

Private Members'

Bills and
Resolution

Transport have confirmed that they have ordered a formal enquiry and that they have sent already a senior engineer and a ship surveyor to Bahrein. The total passengers on board is now reported to be 560 traders, hawkers, agents, staff etc. 60, crew 132 survivors 555 out of which 108 being crew and the missing so far are 197.

Shri Radha Raman: It is reported that after the ship caught fire the life boats that were there were not functioning and because they were not able to function the loss has been heavier.

Shri Raj Bahadur: As I have already stated here no life boat got clear of the blazing ship. That is what the hon. Member also has said. That is true, so far as our information goes.

12.07 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

NOTIFICATION UNDER THE ESSENTIAL
COMMODITIES ACT

The Deputy Minister of Agriculture (Shri M. V. Krishnappa): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of Notification No. G.S.R. 464 dated the 1st April, 1961, under sub-section (6) of Section 3 of the Essential Commodities Act, 1955 [Placed in Library. See No. LT-2826/61].

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE
MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESO-
LUTIONS

EIGHTY-SECOND REPORT

Sardar Hukam Singh (Bhatinda): Sir, I beg to present the Eighty-second Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE

HUNDRED AND TWENTY-SEVENTH AND
HUNDRED AND THIRTY-FIRST REPORTS

Shri Dasappa (Bangalore): Sir, I beg to present the following Reports of the Estimates Committee:—

- (i) Hundred and twenty-seventh Report on the Ministry of Food and Agriculture (Department of Food) (a) Directorate of Sugar and Vanaspati, and (b) National Sugar Institute, Kanpur.
- (ii) Hundred and thirty-first Report on the Ministry of Food and Agriculture (Department of Agriculture)—Central Mechanised Farm, Suratgarh.

12.08 hrs.

DEMANDS FOR GRANS*—contd.
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE—contd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now proceed with further discussion and voting on the Demands for Grants under the control of the Ministry of Defence. Shri D. C. Sharma may continue his speech.

Shri M. R. Masani (Ranchi-East): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Let Shri Sharma finish his speech. He is in possession of the House.

Shri M. R. Masani: This concerns something which happened yesterday and on which I seek your ruling.

Mr. Speaker: I got the hon. Member's letter. But Shri D. C. Sharma is in possession of the House. Let him conclude. After that I will see.

An Hon. Member: How much time is left, Sir?

Mr. Speaker: Eight hours had been fixed for this.

An Hon. Member: Only four hours are left.

*Moved with the recommendation of the President.

Mr. Speaker: We are running into the time allotted for other Ministries. Out of eight hours allotted the time that has been taken is 4 hours and 45 minutes. A balance of 3 hours and 15 minutes remain. Now it is 12.10. We will have to conclude it by 3:30.

Shri Naushir Bharucha (East Khadesh): The time may be extended. The hon. Minister took 80 minutes in his opening speech.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I have repeatedly held that whatever time is taken by Ministers will be deducted from the time set apart for the party to which the Government belongs. Therefore, the Opposition does not lose at all. After all, whether the Government party answers or the Ministers answer it is the same so far as the Opposition is concerned. Therefore, there cannot be any complaint on this score.

We must conclude this Ministry by 3.30. We must pass the Appropriation Bill on the 19th. All the Demands must be voted by that time. I do not want to apply guillotine except in cases where the sub-committee has said that those matters need not be discussed at great length.

Therefore, though I would like to allow opportunities for discussion of other matters, and have been giving extensions, I am unable to give extension so far as this matter is concerned. How long will the hon. Minister take for reply?

The Minister of Defence (Shri Krishna Menon): About 45 minutes.

Mr. Speaker: I will call him at about 2.45. Now Shri D. C. Sharma:

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): Ever since we became free, our defence forces have been working in a state of emergency and every day that has passed has added to the seriousness and magnitude of that state of emergency. We began our freedom days with the Kashmir operations and what our armed forces did in those days is a matter of history. We have also been facing difficult problems

of law and order in NEFA. As our Prime Minister said once, our border has become threatened with danger and we have to face several problems of defence and protection of life and property so far as the border areas are concerned. In civil operations our armed forces have been called upon to play their role and they have done very well by the nation. Even so far as our international commitment goes, our armed forces have done a very fine stroke of work and wherever there is trouble in the world we are asked to do our best in order to allay the suspicious and fears of the contending parties. All these things go to the credit of our defence forces.

But, more than all this, our Defence Ministry have been responsible for transforming the colonial set up of our Defence Ministry and the Army into a set up which is worthy of a free nation, which is worthy of a nation that takes pride in its service of dedication to peace all along the line. From that point of view I think any objective critic of the Defence Ministry will come to the conclusion that our production in the defence ordnance factories and other places has increased by leaps and bounds. No country can advance very much unless it is self-sufficient in the production of armaments, explosives and other similar materials. Our aircraft factories have done a very splendid piece of work. We are now, as other countries are, in the age of supersonic aircrafts. I have no doubt that all these industries—aircraft industry, ordnance factories and other industries—are doing very splendid work. Therefore, while our defence forces have been fighting a good fight for the freedom of our country, fighting a very good fight for equipments, armaments and other things needed by the defence forces of this country. Therefore, no one will deny that ever since its inception the Defence Ministry has given a very good account of itself.

But there are certain stresses and strains to which it has been exposed all these days. Unfortunately, we have not been lucky in our neighbours all these days. Ill-luck has over-shadowed the activities of this Ministry all these days. We have not been doing very well by Pakistan, or Pakistan has not been doing very well by us; but there has been lot of tension between Pakistan and our country. At the same time, there has been a lot of tension, a great deal of tension, between China and our country. Of course, there is no doubt about it that China is in illegal possession of 12,000 sq. miles of our territory. But to say that our defence forces are not alive to this is saying something which is contrary to facts.

We have thought of the strength of China. I know China is a great country and I have no doubt about its military might, its potentialities and all those things. Some people are saying or asking: what about the 12,000 sq. miles of our territory which China has occupied? I ask: why not put the same question to China? What is China doing with regard to Portuguese Macao. What is China doing with regard to Taiwan. The idea is this. China is waiting for a suitable opportunity to get Macao and Taiwan. We are also waiting for a suitable opportunity to get the aggression vacated. I tell you, every second, every minute, every hour of the day the situation is being watched and we are fully preparing ourselves for that great moment, for that glorious moment in the history of our country, for that splendid moment in the history of our country, when we shall be able to get the Chinese aggression vacated from our country. I think this will not be done by the speeches over here, but by the combined might and the combined will of the people of the country. At the same time, I would say that so far as our defence forces are concerned, whether they have been working in the Ministry of Defence or at various fronts or in the border areas of our country or abroad wherever they may be working, they

have given an impression of co-ordinated and well-integrated effort. They have given the impression of unity of outlook and unity of approach. They have given the impression of very happy relations from the Chief of Staff to the jawans. Now, to bring in the question of appointment or promotion, so far as two or three persons are concerned, shows a lack of sense of proportion, I do not know the gentleman and I do not hold any brief for that gentleman or anybody else. But to say that since one gentleman has been superseded, or half a dozen gentlemen have been superseded, therefore, the Defence Ministry is in a state of bad health, I think that shows utter lack of proportion and utter lack of sense of perspective. In a big Ministry which deals with lakhs of people which deals with so many things, I think such things can happen. I think these things do not happen as a result of ad hoc decisions, as a result of the whim of one person. We are living in a democratic set up where things are done by committees. There is a committee at the level of the Defence Ministry and another committee at the Cabinet level. Therefore, things are shifted properly at these levels and to think that these things are done on account of aberration on the part of somebody is not taking things in the proper light. I believe our defence forces have given an impression to the outside world and to my own country men of united approach, united outlook and solidarity in its effort and solidarity in its objective and I think anybody who tries to disrupt that sense of solidarity is not doing good work by the country, is not doing any service for the country.

The Defence Minister was speaking yesterday about the morale of the army. I know the morale of the army depends on many factors. They must have education, pension, proper scale of pay, promotions and all that. The morale of the army, in fact the morale of any services is dependent more on

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

inponderable factors rather than on ponderable factors.

Those inponderable factors are such as make people think that the Army is free from political influence, that the Army officers are not politically minded, that they do not go to Members of Parliament and ventilate their grievances to them and that they do not try to bring politics. Therefore anybody who tries to support one person at the expense of others or one section of the Army at the expense of others, I would submit he is trying to destroy that unity and discipline in the Army of which we are boasting all these years.

I was going to say that there is an element of vulnerability in our borders. For instance, we all feel very unhappy when we think of Karam Singh and the way he was tortured by the Chinese. We all feel distressed when we think of Colonel Bhattacharji who has been taken away by the Pakistani forces recently. We feel very distressingly when we remember the aircraft which was shot down by Pakistan. All these things distress us. There is no doubt about it. But the fact of the matter is that all these things are unfortunate and dangerous accidents of warfare. I am sure that the hon. Defence Minister and the Defence Ministry will do something to bring down the element of vulnerability that we have come to associate with these operations.

Another point that I want to make is that the Defence Ministry should be very generous so far as the border States, like, West Bengal, Himachal Pradesh, Punjab and other border States, for example, Assam are concerned. They should give them a very generous treatment. We did not inherit a large number of cantonments when our country suffered division and I find that the number of cantonments is not adequate even now. I would therefore request the hon. Defence Minister that he should have a cantonment in every district town of the

border district of Punjab. For instance, I come from Gurdaspur. There should be a cantonment in Gurdaspur. Similarly there should be cantonments in other States of India, in Assam and other places.

I would also say that in order to give people an impression of our preparations for the defence of that area, there should be a Sainik School opened in every district of the border States. For instance, there should be a Sainik School opened in one or two border districts and this will give people a better idea of our defence preparations than anything else.

I would also submit that the shortage of officers should be made up. This is a very unhappy position that we are suffering from shortage of officers. I believe the Indian Military Academy should be expanded so that we can produce those officers who can take charge of the operations whenever we need them.

I would also say that the NCC, the ACC and the National Discipline Scheme should be encouraged and every schoolboy, every school girl and every college student in my country—all these should reap the benefit of this scheme. This scheme should be broadbased and should be thrown open to every school and college student so that they can learn discipline and other things and can become potential soldiers for my country whenever there is a need and God knows when that need may come.

I would say one thing. I am very happy that the Himalayan Mountaineering Institute has been established at Darjeeling. It is a great institution and I know it is doing very wonderful work. But I submit that such institutes should be established in other States also where there are hilly areas so that the mountaineering institute can teach people mountaineering.

Yesterday an hon. Member said "I charge the hon. Defence Minister with

this thing or that thing." I would charge the Defence Ministry with the task of defending this country. I would charge the Defence Ministry with the task of standing for the defence of the country. I can assure you that so far the Defence Ministry have been facing up to the task admirably, creditably and splendidly. I hope that as time passes it will do better and better.

Shri M. R. Masani: Sir, I crave your ruling on a matter which is causing considerable perplexity to hon. Members of this course. Yesterday when you were in the Chair, the hon. Defence Minister said—I am quoting from page 15168 of the official record—

"Our General Thimayya who is now the Chief of Staff was made Chief of Staff in supersession of three others. He has superseded Gen. Kalwant Singh, Gen. Sant Singh and a lot of other people."

Yet, a little later when the hon. Deputy-Speaker was in the Chair and Acharya Kripalani tried to give parallel cases to the one referred to by the hon. Defence Minister, though the hon. Deputy-Speaker gave a ruling that hon. Members of the House are entitled to refer to such matters he gave advice in such strong terms that even Acharya Kripalani felt constrained to desist from his intention of illustrating his point by giving similar references. I am therefore craving your ruling that the right of hon. Member to refer to cases of officers, when necessary in the public interest, is intact and that whatever the advice of the incumbent of the Chair might be that right is open to those hon. Members who will take further part in this debate.

Shri Krishna Memon: I referred to that in order to point out that "supersessions" were not uncommon. If the House will recall, I also referred to the cases of British Generals, specially of the CIGS in England. Supersessions take place and have taken

place in our country in notable cases. There, there was no reference to the personalities. On a minor point of correction I want to make in regard to this and that is that in this particular case there have been two supersessions. Of course, that is not of relevance now. My reference is not in the same category as reference to merits of individual officers. That was merely to point out that "supersessions" take place and in notable instances they have taken place.

Shri M. R. Masani: I am not questioning the right of the hon. Defence Minister to illustrate his point. I am requesting that other hon. Members of the House should have similar liberty to illustrate their point. I do not think any distinction exists between what Acharya Kripalani tried to do and what the hon. Minister did.

