

The cut motions were, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts shown in the fourth the column of the Order Paper, be granted to the President, to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1962, in respect of the heads of Demands entered in the second column thereof against Demands Nos. 1 to 5 and 109 relating to the Ministry of Commerce and Industry."

The motion was adopted.

[*The motions of Demands for Grants which were adopted by the Lok Sabha are reproduced below—Ed.*]

DEMAND No. 1—MINISTRY OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 70,87,000 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, 1962, in respect of 'Ministry of Commerce and Industry'."

DEMAND No. 2—INDUSTRIES

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 18,10,07,000 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, 1962, in respect of 'Industries'."

DEMAND No. 3—SALT

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 49,21,000 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, 1962, in respect of 'Salt'."

DEMAND No. 4—COMMERCIAL INTELLIGENCE AND STATISTICS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 85,51,000 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, 1962, in respect of 'Commercial Intelligence and Statistics'."

DEMAND No. 5—MISCELLANEOUS DEPARTMENTS AND EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,16,20,000 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, 1962, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Departments and Expenditure under the Ministry of Commerce and Industry'."

DEMAND No. 109—CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 24,44,29,000 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, 1962, in respect of 'Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Commerce and Industry'."

The motion was adopted.

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

Mr. Speaker: We will now take up the Demands relating to the Ministry of Defence.

DEMAND No. 8—MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 40,18,000 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, 1962, in respect of 'Ministry of Defence.'"

DEMAND No. 9—DEFENCE SERVICES, EFFECTIVE—ARMY

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,90,95,65,000 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, 1962, in respect of 'Defence Services, Effective-Army'."

DEMAND No. 10—DEFENCE SERVICES, EFFECTIVE—NAVY

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 18,37,60,000 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, 1962, in respect of 'Defence Services Effective-Navy'."

DEMAND No. 11—DEFENCE SERVICES, EFFECTIVE—AIR FORCE

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 57,69,02,000 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, 1962, in respect of 'Defence Services, Effective-Air Force'."

DEMAND No. 12—DEFENCE SERVICES, NON-EFFECTIVE—CHARGES

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 17,04,95,000 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, 1962, in

respect of 'Defence Services, Non-Effective-Charges.'"

DEMAND No. 111—DEFENCE CAPITAL OUTLAY

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 30,21,88,000 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, 1962, in respect of 'Defence Capital Outlay'."

The hon. Minister of Defence,

The Minister of Defence (Shri Krishna Menon): Mr. Speaker, it has not been my practice in the past years to initiate the debate on Demands for Grants but since there are many problems on which a considerable amount of misunderstanding exists and you, Sir, yourself has asked me to explain certain matters and in order, also, to take this occasion to put out the Defence policy, as far as I understand it, in perspective, I propose to do so. In this year's Budget, we are asking for a grant of Rs. 283 crores on the revenue side and Rs. 32 crores on the capital side; it shows an increase of Rs. 16 crores in revenue expenditure and a decrease of Rs. 5 crores in capital expenditure. The increase is largely due to the pay and allowances of officers and men and also of stores and equipment. These figures perhaps may not represent the reality as the year goes on. In order that our finances may be properly administered—and we had discussions with the Finance Minister—it is only in regard to sanctioned schemes that provision is made in this budget. I say this because in the course of the year, in the circumstances in which our country is placed at the present time, it would be necessary for Government to come and ask for supplementary grants.

Also, I would like to say that this expenditure, with the experience that has gone on since Independence, and

[Shri Krishna Menon]

with the growth of indigenous production, the capacity for adaptation, the money does go further.

That takes me to the consideration of an expression of statement in regard to our Defence policy. It is not possible to do anything more than make a general statement of principles. As the House well knows, the policy of this country in regard to the world as a whole is to work for a world without a war. At the same time, so long as the world is not disarmed, and when we have a very long process to achieve it—to which I shall make a reference later on—we have to protect ourselves and recognise that we do not live in conditions of reasonable security unless we provide for our defence. Therefore, the three-fold basis of our defence policy is, firstly, the protection of our frontiers which is somewhere near 9,000 miles in respect of land and 3,500 miles in respect of coastline; secondly, to come to the aid of the civil power not only in regard to the problems of law and order which unfortunately do arise from time to time, but in regard to the assistance when natural disaster or similar circumstances occur; and thirdly, to help this country to discharge the international obligations which it undertakes as, as has been recently done, in sending our troops to the Congo.

The important features in regard to the services has been the greater efficiency in the armed forces of India by greater insistence on improvement in the quality of training, the advance made in the condition of troops and officers not only by the increase of emoluments and other facilities in regard to the movement but also in regard to the welfare of troops. The services have also vastly improved in logistic capacity, and while it is not possible to disclose to the House the gaps that have been bridged in this matter, I think I am justified in saying that the Indian army has today got much quicker

movement than it was sometime ago. There has also been very considerable advance not only in the co-ordination between these three services but even in the steps towards integration in regard to training, provisioning and even manufacture.

The main purpose of this debate is to discuss these principles and go into criticisms of the administration, and it has been repeatedly stated by certain Members of this House that there is not adequate information given, and that in the British House of Commons a White Paper is presented. I believe the Prime Minister said something about it which merits consideration. I have here the British White Paper and the report that is presented by the Government of India. There would be no objection to bind this volume in white, but there is vastly more information in these pages, given at great length. I do not want to transgress the limits of propriety by referring in detail to the British document, but all that it contains is not more than and not other than what we have given in these pages here in our report—about the size of troops and about certain equipment. The reason why the number of personnel in the army is given in the British budget is this—I shall refer to it later—namely, it is a historic reason. In the 17th century, the kings at that time raised levies and Parliament put a check on them, and unless Parliament granted the money the troops could not be provided. Therefore, it has gone on. It is a constitutional necessity to put that in, but it is pretty well covered. If you look at the White Paper and compare it with what is contained in this document, you will find this. It used to be 16 pages when it first started. Now it is 87 pages. It deals with every branch of administration and gives a very considerable amount of detail. It may well be that the volume of information sometimes prevents a perusal of it, as it always happens in some cases. So, so far as the Government of India

is concerned, the information is placed at the disposal of the House in this report, in answer to questions, adjournment motions and also information is supplied to the Estimates Committee and other committees of Parliament. If in any way this can be improved as a result of this debate, speaking for the Government, I may say that we would only be glad to do so

There has been a pointed reference to the fact that some of this information is rather bald, that is to say, we just give a very large number of items, but you yourself, Sir, were under the impression that more information ought to be given as is the practice in the House of Commons; and you, Sir, also said that where there is no precedent, we copy them. If you look at the army, the air and the navy estimates, you will find what is given in the British estimates: there is 'ammunition'—£10 million and odd. That is all that is given. The same applies to aircraft, air-frames—40 million pounds and aero-engines, £30 million. There is no other information given in this White Paper. Indeed, it would be against the security of the country to give very much more than that.

Mr. Speaker: They have given the numbers of the Royal Navy, the army and the aircraft.

Shri Krishna Menon: I said that. In England they give the number of troops. In fact, if I may say so, there has been considerable effort on the part of the various other countries to find out the strength of our army, and we have consistently refused to disclose it.

Mr. Speaker: They also given some items: for example, a blood-hound missile costs £35,000; a heavy AA shell would cost so much, etc. I am reading from the White Paper.

Shri Krishna Menon: Yes, Sir. Some equipment is given. When I come to deal with it, I will give all the infor-

mation about what they do not give.

Mr. Speaker: The main point is, from time to time, during the Question Hour and at other times, the House wants to know the figures. Here, in the White Paper in England, the number in each—the Royal Navy, the army and the aircraft—is given; the details are given. What they propose to raise during the next year is given; the recruitment is given. The basis in the whole world wherever they have them and in England are given.

Shri Krishna Menon: They have given some figures. But it is not so in the whole world. There are very powerful countries who are in a position to give that information. In Britain there are historic reasons for their giving it. If as a result of consideration the security of the country is not affected by disclosing these figures and resources, it could be given. But if it would result in endangering safety, then, it is not disclosed. There is a historic reason for it. The Bill of Rights says: "to raise or keep an standing army in times of peace, unless it be with the consent of Parliament". That is the reason for this. Anyway, if you permit me, I shall deal with the question of public interest later on.

Shri Nath Pal (Rajapur): May I invite your attention to this aspect, Sir? Now that this question has been raised—it is a bone of contention—may I draw your attention to what information the House of Commons supplies to the Members there?

Mr. Speaker: He will come to that.

Shri Nath Pal: Now that your attention has been drawn to it, I wanted to raise that aspect of the matter.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister says that he will come to it later on. Let him proceed.

Shri Krishna Menon: From here, I may proceed to a brief consideration

[Shri Krishna Menon]

of our three services. In regard to the army, there has been an increase in its strength, partly by fresh recruitment and partly by the embodiment of the territorials when our operational requirements have placed a greater strain upon it. There has been a greater intake of officers. The intake capacity of the Indian Military Academy at Dehra Dun has been practically doubled. A new corps has been raised in view of our difficulties in the eastern and northern frontier. The strain that is placed upon our troops has also led to the consideration of measures whereby they can be relieved and others can take their place.

I think it should be said that since 1939, the Indian army has known no rest either in Kashmir or in the Naga Hills or now on the northern borders. It has also to face other responsibilities of a character which normal armies do not. We have, however, had difficulties of shortages of officers and materials. The National Defence Academy at Khadakavasala, which is the nursery of the future officers, where young boys come and join, has never been up to the strength. My predecessors here will tell you, it was planned for a certain number and we have never been able to get that number of recruits. It is not for me to say whether the quality of recruits can be better or worse—that is a reflection on our people—but certainly it can be improved. It has never been up to the strength and a great deal of effort has been put in the last few years and it is coming up a little. The result of that is, the Dehra Dun College, the Rashtriya Indian Military College and some other schools of that kind provide a certain amount of officers and material.

The Government of India have been seeking the assistance of the States for the establishment of Sainik Schools and it is hoped four or five of them will come into existence this year. The K.G. schools generally take the children of officers and serving sol-

diers. But in spite of all these, officers and material available are short. There is no harm in saying, as it has been said before, in the Indian army, the officers' strength is considerably low, below the standard laid down, which standard itself is lower than the standard in the army elsewhere.

The navy has been advanced in the acquisition of the aircraft carrier which has been commissioned and will join the fleet in Cochin somewhere in September. The naval dockyard at Bombay must be regarded not only as a naval achievement, but as a great national achievement. It is for the first time that the navy with the assistance of the army has by direct labour, where the building arrangements have broken down, built this naval dockyard and the first phase is being completed in a few weeks' time. The first dock in India which is of considerable size, capable of taking warships will be opened. Recently Government have acquired two dockyards, one in Bombay and one in Calcutta, which in addition to assisting in the supply of general engineering material and equipment, will also build destroyers in future and are already building small craft for the army.

The Indian Air Force also has developed. Its fighter strength has increased and its transport strength has also increased. In the last year, the capacity of the air force has been strained beyond limit by the requirements of the supply of material and men for the border not only in regard to direct military requirements, but in the opening up of communications. I think it is no exaggeration to say that in some of these far-off posts—not very far-off—anything from the supply of ordinary type of food up to the heaviest machinery has to be taken by air. While the exact tonnage that is taken need not be disclosed, the requirements of the army and that of border defence go very well into five figures, not five figures, but very nearly six figures.

The Indian Air Force has also made great advance in the way of providing equipment for itself. For the first time in this country, it will build supersonic fighter aircraft. I would take this opportunity, in all humility, of paying my tribute to my predecessor, Shri Tyagi, who initiated this project some years ago. The Hindustan Fighter 24 powered by two jet engines will take to the air in a short time, although it will take a longer time to achieve supersonic speed. The arming of this machine is a problem which is being studied. The Indian Air Force which was conditioned only to maintain aircraft has broken all records in maintenance in the sense that not a single aircraft is left in the depots beyond time. They have gone on to build transport aircraft which will take to the air in a few months' time, in probably less than a few months' time. They have also designed for the purpose of army communication light aircraft which is undergoing tests and will be probably certified in the course of this month. Also are going into production the Rolls-Royce Dart engines and the Orpheus engines that give power to the fighter aircraft as well as the Gnat aircraft which is being made in the Hindustan Aircraft Limited.

The Hindustan Fighters are made on licence from British manufacturers while the Kanpur light aircraft is a communication 'plane' which is being designed by ourselves. But perhaps the most important achievement of the Indian Air Force in combination with the scientific department of the Ministry of Defence as well as the CSIR who provide the money, is the jet engine that went into action two or three days ago. It is totally designed in this country; it is a novel design. What is more, it is not like some of the other things we have today, where we sometimes say it is made in India, but probably all the material comes from somewhere else. This is made with indigenous material and designed by our own people. Its performance so far has broken all records. A tribute is due to the scientific adviser, Dr. Kothari, who on account of the re-

quirements of the country in other fields is being taken away from the Defence Ministry, at least in part for the chairmanship of the University Grants Commission. The young men of the IAF who designed it deserve great appreciation, because it is a very great achievement; it is not very easy to design things of that character.

Also while in the past there have been helicopters in the service of the Indian Air Force, they have been rather odd machines of one kind or another. Now helicopters will become a general part of the IAF.

The navy also has developed. The naval air arm, which is also powered by very modern machines, works in co-operation with the Air Force, but to a certain extent is independent. I have briefly referred to the three services in this way.

The other fields are the auxiliary activities in the field of direct defence services and the Territorial Army, the Lok Sahayak Sena and the National Cadet Corps. I am bound, Mr. Speaker, to confess to a sense of regret regarding the comparatively limited advance made by the Territorial Army in our country. It is not only a question of numbers; it is a question of the people that come in. The Territorial Army in every country where parliamentary democracy is functioning is intended to be an army of citizens who would relieve the regular army, when it goes into action; it takes the place of the regular army and its men and officers receive the same salary. While the Territorial Army of India has very good fighting material and has taken its place in Kashmir and other places, it does not attract if I may say so: no Member of Parliament has joined the rank of the Territorial Army.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): That is on account of over-age.

Shri Krishna Menon: I have not gone into the reasons. Its size is small, but it is hoped that it will be

[Shri Krishna Menon]

expanded, because both for national reasons of citizenship as well as economic reasons, the man-power has to be supplied in this way to a considerable extent. No one thinks that the regular army can be substituted or there can be any relief either in regard to the strain placed upon it or its requirement in regard to numbers. But we have found in the last 18 months that the Territorials have had to be employed in certain regular duties such as manning of coastal batteries whether it be in Bombay or in Cochin, in guarding of the strong points and, today, in some of the operational fields they had to be sent. And, we can pay a tribute to the employers, the labour organisations and, in some cities, the members of the public who have assisted in its recruitment. There are two classes of employers so far as we are concerned: one help the Territorials and the others are those who want the Territorials to help them. I would like to say that the first class is increasing.

Then we go to the National Cadet corps. The National Cadet Corps is not a military organisation. It has been founded by an Act of Parliament, and repeatedly it has been pointed out that it is not our intention to militarise our youth in the sense of making it a part of the armed forces of India. But they constitute, among citizens, material which is adequately disciplined, so that not only in the strength of the fighting forces but in the capacity of a country to defend itself, which can come only from a disciplined people, they will be of help. Even in a small sense, if our population get in the way of troop movement and are not able to understand the restrictions imposed on them our defence would become difficult, especially in a large country of this character. Over and above this, in peace-time even the regular army and the Territorials after often absorbed into duties which can hardly be performed by others—some of them may be ceremonial, some of them may be characterised as duties which are in the hinterland.

The National Cadet Corps has not only made considerable advance but it has transformed itself in its character and is becoming more and more a well-knit, disciplined unit. Today there are 1,20,082 cadets in the senior wing of the National Cadet Corps, 1,30,000 in the juniors and 29,043 girls making altogether 2,79,125 cadets who all come in for a period of four years. In addition to that a quarter million young men and a few thousands of young women have been enlisted in the N.C.C. Rifles. Therefore, altogether in the National Cadet Corps today there are nearly half a million cadets. With the present pace of progress, considering that 3,00,000 or more of them have come in in the last twelve months, and with the enthusiasm that is put into it by Vice Chancellors, by Principals, by State Governments and not less by the officers of the regular services and the officials of the Ministry, it is to be hoped that at least every boy of the proper age, physical fitness and security clearance will be able to join the National Cadet Corps. Its military value is not that it would be fit to be sent to the Himalayas or anything of that kind. If, however, we should be engaged in any serious trouble, if unfortunately we should be involved in serious trouble, all the Territorials will all be removed from the places where they now are. There are considerable duties which are performed by these people.

Over and above that Mr. Speaker, the fact that is not usually known is that the National Cadet Corps has provided a greater part of the officer element for the Indian Army. 15 per cent. of the seats in the Dehra Dun Military Academy are reserved for them. But that reservation is quite unnecessary because they take more than 50 per cent. of the open competition seats. More than 50 per cent. of the boys who go into Khadakvasala have been in the National Cadet Corps in one way or another. We calculated that more than 50 per cent. of officer material in the Indian Army goes

through the National Cadet Corps in one way or another. Now provision has been made for the formation of officer training units in the National Cadet Corps, and if they go through the officer training units in the National Cadet Corps then they need spend only three terms in Dehra Dun before they go back into the Army.

Going back to the officer problem, Sir, the services are deficient in this. There is no harm in disclosing it. The services are deficient in technical personnel both in the field of medicine and in the field of engineering and also in the field of higher science. Therefore, the Navy, for example, has adopted the device of commissioning engineering students before they pass their final examination. Then they are already in the Navy before they leave the college and even if they get a better job afterwards they cannot get out. If the present situation continues, it will be necessary for Parliament to consider what steps should be taken to secure for the defence services the necessary technical personnel.

When we go into the question of production, the main units of our production are the ordnance factories, the Hindustan Aircraft Limited, the Bharat Electronics, the Indian Air Force and the electrical and mechanical engineers. These are the people who produce the goods that are required for the Army, the Navy and the Air Force, as well as maintain and repair them.

In regard to the ordnance factories, during the sitting of this present Parliament there have been considerable advances. The production in 1956-57 was worth Rs. 14 crores. In 1960-61, according to the estimates based upon the figures of the Military Accounts Department, it would be Rs. 32 crores—there may be differences in this because always in the last month there may be something more or something less. But we have based this on the material utilisation. But

this is not the whole story; that is to say, the country is today getting more for its money than before. In the early days, soon after we took over from the British, when everything was made in that country and only the exigencies of war accentuated the production in our factories, we had a very large quantity of labour. They were displaced after the war. Even as late as 1956-57 the Government were obliged to discharge some 6000 people. After the discharge of those 6000 people, there were in the ordnance factories 46,883. Out of this number of 46,883 a considerable proportion were not doing any work. We could not discharge them on account of social, political and other difficulties. Apart from that, they were highly skilled people whom we once let go we would not get back. The figures for idle labour, as it is called, were Rs. 63 lakhs or 11 per cent. of the total wage bill in 1956-57.

Mr. Speaker: Rs. 63 lakhs or Rs. 63,000?

Shri Krishna Menon: Rs. 63 lakhs or 11 per cent. of the total wage bill. The total wage bill was for a sum of about Rs. 5 crores or so, and 11 per cent. of the wage bill was payment for idle labour. In 1959-60 this has been reduced to 3.8 per cent. I have not got the figures for 1960-61, but I believe that they have been very considerably absorbed. The cost of production has been steadily brought down, because in the Government calculation the losses incurred by Government, payment for idle labour etc. are all to be distributed on the cost of production. A sample survey conducted recently on items manufactured in 1957-58 and 1959-60 shows a decline of 16 per cent. in the costs.

Mr. Speaker: What is the total labour cost?

Shri Krishna Menon: The total labour force would be today somewhere about 42,000 to 43,000 in the ordnance factories—a little over 43,000.

[Shri Krishna Menon]

In the Hindustan Aircraft Factory there has been considerable improvement particularly in the output. There was an unfortunate superstitious belief in our country in the days gone by that it takes three Indians to do what one Englishman does. That had crept into the general Government calculation, and there was 1:1.8 calculation. You may have heard in this House that indigenous production has suffered a 20 per cent. loss, considering that in Japan the production is 40 per cent. cheaper than us. We do not see any reason why it should be so. Our general aim is to have one man for one man hour, and that has been achieved, certainly by the Indian Air Force and in the ordnance factories. The Hindustan Aircraft Factory has moved towards that—I am speaking from memory—and I believe they have come to 1:1. And if this is not a digression, Mr. Speaker, this improvement has been largely due to improvement in labour conditions. It pays the Government to pay higher wages; it pays the Government to meet the demands that are legitimate. In the Hindustan Aircraft Factory, there has been considerable improvement in their conditions. About six months ago, both in the Bharat Electronics and the Hindustan Aircraft Factory, in common with other Government factories in Bangalore, we have improved their conditions in regard to dearness allowance and consolidation of salaries, costing the Government nearly Rs. 23 lakhs a year in the Hindustan Aircraft Factory alone. And it would be of some interest to the House, especially to, I am sure, Shri Banerjee, who will recognize that in the defence factories the employer-employee relations are happy. In 1956 we lost 82,768 man-days. In 1957 we lost 9,772 man-days. In 1958 we lost 6,931 man-days. In 1959 we lost 3,501 man-days. In 1960 we lost 340 man-days. In 1960 we lost 340 man-days which is exclusive of the man-days we lost during the general strike, which has nothing to do with our own economic problems. I am happy to say that the labour relations are of this

character, largely because of the increasing introduction of the piece-work system, use of scientific methods to diminish the fatigue of the working people, including colour schemes inside the factories and machines, and also the incentive in regard to the acceptance of ideas produced by working people themselves.

From this I would like to look at the aircraft of the Indian Air Force. Under the British system, they maintained a very sharp difference between maintenance and manufacture and it used to be almost a religious rule that no maintenance factory should manufacture anything. Since we had only maintenance factories, India could not manufacture anything. The reason was very simple, namely, their manufacturers had to come here. Now, the Indian Air Force broke this rule, and Government accepted it, with the result that not only have they gone into the production of Avro, maintaining the maintenance target somewhere about one per cent. more, over and above the limit which has been prescribed for them, and keeping all our fighting aircraft in good condition, but also salvaging a very large quantity of material which, in the year under report, comes very nearly to Rs. 1½ crores. That is to say, it has been utilisation of what usually would be regarded as disposals, taken over and re-conditioned by expert men. One of the very refreshing lessons that one learns from this is that there is precious little that our working people and technicians cannot do, if they are given a chance. Therefore, there has been considerable salvaging of this material, which has not only saved money because some of them are impracticable both for reasons of paucity of foreign exchange as well as our general narrowness of resources.

