to take this matter up with the State Governments and with my colleagues in the Central Government who are in charge of public sector undertakings. In this respect I will appreciate whatever help the leaders of parties could give because some of the parties are in power in the several State Governments and they could help a great deal in finding for these young men alternative means of either employment or rehabilitation. Mr. Alva made an excellent speech full of emotion. I would like to correct only one small figure. He said that the expenditure on the Navy is only Rs. 58 crores, as compared to Rs. 211 crores on the Air Force. It is true that the total expenditure on the Navy is less, but he has looked at one page of the statement only. He will see that there is another sum of Rs. 22.73 crores which is under another head for equipment. So, the total comes to Rs. 80.73 crores and not Rs. 58 crores as he mentioned.

My hon. friend, Mr. Mani, is not here. I am surprised at what he said about the mountain gun and I do not know from where he got the information. Himself being a newspaperman Mr. Mani always quotes a newspaper and he said that we cannot make even a mountain gun. That is incorrect. We have a fully indigenously developed mountain gun and Mark I was the first model. This was hardly in regular production when we produced the Mark II, which made it the best mountain gun

compared to any mountain gun in the world and we are producing it. It is true that there have been delays in actual production and the number that rolls out from our production units could be improved upon but it is wrong to suggest that we have not been able to develop or manufacture the mountain gun. He attaches more importance to newspapers than to the Reports although today we are discussing the Report basically.

Then, mention has been made about the research and development effort. We attach very great importance to the Research and Development Organisation. I would like to say that now we have built up, in the course of a year, a sufficiently large number of really good scientists. I would like to inform the House that we have got about 1700 scientists who can be described as scientists, who get emoluments which can be described as officer level emoluments, although I hate to divide scientists into officers and non-officers. I would like to say that in the higher pay scales we have got about 1,700 scientists and along with them we have got another about 5,000 scientists, all of them practically post-graduates. Many of them have post-graduate degrees and even doctorates and they are supporting the essential work. These young and bright people carry most of the load and I had occasion to make a reference to them when I was in Poona the other day to inaugurate the big complex, viz., the Armament Research and Development Establishment and the Explosives Research and Development Laboratory. Two very good establishments have come up there and there I had to tell the Senior Scientific Officers that their real strength depended on their capacity to get the 5,000 young scientists, who were working under them, sufficiently motivated and to get the maximum from them. It is our aim to create conditions in which they feel that they can pursue their scientific research with all possible encouragement and help. It is a fairly large body of scientists and if they are properly utilised, as they are being utilised, I have no doubt that this will be a source of real strength to our research and development effort.

I would like to say that comparison of expenditure, in terms of percentages, is not always a very ideal way of comparing efforts. Not only the research and development wing of the Defence organisation, but also the entire research

[Sardar Swaran Singh.]

and development undertaken by the universities and the string of laboratories which are functioning under the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research adds to our basic knowledge of science. Everything should be utilised. It is our effort, by proper co-ordination, to see that we utilise whatever knowledge is available from these national laboratories that are functioning under the CSIR. Take, for instance, metals and chemicals. The CSIR laboratories are doing excellent work and we get benefit from them also. We have to look into the efforts as a whole which the country is putting on research and development generally, although it is true that in regard to defence research and development it has to be oriented to certain objectives. This aspect I have been highlighting to our scientists. Whereas in purely research laboratory or in a university, the pursuit of purely academic objectives is good and that is the function of the research laboratories of the universities, in the case of research and development related to defence, it has to be oriented to certain objectives, certain targets and to produce concrete results. It is this aspect that has been highlighted and it is this aspect which I have been impressing on them.

Mention has been made of the former Scientific Adviser. The best thing would be not to bring in names. Dr. Bhagavantam did good work and he retired after getting some extension. He retired at the age of sixty. We thought that perhaps a younger man would do. It is true that we took a little longer and I would be quite frank. When the rules were studied we found that the appointment of the Scientific Adviser also had to be routed through the Union Public Service Commission. We are taking some steps, now after this experience, to take it out of the purview of the UPSC. In this case the advice given to me was that it has to be routed through the UPSC. So, we made a reference to them and, for a variety of reasons, they took a pretty long time. They have made a recommendation. Although various names have been mentioned in newspapers, no final decision has been taken. It is our intention to give the Scientific Adviser the status of Secretary to Government. The press report that it is going to be Cabinet Secretary is not correct. I do not know how the pressmen picked it up. What I said in Poona was that it was

my intention to give him the status of Secretary to Government, so that the scientists working under him should have a feeling that their leader is their own scientists. I told them also that I wanted the scientists to be denied the alibi that they were being over-shadowed by bureaucrats. Therefore, I am making a scientist their leader and I hope they will be able to produce results. We are interested in results, not in the methodology or in the structure. Howsoever good a structure may be on paper, unless it produces results it is of no use.