Acharya Kripalani (Sitamarhi): You also said just now that the hon. Ministers are also Members of Parliament. Can some hon. Members of Parliament have certain privileges which other hon. Members do not have?

Mr. Speaker: The same point was raised by Shri Masani yesterday. I was not present here then, but the hon. Deputy-Speaker was in the Chair. The very same point was raised by Shri Masani and the hon. Deputy-Speaker, after hearing in *extenso* what Shri Masani and other hon. Members had to say, observed:

"Therefore, my advice even now, after hearing all the Members, would be that names should not be mentioned."

I want to make it clear that the hon. Deputy-Speaker, or whoever sits in the Chair, is as much the Speaker for the time being as the Speaker himself. I want to establish proper conventions. I am not sitting as an appellate authority over what happens in my absence.

So far as a ruling is concerned, I do not mean to say that once a ruling

[Mr. Speaker]

is given, whatever might be the effect, it cannot be touched. But so far as this particular case is concerned, the ruling is final, whatever might be its efficacy. Any hon. Member who is a lawyer knows this. So far as future cases are concerned, the ruling may be looked into once again and either it may be confirmed or if there be a difference it may be changed. But so far as this case is concerned, the matter is final. At one stage ruling is given. At another stage, some other person or one of the members on the panel of Chairman comes in and it happens that for each individual Member a ruling different from the previous one is given. Some are allowed and some are not allowed. Hon. Members would kindly consider that to go into it would not be in their interest. There are precedents in the courts. Therefore, so far as this matter is concerned, the decision of the hon. Deputy-Speaker in this case is final.

Shri M. R. Masani: May I point out that he gave no ruling?

Acharya Kripalani: The hon. Deputy-Speaker gave no ruling. Rather, he said that he was not going to give a ruling but would only advise. Because so many English precedents were given, the hon. Deputy-Speaker said that he was not going to give a ruling.

Pandit K. C. Sharma (Hapur): The Chair's advice is to be respected.

Acharya Kripalani: At that time. But what about now? At that time, the question was not raised that the hon. Defence Minister had himself given the names of people and had said something in favour of somebody and against somebody.

Mr. Speaker: I am not disposing of it.....

Shri M. R. Masani: I fear, Sir, that you have not followed me. I was not appealing to you to reverse the ruling

to the hon. Deputy-Speaker. On the contrary, the Deputy-Speaker only said:

"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."

Then, he went on to say that Members have the right, but his advice to Acharya Kripalani was not to mention names. I am asking you to re-emphasise his statement that the right of Members is there, and the advice is only an advice and not binding on Members.

Sardar Hukam Singh (Bhatinda): May I say one thing, if you would allow me? What has been presented by Shri M. R. Masani is not in the very context in which I said that I was not going to give a ruling, because the constitutional powers and the legal powers of Parliament were being put forward, namely, that this House was a sovereign body, and that it could discuss any matter that it liked. I said that so far as sovereignty was concerned, there was no doubt about that; the House is sovereign, and Parliament is supreme, and it can discuss, but my advice was that so far as the individual cases were concerned, if they were mentioned, then, we would become a court of enquiry in every case, and even now, I feel that I was right in holding that individual cases should not be brought in here, and names should not be mentioned. Therefore, I gave that advice, and I am thankful to Acharya Kripalani that he has respected it.

Shri Khushwaqt Rai (Kheri): May I say a word? Yesterday, I had raised a point of order on the basis of article 105 of the Constitution, and on that point, ruling was given by the Deputy-Speaker; he said that he could not give an authoritative ruling, because he had not studied the points in detail. That is a point which ought to be decided by you now. So far as the advice is concerned, Acharya Kripalani

acted on that advice. But, shall I read out a few sentences from the records?

Mr. Speaker: It is not necessary. I have got the records here before me.

Shri Khushwaqt Rai: What I would emphasise is that the House is sovereign and it can always discuss anything that it likes. What the Deputy-Speaker said was only this, namely:

"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."

On that, I had raised a constitutional point saying that article 105 of the Constitution gave us the same powers which were possessed by the House of Commons, and especially when a similar matter, as pointed out by Shri M. R. Masani had been allowed to be discussed there, this House should not be denied of that opportunity.

Shri M. R. Masani: May I draw your attention to the fact that in the third week of March this year, the British House of Commons had a full-fledged debate on the appointment of Dr. Beeching as head of the British Railways on a very big salary. The gentleman's qualifications, his appointment, his terms of appointment etc. were discussed in detail and the Ministers gave answers and justified the appointment. Here is the example of the Mother of Parliaments from which we draw our precedents and conventions. How can this House then be prevented from making references in the public interest to matters of a similar nature? And particularly when you allow the Defence Minister, surely, other Members have not lesser rights.

Acharya Kripalani: I think advantage should not be taken of the respect in which I hold the Chair. I may not have accepted his advice, and I may have gone on giving names. Therefore, I think that in deciding this matter, this should not be brought in,

Mr. Speaker: Very well. I take it that the advice was a direction. Other wise, the hon. Member could have insisted upon going on giving names.

Acharya Kripalani: No the Chair said that I could go on.

Mr. Speaker: I do not want to dispose of this on a merely technical ground. All that I wanted to say was this. When once a person who is in the Chair, for the time being, gives a ruling, in the same case, the matter ought not to be re-opened, whatever might be the necessity to re-open it at some other stage.

It is said that that was only an advice, and the hon. Member has acted upon that advice. But I do not want to dispose of it in a technical manner.

The point is that these matters relate merely to a question of promotion; that is absolutely an administrative matter. The question of promotion was also explained by the hon. Defence Minister. He said that after a particular stage, seniority was only one of the matters that was taken into consideration. That is the principle that has been adopted. Later on, in applying the principle if we were to go into the question whether X has been taken or Y has been taken, it is a question of interfering with the discretion. No doubt, if in a series of cases the discretion is from time to time badly exercised, or the committee that is appointed is not competent, and it is managed in a particular manner, that is another matter. But, even then, it is purely a matter of administrative detail.

If I allow this, there will be eternal lobbying. Member after member of the Armed Forces—whose discipline we are very anxious to maintain—who is superseded will come and catch hold of all the five hundred odd Members here, and lobbying will go on eternally. This House is not competent to go into this matter.

Acharya Kripalani. rose—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member will kindly bear with me.

It is said that the hon. Defence Minister himself started this and referred to three names. I find that two or three names were referred to, along with General Thimayya's name. But General Thimayya's name was not the only one; there were some other cases also mentioned; an English case was also referred to by him for the purpose of showing that it was not a matter of supersession, but it was a matter of appointment. If the entire promotion depends on the question of seniority, then the question of supersession arises. The hon. Minister wanted to say that this was not a question of supersession at all, but it was a question of appointment; and so far as appointment is concerned, the question of seniority is only one of the items that would be taken into consideration. And for this purpose, he quoted General Thimayya's case.

Shri M. R. Masani: He said that he had superseded General Kulwant Singh, General Sant Singh and a lot of others.

Mr. Speaker. So far as that is concerned, that is only an instance which has been given. But, if at an earlier stage, the matter had been brought up here and it had been stated that General Thimayya had superseded so-and-so, or if some hon. Member should have said that Mr. Kulwant Singh ought not to have been superseded, I would have disallowed that matter. It is open to the hon. Minister to give an instance now where a number of persons have been affected, and that it is not a question of supersession; it may be that the other people might have been competent to be appointed to that post by virtue of their seniority, but it is not seniority alone that counts. For this purpose, the hon. Minister has given that case by way of illustration. In this case, General Thimayya is no longer in the field now. If he had continued to be there, I would have hesitated to allow him to make any reference to the particular individual.

But he is no longer there in the field, and if his case is mentioned, it would not affect the discipline. All of us, individually and collectively, are interested in seeing that the discipline of the Army is never shaken. I feel that this is an administrative detail which has been elaborated.

My attention has been drawn, or rather the Deputy-Speaker's attention had been drawn yesterday to this fact by Shri M. R. Masani; he has again referred to it now; and Shri Khushwaqt Rai also has referred to the ruling given in the House of Commons earlier and the latest ruling as well.

So far as the earlier ruling is concerned, it was not a question of a ruling. The House of Commons allowed in 1809 a reference to be made to a Commander who had been superseded by so-and-so. I do not find that it has been followed up recently.

Yesterday's case mentioned by Shri M. R. Masani stands on a different footing altogether. It is said that a person who is not competent has been appointed as the head of an administration, a man who has no qualifications, whereas the particular statute prescribes something else. We also pass a number of statutes here, providing, for instance, that the chairman of a particular committee ought to be a person who is a chartered accountant and so on; it is open to the House to say that this particular individual or that particular individual knows nothing about accounts and so on.

Now, so far as promotion is concerned, it stands on a different footing from appointment. This is a matter of appointment. This is a matter of administrative detail. Therefore rightly, the hon. Deputy-Speaker has said so; no doubt, he might have wanted to say it, but he did not say 'Yes, this is my ruling'. I would accept it as a ruling, though it was an advice. That is my ruling. My ruling is that so far as administrative details are concerned.....

Acharya Kripalani: Before you give your ruling, I would submit one thing. Supposing the Defence Minister goes on promoting people of his choice, we might have tomorrow a dictatorship here.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): May I say a word? Supposing he does that, it is up to the hon. Member to bring a vote of censure against him or against Government. It is not open to him to challenge these things.

Acharya Kripalani: As long as there is a majority party, shall we allow our country to be disrupted like this? We have also a right. (*Interruptions*)

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: This is very remarkable....

Acharya Kripalani: It is not a question where only because you are having a majority, you can do anything you like. We cannot allow the Defence Minister to go on changing people like that, till he becomes a dictator. (*Interruptions*).

The Minister of Mines and Oil (Shri K. D. Malaviya): You will have to submit to the majority.

Acharya Kripalani: This is a more serious question than what the Prime Minister thinks. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I should like you, Sir, and the House to consider as to who at the present moment is functioning as dictators normally function. Look at the hon. Member opposite, the language he uses, the arms he waves about, the looks he casts around him....

Acharya Kripalani: You see my looks, but you do not see your looks, I see your looks. Your mirror is here; and my mirror may be there.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I hope my looks please him. It is an extra-

ordinary state of affairs. The hon. Member seems to think that the majority should not function here at all.

Shri Ranga (Tenali): It should function responsibly.

Acharya Kripalani: Not like a dictatorship.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The next step will be that the majority in the country, of the people, should not function at all. That is the logical argument.

Shri Ranga: The majority also should have some respect for the minority. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: Let there be no interruptions. What is the meaning of this? I am afraid unnecessary excitement is taking place here.

Acharya Kripalani: The excitement was begun by the Prime Minister.

Mr. Speaker: No, no. Let us laugh it out.

The only point is that in a parliamentary democracy, there is no good ignoring hard facts.

Shri Ranga: An advice is being turned into a ruling in parliamentary democracy.

Mr. Speaker: It is not advice. I am coming to an independent judgment. I am not merely going by what has been said inasmuch as the hon. Deputy-Speaker did not give a ruling. He said that this was a matter in which he would like to think again. But so far as this matter was concerned, he gave the advice and the hon. Member was good enough to adopt that advice and he did not refer to names. Now, I am called upon to give a ruling and I am giving it.

The position is that in a parliamentary democracy, there is no good the Opposition complaining that the majority party is ruling. If there is no majority it will not rule; the Opposition only will rule. Therefore, let us

[Mr. Speaker]

go into that position (*Interruptions*).
Order, order. What can be done?

Shri Hem Barua (Guhati): Is that the issue before the House?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

That is the first step. The second step is this. The hon. Minister in charge of the Defence administration is the person who has to appoint the Commander or Officer in charge or Staff officer and so on, is it the contention of hon Members that we can go into individual cases? I agree that if there is a definite rule, either in the Constitution or elsewhere, which has been adopted and which says that appointments shall go strictly by seniority, irrespective of capacity, it is a different matter. In that case, if a man is 50 and the other is 30 and the former has been superseded, I will certainly allow a discussion on that matter. But seniority is only one of the five or six conditions. Therefore, it is the Minister who has to decide. Shall I allow the Opposition to decide as to whether a particular person should be the Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces in supersession of the decision of the Defence Minister.

Acharya Kripalani: We do not want to decide. We want to criticise, and we have a right to criticise.