Now, in the Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, which are called "common workshops", there is not yet any manufacture. But it all depends on what you call manufacture. If an old engine is recon-

ditioned to work to 95 per cent capacity, just after stripping it completely, I suppose it is very near manufacture. But, anyway, in these factories, on account of the work that is being put in there, and largely depending upon the willingness and enthusiasm of these people, tens of thousands of vehicles, which were on the dumps, which were thrown away, have been rescued and are now in service and they will probably work for 5 or 6 years. Otherwise it will be difficult for the Indian army to move, because its locomotion is probably one of its difficult situations.

Acharya Kripalani (Sitamarhi): What has been rescued?

Shri Krishna Menon: I did not say anything about rescue. I can only supply information. I cannot supply understanding. What I said was that these old vehicles which have been discarded have taken from there and put into service again. That finishes my survey of more or less controversial matters.

I cannot leave this thing, however, without referring to the sending of the Indian army abroad to Congo and their presence in the Gaza strip. For the last 5 or 6 years, in pursuance of the discharge of the international obligations of this country, the armed forces of this country, that is, Army and Air Force, have been sent out more than once.

Mr. Speaker: There is too much of noise in the House.

आचार्य कृपालानी : कुछ सुनने में नहीं आता ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मेम्बर आवाज कर रहे हैं ।

आचार्य कृपालानी : मिनि-टर मा'ब नीचा मू' करके बोलने दे इस लिए सुनने में नहीं आता ।

Mr. Speaker: I thought the hon. Defence Minister is sufficiently audible.

Some Hon. Members: Yes, yes. He is quite audible.

Mr. Speaker: Probably, he wants the Defence Minister to look up to him.

An Hon. Member: Let him not look down.

Shri Krishna Menon: The Indian Armed Forces today are on the Gaza strip guarding the peace between Israel and the United Arab Republic. They are discharging their duties. It is not merely a question of military skill, which is considerable, when an army has to perform its duties without fighting. Fighting, probably, is the easiest duty for the army. Thus, truly in the Gandhian tradition of our country, they have to keep peace rather than wage war, when they go abroad. The Indian army, in the past, had been trained and released only for the purpose of conquest or imperial acquisition. To day the situation is somewhat different. Today, the Gurkhas, the Jats, the Dogras are there in Congo, or are on the way to Congo, in a very difficult and confusing situation. Their presence there is helping to bring back the restoration of pacification. These troops have been sent out in pursuance of the United Nations resolution, not only sanctioning the use of troops but also the use of force.

Mr. Speaker, it has been raised the other day in this House whether the sending of these troops abroad is constitutional or otherwise. While it is largely a matter for the Prime Minister to explain, since he is not here, I have, of course, to say this. It is part of our constitutional duties, which we have undertaken, to go to the assistance of the United Nations. The Law Ministry has been consulted in this matter and the action taken is perfectly legal and constitutional. So, these three battalions, forming a brigade unit of the Indian army, where we have 2,887 fighting troops, making in all 4,671, with all their

[Shri Krishna Menon]

equipments and everything else are in various parts of Africa. They are commanded by a brilliant officer, who was formerly in the Gaza strip, Brigadier Raja. While they are at the disposal of the United Nations' command, they must decide upon their deployment, they will, on the whole, be kept together, not physically but under one command. I would not like to use the term "autonomy of command". In any case, there is considerable amount of working together. Another officer of the Indian Army has been lent to the United Nations as **Adviser to the Secretary-General on military matters.**

14 hrs.

There is a cut motion in regard to our defence policy in relation to China. There has been a violation of our territories and the intrusion of Chinese elements into our soil and a failure to get any adjustment of this matter. Our borders, are on the one hand with Pakistan and the other with China; the rest fortunately is with the friendly country of Burma, that we need not take it into account at the moment. On the Chinese border there have been deployment of troops in this country in such a way that incursions into our territory are impossible. This has placed a great strain on the Indian army. I do not want anyone to think that it is possible for us in relation to China—nor would it be right to think,—of raising an army equal to the size of the Chinese army, or weapons equal to that of the great powers. We are in a different position from other countries in that we have no military allies, being an independent country. Since we have no military alliance, the position is that we have to look after ourselves. The advance deployment of these troops, has meant taking tried troops, troops that have had a great deal to do in recent times on to near positions required for the purpose, and the character of these defences are such that while the position in regard to numbers in extreme

positions may be small, the strain on them is considerable, because these men are living at heights which normally for any Member of this House it would be impossible to carry on for more than twenty or thirty minutes without oxygen.

As I said a little while ago, we are feeding them, clothing them and what is more, only recently with the aid of a helicopter service we are supplying them medical aid. These have strained our resources very considerably. All I can tell the House is that within our understanding of what is required in the way of defending the Himalayan border, our resources and our understanding of how to deploy the forces for the purpose of that defence, Government have taken such steps as are necessary. Any idea that the Chinese can at any time walk in here need no longer be present, in the sense that if they do transgress into India and our territory, their lines of communication are longer than our lines of communication.

These are well-trained troops. New specialised forms of fighting may be required and the Government have taken this into account. While the results may take longer than one may think, the necessary arrangements are being made for that purpose.

One of our main difficulties in this area is communication. As I said, everything has to go by air. More lines of communication are being built and we hope that in a period far less than normal in these cases, these areas would be opened up not only for military communications but also for occupation. At the present moment, they are practically unpopulated areas, inaccessible and very difficult for normal life.

Mr. Kripalani, whom I heard

Acharya Kripalani : I have not yet spoken.

Shri Krishna Menon: Be patient, you will hear what I have to say,— said the other day:

"I have spoken about the general deterioration in the standard of discipline. There was, however, one organisation in India which, it was recognised, had not been adversely affected by the general lowering of standards. This was our Army. But here too, in recent years, after Defence has been taken over by our temperamental foreign expert, there have been persistent reports of a distinct deterioration. The strength of our fighting forces depends not only on arms, ammunition or their equipment or the scientific apparatus, as our Prime Minister calls it, but more than anything it depends upon the morale of our soldiers. This morale, I am afraid, is on the decline, and it is not very high. And it cannot be high if some of our best officers, loved and respected by their soldiers, are obliged to leave the Army. High officials in the Army, men of proved valour and integrity, do not resign their posts lightly. Greater emoluments or more comfort may not induce them to leave their honourable profession of defending the country. I am sure there must be something deeper and more fundamental in this phenomenon."

It is always possible to produce the conclusion you want if you prescribe the premises. The morale of the Indian army is higher than ever before. Mr. Kripalani has no knowledge of the Indian army. He goes nowhere near it; and he won't be allowed to. The morale of the Indian army stands very high and I think it is a poor service to the troops and to the officers, who as I said a little while ago are functioning under very difficult conditions. Most of our young officers come out of the Academy and they are practically straight on posted to an operational area, Kashmir, Naga, Hills, or wherever it may be. There are many cases where they do not come back for six or seven years.

The morale of the army is very high for many reasons. There is nothing to discount the fact that the morale of the army depends upon the amenities provided for them. That is not all. But it must be taken into account. So far as the Army, the Air Force, the services as a whole, are concerned, there have been in recent times very considerable improvement in regard to their pay, their allowances, their means of locomotion, conditions of living, and so on and so forth. One of the main complaints in the army has been the provision in regard to separation from their families. This is being gradually provided. To a certain extent, we must always do it according to the means that our country can afford.

While there is provision for giving houses that is required for the troops, this has been one of the many complaints we have always had. Under Government rules, Majors and above are provided one hundred per cent married accommodation—the presumption is that an officer above the age of a Major would be a married person and therefore one hundred per cent accommodation is provided. Captains are provided up to 80 per cent and subalterns up to one-third of their number. Junior Commissioned Officers are provided 90 per cent married accommodation; other ranks are provided 14 per cent married accommodation and 86 per cent single accommodation. Now, when there is no government accommodation, then they are paid money or some other arrangement is made.

It is interesting to notice that in the first seven years after our independence when we took this on as pioneers in the field there was much more difficulty, because there were so many regulations and procedures that took time and the speed that was required was not possible. In the first seven years we had provided quarters for 10,320 troops; in the next four years we provided accommodation for 29,015 troops; in the next year we provided accommodation for 24,220 troops. That is to say in the last five

[Shri Krishna Menon]

years 57,000 of these quarters have been built as against 10,000 in the seven years previously. And I suppose when the accommodation at Ferozepore goes through, that will be increased very considerably.

The Defence Budget is heavier to the extent of Rs. 15 crore, annually on account of the increased emoluments. Similarly there has been other provision made which is of very great importance and that is up to the rank of Lieut-Colonel today an officer can expect to go, even if he is not very bright. That is to say, if he is commissioned in the Army and if he has got great capacity he is promoted in a short time. But even if he is not promoted in his earlier years by time-scale he retires as a Lieutenant-Colonel.

Reference has been made to older officers leaving the army. If older officers do not leave, younger officers do not get promoted. That is why there is a rule in the Services as to the limit you can be in a particular office.

Also, there have been, quite rightly, sentiments expressed in the House from all sides with regard to opening the officer ranks of the Army to all classes of people, according to our Constitution and according to modern ideas. And this has been done to the extent possible where educational and other requirements had to be met. And as a result of this in Nowgong in Madhya Pradesh we have opened a college in which are taken regular soldiers; that is to say, ordinary infantry men or others, the ordinary rank and file people, they come in as soldiers and after four or five years they come to the notice of the officers, they go to this college and they are commissioned after a year's training. One hopes that as a result of this, large numbers of men who will come from the rank and file of the army would go into officer ranks. There are no distinctions in the Indian Army today as to who

may be an officer, who may not be an officer, and there is no reference to martial classes. There is no rule that a Gurkha unit cannot be commanded by a non-Gurkha or anything of that character. So, so far as morale is concerned, it is my duty as your Minister of Defence to tell you that the morale of our Armed Force has never been higher than today.

And there is another reason for all this, apart from all these considerations of the Indian Army, not to speak of the Air Force and the Navy where they recruit people with a higher level of education. The Indian Army today has a very much higher civic sense. They have the consciousness of being a national army. They know, for instance, what they are sent for. They do not regard themselves as mercenaries seeking a job. At the same time there are certain responsibilities placed upon the community and the country. One is in regard to their families, that they are separated from them, and the other is in the care of the ex-service men. When young men are taken at the age of eighteen or nineteen—they say nineteen even when they are not—when they come into the army at the age of nineteen, they join colours for seven years, and then it is extended by another seven years. So they retire at the age of twenty-six or thirty-four. And they being life again. And in an organisation of that kind their placement in society afterwards would have to form part, as time goes on, of the regular recruitment conditions of our services.

Now I come to this question of promotions. There has been a certain amount of misrepresentation or misunderstanding both in the newspapers and in some small sections of this House as to how these promotions are done. And there have been talks about supersession. As I said, up to the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel an

officer gets promoted just because he has been an officer; by efflux of years he gets promoted. After that no question of supersession arises. This word 'supersession' is a misnomer, because they are selection appointments. There is no pre-emptive right to the next office because a person has been there. Seniority is one of the considerations and would be a guiding consideration if there is nothing else. And I would like—because I am sure the overwhelming majority of the Members want to understand this problem—try to explain it as best as I can.

Promotions are done by well laid down methods. In regard to Junior Commissioned officers they do not even come to the Army Headquarters. They are done in their own regions, and neither the Ministry nor the Minister or any one else knows very much about it, unless there is an outrageous case which is brought to attention and you call for papers.

Then we come to officers upto the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel, acting Lieutenant-Colonel. This is done by what is called the No. 2 Selection Board which consists of officers of a certain level. That is laid down in the rules. Their record is examined and promotions are made by that Board itself, and neither the Ministry nor anybody else comes very much into the picture. I am not saying for a moment that the Minister responsible to the House cannot interfere if there is a case of irregularity of any kind. But this is important, Mr. Speaker. In this selection for Lieutenant-Colonels, in the year 1960-61, 226 officers, that is Majors, were promoted as Lieutenant-Colonels. But 485 were "superseded"—I say superseded within quotation marks. For the rank of Colonels, 70 were promoted and 82 were "superseded". For Brigadiers, 39 were promoted and 57 were "superseded". For Major-Generals, 7 were promoted and 17 were "superseded". And for Lieutenant-Generals 4 were promoted and 5 were "superseded". This is about 1960-61.

So, supersession, as it is called, is a normal thing in the Army, very much more in the other Armies than ours. Otherwise, all that is required of one is to join it and do nothing, and then promotion will come! Now, this is the same in the civil service. We have got Secretaries to Government who today are younger than some others who are either Joint Secretaries or Additional Secretaries. And it is a good thing in public service. It is not only age, but talent, performance, and achievement that is recognised.

Then we come to the No. 1 Selection Board which deals with other officers, and that is composed of senior officers of the Army—the Army Commander, the principal Staff Officers, and in the Air Force and the Navy the corresponding numbers. What happens, Mr. Speaker, is this. I believe in the Army there have been nine of them, and the names of all the people who are entitled to promotion and, what they call, their ACRs, their record books, come before them. And these officers also have knowledge of all the men. It is not as though they sit down and take a name out of their hat. There are various examinations and marks are awarded. They are awarded separately. Each of the nine persons gives his remarks separately, and it is tabulated afterwards. If there are differences then they are reconciled in the Board. Then the recommendations come to the Government, that is to the Ministry.

Very often it has been the practice, certainly in my time it has been the practice, that if there are one, two or three vacancies, more candidates than there are vacancies are recommended. There are two lists, one within the sphere of promotion, or fit for promotion—not within the sphere of promotion—but fit for promotion; the other recommended for promotion. Those who are not fit for promotion are never even considered. That is to say, neither the Ministry nor the Minister even asks for the names of the people who are not considered

[Shri Krishna Menon]

fit for promotion. The cases of "fit for promotion" and those recommended for promotion are carefully scrutinised by the Ministry. Since we have a parliamentary system of government where the control is the civilian authority, and the army is a parallel of the civil service and it has certain defined functions, this control has to be exercised. These records and other things are examined, the Ministry puts the pros and cons in each case, and if things are forgotten sometimes it is referred back to the Army Headquarters to have a look at it—these are very rare cases—and then it comes to the Minister for sanction. And practically, once it has been through all this and been through the Ministry, either the Minister accepts the recommendations of the Ministry or of the Services.

In my experience there has been no difficulty in making this choice, because before it comes to me there has been a reconciliation of those differences. Largely, in the case of the lower officers this function falls to the Military Secretary, and since so many officers are involved there are bound to be cases where perhaps something has been overlooked. It is not possible to say that in every case a large number of lower officers are promoted. There may be some one who feels he has got a legitimate cause for complaint; but it is important for us to realise that there are methods laid down in the rules where representations can be made—I mean the representation to the Army Headquarters.

In the case of Lieutenant-Colonels, last year, 64 representations were made to the Army Headquarters. They were all rejected. Two were made to the Government. One was accepted, and the other is under consideration. For the promotion to the rank of Colonel three representations were made to the Army Headquarters. All were rejected. One was addressed to Government, and it is under

consideration. As regards promotion to the rank of acting Brigadier, one was made, and that was rejected; that is, one was made to the Army Headquarters, and it was rejected.

And so, this is a normal procedure, and as far as human ability permits, it is done in a way very much more meticulously than in many other places. And I think it is a great mistake to think that the opinion of a disgruntled person or a dismissed employee or of a disappointed person is necessarily a statement of the facts. It is said that every officer has got a Field Marshal's baton in his nap. Every officer thinks that he is fit to be a General. It is a very legitimate aspiration, but whether he is fit or not, whether his colleagues in the Administration think he is fit must be judged in this way.

I think what upsets the moral of the Army is reference to its lower morale, is the feeling that may get around, or that it is possible to get round the roads. And in my experience,—and I want to say both sides of this—I hold the view that Government have got a right to overrule Army Headquarters. The recommendations are made to me by the Chief of the Army Staff. I have the right to overrule them. But in my experience of four years, there has been only one instance, not even two, but only one instance in which this became necessary, and that one instance was an instance in which I had no other option. And, therefore, any idea that these promotions are made by some quixotic method, to call it by nothing else, is entirely wrong. And this is not peculiar to our Army.

Now, the Chief of the Imperial General Staff today, Sir Richard Hull has superseded a lot of people. Our General Thimayya who is now the Chief of General Staff was made Chief of General Staff in supersession of three others. He has superseded Mr. Kulwant Singh, Mr. Sant

Singh and a lots of other people. (Interruption). Whatever it is, whatever I call him, he is the same man.

So, there has been supersession as it is called. And Government does not recognise these as supersessions. There is no special entitlement to this.

The general rule that is followed, is that, other conditions being equal, seniority counts, and if seniority has to be disregarded, the man who supersedes must not just be good enough but must have an edge over the other person and we have also to take public interest into consideration. Sometimes, it may happen that where there are five people—I do not have an instance in mind—out of the five persons who are recommended, four of them may belong to one arm in the Army, and you may want somebody else in another arm in the Army. Public interest must come before the interest of that officer. In the majority of cases, these people come up again. And it is only a propaganda that goes on in certain sections of the press. It is very difficult to know what knowledge they can have of what goes on in these ways.

Yesterday, when I had the opportunity to talk to leading persons in the press who came to see me, they were very surprised, so far as I could make out, to learn that the promotions were made or done in this meticulous fashion, and that there is a laid-down procedure with regard to this.

Now, I come to the last of these, namely the Army Commanders. There are three Army Commanders in India, because there are three Armies in India, three Armies in the sense that they are divisional armies. There is one in the West, which is in the north of India, one in the south, which stretches from the bottom of Rajputana to Cape Comorin, and the other in the East. These three Army Commanders' posts are government appointments, because an Army

Commander is not merely an expert soldier; he is more or less a regional Commander-in-Chief. And it has been the condition not only in our time but in all times that the Army Commander is appointed by Government. But I think I am not disclosing any secret in saying that in putting forward the name, which must finally be approved by the Appointments Committee of the Cabinet, I have consulted both the outgoing Chief and the incoming Chief. And Mr. Speaker, I take full responsibility for these appointments, but at the same time, since so much dust is raised in this matter—I do not mean in a disrespectful way—since so much extraneous matter comes into this, it is as well to say that these gentlemen were good enough to give me their opinion, and I do not say that I relied on that; that is to say, I am not taking shelter under it. There is no reason for me to think that there has been a departure from the requirements of this country or from the notions of ethics or of integrity in this way. I feel that what really pulls down the Army is this kind of propaganda. But it is surprising that in spite of these observations of this character, there is very little in the way of discontent in the Army.

Acharya Kripalani referred to numerous resignations. I think, after all, if you are indulging in a fancy, if you are flying in the air, you might as well fly high. Why be small? So far as I know, there have been no resignations from the Army. There has been one case of application for premature retirement; there are not many cases. That is to say, the officer concerned, whom Acharya Kripalani has in mind, could have retired anyway at the end of next year. He is still in the service of the Government, and he has taken nine months' leave. Therefore, there is one case of premature retirement. And it is customary in the Army that if an officer who expects to be promoted or comes into that line finds that he has no future there, then he prefers to retire at that stage rather

[Shri Krishna Menon]

than later, because he wants to get a job outside, and it is far better for him to go out then and get it. And normally, Government considers this and permits premature retirement. It happens in the case of Lt.-Cols. and Brigadiers; in that sense, there is premature retirement. In this circle, to which reference has been made, there has been one case of premature retirement.

But, Mr. Speaker, if you read these observations, it would look as if there are many desertions in the Indian Army. If you read some of the articles in the newspapers, you would think that the Defence Minister should have been annihilated long ago; you may want to do that, but still he survives.

Then, we come to this problem to which you rightly drew attention, and that is the question of public interest.

Acharya Kripalani: Now, we know why he survives.

Shri Krishna Menon: I shall tell you in a moment how I have survived.

Shri Ranga (Tenali): Government is surviving.

Shri Krishna Menon: Mr. Speaker, you were rather concerned, not for your own sake, but for the sake of the House, that the House was not getting adequate information. And from the question that you just now asked, there is some misunderstanding about it. And this was what was said.

"On this matter, I find it difficult, because the hon. Minister very often says that it is not in the public interest to disclose this information."

And I hope you will not consider that it is any disrespect to you if I quote the facts, which probably do not warrant these observations.

During the period 1st January 1960 to March 31st, 1961, fifteen months, the number of questions admitted is 601, out of which the number of questions on which information was refused or partly refused was 50. Out of 601, Government did not give information fully or partly on 50. Information was partly refused during supplementaries on 8 other questions. Out of the above, part information was given on 37 questions. Therefore, the number of questions on which information was totally refused is only 13. The number of questions disallowed by the Speaker on our representation, and where you, Sir, agreed with us, is 23. The number of questions answered subsequently, that is to say, where first I said that we cannot give it to you but afterwards, circumstances changed and we gave it was two. Again, we have tried to make a classification in this. On grounds of security, 16 of these questions were not answered. On grounds of disclosures prejudicial, including those of numbers, quantum or quality of equipment, 11 questions were not answered. On grounds of disclosure of capacity or volume of production or deficiency, 6 were not answered; on grounds of disclosure of quantum of movement of troops, 2 were not answered; on grounds of disclosure of air strength and radar defence, one was not answered; and the Chinese want to know what our radar defence is. On grounds prejudicial to transactions under negotiations, 3 were not answered, on grounds prejudicial to Government's financial interest by disclosure, 4; regarding arrangements where other Governments or countries were involved, 2 were not answered; in regard to information of an operational nature, 5 were not answered, and in regard to location of key defence installations, 2 were

not answered. Four questions relating to military works of a secret nature were not answered; and with regard to the stage of development of aircraft and armament one was not answered.

