

Mr. Chairman: All right. The name of Mr. Matin will be excluded and in its place the name of Shrimati Vijaya Raje will be included.

The question is:

"That the Probation of Offenders Bill, 1957, be referred to a Joint Committee of the Houses consisting of 36 Members, 24 from this House, namely, Sardar Hukam Singh, Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava, Shrimati Uma Nehru, Shri Sinhasan Singh, Shri C. D. Gautam, Shri Jaganatha Rao, Shri T. Manaen, Dr. Y. S. Parmar, Shri Venketrao, Shri Shrinivasrao Naldurgker, Shri N. Keshava, Shri M. K. Jinachandran, Shri C, Bali Reddy, Shri K. S. Ramaswamy, Shri S. Keswara Iyer, Kunwarni Vijaya Raje, Shri Yadva Narayan Jadhav, Shri Purushottamdas R, Patel, Shri Jagdish Awasthi, Shri Naushir Bharucha, Dr. Sushila, Nayar, Shrimati Mafida Ahmed, Shrimati Sangam Laxmi Bai, Shri B. N. Datar and Shri Shree Narayan Das (Mover and 12 Members from Rajya Sabha;

that in order to constitute a sitting of the Joint Committee the quorum shall be one-third of the total number of members of the Joint Committee;

that the Committee shall make a report to this House by the first day of the third week of the next session;

that in other respects the Rules of Procedure of this House relating to Parliamentary Committees will apply with such variations and modifications as the Speaker may make; and

that this House recommends to Rajya Sabha that Rajya Sabha do join the said Joint Committee and communicate to this House the names of members to be appointed by Rajya Sabha to the Joint Committee."

The motion was adopted.

The Deputy Minister of Defence (Shri Raghuramalah): Mr. Chairman, I beg to move:

"That the Bill to consolidate and amend the law relating to the government of the Indian Navy, as reported by the Joint Committee, be taken into consideration".

As the House is aware, the Bill was introduced in Lok Sabha on the 31st May 1957. The hon. the Defence Minister moved the motion for reference to the Joint Select Committee on 22nd July 1957 and the House agreed to that and referred it on the 23rd July.

The Rajya Sabha discussed the motion on the 13th and 14th August and concurred in the motion on the 14th of August 1957.

The Joint Select Committee had held 13 sittings, considered the matter for nearly 46 hours—to be more specific 46 hours and 40 minutes—and also disposed of about 350 amendments. The Committee brought to bear on the measure, not only its legal acumen but also the exhaustive knowledge which some of the hon. Members had regarding our Navy. The Chairman and members devoted their very best attention to the proceedings and have now submitted their report. That report is now before the House.

The Indian Navy has had a very chequered history. The hon. Defence Minister, when he moved the motion for reference to the Joint Committee in July, made a very exhaustive speech, tracing back the maritime history of this country, going back thousands of years, with particular reference to that part of our history wherein in about the early centuries of the Christian era, India had the unique honour of being the then greatest maritime power, with complete mastery of the seas around. We have passed through many vicissitudes of history since then. There was a time when the Navy was merely the hon. East India Company's marine,

[Shri Raghuramaiah]

later on it developed into what was then called the Bombay marine. It was only before Independence, some time before that, that we had what was then called the Royal Indian Navy. After Independence, with the proclamation of the Republic, the word Royal was omitted and since then, we have the nomenclature the Indian Navy. It is not my object to go into all that chequered history because that has been done very ably, if I may say so, and in his own inimitable style by the hon. Defence Minister. I would only like to recapitulate the very recent history beginning with the enactment of the Indian Navy Discipline Act, 1934.