Mr. Speaker: Surely, he cannot criticise like this. My ruling is that he cannot criticise individual appointments like this (*Interruptions*). Order, order. Now, there must be an end to this.

Shri Hem Barua: The Defence Minister was mentioning names. He was not stopped.

Mr. Speaker: A number of accusations have been made from time to time. I was here when the hon. Defence Minister spoke. He referred to a kind of campaign or a number of accusations going on in the Press outside and elsewhere that appointments in the Army have been irregular. He

has to satisfy not only this House but the general public also, and he wanted to say.....

Acharya Kripalani: For that he called a party of editors.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members have a right to accuse, but there are limits. It is not that every small matter will be brought up here. They must abide by my ruling.

Acharya Kripalani: This is not a small matter.

Mr. Speaker: If hon. Members are not satisfied with the manner in which things are being done and if there is a specific violation either of a constitutional right or of the rules framed under the Constitution or a statute, it is open to the House to say that the Defence Minister did not carry out those rules, because he has to promote by strict seniority and he has not done so. This is not such a case. So it is left to the Defence Minister to decide who ought to be and who ought not to be promoted. I am not going to allow any hon. Member in the Opposition to decide for the Defence Minister. If he has any complaint against the Defence Minister from the series of appointments that have been made, it is open to him to move this House to get rid of the Defence Minister.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Or the Government.

Mr. Speaker: Or the Government—of course—as they choose.

Therefore, individual cases shall not be referred to.

Acharya Kripalani: What is the function of the Opposition?

Mr. Speaker: I am stating it. As the Defence Minister himself said, he wanted to justify the various appointments and show that there was nothing wrong in them. Likewise, it is open to Opposition Members to refer,

without mentioning names, to various cases—not one, nor two—where a Major has been superseded, not one but four, and so on. He referred to a case and said that only one has been superseded, and that was a case of premature retirement and so on. I do not remember the various designations. Hon. Members can say that the man was the most senior, and this is so not in one case but successively and so on. Of course, this is a general rule. But no names ought to be allowed to be mentioned here.

I would refer to one other matter by way of analogy. I think there is a rule under the relevant rules of procedure that when an officer has to be accused of corruption, the Minister has to be given notice. If the House wants to move the Government to get rid of a particular officer on account of corruption etc., even then it is open to the Chair to allow a reference or not to allow it. But normally the Chair does so. But the present one is not such a case. It is purely a case of appointments, and the matter of appointments is in the hands of the Defence Minister.

Therefore, no names should be brought in. I am looking at larger consequences of any other step. There will be eternal lobbying and the very hon. Members who want to refer to these names will themselves come to me and say, 'Do not allow us to mention names hereafter'.

Under these circumstances, a general statement can be made—not that this, Major was not promoted and so on—that so many promotions have been made, and it can be refuted.

श्री अन्नं नरिंह न बोरिया (इटावा) :

मध्यम महोदय, समय घोर बढा दिया जाय ।

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Mr. Speaker. I am grateful to you, Sir, for giving me this opportunity to say a few words on this occasion, during the relatively short time at the disposal of the House to discuss this matter further.

Shri Khushwaqt Rai: The time may be extended.

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): No, no.

Mr. Speaker: Time has already been extended. I am unable to extend it further.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I hesitate to take much time of the House. I would not have done so because my hon. colleague, the Defence Minister, will no doubt give an adequate reply to such criticisms as have been made.

An Hon. Member: What is the need?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: But there were two or three points made in yesterday's debate.

Mr. Speaker: Any hon. Member is entitled to speak and it is my privilege to call upon hon. Members to speak.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: But there were some points made in yesterday's debate—I regret I was not here to listen to the debate myself; but I have read in full the script of it, specially of Acharya Kripalani's speech—which make it incumbent on me to say a few words.

Now, as the House knows, I have the greatest respect for Acharya Kripalani,.....

प्रधानमंत्री : याद बरज ।

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: ...though, I think that his judgment about various matters is frequently wrong. But it is one thing for a judgment to be wrong; it is quite another for facts to be wrong. And he and some other speakers have indulged in this matter in wrong facts, distorted facts, and I protest against this kind of statements in regard to officers or other people serving our country. Although you have been pleased to say that names should not be mentioned—and I respectfully submit that that is the

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

only course we can follow in this House—it is not fair either for military or civil officers to be condemned here in this way. If anything serious has happened, surely there are other ways of dealing with it, not by just casting aspersions on a person's past record or present activities. Although actual names were not mentioned, in some speeches, in those of Acharya Kripalani and Shri Goray, without names very clear reference was made to some of our senior officers, based on facts which are completely wrong and distorted.

Shri Rajendra Singh (Chapra): How can we ascertain facts when we are not on that side. . . . (*Interruptions*).

Acharya Kripalani: Let a Committee be appointed.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is not too difficult a matter for the hon. Acharya to have asked me about certain basic facts—there are certain basic facts about a person's record, what has happened and what has not happened—and I would have given him the facts. If he has a particular aversion to deal with the Defence Minister, he could have asked me about it. I could have given facts. But he has not mentioned. During the course of all these events, in every speech, whatever the subject, he has brought more or less the same thing. But, he has never taken the trouble to ask me what the facts are on which charges are being levelled.

Acharya Kripalani: He never called me to explain the facts to me. I cannot go to a busy man and make myself a nuisance. It is for the Prime Minister to take the Opposition into confidence. It is done in every country, excepting our own.

Shri Ranga: Here is an article, an open letter to Shri Morarji Desai, who was the Acting Leader of the House in the absence of the Prime Minister. It was published in the *Current* some days ago. (*Interruption*). It was

open to the Defence Minister or Shri Jawaharlal Nehru to come out with a reply to this in Press Committees or Press Conference or anything like that. They have not done that till now.

Acharya Kripalani: When the Editors of papers are called we could have been called.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Who was called by whom and where?

Acharya Kripalani: The Defence Minister called the editors. He himself said that yesterday.

Shri Ranga: He did it the day before yesterday and referred to it also in his speech.

Acharya Kripalani: They instruct them regarding what to write and what not to write. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Am I supposed to go on, Sir, or am I to listen to these interruptions?

I was venturing to say it is quite easy for a person. I am talking about facts. Judgment of course one can form. I should have been approached or written to or asked orally. The hon. Acharya says that he does not want to make a nuisance of himself to me. Why then did he do it here in the House? It is better to be a nuisance to me than to the House.

Shri Hem Barua: On a point of order, Sir. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Rajendra Singh: It is open to an hon. Member to criticise the Government during a speech in the House.

Shri Hem Barua: When a Member speaks here he does so only because he is shouldering a responsibility, a duty to the people. When Acharya Kripalani was levelling the charges he was doing that only as a representative of the people. The Prime Minister does not want to give him the right to do that. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not give way Sir.

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Ferozabad): He will have to give way.

Mr. Speaker: There is no point of order. If such interruptions go on how is the debate to be carried on?

Shri Khushwaqt Rai: It is a matter of our right and privilege. I have a right to rise on a point of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: There is no point of privilege.

Shri Khushwaqt Rai: Let him hear me and then disallow it.

Mr. Speaker: A point of privilege cannot be raised like this off hand. We are not adjourning today. We are sitting till the 5th of May. If necessary, we shall devote a sitting of Parliament to discuss the matter of privilege.

Shri Khuwaqt Rai: It has to be raised now, Sir. Otherwise, it will be late.

Mr. Speaker: Let him write to me.

Shri Hem Barua: Sir, will you allow the Prime Minister to go on chastising us like this?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have not done that, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: I allowed 56 minutes to Acharya Kripalani. I never interfered with him. I allowed him to level accusations. Is it not the duty of the Prime Minister, when he wants, to intervene, and explain the position? Is the Government run by the Opposition here? I cannot understand this. Hon. Members ought not to be impatient. I would make this appeal to Acharya Kripalani and the leaders of the various groups. *(Interruptions)*.

Order, order. I would ask them not to interrupt like this. After all we have to maintain some decorum and allow opportunities for all shades of opinion to be expressed.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Sir, you appealed to the hon. Members just to say to some of the hon. Members of the Opposition that they may disabuse themselves of the idea they seem to have that they are running the Government.

Shri Rajendra Singh: Again, it is an aspersion, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members ought not to be too sensitive like this. *(Interruptions)*.

Shri Rajendra Singh: Let the Leader of the House maintain some decorum.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Member may kindly resume his seat. Hon. Members ought not to be too thick-skinned.

Acharya Kripalani: Sir, I have a function to perform; the Opposition have a function to perform. Please define it, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: That is why I called him first. That is the definition of the function.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I said that I respect Acharya Kripalani very much even though I think his judgment is very often wrong.

Acharya Kripalani: I also do.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: But it is not a question of judgment. We may differ in regard to our judgment. The other Acharya present here differs in everything he says now *(Interruption)*.

Shri Ranga: That is why I passed a vote of no-confidence in him. We share our feelings in a mutual fashion. We share the same view about his judgment.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member will have his opportunity.

Shri Ranga: I passed a vote of no-confidence in him and crossed the floor.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not wish to reply; there is something wrong in me or the Acharya. (*Inter-ruption*).

Acharya Kripalani: It is easy with a majority behind you to excite laughter; but this is no argument.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: This is not argument at all.

Acharya Kripalani: If I had also a majority like that I can excite laughter. But it does not behove him. It does not behove the Leader of the House to speak like that.

Mr. Speaker: Very well; let him not make references.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I hope the hon. Member will permit me to speak in a lighter vein and not to be continuously angry like himself.

Shri Hem Barua: Sir, should the Prime Minister indulge in invectives?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I said that the charges made here—some may be based on judgment, I think misguided judgment—but most of them are based on completely wrong facts, as, no doubt, I have been informed. I should be very glad if even now the hon. Members opposite will come to me and tell me what their sources of information are—privately, not publicly—so that I may give them the factual information.

For instance, in his speech the Acharya asked for a committee of inquiry—for some old officers and new officers and others to form part of it. Now, he used, as it happened, identical language which a retired officer used to me when he put forward that proposal.

Acharya Kripalani: May I say this on a point of correction? I said, let there be a committee of this House. If that is not acceptable, then, I said, let there be another committee. I never said that this should be the only committee. The Government has the choice.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am merely asking him for facts. He must have got some information, on which he has based his charges, from some people, from some individuals. I shall be glad if he tells me in private who those persons are. I want it in private. I may mention here that that proposal was made some months ago and repeated two or three times afterwards by a senior officer who retired some 8 or 9 years ago from the Army—a long time back. It seemed to me rather an amazing proposal for old officers, retired years ago, to come and sit in judgment over those who have succeeded them. It is a proposal without precedent. And I told him so.

As a matter of fact, I went a step further and I discussed this matter more than once with the the Chief of Staff, Gen. Thimmayya, and he told me that it was an absurd proposal. It is his opinion. It is without precedent and this kind of thing cannot be done.

The proposal for that kind of committee or any committee to be appointed to consider the whole question of the Army as it is run cannot be accepted. I am not aware of any such thing being done. Of course, sometimes, particular aspects of policy are considered, or may be considered or debated. But, this is a different matter.

13 hrs.

But, here, if you analyse the various charges made, they revolve from larger to minor things on promotions. They round and round that subject. I think some other facts also were actually mentioned. First of all, may I say that in so far as these senior appointments and senior promotions right at the top are concerned, the Defence Minister does not do things of his own bat. There are others. Certainly, I always, as Prime Minister, come into the picture; others also do. Senior Members are consulted. There has not been a single case of appointment or promotion in which I have not been consulted and which I have not gone

into so that the responsibility is certainly shared by me as well as some other senior members of the Defence Committee of the Cabinet. This fact should be clearly remembered. So, it must be clear that these top ranking appointments must be based on merit, apart from seniority and all that. Our Army would go to pieces if we lay down the rule of promotion only by seniority. I have never heard of an Army where that has been done. It might have been done in some remote and primitive army but no advanced country can do like that. I do not say that the hon. Member says it. I am merely stressing this fact that these are top appointments. The other appointments, the lower appointments, can be by seniority. But as soon as you reach a stage—I am not sure, perhaps it is the brigadier stage—in the Army, appointments are made by selection committees who go deeply into the records of each person and then appoint him, ignoring seniority—not ignoring it but certainly not attaching too much importance to seniority, at that stage. That is how it is done.

Acharya Kripalani: I quoted from the report of the Public Accounts Committee:

"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."

The report says and I have mentioned it in my speech yesterday:

"The Report says that the Captain Superintendent had been transferred in the normal course to a senior post on completion of his tenure."