In this case, this has also to be added that apart from giving information to you or the Secretariat, why something cannot be done or what are the reasons, the Estimates Committee and the Public Accounts Committee have been given information not given to the House on the contracts in regard to Vampire De Havilland, the production details in the Hindustan Aircraft and BEL and other reports which are classified as secret. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, while one's effort never goes as far as it should, every effort is being made to maintain the traditions of Parliament. Now, you will bear with me. I would like you to listen to some of the questions.

There are questions of different classes. Some questions look innocent and very harmless. And, I am quite sure they are not put with a bad motive. But if the answer is given, then, some of these prohibitions which we rightly or wrongly impose, we think rightly, would be useless. It would reveal other things.

Take a simple question like this. The number of officers allotted residential family quarters in Jammu and Kashmir and the number of those who are getting allowances in lieu of quarters etc. Now, that looks very simple. Does it not? How many people have family quarters in Kashmir and how many have not? That means the total number of the Army in Kashmir. When I put it that way it becomes very clear. Therefore, it was said that the information cannot be given.

Then, progress made in the field of rocketry in India and whether Government have tried to secure technical know-how and from what country. First of all, in these arrangements from other countries the basic part of that is secret. If we are

going to disclose them in this House we have to take their consent. Most of these arrangements are with the United Kingdom and the United Kingdom has an agreement with the United States. It takes a very considerable time for us to get the United States to agree to give it to us; and it is one of the basic conditions that we should not disclose anything at all.

Another innocent question, the total annual requirements of shoes and other footwear for the Defence forces. That looks very innocent. But everybody knows that in the Army every person requires two pairs of footwear. If I tell you how many shoes are required you know how much the Army is.

There is a less innocent class of questions. (Laughter).

Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is not a laughing matter.

There is an innocent class of questions. I am asked on the 17th of February of this year, what are the measures taken to guard against disclosure of secrets and sabotage. Fortunately, it was an Unstarred Question. Then, there was a question about the extended manner of training to Indian troops for mountain warfare at the present time; the number of technicians and non-technicians working in the I.A.F. storage unit at Madras, Sulur; the developments contemplated during the next year and all that. It is also asked when we have reason to think that there are some difficulties in that area.

We are asked some questions with regard to production. When something is being negotiated for production in the public sector some private interest is interested in the same thing.

Then, we are asked whether the BEL is able to take up the production of radar. Radar today is a very competent and very sensitive defence

[Shri Krishna Menon]

and if it is known that a country has radar or has not radar and what is its amplitude and its reachable capacity and what kind it is, whether it is a marine radar and whether it can hit and come back and so on that means it would be practically useless.

Shri Goray (Poona): Is there any country which has not radar?

Shri Krishna Menon: May I answer this question, Sir? Every country has radar. There is radar in ships and in aeroplanes. Radar is a very general term. It all depends on what the radar is for.

Then there was a question whether the practical applications of the weapons organisation were discussed at the C.I.D.S. conference I have given you the details, Mr. Speaker, with regard to a number of questions that are answered and not answered.

Sir, you referred the other day in some other connection to the practice followed viz. that it was not to press for information of this character. It has been laid down, I believe, somewhere in the rules or so, that when there is no definite rule the British Parliamentary practice is to be followed. The practice in the House of Commons is appropriately described in *May's Parliamentary Practice*, and it says that an answer to a question cannot be insisted upon. If the answer is refused by a Minister, the question to which the answer has been refused like any other question which has been fully answered cannot be repeated. It cannot be replaced on the Order Paper. The refusal of a Minister to answer a question on the ground of Public interest cannot be raised as matter of privilege. No leave should be sought to be made for adjournment of the House for this reason. This is the parliamentary practice. Then, there are some cases of minor procedure. In the House of Commons a question seeking information about matters which are in their nature

secret cannot be asked. I have here a whole list and I propose to use it at some other time, if necessary. I have mentioned the matters on which no information has been disclosed in the House of Commons for the reasons I have mentioned. These are matters very much relating to what can be said to be in the nature of equipment.

Shri Ranga: Has he not given enough answer to your question, Sir?

Mr. Speaker: He is concluding. (*Interruption*).

Shri Krishna Menon: I do not know what his objection is.

Mr. Speaker: He says the hon. Minister has answered enough. Hon. Members are anxious that they should also be heard.

Shri Krishna Menon: I think you are presiding over the House.

Mr. Speaker: I agree. I am no doubt presiding over this House and have to decide intricate matters. But, then, I receive inspiration from both sides.

Shri Krishna Menon: I hope you have received some inspiration now I may be allowed to conclude.

In our system of Government I am as much a Member of Parliament as the person who is seeking information. I was asked why I am here. I am here because I am a Member of Parliament; and what is more because I have the confidence of this House. If the hon. Members want to test it they can try it. I am here because Government is here. Government is here because it has got the confidence of the House. So long as we rule in this country—and the Sovereign Parliament can alter it—we are charged with the responsibility of maintaining the security of this country. And they must decide it in their wisdom. So long as I am the Defence Minister may I

assure you, Sir, that I would like to carry out the duty with which I am charged, to the best of my ability.

Acharya Kripalani: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have listened with great interest and patience to what the Defence Minister has said. The first part of his speech was devoted to matters that he has already given in the White Paper. In the second part he described very eloquently a very encouraging picture of the might of our military forces and what has been done under his stewardship. It is, perhaps, therefore, that we have lost 12,000 sq. miles of our territory without striking one single blow!

14.39 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Several Hon. Members: Shame, shame.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

Acharya Kripalani: Sir, two cut motions have been moved by the motley crowd of opposition parties. The Communists have not joined. They are admirers of the Defence Minister, and his works.

Shri A. M. Tariq (Jammu and Kashmir): So are we.

Acharya Kripalani: But, it would have been better if they had not supported him because the more support he gets from that quarter the less support he gets from the country. Sir, I have been commissioned to speak on one of the two cut motions. I wish somebody else had been assigned this task. It is held in some quarters that I am prejudiced against the Defence Minister. I can honestly say that I have no personal prejudice against any Minister except in so far as his policies adversely affect the national interest as I see them. I have always kept these interests above any personal likes and dislikes and—I can say with confidence, and I think the House is with me in this,—above party politics, whether I was in the Congress, or the KMPP or

the PSP or as an Independent Member of this hon. House.

Sir, I have to speak under great handicaps to which the hon. Speaker has often referred. There may be some foolish questions also; there are always, in all departments. But even the Speaker gets confused. Significant questions about the working of this Ministry are not answered on the plea that it is not in public interest. We know only the end results; we know only the end results after the mischief has been done and that too, through the Press, through the foreign Press. For example, we knew from the Press, about the Chinese aggression; we again know it from the Press about the Russians flying over our strategic areas in Ladakh. Is it how this House is to be treated?

Sir, before I say anything about the general working of this Ministry, I would speak on the question of the proper policies to be laid down for appointments, promotions, etc. in the Army. During the course of my observations, I shall be obliged to mention the names of certain officers and say something about their careers. But this cannot be avoided. I do not know them; I have never met them.

Sir, the point at issue is not, as it is purposely stated, one of seniority versus merit. Undoubtedly seniority cannot be the sole criterion for promotion in any service. What, however, I shall endeavour to show is that merit has not always been the criterion for promotion in our Army.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: One minute, if I may be excused. The hon. Acharyaji has given an indication that he shall be obliged to mention certain names. Now, certain names are brought in; some merit is given here; some such things are said in favour of this or that person. Then certainly the Defence Minister would be obliged to refer to the other side and the other things that he took into consideration. (Interruptions.)

An Hon. Member: He may do it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Can each case be discussed here and can individual merits and demerits be discussed here... (*Interruptions.*) That should not be the purpose of Parliament—to discuss individual cases and their merits and demerits. That should not be done.

Shri Ranga: There is nothing preventing Parliament from doing it.

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): The should not mention names here.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am very sorry (to say this). Even if there is nothing to prevent Parliament from up individual cases, it would not be advisable here to discuss each case, its merits or demerits, and then to advance arguments in favour of one person or against another person. I would request Acharyaji to avoid the names. He may refer to such cases as one officer or one person. But he may kindly avoid mentioning all names.

Shri M. R. Masani (Ranchi—East): Sir, on a point of order, I would like to make an observation on this point and I think you will hear us before you give your ruling. I understand that in the British House of Commons this is not the practice and individual cases have been argued and successfully argued. Let me cite an instance from Todd's *Parliamentary Government in England*. Page 417 cites the case of an irregular promotion of an officer, Lord Burgharsh, to a higher military rank. This was discussed because it was contrary to the prescribed procedures, was objected to in the House of Commons and after the debate the Government was compelled to cancel the promotion. This is a clear case of where an individual's undue promotion was objected to and debated and the Government in that democracy was responsive enough to bow to the decision of the House.

Similarly, Sir, on another occasion, Parliament asked for the appointment

of a Royal Commission to consider the 'existing system of promotion and retirement' regarding the Royal Navy. Examples were given where promotions were not being made on sound principles and individual cases were cited, and on that occasion the motion was negatived. Later on, the Government themselves appointed a Committee. Therefore, I would request you, before giving such a ruling, to consider whether this would not be an undue truncation of the privileges of this House. We believe, Sir, therefore, that we are entitled to raise the case of the individual officer and the hon. Minister is perfectly entitled to give his answer.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): Sir, Acharya Kripalani is opening out a very dangerous front. We are tampering with the Defence Forces by dragging in the names.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member can direct himself to the point of order that has been raised and not embark on general observations here. I would request him to confine himself to the point of order, if he has to contribute anything to guide me in that respect, he may gladly do it.

Shri Joachim Alva: A year ago, when I made a reference to an officer of the External Affairs Ministry in a complimentary manner—he is one of the most esteemed officers of the External Affairs Ministry and is going in a shortwhile on a very high assignment, having had very important associations with our work in Pakistan and China—the hon. Speaker called me to order and said that no names of officers should be mentioned. I would like to show you that ruling. If the hon. Speaker such a ruling, Acharya Kripalani would not be entitled to mention names now.

Again, I beg to say that the matters relating to Defence Forces are delicate affairs. Let us not drag them by this kind of references.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (His-sar): Sir, I am glad about your ruling. And gree with it

An Hon. Member: No ruling.....
(Interruptions.)

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Sir, two cases were mentioned by Shri Masani. In one case a committee was appointed; in the other case a commission was appointed. They went into particular matters and decided the question. But no names and merits were discussed.

Shri M. R. Masani: No.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: If names are dragged in and if individual cases are decided here, will the fate of the military officers be decided by votes of members? What about the other ranks and other officials also? Then, this will be a forum for all individual cases to be brought forward and discussed here; this will be very difficult and embarrassing. Whatever be the precedents in other countries, I should think that in our Parliament such a thing should not be allowed. If the hon. Acharya Kripalani has got a number of such cases, a Commission may be appointed or a committee may be appointed if the House so likes. But names should not be talked of here and the promotions and things like that should not be decided here. Otherwise, it will be difficult to go on with such cases here.

Shri Nath Pal: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I fully welcome the suggestion made by Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava. We would not like to bring in names here and I think Acharya Kripalani would be the last person to drag in names here. As regards the question of constitutional propriety, whether this House has the right to discuss such things or not, I may say that the right is absolutely undoubted. We have quoted this authority before also and it is clearly laid down in the *Rules of Procedure* that whenever there is no precedent or when there

are no clear rules laid down, the procedure followed by the House of Commons shall be applicable. That procedure has just now been cited and I will refer you to be very little pamphlet compiled by the research section and made available to hon. Members. In case this is not available. Today's may be demanded where it is said that the question of promotion was fully discussed in the House of Commons. But if we are not to do so, I will ask two questions. There is the case of General Verma which is being discussed in the whole of the Press. (Interruptions).

An Hon. Member: We do not want to discuss it here.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He is only referring to a case mentioned in the Press... (Interruptions.) It is desirable perhaps—I do not know whether there has been a discussion of it.

All kinds of insinuations and innuendoes and misapprehensions are being made and created in the minds of the public and some Members of the House because it touches the vital question of the security and defence of the country. Are we to be stopped from discussing these matters when the press is discussing them? We are in your hands and we will be guided by you. We would like to have an assurance that no names are to be mentioned in this House. Let the Defence Minister be graceful enough to say that a full enquiry will be made by a Commission appointed by this House into this whole question. Then we do not mention names. Otherwise, our constitutional right is very clear.

Shri Khushwaqt Rai (Kheri): I want to say a few words to supplement the point of order raised by Shri M. R. Masani. I want to invite your attention to article 105 of the Constitution under which the powers of this House and of the committees thereof and of the Members of this House are the same as those obtaining in the House of Commons. So long as they are the same,—the same

[Shri Khushwaqt Rai]

as those of the House of Commons—and if this matter can be discussed in the House of Commons, in the same manner it can be discussed here also. It can surely be discussed here.

Shri Naushir Bharucha (East Khadesh): The point of order raises or involves two issues. The first issue is the constitutional right of the House to discuss names in the House. The second aspect is, whether it is expedient or wise to do so. The constitutional aspect and the expediency or the wisdom of it have got nothing to do with each other. The constitutional right is clear. This House is sovereign and supreme and it may drag to the dust the names of anybody it likes if the occasion demands it. Therefore, there cannot be any prevention of it so far as the constitutional right is concerned. That is absolutely clear.

The question of wisdom also does come in. Personally I am of the opinion that as a matter of fact no names should be brought in unless it becomes absolutely necessary. I think it must be left partly to the goodwill of the House as well as to the discretion of the Chair. The Chair may control and stop a Member by saying that he probably is abusing the privilege, which privilege undoubtedly exists. My submission is that unless an hon. Member feels that it is absolutely necessary and inevitable, no name should be brought in. But if it becomes necessary, even though one may be unwilling to do so, the names will have to be mentioned and reference may be made in a dignified manner.

May I point out one example? The hon. Minister said just now that there was only one case in which premature retirement was resorted to. Supposing, there are three cases, and three names. Without citing the names, how can I point out the facts? It is impossible. The Defence Minister may say "there is one name". But I

do not know which name or which persons he has in view. So, sometimes the thing becomes inevitable. Therefore, I would request you to give a ruling on the constitutional aspect of it apart from the expediency part of it. I am sure the House will certainly respect the Chair's guidance in this matter, namely, that as far as possible, the mention of names should be avoided.

Shri Goray: I have a cut motion. I would like to draw your attention to cut motion No. 1227, which seeks to discuss that the appropriate policy regarding the promotion has not been effected. Once you admit this cut motion, unless we give certain instances, the cut motion, cannot be discussed or supported.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I may straightway say that the cut motions are admitted subject to their being admissible otherwise. That discretion is always with the Chair. Therefore, he cannot take advantage of that.

Shri Goray: Yes, Sir. Here, in the same brochure to which your attention was drawn by my hon. friend Shri Nath Pai, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom. Mr. Churchill has been quoted. Speaking in the House of Commons on 27th January, 1942, during the war, he said:

"Any Member will be free to say anything he thinks fit about or against the administration or against the composition or personality of the Government subject only to the reservation, which the House is always so careful to observe, about military secrets."

These are not military secrets, and if you watch the press, everywhere discussion is going on—in the lobbies, in the officers' mess, in the press. If

this House is barred from discussing them, then that means that this House has less rights and privileges than other people, the people outside.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur) rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let him be very brief.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Before you give a ruling on the point of order raised by my hon. friend Shri M. R. Masani, I would also like to get a ruling on this matter: It is not a question of defence alone. I would request you to consider that there is another aspect of it. Many other names were brought in on one occasion—the names of anti-social tax-dodgers. I have brought those names, which were ultimately expunged, want to know whether this will apply to the Defence Ministry alone or to other Ministries as well.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Does he mean to say that first I should allow them and then expunge them?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I am placing these points of view before you. It has been done in another case. I want to bring those names of anti-social elements here. I would request you to consider that aspect of the matter also, before you give your ruling.

Shri C. K. Nair (Outer Delhi): It is not merely a question of constitutional right. This House is the supreme and sovereign body, and so, no doubt we can discuss anything at any time. But as a responsible body, we should see what the repercussion on the army men would be. I think only a sense of responsibility like that should restrain us from bringing names into this House. We have got so many other methods to deal with such things when so many interests are involved.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I would like to ask the hon. Minister if he has anything to say, before I give my opinion,

though I have expressed that no names should be brought in.

Shri Krishna Menon: I have already said that there has been no irregularity in promotion. This particular reference is to the appointment that has not only been made but—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I might just observe that this is not a question as to whether there has been any irregularity or not. The point at present is whether it can be discussed or cannot be discussed here.

Shri Krishna Menon: My submission is, 'not', Sir.

Shri Raghunath Singh: The hon. Law Minister is here.

Some Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I think we should not spend more time on this matter.

Shri Tyagi: I want to make one suggestion. If the Minister agrees, it would be better if those Members who have some instances discuss the matter with the Minister privately.

An Hon. Member: That is a different matter.

Mr Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. I have heard the arguments. So far as the constitutional point is concerned, as to whether the House has powers to discuss it or not, presumably I should not question that. The House is sovereign and it can always discuss anything that it likes. I have not studied the points in detail, because the question has been raised only just now, and therefore, I cannot give an authoritative ruling. But I feel that the House is sovereign and has got all the authority, if it chooses, to discuss any particular question or any particular appointment. But leaving that aside, the first observation that I made was, whatever it might be, it is not advisable to discuss it here. That was what I said. I never gave a ruling on the constitutional or legal point. But after hearing hon. Members I am confirmed in my view that if we take up those instances and begin

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

to argue about them,—one side being in favour of one employee and the Government just supporting the action that has been taken—we will be reducing ourselves rather to the position of a forum which, I should say, is not becoming of us, and we will not be able to resolve anything that we want to resolve. Therefore, my advice even now, after hearing all the Members, would be that names should not be mentioned. Shri Naushir Bharucha gave me an instance. He said that there might be certain circumstances, and a compulsion or a compelling necessity for mentioning names. He gave an instance by saying that the Defence Minister had said that there was only one case where the recommendation has not been accepted; that is, about premature retirement.

Shri Krishna Menon: I said "in this context" immediately and I also said that premature retirements in the army are common when they have no future in service.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If that is said, namely, it is not one but two or three—such and such numbers—have also been prematurely retired, I would not have any objection. I would allow that much. But if it is taken up on this ground that this was not justified, this man was a superior man, he put in such and such service, etc., that would not be advisable, because we would be entering into a discussion that is always controversial and the purpose we have in mind would not be served. Therefore, I would request the hon. Member not to mention names in that context.

15 hrs.

Acharya Kripalani: While not agreeing with you in this respect, I submit to your decision. It would have been better if the liberty that is allowed to the Press was also allowed to the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The liberty of this House should not be compared

with the liberties of the Press. We are more responsible. Anything that is published in the Press has not got that much of credence, strength or even reliance, whereas when we speak here in the House, it has a different meaning altogether. Therefore, that should not be compared with the liberties of the Press.

Acharya Kripalani: I cannot question your wisdom in this respect and so far as it is possible, I will try to give effect to it. As I will have to say things in an indirect form and I do not know whether I will be able to express myself properly and it will require much more time. A good deal of time of the House has already been taken.

I was saying that the point at issue in army promotions is not one of seniority versus merit, as is made out in order to confuse issues. Seniority, of course, cannot be the sole criterion for promotion in any service. What, however, I shall endeavour to point out is that merit has not always been the criterion for promotion in our army these days. If it were, we may not have the present Head of the Army Staff, nor, as I shall show later, would officers of proved incompetence, be promoted.

Therefore, the real issue is whether appointments should be made according to sound principles and appropriate procedures laid down in advance or should be made arbitrarily according to the whims and fancies of the Defence Minister or what will suit his political and ideological purposes. A scrutiny of the facts will show that a great deal of hanky-panky has been going on in recent years. This has led to heart-burning among officers and discontent among the ranks, injurious to the morale of the fighting forces at this critical juncture.

Under the British, senior appointments above the rank of Colonel, were made on the recommendation of No. 1 Selection Board. It consisted

of the Chief of Army Staff and his Deputy, the three Army Commanders and the four Principal Staff Officers, with the Military Secretary as Secretary of the Board. The decisions of the Board were normally accepted. This is no longer the case. Why? After independence, the Defence Ministry has a say in the final selection of the senior-most ranks and individual careers are much influenced by the likes and dislikes of the Minister, not only that, by the likes and dislikes of the Secretary and sometimes even of the Joint Secretary. This, I believe, led to the tendering of the resignation of the Chief of Army Staff in 1959. It was withdrawn at the instance of the Prime Minister.

Coming to recent cases, in 1959, some General was promoted. Everybody knows the name, but I am not to mention the name here. He went over the heads of a dozen Generals. It is quite possible that some, not all, of them were not fully qualified for the next higher rank. But the question is, was it the fault of these people or was it due to the exigencies of the services and defective planning? It will be interesting to know how it was that whereas all the superseded officers—the Defence Minister does not like the word 'supersession', though he used it many times—were not fully qualified, this particular General who is an Army Service Corps Officer and not a combatant arm of the Forces acquired the necessary qualifications to be promoted to the rank of Lt. General?

Shri Kalika Singh (Azamgarh): On a point of order. When it has been already decided, can it be raised?

Acharya Kripalani: I can as well be asked not to speak.

How was it again that the same officer was appointed Chief of General Staff? As far as is known, this appointment has never been filled by an Army Service Corps Officer. How is it that this officer is better qualified for a General Staff appointment than

officers who have throughout their career been in the combatant arms?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It should not be the attempt only to ignore my advice.

Acharya Kripalani: May I submit that it becomes almost impossible to go on? You may as well ask me to sit down.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I said he should refrain from mentioning the names.

Acharya Kripalani: I have not mentioned the name.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have followed it and I am thankful to him that he has not mentioned the name. I am only advising him that this attempt should not be there, giving this impression that the same thing is being done simply by another method. Otherwise, I am not obstructing him.

Shri Krishna Menon: On a point of order. Most of these are not factually correct with regard to the categories of arms to which the officers belong. If it is said in this way in this House, it becomes necessary to point out to what arm each officer belongs. It is very difficult to conduct the business of Government when officers cannot be protected against attacks of this kind.