That Act was enacted in pursuance of the provisions of the Government of India Act. The Indian Navy Discipline Act of 1934 adopted the U.K. Navy Discipline Act with such modifications as were considered necessary. At that time, no attempt was made to adopt other statutes in the U.K. governing the Navy. The U.K. Navy Discipline Act confined itself to disciplinary matters. Following that pattern, the Indian Navy Discipline Act also confined itself to matters of discipline. As I mentioned, no attempt was made at that time to go through the other enactments in the U.K. governing not only discipline, but enlistment, service conditions, pay and allowances, etc. of the persons belonging to the Navy. Although we had our new Air Forces Act and Army Act—Parliament passed those measures in 1950—, it was considered prudent at that time to wait for some time more before bringing in this fresh enactment because at that time, one of the important Committees appointed in the U.K. to consider the whole naval structure there was still considering the whole matter. It was thought that it would be wise for us to await the recommendations of that Committee also. Since then, the Committee did make recommendations and not only that, the U.K. also have passed the new Navy Act.

The members of the Joint Committee which went through this measure had, therefore, the advantage of going through all those enactments in the U.K. and also they went through or, at any rate, considered, I presume, the salient features of other Naval enactments of other countries. The present Bill comprises, therefore, not only discipline, but all other matters which are necessary in the administration of the Navy, raising of the Naval forces, administration, enlistment of persons, conditions of service of those persons, pay and allowances and all other matters appurtenant thereto.

The Joint Committee very carefully, if I may say so, considered the numerous suggestions made both in this House and in the Rajya Sabha and the criticisms levelled in regard to certain matters and has given its very best thought to them. I shall not tire the House by going through every clause which has been dealt with in this manner because during the further stages of the proceedings, we shall have ample opportunity to do so. I shall, however, mention a few of the important alterations which the Joint Committee has thought fit to make in regard to the original Bill

Great attention was paid, quite rightly, both by the Government and by this House to ensure that conditions of service are honourable. In particular, attention was devoted by many of the hon. Members here and by the Committee to ensure that the conditions of service in relation to officers and other ranks are no more onerous than are required by the necessities of the maintenance of the structure of the armed forces and the discipline of the persons belonging thereto. In some matters, what was implicit in some of the other provisions of the Bill have been made more explicit or what was a mere matter of rule of practice has been incorporated into this Bill.

One such example is the right of resignation given to seamen. As the original Bill stood, this right was incorporated specifically only in relation to the officers. However, it has been a longstanding practice that even other ranks could always ask to be released and on compassionate grounds there have been cases of such release. But, the Committee thought it would be better if that provision relating to the right to resign is extended statutorily to seamen also and that has been incorporated in the Bill.

The Committee has also made another important addition, the addition of a new clause No. 46 which relates to ill-treatment of subordinates. As the Bill was originally framed, it was thought that clause 57 of the Bill which penalised any conduct of an officer unworthy of him would be sufficient to cover cases of ill-treatment also, because, if I may say so, there is nothing more reprehensible in the Naval Code as ill-treatment of a subordinate officer by a superior officer. The Committee, however, thought that it would be better that specific provision in that regard is made. Clause 46 has been inserted penalising specifically ill-treatment of subordinates.

Another example where the Committee wanted that there should be equality of treatment so far as it is consistent with, as I mentioned originally, the structure of the armed forces and the discipline of the persons belonging to them—equality of treatment as regards officers and other ranks—is in relation to drunkenness. As originally framed, the Bill imposed a different punishment in regard to drunkenness by officers than in regard to the commission of the same offence by seamen. In regard to an officer, drunkenness was made punishable with dismissal with disgrace, that was the maximum punishment. If the same offence was committed by a seaman, the maximum punishment in certain circumstances was six months. The Joint Committee thought fit to revise the relevant

clause and remove the distinction and make the same punishment of two years or six months as the case may be applicable in both the cases. These are some of the instances wherein the Joint Committee had taken very great pains to ensure that there is equality of treatment between officers and other ranks in matters in which such treatment can be accorded, and to see that it appears also on the very face of the measure.

