

[रामसिंह अयरवाल]

बड़ी कठिनाइयां आयेंगी, उन को मन्जूरी मिलेगी, तभी वे काम कर सकेंगे। इस लिये जो शोध का सवाल है, वह बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण मसला है—मैं चाहता हूँ कि उन के जो दुर्बलिंग हाउसेज हैं, जहां वे बीड़ी बनाते हैं, उन को भी इण्डस्ट्रीज प्रेमिसेज में ले लिया जाये, इस तरह से यह शोध की समस्या खत्म हो सकती है।

सभापति महोदय, जिस प्रकार से सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट के एम्पलाइज को रिवाइज्ड स्केल दिये जाते हैं, उसी तरह से इन के रेट्स भी हर वर्ष रिवाइज किये जायें, जिससे मालूम पड़े कि वास्तव में उनकी प्रगति हो रही है, उनकी शिक्षा दीक्षा हो रही है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इन सारी चीजों पर गहराई से जांच कमेटी के माध्यम से निरीक्षण किया जाय।

अन्त में, चूंकि हमारे मंत्री जी ने बहुत से अप्वासन दिये हैं, उनकी भावनाओं और विचारों को ध्यान में रखते हुए तथा उन के दिल में मजदूरों के प्रति जो दर्द है उस को महसूस करते हुए मैं अपने इस संकल्प को वापस ले रहा हूँ और आशा करता हूँ कि मंत्री महोदय बीड़ी मजदूरों के हित के लिए अवश्य कुछ करेंगे।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : मंत्री महोदय, के अप्वासनों को दृष्टि में रखते हुए मैं अपने संशोधन को वापस लेने की अनुमति चाहता हूँ।

सभापति महोदय : श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय अपने संशोधन को सदन की अनुमति से वापस लेना चाहते हैं, अतः उन्हें यह संशोधन वापस लेने की अनुमति दी जाय।

Amendment No. 2 was, by leave, withdrawn.

सभापति महोदय : श्री रामसिंह अयरवाल सबन की अनुमति से अपने संकल्प को वापस लेना चाहते हैं, अतः इस संकल्प को उन्हें वापस लेने की अनुमति दी जाय।

The Resolution was, by leave, withdrawn.

17.44 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE : DEFENCE NEEDS OF INDIA

SHRI RANJIT SINGH (Khalilabad) :
Mr. Chairman, I move :—

"This House resolves that a Standing Parliamentary Committee on Defence be appointed to study the problems of India's defence needs and periodically to keep scrutinizing her defence preparedness and suggest ways and means to the Government to ensure the security of the country's frontiers."

I move this Resolution not for mere criticism of the Government though that will come. During my speech I will not criticize only because I take it to be the role of the Opposition to criticize the Government. The sentiments behind my criticism are motivated purely by non-partisan considerations and for the better security of the country, also for the better utilisation of the armed forces on which we are spending half our Budget.

I must also make it clear that my stentorian voice, the voice of defence, may not be misunderstood. The Prime Minister has counselled, and her counsel I take to be the counsel of the leader of the House that we should not talk in a loud tones. She got angry and lost her temper but even in her anger, she looked sublime. I shudder to imagine what the Defence Minister would look like when he loses his temper and, therefore, I apologise to him, in the beginning, and I request him that I may not be misunderstood. I will not criticise individuals because I have to criticise the system and that system is not born out of a wrong policy of any individual but it is an inherent weakness of democracy. I will explain forthwith.

The necessity for a Standing Parliamentary Committee on Defence arises out of past experiences on the functioning of democratic armed forces and the democratic set-up in a democracy like India. I will give example of how on the question of defence even England, perpetually fighting wars since hundred of years, maintaining an empire by the force of might, fail owing to the inherent weaknesses of democracy. The psychology of a democratic Government is a psychology of peace. We do not say that

political power is born out of the barrel of a gun. That is what Mao says. Mao says that war is politics with bloodshed and politics is war without bloodshed. He regards war as a continuation of policy not by other means but by the best means. He says, war is the highest form of struggle to resolve contradictions. Keeping in mind the sayings of Mao, because at the moment we have to combat him, we have to consider how far we can improve our armed forces with limited means we have and within a democratic set-up.

Our psychology is built up in such a manner that the moment a person, a Defence Minister or even a Member of the Opposition cries out for having better defence, he is dubbed as a war-monger. It is the inherent weakness of democratic persons that they do not want a charge against themselves. So, they keep quiet and the result is that our defence gets weaker and weaker.

