

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

they were indulging in against people in favour of merger. This news has come today and we have immediately taken action and communicated with the French Ambassador here and with the authorities in Pondicherry. We shall communicate with the French Government also. We have demanded also the immediate return not only of the Indian citizens but the Mayor who was taken away, and punishment of the policemen who had perpetrated this outrage on Indian territory. We have also taken measures, that is, through the Madras Government, the armed police of the Madras State, to prevent any armed people policemen or any persons with arms entering Indian territory from those French Settlements. That is all that I have to state before the House.

The situation is obviously a changing and developing one and if anything important occurs I shall come before the House and place the information before it.

COMMITTEE ON ABSENCE OF
MEMBERS FROM SITTINGS OF
THE HOUSE

PRESENTATION OF FIRST REPORT

Shri Altekar (North Satara): Sir, I beg to present the first Report of the Committee on Absence of Members from the Sittings of the House. [See Appendix VI, annexure No. 64.]

*DEMANDS FOR GRANTS—contd.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now take up the Demands for Grants of the Defence Ministry.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat): Sir, I would like to make a submission. In view of the fact that the Congress Party and the Treasury Benches will be supporting the Government policy, and in view of the fact there are so many Ministers who will

be taking part in the discussion, may I suggest that the time as between the Congress Party and the Opposition may be allotted on a fifty-fifty basis?

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram): They have no cut motions to their credit; we have tabled all the cut motions.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I thought the hon. lady Member was about to say that the Ministers' time ought to be excluded from the time taken by the Congress; that is what they have been doing. (*Interruptions*).

I shall try to adjust. I have been giving an opportunity to the leaders of the various groups.....

An Hon. Member: May I suggest that the matter may be taken up by the Business Advisory Committee?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have already divided the time and I shall see to it that no representatives of the groups are unrepresented in the debate. That is what I can do. Now, let us proceed with the Demands. The House will now proceed with the consideration of the Demands for Grants Nos. 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 114.

Members and leaders of groups may hand over the numbers of the cut motions which they select to the Secretary in fifteen minutes. I will treat them as moved if those hon. Members in whose names those cut motions stand are present in the House and they are otherwise in order.

These numbers of selected cut motions have been received *Praja-Socialist Party*: Nos. 63, 65, 67, 68 and 69.

Communist Party: Nos. 530, 531, 532, 542, 837, 838, 510, 826, 710 and 839.

Democratic Group: Nos. 842 and 822.

On behalf of Independent Members Parliamentary Group the following cut motions will be moved:

Shri G. S. Singh:...No. 715.

*Moved with the previous sanction of the President.

Shri M. E. Krishna: Nos. 717 and 718.

Dr. N. B. Khare (Gwalior): I insist upon moving my cut motion No. 266...
.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What is the meaning in insisting? I am inviting hon. Member to give the intimation. Hon. Member belongs to this House at any rate.....

Dr. N. B. Khare: Yes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Why should be absent-minded and then quarrel with these things? I have already told the House that within fifteen minutes all hon. Members who want their cut motions to be moved may hand them over to the Secretary and be present in their seats. I shall treat all those cut motions as moved. Hon. Members may kindly do so.

Dr. N. B. Khare: Oh, yes; I shall do so.

DEMAND NO. 11—MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 25,11,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March 1955, in respect of ‘Ministry of Defence’.”

DEMAND NO. 12—DEFENCE SERVICES, EFFECTIVE—ARMY.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,46,36,32,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March 1955, in respect of ‘Defence Services, Effective—Army’.”

DEMAND NO. 13—DEFENCE SERVICES, EFFECTIVE—NAVY.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 11,16,39,000 be granted to the

President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March 1955, in respect of ‘Defence Services, Effective—Navy’.”

DEMAND NO. 14—DEFENCE SERVICES, EFFECTIVE—AIR FORCE.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 32,91,25,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March 1955, in respect of ‘Defence Services, Effective—Air Force’.”

DEMAND NO. 15—DEFENCE SERVICES, NON-EFFECTIVE CHARGES.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 14,40,83,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March 1955, in respect of ‘Defence Services, Non-Effective Charges’.”

DEMAND NO. 16—MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,17,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March 1955, in respect of ‘Miscellaneous Expenditure under the Ministry of Defence’.”

DEMAND NO. 114—DEFENCE CAPITAL OUTLAY.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 18,37,92,000 be granted to the

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker.]

President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March 1955, in respect of 'Defence Capital Outlay'."

Indianisation of personnel in ordnance factories.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: (Mysore): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Defence Services, Effective—Army' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Failure to implement all the recommendations of the Kalyanwala Committee Report.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Defence Services, Effective—Army' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Corruption prevalent in the purchase and sale of stores

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Defence Services, Effective—Army' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Retrenchment and victimisation of staff in ordnance depots.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Defence Services, Effective—Army' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Archaic condition of Naval vessels

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Defence Services, Effective—Navy' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Failure to implement Mr. Subramaniam's recommendations in the Kalyanwala Committee Report.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Defence Services, Effective—Army' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Re-organisation Committee for Ordnance Factories and question of retrenchment of Ordnance Factory workers.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Defence Services, Effective—Army' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Failure to reduce expenditure on training of Officers abroad.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Defence Services, Effective—Army' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Failure to take steps to build up an efficient aircraft and aeronautical industry in the country.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Defence Services, Effective—Air Force' be reduced by Rs. 100".

Failure to dispense with our reliance on Imperial Defence College training for Indian officers and on Anglo-American experts.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Defence Services, Effective—Army' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Failure to ensure a decent living wage to the "Jawans".

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Defence Services, Effective—Army' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Proposed pension rates.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100".

Continuance of the contract system of employment in the M.E.S.

Shri T. K. Chaudhuri (Berhampore): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Defence Services, Effective—Army' be reduced by Rs. 100".

Failure to detach national defence from the imperial defence system of the British Empire.

Shri T. K. Chaudhuri: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100".

Supply of dilapidated British naval vessels to the Indian Navy.

Shri T. K. Chaudhuri: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Defence Services, Effective—Navy' be reduced by Rs. 100".

Greater utilisation of capacity of Ordnance Factories to produce military requirements.

Shri Ramachandra Reddi (Nellore): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Defence Services, Non-effective Charges' be reduced by Rs. 100".

Proper budgeting and expenditure for Defence.

Shri Ramachandra Reddy: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100".

Modernisation of the services, particularly the technical mechanised arme of the all three services.

Shri G. S. Singh (Bharatpur-Sawai Madhopur): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100".

Policy re: declaration and disposal of surplus servicesable stores through the D. G. S. & D.

Shri M. E. Krishna (Karimnagar—Reserved-Sch. Castes): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Defence services, Effective—Army' be reduced by Rs. 100".

Failure to grant concessions to children of Scheduled Castes and Tribes for admission to the King George's School.

Shri M. R. Krishna: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Defence Services, Effective—Army' be reduced by Rs. 100".

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All these cut motions are now before the House.

The other cut motions of the National Democratic Group are Nos. 59, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270 and 507; the cut motions of the un-attached Independent Members are Nos. 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505 and 506. They may also be moved now.

Necessity of strengthening the defence of the country in view of the U.S.—Pakistan Military Pact.

Kumari Annie Mascarene (Trivandrum): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100".

Failure of Government to make statutory provision to regulate grant of military pensions.

Dr. N. B. Khare: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100".

Failure of Government to adapt administrative Rules and Instructions having the effect of a 'deduction' or 'disallowance' of pension payable on account of disability sustained and death occurred on, or in consequence of, military duty.

Dr. N. B. Khare: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Failure of Government to continue life grants of family pensions

Dr. N. B. Khare: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Failure of the Government to separate legislative, judicial, and executive functions in relations to pensions payable in members of the Defence forces.

Dr. N. B. Khare: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Failure of Government to revise cases of punishments inflicted by courts Martial.

Dr. N. B. Khare: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Failure to use Army for nation building and economic development works to the maximum possible extent.

Shri Boovaraghasamy (Perambalur): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Need for a change in the strategy of defence to meet an attack with modern weapons of warfare.

Shri U. C. Patnaik: (Ghumsur): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Absence of Reserves for purposes of national defence.

Shri U. C. Patnaik: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Failure to organize adequate citizen forces.

Shri U. C. Patnaik: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Need for re-organizing the Ordnance Factories, Depots and other Defence installations.

Shri U. C. Patnaik: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Working of the Military Engineering Services.

Shri U. C. Patnaik: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Purchase of defence stores from outside.

Shri U. C. Patnaik: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Failure to co-operate with other Ministries in building up Civil Defence Units.

Shri U. C. Patnaik: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Failure to ensure integration of Defence with socio-economic planning

Shri U. C. Patnaik: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100."

*Retrenchment of experienced personnel
in the Ordnance and other Ser-
vices.*

Shri U. C. Patnaik: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: These cut motions are also now before the House.

Shri Ramachandra Reddi: The recent speech of the Prime Minister has created an impression that there is an attempt to undermine or minimise the importance of Defence. This is a pity when some kind of drastic action has to be taken in regard to the foreign pockets which is very welcome. We would only suggest that as he proceeds and progresses in regard to his policy of pushing out these foreign administrations from India, he must also feel that there is an imperative necessity to increase the strength of our defence. The changes around us are very rapid and naturally we have to change also very rapidly with regard to our Defence policy. Everybody is aware that the foreigners have no friends or enemies here; they have only their interests here and they are trying to encroach upon Indian interests. So it is very necessary that our interests here should be protected by ourselves. Where we do not depend upon any other foreign military aid, we have to depend upon our own military equipment for reasons obvious.

You are aware that from some time past the position of Goa was a little bit annoying. All along we have found that the French authorities in Pondicherry have been sullen and submissive. But having found that there is a stiffening up in Goa which is not curbed by the Indian authorities, they are trying to stiffen up themselves. It is therefore urgently necessary that drastic action will have to be taken by our Government to push out these foreign people as early as possible. And these pockets should not be taken as coming under our External Affairs any longer;

they must be thought of as subjects coming under our policy of Defence.

Though we are not in a mood, with all our policy of non-violence, to go into a war or be war-mongering, it is absolutely necessary that we have to prepare ourselves for our defence. We can no longer depend upon our policy of non-violence for the simple reason that from the opposite side the spirit of non-violence is not treated with respect. I am reminded of a small story of days gone by when *dharma yudh* was in vogue. Two Rajahs began to fight with each other. The more powerful one wanted to invade the territories of the less powerful one. The less powerful one had to resort to some scheme of defence and his defence was only religion. He recruited a number of Brahmans and collected a number of cows and put caste marks upon them and arrayed them before the coming invader. The invader found that he had to shoot either the Brahman over the cow or the cow under the Brahman. If it was the Brahman that had to be shot, it would be *Brahmahattya*; if it was the cow that had to be shot, it would be *go hattya*. So to avoid both kinds of *hattya*, he seemed to have turned back and retreated with his armies!

But we are no longer in that atmosphere. We are no longer fighting in terms of religion. Therefore, any spirit of non-violence will not help us to protect ourselves in the long run. Though we have declared ourselves to be a secular state. All measures of protecting a secular state will have to be adopted very early. We can have no dependence upon others, nor can our policy be wobbling in regard to our defence.

Having said this, I wish to point out that there are certain aspects of the Defence budget that have been drawn attention to by the Audit Reports in the last three or four years.

[Shri Ramachandra Reddi.]

The Audit Reports have said that there is bad budgeting in regard to Defence, that there is unsatisfactory accounting, that expenditure is not incurred to the extent provided for in the Budget Estimates, and that there is a lot of savings from year to year. If we look into the figures, there has been a saving of nearly Rs. 13.43 crores in the Defence budget of 1948-49, of about Rs. 19.43 crores in the Defence budget of 1949-50, Rs. 17.08 crores in 1950-51 and Rs. 20.73 crores in 1951-52. These figures show that they have been budgeting for more than what is necessary, or more than their capacity to spend under this head. In fact, the final savings in 1950-51 were to the extent of 6 to 38 per cent and in 1951-52 the savings were to the extent of 2.2 to 37 per cent. This shows that there has been an improper assessment of our actual necessities and also an inadequate expenditure programme. There are several other points that have been noted in these audit reports which will show that there have been defective budgeting, over-estimating, financial irregularities, non-procurement of stores to the full extent, non-surrender of unspent balances in time, large amounts of advances not collected, stock verification unsatisfactory, large amounts written off as irrecoverable, over-payments, losses in Ordnance depots, infructuous expenditure, excessive supplementary grants and mounting volume of surpluses and deficiencies. It is surprising to note that in the matter of budgeting, enough care is not being taken. As a matter of fact, in one year's Budget, a sum of Rs. 1,05,00,000 was provided twice for the same stores and there was an omission of Rs. 1,07,00,000 in the final estimate of 1950-51. I wish to be told that defects such as these have been rectified already. I am pointing out these discrepancies for the simple reason that with a careful budgeting of the Defence Budget, it would have been possible for the hon. Finance Minister not to

tax us any more. From the figures that I have given, it is clear that if there has been proper budgeting in the previous years, further taxation could have been avoided. Even during the present year, I feel that when the actual expenditure is known, there will still be a large amount of saving which would show that there is no necessity for further taxation.

It is, therefore, absolutely necessary that, along with the Minister for Defence, the Finance Minister should also take necessary care to see that the Budget framing is properly done and expenditure properly incurred.

With regard to ordnance depots, I find that foreign experts are still working in some of them. I was told of a particular instance which proves beyond all doubt that there is a great necessity for pushing out these experts as expeditiously as possible. Recently—probably a couple of years back or last year—some fire-arms were manufactured by us here and samples were sent to the British firm which was already supplying us with fire-arms. That British firm has advised our Government that the fire-arms prepared by us are defective. If the same defect was pointed out by any other British firm than the one that was supplying us with fire-arms, we could have believed it; but when the firm that has been supplying us fire-arms says that the things which we manufactured are not useful, or not up to the mark, we cannot believe it. It is all due to the fact that the foreman or manager or director of that particular Ordnance factory seems to be a European. Instances of that type perhaps might be multiplied; but I have only mentioned it for the purpose of drawing the attention of the Government and of this House to the danger of keeping these foreigners as experts in our Ordnance factories as long as they have got pals elsewhere in England

or America, who supply us with these fire-arms.

The Stores Purchase Committee of 1951-52 said that very many things that are obtainable in India have been ordered for and it is a pity that necessary attempts have not been made by our Government either to secure them locally or to manufacture them here. I quote from the Report of the India Store Department for the year 1951-52, Chapter III, last paragraph which reads like this:

"In conclusion the desirability of establishing manufacture of common-user items must again be emphasised. It has been observed that the service Departments forward indents for such items as are quite easy to procure in India and were in fact, in production during the last war. There appears to be no doubt that if these stores are produced in India the cost will be much less. Indents for some of the items under this category were referred back to the Indentors to investigate local purchase and in some cases the items were withdrawn. It is therefore, considered most desirable that all defence demands, before being transferred to U.K. for procurement should be carefully screened with a view to omitting those items which can be manufactured in India."

The Minister of Defence Organisation (Shri Tyagi): That is being done now.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): You may reply at the end; not piecemeal.

Shri Ramachandra Reddi: In the next year's report a remark of that type is not found. Either it has not been allowed to go into the report or probably better things are happening today. Whatever it may be, it is very essential that whatever stores could be manufactured in India for defence purposes should be manufactured here without depending upon

other countries. Even such goods which would not come under the category of arms and ammunition and which are capable of being manufactured here must be produced here. In fact, we find so much of enthusiasm for manufacturing things in India. Every opportunity must be given to the manufacturers to manufacture these military stores. As a matter of fact, that would be one way of reducing unemployment in this country.

I find that the procurement of certain stores for defence is being made through other departments. The Ministry of Works, Housing and Supply supplies certain things; the Food Department supplies food and other articles of food. I only wish to ask whether it is not possible for the Defence Ministry itself to place orders for these requirements and secure them directly. That would save not only delays and red-tapism, but also a lot of money on establishment.

I find from the Explanatory Memorandum that a Scientific Adviser has been provided for as usual and an amount of nearly Rs. 3 lakhs more than in the last year has been provided for that. No doubt, it is not possible for us or for the Government to tell the House what is the actual work that is being done by the Scientific Adviser.

Anyhow, I would suggest that a small committee of experts, preferably from this Parliament—a committee in which, I hope, the Government might have confidence and probably a committee that will have confidence in itself—might be appointed to look into this matter, and if need be, more funds should be provided for that purpose if that is going to serve any useful purpose. It is more or less a mysterious department and it requires some scrutiny, though not openly in this House, but at least by a committee.

We can depend no longer for our supplies of arms and ammunition on

[Shri Ramachandra Reddi.]

other countries. We have to gear up our ordnance production and find out ways and means for securing all our requirements internally. I find the provision under Ordnance Factories has been reduced from Rs. 19.10 crores in the 1953-54 Budget to Rs. 18.05 crores in the 1954-55 Budget. I am unable to find a reason for a reduction under this head. If we are seriously minded about improving our ordnance factories, we must have provided more funds under this and utilised them as expeditiously as possible. But, on the other hand, we find from the memorandum that there is a reduction of nearly Rs. 105 lakhs which remains to be explained.

While we are not anxious to spend in the same irresponsible way as it was done during the British days, or extravagantly as it was done during war-time, we have to spend carefully and at the same time provide more money for these undertakings. I therefore urge upon the Government to review their policy of defence much more clearly and closely in view of the events that are taking place around us, or even within our coasts. There is no use getting away from the fact that the matters around us are getting more and more serious, and any delay in tackling them in the proper manner would only land us in greater difficulties.

Pondicherry, which was subservient or submissive a couple of weeks back, within the last 24 hours or 48 hours has become a very aggressive administrative element within our borders. Like that, there is a possibility of other quarters getting more and more exasperated and giving us greater trouble.

I know the hon. Prime Minister is not anxious to keep these foreign pockets alive as they are today, but I also know that necessary action to push them out has not been taken so far with the same eagerness and anxiety as it demands.