Other important alterations made in the Bill relate to review proceedings and also the provisions relating to the Judge Advocate General. In regard to review, it was provided in the original Bill that in every case where there is a finding by court martial, there ought to be a review by the Judge Advocate of the Fleet, or to be more correct under the new designation, the Judge Advocate General. There was, however, no provision in it for a person aggrieved by a decision of the court martial to be heard in person by the authority reviewing it, namely the Judge Advocate General. The Committee has now empowered the Judge Advocate General in suitable cases where an application for review was made by an aggrieved person to accord that person the right to appear either in person or through a legal practitioner or through an officer of the Navy before the Judge Advocate General. The procedure of review has also been made applicable by the Committee to disciplinary proceedings which was not so under the original Bill, so that the remedy of review which was under the original Bill available only to court martial proceedings, has also been made available to cases in which there are disciplinary proceedings.

In regard to the Judge Advocate General, provision has been made changing slightly the nomenclature of persons in that office. The original Bill provided for the appointment of a judge Advocate General and a number of deputies and assistants, but the Committee thought that the proper nomenclature would be, in

[Shri Raghuramaiah]

regard to persons other than the Judge Advocate General, the Judge Advocate, and that authority should be given to the Government to appoint one of them as Deputy Judge Advocate.

There are also a number of other minor matters. I would not like to tire the House listing them all out, but I would like to say that on the whole the Committee has not only improved the general tenor of these provisions, but has gone a long way to present before the House a greatly improved measure from the point of view of drafting. They have taken particular care to see that the measure is made much simpler; I am not at the moment going into the number of clauses which have been economised, but it is certainly much more presentable.

The majority of the Committee have agreed to all these changes which I have mentioned. There have also been a few hon. Members who have appended their minutes of dissent and notes. I shall not go now in detail into any of those matters, but I shall be failing in my duty if I do not refer to at least the most important of them.

A considerable part of the time of the Committee was devoted to the question of the provision of an appeal against the decisions of the court martial. Attention of the Members was invited in this connection to the provisions in the U.K., Canada, Australia, U.S.A., and so on, and the matter was discussed at very great length, and it was also considered by the Government at all levels. The Committee felt that in the present context, in the present circumstances obtaining in the country, perhaps the Bill as it now stands may remain as it is. In the U.K. they have provided for a court of appeal to which any person aggrieved by a decision of the court martial there, subject to certain conditions, could appeal. It was felt that in the circumstances now obtaining in this country, the incorporation

of such a provision might lead to various difficulties. In the first place, I may mention for the information of the House that the number of cases dealt with by the court martial regarding the Navy in this country has been very few indeed—, I think there have been only 31 cases since 1954. There have been no cases of death sentence at all during this period. Considering the volume of cases and also the fact that it would cause considerable delay in the administration of justice if further stages of appeal and so on are provided for, and considering also the need for a quick disposal of cases, it has been the opinion of the Government, and the opinion of the majority of the Members of the Committee, that there need be no provision in this country for a measure like the one they have in the U.K.

At the same time, in order to ensure that justice is done and that nobody's life is placed in jeopardy, steps have been taken to improve wherever possible the provisions. As I said a little while ago, there is a provision giving the opportunity of personal hearing to the person aggrieved before the Judge Advocate General who reviews this matter which will have, I am sure, a very salutary effect. The qualifications of the Judge Advocate General are comparable to those applying to the Judges of the High Court. In addition to this, the Committee have also prescribed high qualifications for the Deputy Judge Advocate General. In regard to the Deputy Judge Advocate General it has been prescribed as seven years practice at the bar or seven years of judicial experience, qualifications corresponding to those prescribed for District Judges. Every case dealt with by court martial will be reviewed by the Judge Advocate General; there is also the right to the person aggrieved to appear either in person or through a legal practitioner or through an officer of the Navy before the Judge Advocate General; furthermore, in matters where the

capital sentence is imposed, the sentence has got to be confirmed by the Central Government. Over and above all this procedure of review, there is also now under the Bill the right given to any person aggrieved by any finding of the court martial to prefer a petition either to the Central Government or the Chief of the Naval Staff. Considering all these safeguards it has been felt that these would go a long way to ensure that justice is done, and that we need not at this stage embark on a new venture and facilitate the delay which will be necessarily involved in the provision of any further appellate authority.