Shri M. R. Masani: How can we do our business of discussing the promotion policy if a senior leader of this House cannot even point out marked deviations from proper practices and principles?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have not objected to the deviations that have taken place from a particular procedure or from regulations. The Defence Minister has raised a point of order. I feel that this is not a question of any point of order. He has said that it is not possible for the Government to carry on. That is a different thing altogether. We have only to see—I have again and again pointed out that

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

it will not be advisable and I have given my advice. I hope some attention will be paid to that, because I am feeling that in the tension that we are having here just now, it would not serve our purpose in any way and we would not be serving any useful purpose if we proceed in that way. Otherwise, there is no point of order.

Acharya Kripalani: Sir, I submit to your wishes. I will try as far as possible. After all, these things have appeared in the Press. Everybody all over India knows about these things. What can I do.

Shri Ranga: Otherwise it would be indulging in make-beliefs.

Shri Masani: It is for the hon. Member....

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): The hon. Member is citing instances. The Government has to justify its existence not by shutting us out.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. Acharya Kripalani does not require support at every moment, at every step. We all respect him and we know that he does not require any support.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): Is the hon. Member attacking the Minister here or the officers? If he is attacking the officers, they are not here to defend themselves. If he is attacking the Minister he can do that without naming him. (Interruption).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Passions should not run high; otherwise, in a calm atmosphere we might proceed.

Acharya Kripalani: The latest case is that of supersession of one Lieutenant General. He was an Army Commandant. He had held several appointments which will make him an efficient Army Commander. At the beginning of this year it became necessary to make appointments of two Army Commanders. Of those

available for consideration the senior-most was somebody.. (Interruption).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. I do not think Acharyaji has any difficulty. If he says there was somebody else senior, where is the difficulty, unless he persists in that?

Acharya Kripalani: I have no objection.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is nothing that he should feel diffident about. He can express himself well—he is doing it—if he has that intention to do.

Shri C. K. Nair: Sir, I rise to a point of order. We really wonder how this information is leaking out. (Interruption). How can it leak out unless there is a serious breach of discipline in the Army?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. What is the decision that the hon. Member wants from me on this point of order?

An Hon. Member: Nothing.

Acharya Kripalani: Sir, I have already submitted to your ruling. I am trying to be as careful as possible. I was saying that at the beginning of this year it became necessary to make appointments of two Commanders. Of those available for consideration the senior-most was General A. But he held some other post. He cannot therefore be said to have been superseded. The next senior-most officer was the General of whom we have talked in the beginning. The next ranking officers in the field were at least two years junior to him. They were, let us say, Generals A, B and C. The first intimation of the mischief that was brewing came in the form of a leak, perhaps deliberate and calculated, in the *Statesman* of New Delhi. It accurately forecast....

Shri M. R. Masani: What date?

Acharya Kripalani: 20th February. It accurately forecast the appointments that were actually made afterwards. The forecast was that Generals A and B were to be promoted to the post of Army Commanders over the head of the Lieutenant General of whom we have talked. In the case of another General, he was to supersede, as I understand it... (*Interruption*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

Acharya Kripalani: All right, Sir...

Shri C. K. Nair: We are doing something wrong. (*Laughter*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We ought to be serious about these things. There ought to be some decorum kept. It should be taken seriously and not laughed at.

Acharya Kripalani: They are laughing at my confusion.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Only because he is laughing himself.

Acharya Kripalani: I am not laughing. Sir, I am very serious.

I understand that on 20th February this aggrieved General felt considerably embarrassed by the appearance of this news and he wrote to the Chief of the Army Staff enquiring whether there was any truth in this news. He was assured that no appointment had been decided upon and the report was not true. Nevertheless, five days later, on the 27th February, the Defence Ministry informed the Military Secretary of the appointment of Generals so and so and so and so, exactly as had been forecast in the Statesman, asking him to announce it. On the 28th February, the following day, the aggrieved General tendered his resignation, or whatever you may call it. His contention was that with regard to his seniority in service he was better placed and his qualifications also were better than those of the two officers who superseded him—if the actual military qualifications, active war experience

or past appointments were to be taken into account.

Sir, the question then arises whether as in the normal course the Ministry had put it in writing the recommendations of the No. 1 selection board and, if so, what were they. If no such recommendations were before the Ministry, why did it not ask for one? On what basis did they make the promotion? What advice in writing did the Chief of the Army Staff give to the Defence Minister with regard to these three important posts? Are the promotions and appointments of colonels and above, apart from seniority, based on merit or also political considerations or the whims of the Defence Minister? I want, Sir, a detailed statement of the reasons for this supersession of which, as far as I am aware, no written record exists.

The result is that the Army will have to lose in the near future a brilliant officer who would have been of great service to this country at this time. I would like the Cabinet to go into this matter and satisfy itself about the facts of the case and find out if justice has been done.

Sir, so far I have been able to carry on. Beyond this I am afraid I cannot carry on because I will have to give names, because otherwise it will become confusing and the House will not understand. Anyway, I bow to your ruling. So I am leaving that portion unsaid.

Then I come to the next point, which is about the Russian pilots flying over our strategic areas. My information is that in November 1960 the Air Force Commander in Jammu and Kashmir told the senior military headquarters in the area that Russian helicopters flown by Russian pilots were permitted to undertake trials in the forward area. The army, being responsible for the security of the border belt, felt that it was wrong for Russians to fly over our defence and land at the out posts and check our de-

[Acharya Kripalani]

fence arrangements. They asked, therefore, for clearance from Army Headquarters. They received no reply to various reminders. By-passing the local military headquarters, the Quarter-Master General took upon himself to fly in a helicopter to one of the forward posts. This process was repeated. The local Air Force Commander was then personally rang up, as I hear, by the Defence Minister to see that the Russians were taken forward and allowed to carry out the trials.

An Hon. Member: Shame.

Acharya Kripalani: The Russians have been flown to most of our forward posts and they, presumably, obtained all information that they and the Chinese need. Why was this extraordinary procedure adopted of issuing orders by phone to junior local Air Force Commanders by the Defence Minister himself? The normal course is that orders are passed through the Defence Ministry to the service headquarters, to the camp headquarters and then to local commanders. In view of what I have said, and what is current in the army and what is current in the press, I repudiate with all the vehemence that I can command, that we here create any loss of morale in the army. It is those who are put in charge of the Defence Department and their actions that put the army into confusion. Thank God, the army is so constituted that even now its morale is not very badly shaken. But if this goes on, I am sure its morale will be shaken. In view of what I have said and what is current in the army, public and the press, I would venture to make a concrete suggestion which will allay the public fear and apprehension about the state of affairs in the army. Let there be an independent review of the state of affairs in the Armed Forces. This can be done by a committee of Members of both the Houses. In the alternative, let the President, as the Commander-in-Chief, appoint a commission of enquiry to go into the

affairs of defence. This commission should consist of independent persons of high standing, in and outside Parliament, and some retired military and civil officials. It should be presided over by the Vice-President or a person of equal status. The Defence Minister should not object to this if all is well in the army. I believe that such commissions are sometimes appointed in U.K. and other democratic countries. Nothing else, I am afraid, will allay the apprehension that is widespread in the public mind. I say this (apprehension) is a fact and those who do not recognize it are living in their own heaven. This alone can restore among the armed forces some confidence.

Shri Tyagi: Could we not, Sir, declare all these proceedings as secret? Because, otherwise all these things will go into the press.

Shri Ranga: Why?

Acharya Kripalani: What the Defence Minister can say can go to the press but what I say could not go to the press.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member might proceed.

Acharya Kripalani: He may rest assured that whatever I may say, only a few lines will appear, whereas all the lines of whatever the Defence Minister says will appear in the press.

Apart from the question of appointment and promotion in the armed forces, here are serious lapses in the working of this department and the industrial programme which it has undertaken. I would mention some of the findings of the Public Accounts Committee report, presented to the House as late as on the 3rd instant. This Committee has examined the Audit Report of 1960 about the defence services. From a cursory perusal I find it has confirmed every point that the Auditor-General had

made in his report of last year. As a matter of fact, the language of the Public Accounts Committee report is stronger than the Audit Report of last year.

Shri Ranga: As it should be.

Acharya Kripalani: It will be remembered that last year there was some trouble about the placing of the Audit Report on the Table of the House. There was a controversy between the Finance Minister and the Defence Minister. It was alleged that the report was placed on the Table of the House in a hurry. I hope this House remembers it. It was also stated, if I mistake not, that the Auditor-General was allergic to the Defence Minister. It was further stated that the allegations contained in the Report were not correct and no chance had been given to the Defence Ministry to explain their position. It was, therefore, urged that the Report should not be referred to by hon. Members in their speeches till it was examined by the Public Accounts Committee. Now this Committee has examined the Audit Report of 1960. The House will see what its findings are. I will give a few examples, not many.

A Captain Superintendent of a naval dock-yard purchased one item of store at the rate of Rs. 26,320 per ton when the market price was about Rs. 720 per ton. Mark the figures—Rs. 26,320 and Rs. 720; about 36 times the market price. Another item of stores was purchased by the same officer at the rate of Rs. 25,200 per ton when the market price was Rs. 4,860. I want the House to remember these figures—Rs. 25,200 and Rs. 4,860. These are astounding figures. When I read them, I thought my eyes were deceiving me, as you will think now I am misquoting. I asked some friends about the accuracy of the figures and they said the figures were correct. What happened to this Captain Superintendent? We are now hearing about merit. What happened to this Superintendent? The Report

says that the Captain Superintendent had been transferred in the normal course to a senior post on completion of his tenure. His promotion was made in direct contravention of the instruction issued by the Home Ministry in November 1958. This requires that a Government servant, whose conduct is under investigation, should be promoted only after exoneration. Yet the Defence Minister, and the Prime Minister in his defence, told us that promotions are given not only on seniority but also on merit. I suppose the merit of this officer was quite clear to the authorities, though it is not so clear to this House, or to the public, or to the Public Accounts Committee.

Sir, there is another instance of waste and negligence, if not also of corruption. The Government sanctioned the construction of certain roads, approximately 308 miles, at an estimated cost of about Rs. 305 lakhs. I want the House to remember the figures. This was in December 1952. After six years, that is, by December 1958, only 98.11 miles were constructed. The amount spent was Rs. 392 lakhs, nearly four times. The original estimate of explosives to be used for this road-building was about Rs. 20 lakhs; actually the explosives used only on one-third of the construction was Rs. 155 lakhs—Rs. 20 lakhs and Rs. 155 lakhs.

Two senior engineers visited the work site and reported:

"Explosives had been used indiscriminately and on jobs which could have been done by manual labour."

The Public Accounts Committee opines that it:

"is not convinced that the increase in construction cost was justified, that there had been unnecessary expenditure which could have been avoided had greater supervision been exercised."

[Acharya Kripalani]

The Committee has not talked of corruption: it is because they have no machinery to detect it.

Sir, here is yet another example of culpable negligence. This relates to a loss of Rs. 174 lakhs due to defective storage. About this the Committee says that they are—

"shocked to see the magnitude of the loss."

Commenting on the accounting method of the store materials in a Naval Dockward, the Committee says—

"The Committee are distressed to find that the store accounts should be in such a chaotic state."

They had reported on many occasions the importance of accurate store accounting and periodic accounts verification. Unless the stores are correctly accounted for, there is grave risk of pilferages. The report of the committee is bristling with remarks like "the Committee are shocked", the "committee are distressed", "the committee are unhappy", "the committee are not convinced", etc.

The pity of it all is that this is not the first time that such astounding and such scathing remarks have been made about this Ministry; but it learns neither by experience nor by informed and impartial criticism. It does not learn by experience, because there are obstinate men in charge of this Department.

15.33 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

Let us, Sir, now have a look at the Audit Report of 1961. The report is not from the former Auditor-General who was allergic to the Defence Minister, but from the new Auditor-General. I hope he has not inherited the prejudices against the department from his predecessor. His report

makes more distressing reading than that of the former Auditor-General.

There was a question in this House as you will remember, about the purchase of spare parts of mechanical transport vehicles. That transaction was considered so irregular that the Public Accounts Committee, last year, recommended special investigation. Accordingly a one-man committee of Shri Vishnu Sahay was appointed. How far it is right that a special investigation recommended by a Committee of this House should be entrusted to one civil servant is something which the House will have to consider. However, the report of this one-man committee is still awaited. But in the meantime "contracts still continue to be placed without a proper and accurate estimate of the requirements". For instance, in respect of certain new contracts placed in January 1958 to July 1959, with the same foreign firm and for similar items, namely spare parts of mechanical transport vehicles, after the orders were placed an attempt was made by the Department to reduce the quantities in respect of 140 items. This is how they plan. This attempt did not succeed and we had to purchase materials not wanted by us. This is how planning is done in this Department upon which depends the safety of our country.

Sir, much has been said about the production in the Ordnance Factories under this Ministry. The Audit Report of 1961 makes interesting reading about the rejection of products from these factories and also about the method of planning and production. It says:

"At the end of the financial year 1958-59 the total value of semi-finished stores. . . in the ordnance factories was Rs. 953 lakhs".

Out of this Rs. 355 lakhs was in respect of orders prior to 1958-59. The report says:

"Apparently these stores, the manufacture of which was taken

up more than six years back, are not required by the indentors and the expenditure is likely to prove infructuous."

The Machine Tool Prototype Factory furnishes another example of what I have said. This was scheduled to go into full production in 1951, but actually opened for production in 1953. Almost a decade has passed, but "no definite programme for development and manufacture of prototype of arms and ammunition has so far been laid down by the Government." The total amount invested in this factory is Rs. 437 lakhs, and even after six years of commencement it has actually suffered a loss of Rs. 77 lakhs.

I shall now give one or two examples of delay in the manufacture of articles, and the loss incurred due to heavy rejections. In June 1948 and August 1950, three orders were placed for 69,000 units of a certain item of ammunition. These orders were to be completed by March 1952. Up to the end of May 1960 one factory was able to complete only 8,120 units and the rejections were 8,619 units. The second factory completed only 1,853 units and the rejections were 8,528 units. The rejections have been 106 per cent in the one and 460 per cent in the other case. Also, though the ammunition was required by March 1952, it was not manufactured till August 1960. This is the efficiency of which we talk so much.

Here is another instance. A Central Ordnance Depot placed five orders between December 1947 and 1949 for 401 units of a particular article. In September 1955 the same depot proposed the cancellation of 341 units out of this order. But his cancellation was not accepted on the plea that parts were already "at an advanced stage of manufacture". However, only 20 units were supplied up to January 1960.

Let me, Sir, come back to the present report of the Public Accounts Committee. It says that a second-

hand cargo vessel was purchased in June 1952 for Rs. 38.30 lakhs as it was urgently required, and a new one would take time. After purchase, an expenditure of Rs. 8 lakhs was incurred on certain alterations. Then, machinery worth Rs. 20 lakhs was acquired for this vessel. In 1958, a firm was asked to carry out certain structural alterations and to install machinery for a sum of Rs. 16 lakhs. This vessel was ultimately put into commission in April, 1959. During this period, a large expenditure was incurred on the employment of officers and ratings to look after this ship.

About this transaction, the Public Accounts Committee have said:

"The fact that this vessel could be commissioned only seven years after the purchase, makes the Committee wonder whether the plea of urgency was really so. The Committee are distressed at the complete lack of prior planning and unbusinesslike manner in which the conversion work was allowed to proceed. The delay has resulted not only in more expenditure on the complement of officers and ratings appointed to look after the ship but also in loss due to non-availability of repair facilities to the Navy for a longer period."

This reminds me of....

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member may pass on the brief to some others also.

Acharya Kripalani: But there have been so many interruptions that I hope you will give me some more time.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: The time may be extended.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi (Puri): The time should be extended. (*Interruptions*).

Acharya Kripalani: This call has come not for the Minister but for me.

[Acharya Kripalani]

This call comes from the Communist Members. That shows which way the wind is blowing.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: Why should he feel like that?

Acharya Kripalani: The more you support him, the less will the people have faith in him.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: I only said that the time might be extended.

Mr. Speaker: He only says that the time should be extended.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: There is something wrong with him.

Acharya Kripalani: I can understand what he means.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: There is something wrong with him.

Acharya Kripalani: This reminds me of the recent purchase of the aircraft carrier for the very modest sum of Rs. 30 crores. Aircraft carriers, everybody knows, are outmoded, but we do not know of these military sciences very much. In France, they are now used merely as transport vehicles. They are not considered any more as an integral part of the Navy for defence, now that the range of planes has become very wide. In any case, I submit that we must allot proper priorities. Looking to the danger in the north, one cannot feel happy over the purchase of this big toy at this time, which can, if at all, defend the southern part, from where definitely we do not expect any danger.

Apart from the capital cost of this carrier, there is the recurring cost, which is estimated to be about Rs. 3 crores, because it will employ about 1,300 persons of whom at least about 300 would be officers.

We have heard of the much-advertised Ordnance factories. May

we know the number of trucks and jeeps actually produced? And what about tanks? We heard of collaboration with the British for the production of the Centurion tank. The decision was delayed, and in the end, nothing was done, and the deal fell through. We heard about the French AMX tank. It met the same fate. And now we hear of the German tank. Behind these unending delays and grand claims, may we know how many tanks have, in fact, been manufactured? The fact is that the reported dynamism of the Defence Minister is merely nervous activity which does more harm than good.

We have the example of this nervous activity in the truck deal with the Rehabilitation Ministry. I need not go into the details. They are well known. Not only has the nation lost a good deal of money, but there has been delay in the work of reclamation. Also, there has been a kind of civil war between two departments of the Government of India.

The Defence Department charged the Rehabilitation Ministry with sabotage, of deliberately mishandling the tractors. It has now been found that the tractors were highly defective. We would like to know if these tractors will be continued to be produced and used in the Army.

In this connection, I am puzzled to find that apart from the public sector and the private sector, we have also a defence sector. One may have no objection to the growth and expansion of the Defence Production Organisation. But let it be on the basis of a rational, national plan in which the public sector and the private sector also participate. Apart from the production of arms and ammunition, there is no reason why other categories of production should be reserved for Defence and put under a cloak of secrecy. There is no reason why aircraft manufacture, electronics and a plant like the Prototype Machine Tool Factory should be under the Defence Ministry. It is not

so in any other democracy. The exclusiveness of some of these plants under the Defence Ministry has come in the way of their utilisation to the best national advantage.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member may conclude now.

An Hon. Member: How many pages more?

Shri Nath Pai: Till you are educated

Acharya Kripalani: Few in this House will grudge expenditure on the defence of this country and on defence production. It is necessary that the amount sanctioned by Parliament should be properly utilised and accounted for. Otherwise, there will be demoralisation. The fact is that year after year, report after report, one comes across a lamentable waste and extravagance, negligence and corruption in this department. All this has happened in peace time. What will happen in war time is too dangerous to contemplate. I think it is high time that the House took a serious view of these reports and did not try to treat them as routine documents. Sir, I hope you, as the guardian of the House, will suggest ways and means by which culpable lapses and negligence of this important Ministry can be remedied. I think it was the Taxation Inquiry Commission which said that the Government has no right to tax the people if the amount of taxes is not properly utilised for public purposes. I am glad that the Defence Minister is here today. I hope he will defend himself and his Ministry better than he has defended the country.

Sir, I charge him with having created cliques in the Army. I charge him with having lowered the morale of our Armed Forces.

An Hon. Member: Question question.

Acharya Kripalani: I charge him with wasting the money of a poor and starving nation. I charge him with the neglect of the defence of the country

against the aggression of communist China. And, in the international field, I charge him with having lent his support to the totalitarian and dictatorial regimes against the will of the people to freedom. May I

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member is going beyond the scope of the debate here.

Acharya Kripalani: May I, Sir, at this critical moment appeal to Congressmen who were not afraid of the British bullets and bayonets to place the good of the nation above the supposed good of the party? I would remind them of how the Conservatives in England acted during the last war. They obliged even their Prime Minister Chamberlain to resign.

Shri D. S. Raju (Rajahmundry): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I thank you, very much for giving me this opportunity to make a few observations, on the Defence Budget. After listening to the speech of the Defence Minister..... (Interruptions.)

Mr. Speaker: A little louder. The hon. Member may come forward. With less noise in the House, everybody can hear him.

Shri D. S. Raju: Sir, after listening to the speech of the hon. Defence Minister, I feel very happy. Some of the doubts which we had and some of the fears which we had entertained before have been completely allayed. I am glad he has made his speech in the beginning; this might as well have been a concluding speech because this speech has been very exhaustive and comprehensive. He has touched almost all the aspects of the Defence Organisation, including the Army, the Navy and the Air Force, the development programmes, expansion of the Armed Forces, promotions, etc. He has dealt with them thoroughly and very conclusively. He has given us sufficient information.

I do not agree with what Acharya Kripalani has said on many of the issues. After listening to him, I have

[Shri D. S. Raju]

come to the conclusion that his criticism is based more on fundamental political differences than on actual facts.

Coming to the defence problems of our country, it is a very serious problem that we are considering. When we consider this problem, we must discuss and view this problem from different angles. We must appreciate the international situation, especially in this missile age. Can there be any planning or strategy in this scientific and technological age? Even great Generals have admitted that in this atomic age, when there is a world conflict it is impossible to have any planning and nobody knows what is going to happen within the first three or four hours because there will be complete destruction and annihilation.

So, Sir, if our country is unfortunately dragged into a major conflict, much against our wish of course, we have got to share the fate of the world and there cannot be any policy or any strategy in that connection. Barring a major conflict, we might be involved in a local conflict with, say, Pakistan on the one side or China on the northern side. Now, leaving alone Pakistan, let us come to the question of the Chinese on the northern side. There, it is possible that this tension may develop into a major and prolonged conflict. The Chinese civilisation is an old civilisation; they have an ancient culture. They know fully well that any major conflict is going to be very very dreadful and a devastating one which will be destructive to both China and India. I am sure that they will not easily drag their country into any major conflict with India. Now, barring these two possibilities of a major global conflict in which we might be involved, and major war with China alone with other powers, remaining neutral, there is a third possibility of continuing frictions, hit and run tactics, such as frontier violations as kidnapping, theft, exchange of rifle fires, etc. This sort of friction might be prolonged with China and might

last for a few decades. With this picture in view, we have got to plan our strategy and tactics.