Shri U. C. Patnaik (Ghumsur): While discussing the Budget demands for Rs. 243.85 crores and odd, I would like to take this opportunity of reiterating what hon. Members on both sides have been stating here in this House during the last two years, viz., that we have absolutely no objection to the expenditure of fifty per cent of our annual revenue, or even more if necessary, for defence. We are all proud of our Armed Forces, their achievements, in and outside India, and the account they have given of themselves and of their country in different theatres of the world. We also realise that the expenditure on defence is a sort of insurance premium due to mature when there is an enemy attack. It is to enable us to maintain our freedom, and to save our existence in the event of an attack from outside with modern weapons or from fifth columnists inside our own frontiers. But the real question is whether we are incurring the expenditure properly, whether our policy, plan and programme for defence are such as will ensure us success in the event of an enemy attack.

Let this not be treated as a party question. This is a subject of national interest and importance, irrespective of party affiliations and other differences among ourselves. Every patriotic Indian is entitled, nay, bound to think in terms of the country's defence. Let not suggestions made on this side of the House arouse antipathy, simply because they emanate from people belonging to a different group or a different side. On the other hand, for a successful defence of our country, if and when the time comes—let us hope that such a contingency will not arise—Government must welcome the help and co-operation of everybody in the country, whatever be his party affiliations. Let not also this question relating to the Defence Organisation

be treated as our Government have been doing, as a closed military secret in every respect. Transactions under the cloak of secrecy in different countries have led to huge frauds in the matter of purchases of warlike weapons. Our own audit reports for the last four or five years have been referring to a number of transactions entered into with two or three retired British officers, with a capital of £ 100 or £ 500, who are running commercial organisations in different names only to book orders from India. Of course, there has been an attempt to make one or two persons scapegoats, but we have to consider in this connection, what our Defence Ministry has been doing, and what sort of control they have been exercising over our purchase missions outside. The hon. Member who preceded me referred to some instances; but there are ever so many cases of such a nature, to which reference has been made in our audit reports.

It is really unfortunate that, under the cloak of secrecy, the Defence Authorities in the Secretariat, who are expected to supervise the purchase of weapons and other things, have not been exercising proper control or ensuring proper security. Even fraud is sometimes excusable, but neglect of the real defence interests of the country—when we are prepared to spend crores and crores of rupees on defence—as for instance, getting from outside blankets which are found to be useless for our forces, getting weapons which have been proved to be not satisfactory, etc. is really something which must be considered not merely from the financial point of view, but from the military operational point of view as well.

The Deputy Minister of Defence (Shri Satish Chandra): Will my hon. friend give some concrete instances that he may have in mind.

Shri U. C. Patnaik: I would refer the hon. Minister to the audit re-

ports presented during the last three or four years. If he would go through them, he would find a number of concrete instances.

Shri Namblar: He will read them hereafter.

Shri U. C. Patnaik: In any case, we are entitled to know whether we have the best equipment that we could purchase for our Armed Forces, and whether our manpower is best organised and trained to meet a modern war.

Before going into other details, I would like to refer to the question of organisation of human resources and certain aspects of modern manpower mobilisation with special reference to the statement that the hon. Defence Minister in his capacity as Foreign Minister made the other day. He was telling us—If I remember aright—that it was unnecessary to think of Civil Defence and that we could think of civil defence and the organisation of civilian manpower only if and when the contingency arose. Secondly, he told us that civil defence in that sense was outmoded, that civil defence meant only gas-masks, going into baffled walls and trenches. I would respectfully submit, Sir, that real defence in the modern set-up, as you will be told by your military experts, is only when the entire nation's resources—human and material—are mobilised for national defence. Our Army, Navy and Air Force are there; we are proud of them; they form the nucleus around which should be built up, if and when an emergency arises, trained reserves, auxiliaries and citizen forces, marshalled in order to increasingly utilise the potential resources of the country—human and material. From that point of view, it is necessary that there should be some training and organisation of the civilians with the help of the Defence Ministry and the Defence Organisation as well as of the Home Ministry and the

[Shri U. C. Patnaik.]

State Governments. That is a very important feature.

I would here draw the attention of the House to the fact that civil defence does not consist of merely "Air Raid Precautions" like gas masks and other things which were used during the last war. Civil defence is a mobilisation of the civilian manpower with a view to ensure the maximum defence measures and that is done through Home Guards, Civic Guards, Fire-fighters, First-aid squads and Railway Protection Police; and of course, ARP is one of them. All these different items of civilian manpower are mobilised, organised and trained so that they will combat fifth column activities and they will see that there is no chaos in this country when an emergency arises. They will see that the morale of the people will be kept up and there is no trouble. I think there should be no demoralisation, no rushing of people from the towns to the villages and from the villages to the towns at the sound of bombardment or of a long-range weapon or even a true or false report of such enemy action. That is why civil defence has got to be treated as a part of the defence organisation with co-operation, weapons and other facilities from the defence side. Of course, we are told that it is outmoded. But it is not. Every country is resorting to civil defence. It has been stated that Civil Defence has been discontinued in other countries. I have brought last year's budget of the U. K. here because we have got so many advisers and experts from the U. K. in our three Defence Services as well as at the head of certain Defence Services. I will point out that in 1952-53, in U.K. they had spent £ 15 millions and odd on Civil defence and in 1953-54 they spent £. 19 millions and odd. The latter is the last budget of U. K. which shows that civil defence is not an outmoded thing but it denotes preventive

measures which every country is adopting with a view to ensure the maximum defence against a modern attack. I would point out, Sir, that our defence organisation and the other organisations in this country in charge of maintaining peace and security when times of trouble come, ought to see that there is some sort of training of the civilians. In our country also during 1939-45 we had a skeleton civil defence organisation confined only to cities and consisting of civic guards, fire fighters, first-aid squads, railway protection police, and the ARP which last item included something like baffled walls and gas masks. But I would respectfully submit that this is not the whole of civil defence. Even today, when we see the printed list of subjects for which Ministries are responsible, we find that the Home Ministry is responsible for civil defence, but then the only item in the Budget for civil defence is an amount under the Labour Ministry for a scheme for persons who have been injured in some war. Civil defence is an absolutely necessary thing. It is not the Hiroshima or the Nagasaki bomb that destroyed the might of Japan; it was the lack of proper civil defence organisation which broke its morale. That was the case also in France and various other theatres of war. Lack of civil defence has worked to the detriment of national security. In the U. K. also gas masks and other things might be awkward-looking and might offend against aesthetic tastes but it is they that defended that country against the blitzkrieg methods. Anyway, I will come to civil defence later, Sir, if I get the chance when we discuss the Demands of the Home Ministry, under which there is no provision at all for civil defence. I would, on that occasion also point out how the various civilian organisations in the country could be utilised to the maximum extent for civil defence.

There is another point which the Prime Minister mentioned which I personally would endorse fully. It is that we should avoid war at any cost. I would go a step further and quote an authority that the best kind of defence that we can have is not to have any war at all. That authority says that propagation of peace, to ensure that there is peace in the world over is the best defence not only for each country, but for the entire mankind, against a global atomic war. I would submit, Sir, that in our relations with an enemy also, if we can win them over to a peace campaign, well and good. But then, let us take the example of Chamberlain who was trying to have peace with Germany when the latter was preparing for war. Let us take a lesson from history, and see that we do not commit the same mistake. In any case, we must make our potential enemies realise that we have the strength to retaliate if and when necessary.

Of course, there are two ways of doing it. One is to declare from the house tops that we are organising our Forces; that we are building up our strength whether or not we are actually doing so. I have great respect for my hon. friend who is in charge of defence organisation when he says that he would enforce conscription of Government officials for the Territorial Army. That is a very good way of telling the other countries that we are militarising ourselves. But there is another way: we can organise our forces in such a manner that if the time comes the entire country will be behind us; that there will be training of our entire manpower and that there will be the maximum equipment for our Armed Forces. There is no gain saying the fact that there might be an attack on this country, and when there is one, all classes of government servants who are proposed to be conscripted into the Territorial Army and others—both in the

public and private life of the country—have got to be utilised.

We have, however, to remember what is the kind of attack that we might expect, because our strategy of defence, our planning of defence, our policy of defence, must always depend upon the type of attack that you expect, the form of attack, the people from whom you expect an attack, the equipment with which the attack comes and so on. Till last year, our strategy was based upon the fact that we anticipated an attack if any from a second-rate Power which had far inferior manpower in numbers at least, and far inferior equipment compared to ourselves. As you know, Sir, defence planning must not be based upon any static principle; it must be a dynamic one, changing with the type of forces that you have to meet; changing with the type of weapons with which you anticipate the attack; changing with every changing circumstance.

We have now found that our neighbouring country has taken arms and equipment from a first-class Power, which has got the best arms and equipment today; and our neighbour is getting both. It is that neighbouring country that we think of when we think of defence. Till last year, we were thinking that that neighbour was only a second-rate Power, with insufficient forces and inadequate equipment. This year, we find that that country is getting up-to-date equipment from another country. We have also been having trouble from the foreign pockets in this country who are strengthening themselves with foreign military aid. We have no quarrel with the country that is giving them aid, because it is a transaction between them *inter se*. But when we realise that it is going to be a menace to us, that cold war is getting nearer our borders, that there is a possibility of attack against us, then we have to change our strategy and plan for defence. We must see that we have the best equipment and the maximum mobilisation of manpower. I am not asking you to have an ato-

[Shri U. C. Pantnaik.]

mic pile, because we know that in Korea all weapons except atom bombs were tried, and it was found that it is ultimately a question of manpower. We have an abundance of manpower. Train and equip that manpower to have the maximum effect. They shall be our atom bomb. So long as we maintain a defence organisation at the expense of Rs. 250 crores, we must see that it is properly equipped and is capable of expansion to nation-wide proportions. That is the real defence policy in the present context. We must have trained reserves and other civilian Forces.

Regarding the reserves, I can tell you that we have very little. As to the Territorial Army, we have found that we are not having a proper response for various reasons: One of them is that our Urban Units are meant for only technological persons; our rural units are called up for training for three months at a time during the first year and two in subsequent years; sometimes there is mobilisation for five or six months at a time for service at distant places. Therefore, we must see that the Army and other Services are co-ordinated to have the best kind of defence organisation on the manpower mobilisation side.

On the question of equipment, I can assure the House that we do not have the latest and best equipment, although we thank the hon. Shri Tyagi for the kindness of taking us there yesterday. I would prefer not to go into details for obvious reasons.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Taking you where?

Shri U. C. Pantnaik: To show their equipment. As I said, for obvious reasons I would prefer not to go into details. I shall go into details if there is a secret session of the House to examine this question.

I believe, at the same time, that the equipment in the depots could be more fully utilised. I feel that the ordnance factories could be re-organised; our ordnance work is not pro-

gressing, and at the same time, there is retrenchment. There is, therefore, discontent in the organisation, and there has been trouble. The trouble for example, has arisen in a particular case where there is a British officer in the Ambarnath Factory and where there was suspension of work for several days some time ago and several man-hours were lost. The same gentleman, we were told in the House the other day, was responsible for the loss of a secret file from another ordnance factory, and still he is there in a responsible position.

On the M. E. S. side, when we are spending about Rs. 40 crores a year, we are still getting the work done through contractors. We have got two British officers at the top.

4 P.M.

Recently an air strip was constructed where without the aid of contractors it was found that it could be done in much less time and with much less expenditure departmentally. It was a case where they wanted an urgent air strip at a particular place. They wanted to pay one lakh of rupees to the contractor who tendered the lowest and the work was to be done within three months; and it was only with difficulty that he agreed to do it in two months provided he was given more money to construct it. Luckily it occurred to the Chief Engineer of that area, who happens to be an Indian, that the employees who were retrenched from that organisation could be asked to do the work and on their agreeing to do so, it was taken up departmentally. They spent, it seems Rs. 30,000 and it seems that the work was done within 26 days! Less costs and less time. I do not know whether this is correct or not but if it is, the system of getting M. E. S. works done by contracts should be revised and we should see that the work is done departmentally through our Engineering Corps, Sappers and Miners, Pioneers and so on.

There is also another thing as regards the officers who are there as

advisers in the Defence organisations. There are people from outside, whom we have got to consider whether they are the right type of advisers. If our neighbour Pakistan or if Goa attacks us, or if their is a simultaneous attack against us, what will be their loyalty?

Another thing which I would appeal to the Defence Ministry to examine in this connection is how they can best utilise the grants under socio-economic heads to the benefit of the Defence Services. After our Cochinchina tour, we Members of Parliament had given some suggestions as to how grants, for instance, under 'Merchant Shipping' could be so utilised that a naval officer could advise about the specifications, designs and other things, but the grant would be made to private ship-building people at lower rates of interest and spread over a long period so that when we want to commandeer the vessels in times of need for naval purposes, they will come to our rescue. Similar will be the case with deep sea fishing trawlers and other grants under 'Lighthouses', 'Harbours' and so forth. These grants should be so utilised that without much loss to your other requirements, these things could be commandeered for our defence purposes and then you will have the best of them.

सरदार ए० एस० सहगल (बिलास पुर) : उपाध्यक्ष जी, मैं अपने विचार डिफेंस सर्विसेज एस्टीमेट्स के बारे में रखना चाहता हूँ। मैं आपसे अर्ज करूँ कि डिमान्ड नम्बर १२ में पेज ६ पर पे एन्ड अलाउन्सेज आफ दी रेगुलर आर्मी की मद में सन् ५३-५४ के लिये दस करोड़ अड़तीस लाख रुपया बताया है और सन् ५४-५५ के लिये दस करोड़ पचास लाख हैं। उसके साथ साथ आप देखेंगे कि पे एन्ड अलाउन्सेज आफ अदर रैंक्स के मातहत सन् १९५३-५४ में तैंतीस करोड़ तैंतीस लाख रुपया रक्खा

था और सन ५४-५५ में बत्तीस करोड़, उनतालीस लाख, उन्हतर हजार रुपया रक्खा था। अब हमें यह देखना है कि यह अदर रैंक्स कौन हैं, जो काम करने वाले हैं वह आप के फौज के सिपाही हैं और यदि हम सिपाहियों का तनखाह में और उनकी तादाद में यदि कमी करते हैं, तो ज्यादा अफसरों को बढ़ा कर हमारा कोई फायदा नहीं हो सकता। इसलिये मैं अर्ज करूँगा कि यह डिफेंस डिपार्टमेंट के जो आपके सिपाही हैं, उनके लिये यदि मैं कहूँ कि जिस तरह से मनुष्य के शरीर में रोड़ की हड्डी का स्थान होता है, उसी तरह से ये हमारे सिपाही लोग हैं तो अनुचित न होगा। इसको जितना हम मजबूत बना सकते हैं बनायें, इसमें किसी किसम की कोई चीज न आने पाये, उनके दिलों में कोई ऐसी भावना पैदा न होनी चाहिये कि हमारी तरफ अच्छी तरह से नहीं देखा जाता है। इसलिये मैं आपसे अर्ज करूँगा कि इस मद में जो रकम रखी गई है उस पर मंत्री महोदय गौर करने की कृपा करेंगे। इसके साथ साथ मैं आपका ध्यान टैरीटोरियल आर्मी की तरफ दिलाना चाहता हूँ। उसके लिये गत वर्ष यानी सन् १९५३-५४ में सैंतालीस लाख पांच हजार रक्खा गया है और इस वक्त सन् १९५४-५५ के लिये उनचास लाख पैंतालीस हजार है। मैं यह मानता हूँ कि इसमें दो लाख चालीस हजार रुपये की बढ़ती है, लेकिन यदि आप ब्रीफ स्टेटमेंट जो सफा सात में दिया हुआ है उसको पढ़ेंगे तो आपकी समझ में आजायेगा। उसमें यह दिया हुआ है :

"For various reasons, partly financial difficulties and partly difficulties of recruitment the expansion of the Territorial Army has been rather slow and a change of policy in some respects seems to be called for."