The history of U.K. and of other countries is quite different. The institutions there have grown out of their own moorings, and we have to find our own solutions consistent with the genius of our country and the conditions obtaining here. This is one of the answers to the allegation often made that we have simply copied *verbatim* the provisions of the U. K. Act. This is a clear instance where we have thought fit to differ from the provisions of the UK Act and the practice obtaining in that country.

In formulating the various provisions of this Bill, we have taken into account not only the provisions of the Army Act and the Air Force Act but also various other enactments. But in no case have we blindly followed or copied any particular measure. The naval history shows that of all the wings, the wing which takes the longest time to build is the naval wing; it is so the world over; it is an international community. So, in formulating this Bill, I believe by the committee also while considering the Bill, all this great history running over centuries, in various countries, and all the traditions that have been built up have been taken into account.

Our present Navy, though young, has, I am proud to say, built up glorious traditions within these few years. It is, of course, in the formative stage, but I suppose nothing is

more important than that there should be sound foundations.

The Bill as now presented before this House is a comprehensive measure, a self-containing code which has taken into account all the various enactments the world over, and the traditions that have been built up within our town country. And I would commend it for the consideration of the House.

Before I sit down, I would like to mention once again personally my own thanks to the chairman and members of the Joint Committee, who have given their very best attention and spent a long time over the various provisions of the Bill.

Shri D. C. Sharma: Who was the chairman?

Shri Raghuramaiah: As you know, the chairman was Shri S. V. Ramaswami.

The Deputy Minister of Defence (Sardar Majithia): The committee was appointed by the House. So, the hon. Member should know.

Shri Raghuramaiah: If there are any points which will arise during the course of the discussion, I shall be most happy to be of any assistance to the House in clarifying them.

Mr. Chairman: Motion moved.

There is an amendment to this motion....

Shri Naushir Bharucha (East Khadesh): I desire to move an amendment to the motion made by the Minister.

Mr. Chairman: I am referring to that. The first point that I find, apart from the question of waiving of notice is that whatever amendments are suggested by the hon. Member in his amendment can be made by tabling amendments while the Bill is under consideration.

[Mr. Chairman]

Secondly, after the Bill has returned from the Joint Committee after consideration by them, no new circumstance has arisen which requires consideration by the Joint Committee.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: That is for the House to decide.

Mr. Chairman: I have to put it to the House. Then, the House can decide. I do not think that this amendment of the hon. Member is admissible. Under rule 341 (3), I find:

"If the Speaker is of opinion that a motion for re-committal of a Bill to a Select Committee of the House or a Joint Committee of the Houses or circulation or re-circulation of the Bill after the Select Committee of the House or the Joint Committee of the Houses has reported thereon, is in the nature of a dilatory motion in abuse of the rules of the House inasmuch as the Select Committee of the House or the Joint Committee of the Houses, as the case may be, has dealt with the Bill in a proper manner or that no unforeseen or new circumstance has arisen since the Bill emerged from such Committee, he may forthwith put the question thereon or decline to propose the question."

In this case, the report of the Joint Committee was presented to the House only on the 11th inst. No new circumstance has arisen since then, which requires this House to send it again to the Joint Committee. So, on that ground.....

Shri Naushir Bharucha: Before you give your ruling on this, may I be permitted to mention one thing? The amendment which I want to move desires to recommit the report to the same Joint Committee with instructions to the Committee to make the following particular and additional

provisions in the Bill by the 31st of January, 1958, namely:

"That clause 5 be re-drafted..

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member may please show me that part of the amendment he wants, which he thinks cannot be done by the whole House, while the Bill is being considered.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: All of them. For instance, if I say that clause 5 be re-drafted so as to lay down in the Bill itself the principles and policies governing the raising and maintaining of regular naval force and auxiliary naval forces, including their constitution, hierarchy of commands, the relation of naval forces to the Army and Air Force etc., the thing cannot be done by an amendment, unless the Joint Committee has gone into the matter. In fact, the Joint Committee has not gone into this matter.