I would like to say that priorities must be given to these defence allotments. What has been given to the Air Force is, I feel, very inadequate. After the Second World War, Air Force has become a very dominant weapon. In fact, the Air-Arm was indispensable, for Army, and Navy as well. It played the key and decisive role in winning the war for the Allies. So, I feel that much more attention should be paid, namely, to the allotment for the Air Force.

Secondly, I would like to remind the House about research. It is a very important subject. Defence laboratories are very important, where they can discover and improve our methods and techniques, and weapons. They can carry on such activities in the laboratories. In fact, all the western countries are going ahead and spending considerable amounts of money in the research departments. In this connection, I would like to bring to the notice of the House a chemical weapon that has been discovered. I believe it is a gas. It is a very wonderful gas which has been discovered lately. It does not kill people, but I believe it frightens them. It has been proved by experiments that it is a very potent and valuable weapon and that when it is thrown upon the enemy, the enemy loses his nerve, flees from the battlefield and runs away. Similar discoveries are being made in almost all countries. So, I would suggest that our Government and the Defence Ministry should take up this question of research in an earnest manner, and utilise the best brains of this country in that direction. From the budget report, I find that our civilian scientists are not attracted in sufficient numbers. I believe that adequate provision and encouragement should be given to them so that the best talents and brains of our country could come to our laboratories.

I was glad to hear that an announcement has been made recently to the effect that four Sainik schools are being established in India. I wish that this decision was made much earlier. I would like to know from the Government why they are not able to expand this programme. The four schools are supposed to be established in Rajasthan, Punjab, Maharashtra and Gujarat. I feel it is very inadequate, and these few schools will not be able to meet the demands and the needs of the times. I do not think the Government has fully appreciated the spirit of the country. In a country like ours, where the population is increasing by 70 lakhs a year, we should produce every article in a mass scale. I should request the Government to see that such Sainik schools on the model of the one at Dehra Dun should be established in every State I am not making this plea from a linguistic or a provincial point of view. The hon. Minister said that he is not able to get sufficient number of recruits to the academy at Khadakvasla. When we establish many preparatory schools all over India, I think there will be every chance ultimately of getting more recruits to the Khadakvasla academy.

In this connection, I would like to remind the House that one of the hon. Members of this House, Dr. Vijaya Ananda, has promised to give his palace at Korukonda in Vizianagaram, worth about Rs. 30 lakhs with an extensive compound of 60 acres. I would like to know the reaction of our Defence Minister to this proposal. If there is any financial difficulty, we are prepared to meet it. There are people enough who can collect money on a voluntary basis and help the Government to establish these military schools.

I would also urge that we must have the ACC and NCC courses expanded. I have been urging year after year, for the last four years, that it is very essential, for the building up of the future of our country, that every boy and every girl passes through these ACC and NCC courses. It is very important. I am glad to know that

over three lakhs of students are undergoing this training. Why three lakhs? I wish the Government had said that about three millions of students are undergoing these courses. After all, we are producing millions of graduates. What for? We are not able to produce decent men and women who are able to stand up boldly and courageously, who have got the patriotism and who possess strength and vitality. After all, the nation needs such strong people. Where else can we build up our future and build up the future nation except in schools and colleges? Those are the places where we can lay the foundation for the future of our country.

We have got the national discipline scheme of Bhonsle in operation in Delhi and at other places. That is an important step which the Government should seriously consider and put into practice on a larger scale. Measures such as the increase in the number of Sainik schools and expansion programmes with regard to the ACC and NCC and also the national discipline scheme should be taken on hand vigorously and given maximum encouragement. Unless we take such a long range view of things, we would not be able to develop the spirit and morale of the country as a whole.

16 hrs.

Lastly, I would like to make an observation about these promotions. I have also seen all sorts of controversies in the Press and in the public, but after listening to the speech of the Minister, I am very happy to know how exactly these promotions were done. I think everybody should be satisfied with the speech he has made. Apart from that, certain observations were made that on purchases and other things a lot of money was wasted. I hope the Minister will be able to give satisfactory answers to them in his final reply.

Before I conclude, I would again request the Minister to give me his reaction to this proposal for the expansion

[Shri D. S. Raju]

of the military schools all over India, so that there may be at least one such school for each State.

Shri M. R. Krishna (Karimnagar—Reserved—Sch. Castes): After hearing the speech of the Defence Minister and Kripalaniji, I do not know what line I should adopt. The Defence Minister has been criticised for one very important thing, i.e., about promotions. The Defence Minister has been kind enough to explain to this House the procedure that is being followed in giving promotion up to the rank of Lt. Colonel. He said, there is the time-scale promotion where no recommendations are required. It does not come to the Defence Ministry. The time-scale promotions are automatic. After that, upto the rank of the Major-General, it is selection post and there are only a few instances where the Defence Ministry has disagreed with the recommendations made by the lower authority.

There is only a small point to be made clear. After the Major General's rank, what is the procedure that the Defence Ministry follows in giving the promotions? From the speech of Kripalaniji, it appears that there are a lot of people who are superseded and a lot of people who are recommended or promoted solely by the Defence Minister. If the Defence Minister could take the trouble of explaining to the House what the committee is like, how it is constituted, who are the members of the committee who deal with this matter after the rank of Major General, I think the Defence Minister will be able to satisfy the House to a great extent.

Lot of time was wasted about referring to names, etc. I think I should not deal at length about this point. But I would like to say one thing. Already there are some people who are trying to create lot of dissensions and disruption in the army, on the border. The Defence Ministry and some people who are connected with the Defence Ministry will be knowing how difficult

it is for the officers to function on the borders. There are some men in the army who are taking the law into their own hands and try to misbehave even with the officers. There are certain instances which have occurred in the borders. The Defence Ministry perhaps rightly kept that kind of information away from the House and the country. Once it becomes clear to the men that the officers who command them are being criticised here, I think the officers will command very little respect from the men whom they have actually to control.

Shri Ranga: Who is criticising whom?

Shri M. R. Krishna: I did not hear Prof. Ranga speaking here, but I am only saying about the way in which the defence officers have to function on the borders. If suppose in this House we criticise an officer by mentioning his designation or name, it becomes almost impossible for that officer to function on the borders or anywhere else. He has to control a huge number of men. If a particular officer feels that for his actions on the borders he is being criticised, I think he will not be able to do much justice. That is all that I have to say about it.

The Defence Minister has told this House how much has been done in the ordnance factories and ordnance depots. It is definitely a point on which the Defence Ministry has to be congratulated. I know the information which used to be given to this House by the former Defence Ministers. They were definitely not even half of what we are getting from the present Defence Minister. Leaving that apart, the Defence Minister, as I am able to understand, is over-anxious to build everything for the Defence forces in his own ordnance factories. It may be a wrong step. But one cannot misunderstand or mis-judge his interest or sincerity about the defence forces being solely dependent on their own defence factories for their requirements.

He has taken up very many things. Many changes have been brought about in the defence forces and in the ordnance factories. The things that they are trying to produce in the ordnance factories are to meet the requirements of the defence force. This is not a thing which he has just suddenly taken up. We know that when certain chassis were brought from foreign countries and when they were actually to be built with body, etc. in this country the Defence Ministry had to depend upon the various private industries in the country. The prices which the private industries quoted and their actual performance were really the reasons which perhaps rightly induced the Defence Ministry to take up the manufacture of certain things in the defence factories, Sir, in a department like the Defence Ministry where they deal in crores of rupees and through many agencies, many mistakes might happen. Therefore, we may not be doing the right thing if we condemn the Defence Minister and his Ministry for things for which they are not actually responsible.

I can appreciate hon. Members taking up defence matters item by item. I have got reasons to find fault with the Defence Ministry in respect of various things. In this House, not only Members belonging to the Opposition but even Congress Members have been criticising various other Ministries on their performances. But, as I said, I have reason to find fault with the Defence Ministry for one thing. The Defence Ministry wanted to produce certain trucks in the ordnance factories. They have entered into an agreement for producing *shaktiman*. They are now going to produce one-ton trucks in collaboration with the Japanese firms.

These are really right things for a country's Defence Ministry to do. A country which is self-sufficient, a country which can produce the automobiles required for its defence forces from A to Z will be really doing the right thing. They will not have to depend upon various other sources in an emergency. The production of

automobiles is given the highest priority in any country as far as defence is concerned.

But one thing that I would like to point out here is that standardisation is an essential thing, on which even the NATO countries are concentrating much today. The Defence Ministry, no doubt, in their recent report have said that they have standardised things and they have brought down the components from 2,000 to 700 or so. This is not really a very appreciable thing, because now when we are going to produce two types of vehicles, the Defence Ministry should take into consideration the amount of common components that will be inter-changeable between one truck and another truck. This is one of the very important things on which the NATO powers are devoting much of their attention. They have standardised even the rifles, air-crafts, ships and various other important items. When that is the position in other developed countries, I do not see any reason why the Defence Ministry should enter into agreements with different countries. Possibly, those countries are not willing to supply the type of thing which the Defence Ministry would like to have for standardising their equipments.

Coming to tanks, some hon. Member was saying that we are going to produce Centurion tanks in this country. As far as I know, the British Government were not willing to maintain the Centurion and Sherman tanks and they were thinking of multi-fuel tanks. But, in this country, we are still depending on the left-overs of the Americans and the British, with the result that tanks in this country have become absolutely white elephants. I think the consumption of these tanks is nearly four gallons per mile, which is very expensive for a country like India. Therefore, the Defence Ministry would do well in producing some tanks which will consume less of fuel instead of manufacturing all types of tractors.

Then, standardisation is not the concern of the Defence Ministry only. The whole country has to be geared up to

[Shri M. R. Krishna]

standardise various things. For instance, we are giving licences to various firms in this country to produce ump-teen types of small cars, which is not a right policy for any country which wants to develop its automobile industry. Though this subject is within the province of the Ministry of Commerce and Industry, they should ask the private sector to stick to one or two types so that at the time of emergency, both the civil and defence requirements will be met from the civil as well as defence production.

The Defence Ministry has entered into some agreements for producing some tractors. I do not think the production of tractors is the function of the Defence Ministry. When they entered into an agreement, I thought it was only to produce tanks. Now I find they are going to produce tractors alone. First they entered into an agreement with Japan. We now hear that the tractors which were produced were not utilized in Dandakaranya. After that, the Defence Ministry is going to enter into an agreement with a German firm for producing tractors. If it is only to produce tractors that the Defence Ministry is going to enter into agreements with the various foreign countries, I think the time has come to give it up, as this can very well be produced by non-defence factories. The Defence Ministry should think of producing items which are needed for the defence of the country. In stead of tractors, they can very well go in for tanks.

An Hon. Member: Tractors are also very important.

Shri M. R. Krishna: Then, we have been agitated about meeting our enemy countries. Both in this House, as well as outside, people are anxious to know whether the defence forces are equipped fully to meet any aggression coming from China. We will not be able to do justice by telling our people outside that we are weak and we cannot meet China. The Defence Minister has stated—I do not know

whether I have correctly understood or correctly followed him—that we cannot fight with China or some such thing.

An Hon. Member: He never said that.

Shri Ranga: That is the import of it, anyhow.

Shri M. R. Krishna: If he has not said it, the country wants to know whether we are making our defence forces effective enough to meet any aggression coming, either from China or from any other country. We have only to tell this country that we are in a position to meet that. But so far I do not think we have been putting things correctly, or very effectively.

I would in this connection like to say one thing, with which many of my hon. friends may not agree. Today no country is going to fight a war single-handed. They have to depend upon other countries. Now the most important organisation which comes to the rescue of a weaker nation or a nation which loves peace like our country, is the United Nations. We may not be preparing to meet the aggression of China, we still think that there are certain countries in the world which would come to the protection of countries which like us are devoted to peace. There are very many bases of Americans in various corners of the world. Our foreign policy speaks against the American bases. But if one were to think over this matter deeply he would be convinced that some time or other we may have to depend upon the American bases near by—that is the American bases near Thailand, Formosa, etc., not the bases in Pakistan. If these bases could be controlled by the United Nations Organisation, I think many of the countries which are now trying to equip themselves, and spending huge sums of money on military equipment, will be saving a lot of money.

Sardar Iqbal Singh (Ferozepur): Do you think the United States will agree to it?

Shri M. R. Krishna: We have to persuade the United Nations Organisation to accept that kind of an arrangement.

Shri Ranga: It is only a constructive suggestion—why do you not follow it?

Shri M. R. Krishna: We are definitely equipping our country to meet any aggression. But this country is not rich enough to fully arm our country with all the modern weapons.

Today China is in possession of all the left-overs of the Second World War which they have inherited from Russia; after that from Korea they got a lot of materials; from Indo-China also China got a lot of materials. That is not the position with regard to India. We got certain things which were left over by the American Disposals, which have become almost obsolete today. Defence Science has improved to such an extent that an expert of today will become a novice tomorrow. Take, for instance, what we have done in the Bharath Electronics. We wanted to produce radar, but because we were not able to get some guns to be operated by the radars we are trying to give up radar production. This is a costly experiment. After spending huge sums of money we cannot afford to give them up. That is why I would like to suggest to the Defence Ministry and the Government of India that whatever things we have to do immediately to meet any aggression we must do them at once. We cannot think of producing everything from the design stage to the production stage and then make use of them. Whatever we may try to do, by the time we get the plant, by the time we get the know-how the other countries against which we have to prepare would have advanced much and our products would have become obsolete. Therefore, my suggestion is that even if it be a matter of spending more money for the defence, they should purchase whatever things we

immediately need. We should not wait for our production. For certain basic things like the production of trucks, the Defence Ministry must have their own manufacturing centres and they must induce the private entrepreneurs to produce as many things as are required for the defence of this country.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member must now conclude.

Shri M. R. Krishna: I need some more time.

Mr. Speaker: No. There are others who want to speak. One hon. Member ought not to exhaust all the topics.

Shri M. R. Krishna: We have been talking about NEFA. In the Second World War I think it was a unit of pack animals and men that held the borders. The people of NEFA are very sturdy people, one of the sturdiest people in the world. They could present very fine material to become very good soldiers and to take up places in NEFA. I do not know what is the policy of the Defence Ministry about recruiting a larger number of people from that region. Besides that, it appears that we depend more on the photography and topography of the Himalayan range. The Defence Ministry must take the responsibility of physically surveying the whole of the Himalayan range and then plan for the defence of each of the ranges. If they want to have a uniform way of defending the whole range, it may lodge the Defence Ministry in a difficult position. I think the people who have given a lot of thought on these borders have confirmed that the NEFA borders will be very well guarded by the NEFA people themselves if they are given proper training.

One very important thing I would like to point out. The Defence Ministry has constructed the Amar project and various other projects. Before they consider taking up any more projects they should think of providing the bunkers which are very essential

[Shri M. R. Krishna]

on the borders. I am told that even though they have taken up this work of constructing bunkers for the forces on the borders, they have not been able to complete it. They are trying to give the contracts to some people who are not in a position to complete these bunkers. These bunkers are very essential for the troops' shelter, because they will not be washed away in the snow. I think the Defence Ministry will have to give more thought to this and see that bunkers are provided for our troops on the borders to enable them to do their job effectively.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: Yesterday there was a question about the cost of some aircraft that the Ministry has bought from France and the Defence Minister said that in the interest of the public neither the number nor the expenditure can be disclosed as it will reveal the strength of the Armed Forces. I think he was right when he said that the strength of the Armed Forces should not be revealed. But I was going through a book which has been prepared on behalf of the Indian Council of World Affairs under the instructions of the Pacific Relations Society which is in New York. Men like Shri Kunzru are associated with the Indian Council of World Affairs, and the Study Group appointed by the Indian Council of World Affairs had prepared this book. And in that book they have given India's defence strength.

They have given out these details:

"INDIA.

Army. 300,000 to 500,000, including 1-2 armoured divisions, 5-10 infantry divisions. Reserve and Territorial Forces also exist.

Navy. 2 cruisers; 15-20 destroyers and frigates; 40-50 minor craft; 1-3 squadrons flying boats.

Air Force. 15-20 jet fighters squadrons; Under 10 bomber squadrons; under 5 transport squadrons. A sub-

stantial reserve of pilots and transport aircraft available from India's Civil Aviation."

Therefore, the information that is not revealed to this House somehow or other escapes to the notice of other people who are very much interested to know the strength of the Indian Armed forces. It is unfortunate that some of the very leading people of this country who are associated with this Indian Council of World Affairs, and the Study Team appointed by it, have published the strength of the Army. It may be said that it is not true. But one can easily imagine, and when these tentative figures are given, an enemy country can know that the strength of the Armed Forces is this and that. Therefore, we find that sometimes whatever information is not being given to us is given to the outside world by some people in this country who are associated with certain agencies also, and they are recognized as the most responsible leaders of this country, and they go by the name of nationalists and they claim to have a higher sense of patriotism than people like us.

There was another question which was very much discussed today, and that was with regard to the promotions and supersessions in the Army. I was under the impression that only young men when they get angry and frustrated sometimes got derailed, but today, after hearing Acharya Kripalani I had the feeling that even older people, when they get frustrated in their political life and public life also get derailed and they speak things which harm the interests of the country.

I am really surprised that this question of promotions and supersessions in the Army should have come up before this House very often during the last two years. In 1959, when General Thimmaya submitted his resignation, the news appeared in certain papers, and there was an adjournment motion, and, you, Sir, were in the Chair, and

you rightly said that you were withholding your consent to that adjournment motion, but if something serious happened, then you would immediately come forward the next day and ask the hon. Minister to make a statement. And you were right; but nothing serious happened. It was said by those who moved that adjournment motion that many Commanders and Chiefs of Staff had also submitted their resignations following the resignation of the particular Chief of Staff.

Some time ago, Dr. Kunzru had said in the Rajya Sabha that the services of a number of senior Army officers would be lost to the country because of serious dissatisfaction in high Army circles over recent appointments and promotions. In a similar vein, Acharya Kripalani and Shri Goray also have said in this House that there is a fresh wave of dissatisfaction in the top ranks of the Army on account of the recent promotions. We are not here to defend or to appreciate any promotions or to object to anybody who has superseded or to support him. But here is an important point.

When this question came up here in this House, the Prime Minister said definitely that the Army was subservient to the civil authority in this country, and I think that once and for all that declaration of the Prime Minister stands namely that the civil authority stands supreme in this country, and, therefore, the Parliament is sovereign. But what we would like to know is whether, if a General has been promoted or if a certain General has not been promoted, would it be proper that such things should be brought before this House and discussed.

In this connection, I may invite the attention of the House as also that of the hon. Minister to the attitude of the men who are the Chiefs of Staff or the Commanders in this Army, because the Indian Army today is going to be and is becoming a national Army gradually; it was not so before. In this connection, I would invite your attention to certain remarks or observations

which had been made recently by General Cariappa; now, he is no longer General, but he was a General. Addressing a public meeting, he said 'Look at Pakistan. People there are happy, and everything is clean'. He said that he would prefer President's rule in India for at least two years, with the assistance of the Army, the civil administration being made subordinate to the Army. If a Chief of Staff or an Army officer continues in the Army with this kind of attitude and outlook then it is time for Parliament to consider and for this country to consider, whenever officers are promoted, or they are given the command of the Indian Army which is now becoming a national Army, whether such persons have adjusted themselves to the changing conditions of this country and whether it is such people who are going to take up positions in the Army. I think this factor also must be taken into consideration. For ourselves, we want more and more democratisation of the Indian Army, because the Army's duties and obligations to the nation have changed. The Indian Army is also shouldering international responsibility increasingly. Therefore, we want the Army to be democratised more and more and the Army should be a conscious Army. (Interruption). We do not think that because the Army will be democratised any promotion or demotion in the Army should be the subject-matter of public controversy. We want a stable Army; and a stable Army means that it must be a disciplined Army. To maintain a disciplined Army, happy and cordial relations must be maintained between the officers and the ranks and the Ministry and the top command. This is possible if there develops mutual understanding at all these levels and the immediate Junior is not by passed.

We feel that in all cases of promotion in the Army there must be consistency in the principles followed. Otherwise, there will be scope for favouritism and scope for public criticism. We would like that promotions in the Army should generally be on the basis of seniority cum merit. We

[Shri Chintamani Panigrahi]

do not want that in the name of defending one promotion against another attempts should be made by some political parties to encourage factionalism inside the Army. That would be trying to undermine the morale and discipline of the Army.

May I submit that when the Indian Army is trying its utmost to defend the borders of the country and our soldiers are bravely facing all the difficulties in the frontier, those persons who were very much vocal in this House that they want the defence of the border, they by discussing these appointments by supporting one officer against another—are breaking the morale and solidarity of the Army at a critical juncture. I think they are going to do more harm to the democracy and they are going to demoralise the Army when they prefer to defend the country. That shows these people in their true colours.

I want to come to the question of defence production in the Ordnance Factories. According to the report of the Defence Ministry the defence production in the Ordnance Factories is increasing. Tractors are being manufactured in Jabalpur—Saktiman tractors—and trucks have been manufactured in Cossipore. The Defence Ministry has revealed in its report that they are going to take up new projects. We do not know what these new projects are. I think when the Defence Minister replies to the debate he would give us some idea as to what new projects they are going to take up in the Ordnance Factories.

According to the report of the Defence Ministry, in 1956-57, the value of equipment manufactured in the Ordnance Factories was Rs. 14.8 crores. Now, in 1960-61, it has gone up to nearly Rs. 32 crores. And we feel that all these efforts are in the right direction. And these measures will help in laying the true foundation for India's defences.

In this connection, we would like to know the progress of the projects which have been undertaken so far.

There was a time when the persons employed in the Ordnance Factories found no job and were retrenched. Now, that position has changed. There is no retrenchment and the workers have been absorbed. It is good. It has been said in the Audit Report that the number of tractors which were scheduled to be manufactured in 1959-60 have not been manufactured; the number of trucks which were scheduled to be manufactured in 1959-60 have not been manufactured. Why was there this short fall. There must be proper co-ordination between the Ministry of Steel, Mines and Fuel which supplies the steel to the Ordnance Factories and the Defence Ministry and there must be co-ordination between the Ordnance Factory and the Army workshops.