This is what the Public Accounts Committee says and the Public Accounts Committee is presided over by a Congressman and the majority of the Members are Congressman. I have never said that it should be by seniority. That it should be by seniority. But that is how promotions are being given in the Army.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Defence Minister will no doubt deal with that question..... (Interruptions.)

Shri Braj Raj Singh: He will not deal with it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Let him be allowed to speak in his own way. What is the meaning of cross-examining like this? Is he in the dock? I allowed Acharya Kripalani to go along with his facts.... (Interruptions.)

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): Yesterday, we heard Acharya Kripalani's speech without any interruption for more than an hour. The same treatment has been given to the Opposition Parties. Will they not show us the same courtesy?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I repeat, Sir, that senior appointments are made that way. I do not know about this. I cannot remember this and the hon. Defence Minister will deal with it. But the procedure is that from lieutenant, colonel, when you go to colonel and brigadier; they are seeded out by special selection committees. The Defence Minister does not come in except that finally he may initial them. The staff officers and the others do it; it is quite clear and they do not go by pure seniority. They have to go by records, etc. establishing merit. When you go to the topmost stage, lieutenant, colonels etc. it is the Government's privilege to appoint, after, no doubt, consulting the concerned people. But it is the Government that appoints them, considering all the facts of the case. There are only very few persons and they consult the others. Naturally recommendations are made. It is purely a selection post in the case of the topmost few persons. And because it is a very important appointment, the Defence Minister always consults the Prime Minister. That is the convention and the practice. Therefore, I am clearly as much responsible for any of these top appointments as the Defence Minister. I do so if I may

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

say so, not casually but I do so every time after full consideration and discussion. I think the appointment made have been proper appointments otherwise I would not have done so. The choice made has been a good choice. If this practice prevails that every disgruntled and disappointed person, sometimes a person who has no other virtue except seniority goes to the Members of the Opposition or Members of this Party and complains, it is not a good practice, if I may say so. One may make a mistake. But certainly the party who goes to complain is not a very impartial authority. Some persons who go, maybe, may have many factors which they do not place before the other party at all. Therefore, I said that if any such case arises, I am prepared to tell the hon. Member what I think if he writes to me or sends me word. At least some of the facts, I shall be able to place before him. It is a very bad practice and it will encourage, whether in the civil line or other lines, all wrong kinds of accusations, charges and counter charges, etc. which cannot be dealt with. Newspapers deal with them sometimes, to my regret. I do not wish to come in the way of newspapers but it is not, nevertheless, a very fair way of dealing with these matters and complaints. Let us take a single instance. Shri Goray referred yesterday—I think Acharya Kripalani also referred—to the appointment of the Chief of General Staff in the Army. Now, I do not know where they have got their facts because what they stated are not facts; they are completely wrong. For instance, it was stated that he had superseded so and so and others, that he was not in the infantry and he has been put there and so on. I do not want to go into it fully. He was an officer who had been in the infantry for 25 years out of his 28 years of service. I am not going into the details but I may tell him that they are criticising a person whom they do not know. All these Generals and others in the Army are more or less known to us. For thirteen years, since I have been Prime

Minister I have come across them; I have met them; I have for some time functioned as the Defence Minister also. I know them personally; I know their records also. I do not say that my judgment is final about them but I know them and at least their records. May be I maliciously, inspite of that, choose the wrong person. That is a question about which I cannot answer. But my knowledge of them is certainly far superior to Acharya Kripalani's who says that he has not met them and knows nothing about them. Therefore, he has to rely on reports that may come to him from persons who are disgruntled. It is obvious, because he has no other source of reports. He does not know them personally. I say it is not a safe way of considering these problems.

Acharya Kripalani: Do you want us to know them personally?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I should like that you know them that is better than knowing a few like these.

Acharya Kripalani: I thought that the Defence Minister said yesterday that he would see that we did not see them.

Shri Ranga: He said that you would not be allowed to go anywhere there.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Where?

Acharya Kripalani: He said that he would not allow me to go anywhere near the army.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Obviously, hon. Member is seeing those who criticise them.

Acharya Kripalani: I have not seen anybody, as I have stated. I have said that I have got this information. I have seen nobody but I am willing to see them if the Defence Minister has no objection, because he said yesterday that he would see that Acharya Kripalani did not go near the Army; the Army is his own preserve.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not quite understand.

Acharya Kripalani: It is there; you can see from the records.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I venture to say that I know them well simply because I have functioned in this post for the last thirteen years or for fourteen years.

Acharya Kripalani: We are willing to function with them . . . (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Spēaker: Let us not interrupt like this.

Acharya Kripalani: That is the only thing left to us.

Mr. Speaker: If he is not satisfied with one hour out of eight hours, I do not know how I am going to satisfy him.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: No, Sir. I entirely appreciate and sympathise with the deep feeling to which he gave expression just now. Well, he is in the position of being always with the Opposition.

Acharya, Kripalani: You cannot help it. (*Interruption*).

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: How can I help it? I know I cannot help it! Now, Sir, there are only two points I wish to say. I am sorry I have taken up so much time. One of the points is that I am personally, as Prime Minister, responsible for every senior appointment or promotion in the last two years and longer. The present Defence Minister came in four years ago. There have been other Defence Ministers and they always came to me and I have always discussed with them as to how and who should be given senior appointments. So I have that responsibility. I do not wish to dilate on that.

Secondly, many of the charges made by the hon. Member are charges or condemnations of the broad policies we pursue. For instance, Shri Goray talked about Goa. Our Goa policy may be right or wrong. It is a different matter, but it is no good saying

in connection with the defence estimates, that it is right or not. I is a policy which the Government of India decide, and it may be wrong. You might criticise or condemn or censure the Government of India for it or any other policy. We discussed the China policy and the troubles on our borders. It has been discussed repeatedly. We decide the policy and no individual decides. It is a policy which has been put before this House repeatedly and presumably approved by the House. It may be that some hon. Members do not approve of it. It is my regret that I could not convince them. However, the Defence Minister as such does not decide any policy. In these matters, the person who is most responsible is the Prime Minister and of course the whole Cabinet.

Acharya Kripalani: May I point out that when we are discussing the Demands for Grants of this Ministry . . . (*Interruptions*).

Some Hon. Members: Sit down!

Shri Braj Raj Singh: What is this noise, Sir? Could you not control them?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I would ask Acharya Kripalani—

Several Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: Order order. I am really surprised at the attitude even of Acharya Kripalani. Does he not want that whatever he has said should be answered, and does he expect an answer only on the lines of what he has himself accused? I cannot understand this. (*Interruptions*). Order, order. I am inclined to come to the conclusion, on account of the various interruptions, that unless the Prime Minister admits everyone of the accusations, Acharya Kripalani will not be satisfied! I am really surprised at it.

Acharya Kripalani: I only wanted to say that when we are discussing the Demands of a particular Ministry, we will talk of that Ministry

Mr. Speaker: Very well.

Acharya Kripalani: The Ministry may have the support of the whole House and the whole Cabinet behind it, but when we are talking about the Defence Ministry, we have to talk about the Demands for Grants of that Ministry, and....

Mr. Speaker: Nobody denies it.

Acharya Kripalani: That is all that I wanted to explain. We are discussing the Demands of a particular Ministry. So we will talk of that Ministry and that Ministry may have the support of the Cabinet. But we are not talking of the Cabinet.

Mr. Speaker: Nobody complains about that.

Acharya Kripalani: That is all that I wanted to say.

Mr. Speaker: Nobody is complaining about that.

Acharya Kripalani: The Prime Minister said that it is the Cabinet policy. I have no doubt about that.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: If I may say so, if the hon. Member will hold himself in patience for a while, I shall finish in five minutes. What I was saying was that the broad policy, for instance, the Goa policy, has nothing to do with defence estimates; it is the policy of the Government of India. Let him criticise it certainly or even the policy about our borders, or say Pakistan. Our army follows the directions given to it.

Now, there was reference to an officer, without being named, but nevertheless criticised. I say with complete confidence and knowledge that he is one of our brightest and best officers in the army. I am absolutely certain that if the hon. Member, Acharya Kripalani, knew anything about him he would have the same opinion.

Acharya Kripalani: I will cultivate his friendship!

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is so amazing to me; Shri Goray and others talked in this vein about some of our finest officers in the army. I would say that we have got a good army and good officers generally speaking.

Shri Rajendra Singh: Is the Opposition to be guided by the Prime Minister and have we no opinion of our own here?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member who has made that interjection will never be guided by our opinion. He has chosen the wrong path permanently.

Shri Rajendra Singh: That is the misfortune. (*Interruptions*). That might be his opinion.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That is my misfortune—that he has never followed my opinion. Otherwise, he would have been more helpful. I merely said that casting this kind of aspersion, based on wrong facts, on our distinguished officers is a very improper thing, if I may say so, with all respect.

The second point is this. I may quote what Acharya Kripalani said, when he made the charges, at the end, in a peroration. He said:

"I charge him—

that is, the Defence Minister,—•

"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 and freedom."

What does it mean? I do not understand, except that the hon. Member has spoken so in any angry mood. Talking about the international field, whatever the Defence Minister has done in the international field is to

support the policy of the Government of India, which he proposes to go on doing. If the hon. Member does not agree with that policy, that is my misfortune and his mistake. There it is.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that this kind of wild talk and these wild accusations do not help. They show simply that he approaches the whole question not in an objective way, not with the desire to find out what has happened, but just in an angry way, and in an eloquent way as he has put it. But it is really the anger that has come out. That is not helpful. Anyhow, in considering these matters—army matters are well known to be more delicate than other matters, especially when one talks about individual officers, etc.—I do submit that this House should deal with them in a somewhat different way. I am not seeking to limit the freedom of the House. But it is for the House to realise that the responsibility is not that of an individual; it is a spread-out responsibility, spread ultimately over the whole Government and the Cabinet and certainly the Prime Minister. We have to do our best. We may make mistakes, of course, and the mistakes ought to be rectified or the Government should go. There it is. But for the hon. Member merely to feel rather annoyed that the Government does not go of its own accord, it is rather unfair to us. He talks so much about parliamentary and democratic procedures. But he must accept the fact that the majority functions and the minority also functions in its own right. He does not accept that basic fact and gets angry because the majority goes on functioning. I am sorry I cannot oblige him in that matter. So long as the people of India seem to have greater faith in us than in the hon. Member and his colleagues, we shall continue to function.

Shri Khushwaqt Rai: The hon. Prime Minister said that the majority rules in its own right. In a democratic House has the majority any right to rule in disregard of the rule of law? (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Rajendra Singh: Just one question, Sir. Does the majority enjoy the right to misrule also? (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Shri Ranga.

Shri Ranga: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am glad that the Prime Minister has taken part in this debate because he has been able to make quite a number of things very clear. I have been wondering for sometime whether we are not heading towards a situation where we might have to come face to face with a Naguib and a Nasser. My fears are confirmed by what has been said today by the Prime Minister.

Sir, the Prime Minister has just now advised us to accept the well-known fact that the majority should be allowed to rule. I agree. But, at the same time, if democracy is to be a real democracy and not a mockery, the Opposition also should be respected and should be taken into the fullest possible confidence on such extremely important issues as are before the House. Neither the Prime Minister nor the Defence Minister has taken the trouble at any time to discharge that basic responsibility of theirs as a majority.

Sir, my hon. friend Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru spoke in the usual Kashmir fashion that it was his judgment, that his judgment was fortified by the advice he received from his highest officers and that his judgment was reached over and above the advice or the judgment that had already been reached by his Defence Minister and other senior colleagues in his Cabinet. Well—it is open to us, as he has said in regard to us also—it is not necessary for us to accept his judgment, the rationale of his judgment and the wisdom of his judgment.

And what is more, till the other day until he passed away, there was one of his most bosom comrades and that was Maulana Azad. I need not ask

[Shri Ranga]

the House to do anything more than read what Maulana Azad has written about what he thought about the judgment of the Prime Minister especially in regard to the choice of men. He has made it very clear as to what he thought of the Prime Minister's judgment, what opinion he formed in regard to the choice of the Defence Minister. I need not have to say anything more.

Then, Sir, you were good enough to say—the hon. Prime Minister also took advantage of it—that it was only one appointment. Yes, it is one appointment. It is true. But it is a capital appointment, it is a kingpin appointment, it is an appointment the incumbent of which would have in his responsibility a power which can be used in the right way or wrong way. If it is used in the right way, India will be strengthened, provided of course the Cabinet would have the judgment to give the proper orders to that officer and to the whole of the defence forces.