Mr. Chairman: The Committee is only a substitute for the House, where some consideration is necessary, which cannot be done by about five hundred Members. It is not that every amendment, unless it goes before the Select Committee or the Joint Committee, cannot be considered here. I do not find that the reason given by the hon. Member is justified.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: Rule 77, under which I have tabled this amendment reads thus.

"(1) After the presentation of the final report of a Select Committee of the House or a Joint Committee of the Houses, as the case may be, on a Bill, the member in charge may move—

.....
.....

(b) that the Bill as reported by the Select Committee of the House or the Joint committee of the Houses, as the case may be, be re-committed to the same Select Committee or to a new Select Committee, or to the same Joint Committee or to a new Joint

Committee with the concurrence of the Council, either—

- (i) without limitation, or
- (ii) with respect to particular clauses or amendments only, or
- (iii) with instructions to the Committee to make some particular or additional provision in the Bill;....".

Then, say Member can move also..

Mr. Chairman: There is no bar to moving, but the hon. Member may please show me how he meets the provisions of rule 341.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: If the Chairman is satisfied that this is a dilatory motion and rules on that point, I cannot help it. But I submit that this is under rule 77. It is absolutely within the four corners of the rules.

Mr. Chairman: Under rule 341, the hon. Member may please show that certain new circumstances have arisen which render it necessary that the House must re-commit the Bill to the same Joint Committee or some other Joint Committee.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: Rule 77 gives me the right without imposing any such restriction. Where does rule 77 say that a new circumstance must arise and then only a Member can move a proposition for re-committing the same Bill to the same Joint Committee?

Shri Raghuramaiah: May I mention that all these points were considered by the Joint Committee, namely points Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 4 of the hon. Member's amendment, and some of these are subject-matters of the minutes of dissent?

Mr. Chairman: So, I do not propose to accept it or waive notice. I rule it out of order.

Since there is no other motion like that, I now call upon Shri U. C. Patnaik.

Shri U. C. Patnaik (Ganjam): I agree with the Minister that India had a great naval past, that India was a great nation which went to all countries by the sea both for colonisation as well as for occupation, and that our officers of the Indian Navy and our ratings and seamen have kept alive that reputation, and during the last few years they have built up a reputation for the Indian Navy. Our Indian naval personnel have gone more or less as semi-official ambassadors to other countries, and they have raised the prestige of our country abroad. I pay my best compliments to them.

At the same time, I would submit that our naval organisation is not commensurate with the requirements of defence of our 3500 miles of coast-line; it is not commensurate also with our oceanic trade and our communications. We have, therefore, got to consider while examining this Navy Bill, what steps could be taken to reorganise our Naval Forces, to reorganise the administrative machinery which is now running the Naval Forces so that they will be adequate for our national requirements.

We have been told just now that our Navy Bill is a compilation of all the Navy Acts of different countries.

Shri Raghuramaiah: May I say a word, Sir? I did not say 'compilation'. I have said that it has taken into account the provisions of various enactments.

Shri U. C. Patnaik: It has taken into account the provisions of the various Acts of the various countries or the experience of the various countries. It is a comprehensive legislation for running the naval organisation. With all respect, I beg to differ from this statement.

He has just now stated that our Navy Bill is largely based upon the UK model, not a faithful follower of

[Shri U. C. Patnaik]

the UK Acts and that was the trend of discussion in the Joint Committee. I could point out the fact that all the Naval Acts of UK and the naval organisation of UK itself—are all based upon one fundamental organisation and that is the Admiralty organisation. In the UK they have got their Admiralty to look after the Navy, the Air Council to look after the Air Force and the Army Council to look after the Army. In fact in 1903, there was a reference to the Usher Committee to organise the Army itself on the Admiralty model. In that country, all their enactments and rules of procedure are based upon that basic concept—Admiralty. So also in 1904, they organised the Army Council on the model of the Admiralty in order to run the Army organisation. In 1924 or so, they organised the Air Council to run the Air force organisation? The thing is that they want the Admiralty, the Army Council and the Navy Council to function as a Government itself.