[सरदार ए० एस० सहगल]

में आपसे अर्ज करूँ कि यह जो आपके अफसर भर्ती करने जाते हैं, और मुझे भी बोड़ा सा एक डिपार्टमेंट में काम करने का मौका करीब २ पांच साल तक रहा और इस नाते में जानता हूँ कि टेरीटोरियल आर्मी की भर्ती खास कर मध्य प्रांत में किस तरह से होती थी और जबलपुर और नागपुर में किस तरह से की जाती थी। मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि वहां पर जो लोकल लोग हैं, आपके म्युनिसिपैलिटी के प्रेसीडेंट हैं, मेम्बर्स हैं अथवा लोकल कार्यकर्ता हैं उनको मिलाकर और उनके जरिये से टेरीटोरियल आर्मी क्या कर रही है, हमारा फौजी काम किस तरह से बढ़ रहा है, और हमारी फौजें क्या कर रहीं हैं, ये सारी चीजें सभायें करके बतलायें और एक जोश और उत्साह लोगों के दिलों में पैदा करें जिससे ज्यादा से ज्यादा लोग उसमें भर्ती हों। इसके साथ साथ मैं यह भी कहूँगा कि बंगाल में जो प्रान्तीय रक्षक दल आपके हैं जैसे बम्बई में होमगार्ड्स थे, मध्य प्रदेश में जो होमगार्ड्स हैं वह बहुत अच्छी तरह काम कर रहे हैं और सभापति जी मैं आपके जरिये मंत्री महोदय से कहना चाहता हूँ कि वह अपने एक्सपर्ट्स को भेज कर वहां पर यह देखें कि देहातों और हर एक तहसीलों में चालीस चालीस लोगों का तीन माह का कैम्प आर्गनाइज करके वहां पर उनको तीन तीन महीने की ट्रेनिंग दे रहे हैं और हर साल रिफ्रेशर कांर्स होता है जिसका सारा खर्च आपकी स्टेट्स गवर्नमेंट्स बर्दाश्त कर रही हैं। इसके साथ साथ मैं आपको यह भी बतला दूँ कि उसमें जो शिक्षक लोग थे वे वे लोग हैं जो स्वर्गीय सुभाष बाबू की बनायी हुई इंडियन नेशनल आर्मी में शामिल थे और ऐसे देशभक्त आदमियों के द्वारा यह जो हमारी फोर्स हैं इनको खींच कर रहे हैं ताकि अगर कभी कोई इमर-

जेंसी आ पड़े, कोई हमारे ऊपर विपत्ति आ जाये तो मुझे विश्वास है कि हम इनकी सहायता और सहयोग से उसका सफलतापूर्वक मुकाबला कर सकते हैं। हम जानते हैं कि हमारे ऊपर कोई विपत्ति नहीं आने वाली है और अगर कोई आती भी है तो हम में उसका मुकाबला करने की क्षमता मौजूद है। लेकिन इसके साथ २ यह जरूरी है कि हम इन चीजों को देखें और इस तरह के रक्षक दल देश भर में तैयार करें। आप प्रान्तीय सरकारें जो रक्षक दल अपने अपने प्रांतों में चला रहीं हैं उनको देखें, बंगाल, बिहार और आसाम और मध्यप्रांत में चल रहे रक्षक दलों को देखें, इन सारी चीजों को देखें और इन सब को देखने के बाद यदि आपके एक्सपर्ट्स इसको मानने को तैयार हैं कि हां इस तरह के रक्षक दल आवश्यक हैं और मौका आने पर वह एक दूसरी जगह काम कर सकते हैं, तो मैं आपसे कहूँगा कि आप इस पर गौर कीजिये और तहकीकात करके इस काम को प्रोत्साहन और बढ़ावा देने के लिये आप को प्रान्तीय सरकारों के साथ में मिल कर इस दिशा में काम करना चाहिये और द्रव्य से मदद पहुंचानी चाहिये।

इसी सम्बन्ध में मैं आपसे अर्ज करूँ कि डिमान्ड नम्बर १२ में एलेक्ट्रिकल एन्ड मैकेनिकल इंजीनियरिंग यूनिट एन्ड फार-मेशन्स में अफसरों के लिये १९५३-५४ में तीन लाख साठ हजार रुपया आपने रखा था और ५४-५५ के बजट में चार लाख पैंतालीस हजार रुपया आपने रक्खा है, लेकिन इसके साथ साथ हमें यह देखना है कि आखिर ये जो हमारे काम करने वाले लोग हैं, जो उत्पादक हैं अर्थात् पैदा करने वाले लोग हैं उनको यदि हम न बढ़ायें और केवल अफसरों में बढ़ोत्तरी करें, तो यह चीज कहां तक मौजू होगी, यह मैं नहीं समझ सकता।

उचित तो यह है कि हम उत्पादक लोगों को जिनको कि जाकर उन जगहों पर काम करना है, उनकी संख्या को हमें और ज्यादा बढ़ाना चाहिये और वह चीज हमारे लिये ज्यादा लाभप्रद सिद्ध होगी न कि अफसरों की संख्या को, क्योंकि जैसा कि प्रधान मंत्री ने कहा है कि यदि हम यहां पर बड़े बड़े टेक्स और बड़े बड़े जहाज और दूसरी चीजें तो यहां पर मंगवा लें, लेकिन अगर उनके टूटने फूटने की हालत में उनके ठीक करने का माकूल इन्तजाम न हो, तो हमारा काम कैसे चल सकता है, ठीक उसी प्रकार यदि हम उत्पादकों को जो हमारे रीढ़ हैं बढ़ावा नहीं देते हैं, उनकी तरफ ध्यान नहीं देते हैं तो हमारा काम ठीक से चलने वाला नहीं है।

इसी तरह से मैं आपसे अर्ज करूंगा कि यह जो लोग हैं, बैक बोन (Back Bone) यानी रीढ़ है जो उत्पादक हैं, उनकी संख्या को हमें ज्यादा बढ़ाना चाहिये और देखना चाहिये कि इसकी जगह पर हम ज्यादा अफसर न रखें।

इसके साथ साथ मैं आपका ध्यान डिफेंस सर्विस के ट्रान्सपोर्टेशन सफा ३६ की तरफ दिलाना चाहता हूँ। इस मद में करीब करीब ७५ हजार बढ़ा है। जब कि सन् १९५३-५४ में यह १८ लाख था तो १९५४-५५ में यह १८ लाख ७५ हजार है। अब हमको यह देखना है कि इस में हम कैसे बचत कर सकते हैं। इस मद में जो क्राफ्ट इंजीनियरिंग के लोग हैं और जो दीगर काम करने वाले सिपाही हैं, साथ में जो सी० पी० डब्ल्यू० डी० के लोग हैं उनको मिलाया जायें तो बचत की सम्भावना हो सकती है। हम को अलग अलग चीफ-इंजीनियर्स जो रखने पड़ते हैं, उन इंजीनियर्स को अगर हम कम कर दें तो मैं समझता हूँ कि इस में काफी खर्च बच जायेगा।

जा दूसरी दूसरी डिफेंस इंडस्ट्रीज हैं उनको भी हम को बढ़ाना चाहिये। अगर हमको आवश्यकता हो तो जरूर बढ़ाना चाहिये और अगर न हो तो मैं तो आपसे कहूंगा कि आप इन दोनों डिपार्टमेंट्स में से कम कर के देखें। इस डिपार्टमेंट में ज्यादा खर्च नहीं होना चाहिये। जैसा मैंने आप से अर्ज किया, इसके लिये जो हमारी सी० पी० डब्ल्यू० डी० है, उस के जो काम करने वाले हैं, और जो बाकी इंजीनियरिंग वर्क्स डिफेंस के काम करने वाले हैं, फौज की इंजीनियरिंग के वर्क्स हैं, इन सबको मिला कर यदि हम अफसर रखते हैं तो काम चल जाता है। इसी तरह जो दूसरे डिफेंस व सी० पी० डब्ल्यू० डी० के अफसर हैं उनको भी हम मिला देंगे तो इससे खर्च में कमी हो जायेगी।

अब मैं आपका ध्यान पर्चेज आफ मैटीरियल्स सफा ४६ की तरफ दिलाना चाहता हूँ। इस मद में १९५३-५४ में ८ करोड़ ३० लाख रुपया रक्खा गया था, सन् १९५४-५५ में इस साल ७ करोड़ १५ लाख रक्खा गया है। यानी एक करोड़ १५ लाख रुपये का सामान इस साल कम खरीदा जायेगा। जहां पर कि कार्य होता है वहां पर हमें सामान की जरूरत होती है। यदि हम सामान खरीदने में कम पैसा खर्च करेंगे तो वहां पर जो काम करने वाले हैं उनको काम कैसे मिलेगा? अगर इस तरह से हम अफसर ज्यादा बढ़ाते जायेंगे और जो काम करने वाले हैं उनकी संख्या कम करते जायेंगे तो इस तरह से काम नहीं चल सकता है। पर्चेज आफ मैटीरियल्स के बारे में मैं कहूंगा कि मंत्री महोदय देखें और देखने के बाद चीजों को खरीदने का जो तर्फीना हम ने पहले रक्खा था उसी तर्फीने को हम इस बार भी रखें।

[सरदार ए० एस० सहगल]

अब मैं डिफेंस एकाउन्ट्स आफिसेज के बारे में जो डिमांड नं० १२, सफा ३८ पर है उस के बारे में कहना चाहता हूँ। यह जो १७ लाख ४८ हजार सन् १९५३-५४ में रखा गया था और १६ लाख ७३ हजार सन् १९५४-५५ यानी अबकी रखा गया है, यानी इसमें जो २ लाख २५ हजार जो बढ़ा है, इसका मुख्य क्या कारण है और किस तरह से यह बढ़ाया गया और क्या बातें हैं जो नहीं जानी जा सकी हैं। मैं मंत्री महोदय से यह बात कहूंगा कि वह यदि इस पर रोशनी डालेंगे और इसका पूरा ब्योरा देंगे तो मैं समझता हूँ कि इस से हम लोगों को ज्यादा फायदा होगा।

यह जो हमारा ब्रीफ स्टेटमेंट है उस में यह है कि :

“Efforts in previous years directed towards self-sufficiency in Naval Armaments began to bear fruit during the year. A modern armament depot with ancillary facilities is nearing completion in the East coast and work has been started on another on the West coasts.”

यह जो चीज है और जो बड़ा इन्स्पेक्शन का दफ्तर है :

“The Directorate of Naval Armament Inspection was moved to Delhi Cantonment in August, 1953.”

ठीक है आपने जो इन्स्पेक्शन का दफ्तर है उसको दिल्ली बुला लिया लेकिन जो जो कोस्ट्स हैं, ईस्ट और वेस्ट कोस्ट्स, वह तो वहीं रहेंगे। अब यहां जो आधुनिक आयेगा, अफसर आयेगा, आप के नैवल हेडक्वार्टर्स का जिस को आप यहां रख रहे हैं, वह वहां जा कर काम देखेगा। लेकिन

इस तरह से जो काम वह नजदीक देख सकता है वह दूर से नहीं देख सकता। इसलिये ईस्ट और वेस्ट कोस्ट, कहीं पर भी आप रखें, इस के लिये मुझे कुछ कहना सुनना नहीं है, लेकिन मैं चाहूंगा कि आप उस को ऐसी जगह पर रखें जहां से वह दोनों जगह जाकर अच्छी तरह से तहकीकात कर सके, देख सके कि कार्य किस तरह से चल रहा है।

इसके बाद मैं आपसे अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे यहां जो रिआर्गेनाइजेशन कमेटी बनी है, उसमें कम से कम, अगर आप इस तरह का मौका निकाल सकते हैं, तो जो आप की आर्डनेंस फैक्ट्रीज का लोग हैं, उन्हीं के फेडरेशन में से लें तो हमें ज्यादा फायदा हो सकेगा। इसी तरह से जो आप की कल्याण वाला रिपोर्ट है, उसको मैंने देखा और उस रिपोर्ट को पढ़ा अच्छी तरह से देखने के बाद आप से कहूंगा कि उसे शीघ्र अमल में लावें।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am finding it difficult to control the debate. Every hon. Member wants within fifteen minutes to speak from end to end of the Defence Budget. May I appeal to all Groups or Parties to sit together and among those that want to speak divide the various portions between themselves, so that each may concentrate on one section of the Defence Budget instead of every one speaking on every section and my ringing of the bell and the hon. Member feeling that he has not said enough on any subject. But that is what we find for want of concentration. The Opposition Groups can sit together and decide between themselves that one Group will take up a particular portion, another Group another portion and so on. They will adjust according to the time also.

सरदार ए० एस० सहगल : उपाध्यक्ष जी, यदि मेरा वक्त हो गया है तो मैं एक चीज जरूर कहना चाहता हूँ और वह यह

अर्ज करना चाहूंगा कि जबलपुर में जो खमरिया फॅक्टरी के बारे में बहुत सी बातें चलीं उनके बारे में ठंडे दिल से तहकीका करें, और तहकीकात करने के बाद जो वाजिब रास्ता है उसको अपनायें। वहां पर बहुत से लोगों के ऊपर मुकदमे चल रहे हैं, यदि वह समझते हैं कि हां, उन में से बहुत से लोगों पर गैर वाजिब तरीके पर कार्यवाही हो रही है, तो मैं प्रार्थना करूंगा कि इन सारी चीजों को देखने के बाद उचित कार्यवाही की जाय। अगर ऐसा किया जाय तो बहुत अच्छा होगा और इस समय वहां पर जो वातावरण है उसमें रहोबदल हो सकती है। आर्डीनेंस फॅक्टरियों में जो कमी की जा रही है वह ठीक नहीं है इन शब्दों के साथ मैं मंत्री जी से कहूंगा कि जो हमारा महकमा कायम है, उस आर्गेनाइजेशन को आगे बढ़ाने के लिये जो हमारे काम करने वाले हैं जो हमारी रीढ़ हैं उनकी हालत को सुधारें और अपने आर्गेनाइजेशन को मजबूत करें।

श्री भागवत झा आझाद (पूनिया व संचाल परगना) : मैं रक्षा की इस मांग पर

श्री नम्बियार : अंगरेजी में बोलिये, बाबू।

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: I very well appreciate the anxiety of my hon. friend to understand, but it will not be too difficult for him to get the translation. Of course I know that the press will not help, because they are not so kind to the views we express in the House in Hindi. But still he can understand.

मैं इस रक्षा की मांग पर बहस करते हुये, इसके सब पहलुओं पर तो प्रकाश नहीं डाल सकूंगा, लेकिन फिर भी मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस के कुछ भागों पर माननीय मंत्री महोदय का ध्यान आकषित करूँ।

मेरा इस बात का दावा नहीं है कि मैं रक्षा के तीनों विभागों यानी जल से थल सेना और नभ सेना के बारे में जानकारी रखता हूँ लेकिन मैं यह कह सकता हूँ कि मैं एक विद्यार्थी की तरह जानकारी प्राप्त करने का प्रयास कर रहा हूँ। लेकिन कुछ ऐसे विषय हैं जिन पर रक्षा के सम्बन्ध में कोई भी साधारण बुद्धि रखने वाला आदमी विचार कर सकता है। इसमें कोई सन्देह नहीं कि हमारे सैनिक शारीरिक और मानसिक दृष्टि से पूर्ण हैं और चाहे मध्यपूर्व का रेगिस्तान हो चाहे मलाया के जंगल हों वहां पर उन्होंने अपनी बहादुरी का परिचय दिया है और इसमें संदेह नहीं कि जब समय आवेगा तो हिन्दुस्तान की रक्षा करने में भी वे अपनी वीरता का परिचय देंगे। लेकिन आज की लड़ाई में हथियारों का अधिक महत्व है और इन आधुनिक हथियारों ने मनुष्य को पीछे ढकेल दिया है। आज रामायण या महाभारत काल की तरह युद्ध नहीं होता जब कि स्वयं सेनापति हाथ में तलवार या भाला लेकर आगे बढ़ता था। आज तो यह होता है कि कमांडर इंग्लैंड में है और मलाया का पतन होता जाता है। इसलिये ऐसे समय में हमको अपनी कमजोरी को जानना चाहिये। हम जानते हैं कि आज हिन्दुस्तान में जो अस्त्र-बास्त्र हैं वे आजकल की दृष्टि से पूर्ण नहीं हैं। कल हमें एक टैंक देखने का अवसर हुआ जो कि हमारी दृष्टि से पूर्ण है और बहुत आधुनिक है लेकिन वह इंग्लैंड के सेंचुरियन अमरीका के पैटन या रूस के जोसेफ स्टालिन टैंकों के सामने कुछ नहीं है। इसलिये मैं समझता हूँ कि इन टैंकों के मुकाबिले में जो टैंक हमारे पास हैं वह किसी भी काम के नहीं हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे कम्युनिस्ट भाई जोसेफ स्टालिन के नाम को सुन कर प्रसन्न हो रहे हैं क्योंकि वे आज वहां से इन्सपिरेशन लेते हैं। तो मैं यह कह रहा था कि ऐसे टैंकों

[श्री भागवत झा आज्ञाद]

के सामने हमारे टैंक आउट डेटेड हैं । इसी लिये जब अवसर आवेगा तो हम इन पर भरोसा नहीं कर सकते । हमारे रक्षा मंत्री ने भाग दिया कि हम अपनी इंडस्ट्री पर जो खर्चा खर्च कर रहे हैं उसको अस्त्र बनाने में पर खर्च नहीं कर सकते, हम अपने बजट का ५० प्रतिशत अपनी रक्षा पर खर्च करते हैं और इससे अधिक नहीं खर्च कर सकते । लेकिन इसका यह अर्थ नहीं है कि हम उन विभागों पर ध्यान न दें जिनसे हमारी रक्षा हो सकती है । कल इस पर बहुत बहस हुई, सिविल डिफेंस क्या है और इसका बड़ा मजाक रहा । मैं इसकी समझता चाहता हूँ । मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब हमारे सब से बड़े प्रोटेस्ट के बावजूद भी आज अमरीका पाकिस्तान को मिलिटरी एड भेज रहा है तो क्या उससे हमारे और पाकिस्तान के बीच जो शक्ति संतुलन है वह बिगड़ता नहीं है । क्या यह सत्य नहीं है कि आज अमरीका जिस प्रकार से समूचे संसार में युद्ध की क्रिया को प्रोत्साहन दे रहा है उससे युद्ध का खतरा बढ़ रहा है । अभी अभी पैसिफिक में उसने एक आईलैंड पर एक बम का एक्सपेरिमेंट किया है । इस एक्सपेरिमेंट के फलस्वरूप ७० मील की दूरी पर कुछ मछुओं के ऊपर जो राख गिरी उससे उनके बदन में फोड़े हो गये । और मैंने सुना है कि जो मछलियां थीं वह रेडियो एक्टिव हो गयीं और जापान का रेडियो प्रचार कर रहा है कि मछलियां मत खाओ क्योंकि वह रेडियो एक्टिव हो गई हैं और उनके खाने से मर जाओगे । तो आज अमरीका ऐसे विध्वंसकारी अस्त्रों का विकास कर रहा है । हमारे प्रधान मंत्री कहते हैं कि हम शांति पूर्ण उपायों से अपने प्रश्नों को हल करें और वे शांति का प्रस्ताव रखते हैं और जब : कहते हैं कि हम युद्ध पर खर्च

नहीं करेंगे इसी समय अमरीका के बड़े बड़े सिनेटर कमेटी आन एप्रोप्रियेशन्स की सब-कमेटी में जो विचार प्रकट करते हैं उनको मैं उद्धृत करना चाहता हूँ । वे इस प्रकार हैं :

“Senator Ferguson: Well, then, how are you going to distinguish this Government in India? Does it not have a tie to Moscow?”

Mr. Rusk: Mr. McGhee can speak with respect to that. I don't think it does.”

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Hon. Member need not be in a hurry.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: I suppose, Sir, as you have been kind enough in suggesting this to me, you will also be kind in giving me more time.

“Senator Ferguson: You do not really think it does?”

Mr. Rusk: No, Sir.

Senator Ferguson: No tie at all.

Mr. Rusk: I think they are trying to keep from being tied to either Moscow or to us

Senator Ferguson: Does not that tie them to Moscow?”

By simply quoting this...