In answer to some of the questions here it was said that tractors which are being manufactured by the Ordnance Factories were sent to the Dandakaranya Development project; but when the Rehabilitation Ministry took those tractors they were found to be defective. The Ministry of Defence had appointed a committee and an officer went there to enquire into this matter. The House would be benefited if that report is placed before this House because rumours are circulating that the men in the Rehabilitation Ministry do not want to purchase tractors from the Defence Ministry. It may be because of the commissions; they want to have tractors from the United States—caterpillar tractors. It is said that these tractors produced by the ordnance factories are working well in digging Rajasthan canal. How is it that the tractor of the same make could not work in the Dandakaranya area? I think it must be enquired into. I think the Defence Ministry had sent a special Officer. I understand that 45 tractors have been purchased from outside. I think there must be co-ordination between the Ministry of Rehabilitation and the Defence Ministry. One Ministry wants to have tractors from foreign countries and the tractors that are being produced

here are not being utilised by the other Ministry. When there is so much production in the ordnance factories, it is unfortunate that many of these workers in the ordnance factories have been dismissed or discharged or served with notices. In the ordnance factory at Khamaria and the factories at Issapur, Jabalpur, Delhi Cantonment, Kirkee, Bombay and other places some of the workers participated in the strike of the Central Government employees in 1960. There was no case of sabotage or violence and the only charge against them was that they participated in the strike. But we were promised that mere participation in the strike was not enough for their dismissal. Therefore, I hope that these cases should be reconsidered. Appeals that have been made are lying in the Defence Ministry. I think these cases should be reconsidered and they should be reinstated. No case of harrasment should be there when these workers have helped in increasing Defence production in the ordnance factories. z

I would refer to the question of travelling allowance to the JCOs and other ranks. Recently, there were some questions in this House. The hon. Minister has said that the JCOs received an allowance of Rs. 2.25 nP per day when travelling by rail or road on normal duty, Rs. 3 per day on courier duty and Rs. 2.37 nP per day when escorting secret documents. I think this is not sufficient. Is it considered that this is sufficient to meet their minimum needs on the journey. How does it compare with the TA given to the higher officers in the Army when they go out? We feel that these allowances should be increased. It is good that separation allowance is now being given to married officers in the Army and Air Force when posted to units where families are not permitted to accompany them; they get separation allowance at Rs. 50 per month. But this separation allowance is not admissible to JCOs and other ranks. Therefore, we plead before the hon. Minister that the question of giving separation allowance to

149(A) LSD-7.

the JCOs and other ranks may also be taken into consideration and it may be allowed to them. Take, for instance, the pay of the ordinary sepoy. A sepoy in third class gets a sum of Rs. 86, which includes pay and dearness allowance and every thing. A class two sepoy gets a maximum of Rs. 73.50 nP and a class one sepoy gets Rs. 81. It is very meagre. We can see the disparity among the different ranks in the Army. A General gets Rs. 3,000 and a sepoy gets Rs. 81. I think this disparity should go and the sepoys in the first, second and the third class must get more.

Of late we find that the Service chiefs are making more public statements than even the hon. Defence Minister. Of course we find that the Defence Minister is making some speeches. But we find that the Service chiefs of late are making too many public statements. If they address the cadets or the army men, that is different. But if they make public statements, while attending receptions or something like that, such statements should not be encouraged.

16.40 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

With regard to the MES organisation, it has come to our notice that the establishment costs and works are still far in excess of those in other departments such as the CPWD and the railways. Here is the air force works project which was started in Agra in 1952-53. But it is still not complete and the work is still continuing, in 1961. But the gross value of this project is only about Rs. 3 crores. We do not understand why it has not been completed so far.

With regard to the role of the army in coming to the aid of the civil authorities, it has been stated in the report that the army has done commendable work. But in recent years, we find that on the broad plea of maintaining law and order, the army is being used by the ruling party to suppress the democratic movement of the people in many cases. Take the strike in Jamshedpur steel

[Shri Chintamoni Panigrahi]

works. When the heroic workers of the steel factory there were fighting for their grievances to be redressed, for increasing their salaries, the troops were immediately rushed to the aid of the employers, namely, the Tatas. Similarly, during the days when the people of Orissa were fighting for the unification of the Oriya-speaking tracts left over in other States, the army was despatched in one or two days and the movement was suppressed. Take the case of Jabalpur and Assam. After how many days after the trouble started did the army come to the scene? It is said in the report that the army went to the aid of the civil authorities in Assam.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The army can go only if the civil authorities ask for it. When the civil authorities are responsible, the army could not go there by itself.

Shri Chintamoni Panigrahi: I agree. The civil authorities want the help of the army sometimes to crush the working class movement. But when there is a communal trouble, I do not know why the civil authorities do not want the aid of the army promptly. Even if they want it, we do not know whether the army goes there or not. It is only the Government which can give the information to us.

I was told that in Jabalpur the army was asked to help the authorities there. But I do not know how long the army took to go there, when so many innocent people were massacred. Therefore, my submission is that when the army is employed it must also be taken into consideration that the army should not be unnecessarily used to suppress popular movements, because the army by that process will become unpopular in this country.

The army has come to the aid of the civil authorities also in cases of earthquakes and floods. The army has done this work last year in Punjab and Uttar Pradesh. But there was an unprecedented flood situation in Orissa. It was unprecedented in the history of Orissa during the last 100 years. But

I do not find in the report that any army went to the rescue of the civil authorities in that State. I think this was brought to the notice of the Prime Minister also, but I do not think any army had been there for aiding the civil authorities in that situation. I plead that the help of the army in aid of the civil authorities must be more prompt in the case of earthquakes and floods than in the case of suppressing strikes and popular movements.

I was surprised to go through the report of the Estimates Committee. At one place, they have said that the ordnance factories should either come under the Ministry of Commerce and Industry or private business interests should be associated with the ordnance factories and defence production.

I cannot understand how the Estimates Committee can recommend in this way. The House has decided a policy and the ordnance factories are manufacturing goods worth only Rs. 3 crores or so so far as civil consumption is concerned. They manufacture Rs. 26 crores worth of goods of a military nature. Therefore, I do not understand how the Estimates Committee can recommend that "private industrialists should be actively associated" with the Defence Production Board. I think the Estimates Committee cannot work with a bias in favour of the private industrialists. The private industrialists have their scope in the private sector in this country; it should not extend to the production of defence goods in ordnance factories.

The Estimates Committee have also suggested that there must be a second naval dockyard in the eastern region. They have said:

"The Committee would suggest that while taking a final decision on the location of the second Dockyard, all the factors mentioned in para 35 of the Report should be carefully examined. They would further suggest that the possibilities of other sites including the Chilka Lake, Paradip etc. on the

East Coast may also be taken into consideration".

They have further said:

"The Committee regret to observe that though as early as 1948, Government of India recognised necessity for a second dockyard on the East Coast, no effective steps have so far been taken in that direction. They recommend that in view of the importance of the matter, a decision should be taken as early as possible."

I think the Estimates Committee have gone into details of the second naval dockyard. So, the Defence Ministry should try its best to locate the second naval dockyard in the eastern coast in Chilka Lake or Paradip. I think it must be again gone into.

Lastly, I come to the question of Indianisation of the army. The report of the Ministry of Defence for 1960-61 says:

"As a general policy, recruitment to the armed forces is confined to Indian nationals. Non-Indians are appointed in very exceptional cases only to such posts for which suitable Indians are not available."

But the report reveals that last year there were 46 non-Indians in the armed forces and this year the number has been reduced only by four; it is 42. I think the progress is not very satisfactory and more efforts should be made to train Indian personnel, so that they can take up these posts.

With regard to foreign training, we find that most of the officers are being sent mainly to the U.K. When the science of armament is developing so fast, I think it is better that our Government sends its officers for training to whichever country has made any advance in the field of military science and there should not be any bias in favour of one single country. You will find from the report in 1956-57, that 80 officers went to the U.K. Most of the officers are going to U.K. only and only a few go to other countries. Therefore, I would submit that while

providing facilities for military training to the Indian officers, they should be sent to those countries which are advanced in the field of military science. There should not be any restriction and it should not be that we shall heavily depend for armament or for military training only on U.K. The facilities should be extended to other countries also.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh (Sasaram):
Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I was listening very attentively to the speeches of Acharya Kripalani and Shri Panigrahi. Acharya Kripalani pointed out certain irregularities in regard to promotions etc. He said that the Defence Minister had previously said that other conditions being equal seniority must come in. I think this principle can easily be applied, if there has been any irregularity. I do not know whether there is any truth in what Acharya Kripalani said. I think we should be guided by the statement made by the Defence Minister, and one can easily have access to all the records that are available.

Just now Shri Panigrahi said that our Army ought to be democratised. I do not understand the meaning of this 'democratisation', whether he wants that our officers should be elected by jawans or he wants the Communist type of army to be established here. I think that our Army must be kept free from all types of regimentation and politics and should be allowed to maintain the hoary traditions which have been built so far.

Regarding the report, Sir, I want to say that there is much which could have been said in this report, because this report does not contain anything, not even a line about our border situation. Last year there was some mention about it. In the report of 1959-60 it was said:

"Our policy in the past had been to entrust the security of the border to the police; the Army came in only when there was an organised incursion from across the border. In 1958 there were a number of firing incidents on the Indo-

[Dr. Ram Subhag Singh]

Pakistan border on the eastern side. When the situation deteriorated, in June 1958, the Army took over operational control of the international border between Assam and Pakistan.

During 1959 as a result of Chinese incursion in the Longju area in Subansiri Frontier Division NEFA it was decided to give the responsibility for the entire NEFA border with Tibet to the Army. The Army accordingly took over operational control of the border posts as well as the civil forces deployed there. A little later when there were some incidents on the Ladakh border of Tibet, in October 1959, the Army took over similar responsibility for the J. & K. Punjab, Himachal Pradesh and U.P. borders with Tibet. All civil forces deployed on border security were placed under the operational control of the Army. In November 1959 the security of border of Sikkim with Tibet was entrusted to the Army."

I had imagined that this year's report would give more details or at least it would enlighten us about our position there, about our position in the entire border area—when I say 'border area' I mean our border with Pakistan, our border with Tibet. I do not mean to say that there is anything like border in the Naga Hills. But that charge was also given to the Army. I am referring to Goa also, because Goa is a place which must be assimilated with India. Recently we read in the papers that about 1500 Portuguese soldiers are coming to Goa. Therefore, I had thought that this report would throw some light about our position near Goa, on the Indo-Pakistan frontier etc. Recently, we heard in this House, that Col. Bhattacharjee was kidnapped by the Pakistanis. We also hear about some incidents at Kathua and other areas near the Pakistan border. But there is no mention about them in this report. The Defence Minister said there is much information in this Report. But

I find that information is about the organisation of the Defence Ministry. There is very little information, or no information at all, about our border position. That must always be kept in view. There is nothing which will go against public interest. The interests of the people of India demand that they should be properly briefed about our defence position.

Here I want to mention that I am proud of our international commitments. Our soldiers have been sent to Gaza area and, recently, to the Congo also. Now there has been a slight change, not a total change, in our policy in regard to sending of troops. It is true that constitutionally we must respect our commitment to the United Nations. But our own border also must always be properly and constitutionally protected. It is a stigma on us that 12,000 sq. miles of our territory is under Chinese control and a still bigger area is under the control of Pakistan. Previously, our position was that we will not march our army anywhere, not even to Goa, as that was declared to be the policy of the Government of India on several occasions. Under that policy, we were prepared only to defend ourselves. Now we have sent our soldiers to the Congo. According to our declaration, we could not send our soldiers to re-occupy an area which is under Chinese or Pakistani possession. Now, I would humbly suggest to the Government that they should clearly examine their stand vis-a-vis the stand taken in regard to our sending soldiers to the Congo. I would also urge upon the Government to create history; history, in the sense of making posterity know that we shall not allow an inch of our territory to remain occupied either by China, or Pakistan or Portugal.

The hon. Defence Minister has just now referred to the martial class or something like that. Here I have got a clipping of *The Statesman* of the 4th April. In this it is stated that Lt. Col. S. S. Maitra warned that his regiment would brook no interference

with their duties on behalf of the United Nations. He has also stated that the Gurkhas had 150 years of fighting tradition behind them and that no one could ever disarm them. I do not know whether anybody could match the Gurkhas. Therefore, I think that we must respect the traditions of valour of the persons who are prepared to give up their lives for the cause of the country. Can anybody match the Gurkhas or Jats in their valour? I think they should be given as much priority as possible. But by this I do not mean to say that there should be any ban on others. Let us recruit all Indians and train all of them. But, at the same time, chivalry and courage must also be appreciated.

If there is anyone who would die at his post of duty it is the Gurkha. Last year, as I had pointed out that incident did not occur at the Ladakh border of Tibet as was mentioned in the Defence Ministry Report of 1959-60. It occurred about 45 miles deep in our territory. So, I would very humbly request the Government that in future the report should be such that it gives enough and accurate information to the House and to the people.

17 hrs.

It has been mentioned in the report that we are short of officers and therefore we are re-employing some officers. It is essential that we should use all the talent that exists in our country. Other things being equal seniority must be recognised; of course, really distinguished and meritorious service must be recognised and respected. Whatever may be, conditions must be created where nobody feels frustrated. The Defence Minister said that disgruntled officers and politicians might be saying all this. I do not know whether in our army there are any disgruntled officers. But at no time should we allow creation of any conditions where anybody feels disgruntled. It is the duty of the Government, and more so that duty of this particular department, to see that this

state of affairs does not exist. For instance, it is the duty of every Minister to give proper guidance with a view to seeing that everybody who is working in his Department gets justice. He should, like the Gurkhas die for protecting the interests of the persons who work under him.

I am very happy that the Defence Minister declared that they are going to establish some schools in certain areas to promote the requirements of our Defence Academies. Four such schools are going to be opened and one has already been opened in Nowgong. In this connection I would like to suggest that we should take a census of our entire country with a view to finding out the area from which most of our recruits come. Today the pattern of the army has changed and with the increased growth of technology and science the entire recruitment policy will have to undergo a change. But then we should also try to see that the persons who were recruited previously from a particular area are also given opportunities for getting that type of training, so that those areas may not suffer.

Regarding the Naga area, last year one of our planes was shot down by the Nagas and some of our officers are still in their custody. I would not call it "custody"; they have kept them somehow or other and I heard that our army was about to have them released, but it was not agreed to. Now that our army is operating there, we should see that our officers are released as early as possible.

In the report of the Ministry of External Affairs—I did not find a mention in the report of the Ministry of Defence—it is stated that many violations of air and ground space have taken place. The Report says:

"Notwithstanding the agreement reached at the conclusion of the Prime Ministers' meeting, a number of instances of violations of Indian air and ground space along the Sino-Indian boundary came to

[Dr. Ram Subhag Singh]

the attention of the Government of India."

Therefore I think it essential that our army should be detailed in each and every area on our border.

And the Defence Minister said that we won't allow any further intrusion. I am glad to hear that. But despite our best precautions, even recently, thrice the Chinese have entered into our territory near Jalapla, Saratang, Kopup Nathula, etc. I do not know how they dared come into our territory even hundred yards. That means that that much of lucuna is there. So, just like the Chinese let us also prepare. Not a single Indian can cross into their territory even for a yard—if anybody has crossed I would like to know that. I would like that our preparations should be of that order. The preparation must be of the order that our entire area is easily vacated by the foreigners who are occupying those areas.

About mountaineering also we must train the people, because much depends upon our skill to go into that area. Today only our pilgrims go there mostly. But each and every area of the Himalayas is known to the Chinese. So it should be our effort to train our people in mountaineering. I am glad that the Prime Minister has gone to Darjeeling to encourage the graduates of the Himalayan Mountaineering Institute. Last year our expedition went to Everest also. Though it did not succeed, it was a grand effort. But it should be our effort to train civilians and the military people to know each and every area of the Himalayas, particularly the entire area which belongs to India.

All these things require that defence production ought to be expedited. Acharya Kripalani wanted to know about the number of trucks and tractors that have been manufactured. That number has been given in this report. It has also been mentioned

that during the past three years the production of the Ordnance Factories has gone up by Rs. 7 crores. This is a good sign.

But, as I said previously, the entire pattern of defence has changed, and that country is easily the strongest which possesses the most modern equipment. In that respect I agree with my friend Shri Chintamani Panigrahi who said that we should also get training from the country which is in possession of the best equipment. So if the suggestion is that we should send our people to know from Russia about these things, I will gladly accept that. But I do not desire that anybody should come and see our strategic areas. The production of trucks, tractors, etc. is good the best thing from the point of view of defence is that we should manufacture the most modern equipment. The key to this is that we should tap the entire knowledge of our scientists and other technologists. The defence and the integrity of the country is the sole responsibility of the Government, and particularly of the Defence Ministry. I do not want any scheme of allowing twelve thousand square miles of our areas to be occupied by China and some more thousand miles of area to be occupied by Pakistan. I would therefore request the Government that they should take strong steps to free those areas. But along with strengthening...

Shri Tyagi: Unless a war is declared, how could that be possible?

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: My hon. friend was Minister of Defence production, and having been a Defence Minister he ought to know about this much more than myself. Pakistan had occupied the Rann of Cutch and it was my hon. friend Shri Tyagi who had perhaps ordered our troops to go and immediately occupy the Rann of Cutch.

And they went and occupied that. For that, Shri Tyagi did not declare any war, nor did the Government of

India declare any far. So, when it is said that our area is sparsely populated, I would like to request Government to see that the entire area is liberated, because every where we can do something, as the Chinese are doing. We learnt from Shri Karam Singh—though Shri Karam Singh's effort was tried to be minimized by a doctor, an eminent surgeon from Bombay who had taken a trip to Peking to see Mr. Chou En-lai that the Chinese have built roads etc. where one can ply trucks etc.

So far as M.P.s. are concerned, I would say this. I think it was very good for our Defence Minister to have gone to a height of about 13,000 feet near Chusul and other places. He said that no M.P. could go to the places where our soldiers were stationed today. They are all our brothers. I would say that there are several M.P.s who can easily go to a bigger height than where our soldiers are stationed. In this modern age of technology, if we are not in a position to go, that is our weakness. And we must make efforts to see that that weakness is won over, and we are in a position to take our M.P.'s to bigger heights, in fact even to Mt. Everest.

Shri Krishna Menon: That is beside the point. We have not prohibited M.P.s from going anywhere.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: I could not follow what the hon. Minister said.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: He says that he has not prohibited Members of Parliament from going there. They can go there.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: I appreciate his point that we are not in a position to go there. I wanted that we must eliminate that much of weakness and we should create conditions where one can easily go. Even now, there are Members in the House who can go to a bigger height of 15,000 or 16,000 feet.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That was what he said. The Defence Minister

would consider them as very good soldiers.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: Therefore, I want the co-operation of the people because it is today not the sole responsibility of the Government or the Defence Minister only to carry the defence responsibility of the country. The people should also be enabled to associate themselves hundred per cent with it. In that light, I appreciate the efforts made in regard to organising the territorial Army, Lok Sahayak Sena and the NCC. But there has been some shortfall in the Territorial Army, as was pointed out by the Defence Minister.

Here, I want to administer a note of warning to these persons because there are people who propagate the Chinese cult in our border area. We should see that we should not keep any association with the people who propagate the Chinese cult in the border area and other cult in Goa and other places. Otherwise our hill folk or even Army people would not get much encouragement.