Here, our Government is the Defence Ministry assisted by associated Finance. The Army, Navy and the Air Force are subordinate departments under the Ministry of Defence. That is why there has been a lot of trouble. During the last ten years, we have not been able to advance rapidly. Moneys are being asked for certain projects, for equipment, for weapons, for modernisation of the Defence Services. The request is put by the Army or Navy or the Air Force Headquarters in consultation with associated Finance. Then it is accepted by the Government and incorporated in the Budget. After incorporation in the Budget, the whole thing goes again to the Defence Ministry and you know in our Defence Ministry we have very few people who have got any defence background or training in the defence services. The result is that it takes some months for the Defence Ministry to think it over. It goes again to the Defence Finance or the Financial Adviser. It takes some more months.

An urgent item of work is postponed for seven or eight months hung up in the Defence Ministry, Financial Adviser's office. When it finally receives the approval of the Government, it is too late to get the thing and the whole thing falls flat and the need for our requirements are over and so we do not have it. That is why they have got some organisations in other countries to expedite the naval, army and other defence requirements.

Here, in our country we have got the head of the Defence Organisation fighting our battle in foreign countries. We have got his entire staff, hundreds of officers, who have no background either of the Army, Navy or Air Force, with the result that all proposals emanating from the three service headquarters are pigeon-holed in the Defence Secretariat, in the Finance or in the Planning Commission and we are not able to go ahead. Therefore, it was probably the proposal of some hon. Members in the Joint Committee particularly members of the Ruling Party like Dr Barlingay and the hon. Member from Tehri Garhwal, to have reorganisation on the lines of the Admiralty.

Admiralty is something corresponding to the Air Council and Army Council. Admiralty consists of the Defence Minister as Chairman. Its Vice-President is corresponding to our hon. Deputy Minister. The Secretary of that Committee is the permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Defence. Then you have got a number of Civil Lords as you have civil members in the Air Council and Army Council. You have also Military Lords or Naval Lords, the Chief of Navy Staff, the Deputy Chief, the Chief of Personnel, the Chief of Material, the Chief of Air Arm and so on. These people constitute the Admiralty. They deal with all the problems relating to the Navy and they take a decision. That decision is the decision of the Government, because Finance is represented there, the Ministry is represented there, the

Minister himself runs the show and the permanent Under Secretary—corresponding to our Defence Secretary—is the man in charge of the organisation. So, everything is finalised at that level. They sit across the table and discuss every project, every scheme, every naval requirement and the whole thing is decided there with the result that things have not to go for eight or ten months in the Defence Ministry and the office of the Financial Adviser.

That is why I have moved an amendment that we should have some organisation with the Defence Minister in the Chair, with the hon. Deputy Minister as Vice President to officiate whenever the Defence Minister is fighting our battles in the UNO or elsewhere, the permanent Secretary of the Department as one of the members, and also the Additional Secretary to be one of the members. I would not have asked for that but, unfortunately, our permanent Secretary comes from a State Government with probably no knowledge of defence affairs. Therefore, I think that the Additional Secretary who was Director General of Defence Accounts for some years

Shri Raghuramaiah: May I just seek the protection of the Chair to see that personal attacks on officers who are not here to defend themselves might be avoided?

Shri U. C. Patnalk: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, I did not attack anybody. What I say is that for our defence requirements we must have the best men with defence knowledge.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member I think only said that a particular officer was not well experienced. I think that is not a reflection. He has not even named the person. We must have everything in moderation and not go to the extreme. That can be contradicted by the Minister or by any other Member.

Shri Raghuramaiah: I thought I heard the hon. Member saying that the permanent Secretary comes from

a State and then went on saying something about want of experience. I thought it may be construed as a reflection. Anyhow, I am in your hands, Sir.