मैं हाउस के सामने यह बात लाना चाहता हूँ कि आज अमरीका की मेनटिलिटी क्या है । आज उनके बड़े बड़े सिनेटर यह समझते हैं कि अगर हम शांतिपूर्ण उपायों से शांति रखना चाहते हैं तो हम अमरीका के साथ नहीं हैं पर मास्को के साथ हैं और मास्को वाले कहते हैं कि :-

Those who are not with us are against us.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: When did they say it? Quote.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: So simple it is, this theory of yours that those who are not with us are against us.

इसलिये मैं यह कह रहा था कि ऐसे समय में जब कि युद्ध के बादल हर जगह मंडरा रहे हैं और अमरीका की सैनिक शक्ति प्रचुर मात्रा में पाकिस्तान के अड्डों पर पहुंच रही है, क्या हमारा यह फर्ज नहीं है कि यद्यपि हमारे पास अस्त्र शस्त्र नहीं हैं फिर भी हम अपने देश में सैकिड लाइन आफ डिफेंस का प्रबन्ध करें। मैं सिविल डिफेंस का मतलब यह नहीं समझता कि हम खाइयां खोदें या वार साइकालाजी क्रियेट करें लेकिन हम चाहते हैं कि हम अपने देशवासियों को इस तरह संगठित करें कि ऐसा न हो कि अगर दिल्ली में एक बम गिरा तो कोई लखनऊ को भाग रहा है, कोई हैदराबाद को भाग रहा है, और कोई कहीं को भाग रहा है। मैं अपने मंत्री महोदय से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि अगर इस देश पर आक्रमण हुआ तो क्या वह गारंटी दे सकते हैं कि एक बम गिरने पर समूचे देश का मोराल नीचे नहीं गिर जायेगा। क्या त्यागी साहब या दूसरे मिनिस्टर साहब यह कह सकते हैं कि जब एक बम कलकते में गिरेगा तो वहां पर और सारे देश में लोगों का मोराल नहीं गिर जायेगा। मैं जानता हूँ कि हमारे नागरिक डिमारेलाइज्ड नहीं हैं लेकिन उनको सिखाना पड़ेगा। इस देश के पास एन्टी एअर-क्राफ्ट गन्स इतनी नहीं हैं जो कि दुश्मन के हवाई जहाजों को गिरा सकें, इस लिये हमें अपनी शक्ति पर भरोसा करना पड़ेगा। इस शक्ति को बढ़ाने के लिये हम क्या कर रहे हैं? मैं यह नहीं चाहता कि आप भाखरा नांगल योजना से या डी० वी० सी० से रूपया लेकर हवाई जहाज बनावें। लेकिन मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि आप एक ऐसी फौज तैयार करें जो ऐसे समय जब कि हमारे देश पर आक्रमण हो तो हमारे देश के नागरिकों के दिमागों को ठीक रख सके। पंडित जी ने कहा कि हम उस आक्रमण

के बाद तैयारी करेंगे। मैं इस पर कुछ नहीं कह सकता। लेकिन मेरे जैसे छोटी बुद्धि वाले के समझ में यह बात नहीं आई। मैं नहीं समझता कि आक्रमण के बाद भी कोई तैयारी हो सकती है। सबसे बड़ा राजनीतिज्ञ वह है कि जो कि बीते हुये काल और आज का ही विचार नहीं करता बल्कि आने वाले काल का भी विचार करता है और उस विचार के आधार पर हमारे बचाव का विचार करता है। मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे डिप्टी मिनिस्टर इस बात पर कुछ कम जोर दे रहे हैं। मैं जानता हूँ कि वह इस विषय में उतने ही ऐक्सास हूँ जितना कि मैं या इस हाउस का कोई और मम्बर हो सकता है। लेकिन मेरा कहना यह है कि वह इस बात पर जोर नहीं दे रहे हैं। आप कहते हैं कि आपके पास मार्टन हथियार नहीं हैं, आपके पास अधिक शस्त्र नहीं हैं, पर आप कहते हैं कि हम इनर मैन से फाइट करेंगे। तो मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि इस इनर मैन को जगाने के लिये आप क्या कर रहे हैं। क्या टेरीटोरियल आर्मी का आपका माडेस्ट एस्टीमेट भी पूरा हो सका? आज आप क्या कर रहे हैं? आपने कहा कि हम आफिसर्स का कांस्कृप्शन करेंगे। यह सारे देश में नहीं होगा लेकिन पाकिस्तान चिल्लायेगा कि आप कांस्कृप्शन कर रहे हैं। आप ऐसा प्रबन्ध करें कि आप रूल एरियाज से ठीक आदमी ले सकें। आप नान टैकनिकल लोगों को नहीं ले रहे हैं। आप देहाती एरिया में तीन महीने की ट्रेनिंग देते हैं। यह कम है। जब आप आग्जिलरी फोर्स तैयार कर रहे थे तो हमने कहा था कि सात दिन की ट्रेनिंग पर्याप्त नहीं है। यह उस बादल की तरह होगा जो कि आता है, मंडराता है और चला जाता है। आपके आफिसर्स आयेंगे, एक दो लेफ्ट राइट करायेंगे और उसके बाद सब समाप्त हो जायेगा। अस्तु

[श्री भागवत झा आजाद]

मेरा कहना यह है कि अगर हमारे पास काफी मात्रा में फर्टिलिटी लाइन आफ डिफेंस नहीं है तो हमको सैकिंड लाइन आफ डिफेंस मजबूत बनानी चाहिये। इसलिये मैं कहता हूँ कि हम अपने आप को तैयार करें। मैं आपको उदाहरण दूंगा चीन का। जब जापान ने चीन पर चढ़ाई की तो उसके पास मार्डन हथियार नहीं थे। लेकिन उसके पास सैकिंड लाइन आफ डिफेंस थी। चीन का हर एक गांव इस बात के लिये तैयार था कि अगर जापान की चढ़ाई होगी तो हम मार्डन वेपन्स पर भरोसा नहीं करेंगे जो कि दूसरे देशों से आते हैं।

आज अगर हिन्दुस्तान पर चढ़ाई हो तो क्या आप समझते हैं कि अमेरिका के या किसी और मित्रराष्ट्र के टैंक या और मशीनगनों आपकी सहायतायें आप की भूमि पर आ सकेंगे। शायद तब जब सब रास्ते बन्द हो जायेंगे उस हालत में आप क्या करेंगे? क्या आपने इंडस्को इंडस्ट्रियल कोऑपरेटिव्स की तरह जैसे चीन ने जापान के विरुद्ध अपने को तैयार किया, उस तरह हिन्दुस्तान को संभालने का प्रयत्न किया? चीन ने जापान को हराया उस का कारण था उस की स्माल स्केल और कार्टेज इंडस्ट्री। आजकल के तैयार होने वाले मार्डन अस्त्र आपके पास नहीं हैं, आपके पास मार्डन टैंक नहीं हैं आप के पास मार्डन एयरक्राफ्ट नहीं हैं और हम एटम बम और हाइड्रोजन बम की कल्पना भी नहीं कर सकते हैं और न करना चाहते हैं। लेकिन ऐसी स्थिति में जब कि हमारे देश पर कोई आक्रमण हो तो हमारे पास सैकिंड लाइन आफ डिफेंस हो, इसी को हम सिविल डिफेंस कहते हैं। हम सिविल डिफेंस के मतलब यही नहीं लगाते हैं कि एयर रेड प्रीकाशन हो तो डिफेंस हो। हम सिविल डिफेंस की वह परिभाषा नहीं करते हैं। हम सिविल डिफेंस की यह

परिभाषा समझते हैं कि आप के पास रक्षा के लिये एक सैकिंड लाइन आफ डिफेंस हो। इसी लिये हम जानना चाहते हैं कि आपने हमारी रक्षा के लिये क्या उपाय किये। बिना अधिक खर्च के, बिना अधिक खपत लगाये, आप कम से कम यह तो कर सकते हैं। बिना वार साइकालाजी क्रिएट किये हुये श्री आप कम से कम यह काम तो कर सकते हैं। पड़ोसी राष्ट्र पाकिस्तान में आप ने देखा कि किस तरह वे काम करते हैं आपकी तरफ ट्रेनिंग देने को जाते हैं। लोग आते हैं और उनको ट्रेनिंग दी जाती है, कहा जाता है कि तुम चाहे जिस ड्रेस में होवो, तुम को ट्रेनिंग दी जाती है, वह उनको सब बातें सिखाते हैं। और एक इधर यह हाल है कि हमारे यहां के मेम्बरान को राइफल ट्रेनिंग देने के लिये कहते हैं तो वह नहीं मिलती।

श्री सतीश चन्द्र : मिलेगी।

श्री भागवत झा आजाद : हां, मिलेगी, लेकिन कब, क्या उस समय मिलेगी जब कि छट्टी हो जायेगी।

श्री त्यागी : आपका बगैर राइफल के तो यह हाल है ?

श्री भागवत झा आजाद : लेकिन मैं जानता हूँ कि जब ऊपर से बम वर्षा होगी तो यह राइफल काम नहीं देगी, वही राइफल काम देगी। इस लिये जो हमारी जवान की राइफल है, उस पर आप भरोसा न करें।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : दो मिनट और हैं।

तो मैं यह कह रहा था कि हमारे देश की यह हालत है। मैंने शुरू में ही अपनी अनभिज्ञता प्रकट की है कि हवाई जहाज में, जल सेना और स्थल सेना में क्या होता

। लेकिन इतना जानता हूँ कि वह उतने मार्डन नहीं हैं जितने होने चाहिये। इसलिये हम उन पर अधिक भरोसा नहीं कर सकते हैं।

इस कारण ही मैंने कहा कि हमको सैकिड लाइन आफ डिफेंस रखनी चाहिये। क्या आप समझते हैं कि महज कह देने से काम चल सकता है, क्या आप समझते हैं कि जब बम वर्षा हो तो लोगों को कहने से कि घबराना मत, क्या इससे देश तैयार हो जायेगा? क्या आप समझते हैं कि हम लोग एम० पी० बाहर जाकर यह कहें कि हमारे डिफेंस मिनिस्टर साहब ने, हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने कहा है कि घबराने की कोई बात नहीं है, आप खड़े रहिये, बम कैसे गिर सकता है, तो क्या इससे देश तैयार हो जायेगा? हमारा अनुभव है कि कलकत्ता में जब बम गिरे तो सब के सब आदमियों का वहां से भागना शुरू हो गया। ऐसी हालत हो उस समय आप क्या करेंगे? आज के जमाने में न रूस अमेरिका पर विजय कर सकता है और न अमेरिका रूस पर विजय कर सकता है। लेकिन आप के पास सैकिड लाइन आफ डिफेंस नहीं है और आप पर आक्रमण हो तो आप का पड़ोसी देश आप के यहां फौजें भी उतार सकता है, इस तरह की घटना हो सकती है। मैं नहीं चाहता कि ऐसी घटना हो, भगवान करे कि ऐसी घटना न हो, लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे पास सिविल डिफेंस नहीं है।

आप के यहां आर्म्स एक्ट है। उपाध्यक्ष जी, उस आर्म्स एक्ट का क्या हाल है कि एम० पी० राइफल क्लब के लिये मैंने सात महीने पहले दिल्ली स्टेट के पास राइफल को लाइसेंस के लिये अर्जी दी थी। रोज छः आने पैसे टेलीफोन पर खर्च करता हूँ। लेकिन आज तक वह लाइसेंस नहीं आया। जिस

देश की यह हालत है वहां सैकिड लाइन आफ डिफेंस क्या बन सकती है। जिस देश की यह हालत है कि यहां का नागरिक एक मामूली राइफल हैंडल नहीं कर सकता तो वह एंटी एयरक्राफ्ट गन क्या हैंडल कर सकेगा। इस लिये आप को इसकी तैयारी करना चाहिये।

इस में कोई सन्देह नहीं है कि हमारे अन्दर भय नहीं है, हम घबराते नहीं हैं, हम डरते नहीं हैं। हम जानते हैं कि जिस बक्त देश पर आक्रमण होगा तो चाहे कोई कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी का हो चाहे किसी और पार्टी का हो, हिन्दुस्तान का बच्चा बच्चा देश की रक्षा करेगा। लेकिन उसको स्पिट दीजिये, उस को शिक्षा दीजिये तभी आप आने वाले कल के दिन रक्षा कर सकेंगे।

इन्ही शब्दों के साथ मैं समाप्त करता हूँ।

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: Today we are discussing the Budget under the shadow of the Pak-U.S. Aid Pact. This naturally brings home to us the greater urgency of the problem of how to build up a strong army capable of defending our country as well as developing a defence industry capable of coping with its responsibilities.

Last year, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru spent a great deal of the time of his speech in showing that it was not the numerical strength of the Army, the Navy and the Air Force alone which determines the fate of a war, but the technical efficiency and improvement of the capacity to produce all the necessities of defence. We certainly accept the importance of technical efficiency. But, we do not agree that this is the biggest factor that ultimately decides the fate of a war, especially when you have to deal with an under-developed country. The biggest factor is the human factor. The question of the morale of the people, how we mobilise all our re-

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty.]

sources, the technical 'know-how' which is at our disposal, how we are able to enthuse the people as well as the Army and make it into a homogeneous and invincible whole,—these are very important.

When we discuss this Defence budget, we have to bear in mind a new factor and that new factor is this. Those whom the Indian Government had looked upon as the saviours of our Defence Forces, those on whom, it has been said, we have to rely for historical reasons—again and again we have heard this expression "historical reasons", many of us in this House think that these historical reasons should have warned us as to what will be the fate of our friendship with U.K. and U.S.A. (An Hon. Member: Hysterical.)—those very people have at a very critical moment let us down. We have tried to show that remaining within the Commonwealth does not give us all the benefits without any of the disadvantages. Whether it has been the question of Kashmir, whether it has been South Africa, or now when it has come to the question of U.S.-Pak-Pact, what is it that U.K. has done? When the United States of America, in spite of all the protestations of our Government, has gone in for military aid to Pakistan, they have consistently supported it,—whether it is Mr. Eden, whether it is the United Kingdom High Commissioner here, whether it is Lord Swinton or whether it is the present representative of the United Kingdom who is participating in the Commonwealth talks in Lahore. That is what exactly happens when we go with the beggar's bowl. The Finance Minister, only the other day, spoke very vociferously and proudly that we do not beg from anybody. But, it has been ignominiously said and we have seen the United States telling the world, and so also Britain, that there is no difference between economic aid and military aid. They go about saying that the first military mission is not in Karachi, but in India. We

have always been giped at by the Prime Minister when we say that remaining within the Commonwealth will bring us in to difficulties. Pandit Nehru has talked of imperialism as if it does not exist any longer. We shall go on telling him that the Commonwealth remains a danger to our growth, to our development and to our freedom, for, within the Commonwealth, it is the United Kingdom, it is South Africa, it is Canada, it is Australia, the white section within the Commonwealth which remains imperialistic, and imperialists are always blood brothers. They remain within the NATO. That is why they threaten at every time, whether it is Goa or whether it is a question of the French possessions, that the NATO will be utilised against us. This blood bond cannot be broken by playing between the two camps.

In the first Budget debate in which we participated, when we spoke on the Defence budget, we pointed out the direct influence of the British through their officers retained in our Defence Forces. Last year, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru told us that we do not have a single British officer in any operational post. As far as we know, there are certain people who are still in rather "high up" executive posts. I do not know whether you would call them operational officers. Certainly, it is true that in our ordnance factories, in our training depots as advisers we still have quite a large number of British officers.

Shri Tyagi: Not very large.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Now, I will quote to you not from Communist sources, but from the *Amrita Bazaar Patrika*, a very pro-Congress paper and a virulent anti-Communist paper. After hearing Mr. Tyagi's enumeration of the number of foreigners in our Defence

department, this is what they remarked:

"Their present number which is about 200 is likely to cause serious misgivings.....apart from this, the policy of employing so many foreigners in Indian Defence Services can hardly receive public support, particularly at a time when devious currents of international politics and diplomacy are hard to fathom. One should furthermore like to enquire why even six years after independence India should require so many foreigners in her defence services."

It is certainly stated that we require them because we are under-developed. We have not got the 'know-how' and therefore we need technical people. But we have to see how far really we have been able to industrialise. Already, previous speakers have given certain specific examples. For instance, Shri Satish Chandra was worried and wanted specific examples as to how matters are being, shall we call it, sabotaged, shall we say, held up in industrialisation. For instance, I would like to have an answer to this. I hear that one of our many factories has been producing 20 and 40 mm. cartridges. They have stopped during the last six months, and the reason is that there is a Mr. Gibbs, a technical officer, who has to pass the things produced at the factory, and he has not passed them, and now we are importing these from the United Kingdom. This is a very small matter no doubt. We do not yet produce very big things, but it is certainly true—I will show you, you may laugh at it, you may deny it.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am not laughing at it. The hon. Member must address the Chair.

Shri V. P. Nayar (Chirayinkil): You are smiling.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I will show you another example about the

rate of industrial development, from the budget figures themselves.

Shri Satish Chandra: She has some serious misapprehension about the matter. (*Interruption*).

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: How far has the rate of industrial development been speeded up? We find that in 1952-53 we spent about Rs. 1 crores. In 1953-54 we find a figure—peculiar thing—we find a revised estimate for Rs. 25 lakhs only. This year, the Budget estimate for 1954-55 is Rs. 125 lakhs. I wonder how much of it will be a shortfall again. Not only this, in 1953-54 in the Defence Capital Outlay a sum of Rs. 15 crores was budgeted. Now, we are told the revised estimate for the year is only Rs. 10,36,30,000. We would like to know why, at a time when we are speaking so much about industrialisation of our defence establishments, that we must go ahead and must not rely on foreigners, even the amount that is budgeted is not utilised to the full.

Then, let us look at our purchases of stores and equipment from abroad. I would not like to spend much time on this because there are a number of other points I want to make, and the previous speakers have already shown how the figures have gone up and not gone down. And then again, what we have brought has not been the latest or the most modern ones. We have contented ourselves, as my previous speakers have said, with outmoded weapons, as was brought to light during the last debate about Sealands. That is why we say that we have to give up this idea of getting the foreigners to help us. We will only find that the foreigners will try to retard and impede our progress. We will have to depend more on mobilising to the maximum the defence capacity of our Army, Navy and Air Force with the present technological level of development which we have. Certainly we shall try to go ahead. It may be difficult when we are hemmed in on all sides by imperialists who are

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty.]

not going to give us the 'know-how' which will go against them. So, that is why we do not under-estimate the need of constant effort to get over our backwardness. But we must also realise that the attainment of technical progress is something that is dependent on other factors also. We have to go on thinking how to gain the maximum defence capacity within our limited technical resources.