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यहाँ तक तो मैं न सीमा के ऊपर में चर्चा ही रहो थी। अब मैं हिन्दुस्तान को समुद्र सीमा की तरफ आपकी ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : बहुत गहरे गाने न लगाना।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : मैं डिमांड नम्बर १० और डिमांड नम्बर ११ की तरफ आपकी ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ।

आपको याद होगा कि परमों मदन में एक सत्रान पुस्तक भया था। उसके अन्त में बताया गया कि रूडमन निकोबार में चीन के कुछ लोग फिशिंग बोट पर आये और उनमें से कुछ सावमी पकड़े गये और उनको सजा हुई।

[श्री रघुनाथ सिंह]

अगर आप हिन्दुस्तान के नक्सो को देखें तो आपको मान्य होगा कि हमारे वास्ते यह आवश्यक है कि एंडमन निकोबार और लंका-द्वीप को अगर हम अपने हाथों में नहीं रखेंगे तो उसका कल यह होगा कि भारतवर्ष के समुद्री तट की रक्षा नहीं हो सकती। सन् १९४० में जापान लड़ाई में आया तो उसने पहले एंडमन और निकोबार को अपने कब्जे में किया और उसके बाद उसने बर्मा, मलाया आदि को लिया। आज चाहना के लोभ आ रहे हैं। उनकी बोट्स आ रही हैं। अभी तक केवल दो बोट हम पकड़ने में सफल हुये हैं। जब होप मिनिस्टर साहब से पूछा गया कि इन बोट्स का ऑरिजन क्या है तो उन्होंने उसे बताने से इन्कार कर दिया।

आपको मान्य होगा कि अरेबियन सी में इंग्लैंड ने माल दीव में अपना एक नेवल बेस बनाया है जबकि ट्रिकोमाली से उनका बेस हटा दिया गया। अगर आज हम अपने समुद्र तट की रक्षा के प्रति सजग नहीं होते तो जैसे हमारी स्थल सीमा पर आज चीन का आक्रामकान हो गया है उसी तरह से हमारे समुद्री तट पर भी दूसरे शत्रु की सेना आ सकती है।

अब मैं डिफेंस बजट की ओर आपका ध्यान आकषित करना चाहता हूँ। आप देखेंगे कि सन् १९५२-५३ में डिफेंस पर हमने अपने बजट का ४५.५ परसेंट खर्च किया था और बाकी सिविल एक्सपेंडीचर था। उसके बाद आप देखें कि सन् १९५५-५६ में हमने अपने बजट का ३८ परसेंट डिफेंस पर खर्च किया, १९५६-५७ में हमने बजट का ३४ परसेंट डिफेंस पर खर्च किया, १९५७-५८ में ३५ परसेंट, १९५८-५९ में ३१ परसेंट, १९५९-६० में २६ परसेंट और १९६०-६१ में २६ परसेंट अपने बजट का डिफेंस पर खर्च किया। यानी आप देखेंगे कि जैसे-जैसे चीन हमारी भूमि पर अधिकार जमाता गया वैसे-वैसे हम डिफेंस एक्सपेंडीचर कम करते गये।

और सिविल एक्सपेंडीचर बढ़ते गये। हमारा सिविल एक्सपेंडीचर बढ़ रहा है। जहाँ सन् १९५२-५३ में हमारा सिविल एक्सपेंडीचर हमारे बजट का ५५ परसेंट था वहाँ आज बढ़ कर ७० परसेंट हो गया है। इस गति से हमारी रक्षा नहीं हो सकती। अगर हमको हिन्दुस्तान की रक्षा करनी है तो हमको समय की गति के अनुसार चलना होगा।

अब मैं आपके सामने पाकिस्तान के आंकड़े देना चाहता हूँ। पाकिस्तान ने सन् १९५४-५५ में डिफेंस पर अपने बजट का ५२ परसेंट खर्च किया और आज पाकिस्तान अपने डिफेंस पर अपने बजट का ५५ परसेंट खर्च कर रहा है। इसमें अमेरिकन एंड और दूसरी एंड शामिल नहीं है। अगर अमेरिकन एंड और दूसरी एंड भी इसमें शामिल कर ली जाये तो आप देखेंगे कि पाकिस्तान अपने सारे देश के बजट का ८० परसेंट डिफेंस पर खर्च कर रहा है।

हमारी तरह अमरीका भी शांति शांति चिल्लाता है, लेकिन आप अमरीका का बजट देखें। अमरीका इस साल अपने बजट का ५८ परसेंट डिफेंस पर खर्च कर रहा है। हिन्दुस्तान के आंकड़े को आप लें तो आप देखेंगे कि हम इस साल अपने बजट का ३० परसेंट डिफेंस पर खर्च कर रहे हैं और अगर स्टेट्स के बजट्स को भी इसमें शामिल कर लिये जाये तो आप देखेंगे कि हिन्दुस्तान अपने देश के बजट का ११ परसेंट से ज्यादा डिफेंस पर खर्च नहीं करेगा; जबकि अमरीका अपने फेडरल बजट का २६ परसेंट डिफेंस पर खर्च कर रहा है।

श्री अखरज सिंह (फिरोजाबाद) : आप कितना चाहते हैं।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : मैं चाहता हूँ कि आपके से ज्यादा डिफेंस पर खर्च किया जाये।

दूसरी बात मैं नैवी के बारे में कहना चाहता हूँ। आप नैवी पर कितना खर्च कर रहे

हैं। आपने नैवी पर सन् १९५५-५६ में १२ करोड़ खर्च किया, सन् १९५६-६० में १८ करोड़ खर्च किया, सन् १९६०-६१ में १८ करोड़ खर्च किया, और इस साल यानी सन् १९६१-६२ में आप नैवी पर २० करोड़ खर्च कर रहे हैं। यानी हम अपने सुरक्षा बजट का ६.५ परसेंट नैवी पर खर्च कर रहे हैं जोकि जल सेना थल सेना से कम है। अमरीका अपने सुरक्षा बजट का ४० परसेंट नैवी पर खर्च कर रहा है। इंग्लैंड अपने सुरक्षा बजट का करीब २८ परसेंट नैवी पर खर्च कर रहा है, जबकि हम अपने सुरक्षा बजट का केवल ६.५ परसेंट ही नैवी पर खर्च कर रहे हैं।

अब मैं आपका ध्यान कैपिटल आउटले की तरफ आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ। जहाँ तक कैपिटल आउटले का सवाल है आप देखेंगे कि इसमें सन् १९५५-५६ में ७ करोड़ नैवी के वास्ते रखा था, सन् १९५६-५७ में हमने नैवी के लिये ८ करोड़ रखा था और बैसिल खरीदने के वास्ते सन् १९५६-६० में १२ करोड़ रखा और सन् १९६०-६१ में १३ करोड़ रखा। और आज जबकि अंशमान निकोबार और साकादीव के पास चीनी बोटें घा रही हैं तो हमने बैसिल खरीदने के लिये केवल ४ करोड़ रपया रखा है। दो साल पहले हमने बैसिल खरीदने के लिये १२ करोड़ रखा, एक साल पहले १३ करोड़ रखा, लेकिन आज जबकि खतरा बढ़ गया है हमने ४ करोड़ रपया रखा है।

आप परसोनल को लें। सन् १९५४ में हिन्दुस्तान के पास नैवी में आफिसर और रेटिंग सब मिलाकर ७७०० आदमी थे और सन् १९६१ में यानी आज करीब-करीब हमारे आफिसर्स और रेटिंग की तादाद ८८०० है। प्रवर्ति हम कुल ११०० आदमी और ज्यादा नैवी के वास्ते ड्रेन कर सके। पाकिस्तान की तरफ देखिये तो आप पायेंगे कि उसके पास ७२०० आफिसर्स और रेटिंग मिला कर हैं। पाकिस्तान की समुद्री सीमा ५००-६०० मील

है जबकि हमारी समुद्री सीमा ३००० मील है लेकिन पाकिस्तान नैवी के मामले में हमारे बिल्कुल परलल जा रहा है। हमारी तादाद ८८०० है और पाकिस्तान की ७२०० है। ऐसी हालत में क्या हम पाकिस्तान का सामना करने में सपर्य हो सकते हैं जबकि उसके पास अमेरिकन ऐड भी मौजूद है। हम मीरेली भले ही पाकिस्तान का सामना करने में कामयाब हो सकते हैं लेकिन इक्विपमेंट्स से नहीं कर सकते हैं।

अमरीका की नैवी के बारे में मैं अबन् को बताना चाहता हूँ कि उसमें ६ लाख ३० हजार आदमी हैं। यूनाइटेड किंगडम में १ लाख २ हजार आदमी हैं। यहाँ पर अपने देश में लोक सहायक सेना के वास्ते बहुत कुछ कहा गया है। जिन लोगों ने वालियेटरी प्लेज साइन किया है उनकी तादाद ६६ हजार ६५६ है जबकि चीन में पीपुल मिलिशिया की तादाद २०० मिलियन की है। हमारे यहाँ इस लोक सहायक सेना के वास्ते जिन लोगों ने प्लेज साइन किया है उनकी तादाद कुल ६६ हजार ६५६ है जबकि चीन की पीपल मिलिशिया की तादाद २०० मिलियन है और इसके रहते हम चीन का सामना करने के लिये सोचते हैं और पाकिस्तान का सामना करने के लिये सोचते हैं। अतः यह है कि उनका सामना करने के वास्ते हमें मॉडर्न इक्विपमेंट्स चाहिये।

अब मैं नैवी के बैसिल्स की तरफ आपका ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ। इस विषय में मैंने आरी बुनिया के आकरे इकट्ठे किये हैं। आपकी मान्य होना चाहिये कि चीन और रूस की नैवी के बारे में जो योजना है वह एक प्लान्ड योजना है। बेंटिशिशिफ, क्रुजर्स, डेस्ट्रॉयर्स, सबमरीन, एंटी सबमरीन और फ्लिगट यह सब रूस के पास है। बाकी चीन के पास आरे अर्टिलरी इक्विपमेंट्स हैं, लॉन्ग शिप्स हैं, टैंकर्स हैं, टोरपीडो बोट हैं। इस प्रकार से चीन के पास जो नैवी है वह नैवी रूस के पास नहीं है। इशियन चीन और रूस

[श्री रघुनाथ सिंह]

का। आपस में एक प्लान है एक योजना है जिसके कि अनुसार वह दोनों चल रहे हैं। इसके विपरीत हमारे पास क्या है? पाकिस्तान और हिन्दुस्तान की जो नेवी है उनके क्रुजर्स और बैटिलशिप्स को आप देखें तो दोनों में केवल ३० परसेंट का अन्तर है। उनकी नेवी में और हमारी नेवी में कुल ३० परसेंट का फर्क है जबकि हमें ३००० मील लम्बी समुद्री सीमा की रक्षा करनी है। इसके अलावा मैं यह बताना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे यहाँ बैटिलशिप्स और क्रुजर्स पर बड़ा जोर देने हैं लेकिन हमने इंग्लैंड द्वारा रिजैक्ट किये हुए बैटिलशिप्स और क्रुजर्स खरीदे हैं। जिन कन्वेंशनल आर्म्समेंट्स को उन्होंने रिजैक्ट किया और स्कैप किया उनको आज हम और पाकिस्तान दोनों खरीद रहे हैं।

मैं आपको बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि सन् १९५२ में इंग्लैंड के पास ५ बैटिलशिप्स थे जबकि आज उसके पास १ है, ४ को उसने स्कैप कर दिया। इसी प्रकार मे एयरक्रैफ्ट कैरियर्स इंग्लैंड के पास १२ थे जबकि आज उसके पास ८ हैं। क्रुजर्स इंग्लैंड के पास २४ थे जबकि आज उनकी तादाद केवल ११ है। डिस्ट्रॉयर्स ६२ थे आज सिर्फ ५२ हैं। आज के युग में कन्वेंशनल नेवी कन्वेंशनल नेवी की जरूरत नहीं रह गयी है और इसका समय बीत गया है। हमने और पाकिस्तान ने इंग्लैंड द्वारा स्कैप और रिजैक्ट कन्वेंशनल आर्म्समेंट को खरीद लिया। इंग्लैंड के वास्ते हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान का यह बड़े अच्छे मार्केट थे। हमने एयरक्रैफ्ट कैरियर्स भी खरीदे, क्रुजर्स भी खरीदे और डिस्ट्रॉयर्स भी खरीदे। लेकिन आज के जमाने में उनसे क्या आप हिन्दुस्तान की रक्षा कर सकते हैं? मेरा कहना है कि आप उनसे रक्षा नहीं कर सकेंगे। आपको मीडन वारफेयर के अनुसार अपनी नेवी को तैयार करने की योजना बनानी होगी।

आज लीयरेंज सबमैरीन विद गाइडिड मिसाइल एंड न्युक्लियर वेपेंस ने सारे मीडन नैवल आर्म्समेंट्स को पीछे छोड़ दिया है। आज सबमैरीन विद गाइडिड मिसाइल का रेंज ३०,००० मील है और उसकी स्पीड २५ नोट्स है। रिफ्युलिंग की जरूरत नहीं है। आपके पास एक सबमैरीन भी नहीं है। गाइडिड मिसाइल के वास्ते आप क्या कर रहे हैं? दुश्मन की एक सबमैरीन अन्तर आपकी सारी नेवी को तबाह कर सकती है। आप तोस्वन् लॉग में विचरते भालूम होते हैं। मेरा निवेदन है कि आप पृथ्वी पर उपरिये और फेक्टम को फेंग करिए। आज देश की रक्षा का सवाल सामने मौजूद है और आपको देखना है कि देश की रक्षा कैसे हो सकती है। इसके लिए आपको आकाश में जाने की जरूरत नहीं है। आपको तो जमीन पर उतरने की जरूरत है और अगलियत का सामना करने की जरूरत है।

सन् १९५४ में पहली न्युक्लियर प्रोपेल्ड सबमैरीन य० एम० ए० में लाच की गई थी जिसका कि रेंज ३०,००० मील था और स्पीड २५ नोट्स की थी। आज उसको सात वर्ष हो गये हैं मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि हमने मीडन वारफेयर, सबमैरीन या गाइडिड मिसाइल से अपनी सेना को इक्विप करने के वास्ते क्या योजना बनाई है? हमारे बजट में ४ करोड़ रुपये कैपिटल इक्विपमेंट और बैसल्स के वास्ते रक्खे गये हैं। इसके अलावा और कोई प्राबिजन नहीं किया गया है। मैं यह कहने के लिए बिबश हूँ कि इस तरीके से सभारतर्ष की रक्षा नहीं हो सकती है। आपको पुरानी हिस्ट्री से सबक लेना चाहिए। आप पानीपत में तीन तीन लड़ाइयाँ लड़े। पहली पानीपत की लड़ाई आप क्यों हारे? पृथ्वीराज के पास

यद्यपि बड़ी भारी सेना थी लेकिन चूंकि मुहम्मद गौरी की फौज नये इक्विपमेंट्स से लैस थी और उसके पास अश्वारोही फौज थी इसलिए हम उसके मुकाबले में हार गये। इसी तरह हम देखते हैं कि इब्राहीम लोदी के पास १ लाख २० हजार फौज थी जबकि बाबर के पास केवल १२००० आदमी थे लेकिन बाबर १२००० आदमियों से जीत गया क्योंकि उसकी सेना के पास बंदूकें थीं। इससे आप देखेंगे कि जबतक हम नये और मॉडर्न इक्विपमेंट से अपनी सेना को लैस नहीं करेंगे, समय की गति के अनुसार नहीं चलेंगे तब तक हम अपने देश की रक्षा करने में अग्रगण्य रहेंगे।

डोक्यूमेंट की बात यही गई। चीन के पास ५ डोक्यूमेंट हैं, रूस के पास ५ डोक्यूमेंट हैं जबकि हिन्दुस्तान के पास नाम के वास्ते जैसे आज कहा गया वापर्स में एक डोक्यूमेंट है। उसमें हमने तैयार क्या किया है? हमने ५०० टन का वाटर-बोट तैयार किया है जिसका कि नाम "अजय" है। तीन में से केवल एक तैयार कर रहे हैं जिसमें कि २५ टन का एम्प्युनिशन बार्जेज होगा। यह तो हमारी डोक्यूमेंट की स्थिति है। एस्टिमेट्स कमेटी ने अपनी ८ वीं रिपोर्ट में यह कहा था कि हमें रूस, जापान, अमरीका, पश्चिमी जर्मनी और इटली में अपने आदमी भेजने चाहिए जो कि वहां से डोक्यूमेंट और शिप्स बनाने की कला सीख कर आयें। आज एस्टिमेट्स कमेटी ने अपनी १०६वीं रिपोर्ट में उसको दुहराया है और कहा है कि हमें यू०के० के साथ टैंग नहीं होना चाहिए। कन्वेंशनल आर्मामेंट्स के साथ टैंग नहीं होना चाहिए बल्कि दुनिया मीडन बारकेयर में जो तरक्की कर रही है उससे हमें फायदा उठाना चाहिए और अपनी फौज को उसके हिसाब से तैयार करना चाहिए। मैं समझता हूँ कि एस्टिमेट्स कमेटी की ८ वीं रिपोर्ट के बाद जो उसकी १०६ वीं रिपोर्ट है,

उससे हमारी आंखें खुल जानी चाहिए। इतने पर भी यदि हमारी आंखें न खुलें तो फिर भगवान ही मालिक है।

हमें अपनी आर्मी के वास्ते भी प्लानिंग की जरूरत है। मैं समझता हूँ कि जैसे फर्स्ट फाइव इयर प्लान है, सेकंड फाइव इयर प्लान है और थर्ड फाइव इयर प्लान उसी तरह डिफेंस का भी प्लान होना चाहिए। यह खेद का विषय है कि डिफेंस में ठीक प्लानिंग मौजूद नहीं है। आचार्य कृपालानी इसके बारे में विधायन कर रहे थे और इसी प्लानिंग को लेकर पब्लिक एकाउन्ट्स कमेटी ने १०६वीं रिपोर्ट में पेज ४१ में यह लिखा है कि डिफेंस की प्लानिंग अधूरी है। पैरा ६१ में कमेटी लिखती है कि प्लानिंग का अभाव है। कमेटी पैरा ६२ में लिखती है कि नेवी की कोई प्लानिंग नहीं हुई। एक्टिंग में यह माना गया कि प्रोजेक्ट ठीक से प्लान नहीं किया गया।

देश की रक्षा कामयाबी के साथ करने के लिए प्रोपर प्लानिंग की जरूरत है। पब्लिक एकाउन्ट्स कमेटी बार बार इस चीज को कह रही है कि हमारे डिफेंस का प्लानिंग होना चाहिए, नेवी का प्लानिंग होना चाहिए। हम उससे क्या नहीं लाभ उठाते? अगर हम उन कमेटियों की राय और सुझावों से लाभान्वित नहीं होते तो फिर यह एस्टिमेट्स कमेटी या पब्लिक एकाउन्ट्स कमेटी कायम करने का फायदा ही क्या है?

जहां तक हिन्दुस्तान का सवाल है यह एक ऐसा अजीबोगरीब मुल्क है कि यहां पर ६१०४४ बिदेशी रहते हैं। हमारा हजारों मील का विद्यालय समुद्री तट है और उधर से कोई भी किसी भी समय हमारे देश में बाहर से आ सकता है और कोई उसमें रुकावट नहीं है। हमारे पास वैट्रोल बोम्ब इतनी ज्यादा नहीं है कि हम अपने समुद्री तट की रक्षा कर सकें।

[श्री रघुनाथ सिंह]

जिस मुल्क में ६१,०४४ फारेनज रहते हों, जिस मुल्क का समुद्र तट रक्षित न हो, वहाँ किस समय क्या हो जाये कौन कह सकता है? जैसे चाहना ने काश्मीर की बारह हजार वर्ग मील भूमि पर अधिकार कर लिया, भगवान् न करें कि वही स्थिति भ्रमेमान, निकोबार और लकादीव की हो। आज आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि हम डिफेंस पर अधिक से अधिक खर्च करें। इस देश में जितनी प्लानिंग हो रही है, जो बड़ी-बड़ी योजनायें चलाई जा रही हैं, अगर यह देश आजाद नहीं रहेगा, अगर इसकी सुरक्षा नहीं होगी, तो क्या यह सब कुछ पाकिस्तान या चीन के लिये बन रहा है? उसकी रक्षा होनी चाहिए। देश में धन इकट्ठा होता रहा और अफगानिस्तान से पठान लोग आते रहे और सब धन लूट लूट पर ले जाते रहे, वह हिस्ट्री नहीं फिर रिपीट न हों। इसलिये इस विषय में दृशियारी से काम होना चाहिए।

हमारे मिनिस्टर साहब "बल्ड विदाउट वार" की बात करते हैं। लेकिन क्या हिन्दुस्तान ने कभी किसी मुल्क पर हमला किया? उसने कभी किसी मुल्क पर हमला नहीं किया, लेकिन सात सौ बरस में हिन्दुस्तान पर ३३ बार हमला हुआ और ३३ बार उसको लूटा गया। आज कहा जाता है कि "बल्ड विदाउट वार" के लिये कोशिश करनी चाहिए, लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि वार तो दुनिया में हो रही है और हमें वार का सामना करना है, हिन्दुस्तान की रक्षा करनी है। अगर हम अपने देश की रक्षा नहीं करेंगे, तो यहां पर बड़ी-बड़ी योजनायें बना कर क्या करेंगे?

धन में एक संस्कृत श्लोक कह कर मैं समाप्त करता हूँ। वह इस प्रकार है—

अधतः चतुरो वेदाः;

पुष्टतः सपाराधनः।

इंद शास्त्रम् इंद शस्त्रम्
शास्त्रादपि शारादपि

दोनों बातें होनी चाहिए। अगर वे विवेक से मानते हैं, तो उनके लिये विवेक और शास्त्र है और अगर वे विवेक से नहीं मानते हैं, तो हमारे पास शास्त्र भी है। जब तक शास्त्र और शास्त्र दोनों एक संग नहीं चलेंगे, तब तक भारत की रक्षा नहीं हो सकती है। अगर शास्त्र की आवश्यकता हो, तो शास्त्र का प्रयोग करना चाहिए और अगर विवेक और शास्त्र की जरूरत हो, तो विवेक और शास्त्र को काम में लाना चाहिए। "बल्ड पीस" "बल्ड पीस" कहने से हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी की रक्षा नहीं होगी।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There are 32 cut motions included in the Consolidated Lists Nos. 15 and 16 relating to the Demands under the Ministry of Defence which have been selected by hon. members to be moved. They may be moved provided they are in order.

Failure to take effective steps to defend the country against aggression from Communist China

Shri Naushir Bharucha: I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head Ministry of Defence be reduced to Re. 1." (1250)

Failure to take strong and effective action against the forces of Communist China which have been in occupation of a large tract of the Indian territory

Shri Khushwaqt Rai: I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head Ministry of Defence be reduced to Re. 1." (1253).

Need for evolving a sound policy and appropriate procedures in regard to appointments in and the administration of the Defence Services in order to ensure the maintenance of high morale among members of the Armed Forces

Shri Naushir Bharucha: I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head Ministry of Defence be reduced by Rs. 100." (1227)

Non-implementation of certain recommendations of the Pay Commission

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

"That the Demand under the head Ministry of Defence be reduced by Rs. 100." (1532)

Need to make permanent 80 per cent of the industrial and non-industrial staff in Defence establishments

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

"That the Demand under the head Ministry of Defence be reduced by Rs. 100." (1533)

Dismissal and discharge of civilian employees as a result of participation in July 1960 strike

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

"That the Demand under the head Ministry of Defence be reduced by Rs. 100." (1534)

Expansion of Ordnance factories

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

"That the Demand under the head Ministry of Defence be reduced by Rs. 100." (1535)

Need to restore recognition to the All India Defence Employees' Federation and other unions

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

"That the Demand under the head Ministry of Defence be reduced by Rs. 100." (1536)

Expansion of Army workshops

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

"That the Demand under the head Ministry of Defence be reduced by Rs. 100." (1537)

Need to make civilian employees in Air Force permanent against Air-men vacancies

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

"That the Demand under the head Ministry of Defence be reduced by Rs. 100." (1538)

Need to construct residential quarters for other ranks and class III and IV civilian employees

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

"That the Demand under the head Ministry of Defence be reduced by Rs. 100." (1539)

Dismissal of certain Air Force civilian employees of I.A.F., Chakeri

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

"That the Demand under the head Ministry of Defence be reduced by Rs. 100." (1540)

Production of trucks and tractors in Ordnance factories

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

"That the Demand under the head Ministry of Defence be reduced by Rs. 100." (1541)

Non-implementation of Pay Commission's scales in the case of re-employed ex-army men in Defence establishments

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

"That the Demand under the head Ministry of Defence be reduced by Rs. 100." (1542)

Conversion of checkers of Ordnance factories to Lower Division clerks.

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

"That the Demand under the head Ministry of Defence be reduced by Rs. 100." (1543)

Manufacture of civilian goods in ordnance factories

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

"That the Demand under the head Ministry of Defence be reduced by Rs. 100." (1544)

Abolition of contract system in M.E.S.