I have tried to cover some of the important points and I would like to assure you that, if any other points have been left out, we will very carefully examine them and try to take benefit from them.

SHRI R. T. PARTHASARATHY : Many of the Members who spoke made a reference to the Government's nuclear policy and I also asked whether the Minister would be pleased to place a White Paper on the Table of the House.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : About the nuclear policy which is in the hon. Member's mind, I have stated on more than one occasion that it is the Government's considered policy that we develop our nuclear technology for peaceful purposes. We have taken a national decision not to utilise and not to develop nuclear energy for purposes other than peaceful. That is our policy. I know that there is another viewpoint, but it is no use repeating the argument again and again. Some days back I stated the position clearly and I thought that to repeat it would be boring to the House and would be trying their patience if I were to repeat it again.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : On the basis of the indications available so far, may I know whether the hon. Minister can say in regard to the Indian Ocean whether it going to be Russian lake, American lake or Chinese lake? That is a matter of great concern to us. We had it as British lake earlier. I would require information as to which country at the moment has the largest naval presence in the Indian Ocean. That is Number one. Number two on the other side, we have now the silk road connecting Sinkiang with Gileit. You can throw light on this because the whole question of defence is an integrated one. On the one side we have got

the Indian Ocean problem arising and on the other we have got the Silk Road which has been constructed by China connecting Sinkiang and Gilgit. Whether the Hon'ble Minister has given some thought to this whether it is not meant for military objectives, not only the trade objective which has been mentioned, may please be stated. Thirdly, you mentioned, and that is the claim which is always made, that you have got 1:1 capital output ratio so far as defence production is concerned. Now it may be an average ratio of the whole but there may be capital intensity of certain industries of a very high order. The latter would give us an idea which industries are of a very sophisticated nature. Therefore, I would like to know whether he can give us, at a later date, the various degree of capital intensity so that we can have an idea of the relative capital intensity.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I would like to mention the points very briefly, just sort of a telegraphic reply. So far as the Indian Ocean is concerned, this matter has been discussed here more than once. My colleague Shri Mishra made a statement and then the External Affairs Minister also made a statement. Our policy has been clear that we would like this area to be free from tensions, but we also should be realistic enough to remember that other forces are not likely to listen to us or likely to fall in line with our own way of thinking. But that should not detract us from the pursuit of our objective. About the factual position, if you look at the Indian Ocean as a whole, then we have got the Australian Coast where the Australians and the Americans will develop, in course of time, sufficient facilities. The Americans and the British are also developing what they have described as a Communication Centre of Mauritius. Then there is the British presence at the moment in Gang and that facility is also being utilised by the Americans. The British have got facilities in Singapore. They have also got facilities in the Gulf area. They have withdrawn from Aden but they are still there in the Gulf area Bahrain, and

also Kuwait to a certain extent. About the actual facilities, there is no end. Then at the extreme end, Cape of Good Hope, we have got the South African countries. African countries have got very little, except that there is something in the UAR, Israel, Iran, Pakistan, Burma, Indonesia. These are the countries which have got some naval forces. Whether the outside powers, i.e. the big powers, will come into this area in a big way is anybody's guess and I think it will be premature for us to imagine that this area is likely to be saturated. It depends on a developing political situation and a variety of other circumstances.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: At the present moment which country has got the largest force?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: It is very difficult to say that. It is not possible for any country to keep track of the actual naval craft that might be present. About the Sinkiang-Gilgit Road, this matter has been explained here. It is not only the silken road as it used to be called, the former trade route, between Sinkiang and Gilgit. What is disquieting is that another link road is being provided, Khunjerab—Morkhund Road. This is a matter of which we have to take serious note of. Actually, on this issue the External Affairs Ministry have taken up the matter with Pakistan. They have actually lodged a protest. This does create a problem for us of which we have taken full note of in our defence arrangements. About the third question, it is true that the capital ratio to production will vary from unit to unit, but I have not got that analysis with me at this moment.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS): The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. of day-after-tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at thirty-six minutes past seven of the clock till eleven of the clock on Friday, the 22nd May, 1970.