Many amongst our Army people as well as the Government cannot get out of thinking that the only way to go about it is to somehow model ourselves on the United Kingdom and on the United States pattern and we forget that they have built up their Army and defence entirely on a different basis. They have a huge and technically developed background and economy with much smaller manpower, whereas with us it is just the opposite. Therefore the tendency grows to trust material rather than men. Yet is it not surprising that we have never thought of trying to study the methods utilised by the Chinese Army? As soon as China is mentioned, some people throw up their arms, saying: "Red China. Communists want us to go to China"! If we are really patriotic, if we really want to learn from everybody, and especially from a country that has had to face the same difficulties and limitations we have, has it not occurred to any of our defence people and those in charge of this Ministry in the Government to try and study the methods of China? We do not want to speak of people like Mr. Anthony who try to question our loyalty—we treat it with the contempt it deserves. Where was he when the fight for freedom was going on? But when we see this fear on the part of Government not to learn from where we should learn, when we do not learn from the circumstances which are similar to ours elsewhere, we begin to have certain suspicions that really we are tied on to one set of thinking, and that

thinking is going to land us into difficulties. (*Interruption*) I do not know why that undertone goes on there. They will have their chance.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: They ought not to be talking across the benches.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: They are worried because I have mentioned the word "China". (*Interruption*)

In the Chinese Army, the strategy and tactics have grown out of its own experience. They rely on man-power, not on a technically developed economy which is the basis and the strength of the United Kingdom Army or the United States Army.

There is one other point I would like to stress. It is true that the number of British officers in our Army, Navy and Air Force is being reduced, but there is one other danger which we see in that, although we are replacing the white by the brown, the training, the mentality, the outlook that we are giving our officers is still of the old type. I would like every clearly to state that we still have as the head of the Indian Staff College a British officer, and the high priest of strategic thinking in Army Headquarters is another Britisher—General Russel. (*An Hon. Member:* He has left.)

Shri Tyagi: He has retired.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: He has left only during the last week. And then all our Generals and future Admirals and Air Marshals get their training at the Imperial Defence College. The Imperial Defence College is an Imperial Institution designed to defend the Empire. Of course, we are asked to believe there is no Empire left. We are not prepared to accept that. The Imperial Defence College is the highest organ of training in Britain, and the Americans have a share in the proceedings. What unites them both is the interest in the cold war, with the accent on a rise in temperature against the Soviet Union. The mission of the Imperial

Defence College is to prepare the blueprint for World War III. Our officers go there. What is it they learn? They learn, maybe, a certain amount of technical knowledge. But they also learn the ideological part of anti-Sovietism, and they learn how it is that inevitably the Soviet Union is going to attack, and it is because the Soviet Union is the main aggressor, that NATO is the peace effort of the freedom-loving countries! What have we got to do with this framework? Have our officers anything to contribute in this background? That is why we say it is not sufficient only to replace white officers, but to replace the 'White Saheb' mentality with a truly people's mentality.

We still continue to look upon our Army as a separate caste. That struck me very forcibly when we were discussing the Cantonments (Amendment) Bill. The cantonments were—I will not call it a figment, for it is a very big reality—built up with the conception of a Britisher, in order to segregate the Army from the people. I remember well how Sardar Majithia in the course of his speech, insisted, in spite of even certain protestations from his own party, that it was necessary to continue with the cantonments. It is this idea of a separate casteism which is really a brasshat attitude, and which is completely out of keeping with the things of today.

Lastly, I would like to expand this point that in a technically backward country like ours, it is the men who count, and not so much the material. If that be so, one of the most important factors is to build up the comradeship between the officers and the men. Last time, in the course of the debate on the Defence budget, the hon. Prime Minister talked very eloquently about the relations between the officers and the men. He said, they sang, they danced, and they were happy; and Shri Jaipal Singh said, good show, good show! But what is needed is not mere singing and dancing, but something more than that.

We have to think in terms of the real things that matter, and what the differences in the scales of pay of the officers and the men mean. I would give you quotations from your own figures, but I would not like to take up the time of the House. However, I would just say that in the case of a Second-Lieutenant, he starts from a pay of Rs. 350, and in his twenty-fourth year of service, he draws a pay of Rs. 1,400. But if we see the lowest rate of the Other Ranks, we find that a person belonging to the Other Ranks starts with a pay of Rs. 25 in class III, Rs. 30 in class II, and Rs. 35 in class I. It is true that the officers may need more, for, maybe, they have to keep up appearances a little more, but it is also true that the basic minimum for the Other Ranks should not be merely Rs. 25. I would therefore say that the spirit of comradeship which develops by singing and dancing is not enough; in a poor country like ours, we must try for a spirit of comradeship by the sharing of the common burdens and difficulties of life together. It is not economy that I am so much stressing here, because I do not think we shall be able to produce much out of that; but it does create a great psychological effect. I do not say that it is necessary only in the Defence Department, but I think it is necessary for every other department, including Members of Parliament, and I think we shall raise our voice again, when we discuss our own salaries and allowances, when that matter comes up before the House. I say it is essential to build a contented army. It is essential to build a homogeneous army. That is why we have to level down to a certain degree the differences. I know that if we appeal to the patriotism of our officers—they have that patriotism in our officers—they will themselves accept it, and realise the political and other psychological factors involved in such a change.

Next I come to the question of living quarters. This question of the

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty.]

living quarters is something that has brought great hardships to our Army, both the civilian workers as well as the active fighting forces. For instance, if you go to Panagarh, and see the conditions, you will be shocked to find the condition of the condemned barracks they have to live in. Family quarters are so few that many tragic occurrences have taken place as a result of this. Yet in the budgeted figures, what is it that we see? Under the head 'Major Works—Army' we find that a sum of Rs. 23 lakhs had been budgeted originally, while the revised estimate stands at Rs. 12 lakhs, for the year 1953-54. Why is there this reduction? At a time, when the MES is being retrenched, when we say that we need more houses for our soldiers and our jawans in the Army, why has been there this colossal reduction? Again, under the head 'Abnormal Repairs' a sum of Rs. 1.5 crores had been budgeted, but the revised estimate stands at Rs. 85 lakhs. Similarly, under the head 'Major Works—Air Force', we find that the original estimate for the year 1953-54 was Rs. 4.87 lakhs, but the revised estimate stands at Rs. 1 lakh. We would like to have an answer to the question why there has been a reduction in all these cases. Why is it that at a time when the defence workers are undergoing great hardships for lack of proper accommodation, there is so much of unspent money?

I would like to say one or two words in regard to the pension rules. Our Government have now excelled themselves in forming committees, and refusing to accept their recommendations or to publish their reports. I have seen this happening in the Rehabilitation Directorate, and I am again seeing it in the Defence Department also. The Lal Committee's recommendations have been suppressed. The rational basis on which they tried to work out the pension rules have not been accepted. It is true that some changes have been made, and these have been indicated in the little brochure entitled the New Deal, which

we got from Shri Tyagi. But it is time that we have made some changes in the rules which have been there since 1917 onwards. But even under this 'New Deal', we see glaring injustices. For instance, a jafadar of A group class I, in the highest category draws a maximum pay of Rs. 155, with Rs. 30 dearness allowances; but after twenty-five years of service, he gets a pension of Rs. 55 as against Rs. 40 given hitherto. So there has not been much of an increase. If we look at the amount which a civilian with the same earning gets, we find that under the old rules, he was getting Rs. 62 but according to the Gadgil Committee's recommendations, he will be now getting Rs. 85. In all these cases, we have to take into consideration the human aspect, and not frame pension rules in an artificial manner, without taking into account that the free boarding, free lodging etc. which he had while in service, are taken away from him on retirement.

Shri Tyagi: In the Army, the officer retires much younger.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: But here he works much harder, and much more strenuously, and I could give you many examples of that. As against all this, he is getting only a pittance.

In regard to civilian defence workers, Shri Tyagi has given them a 'New Deal', which is no new deal at all. We do not consider it as a new deal at all, because what is it that has happened? The Kalyanwalla Committee was appointed to go into the matter of pay scales, but unfortunately Mr. Kalyanwalla died, and there were only two persons left, one from the Labour Ministry, and the other from the Defence Department. The somewhat progressive recommendations made by Mr. Subrahmaniam were not accepted by Government, but the recommendations of Mr. B. B. Ghosh, who was a man from the Defence Ministry itself, were accepted mostly. If this were to be so, we would like

to know what was the need for having this eyewash of a committee at all. You could have set up a departmental committee, and done what you liked. We would suggest that the recommendations of the Kalyanwalla Committee, especially those of Mr. Subrahmaniam must be given effect to. If they are not to be accepted, we would suggest that since the two members of the Committee had differed among themselves, the matter should go before a tribunal, and the final decision should be that of that tribunal.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have already given the hon. Member twenty-two minutes.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Five more minutes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There more minutes I shall give.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I am more or less the only spokesman of my party.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member is speaking very well. I shall allow her five minutes more.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam): Chivalrous.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I do not want any chivalry from you Sir, but I know you are kind enough to give some more time because you know that I speak on behalf of a party which has got quite a big following outside in this country.

There is also another discontent in regard to the decision of the Ministry to reckon the service of workers from 1st August 1949. Nearly 15,000 clerks will be falling under this, and there will be lots of reversions, and great injustice will be done to them. The demand of the workers' Federation is for a negotiating machinery and this at least should be met. It is not a revolutionary demand that they are making, it is the most normal thing that they are demanding, because they are asking for something that has been granted to the workers in the Railways, and I think the same should be

granted so far as ordnance workers also are concerned.

I would not go into what Shri Tyagi calls in his 'New Deal' as the more favourable terms that have been given to the defence workers, as compared to what obtains in private industries etc., because I have not got the time for that. But I would like to say that the concession of giving Rs. 30 to unskilled and Rs. 35 to skilled workers is really an eyewash. Only the Central Pay Commission's recommendations have been implemented, which was done years ago in so many of the States, and by so many private industrialists. After five years, their recommendation in regard to minimum wages has been accepted, and this is called the 'New Deal'. Instead of the piece-rates being revised, this is shown as the great revolutionary step that our friend Shri Tyagi has taken.

I would like to say a word about security of service.

Shri Tyagi: You were always kind to me in the past, I know.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I hope you will assure us that we are living in the present.

Regarding security of service, I will not go into the question of contract labour, because that point has already been mentioned, but I would say that there is no security yet to the majority of workers. They are only temporary or casual workers. Again, certain new policies are being introduced such as the militarisation of civil cadres. For instance, the civilian gate-keepers in the defence services. Some have attained the scale of pay of about Rs. 225, after nearly ten or fifteen years of service. Suddenly they are asked to quit, because they were temporary, and they were never made permanent. Now they are offered a lower division clerk's pay of Rs. 85, or asked to quit. But their place is being taken by J.C.O.'s. I think this is most unfair, and certainly, this is not going to solve the problem of unemployment.

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

5 P.M.

The whole question of the utilisation to full capacity of ordnance factories has been put off. The hon. Prime Minister said last year that they had decided to set up a committee to go into the entire question. Then it took them ten months to announce the names of the members of the committee. Now, after the announcement of these names, what do we find? We find represented prominently amongst them the representatives of capital. Sardar Baldev Singh is there, whose views we all know, because when he himself was the Defence Minister this question was put to him, and he categorically rejected it at that time. Then there is Mr. Kirloskar, also a manufacturer of machine tools and a big capitalist. Surely, we would say that though we do not mind your taking them, we certainly have certain doubts because can you believe they can desire to have potential competitors in a shrinking market and that too of State enterprises; and yet in this Committee the workers' representatives have not been included. That, I think, is a very serious handicap. If they want to effect any real reorganisation, the question of security of service, the permanency of service etc. have to be taken up. Not only the small quota of industrial workers must be regarded as permanent cadres but the question of permanency of service of entire workers of the ordnance factories has to be taken up.

I would just say that if we really want to build up the potential that we already have in spite of our backwardness, the army must become a part of the people. They must not only defend the people in time of war but in time of peace also they must serve the people. They must be utilised to build bridges, construct roads; they must be useful for digging wells, developing waste lands and fallow lands etc. Only thus will the people begin to realise that the army is our army, it is a people's army, it is not an army that only seeks legislation to be

used to aid civil power for quelling people's movements, only then they will regard it as a people's army, and only then in spite of everything the army can stand against all odds. That has been proved in the case of China and North Korea. Without one single aircraft at their command, they have fought against superior arms and air power and have won, because the people stood behind them. Therefore, we know that the people are invincible if we can mobilise them even in an undeveloped country. That is what we want to place before this House.

Shrimati Sushama Sen (Bhagalpore South): Sir, I am thankful to you for giving me this opportunity and I am glad to participate in this debate because I was one of the first persons who mooted the question of compulsory military training. At that time the Deputy Minister for Defence said that there was no demand for such a step and it was not necessary and that their financial position also did not allow of compulsory military training. I am glad to find that now it has been decided to expand the territorial force and that it has now become an established fact. Now, it would be better if we could expand the National Cadet Corps and the other auxiliary forces which are there.

Regarding ordnance factories, Mr. Patnaik said that we should manufacture all the military equipment in our country. He said that they were all being imported now. Sir, I do not agree that they are, because we find in the statement that some are being manufactured here. I do not see any reason why we should not expand this manufacture so that all our other requirements like blankets and other requirements for the army are provided in this country.

As we know, the army has already been doing very useful work and therefore the demand for expanding it is quite justified. But I do not see any reason for being so panicky and feeling that war is imminent or that we must immediately mobilise for civil

defence, as Mr. Patnaik said. The Prime Minister has already assured us that there is no imminent danger and I do not see any reason why we should be panicky and spread a sort of fear throughout the whole country. At the same time, it is necessary to expand our army and be ready for any eventuality. I was in London when civil defence was organised there just before the war. War was not so imminent and yet there was such a panic there that some of the ladies with whom we were staying in the hotel were actually having fainting fits! So I do not see why we should be so panicky. We have to depend on our organisation. The defence organisation is quite capable of taking care of that, with the Prime Minister himself at the head, with his most efficient lieutenants. So I do not think we should have any fear of any immediate danger. At the same time, of course, I would appeal to the Minister for Defence Organisation to keep everything in such a state of preparedness that in case there is an emergency, there is no lack of discipline or organised effort to keep the country in a proper state of readiness.

Sir, I would like to refer to one or two other things which come uppermost in my mind. We often have heard about the grievances of the civilian defence employees and the demand for setting up a negotiating machinery to decide the unsettled disputes. I think it is most necessary that there should not be so much retrenchment at the present moment when there is so much unemployment. I believe that as many as 5,000 employees of Defence factories were faced with retrenchment and another 16,000 temporary employees have been made to suffer on account of the Government's policy to give priority to Indian superior personnel in the matter of confirmation. The All-India Defence Employees' Federation claims to represent nearly 2,64,000 civilian employees including those in the defence industries. The Kalyanwalla Enquiry Committee had not finalised its report. Mr. Kalyanwalla died and in his absence, I do not

60 P.S.D.

know what has happened. I think this matter should be gone into and we should see that the grievances of the civilian defence employees are redressed. I know from my own experience what a splendid work the defence people have done everywhere. In Bihar, especially, they did a lot of work. In 1950 a series of calamities overtook Bihar. In some parts of the State famine seemed imminent unless supplies could be rushed. Swollen rivers made access to these areas difficult. The army helped to avert the famine by carrying 8,000 maunds of foodgrains within three weeks even to the remote villages in this area.

So we know that the army has been doing splendid work and my request to the Defence Ministry is to see that these splendid young men who are serving in the Army, Navy and Air Force are properly paid. I have often found that there is a certain amount of anxiety amongst them, especially among those who are serving in the front, that their families or their children are not properly looked after. Their family pensions have been stopped. This is a matter which, I think, ought to be considered by the Defence Ministry, who should see that these young people who are doing such yeoman service to our country are not over-anxious and are placed in such a condition that their families are provided and are above need. I know that the children of those who are serving in the front have no schools to go to, and their families are somewhat anxious. This should be rectified by the Defence Ministry.

Another thing that I would like to place as I said before, is about the defence implements. These implements should be manufactured in our own country as far as possible. We should see that the imports of these implements are not as high as they are at the present moment. I think that in our own country we can manufacture goods if not better implements in some respect than foreign ones. So, why should not this opportunity be given to our countryman to develop the defence implement industry?

[Shrimati Sushama Sen]

It will to a certain extent, relieve unemployment if these young people are employed in the production of these implements. They have been helping in all kinds of civilian work, right from the making of roads. In the Punjab, I have myself seen these young people making roads and helping in every kind of other work. So, I would appeal to Government that these young people should be given facilities to continue the work which they are doing. More facilities should be given to young unemployed people by employing them and helping them to do their work properly.

Shri Kanavade Patil (Ahmednagar North): Before I deal with the Defence budget, I should, in the first place, like to take this opportunity to congratulate our Defence Ministry and all our Defence Services,—the Air Force, the Army and the Navy—for the very strenuous and continual efforts they are putting in towards making the defence of our country strong and adequate. In spite of our many financial difficulties, the Finance Ministry has been able to allot Rs. 205,62,00,000 for defence, which is nearly half of our total Budget.

The first point of great importance which has been realised by all of us is the problem of India's defence. It is well known that we have got a very long coastal line and also long frontiers which are quite vulnerable to enemy attacks. Naturally the question is whether for the present our military strength is such as would be able to meet any danger from outside. I need hardly say that the latest American policy towards our country and its tactics have created a lot of trouble, so far as our defence is concerned. Their military alliance with Pakistan has created quite a new situation not only so far as our country is concerned but for the whole of Asia. It is significant to note that Pakistan's continuous refusal to sign a No-War Agreement with us is an indication of her clear intentions to fight this country one day or the other. I believe

that it is unsafe for us to remain under the belief that Pakistan, if we bring about some sort of negotiations, will not fight against this country. I am sorry I cannot accept this view as a very practical and correct view.