Defence is a very technical matter. We have to recognise that. Defence does not consist of just grand strategy and strategy. It consists of intricate systems of weaponry organisation and of operational research. It is absolutely essential that anybody handling the matter of defence should know the basic rudiments of defence or have personal stakes for the defence of the country. Those personal stakes are not born out of the general feeling of the country for the defence of the nation but it is born out of a feeling of suffering or a feeling of elation at the failure or the success of the armed forces. At the moment, unfortunately, to tackle this very technical matter, we do not have one man who can be called an ideal defence technician. But, separately, in this House, we have persons with personal stakes, Members who have got their whole family in the armed forces, and we have got persons who are experts in military history, we have got persons who are experts in weaponry, persons with personal experience of war, and if we gather these talents, we can certainly avoid the mistakes that England made or Russia made before they faced war.

I recall to you the happenings of the House of Commons in 1934-35. In 1934, in the month of March, Mr. Baldwin assured the House of Commons that England was better prepared for war than Germany and that the Royal Air Force was stronger nu-

merically as well as qualitatively, than the Luftwaffe. Again on the 3rd April he assured the House in reply to a question by Mr. Churchill, just as we receive assurance in this House, that they were prepared for war and that they were stronger than Germany, the RAF was stronger than Luftwaffe. But six months later when Mr. Eden went to Berlin, Hitler boasted there that the Luftwaffe was stronger numerically than the RAF, and Mr. Eden thought that he was being bluffed. The next day 600 aircraft of the Luftwaffe flew past Mr. Eden. When Mr. Eden came back and gave this report to the Prime Minister, and when he spoke to Mr. Baldwin, Mr. Baldwin had the courage to stand up in the House of Commons and say that they were wrong. He said, "I apologize to the House; we were wrong in our assessment of our future strength and the future strength of the enemy". He categorically apologized and he also said that the responsibility was not of one man, the whole Government was responsible, the whole Government was to be blamed, and he added that from then on they would follow a policy that would bring the RAF to a better state of preparedness than the Luftwaffe. So, a single man can make mistakes. Defence is such a matter where if you make mistakes, you will go under foot, you will go under the subjugation of a foreign power.

In this country fortunately we have had people who understand the principles of Defence, who understood how the Defence of a country under the democratic set of Government like India should be conducted. One such person was Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose. But nowhere do we honour his principles of Defence, nowhere are his writings on Defence taught, nowhere are his theories studied and the worst of all is that, in our Armed Forces, the top-brass has not yet reconciled itself to the fact that Netaji's act was a patriotic act like the act of Washington in seeking the help of Germans to oust the Britishers.

Now this mentality for wanting peace creates in the sub-consciousness a wishful thinking that there is peace. Sometimes our Defence Minister or the Government or the other Ministers, in their wishful thinking, may become victims of imagination and they will deny that there is any threat to the country, or when the threat does come

[Shri Ranjit Singh]

and when it is too near, they will not be able to combat it with full force because there is this mentality of peace. Therefore, I appeal to you to accept the formation of such a Committee. With due reverence to the present Defence Minister, I would say this I know his great qualities; I know his great performance in the United Nations; he was one man who outdid Mr. Bhutto; I know what he has done for this country. But then, we cannot always have a square peg in a round hole, specially in regard to Defence.

He is a person very well informed on foreign policy, possibly. But, on Defence, he is the person who made the statement in the House that he would accept Pakistani intrusion upto 20 miles into this country. At times he has given wrong information to this House without meaning it. I make it clear again that I do not say that he intentionally misleads the House, but, I do say that he sometimes is misinformed by his officials and the officials supply to the Defence Minister only the information which they think he should know, not what is needed by the House. The Defence Minister did not know that the Emergency Commission officers were also commissioned from the Ranks. He denied this in the House. In reply to a question on Emergency Commissioned Officers he said that he did not think that they came from the Ranks and that they came from the civil population.

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SHRI SWARAN SINGH) : I never said it.

SHRI RANJIT SINGH : It is on record. If you deny it, then I will bring in a privilege motion.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : There is no need of privilege motion. I thought I have clarified when that matter was discussed here that there are a large number of people who have been promoted from the Ranks and they find it difficult to go back to those positions.

SHRI RANJIT SINGH : This is the first time that the Minister denied it. The records may be seen. I wanted to bring in a privilege motion. I knew that it was a minor matter. Probably the Minister was misinformed, but later on somebody gave

him the correct position. It is good that at least you seek information later on.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH (Rohtak) : Do not spoil a very good speech, Major ?