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

"That the Demand under the head Ministry of Defence be reduced by Rs. 100." (1545)

Discharge of civilian industrial workers under Temporary Service Rules

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

"That the Demand under the head Ministry of Defence be reduced by Rs. 100." (1546)

Recommendations of Raghuramaiah Committee

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

"That the Demand under the head Ministry of Defence be reduced by Rs. 100." (1547)

Need to appoint a committee to go into the service conditions of D.S.C. personnel

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

"That the Demand under the head Ministry of Defence be reduced by Rs. 100." (1548)

Discrimination between the service conditions of industrial and non-industrial staff in defence establishments

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

"That the Demand under the head Ministry of Defence be reduced by Rs. 100." (1549)

Need to provide residential accommodation for the families of Jawans of Indian forces wherever they have to be posted for more than three years

Shri Khushwaqt Rai: I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head Ministry of Defence be reduced by Rs. 100." (1564)

Need to keep high the morale of the Jawans and Officers of the Indian forces

Shri Khushwaqt Rai: I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head Ministry of Defence be reduced by Rs. 100." (1565)

Need to increase the salary of jawans

Shri M. B. Thakore: I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head Defence Services, Effective—Army be reduced by Rs. 100." (270)

Need to provide more facilities and amenities to armed forces

Shri M. B. Thakore: I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head Defence Services, Effective—Army be reduced by Rs. 100." (271)

Need to take liberal view in the cases of resignation of personnel from the armed forces on the ground of health or old age of their parents

Shri M. B. Thakore: I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head Defence Services, Effective—Army be reduced by Rs. 100." (272)

Manner of promotion of senior officers

Shri M. B. Thakore: I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head Defence Services, Effective—Army be reduced by Rs. 100." (388)

Need to increase the salary of recruits

Shri Balasahab Salunke: I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head Defence Services, Effective—Army be reduced by Rs. 100." (918)

*Need to provide more facilities to
Armed Forces*

Shri Balasaheb Salunke: I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head Defence Services, Effective—Army be reduced by Rs. 100." (919)

Need to provide more facilities to the workers of Ordnance factories

Shri Balasaheb Salunke: I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head Defence Services, Effective—Army be reduced by Rs. 100." (920)

Need to provide more facilities to scheduled castes, scheduled tribes and buddhist workers in Ordnance factories

Shri Balasaheb Salunke: I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head Defence Services, Effective—Army be reduced by Rs. 100." (921)

Need to increase the salary of workers in Ordnance factories

Shri Balasaheb Salunke: I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head Defence Services, Effective—Army be reduced by Rs. 100." (922)

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

Shri Goray: Before dealing with my cut motions to the demands, it would be in the fitness of things to pay a tribute to the memory of our late colleague, Shri U. C. Patnaik, who participated every year in the discussion on matters pertaining to defence. He was a very assiduous Member and he was one of those who believed that the security of the country will be assured to the extent we associate popular opinion with our schemes and plans for defence.

I would also like to congratulate the javans who are standing vigil on our borders right from the frontiers of Kashmir to NEFA. I had the occasion to visit some of these places and I must say that they are performing a very difficult and arduous task. I must also add that the task has been rendered very difficult because enough attention is not being paid to the physical comforts of the javans and the officers who are guarding these vital frontiers.

When we think of defence, naturally we think of our two neighbours, Pakistan and China.

Sir, in dealing with these two neighbours it seems that our calculations have invariably gone wrong, because we have worked on some pre-conceived ideas. I would request the Defence Minister to take a lesson from the wise sayings of our ancient writers, one of whom said:

न को पि कस्यचिन्मित्रं न को पि कस्य-
चिद्रिपुः ।

अर्थनन्तु भविष्यन्ति मित्राणि रिपवस्तथा ॥

He has said that nobody is nobody's friend or enemy, it is only the material interests which make friends into enemies or vice versa. So, Sir I feel that because the Defence Ministry or, I would say, the Government of India have failed to understand . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: At the same time it is said:

यानि कानि च मित्राणि कर्तव्यानि ज्ञानानि च

Shri Goray: That is true. But, Sir, I would like to point out that we must correctly appreciate the philosophy of the stand of those countries with whom we are dealing. For instance, when we are talking about China—I would not like to deal at length with Pakistan because I feel that Pakistan is not very different from us so far as military strategy and

[Shri Goray]

military training are concerned; it may be that they have got some more weapons but by and large the way they look at the military strategy is the same and their training is the same as the training that our generals have received or our soldiers have received, but so far as China is concerned the situation is absolutely different—I would like to quote a sentence or two from a thesis by Mao Tse-tung in which he has said:

"War is the highest form of struggle in existence since the emergence of private property and social classes for settling contradictions between classes, between nations, between States or between political groups at given stages of their development."

This is the basic principle on which the Chinese strategy is developing, and this basic conception laid down by Mao Tse-tung is their scripture so far as their defence policy is concerned.

I do not know whether the Government of India or the Ministry of Defence have tried to understand the basic concept underlying the Chinese philosophy of war. Sir, because we did not understand these things we remained negligent, enough vigilance was not there, and that is why we find that since 1950 we have never correctly understood the strategy that the Chinese were playing. In this report given by our team you will find on page 257 under the caption "Claim supported by illegal occupation" they say:

"There is one argument advanced by the Chinese side which deserves special mention. The Chinese side asserted that the Chinese army crossed unhindered the Aksai Chin area in 1950, conducted surveys there in 1954-55 and eventually constructed a highway across it, and they claimed that all this supported their contention that the territory

always formed part of China and that the traditional line ran to the west of it."

This is the contention. Now, I want to know why such a thing happened, that their armies crossed into our territory, they went on constructing roads and still we did not know what was happening in that territory. This was possible simply because we were looking at the Chinese with some preconceived ideas of our own. That day the Prime Minister said, accusing Acharya Kripalani, that he was living in a romantic world. I do not know if this is not a romantic world or day-dreaming, if we could not take note of the fact that the Chinese have crossed our borders and are actually laying down roads to move their armies across them. This has happened because, I think, the military intelligence, the intelligence bureau of the Home Ministry and the intelligence of the External Affairs Ministry are not working in coordination. I would like to point out to the Defence Minister that in the United States of America and U.K. all these three different branches of intelligence are co-ordinated and they work under a senior army officer, who is responsible to the Prime Minister or the President. No such arrangement is obtaining in India and that is why if a particular report is received by the External Affairs Ministry or the Defence Ministry they do not correctly understand the significance of it. Therefore, I would say that in order to prevent the repetition of such things, we must see to it that all these three branches of intelligence are co-ordinated and they function under a proper head who is responsible to the Prime Minister.

I will then come to the next point, which is the particular philosophy of the Chinese and their preparations on the basis of that. Here we have also to take note of the fact that it is not only the Chinese on the border who

are accepting this philosophy, but there are friends of China in this country itself who have accepted it. We have always news from Vijayawada, for instance, for the last two or three days. What are the differences in the Communist Party in India just now? One faction says that China has not committed aggression. The other faction says that, may be they have committed the aggression, but, after all, these are minor differences which could be settled by negotiation. I want to know the stand of the Government in these matters. Just as there are differences between Mr. Mao Tse-tung and Mr. Khrushchev, there are differences between Shri Dange who sits here and Shri Bhupesh Gupta, who sits in the other House. But they are not real differences at all. They are all over minor issues like whether they should just now support the Chinese way of doing things or the Russian way of doing things, while Russia and China, both are agreed that throughout the world the Communist flag, the red flag, must fly. If this is the position, what is the stand that the Government has taken? I raise this question because only a few days back, the Home Minister of Uttar Pradesh, Shri Charan Singh, told the Vidhan Sabha that the Communists in that State are carrying on a whispering campaign, saying that the Badrinath temple formerly belonged to the Tibetans. He said "if that is so, we shall take proper steps". What are those steps? They are carrying on propaganda. Now they are trying to link up the Communist parties of the world. The Chinese Communist Party and the Russian Communist Party are in close alliance with the Indian Communist Party. A man like Mr. Suzlov, one of the top-most Russian Communist leaders has come to India to attend the Communist conference. So, it is high time that the Government also evolved its basic policy towards the Communists. Whether it is the Communist Party in China or Russia or India, basically they are all working according to a particular plan.

49 (A) LSD.—8

I do not want this country to be taken by surprise.

We have been told—the Defence Minister always tells us—that the morale of the Indian army is high. We are always glad when he says that. He always says that the production in the ordnance factories is going up. He says that we are becoming self-sufficient and we are not going to allow the foreign soldiers to sit on our soil. It is all very good. But would you permit me to say that the test of the pudding lies in the eating? Look at the Nagas? For the last ten years this trouble is continuing and we have not even been able to get two or three of our airmen released. These things have been going on for the last four or five months.

On the northern frontier we are told that the Chinese will not now come in. They have already come in. They have already come in, though we do not propose to appreciate the extent of the territory occupied by them. Twelve thousand square miles means an area as big as a district. One district they have already taken.

An Hon. Member: More than one district; three districts.

Shri Goray: All right three districts they have already taken and we say that now we will not allow them to come in. Perhaps they do not want to come in any further.

Goa we have not been able to liberate. The Prime Minister and the Defence Minister tell us that in Africa the Salazar regime is likely to be overturned and Goa is bound to be liberated. Is that the test of our army's high morale? I would like to say that at least there should be one instance where our army with its high morale and efficiency of its officers hits back by action, not by words, to prove that we are not going to stand any nonsense.

Many times we were told that the Chinese planes are coming over our

[Shri Goray]

territory. This has been told by the Prime Minister. And when we put the question as to why they are not intercepting those planes, the answer given is that they are flying at a height of 60,000 feet. They will fly at 60,000 feet. Are you going to tell them: "You come down to 5,000 feet and we shall hit you." We are told that the Nagas move from place to place. Are you going to tell the Nagas: "You stay put in one place we shall release our officers." Every time to tell us something and to treat us as if we were school-boys, we do not like to be treated in this manner.

The other day the Prime Minister, —I was sorry when he said that, admitted that the Russians are allowed to fly over our territory because we want to test the helicopters. Now did the Russians know the territory before? That territory is as unknown to them as much as it is alien to our own pilots. If it is so, how are they going to teach our pilots? I do not understand.

Shri Krishna Menon: I do not want to interrupt the hon. Member. But the statement ought to be corrected. No Russian has flown over any territory over which we do not go. The Russians are not going on the Chinese frontier.

Shri Hem Barua: They have gone to Leh.

Shri Krishna Menon: Foreigners can go to Leh.

An Hon. Member: Why should foreigners can go to Leh?

Shri Krishna Menon: They have not gone there for their own purposes.

Shri Goray: I would like to quote in this connection what the Prime Minister said on a previous occasion. Somebody mentioned that the Americans are giving long-range guns to the Pakistani people. At that time he made a very magnificent remark. He said that a gun which cannot fire

in other directions is yet to be invented. I agree with him and I would say that Russian pilots who only confine their attention to the spot where they are flying are yet to be born. After all, they have also their eyes wide open.

You know that China and Russia, whatever be their differences, are bound in solidarity. They consider each other as fraternal countries. The Chinese consider that Russians are their leaders, leaders of the world revolution. All this is known to you. And yet I do not know why it is that Russian pilots are brought there? They can go to some other territory; they can go a similar territory in their own country and teach our people. In fact, our pilots have gone there.

Therefore, I think that the whole basic fact is that we have not made up our minds as to the world strategy of the communists. We have not made up our minds as to who are our friends and who are our enemies. We try to distinguish unnecessarily between the Chinese and the Russians. I am not saying that you declare war against everybody. The Prime Minister and the Defence Minister always ask us: What is the remedy? Do you advise us to declare war? I say: no. Why should you declare war? Has China declared war on us? No. Without declaring war, they have committed aggression. So there is a variety of war by which even without declaring war you can commit aggression. If that is so, can you not repel that aggression without declaring war? It can be done, provided your claim that our officers are in fine fettle, that we are becoming more and more self-reliant, that our officers are good and can repel any aggression, is true. If that claim is true, then you can show that the aggression which has already been committed can be repelled. Otherwise all this tall talk is without any basis.

Now, I would like to point out how the Chinese are building up their strength beyond the borders. What is their approximate strength? So far as I could cull out from the different magazines, I find that in Tibet up to 1950 there were only 2,000 Chinese troops, and they were brought in there mainly to deal with the Khampa resistance movement. From 1950, today the total number of troops is about 1,50,000. These 1,50,000 troops across the border cannot be described as rear echelons or of the garrison type. They are combat troops, heavy combat troops, and each combat troop is said to be capable of sustained independent operations. A few troops are of rear echelons or Garrison Calibre. Blooded Korean war units have been brought into the military establishment in Tibet. By day and night, military lorries are in constant movement. Fifty miles by trail from Kathmandu, a steady traffic in military transport is under way between Jonka Dzong and Kaerong.

They are building roads, and Lhasa which hardly has seen a wheel has now a fully equipped jet airfield. There are minor airfields all round, and according to my information a number of other militarily useful airfields have been constructed since the occupation, and presently work is going on at two more, namely Nagchhu Dzong and Tingri Dzong. This is the way they are trying to develop their strength there and to build up a solid base from which it will be possible for them to pounce upon our territory whenever the situation is ripe. And to make the situation ripe friends here are helping. You must take note of this fact that there are these factions in the Communist Party, one faction towing the Chinese line, the other the Russian line. How are they divided? You will find that the Punjab branch and the Bengal branch of the Communist Party accept the Chinese line. The territory which is next to China accepts the Chinese line, while Mr. Namboodripad

from Kerala or Mr. Dange from Maharashtra can very well say that they accept the Russian line.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: What about Andhra?

Shri Goray: It is far away from the Himalayas.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: The hon. Member seems to know more about the Communist Party than ourselves!

Shri Goray: Yes, it so happens sometimes. Therefore, I would like to say that you must try to understand what the Chinese Communist Government is trying to do, what their aims are, what build-up is there, and what allies they are likely to have here.

Having said something about the preparations that they are making, across the border, let us come to our own preparations. What are our preparations? A good deal has been said here and I think the tempers have run so high that if some constructive suggestions are made I do not know how they will be accepted. It is not a personal quarrel between the Defence Minister and the Members of the Opposition. All of us, the Opposition Members included, consider this country as our own. Many of us here, on this side or that side, have suffered physically, economically, in every way, during the struggle for Independence. And that is why we feel that the independence of this country, the sovereignty of this land, which we have gained after hundreds of years must be maintained at all costs. That is the only urge that prompts us to critically review whatever is happening in that Ministry. That is the basis, and I would plead that there must be no misunderstanding at all. If hard words are said it is because we think that the situation is going from bad to worse. So many people, the Prime Minister and persons like Shri Morarji Desai etc. said that it was a very delicate situation. We agree that to

[Shri Goray]

deal with our Armed Forces and to criticise them and to find fault with them is really likely to be dangerous. Quite so. But when we think—it may be that we are wrong—that things are going beyond a particular limit, is the Parliament expected to remain silent?

Shri Ranga: No.

Shri Goray: We must assert ourselves, and we must speak out whatever we know, and then, only by exchange of views, not by exchange of vituperatives or recriminations, shall we be able to solve certain problems. Let me not hide this fact from you that when we heard of these recent promotions, we were rattled; there was no question about it. If I may make bold to say so, it is not only the civilian population but the military officers and the cadets also who are rattled. It is no use hiding this fact. You say, Sir, that Parliament should discuss it with restraint, but, after all, Parliament is part and parcel of the whole country. The whole country is talking about it. Wherever we go, whether it be in the railways, or in the lobbies, or in the officers' messes, everywhere, this is being talked about, and the press is writing articles after articles; and sides have already been taken, and the issues have already been joined.

When I speak here, I know that the weekly organ of the Communist Party has already written an article saying that they warn the Kunzrus and Gorays to keep their dirty hands off the Defence Forces. It does not matter if they attack me because I am a small fry, but when a man like Dr. Kunzru speaks, even then, they have the audacity to warn Dr. Kunzru to keep his dirty hands off the Defence Forces, because he does not agree with the Defence Minister.

Shri Ranga: Shame!

Shri Goray: Therefore, I say that the situation is not so simple. When

a man like Dr. Kunzru feels something, then it is the duty of the Defence Minister, nay, the Prime Minister to see to it that he is convinced of the fairness and the justice of their steps. If a General here or a General there is superseded, I do not mind at all, but if the situation is so delicate as we find it, and if we discover that a very competent General is being superseded by a General who has no war experience at all, whose services perhaps might have been lent to the Works, Housing and Supply Ministry, because he has built so many houses, then it is something serious. Building houses is not part of defence, I would say with all respect to the Defence Minister and others. I suppose Shri K. C. Reddy would have welcomed him, or the new Minister in charge would have welcomed him. But we find that such a man is made Chief of the Army Staff, and the other General becomes a Chief of the Army Command. I suppose that Parliament has every right to ask why this kind of thing has happened, because other Generals are available. The man whom I have in my mind is a man who has been decorated with a DSO while fighting on the Arakan front; when, he was sent to Korea; because of his gallantry there, he was given Ashoka Chakra, and then he was given the Padma Shri. If such a man, because he happens to be five months or six months junior to somebody, is by-passed and somebody else is put in his place, who has no experience....

Shri Krishna Menon: Here again, these are incorrect facts. There has been no supersession. According to the procedure....

Shri Ranga: He has been passed over.

Shri Krishna Menon: According to the procedure, he has not been passed over, because a Lt. Gen. functions in our Army for a period of four years, and when that is over, his term is over. That is all there is to it.

Shri Nath Pai: Is it not a fact that the selection was from a particular batch, and it does not matter who is senior? If the selection is to be made from a batch, the best man from the particular batch should be taken. He has been repeatedly stating that the selection was from a particular batch? If that be so, then should not the best man from the batch have been chosen? That is the claim.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It has been said on behalf of the Defence Minister that as regards the man who is said to have been superseded, he was there for a particular term and that term has expired. That is all there is to it.

Shri Krishna Menon: There was no question of supersession.

Shri Goray: All that I wanted to say was that opinion on these matters is so sharply divided that I really support the demand made by Acharya Kripalani that we should have a committee to go through all this. Let us not try to shirk the issue. The issues are there and we have democracy not in this country only. We have democracies all over the world. There have been committees appointed who were asked to go into these things and streamline the whole procedure. Therefore, I would suggest that in all fairness to himself and in all fairness to the Opposition, the Defence Minister should agree to appoint a committee like that. And, we shall be satisfied with whatever their finding is.

18 hrs.

Then I would like to point out one thing.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We have to take another item of business. So, the hon. Member may conclude in two minutes.

Shri Goray: Then, I would like to point out one thing. So far as the White Paper is concerned, I would like you to go through the White Papers published by the Government of the United Kingdom. They are so

informative and they try to give you so many facts. They try to give you the basic principles on which the Defence Forces are being developed.

In 1957 they came out with a White Paper in which the whole policy was laid down; and every subsequent report was intended to show the development, how far they had fulfilled the basic policy.

I would like to ask whether our Army, our Defence Ministry, has any basic principles, whether they have got a plan for the next 10 or 15 years and how far they are trying to fulfil that. So far as our Defence Ministry is concerned, I think, this is absent.

Field Marshal Montgomery in his *Memoirs* has written that immediately after the War he was confronted with the problem of developing a good fighting machine. He said that he had chalked out a programme for 10 or 15 years. And, this is the programme that the Government is trying to put into effect. I would like to know whether there are any Generals in our Army who are devoting themselves to this task, whether the Defence Minister is taking any interest in this and whether, every year, we are trying to implement a particular part of that programme.

These are the points I have to make. There are many other points but because the time is over I would not like to detain the House. I hope that the Defence Minister would not reply in a sort of general way but would take into consideration all the points submitted by the Opposition because it is the security of the country which we want to preserve.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri D. C. Sharma.

Shri D. C. Sharma: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir,...

Shri A. M. Tariq: Is it half-an-hour discussion, Sir?

Shri D. C. Sharma: Ever since India attained freedom our Army has been working in a state of emergency.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member may continue tomorrow.

18.04 hrs.

*AGRICULTURAL COMMISSION

Shri Inder J. Malhotra (Jammu and Kashmir): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, in reply to Starred Question No. 952 on the 17th March, 1961, it was stated, regarding the appointment of the Agricultural Commission, that the matter is still under consideration, in consultation with the State Governments whose views have been asked for.

In reply to another Unstarred Question, No. 1549 answered on the 16th December, 1959, regarding the recommendations made by the Agricultural Administration Committee which submitted its report in October, 1958, it was stated—I am quoting a portion of the reply—like this:

“Formation of a Committee for the Centre once in 5 years to examine programme and policies of Central Commodity Committees and other Central Institutions dealing with Agriculture.”

Now, it is stated that regarding this recommendation, Government has taken the following decision.

“A proposal to appoint a Commission on Agriculture instead of a Committee, to examine, among other things, policies of Central Commodity Committees and other Central Research Institutions dealing with agriculture in its broad sense, is under consideration.”

18.05 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

In reply to another question, Starred Question No. 415 answered on

26th February, 1960, it was stated by the hon. Deputy Minister that:

“As the House knows, there was a Commission as long ago as 1928, and after that, there had been no comprehensive investigation into the problems of agriculture. So, the proposal now is to have a Second Agricultural Commission and for that the terms of reference are being drafted.”

Up till now the Government has been coming forward with positive assurances to this House. The hon. Minister of Agriculture, while replying to a Resolution moved by me in March, 1960, regarding the appointment of a Committee for evaluation of the agricultural research programme in this country, stated:

“In fact the proposal before the Government was of a wider nature. When my hon. friend the Deputy Minister replied to a question the other day, he mentioned that the Government was thinking of a committee or commission which would have very broad terms of reference and would take up a much bigger task than the kind of committee which my hon. friend the Mover has suggested. We have not taken a final decision. That could be taken only when we ascertain and lay down what should be the terms of examination by this commission. Then we must circulate it to the State Governments to see if they have any suggestions to make. Then the various Ministries in the Government of India have to go through it and finally the Cabinet has to decide.”

Now when questions were asked in this House, the Government was coming forward with the reply that the matter was still under consideration in consultation with the State Governments. In the replies given to the previous questions and the references made by the Ministers in their replies,