It is my considered opinion that Pakistan is determined to fight this country one day or the other and we must from this point of view see how far the present military strength is sufficient to meet the situation. The Pakistan leaders have, from time to time expressed themselves very clearly on this point, not only on Kashmir but on so many other imaginary grievances that they have against this country. No amount of our high principles and our talking about the doctrines of non-violence and truth will go to convince Pakistan and it will not help us to come to some sort of a permanent peace or friendship with Pakistan.

The latest effort of America to sign a military pact and its attempts to rope in all the Asiatic-Muslim countries in their military collaboration with Pakistan, and the Turco-Pakistan treaty, are cases in point. I do not know how far the other Muslim States are going to support this association. It may be that Egypt, Afghanistan and Iran and some other countries may not think it fit to join this M.E.D.O., and therefore, I believe the American efforts to isolate this country are likely to fail. I may submit that this treaty is looked upon by the bulk of the Muslim countries as a suspicious affair altogether. They do not believe that this is going to help Pakistan. In fact it is believed by some eminent Asiatic statesmen that Pakistan stands to gain nothing by this treaty.

However, it is always better to be cautious and I very humbly submit that we have to see whether we are prepared to meet danger. If we remain under some sort of an illusion that there will be no present danger, it may be that we will be helpless after some time. Therefore, I submit for

the consideration of this House that it is the foremost duty of every Indian to see that this country is militarily strong. How can we be militarily strong if we have not got sufficiently big war industries when the world is preparing, especially the European powers,—England and other Western European Powers are preparing to attack other or defend their countries with atomic weapons? This, indeed, is a very tragic situation.

I do not want that we should be afraid of the present atomic development in arms and weapons. This American policy of creating so much atomic power is really a threatening situation for the existence of the whole world. They have created a sort of dilemma for this country and it is also directly and indirectly a sort of coercion against this country. It is mainly with a view to violate our neutrality so that we may be forced to go this or the other way. That is probably the idea behind the pact which America has signed with Pakistan.

Therefore, I would like to submit that the present Budget Estimates, so far as our defence is concerned, seem to be very small. I know that under the present financial conditions of this country, there could not have been a better arrangement or a better Budget, but we should find sufficient amounts for the purpose of our defence. I may add here that unless this country which is economically backward and under-developed tries its level best to execute the Five Year Plan, we are not going to have sufficient material to strengthen our defence. Naturally, our improvement in the economic side will be the basis of our strength in defence.

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA
in the Chair]

When we make proposals to the Government that these Defence Estimates are not sufficient to meet the needs of our defence wants, we have also got to see to the financial conditions of the country. We cannot go on taking aid from this country or that.

We have got some day to stand upon our own legs, financially. I feel that side by side with our military preparations the Five Year Plan also must be carried out as quickly as possible.

I may compare our Budget with the British Budget of this year. Our Budget figures are so insignificant and small. Great Britain has budgeted nearly £1,700 million; which approximately comes to Rs. 2,400 crores. Britain is a small country; its size is so small compared to India. Looking at our own country, its big size, long frontiers and coastal lines, I may say our country's Budget is insignificant and absolutely small.

What about the United States of America? The figures there are simply astronomical and it is very difficult to read them in an ordinary way. They have put up these heavy figures with the sole purpose of creating atomic weapons. I may read with your kind permission, a few lines from the *Times of India*—the leader article dated the 24th March, 1954 with the caption 'Atomic Madness':

"All men of goodwill must hope that the details of the recent atomic explosion on March 1 in the Marshall Islands will liberate the people—the common citizens of all nations sharing the common threat of this atomic madness—from this self-destructive apathy.

A few simple facts of what occurred on March 1 dramatically tell a story of stark horror the implications of which should impel every citizen of every civilised State to agitate immediately for saner and more humane counsels by the politicians and statesmen of today. A bomb—whether it is hydrogen powered has not been established—six hundred times as destructive as those used against Hiroshima and Nagasaki detonated with such tremendous force that even the scientists were startled by the results. It appears fairly certain that the Japanese fishermen who were burnt by radio-active

[Shri Kanavade Patil.]

ashes were well outside the specified danger-zone. Casualties occurred as many as sixty or seventy miles away, and two hundred islanders as well as twenty-eight American observers were injured by radiation."

This is how the atomic development of nuclear energy is causing terrific disturbance. American and British Budgets are mainly based on creating more and more destructive weapons. As our Prime Minister said the other day, it may be that another war might bring about the extinction of the whole of mankind. I am really surprised with what motives the big Powers are creating these atom bombs and other bombs. Is it only to fight against the Communists? I do not believe it, I very humbly submit. Their main idea is probably to bring about world domination. That is the idea behind the production of these terrific and destructive bombs.

Our country has produced a series of great men, Lord Krishna, Buddha and others, and Mahatma Gandhi who have all taught us the doctrines of peace, universal love and brotherhood and non-violence. But the Western countries are thinking only in terms of bombs. They are sending their missionaries here and they want to teach us about religion. What is the use of all their talk about philosophy, God, universal brotherhood and other lofty principles relating to mankind, against the production of these destructive bombs? It has been stated even in the Scriptures (St. Mathew's Gospel):

"Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves.Not every one that saith unto me Lord, Lord, shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven".

This is what even the Holy Scriptures say. Therefore, without going further into the point, I would very humbly submit that side by side with our military preparation, this country must also be prepared to show that

not only are we here to preserve our high ideals but we shall also beat back any efforts of any Powers who think in terms of attacking us.

Lastly I want to submit that we must be very cautious about the intrigues of foreign agents. They may try to create some sort of split among the Indian rank and file. It is our duty to see that we reorganise our whole Defence system and Security system on such a basis that persons of doubtful character are checked and watched very carefully. This has to be done in the interests of solidarity and security of our Motherland.

My time is very short and I am not able to put forward all my views. In my opinion undue importance has been given to American aid. I know that America is a mighty-Power. But there are always some strings attached to American aid, to whichever country it is given. The recipient country is always, economically and politically, subjugated to American policy. Let us examine what happened to those who got American aid. Chiang Kai-Shek got it in China. Where is he today? Look at Dr. Syngman Rhee. What is he today? He got American dollars, got help, men, ammunition and everything. But what could they do against the North Koreans and Chinese? Nothing. France is getting American aid. She is losing battle after battle against popular forces in Indo-China, in spite of the aid. The only weapon in the American armoury is the atom bomb. We have not seen what havoc it has wrought elsewhere. But that is the only weapon with which she is likely to threaten any people who are opposed to the American plan.

We have complete faith in our Prime Minister who said only two days ago:

"We have to think in terms of defence in more realistic terms today. The best defence ultimately is a certain psychology that one produces in the country, an certain unity that one produces in the country and a certain lack of fear."

Before concluding I wish to say that if we keep our profound faith in our own unity and devotion to God we have nothing to be afraid of from America or from the Pak-American Pact.

यत्र योगेश्वरः कृष्णो यत्र पार्थो धनुर्धरः ।
तत्र श्रीविजयो भूतिर्ध्रुवा नीतीर्मतीर्मम ॥

With these words I conclude.

Shri G. S. Singh: I must thank you, Sir, for giving me this opportunity. I had very little hope of ever getting it!

As this is a debate on the Defence Services of India and the Defence Forces of India I feel it is only proper to open it by congratulating those members of the Custodian force of India who did a valiant job in Korea. They carried out a difficult task bravely and tactfully, and I think the thanks of this House and of the country should go to them. I would also suggest to the Ministry that they might consider even striking a commemorative medal to be given to these forces in gratitude for the duties performed by them.

I would also like, before I get to the Defence Estimates, to congratulate the Indian Air Force which in two or three days' time will be celebrating its twenty-first birthday. It has come of age, and I think it is competent in its efficiency, in its man-power and in its morale to be able to take up the arduous task of defending this country. That task also is enhanced by the recent Aid Pact. I am glad to say that on the 1st of April the Indian Air Force will have an Indian Commander-in-Chief who will, I am sure, maintain the traditions that have been so bravely kept by this Service. While congratulating the Service on getting an Indian Commander-in-Chief, in spite of the fact that the lady Communist Member had something to say about British advisers, I would like to thank those British advisers and the British Government for having sent us such able officers during the past years who have enabled us to maintain

and to raise the standard of all our forces with which they have had any connection.

Last year, after a long rigmarole, Prime Minister Nehru eventually discovered Chengiz Khan. This year we find that he has discovered a General—who has been, unfortunately, unwittingly forced upon his attention—General Eisenhower. We have heard a great deal about the U.S.-Pakistan Pact. While condemning it wholeheartedly and agreeing with all those people who have condemned it, I must say that every cloud has a silver lining. This Pak-American Pact has given this country, every individual in it, every political party in it and every leader in it, a wonderful opportunity for unifying the country. It is for us not to lose this opportunity. These chances do not come often. We must therefore grab this opportunity to unify and consolidate the country.

Another point which is rather bright is this. In spite of Pakistan's rather unfriendly attitude towards India, geographically she finds herself in a paradoxical position. She finds herself in the position where she will be acting as a brake water for India in the event of any flood coming over the Himalayas. I am quite certain that, should any invasion come from the Himalayas, whether it is from China or Russia or any other country, India will be very grateful for the short respite that she might get from Pakistan acting as a brake-water.

Some Members have criticised the Prime Minister for not having a consistent policy. I, however, find myself afflicted with the popular disease of supporting the Prime Minister, and if it is not impertinent for me to say so, I support him and agree with him because I do agree with him and not for any other ulterior motive. We have no option but to face each and every new development as it comes up. Every new crisis as it rises must be faced in its new context and to follow any policy of consistency at the present juncture would definitely be suicidal. Sir, with your permission I will

[Shri G. S. Singh]

read a paragraph written by a certain Mr. Roberts:

"All the great villains and all the small villains have been consistent men; unimaginative men who consistently believed in war as a means of settling disputes between nations; equally misguided men who consistently believed that war must be avoided at all cost, no matter what the provocation; narrow men who consistently upheld the beliefs and acts of one political party and saw no good in any other; short-sighted men who consistently refused to see that the welfare of their nation was dependent on the welfare of every other nation. Ignorant men who consistently thought the policies of their Government should be supported, whether those policies were right or wrong; dangerous men who consistently thought that all people with black skin are inferior to those with white skin; intolerant men who consistently believed all people with white skin should be forced to accept those with black skin as equals."

On this quotation I have no comments, but I do feel that any nation led by people who make a fetish of consistency are heading to join many a dead empire whose crumbling monuments fill our history books. I am thankful to say that we are at the moment not so afflicted.

I realise that there is threat of outside aggression, but only such a one that can be definitely dealt with by our Armed Forces and which is quite rightly considered trivial. I think the greater threat is from the fifth column inside our own country, whether that is religious or political is for the Government to find out and decide. But, steps should be taken to strengthen and make our security services in the country stronger and more effective. I do not want any form of 'McCarthy witch hunt' to be started in this country, but I would like a certain amount of screening done in our vital defence

installations, in our system of communications, our radio-telegraphy system and all other systems which are vital to the life of this country, and also in our main industrial areas. I would be very grateful if the hon. Minister would take this question to heart and look into it to see how he can expand and augment our security services.

Sir, as I said just now, I have every faith and confidence in the officers and men of our Armed Forces and I am certain that each and every man in them will, without hesitation, lay down his life in the service of this country. But, I demand on behalf of these men, that should that life be necessary, it should be made as costly as possible; and that life can only be made costly if our troops are equipped with modern mechanised weapons. We are doing this by purchasing a great deal of equipment from abroad, but we cannot achieve our aim and as the Prime Minister himself has said, our main object is to raise our basic armament industries. The other day I was happy to read a report in the Press about the Government entering into negotiations with the Rolls Royce Company for the manufacture of jet engines in India under licence. That is a good move and I hope it goes through. I hope the Defence Minister will also consider opening up other industries in the same way. There are people who decry this and who object to it, but I do feel that we should not be too proud to learn from the experience of other nations. With regard to this system, it has been tried by France quite successfully. This new Ouragan, *Toofani* aircraft which we have purchased are manufactured in France with Rolls Royce engine—an English engine,—made by the French people under licence. We can do the same thing in our motor car industry, radio industry and so many other industries. I should like the Defence Minister to consider this proposal.

I know the ordnance factories are doing their best to meet such demands as are put on them by the Defence

Services in spite of the fact that they need re-tooling as they are working with obsolete tools. I would like to suggest that these ordnance factories should not be asked to produce things like cloth, boots and better forms of stores which can easily be produced by industries in the open market. This would also help industrialisation of the country, help to solve the problem of unemployment and in the event of an emergency you would have a ready-made industry which could easily be geared to the war machine.

Sir, I have one or two more proposals. In spite of what the hon. lady Communist or Communist Lady Member had to say about.....

Shri Nambiar: You can say in any form you like.

Shri G. S. Singh: About the rates of pay of officers and men of the Services, it was pointed out to her last year—and also to Mr. Nambiar who also made some suggestions—that in calculating the pay they forget to add little things like free medical aid, free food, free lodging, free clothing, free travelling and all such other amenities, which if added up in cash would come to a considerable sum.

Shri Nambiar: That is different.

Shri G. S. Singh: I would suggest to my hon. friend Mr. Nambiar to go and join up and investigate and see for himself what conditions of employment there are for these people.

Shri Nambiar: Communists are not taken in the Armed Forces!

Shri G. S. Singh: I would ask the hon. Minister to revive some of the conditions of service and benefits which the junior officers used to get before the new pay code was introduced. These junior officers are getting pay which my friends consider as lavish. These people—most of them or at least a great many of them—are married men; they have children to educate, they have to maintain two separate establishments due to exigencies of service. These junior officers have to maintain a standard of

living which is laid down by regulation, clearly defined by some order and which they find very hard to maintain. I am sure the hon. Minister of Defence will agree with me that he is having a certain amount of difficulty in recruiting the right type of men to come up and join the Services as junior officers because the pay-scales, pension rates and other things are not sufficiently attractive. The reserve of officers in the Defence organisation is entirely inadequate. I will not go in for the figures as probably it would not be in the public interest. This is a question of lack of incentive, so very well put by a French writer named Alexis de Torqueville, who said nearly a hundred years ago:

“Military ambition is only indulged in when no other avenue is possible. Hence arises a circle of course and consequence from which it is difficult to escape. The best part of the nation shuns the military profession because the profession is not honoured; and the profession is not honoured because the best part of the nation has ceased to follow it.”

I would suggest a revision of or an enquiry into the pay scales of the junior officers.

One last point, Sir, and I have to make a direct suggestion to the Ministry. I had suggested last year, but the Prime Minister did not approve of the suggestion, that we have one competent senior statesman as a full-time Defence Minister. However, there has been a certain amount of complaint that at the moment, the Defence Ministry whose function is co-ordination, policy and financial control, is overstepping its mark. I have had reports: I can give specific examples of the hon. Minister of Defence Organisation going round and encouraging junior officers and men to break the usual channels of communication and to bring their so-called grievances directly to him. This tends to disrupt discipline. These channels of communication were established for a specific purpose. To disrupt them, I think, is a dangerous

[Shri G. S. Singh]

move. There has also been a tendency on the part of some of our Ministers, instead of congratulating a sentry or a sepoy for doing his duty and for stopping them if he did not recognise them, to take him to task. That, in my opinion, is unfair.

With regard to the Auxiliary Air Force Bill, which has been on the statute book for some time, I would suggest that Auxiliary Air Force Squadrons could be started in such places where there are flying clubs, with the flying clubs as the nucleus. The Government spends a lot of money. It gives a lot of money to the Delhi Flying Club and there is only one pupil. This would also give work to the unemployed pilots, who are going about the country creating a lot of heart burning everywhere, to act as instructors. That suggestion could be profitably carried out. I finish by saying that nobody wants war in this world; but there are people in this country and in all countries who will have war if necessary to keep and hold liberty in all its various aspects.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Defence (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): For the last two years or so, I have been fairly intimately connected with the Defence Forces and the Defence Ministry in this country. Even previously, I have felt it my duty to maintain contacts with them, and with some of our senior military Advisers. But, during these two years, those contacts have been necessarily more continuous and more intimate. I should like to say, therefore, right at the beginning, of the high opinion I have formed of our Defence Forces and of our various Defence establishments in this country. I am not merely saying something in the formal sense of the word. It is my belief that we have a very high class of persons in our Defence Services from the top downwards.

During these six years and a half since Independence, our Defence Forces have practically been built up a new. Of course, they were built up on the

old foundation, it is true. But, as the House will remember, immediately after independence, the Army was split up and a part of it went to Pakistan. Very soon after, came the military operations in Kashmir and other operations. All kinds of varied activities have had to be undertaken by our Army or by our Air Force or by our Navy. The House knows well, of course, about the recent episode of the Custodian Force in Korea to which reference has often been made here. Our Air Force has, continuously for a long period, been engaged in dropping supplies in parts of our North Eastern border, Assam. Our Army has occasionally engaged itself in helping people to grow more food. They might not have grown a terrific quantity of food but the whole point was that the Army, apart from being an efficient and disciplined army, has come nearer and nearer to the people, as we want it to come and to remove the barriers which may exist between them and the people. We have to maintain two things: one is the discipline of the army and the other is a feeling of oneness between the army and the people. So, I should like, and I am sure the House will agree with me, to pay a tribute to the efficiency, loyalty, and discipline of our Armed Forces.

I should like the House to remember that even though we live in times of peace, many of our young men are continually facing a measure of danger. In the Air Force especially, in every Air Force in the world, accidents occur and valuable lives are lost. That is the payment we have to make for the continuous efficiency, continuous training and experiment. It is an exceedingly sad thing if a young man who has been trained for years, lost his life: sad from every point of view, national as well as personal. Yet, we have to face these difficulties.

There have been and there can be a great many criticisms of the Defence Ministry because the Defence Ministry covers a vast field of activities. Nobody can say that every activity they indulge in is done in a perfect manner, without

mistake or without errors; of course there are errors. We welcome criticisms and welcome more especially if hon. Members draw our attention to any particular matter which we can remedy. I would not go into those matters. I have seen the cut motions and they are overwhelming in number, a multitude of them. I shall not deal with them because some of my colleagues will no doubt refer to the important points raised in this debate. I should like to refer only to a few basic issues which always face us.