SHRI RANJIT SINGH : Because I criticise your Party, I spoil the speech ?

SHRI M. L. SONDHI (New Delhi) : Otherwise, let him come over to our side.

SHRI RANJIT SINGH : We are here concerned with truth. We are not concerned with the Party. Let the Congress Party give a proper lead and we will be behind it as we were behind it in 1965 September.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH : Very good, that should be the spirit.

SHRI RANJIT SINGH : The State of our army is not what it should be. We have brave jawans. We have brave officers. We have good leadership amongst them, but, unfortunately that good leadership has not got a hold on the Army. The general degeneration of the morals in the entire country has also seeped into the Army and we must accept that when there is general deterioration, we cannot keep the Army completely aloof. Therefore, we have an Army now whose top brass, some of whose leadership is out of tune with the national aspirations. Who is going to curb the tendency of run-away generals who some day may run away with democracy ? Who is going to control it ? Not one man. It has to be a combined effort, the participation of the whole House and as far as possible, of all Parties, and these people can go into not only the defence preparedness of the country but also in bringing about that affinity and unity of the Kisan and the Jawan which Shastriji dreamt of.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU (Diamond Harbour) : But what about indiscriminate use of Army for furthering the political cause and aggression ?

AN HON. MEMBER : That is a different thing.

SHRI RANJIT SINGH : I have talked to my friend Mr. Basu privately and I find

he has got personal experience. I find he is as much concerned about the defence of the country as all of us are. I have always understood it.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU : How did you understand me ?

SHRI RANJIT SINGH : I have always understood it and even to-day I understand it about you. I am not talking of your Party.

I give an example of the treatment of the Emergency Commissioned Officers. We know that the entire House was concerned about them. We know probably the present Defence Minister was concerned about them very much. I know it. But the officials and bureaucrats combined to mislead him and they told him that 'We want the Army young. Therefore, these people must go out'. This way they shunted out these men of 30 or 35 years and at the same time, they increased the retirement age which extended the service limit of 600 officers who were on the verge of retirement by two years. I put it to you and I believe it will be acceptable to you that the officers and the top brass can fool one man for all times, but they cannot fool many men for all times. They can fool them for some time but they will be caught. That is why it is better to have defence in the hands of many men. They may not have a big committee, but they may have just a selected body or committee. Of course, the argument will be advanced from the side of Government that our secrecy will go. But where is the secrecy that they want to maintain in the matter of defence ? Do they not realise that today they are there is power but tomorrow we may be there. So, from whom are they going to keep the things secret ? And look at their sense of secrecy. In the Army, they circulate a pamphlet called 'The Chinese Army' wherein the details of the Chinese army are given, and the organisational pattern and system of the Chinese Army is given and so on and the pamphlet is marked 'Top Secret'. Again, there are pamphlets giving the recognition features of Chinese aircraft and Pakistani aircraft, and these are all marked 'Secret' or 'Top Secret' I think these are something that should be displayed everywhere.

18 hrs.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore) : All wrong information only.

SHRI RANJIT SINGH : So, I have to make a further appeal and also to refute the argument which I can visualise from Government in advance, because I have talked to the people who are going to give him the answer ; and I know the answer that he is going to give.

While I round off my speech for today, I request that hon. Members may kindly go away with this thought in their mind that there is some substance in what I have appealed for. I have not appealed for a particular committee consisting of all the Opposition Members. Let Government have a committee of the Congress Party only. I am sure that if they have a committee of that type, they will not commit the blunders in defence which we have been committing in the past. I am sure my hon. friends Shri Randhir Singh and Shri G. S. Dhillon would not permit the programme of manufacturing a fuselage here and manufacturing the engine in Egypt. I am sure that national interests will be safeguarded. Then, we would not be selling our telephones in the market and buying them back at four times the price when a war starts. These are things which we have failed to take note of. This committee will safeguard such things.

18.03½ hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

Since it is nearing 6 p.m. and we have to take up the half-an-hour discussion now I shall discontinue my speech now and continue it in the next session.

18.04 hrs.

EX-I.N.A. PERSONNEL[†]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Now we shall take up the half-an-hour discussion, Shri Samar Guha.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai) : I would begin this discussion on the ex-INA personnel by paying my homage to those great fighters of the INA and also to the great heritage of Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose and those who have given

[†]Half-An-Hour. Discussion.