My complaint is that this Government has failed in its duty in regard to China. It is not the fault of the defence forces that the Chinese were allowed to come in here. It is the fault of the Defence Minister, the Defence Ministry and the whole Cabinet.

An Hon. Member: No, no.

Shri Ranga: If you are happy with your family, I wish you all success, I wish you all happiness (*Interruption*). We are all used to indissoluble marriages. In spite of that they were again passing the Hindu Law (Amendment) Bill where divorce is provided for (*Interruption*).

I was saying, Sir, that they have failed miserably—the Cabinet as well as the Defence Minister—in giving the timely, proper, heroic and necessary orders to our defence forces to keep away the enemy from our borders. After having allowed all those

people to come into our country, even then they are not yet ready to give the necessary orders. On the other hand, my hon. friend, one of the very brilliant speakers in the party in power, has been good enough to speak on their behalf that the golden moment was going to come, the shining hour was going to come when the orders would be given. By whom? I do not know. Is it by the present Defence Minister or by the future Defence Minister? God only knows. Till then we have to go on with bated breath. In the meantime the Prime Minister wanted this House, this Parliament as well as the country to believe that in God's own good time—they do not believe even in Gods—the Chinese would see the wisdom to withdraw the troops and leave all the area, area as big as Bastar, as big as half of West Bengal. All this area has been occupied by other people and all the time the Defence Ministry here was doing nothing. It is bent upon doing nothing until the shining hour comes, until the shining star dances on them.

We are interested in this not because anybody has been doing any lobbying. As things are here, we do not have the advantage of any lobbying. It is the duty, the elementary duty of every one of the Members of this House to be concerned as to what goes on in this most important department of our Government.

Acharya Kripalani: The Defence Minister would not allow us.

Shri Ranga: He would not allow us to go anywhere near. That was the attitude of the British Government. They never allowed us to go anywhere there. And the most extra-ordinary thing is, some hon. friend here, from the Communist benches, yesterday, was asking us to be prepared to democratise our army. The cause of democratisation must be indeed very dear to the Defence Minister, because it is a process which is evolved out of

Marxism. He is certainly one of the best students of Marxism. Therefore, in this process of democratisation we are to be content with whomsoever they give as the Chief of Staff.

What would be the consequences of it. I need not go into the details and the various names of all these people. You were good enough, Sir, to allow the Prime Minister to put in again a chit in favour of the present Chief of Staff, the new Chief of Staff. But we were not allowed to go into the manner in which this has been done, the manner in which he has been raised to this highest position, the various stages by which four Major Generals were over-ruled when he got the earlier promotion and, thereafter, how one of these Major Generals was given stepped-up promotions in order to appease him and remove his hysterics because he was very closely related to one of the members of the Cabinet. Again, afterwards there was one other promotion and some other promotions also. The hon. Prime Minister says our facts are all wrong. Very well. Then, how are we to accept these facts. He says the majority is behind him, they would accept it. Sir, this is not parliamentary democracy. In parliamentary democracy when facts are in dispute, when the minority also feels so very strongly on this question of national importance, they should be willing, if they really believe that Caesar's wife is really chaste, to accept an impartial high-powered commission to go into the matter and study all the facts.

Mr. Speaker: Just as there are civil service lists giving the seniority, age, date of appointment etc., are there no military service lists?

Shri Ranga: I am coming to that. Sir, there was a time when all these Indian officers who were till then holding the King's Commission were given an assurance that if they were to accept the President's Commission they would be given some privileges that they had been enjoying. It was only after that the new rules were

brought in. How they did it, was it honourable, was it honest with them etc., I do not know. Anyhow they did it. Why did they accept, they might ask. They had no other go and so they accepted it. They have been implementing it.

Now I am coming to another point. The Defence Minister gave some information yesterday. He said that the selection of these high officers is being made by a Board called the No. 1 Selection Board. He also gave the procedure followed in promoting officers to higher posts. This Board consisted of senior officers of the Army, the Army Commanders or the Staff Officers and their corresponding members in the Indian Air Force and the Navy. It comes to this. The Three Chiefs of Staff are there. These three are within the gift of the Cabinet. These three and another officer sit in the Selection Board with one or two other people. They make the choice of other officers. Then those officers again, in their turn, go on getting into their respective selection committees where they go on selecting other officers. Thus the vicious process goes on. All that they have to do is to meddle with the kingpin. The moment I have the kingpin and the three associated kingpins then the chess board is ready. That is how a selection can be rigged, and the fear is that it is being rigged. We would like to know the facts. It is for that reason Acharya Kripalani has thrown a challenge yesterday. It is a challenge to their moral integrity. Let them accept it. If they do not accept it, although they have a huge majority the country will pass its own judgment, pass its own view. The country also may not be able to assert itself against this machine which is there. The British were also here with all the plenitude of their power. You, Sir, myself Panditji and other friends, all of us, rose against that British Government and, in those days, we knew we were a hopeless minority just as we are today. They were all considering us to be ridiculous minority and yet that minority has been

[Shri Ranga]

turned into this biggest machine of majority. So, if they were to hurt the conscience of the country, a time might also come when we will have the opportunity and if we will make some mistakes (*Interruptions*) we should be kicked out also, as they should be kicked out at the next elections, if only the people were ever to have the necessary moral courage.

Shri K. D. Malaviya: Acharya Ranga is the conscience keeper of the people.

Shri Ranga: I know my hon. friend's conscience is somewhere there kept in oil. We keep things like *Murda* in oil.

Therefore, I say the basic duties of the Defence Ministry are to maintain the efficiency, unity, discipline and sense of contentment and spirit of loyalty of the defence forces. Now, just look at it. The hon. Minister gave information yesterday about the number of people passed over. How many? Oh! any number of them! Hundreds of these people have been passed over. He said that 226 Majors were promoted as Lieutenant-colonels, superseding 485 officers. 485 officers are left there as dead wood.

Shri K. D. Malaviya: What is the quoting from?

Shri Ranga: I am only quoting the figures from his speech; nothing of my own. For the rank of colonels, 70 were promoted and 83 superseded; for brigadiers 39 were promoted and 57 superseded; for major generals 7 were promoted and 17 superseded; for lieutenant generals 4 were promoted and five were superseded. The story goes on. When all these poor fellows were left behind, what are their subordinate and fellow-officers to think about them? That they are useless! Who is affecting the morale of the defence forces, of the army? Not we. They do it by this process, because the men are condemned in this way. A man takes courage in both the hands and appears before the Selection Committee. They want him to take the chance and he has taken the chance.

Then he misses it. So many of his fellow-officers are promoted and they are high above him. What about the morale of the officers who are below them, various cadres and all that? They go on thinking for the next 5 or 10 years that these particular officers are condemned to remain where they have been, that they are useless, duds and dead wood. That is the impression that my hon. friend, the Defence Minister is creating. It is he who is disrupting the morale of the army, not the Opposition. It is the Cabinet which has been responsible for allowing him to do this, not the Opposition. I would like to call it "mischief", but I suspend my judgment pending their readiness to appoint a committee to go into this matter and let them say whether it is mischief or not.

Shri Tyagi: Is it parliamentary?

Shri Ranga: The duty of the army is to protect the territorial integrity of our country and to take the quickest, the most spirited and effective steps to resist and repel aggressors and thus guard the country from foreign aggression. When my hon. friend was told that he should capture Goa, he was saying about our other border that there are no people there, we are building the roads now, we are taking so many other steps, therefore wait. We go on waiting. Should we wait for the Third, Fourth or Fifth Five Year Plan? We have finished two Five Year Plans and we are already in the Third Plan. What did they do in the Second Plan? The Defence Ministry came to this House and got money passed. They had made schemes, plans and estimates and we passed them. This House also gave them money to the tune of Rs. 17 crores. My hon. friend also took credit for the saving effected for economy in this country while the enemy was coming in. We might not know when the enemy came and trespassed into our territory. But my hon. friend must have or should have known it. If he had not known it, he is not

worthy of his job. If he had known it and was not able to repel them, he does not deserve to be there, though he is being kept here. He told us yesterday why the enemies continue to be there. I hope he would be able to give us some reply on this point when he comes back again to make his second speech.

That is why I maintain that on all these three counts the Defence Ministry has failed the country. For this most disastrous consumation, the political and temperamental attitudes and activities of the Defence Minister have been largely responsible. Our friends have already referred to it.

Then some reference was made to the Russian pilots being allowed to go to our borders. Since we have purchased the Russian planes, they have become our planes. Then the Russian pilots came in and they were requested to teach our pilots. But they did not find any other area to fly and teach our people. Therefore, they went over the Himalayas, which is a disputed area, so that they would keep all their eyes wide open. They are not like horses which are made to see only in one direction. These are human beings and very clever, efficient, politically democratised pilots. That is one of the reasons why I say there must be certain political predilections. Many people have accused my friend as being a fellow-traveller of the Communists. It is not necessary for me to make that charge, because quite a number of fellow-travellers are now being welcomed back again into the Congress party and various other political parties also, as soon as they undergo the Ganga-snana. So, there is nothing special about it. Now, the defence forces, more especially the army, have been seething with a high sense of injustice.

Mr. Speaker: Does it apply to all parties or is it an exception?

Shri Ranga: I said "other political parties also." My hon. friends have been sleeping. I am glad you have

woken them up. The pity of it is that I have already said "other political parties also."

The Defence Forces, more especially the army, have been seething with a high sense of injustice done to its leadership and also to the ranks by the irrational, unjust and even personally provocative methods and manner adopted by the Defence Minister. When I say this, my hon. friend, replies that the morale of the army is never higher than what it is today, and it is more national-minded than it had ever been. It is a customary thing when a marriage takes place, even though we know the bridegroom is not good-looking and the bride and bride-groom are not properly matched and it is a marriage between beauty and the beast, yet to say when we go to that place: शतयुः भक्तु ।

were the British. They also used to say like that. You, Sir, were also on our side at that time. They used to say that the morale of the army, navy and air force was so great. They used to say that it was so great until the naval strike had taken place in Bombay. Only Lord knows what would happen. But we should have eyes to see that this kind of mismanagement is bound to have bad effects on the morale of the army.

There is a widespread impression that the activities of the Defence Minister, especially in utilising the Russian pilots to fly in our planes over the Himalayas are likely to weaken our position as against the Chinese aggression.

Then there is the failure of the Defence Ministry to build up our defence equipment and forces, as revealed for example by the non-development of all those projects, writ large in the reports of the Public Accounts Committee. But, on the other hand, my hon. friend says "Oh, we have produced so many things." But the Rehabilitation Ministry has told us the sort of stuff they are producing. Then they say "they are sabotaging us". One Communist friend has come to the rescue of him by

[Shri Ranga]

saying that Rehabilitation Ministry is sabotaging them. Here is a Cabinet which is united. All of them enjoy the confidence of the Prime Minister. The Rehabilitation Minister also enjoys the confidence of the Prime Minister, whereas the Defence Minister is the closest to the Prime Minister. Why is it that they have not been able to prevent this kind of sabotage? Actually, it is not a sabotage. They are all facts. They were published in *The Hindustan Times*.

Acharya Kripalani: Yes, one department sabotages the other.

Shri Ranga: Machines that have been produced by the Defence Department were not good enough, were too costly and useless to be utilized.

My hon. friend wanted to say, "Lo and behold the number of hours that have been lost as a result of strikes have come down considerably." Yes, it has come down because the fellow-travellers and the travellers were hand in glove with each other. Only in one place there was the INTUC. In all other places labour unions of the patriotic type are not functioning. I have gone to these ordnance factories along with so many of my colleagues who were members of the Public Accounts Committee. We were able to get in touch with the labour leaders as well as with the labour ranks there. We were surprised to find that the INTUC had no hold there at all. The Indian National Trade Union Congress had no hold. But, on the other hand, the other trade union congress, which is hand in glove with those visitors who have come to Vijavawada the other day, is having a tight control.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): Sir, I rise on a point of order. The hon. Member is casting some aspersions. There is the All-India Defence Employees Federation with 135 unions. None of the unions is affiliated to the AITUC. Shri S. M. Joshi who is the undisputed leader of this Federation

is not a Communist. It is absolutely wrong.

Shri Ranga: For very good reasons they are not affiliated. Actually I came to know that Shri S. M. Joshi controls only one union.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: No; 135. He controls them. But his party was defeated and he secured only 5,000 votes in Delhi.