One thing I should like to say, and that is that the growth of Defence industries in this country has been particularly satisfactory. All of them are not functioning; some of them are in the process of being built up. I think that our record in that respect is very satisfactory, because, ultimately the defence depends on the growth of industry generally and more especially the Defence industry. More and more the art of warfare becomes mechanised; technical improvements come in daily. It becomes necessary to rely more and more on these technical improvements.

One cannot ultimately rely upon technical improvements that you purchase from abroad. That is dependence on others which can be cut off at any moment. Therefore, the real test of our advance in Defence is the growth of Defence industries in the country. Human beings we have in plenty. They are very good, very brave material. But numbers have seldom counted in the past except in the sense that they give the morale in a big crisis. Of course, properly trained people can be of great help—ultimately, it is the technically trained men and equipment that count.

When we talk of technically trained men and equipment, immediately every person will think of the latest developments in the art of warfare to which reference has been made so often. They may be summed up in one word though they are many, atomic bomb, hydrogen bomb, etc. But, there are innumerable other developments which do not find their way into the papers, of which, if some war comes, we shall hear. Be-

cause the latest developments, of course, are secret. No country is going to give publicity to them. They cannot very well hide the explosion of a hydrogen bomb. That is too big a thing. Perhaps that may be hidden too, so that the latest weapons are secret. They are not used lest the other party might get to know of them. But, even the known weapons of the latest type are terrible enough. It has come to this that except very few countries, no other country can afford to have the latest weapons. The differences that have grown in the defensive or offensive power of States are much greater now than they ever were because only very few countries can afford to have those defence weapons.

Take as an example these atomic weapons. I do not know how many countries have them, in what quantity, but in effect very, very few countries possess them—apart from the major two countries, perhaps two or three or four others, in some quantity, in a small way, not really in a big way.

Now, where are we in defence when we cannot possibly think at the present moment of these latest weapons? Obviously, we have not got the atom bomb. We do experiment with atomic energy, and we have got a fairly competent, high-class Atomic Energy Commission. It has no value from the war point of view at the present moment. It has a good deal of value from the experimental point of view, of using atomic energy for civil purposes. In fact, reading a report recently of world developments in atomic energy, India was specially mentioned as the country in Asia which has developed this,—not the weapons I mean, but atomic energy—has greater development than any country in these particular areas. We may leave that out from the point of view of war. I am merely mentioning this, that we want to be in advance from the scientific and technical point of view in these matters, because these count in the end; and we want to be, as far as possible, not self-sufficient—no country is absolutely self-sufficient—but as near self-sufficiency as possible in regard to our needs.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

Now, self-sufficiency again depends, well, primarily on your having certain mineral and other resources which are necessary for warfare as for industry. Either we have those minerals or we have not got them. If we have not got them, we have to get them from elsewhere. Well, we have them; we are not certainly self-sufficient, but we have them in fairly large quantities—a sufficient number of them. Some we have not got. Anyhow, we are more favourably placed than most countries, and we do not yet know the whole. Perhaps we might have more of them. We have had geological and other surveys in the country, but we have never had an absolutely hundred per cent. full survey of every part of the country. We are now, therefore, trying to carry out those surveys and they are necessary from the point of view of defence and, of course, from the point of view of industry.

Now, in planning or thinking of our defence, what pattern should we adopt? I cannot go into this in detail of course but I should like the House to have certain broad considerations in view. We talk of defence. Every country talks of defence. Nevertheless, there are two aspects of defence. One is defence, and the other is offence. In war it is rather difficult to draw a line between defence and offence, obviously. Nevertheless, one can prepare the country for offensive war, or, essentially, for defensive war. When I say offensive war, I mean offensive war at a distance, because offensive war on your borders is defence. It does make a difference. Some of the great countries of the world prepare themselves for offensive war at great distances, in fact they practically cover the world. Now, obviously both from the point of view of our desires in the matter and our capacity, we do not propose and we have not intended to build up defence forces for a long-range offensive war. They are essentially defence forces so far as we are concerned. What does long-range offensive war require or might require?—let us say an expeditionary force. In the old days of British governance in this

country, they used to keep an expeditionary force to be sent abroad—not to India's benefit, of course, but for their own benefit in case there was a big war, or to go to other countries; and Indian forces have gone to Western Asia, South-East Asia and the Far East, to Africa and to Europe. The first thing we decided was, because we do not think in terms of offensive war at a distance, we need not think of this.

6 P.M.

Take another example. In the air do we require long—distance bombers to go far afield and bomb distant countries? Well, from the point of view of defence, we do not. From the point of view of practical approach to the problem, they would be out of place. One long-distance bomber could be replaced by, would cost as much may be as, twenty, thirty or fifty normal aircraft, and the normal aircraft are much more useful to us in defence than one long-distance bomber. We may not have even the industrial background for the long-distance bomber.

I am merely putting certain considerations which perhaps are not in the minds of some hon. Members, so that some of the problems we face may come before them

Therefore, the pattern of our defence is, if I may repeat, defence, and not aggression or long-distance attack—and that applies to whether it is the Army, or Air Force or Navy—and on that depends, to some extent, the type of weapons that we have to get. Of course, all these things have to be balanced with various other factors. One cannot make one rule the absolute rule, but generally that is our approach.

The second approach is that we should depend, as much as possible, on what we can ourselves produce. Again, we cannot produce things suddenly. It takes a little time. But this leads to two conclusions. One is that we should try to produce the things necessary as soon as possible. The second is that, on the whole, we prefer reliance on something that we can

produce and not on something even better that we might get from abroad. That again cannot be an absolute rule, and we have to get that something better when we can get it from abroad, but there are strict limitations to that. But, generally speaking, we would depend upon what we do or can produce in the near future, because, dependence on something that we can get from abroad, though it becomes inevitable to begin with, is really not a safe dependence, because, after all, you may not be able to get it; and, if you depend too much on that, then you become helpless, when you cannot get it. Therefore, it is better, in the final analysis, that you should think of if I may use the word,—I do not like to use it very much—second-rate weapons from the competitive point of view,—they are not second-rate in the normal sense, of course—on which we can rely and which we can produce ourselves rather than something for which we have to depend upon others and which we may not get in time of need.

As I said, these are broad approaches which have to be balanced by other factors.

Seven years ago, just about the time of independence, our Army was a good Army. We had a good, small Air Force, and the beginnings of a Navy—small beginnings, but fairly good and efficient, however small it was. Even that was split up. We had about that time—I do not know the exact number, but in the Army I think there were about 8,000 foreign officers—a large number. Of course, that was the result of the War, the after-effects of the War, and we hardly had a person in our Army—an Indian—above the rank of a Brigadier. We had to build up this Army from the top downwards—and, after all, we had a fairly big Army. I said fairly big, but I should like to correct myself. Our Army, considering the size of the country, is not big. Of course, it is better to have an efficient and relatively small Army than large numbers who are not very efficient. That is obvious. But I want to make this quite clear because some

people seem to imagine, and some of our foreign critics always say, that because of some considerations, say because of Kashmir, because of other things, we keep a bloated Army, or we spend much too much on our military and defence expenditure. Now, it is true that we spend a large sum, as the House knows, on defence expenditure. But the House will please remember that as everything has gone up in price, defence equipment has gone up very greatly, not only in the normal sense of everything going up in the price, but because every technical advance is expensive, and it is not normally a kind of thing which you can bargain about, for either you get it or you do not get it, or you produce it yourself. In spite of all these factors, and in spite of our desire to have as efficient an Army, Navy, and Air Force as possible, I think that it would be correct to say that we have not added very greatly to our defence expenditure. It can be compared with other countries, whether in numbers or whether in expenditure, and considering the size of our country and the many responsibilities that inevitably our defence forces have to shoulder, I do not think the expenditure involved in it is very great. It is undoubtedly great from the point of view of our desire to have as much money for developmental and other purposes. That is true, but there are certain limits beyond which we can hardly go, if we have to keep an efficient Army, Navy and Air Force. We have, far from increasing the size of our Army, always aimed during the last few years at reducing it somewhat. In fact we did reduce it, two or three by some numbers. But I really confess that I do not see any great reduction in future; I am not thinking in terms of fighting or war, but there are certain limits beyond which we can hardly go, for such a great country like ours.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

Of course, as some hon. Members have suggested from time to time, we should encourage what might be called the second line defences, and the

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

rest. That is a different question entirely, and we should do that, of course, from other points of view, not so much from the point of view of modern fighting—I do not think our second line defences are much good for that—but for something which is equally important, for performing the numerous duties, not in the fighting line, but behind—and that is very important—both because they are important in themselves, and because they release the fighting forces from other duties.

So, we had to face six or seven years ago, this difficult position of our Army breaking up after Partition, thousands and thousands of foreign officers, chiefly British, going away,—remember they were eight thousand in number—and our officers, good as they were, having had no previous experience of high commands—there were a few colonels, or maybe a few brigadiers about; and on top of all that, we had these Kashmir operations, which were very difficult, in a difficult terrain under difficult conditions. Well, we survived all that; we not merely militarily survived it, but I believe that our Army and Air Force, both of which were concerned in these operations improved themselves in the process—if I may say so—by this training.

During this period, first of all, a very large number—thousands—of British officers left us. We had very few left—maybe, I do not know, some hundreds to begin with. And this process of their going back and being replaced by Indian officers has gone on continuously. We have had questions asked repeatedly about British officers or others in our services, and answers were given about their numbers. As a matter of fact, in the Army, there are a few—I forget the number, maybe about a hundred or so—but even those numbers are rather deceptive. In the Army, about which I am talking, there is not a single officer, I believe, who is in any executive position. There are some—a few—in our ordnance factories, and some as instructors in some of our Academies and the like.

We have had till recently a senior officer as an Adviser, he is leaving in a few days, and a very good adviser he has been. We have had in the Air Force and in the Navy, senior British officers in command, because both the Air Force and the Navy, frankly speaking, require expert and experienced guidance. I should like to say—and I say so from personal experience, not only of these two years, but of the last six or seven years—that these senior officers that we have had in the Army, Navy and the Air Force have done us exceedingly well, and I should like to express my high appreciation of the loyal way and the efficient way in which they have worked for us. The House must remember that, so far as our Air Force is concerned, within a few days, the present Air Marshal is retiring, and an Indian will be the head of our Air Force.

Our Navy is small, and we really had to build up from scratch. It is not a question of passing an examination merely, but it requires experience of all kinds of conditions, training in all kinds of conditions technical and other; and one cannot produce the trained person suddenly out of a hat. We have been connected, more specially in regard to the Navy, with the British Royal Navy, in the sense of receiving training, sometimes joining their manoeuvres, and receiving our equipment and the rest. Without some such experience, we would have been far more backward than we are. We could only have that experience from some other navy, and the obvious thing was for us to have it from the British Navy, because our pattern of development of the Navy, and for the matter of that, of the other forces as well, was the British pattern. We had developed that way, and unless we reject that pattern and adopt some entirely different pattern, it is obviously desirable for us to improve along the pattern that we had followed thus far—and it is a good pattern. Naturally, it will gradually be changed to suit our own conditions. There is bound to be that, and it is being changed gradually in many ways. But in many matters,

especially technical, one cannot start anew, and one has inevitably—if you want expert guidance, which you do not possess—to get experts and specialists, to guide us, from abroad. It is a question then of choice, where to get and whom to get. Hon. Members often ask these questions, how speedily we can have our own experts? Of course, we want our own experts in every field of technical or other activity, and they are taking the places of foreigners fairly rapidly; but the fact remains that we can profit by expert guidance from abroad and I think it would be—if I may say so—folly for us to remain backward in any matter, because we are afraid of getting that expert guidance from abroad in any matter, whether it is industry, whether it is river valley scheme, or whether it is something else.

So, in these four or five years out of these difficulties we have emerged, and we have at the present moment in our Defence Services, a very good machine. Naturally, the persons responsible for it are many senior Indian officers and others who are in charge, but in a great measure, more especially in the Navy and the Air Force, a great deal of credit for that must be given to the British officers who have helped us during these years.

Now, I referred to the pattern of our development which, necessarily, had to be on the old lines, unless we scrapped the old lines and started afresh. If we start afresh, what pattern do we adopt? We cannot adopt, if I may say so, an Indian pattern, because there is no Indian pattern of modern warfare. It is a technical thing. It will grow gradually as our scientists grow and others grow and our experience grows. Gradually, we may have some kind of an Indian pattern; that is a process of growth. We have to adopt some pattern, a recognised pattern. The recognised patterns are those of countries which developed defence services—whether it is England or America or Russia or one or two other European countries. Now as we had so far adopted the British pattern in our army organisation, it was natural for us to

continue that. It was good enough. We can change it when we want, here and there. But to have upset it completely would have meant really upsetting our defence apparatus completely and that would have been foolish. We can—and we do—change it here and there and we will, no doubt, gradually change it. Those hon. Members who criticise our having British officers and others are hardly likely to tell us not to have any experts, but presumably they think that we should have experts from some other country than England. There is another difficulty. If you get experts from some other country than England, except for specific activities for which we can certainly get some scientists or some technical men from another country, if you get others, they do not normally fit in with that pattern which has developed here, because they are used to another pattern, apart from their individual ability. So that we might have to change the pattern, the basic pattern, in order to get the others to fit in! As I said, when the need arises, we will change the pattern here and there, and no doubt we want to change it to some extent. But all these factors have to be borne in mind when hon. Members consider how we have been functioning in the Army, the Navy and the Air Force.

Now, we have attached very great importance to the development of defence industry, and in developing defence industry, we have made, I am free to confess, a number of mistakes, as we are bound to. We should not be afraid of making mistakes. We have sometimes to put a plant which is exceedingly good but of which we cannot take full advantage now; if I may use the word, that plant is too good for us, that is, we are not adequately developed to use that plant fully. Of course we will use it later on fully, but not for the moment. Therefore, in sense, we are not using to their fullest capacity the plants we have got. Now we are engaged in trying to find out how to use them to their fullest capacity for civil purposes, whenever necessary. Indeed they can be made use of and

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

various committees and others are considering this matter. I think that is important both from the point of view of our general production and of making those plants useful at all times, and not merely in war time. That is our general industrial approach to these problems.

In regard to the Territorial Army and the NCC, I have stated previously in this House that it is our intention to expand them as rapidly as possible, keeping always in view a certain measure of efficiency. If there is one thing in the history of India that is striking from the military point of view, it is that normally the rulers of old days relied on numbers. Sometimes, they also relied on reckless courage. They seldom relied on discipline, and hardly ever on technical advance. Any proper military history of India would show how every invasion of India was due to two things: one, technical advance in the invading army, their equipment or arms and another, greater cohesion and discipline. Our armies in those days were vast hordes, elephants and horses, mules and donkeys and men and women a whole sort of palace marching on. If something went wrong, there was chaos and all the courage of our brave men was not enough when the chaos came and when there were better technical weapons against them. Babar came to India: Babar had the better gun. That is the chief explanation of Babar's victory. He had a small army, a highly trained army, which could not retire, which could go nowhere; it had either to win or die. But the main thing was that he had the better gun and the gun triumphed through all the courage of the Rajputs.

So we must not think in terms of vague numbers. Numbers are good—for national activities of course—but we have to discipline them. We must build up a disciplined army, technically good, and behind that should be the second line forces, the Territorial force, the Home Guards and the rest, which do other duties in times of difficulty and trouble.

These are some of the points which I venture to place before hon. Members for them to consider this question of defence from this wider viewpoint.

Dr. N. B. Khare: Yesterday, Sir, the Prime Minister in perhaps a spirit of banter criticised my speech as not a very responsible one.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Which Speech?

Dr. N. B. Khare: I do not mind it. I am one of those who does not want to conceal his thoughts. I am happy over it, so much so that I can describe my happiness in this Urdu couplet:

वह दुश्मनी से देखते हैं, लेकिन देखते तो हैं ।
मैं शाद हूँ कि हूँ तो किसी की निगाह में ॥

I simply want to make one point and that is, that my speech may have been irresponsible—I do not know about that—but this Government is very irresponsible in their action with regard to military pensions. Sir, they have failed to make any statutory provision to regulate the grant of military pensions. Pensions are being administered according to the old rules of the British regime. They have not taken even the advantage of Article 372 read with Article 13 of the Constitution, to use the power of the President in the specified time. Is this not irresponsibility? 'Military pensions' fall under the head of 'Union pensions' and are liable to be legislated upon by Parliament to the exclusion of any other authority; this has reference to article 246 and item 71 of the Union Legislative List. Regulating this subject by administrative rules is unconstitutional. Administrative rules on this subject are nothing but a trespass on the legislative field of this Parliament.

Military pensions are distinguishable from civil pensions inasmuch as the same are specifically protected by the Army Act. By virtue of section 28 of the said Act, these pensions are immune from seizure, sequestration or attachment by the decree of a court. The peculiarity of these pensions is that they are immune from 'deductions'—vide section 95 of the

Army Act. Thus, there is absolute immunity—absolute immunity in that while pay for every day a soldier is under custody or in imprisonment is liable to be deducted under section 91 of the Army Act, this deduction will not operate against pension. The administrative rules have derogated from the protection aforesaid, inasmuch as they have created conditions which tend to reduce or narrow down the tenability of pensions like death and disablement pensions. They have created conditions for the total disallowance of pension. Such a power is coercive power and if it is to be used at all it must be sanctioned by this House.

They have established tribunals known as Pension Appeal Tribunals and Government of India Pension Appeal (Assessment) Tribunals and that is the climax of the State's irregularity and irresponsibility. In the United Kingdom these Tribunals have been established by an Act of Parliament which vests power in them and prescribes a procedure and rules of conduct. Here it is the executive government which has sought to establish these Tribunals and which prescribes the procedure and rules of conduct. This system seeks to offend the principles of law that no one can at once be a suitor and judge and no one ought to be his own judge or tribunal in his own affairs.