Shri U. C. Patnalk: It is not a reflection cast on anybody in the Defence Ministry. I would continue in that line and say that they sent a senior officer to foreign countries to undergo military training.

17-00 hrs.

Mr. Chairman: I do not think that is proper. It may not be clear to him whether the officer is experienced or not. That is a matter of discussion which is to be made here. You have just given expression to a view of yours. I think the hon. Member should not go further. He cannot justify it by giving reasons, this and that. Then it becomes a matter not relevant here. So long as it is a simple case, I do not think it is good going to the extreme. He cannot further justify it by giving reasons. All that I would not allow.

Shri Jaipal Singh (Ranchi West-Reserved—Sch. Tribes): It is rather a serious point of privilege which is raised by the objection that has been taken. It is one thing to say—

Mr. Chairman: He has submitted to the Chair.

Shri Jaipal Singh: I say it is a very serious point. I humbly submit that it is one thing to say that a person is not here to defend himself, and even when the Minister is not here to defend himself—that he must not be criticised. Here it is something different, something where an hon. Member got up to make fake statement. Let us go away from Defence and say, some other subject. For instance, take the Secretary for Information and Broadcasting. I would be perfectly entitled to say that the particular civil servant knew nothing about broadcasting when he became a Secretary. There is nothing wrong.

[Shri Jaipal Singh]

Similarly, I am only trying to point out where the limitation is. I can understand personal attacks; well, they are indefensible. But where a general statement is made, as has been done in this particular case, that a particular Secretary or whatever else he is—it may be a Minister, and he need not know anything about defence.....

Mr. Chairman: I do not think it is necessary to dwell on that point. Here, the simple question is, there were certain observations, regarding a person, who, according to the hon. Members' opinion, is not experienced. On that I ruled that it is not such a reflection as to be prohibited outright in this House. But when he wants to justify it, then it becomes a subject-matter of consideration on the floor of this House when it is not so. We are just considering the Navy Bill—whether it is good, all right or whether there need be any amendments or not or any more provision is necessary. We are not here considering whether an establishment in the executive is just as a Member wants. That is entirely a separate matter. Therefore, we should consider what is before the House and not bring in new things for consideration. Let us just dispose of what is just before the House. I have already disposed of the other point. If the hon. Member wants to raise a bigger issue on that, as a general matter, he can do it any moment when the Speaker is here.

Shri Jaipal Singh: I am sorry. I think I have been misunderstood. I was not trying to justify in anyway any extraneous matter that might have been brought up. All that I was trying to point out was that my hon. friend here was trying to give a picture of the organisation of the Admiralty as it is in the United Kingdom, and while he was trying to give the picture of that, *en passant*, when he showed us how it was composed and the like, this picture came. But the objection was taken from the

Treasury Benches, and whatever I have said, it was.....

Mr. Chairman: I have given my ruling on that. Why does the hon. Member rub it?

Shri Dasappa (Bangalore): The hon. Member just now said.....

Mr. Chairman: I do not think it is necessary to go on with this.

Shri Dasappa: I would like to know if a person comes from a State.....

Mr. Chairman: If he likes, he can answer it when he gets his turn.

Shri Dasappa: Am I heard by the Chair?

Shri Warior (Trichur): We are interested in that. Let us have it tomorrow.

Shri Dasappa: Is the fact that a person hails from a State is going to be a disqualification? The hon. Member said he comes from a State.

Shri Narayanankutty Menon (Mukundapuram): It is a very big question. We may discuss it tomorrow

Mr. Chairman: After all, the hon. Member has said, "he has just come from the State and therefore, he does not know about the defence organisation that is running here". This is a very thin end; it is just a general observation of an hon. Member. Any other hon. Member may say, "he is a very competent officer". So, we should not be very much sensitive to general observations of this kind. Otherwise, it is impossible to carry on in this House. I do not think we should discuss this matter any more.

The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

17.06 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, the 19th November, 1957.