Mr. Speaker: Anyway, that is the opinion of the hon. Member. What can be done?

Shri Ranga: When somebody goes on shouting "Thief, thief" . . .

Shri S. M. Banerjee: No shouting.

Shri Ranga: . . . Somebody went on searching his whole house.

I have deeply considered the process of revising and implementing these rules governing the service conditions of officers which was mooted early in 1948. But in reality it came to be utilised to oust the seniormost officers as quickly as possible. Gradually the officer cadre is being demoralised by the innovation of over-ruling seniority on the alleged plea of efficiency. When it suits them they use seniority against efficiency. About 20 officers in the ranks of Major-Generals and above have been retired on an average of less than fifty years or so when even Lieutenant-Colonels normally remain in service.

One hon. friend was saying that there is dearth of officers. Is this just the time for losing all the senior officers and helping these people to retire? Should this thing have happened when there was acute shortage of top ranking officers? Our present requirements are said to be at least 1,000 for officers of the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel and higher ranks. Even under such circumstances, the age of retirement is reduced when it is not done in any other service in this country. These shorter tenures are being introduced even in the case of Generals and Brigadiers' ranks ostensibly to help younger officers to obtain

quick promotion. In reality this procedure has exposed the careers of the seniormost officers to the tender mercies of the hon. Defence Minister.

Shri V. P. Nayar (Quilon): He will take one hour.

Shri Ranga: I am the only person to speak on behalf of my Party . . . (Interruption).

Shri V. P. Nayar: How many pages more are there?

Shri Ranga: It is too much and too hot for them. It is feared my many . . .

Shri V. P. Nayar: It appears that it will take another hour to read through his entire speech. He can either speak or read.

Shri Ranga: I suggest that the commission suggested by my hon. friend, Acharya Kripalani, should go into the justification for the successive promotions of the most favourite General of the Ministry to the detriment of better or equally good claims of his seniors. It will also have to study why the same yardstick, either of seniority or of efficiency or both, has not been used consistently and fairly without any ulterior motive or extraneous purpose with the result that four efficient, loyal and senior Generals—I am not giving any names—have come to be superseded for the benefit of one favourite.

Then, why were the claims of the General who was awarded . . . (Interruption) the Vir Chakra overlooked? Could it have been due to his disagreement with the hon. Defence Minister and his loyalty to the Chief of Staff in accordance with the time-honoured sense of discipline and military honour? If that Vir Chakra General is junior to the more fortunate General and so he was not promoted as it is claimed, why was it that another General who is senior to his successful rival was overlooked for promotion? All these things we want to be discussed.

167(ai) LS—7.

Then, I think it is high time that the hon. Prime Minister and Parliament realise the need to request the President to discharge his responsibility as the Supreme Commander of the Defence Forces by being ready to play an effective role in this aspect of the management of the Defence Forces. The hon. Defence Minister has made so much play of public interest. Who is best able to interpret what it is from time to time? Surely, it can only be the President because he represents not only this Parliament and this Ministry but also all the State legislatures. He is the supreme constitutional head and the elected leader of the whole Indian democracy. So I propose that the hon. Prime Minister should welcome his active participation in this sphere.

Then I suggest that there should be an Army Council to settle these matters, not for this particular occasion but for future guidance also because the hon. Defence Minister may be good enough to vacate his office but some other Defence Minister who will come may also prove to be just as difficult or unreasonable. Therefore we would like a regular Army Council to be organised in this country on the same lines on which it has been organised in England with very good results. They have the Secretary of State for War as the President, the Permanent Under Secretary for War as Vice-President and the members are the Chief of General Staff, Vice-Chief of General Staff, the Deputy Chief of General Staff, the Adjutant General, the Quartermaster General and the Master General of Ordnance, and the Permanent Under Secretary for War as Secretary. What I am suggesting for this country is that on those lines the Army Council should be set up preferably with the President as the Chairman, because the President is the Supreme Commander, the hon. Defence Minister as the Vice-Chairman, the seniormost Army officers as members and the Defence Secretary as Secretary. For day to day affairs, I suggest, a smaller executive committee of the Army Council

[Shri Ranga]

may be set up with the hon. Defence Minister as the Chairman. Time does not permit me to go into the details of such a scheme. It is the principle of the Army Council with collective executive authority that I am placing before the House.

Some Hon. Members: It may be laid on the Table of the House.

Shri Ranga: I am prepared to place a copy of it on the Table of the House. Here is an open letter to Shri Morarji Desai . . . (*Interruption*).

Yes, *Current** I am not ashamed to quote *The Current* because it was the Editor of *The Current* who first of all warned this country about the disastrous policy of the Government in regard to Tibet and China. Kindly read the book *Jawaharlal Nehru: The Lotus Eater from Kashmir*. There you will find all these facts. Therefore why should I fight shy of this paper at all?

I suggest that this Army Council should be brought into existence. I also suggest that every year at least once you should be good enough to persuade the Government to agree to the convening of a secret session of Parliament to discuss all these things without the impediment of our rules, conventions and various other things in regard to publicity. Then this Commission that has been suggested by Acharya Kripalani should be set up.

I have never had any antipathy towards the hon. Defence Minister. We have known each other for the last 30 years now. I have never belonged to the so-called anti-Menon or pro-Menon lobby. Those lobbies are coming up, but I have never belonged to them. I have held him in respect. He was good enough to flatter me by saying at one time that I was the roving unofficial Foreign Minister of India. I held two receptions in this city in his honour because I wanted to

strengthen him when he was hailed by the Americans as their worst possible enemy. Yet, I have come to the conclusion that the time has come when feelings all over India are running so high in regard to the role that he has been playing in the Defence Forces in these four or five years, that he would be well-advised to vacate this office. He would be rendering a great service to the hon. Prime Minister for whom he has been doing so much service even from those days when his books used to be edited by Shri Krishna Menon in England. For his benefit at least, he should be good enough to vacate this office and if the hon. Prime Minister and himself cannot be separated from each other like Siamese twins, then let him at least be content to remain as Minister without Portfolio and be satisfied with the ambassadorial status which he has been enjoying for such a long time at the United Nations.

Shri Ajit Singh Sarhadi (Ludhiana): It is a matter of profound regret that the Defence Forces and their personnel should have become the subject-matter of controversy, because . . .

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Ferozabad): May I request that the time for this debate may be extended?

Mr. Speaker: I said that I would call the hon. Minister at 2-45 p.m. We shall carry on now, till 4 p.m.; so, I shall call the hon. Minister at 3-15 p.m.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: May I submit that there are still many Members who want to speak?

Shri Krishna Menon: I shall try to finish in about 45 minutes, but so many new points are being raised, and, therefore probably I may take an hour.

Mr. Speaker: I am only extending the time by half an hour.

Shri Krishna Menon: That is in your discretion.

*The Speaker not having subsequently accorded the necessary permission, the document was not treated as laid on the Table.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Only one Member has spoken so far from our Party. I hope you will give our Party at least as much time as you have given to Acharya Kripalani and Shri Ranga. Our Party which is the biggest group in the Opposition has been given only very little time so far. Therefore, I would request you to give some more time to the second speaker from our party.

Mr. Speaker: If the first speaker had wanted more time, I would have given him.

Shri V. P. Nayar: We did not want to take the whole time for a single Member. We shall be splitting up the time allotted to us for two Members.

Shri Vajpayee (Balrampur): There are other parties which have not been represented so far.

Mr. Speaker: I cannot allow all the parties.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: This is an important subject.

Shri Ajit Singh Sarhadi: It is really unfortunate that the Defence Services and their personnel should have been the subject of controversy in the Parliament. The Defence Services constitute a national asset and as such should be looked at from a national point of view and not from a party point of view. Therefore, the controversy that has come in about the personnel or their promotions, etc. is most unfortunate, and it does not give any credit to us.

I would submit that the Defence Services deserve the congratulations not only of this House but of the entire country for their achievements not only in the national field but also in the international field. They have brought credit to the country for the peace mission in the Gaza Strip, and now in the Congo, and in other fields in the world. In the national field too, they have brought us credit for the assistance they have rendered to the civil authorities, as, for instance, in

Rohtak and other places, including even in the Bhakra Dam. I would particularly draw the attention of the House to the very creditable work which the Defence personnel did at the Bhakra dam in salvaging the equipment, closing the tunnel and in rendering the service that they did.

In this connection, I would congratulate the Defence Ministry and the Defence Minister also on the very significant progress that the Defence Production Organisation has made in the country and the way it has tried to reach self-sufficiency. The figures that have been given in the report indicate the creditable achievement of production worth Rs. 17 crores during the months from April to November, which is something of which the Defence Ministry and the country should be proud. I am really sorry that criticism should have been levelled at the Defence Production Organisation by certain hon. Members. I would say certainly that I still hope that however highly placed certain Members of the Opposition may be, and whatever high respect they might command in the country, they would not bring in matters which are of a controversial nature because that would affect the morale not only of the defence personnel and the defence organisation but also of those who are working in the production sector of the Defence Forces.

I am afraid that the Leaders of the Opposition cannot be aware of and cannot be acquainted with the facts to that extent as those who are in charge of this. Therefore, to make a criticism on the information and knowledge that is made available to them from the disgruntled or dissatisfied elements is, I think, not just, inasmuch as that cannot be correct.

Acharya Kripalani brought forward a criticism on the working of the Defence Production Organisation by saying that Rs. 953 lakhs worth of defence products had been rejected. If only he had been aware of the way and the nature of the production of the delicate materials of which the

[Shri Ajit Singh Sarhadi]

Defence Production Organisation is in charge, I believe he would not have made that criticism. Even if such large quantities had been rejected, it has to be judged in the light of the total production of about Rs. 30 crores per year. Therefore, I submit, despite the rejection that has been there, and considering the fact that the Production Organisation is at its developmental stage, and it is at its primary stage, this rejection does not reflect any inefficiency; that only shows how well we are going on.

Again, criticism was levelled at the production of ammunition, and it was said that a large part had been rejected. But I regret that facts have not been properly stated, as the Prime Minister had been pleased to remark. We find from the figures of production of ammunition, that in 1959-60 whereas the total production was Rs. 103 lakhs, the rejection was only Rs. 79 lakhs. So, here also, I can say that the criticism is not well placed and is not justified.

Again, I would submit that it is really a compliment to our Defence Production Organisation, and indeed it is very creditable of them that from the ordinary plane, recently, they have gone into the production of the jet plane, and they are manufacturing every machinery right from a plane up to even a button. When this is the case, I cannot understand how criticism can be levelled at this organisation. If we look at the figures during the last four years, of any project under the Defence Ministry, whether it be the Bharat Electronics Ltd. or it be the Hindustan Aircraft Limited, or whether it be the ordnance factories, we find that really the production has been such as would bring credit to the Defence Ministry and to the Defence Minister. Therefore, I submit that such criticism that there has been rejection here or rejection there is not justified and is not called for.

I was referring to the ammunition. Here, I may say that I am myself a little of a shikari, and I use cartridges. I find that the cartridges that have come from the ordnance factories at Calcutta are much better than what I was using previously, namely the imported Eley cartridges and others. I am not a military man, but I can say that the ammunition that I am using in my gun can compare very well with other cartridges. Even if there has been any rejection, that is only natural at the initial stages.

Therefore, it pains me that this kind of criticism should have been made of the Defence Ministry which has done so much in the matter of defence production.

Of course, I can certainly say that the Defence Research Organisation has not been given that attention that it deserves. I do not know where the bottle-neck is or where the hurdle is. I would say that the Defence Research Organisation should have that status or that position which the Atomic Energy Commission has got, and the bottle-necks of the UPSC or the Finance Ministry etc. should not be there. A bulk amount should be placed at their disposal so that they can spend as they want, and they may be in a position to have the best talent from the country in the research organisation.

I considered it really unfortunate when I found from the report that only 21 people had been sent to foreign countries for training. It shocked me when I read that during the year to come, there are only about six senior officers who are being sent for training, and only about 44 junior officers possibly being sent for training. Probably, the hon. Minister finds some hurdle from the Finance Ministry or from some other quarter, but whatever the hurdle be, it is the duty of this House and the duty of the country to see that the Defence Search Organisation and the

Defence Production Organisation are given greater importance, and we are able to put ample funds at their disposal so that they may devote full attention to research and production. Particularly in present conditions when war has become a highly technical affair, when technological and scientific developments have advanced to that extent, we should lay emphasis on this aspect and see how we can better our position.

14 hrs.