The establishment of tribunals is a matter of sovereign law. Their jurisdiction is a matter of legislation which falls under item 95 of the Union Legislative List I, Schedule VII of the Constitution. The State has given jurisdiction to these Tribunals to decide 'attributability,' 'aggravation' by war service, and undue refusal to undergo an operation or an anaesthetic for say, straightening a contracted finger. These are judicial matters and must be decided judicially by a judicial body. There is no dearth of cases in which Courts have occasion to determine that it was *ultra vires* of the jurisdiction of the Tribunal.

Applying the principles evolved by the judgments of the Courts in the matter of the Army Act, it follows that

so long as sections 20, 43, 50 and 51 of the Indian Army Act, 1911 and the corresponding sections 80, 71, 91 and 95 of the Army Act, 1950 are not altered, amended or repealed by competent legislature or other competent authority they will govern the matters of the Army Act. As these sections stand as they are, and as the establishment and jurisdiction of these Tribunals have not been made by reference to the appropriate items of the Federal Legislative List I, Schedule VII, Government of India Act, 1935 and the corresponding item of the Union Legislative List, these Tribunals are not validly established and their jurisdiction is *ultra vires* of the executive government.

There is also the policy of the Government to adopt administrative rules and instructions having the effect of continuance or disallowance of pensions. The rules are meant to carry out the provisions of the Army Act; they are not meant to abrogate or supersede the provisions of the Act. (Authority: Section 191 of the Army Act 1950, and section 113 of the Indian Army Act 1911). The statutory power and the power of making rules have been made one; this is again an invasion in the field of the Legislature.

They have also failed to continue to grant family pensions on the death of the first receiver, say, the widow. Family pensions are meant for the support of the widowed wife, old parents and minor children. This principle stands admitted in the pension rules. In practice, however, they do not follow the principles and family pensions have been stopped. I do not want to go into further details in this House. The fact remains that the pension rules are absolutely feudal based on feudalism. These should not exist.

Even the latest judgment of the Supreme Court delivered on February 11, 1954 has ruled out this feudalism and Government should take measures to enact a Military Pension Law so that this injustice done to the Army personnel could be removed and they may be contented, happy, and well disciplined. Therefore, I gave notice of my intention to move a bill (Military Pensions Bill),

[Dr. N. B. Khare]

but it was not allowed to be moved as it was not recommended by the President. But I am sure some day or the other, the Central Government will have to follow my lead and enact these laws.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Hoshiarpur): I have two reasons for taking part in this debate. First of all I come from the border State of the Punjab, and I think if there is any State in India which can understand the army, appreciate its work and admire it for its heroism, it is the Punjab. (*An hon. Member: Question.*) A question has been put to me, but I say it is on account of the peculiar circumstances through which the Punjab has passed that I am making this statement. It is because the Punjab bore the brunt of partition and is a refugee province that I am saying this. The second reason is that I represent a constituency which is supplying a large number of recruits to the army and which, I think, is doing its duty by this country by giving it human material so far as the army is concerned.

It has been said that we want our army—"our" of course underlined—that we want the people's army, that we want some kind of army whose pattern—if I can use the word which was so eloquently made use of by our Prime Minister—whose pattern is not the pattern of our country but whose pattern belongs to some other country. I have met these army people, without their knowing it that I am a Member of the House of the People, I have met them in all kinds of places, under all kinds of conditions and have had talks with them. I have exchanged views with them and I can say that they are the Indian army. When we talk of the people's army it becomes the army of the ruling party of a country, it becomes the army of a political *junta*, it becomes the army of a political caucus. But our army is the Indian army: Indian in its traditions, Indian in its character, Indian in its loyalty, Indian in its affections for the country, and Indian in

its love of the integrity of this country. I therefore think that our army should be, and should remain, as it is today and that it should not become an army after the model of some other country.

I am glad that an hon. Member here paid a tribute to the "valiant services" rendered by our army in Korea. I am very happy to join him in paying a tribute to them, because I know they had to work under very difficult conditions. But they worked very well. I was reading the remarks of a General who went to visit his army in some other country. And when he went there and came back he said: "I was very glad to find that our army was exemplifying the way of life proper to our country". I do not want to mention the name of the country or the name of the General. There is trouble when you mention names, therefore I do not want to mention either the name of the country or the name of the General. All that I can say about our Custodian Force in Korea is that we are proud of them not only because of their military efficiency but because they exemplified the Indian way of life, which is the way of tolerance, of forbearance, of tactfulness and of patriotism. That is the Indian way that they exemplified there and I am very happy to pay a humble tribute to them.

Now I come to one particular problem. We have been talking of lines of defence; somebody has been talking of second line, somebody of civilian force and someone else about some other thing. I do not want to go into those questions because our Prime Minister has made very pertinent and justified remarks on them. But I want to say one thing. In this vast country of ours which has so many thousands of miles of frontier and which is surrounded by neighbours who mean well—I should say, some of whom mean well and some others who do not mean well, our army is inadequate. Even the Prime Minister admitted now that our army is not equal in strength to the needs of our country. There is no doubt about that.

To have an army which is in proportion to the needs of our country, I think we would have to spend enormous sums of money on that and that is not possible on account of the limited financial resources of our country. In numbers our army is not adequate, but in technical equipment our army is catching up. I am not one of those persons who do not want that we should acquire knowledge from this country or that country and who want that we should fight shy of experts from other countries. Sir, in Lahore there used to be a college on the walls of which used to be written:

“Gather the wisdom from East and West”.

I think, so far as technical knowledge is concerned, so far as the technical ‘know how’ is concerned, we should not be afraid of getting it from any country from which it is available. I do not see any reason why we should fight shy of that. Technically we are not as good as we ought to be and our industries are not in a very high stage of development. Therefore, instead of having two lines of defence, I think we should have five lines of defence. All the levels of society should be properly represented and equipped so that if there is trouble we can face that trouble at all levels. What are those lines of defence to which I refer?

The first line of defence should be our Territorial Army. I have read this report in my hand and I wonder if many persons have read it. I find that the report does not present a very happy picture of the state of our Territorial Army. In the first place, there has not been much enthusiasm for the Territorial Army, and in the second place if there has been some enthusiasm, I think it has not been in proportion to what we want. We have now an Auxiliary Territorial Army also and we have had some camps and all that. I must say that the efforts that we have made to build up our Territorial Army and our Auxiliary Territorial Army are absolutely meagre and inadequate. I think that if we cannot have an army in the sense in which the United States

60 P.S.D.

of America has or the United Kingdom has or some other country has, at least we should have a Territorial Army and an Auxiliary Territorial Army in proportion to the vastness of our country and also our population.

So far as military training is concerned, we must so arrange it that the villagers—people who actually live in the villages—join it and are able to make use of it as fully as possible. But I must say that that message has not yet been carried to the villages as properly as it should have been done. Unless we try to organise these villages as the third line of defence, if I could so call it, I think our country cannot be as safe as it should be.

The fourth line of defence should be our National Cadet Corps. So far as our National Cadet Corps is concerned, our numbers are not very high. How many officers do we have? Of course, these are part time officers. We have 2300 officers. How many cadets do we have all over the country? Some 80,000 and a few hundred. I think this is a very meagre number for a big country like ours. When we come to the Auxiliary Cadet Corps, I find that there is only one State that has taken to it enthusiastically and there is only one university which has accepted it wholeheartedly. Others are not so enthusiastic about it. Therefore, I should say that our fourth line of defence, if I can so call it, should be the National Cadet Corps and our fifth line of defence should be the Auxiliary Cadet Corps.

I must, at the same time, say this about our women. Of course, our women can talk very well,—I am happy over that—and can talk about the People’s Army. Although I am very happy about all that, I must say that so far as our women are concerned, a systematic effort, a concerted effort, should be made to bring them into the orbit of the national defence. From this report I find that very little is being done so far as the National Cadet Corps is concerned. Of course, a girls division here and a girls division there have been instituted. This is a very small thing; this is like having a toy gun to kill an elephant. In this vast

[Shri D. C. Sharma.]

country of ours, we need this sixth line of defence. Unless we have all these six lines of defence, I think our country cannot be adequately defended and adequately protected.

There are two other points to which I would like to refer. I would say that there should be ample grants given to the rifle clubs. Our Government should make every effort to dot this country at any rate with rifle clubs. Unless that is done, our defence arrangements would remain incomplete. Since we have to depend, for the defence of our country, mainly on our civilian population, something must be done to prepare our people, if not in terms of arms and ammunition, if not in terms of training, at least in terms of psychology. I do not mean to say that we should make them war-minded; I do not mean to say that they should be militaristically inclined. What I mean to say is that our Army or our Civil departments should see to it that, when somebody attacks us, when there is some kind of impending attack from anybody, our people do not get panicky. I know more wars were lost on account of panic than on account of anything else. Therefore, I think there should be a psychological preparation of the country for the purpose of defence. I wish to add one thing. I do not know the inner mechanism of our Army. But I must say that our Army must have a first rate intelligence service. When I sit in the House, I find that there are leakages of information from the Defence department. There are certain questions put in this House which show that military secrets are not secrets. They are passed on to some persons in this House and all over the world. Of course, military secrets must be military secrets, and therefore I would say that our Defence department must have a first-rate intelligence service, not only for the sake of getting us the secrets from other countries, but also for seeing that our secrets are not passed on to some persons in this country who are trying to sabotage or who are trying to get secrets from us and preparing this country for some kind of con-

stitution which they have in their heads or some kind of greatness which they think is greatness. Therefore, I say that, so far as I am concerned, as a lay man I find that our defence services do not have an adequate intelligence service, and if they are to do well by the country, they must have a first-rate, up-to-date, effective intelligence service.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: When the Prime Minister intervened in the debate a few minutes ago, we on this side thought that he would reply to some of the important points raised by us on this side, and he would also give us an idea of the defence policy that is pursued by Government. We also thought that he might refer to the approach of the Government to some of the important points which have been raised in the cut motions, but unfortunately he did not reply to these points, and his speech was not an answer to the innumerable doubts that have crept into our minds. His speech was like the speech of a history professor in a University.

He was telling us—he told us also in the previous year—about the superiority of the invading enemy and our inferiority which was responsible for our subjugation in the past. He said last year about the case of Chenghiz Khan. This year he had the case of Babar.

Shrimati Benu Chakravartty: Last year also.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: He said, that because Babar had a superior gun we were subjugated, we were defeated and he had the upper hand. It is rather a misreading of history. If you look back to the period of Babar, you will see that it was not because Babar had a superior weapon in his hand that we were defeated, but because we were disunited, and because there were chaotic conditions here. There was not one ruler at that time. There were many rulers quarrelling among themselves which gave an ideal opportunity for a foreigner to fish in Indian troubled waters. I feel very sorry that the Prime Minister is not rather up-to-date in the knowledge of history.

Sardar A. S. Saigal: You are more than that.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is not up-to-date but behind date!

Shri Radhelal Vyas (Ujjain): He mentioned about unity also.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: And then he said that he was not very anxious to have very up-to-date weapons. At the same time, he said that because the foreigner had an up-to-date or superior weapon than us we were defeated in the past. So, I find here is clear case of contradiction. On the one hand he says we need not have up-to-date weapons. On the other hand, he says, because there was a superior weapon in the hands of the foreigner, we were defeated, subjugated in the past.

Sardar A. S. Saigal: It should be corrected!

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: I cannot understand his speech at all.

The defence problem now has become important because of certain factors, certain developments around our borders. The United States-Pakistan military alliance, the instability of Burma and the occupation of Tibet by China and various developments that are taking place in foreign enclaves in India have focussed the attention of the nation to this problem and made this problem of defence very extraordinarily important. My hon. lady friend Shrimati Renu Chakravartty was telling us, why should we depend only upon England and America for learning things, why should we not look up to China.

Sardar A. S. Saigal: Russia.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Russia is too advanced for you.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: It is not too advanced, but I say it is a retro-grade step. It is not advanced, and I will tell you, why.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Tell me, why.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: You know Chinese history, and what happened in China in the past. America supplied arms and ammunition, and gave technical help free to Chiang-Kai-Shek. And what was the result? This very arms and ammunition was used against Chiang Kai-Shek in China. What does the recent Chinese history teach us? Chiang Kai-Shek played into the hands of America in the past, but now Communist China has played into the hands of Russia. Should we learn that from China? Should we play into the hands of any nation? Or should we learn from China the method of conducting civil war in India?

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Do not.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: We should not. Shrimati Renu Chakravartty was asking us to look to China, and to learn from China. But then again what has China done for us? It has occupied Tibet, where we had vital interests. (Interruptions) I am telling you a fact.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Tell me the fact.

Shri S. S. More: He is not taking any notice of you.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: In 1951, Tibet, a peaceful and tranquil country was invaded by the troops of China, without any provocation. Their leaders did not consult us though we had vital interests in Tibet.

Shri S. S. More: Is it all relevant to our defence?

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: I will show how it is relevant.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is relevant to our defence on the northern side.

Shri K. P. Tripathi (Darrang): Any aggression anywhere in India.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: Today for the first time in our history, our northern frontier is in danger.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: You did not object when it was under the suzerainty of Chiang Kai-Shek.

Shri S. S. More: There is something like a family talk going on here.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: In the past, this Himalayan border on the north was most peaceful and tranquil for ages, and the Himalayas provided the most impregnable barrier against any invasion or threat from the north. But this myth of impregnability of the Himalayas has been exploded now. These snow-clad mountains are warming up with the troops of China, and today for the first time in our history, there is danger from the north.

So, I urge for a new approach to our policy of defence, and that policy should be in keeping with the requirements and the demands of necessity. My hon. friend here was referring to the Himalayan policy. Yes, I am fond of a Himalayan policy. We must have a positive Himalayan policy.

Shri S. S. More: It will be a Himalayan blunder.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: It will not be a Himalayan blunder; on the other hand, it will be a great bulwark of defence. So we should not treat this problem so simply like that.

Next I come to the defence organisation and the working of the defence installations in the land. I am very sorry that time and again we have to raise various problems on the floor of the House before the Minister to get a satisfactory answer. But at no time the Minister has taken any step with regard to these problems. Sir, I refer here to some of the few important problems which are uppermost in our mind. One is about the retrenchment that is being resorted to by the Defence Ministry. Many a time we raised this problem, but in reply the Minister has not given any satisfactory answer. Retrenchment is going on even today and thousands of people are threatened with retrenchment. Moreover, I must remind him that there is enough capacity in defence industry to absorb all these personnel; there is no necessity for retrenchment of these personnel. There is adequate capacity installed.....

Shri Satish Chandra: There has not been retrenchment of a single man during the last one year as far as defence industries are concerned.

The Deputy Minister of Defence (Sardar Majithia): We have employed more.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: I am referring here to the cases.....

Shri Morarka (Ganganagar-Jhunjhunu): Possibilities.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: Not the possibility, but of cases in ordnance depots and factories both.

Shri Satish Chandra: In factories, there has been no retrenchment. He was referring to the production side just now.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: I am referring to factories as well as depots, both.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: How many thousands are retrenched?

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: Nearly 4,000.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Minister says that not even a single person has been retrenched.

Shri Satish Chandra: As far as factories were concerned. He was referring to production, and utilisation of surplus labour for increased production. So I said there had been no retrenchment in ordnance factories.

Shri S. S. More: Is your information up-to-date?

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: If there is no retrenchment in factories, what about depots? If there is retrenchment, what action has been taken to stop this retrenchment?

Secondly, Sir, there are other demands from the defence employees. The main demand is that the Committee which has been set up under the chairmanship of Sardar Baldev Singh has not included any representative of the employees. So far that demand has not been respected and not properly answered by the Minister.

The next point is about the contract system which is prevailing in the MES establishment. Sir, lakhs of rupees can be saved on this item if the contract system is abolished and if the department itself takes up the works. Today, the original works, and even the maintenance works, are given to contractors and the contractors are making a lot of money. There is a lot of wastage. This can be saved. Not only that. People who are going to be retrenched can be absorbed for these works: there is no necessity for retrenchment.

Then, Sir, there is lack of building accommodation for the employees. Various schemes have been submitted by the employees to the Ministry. So far the Ministry has failed to take up this matter and there is no accommodation for the employees. They say that retrenchment is resorted to because there is no work. There is ample work for the employees, but unfortunately the Minister is not taking any steps in this matter.

Then, Sir, I come to the most important thing, about foreign experts who are.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Why does the hon. Member reserve the most important point to the last?

Shri S. S. More: To impress on our minds!

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: So that it may remain in the minds of hon. Members. Sir, the Prime Minister was saying that from 8,000, the number had been reduced to nearly 200 or so. That answer was given by the Minister concerned to one of my questions a few days ago. But the matter is very important, not because we are very much against, or we are afraid of, those foreigners, but the situation that exists today in the land is such that it demands that there should not be any foreigner in important positions.

7 P.M.

Defence is a very important matter and Defence Organisation is a very important thing. If Defence secrets go 60 P.S.D.

out of the country it means the danger for us. We should not allow any foreigner to know anything about our Defence. If it had been normal times, we could have allowed 200 or even 300 foreigners in our service. The number is not important. What is important today is to realise that there is a marked alteration in the situation, and the security of the country is subject to increasing danger. The Middle, South and South East Asia are in a fluid condition and in such a context, should we allow any foreigner to come and work in our Defence Services? That is all the point. As I said, the number is not the important factor; it is the opportunity and scope given to foreigners to know what is happening in our Defence system which is important. There may be thousands of foreigners or there may be one or two of them, but in a matter like this the consequence is the same. Even one foreigner is enough to know defence secrets. So I say that there should be complete Indianisation in all the branches of the Defence Organisation and there should not be any foreigner and we should not allow such people to work hereafter in such positions.

Lastly, I say that the Defence Minister should think of establishing a common defence policy for the South Asian countries. Some of them like Ceylon, and Burma are allied with us. They represent the same area. So we must have a pact or an understanding for the whole area for the purpose of common defence. That will save not only money but also will increase our collecting defence strength. Not only that; it will stabilise our neighbouring countries which means our own stability. So I suggest that we may take positive steps to bring about some sort of an understanding or a pact if necessary to have a common defence for this area.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have to make an announcement. I have to inform hon. Members that the House will sit