Again I congratulate the hon. Minister and his Ministry on a very creditable achievement in the matter of the National Cadet Corps. He made a commitment last year that he would reach the target figure of half a million. He has reached that target; rather he has exceeded it. It is a matter of great achievement. But I beg to differ from him so far as the approach which he is making towards this is concerned. He says that we do not want to militarise the students and youth; rather this is a sort of training ground for them. I would like to say that we have reached a stage, with two unfriendly countries on the north and the west, when we should militarise the youth of the country. Of course, I know he has got a plan, and from what I have heard from him in the Consultative Committee, I do hope that this is not the end of the training of the students. I am sure the MCC will be further expanded. But still I would say that I would look upon it as a second line of defence. We have to have on our borders defence arrangements of a certain depth. To this end, if it becomes necessary, we should give compulsory training to students and youth.

I also complaint the Ministry in the matter of the Territorial Army, the Auxilliary Force and the Lok Sahayak Sena. I find that the allocations in this respect are more than what they were previously. Of course, that is the criterion for my judgment. But I would still urge

that there should be larger allocations and more expansion and we should have military training for these people.

Now, I come to one or two other points. Certain criticism has been levelled about promotions. This is a ground which I fear to tread, because I feel that in the matter of promotions, there should be absolutely no controversy. As I said earlier, it is the Minister who is responsible for it. As the Prime Minister said earlier, he is equally responsible for it along with the Home Minister. All the members of the promotion sub-committee or appointments committee are responsible for it. Whatever their decision be, it depends on the papers they have got before them.

One of the leaders of the Opposition said something on this, of course from his information. But I would certainly say that record is not the only criterion to be taken into account in the matter of promotion of an officer. An officer may be very efficient. But there is also another factor, the reputation of the individual. I for one know that in certain cases the records of the officers may be very good. But when one has to select a man for the highest job in this field, one has also to look into the reputation of that individual and many other things.

Therefore, I would say that whatever the Defence Minister has done in the matter of selection has been done after considering all the facts; he has the opportunity of knowing all the facts and is well-placed and qualified to come to a decision. The knowledge of the leader of a group in respect of the qualifications of an officer, however highly placed he may be and whatever he may have contributed, cannot be considered as authentic inasmuch as the information he has obtained is second-hand. Therefore, his statement is not justified.

[Shri Ajit Singh Sarhadi]

Now I will take up one project only, the Bharat Electronics. I need not deal with the other points dealt with by Acharya Kripalani, because I do believe that the transaction regarding road building and other things are not matters which should have been brought in here. These matters—road building, storage and all sorts of things—relate to a period when the present Defence Minister was not in charge of the Defence portfolio. Therefore, the issues that pertain to these items should not be taken up now. Even if they are taken up, I would ask hon. Members to consider whether with a huge budget such as that of the Defence Ministry, such things are not inevitable.

As regards the promotion of a Captain Superintendent, at the time when he was promoted, the matter of inquiry was not there at all. The question of inquiry came up in April 1959, while the officers had been promoted in the month of October before. This is only a digression. The main thing I was referring to was about the Bharat Electronics.

The Bharat Electronics project is a very important project. Of course, I do not want the hon. Minister to divulge secrets about it; nor do we expect him to do so.

14.06 hrs.

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA in the Chair].

We have got absolute confidence in the Ministry and we believe that whatever they do will be the correct thing, because they are handling a department which deals with the defence of the country and as such, it is their function to look into all the aspects and do the right thing. But I would certainly say that the original purpose for which the Bharat Electronics was started was the development of radar. I am sure the hon. Minister would refer to it in his

reply, but it is very unfortunate that there is not the least reference to this aspect of the work of Bharat Electronics in the Report. We have been told that an agreement is there with the Japanese under which transmitters have been brought in here. Has there been proper planning in this? What are the components imported and what are the components manufactured here? As regards production, they have reached the figure of Rs. 1.10 crores. They have exceeded the target by Rs. 10 lakhs. I quite appreciate that. But is it all assembly or sub-assembly or manufactured here? The Bharat Electronics can claim credit only for what is manufactured here and not for what is imported.

Therefore, I would beg of the hon. Minister to look into the affairs of the Bharat Electronics. Sometime ago, the Estimates Committee had also made some carping criticism about it. Therefore, we would like the hon. Minister to inquire into it.

I would not take more time. In conclusion, I would only say that it is very unfortunate that the Defence Ministry, which has done so well during the last four years in all the spheres—operational, functional, ordinance and others—should be made a target of criticism by parties rather than of appreciation. With these few observations, I support the Demands of the Ministry.

श्री भक्त दर्शन (गढ़वाल) : सभापति महोदय, प्रतिरक्षा मंत्रालय के अनुदानों की मांगों पर विचार करते समय मैं अपना यह कर्तव्य समझता हूँ कि भारत की सशस्त्र सेनाओं के प्रति, जिन्होंने पिछले एक वर्ष तक भारत की सीमाओं की रक्षा में इतनी तत्परता और योग्यता से कार्य किया, अपनी वार्षिक पुष्पाञ्जलि अर्पित करें ।

पिछले वर्षों में हमारे देश में चारों ओर से जो संकट के बादल छाड़े होते रहे हैं, उनके

होते हुए भी गरम से गरम जगहों में, समुद्र के तैरते हुए पानी में, हिमालय की चोटियों पर, राजस्थान के रेगिस्तानों में, नागा पहाड़ियों पर, सब ध्रौर हमारे सैनिकों ने जिस बीरता का परिचय दिया है, उससे हमारा मस्तक ऊंचा हो जाता है। केवल देश के अन्दर ही नहीं, देश के बाहर विदेशों में जाकर जिस तत्परता से, जिस कर्तव्यपरायणता से, उन्होंने अपने कार्य का निर्वहन किया है उससे भारतीय सशस्त्र सेनाओं के प्रति जनता की आस्था और श्रद्धा और भी बढ़ जाती है।

इससे पहले कि मैं चन्द बातें अपनी ध्रौर से इस मंत्रालय के विषय में कहूँ, मैं यह निवेदन कर देना अपना कर्तव्य समझता हूँ कि कल विरोधी पक्ष के प्रवक्ताओं के जो लम्बे-लम्बे भाषण हुए और आज जो एक के बाद एक माननीय सदस्यों ने अपने विचार व्यक्त किये, उनको सुनकर मुझे बड़ा आश्चर्य और दुःख हुआ। जब मैं अपने आदरणीय मित्र आचार्य कृपालानी जी के भाषण को सुन रहा था—जिनके प्रति कि मदन के प्रत्येक सदस्य के हृदय में गहरी श्रद्धा है, जो हमारे राष्ट्रपिता के अग्र्यतम शिष्यों में से एक है—तो मुझे उनके प्रति आदर रखने हुए भी यह खयाल हुआ कि शायद हमारे भारत के इतिहास के पुराने दुर्बासा ऋषि फिर से नये रूप में प्रकट हो गये हैं। उन से हम आशा करते थे कि वे रचनात्मक दृष्टिकोण को अपनायेंगे। लेकिन उन्होंने उस रचनात्मक दृष्टिकोण के बदले केवल ध्वंसात्मक आलोचना का ही आश्रय लिया। इससे आश्चर्य के साथ-साथ मुझे खेद और क्षोभ होता है। उन्होंने यहां पर उच्च सैनिक अधिकारियों को पदोन्नतियों और नियुक्तियों के सम्बन्ध में जो बातें कहीं, मैं उन के बारे में उनसे तथा अपने विरोधी पक्ष के महानुभावों से नग्नतापूर्वक यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि इन बातों को यहां पर उठा कर के वे देश की किसी प्रकार की सेवा नहीं कर रहे हैं बल्कि बह एक ऐसे ज्वालामुखी को बढ़काने का कर्ब अपने माथे पर ढगा

रहे हैं जोकि हमारे देश को और हमारे देश के लोकतंत्र को और हमारे देश के सार्वजनिक जीवन को सदैव के लिए कभी भी समाप्त कर सकता है। इसलिए इस सम्बन्ध में जितनी भी कम चर्चा की जाय उतना ही हमारे लिए उचित होगा।

श्रीमन्, कल हमारे योग्य प्रतिरक्षा मंत्री महोदय ने एक बहुत ही विस्तृत और तथ्यपूर्ण वक्तव्य यहां पर दिया और उन्होंने विस्तार के साथ इस पर प्रकाश डाला कि किन सिद्धान्तों के आधार पर, किम प्रणाली के द्वारा और किस प्रोसिज्योर के द्वारा सेना के अदर पदोन्नतियों की जाती है और नई नियुक्तियों की जाती है। आज माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी ने भी उस पर अपने विचार प्रकट किये। इन सब के बावजूद भी मैं ने देखा कि हमारे आदरणीय प्रोफेसर रंगा ने फिर भी अपना वही पुराना राग झलापा और मुझे उसे सुन कर आश्चर्य हुआ। मैं उन से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि उनको ऐसे मसलों के बारे में अपने प्रधान मंत्री महोदय और अपने प्रतिरक्षा मंत्री पर अटल विश्वास रखना चाहिए। जब प्रधान मंत्री महोदय ने यह स्वीकार कर लिया कि उन सब नियुक्तियों की जिम्मेदारी उनके कंधों पर है और उन्होंने प्रत्येक मामले में गहराई से खानबीन की है तो हमें उनके शब्दों पर विश्वास करना चाहिए। लेकिन ऐसा न करके यदि हम उनके बारे में यहाँ इस तरीके से वादविवाद करते रहेंगे तो हम इस सदन का ही नहीं बल्कि देश के अमूल्य समय को नष्ट करने के अपराधी घोषित किये जायेंगे।

आचार्य कृपालानी ने बीच में टोकते हुए प्रधान मंत्री जी से यह कहा था कि हमारे रक्षा मंत्री महोदय ने अक्षरों के सम्बाद-वाताओं को तो बुलाया और उनसे कुछ बातें कहीं लेकिन विरोधी पक्ष के नेताओं को नहीं बुलाया। मैं इस सम्बन्ध में अपने रक्षा मंत्री महोदय को यह नम्र मुखाव देना चाहता हूँ

[श्री भक्त दर्शन]

कि ऐसे महत्वपूर्ण विषयों पर अग़र वह विरोधी दल के लोगों और कांग्रेस के प्रमुख लोगों को अपने विश्वास में ले लिया करें और उनको भी उन बातों से परिचित करा दिया करें तो उससे स्थिति सरल हो जायगी। आचार्य कृपालानी के कथन से मुझे यह ध्वनि निकलती मालूम पड़ी कि अग़र कभी कभी विरोधी पक्ष के लोगों को हमारे प्रतिरक्षा मंत्री महोदय चाय की प्याली पर बुला लिया करें तो शायद उनकी कड़वाहट कुछ कम हो जायगी।

जब से हमारे देश में विदेशी आक्रमण का खतरा बढ़ा है हमारे सशस्त्र सैनिकों की संख्या में स्वभावतः वृद्धि की गई है और अफसरों की संख्या में भी वृद्धि की गई है। लेकिन जैसा कि इस मंत्रालय की वार्षिक रिपोर्ट के पृष्ठ ४ पर बतलाया गया है कि किस प्रकार अफसरों की संख्या में जो कमी है, उसकी पूर्ति की जा रही है। इस मंत्रालय की ओर से प्रयत्न किया जा रहा है कि अच्छे से अच्छे अफसर बड़ी से बड़ी संख्या में भरती किये जायें और उनको अच्छी से अच्छी ट्रेनिंग दी जाय। कल मंत्री महोदय ने बतलाया था कि खड़कवासला में जो गौरवपूर्ण संस्थान चल रहा है वहां पर पूरी संख्या में अभी तक छात्र नहीं आ रहे हैं और जो आ रहे हैं वह उमर स्टैंडर्ड के नहीं हैं उस स्तर के नहीं है जिसकी कि प्राशा की जाती है। इस सम्बन्ध में मैं यह सुझाव देना चाहता हूँ कि अभी तक विश्वविद्यालयों, यूनियन पब्लिक सर्विस कमिशन और सर्विसेज सेलेक्शन बोर्ड की मार्फत भर्तियाँ कियी करते हैं। इसके सम्बन्ध में स्वयं सैनिक अधिकारियों को यह ध्याम अनुभव हुआ है कि मौका पाने पर उनके अंदर वह दृढ़ता अभी तक नहीं देखी गई है जिसकी कि उनसे प्राशा की जाती है। इसलिए मैं यह सुझाव देना चाहता हूँ कि अभी तक कमिशांड आफिसर्स के लिए जो केवल १० प्रतिशत: जे० सी० धोज० या अदर रेक्स लिये जाते हैं, वे और अधिक संख्या में लिये जाने चाहिए।

कल प्रतिरक्षा मंत्री महोदय ने बतलाया था कि नौगांव में एक आफिसर्स कैंडेट कालिज खोला गया है जिसमें कि ऐसे सैनिकों को जिनके कि अंदर प्रतिभा है, योग्यता है, उनको ट्रेनिंग देने की व्यवस्था की गई है। यह बड़ा अच्छा इंतजाम किया जा रहा है। जो लोग सैनिक के रूप में सेना के अंदर रह चके हैं और वहां के कष्टों को भगत चके हैं, जिन्हें बैरकों में और लाइनों में रहने का अनुभव है, उनमें से अधिक संख्या में अफसर छांटे जाय, क्योंकि वे हर तरह से योग्य और अनुभवशील अफसर बन सकते और ऐसा करने से हमारी सेना और आगे बढ़ सकती है।

श्रीमन्, चीन द्वारा हमारी सीमा पर आक्रमण के बाद हमारी सरकार का ध्यान भारत की उत्तरी सीमा की ओर गया है। . . .

सभापति महोदय माननीय सदस्य का समय समाप्त होने वाला है।

श्री भक्त दर्शन : मेरा समय क्या कमी समाप्त हो जायगा ? अभी तो मैं भूमिका ही कर रहा हूँ।

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member has already taken about 9 minutes.

श्री भक्त दर्शन : थोड़ा समय मुझे और दिया जाय।

श्रीमन्, चीन के खतरे की वजह से हमारी सरकार का ध्यान अपनी सीमाओं की रक्षा की ओर गया और स्वयं प्रधान मंत्री जी की अध्यक्षता में हमारी सरकार ने एक बौंडर रोड्स डेवलपमेंट बोर्ड (सीमान्त क्षेत्रीय सड़क विकास बोर्ड) बनाया है। यह सही दिशा में एक कदम है और मैं उसका स्वागत करता हूँ और सरकार का उसके लिए बचाई देता हूँ। मेरा ध्यान दुष्टिकोण यह है कि अग़र प्राज्ञ से १० वर्ष पहले यह बोर्ड बना दिया जाता और उसके द्वारा यातायात के साधनों का

विकाम कर दिया जाता तो स्थिति इतनी खराब न होती जितनी कि आज है और शायद चीनियों को आगे बढ़ने का मौका नहीं मिलता ।

लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस बोर्डर रोड्स डेवेलपमेंट बोर्ड के बारे में "हथ हथ पालिसी" अपनाई जा रही है । वहाँ के जन प्रतिनिधियों को विश्वास में नहीं लिया जा रहा है कि कौन-कौन सी सड़कें बन रही हैं, किस तरीके से बन रही हैं अथवा किन सड़कों को प्राथमिकता दी जा रही है । पूर्व में नेपा के इलाके में और पश्चिम में लद्दाख के इलाके में जहाँ कि पहले से कोई सार्वजनिक जीवन नहीं था, जहाँ कोई मंगठिन पब्लिक लाइफ नहीं थी, और इसलिए वहाँ के जन प्रतिनिधि नहीं हैं—वहाँ के बारे में तो आप चीजें छिपा कर भी रख सकते हैं लेकिन उदाहरणस्वरूप जर्म कि उत्तर प्रदेश के पर्वतीय जिले हैं और वहाँ से एम० पी०, अरुम्बानी के मेम्बर हैं, जहाँ कि जिना बोर्ड्स और स्थानीय पंचायतें हैं वहाँ किस तरीके से चीजों को छिपा सकते हैं ? उन इलाकों के जन प्रतिनिधियों से सम्बन्धित बातों को छिपाना उचित नहीं है । उनमें जो चीजें छिपाई जाती हैं मुझे यह कहने के लिए क्षमा किया जाये कि मैं दुनिया को वह बातें मालूम हो जाती हैं और हमारे दुश्मनों तक को मालूम है कि कहां क्या हो रहा है । उदाहरण के लिए मैं बनलाऊं कि बद्दीनाथ की ओर सड़क बन रही है । उसके बारे में हम पूछते हैं कि यात्रा सीजन शुरू हो रहा है और सीजन पर हजारों यात्री देश के कोने कोने से वहाँ पर आते हैं और इसलिए उस सड़क का निर्माण जल्द पूरा किया जाय क्योंकि अगर सड़क का निर्माण पूरा नहीं होगा तो सारी यात्रा में व्याघात पड़ेगा, और सड़क के निर्माण में ष्कावट पड़ने से यात्रियों को भारी असुविधा का सामना करना होगा लेकिन उसके बारे में अभी तक कोई सूचना नहीं दी जाती है ।

मैं यह भी सुझाव देना चाहता हूँ कि इन उड़कों का निर्माण सी० पी० डब्लू० डी० और एम० ई० एस० के द्वारा न करा कर अर्थात् ठेकेदारी सिस्टम से न कराया जा कर वहाँ के स्थानीय लोगों की एक मिलिशिया बनाई जाय, उनकी एक लेबर फोर्स तैयार की जाय और उनको यह काम सौंपा जाय व जन-सहयोग प्रामाणित किया जाय तो मैं समझता हूँ कि इस तरह काम जल्दी और अच्छी तरह पूरा होगा और उससे लोगों का यह मालूम पड़ेगा कि यह सड़कें हमारे लिए बन रही हैं ।

श्रीमन्, मैं एक या दो विषयों की ओर माननीय मंत्री का ध्यान और आकर्षित करना चाहूंगा । मैं उन सदस्यों में से एक रहा हूँ जिन्होंने कि पर्वतारोहण के सम्बन्ध में अपनी सरकार का ध्यान आकर्षित किया है । इस रिपोर्ट में जैसा कि बतलाया गया है कि दार्जिलिंग में हिमालियन माउंटैनरियरिंग इंस्टी-च्यूट अर्थात् हिमालियन पर्वतारोहण संस्था स्थापित की गई है और वह बड़ा अच्छा कार्य कर रही है । उसके कारण देश के अन्दर पर्वतारोहण के कार्य की बड़ी प्रगति हो रही है और लोगों में इसके प्रति चिन्ता हो रही है । मैं इस सम्बन्ध में केवल एक दो सुझाव देना चाहता हूँ । यह पर्वतारोहण की संस्था दार्जिलिंग में स्थापित है; लेकिन हिमालय का क्षेत्र अति विद्याल है । पश्चिम में कश्मीर है और मध्य में सेंट्रल हिमालय का इलाका है । मैं चाहता हूँ कि वहाँ पर भी इसकी शाखाएं स्थापित की जाय और ट्रेनिंग देने की व्यवस्था की जाय । एंग्गलान्ड में अधिक लोग इन्हीं नाम उठा सकेंगे ।

पिछले साल जो लोग एक्वेस्ट प्रशियान में गये या इस साल अन्नपूर्णा या नन्दादेवी की ओर जा रहे हैं तो मुझे बतलाया गया है कि वहाँ जो लोग जाते हैं उनकी अपनी बिम्बे-दारी पर सेना से छुट्टी ले कर जाना पड़ता है और अगर वहाँ उनके साथ कोई एक्सीडेंट हो जाये, उनकी मृत्यु हो जाये तो उनके

[श्री भक्त दर्शन]

“ग्रीन इप्टी” नहीं माना जाता है। मैं चाहूंगा कि मंत्री महोदय इस बारे में अपने उत्तर से कुछ स्पष्टीकरण देंगे। मैं तो समझता हूँ कि जिस तरीके से जो हमारे जवान बांगों में या जम्मू काश्मीर में जाते हैं और उनका “ग्रीन इप्टी” माना जाता है उसी तरीके से इन पर्वतारोहियों को भी “ग्रीन इप्टी” माना जाये और उनको पूरी सुविधाये दी जानी चाहिये।

अन्तिम मुझे कहनी है छावनियों के सम्बन्ध में कहनी है। हमारे देश में ५६ या ५७ छावनियां हैं। उनमें लाखों लोग इरहते हैं। यह छावनियां देश के कौने कौने में फैली हुई हैं। मैं मंत्री महोदय का अनुगृहीत हूँ कि मंत्रालय द्वारा वहां इस बीच कुछ विकास कार्य किया गया है लेकिन जितना विकास उनका होना चाहिए या उतना विकास अभी तक उनका नहीं हुआ है। इस बीमवी घावदी में भी बहुत सी ऐसी छावनियां है और ऐसे इलाके हैं जहां कि अभी तक बिजली की रोशनी नहीं हो पाई है। मैं बड़ा अनुगृहीत हूँ कि सेंसडाउन में बिजली लगाने का काम हो रहा है लेकिन मेरा सुझाव यह है कि तीसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना में जो हमारा नियोजन होता है, प्लानिंग होती है उसमें इस बात का लक्ष्य रखा जाना चाहिए कि हर छावनी के अन्दर बिजली की रोशनी प्रा जाये और कम से कम एक हायर सेकेंडरी स्कूल हो जाये।

दूसरी बात मुझे यह कहनी है कि इन छावनियों में मुख्य समस्या आवास की है जोकि एक बड़ा जटिल प्रश्न है। इस रिपोर्ट के अनुसार सरकार द्वारा ४, ५ छावनियों में मकान बनाने के लिए सहायता दी गई है, मैं चाहूंगा कि यह सहायता हर एक कैंटूनमेंट को प्रदान की जाये। यह सहायता उन्हीं छावनियों तक सीमित न रहे, बल्कि सभी छावनियों में यह सुविधा दी जाये।

अन्तिम बात जो मुझे मंत्री महोदय को याद दिलानी है वह यह है कि गत मिदम्बर में पेशनों की दरों में वृद्धि की जो घोषणा की गई थी वह बड़ी स्वागत योग्य घोषणा थी लेकिन अभी तक उन पर अमल नहीं किया जा रहा है। जिन्होंने सारी जिन्दगी अपने देश की सेवा से अर्पित कर दी, वे अब भी प्रतीक्षा कर रहे हैं। मुझे मालूम हुआ है कि इस सम्बन्ध में अब भी बड़ी सुस्त चाल से कार्यवाही हो रही है और अभी तक उन को बढ़े हुए रेट पर पेशनें नहीं मिली हैं। अतः मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि इस बारे में शीघ्रता की जाये।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं आप को धन्यवाद देने हुए इस मंत्रालय की मांगों का हृदय से समर्थन करता हूँ।

Dr. Vijaya Ananda (Visakhapatnam): Sir, I rise to support the Defence Ministry and its grants. There have been terrific amount of criticisms but I think they are criticisms for criticism's sake. If you come here with pre-conceived notions and ideas any stick is good. That is how I feel about it. The Army is the pride of India. I have a suggestion that we in this House should forego some of our privileges so far as the Defence Ministry is concerned. As long as China has got some of our territory and Pakistan is a constant headache to us, I think we should forego some of the privileges of this House and not discuss the Defence Ministry and have implicit trust in the Defence Minister.... (Interruptions.)

श्री अर्जुन सिंह अर्बोरवा : हिन्दुस्तान में श्री बाइना और पाकि तान का सा इन कर बीजिये, तो किसी को बोलने की जरूरत ही न पड़ेगी।

Dr. Vijaya Ananda: ... and his two aides, Shri Raghuramaiah and Sardar

Majithia and the Defence Secretary, Shri Pulla Reddi, a great ICS officer. That is my view. As long as Pakistan and China are a constant head ache to us, let us keep the Defence Ministry a secrecy and let our beloved Prime Minister handle the whole thing. The Army, Sir, has done a great job; no one can doubt it or dispute it, unless he has a prejudiced mind. I know what they did in Lucknow when two of my daughters and four of my grand-children were perched on a house when Gomati was in floods and almost took away the house they were occupying. They were in the jaws of death and but for a military officer, they would not have been rescued. The same has been the case with the other areas. Take for instance, Rohtak floods. When there are riots, military is requisitioned, and it plays a noble part there. Roads and bridges have been constructed by them. They teach discipline to others. I have very great regard for the Army and what they stand for. They are for doing good to the humanity and are humanitarian in every walk of life.

Acharya Kripalani: Who has attacked the Army?

Dr. Vijaya Ananda: I am talking generally of the Army as well as the Defence Ministry.

Acharya Kripalani: Then talk of the Defence Ministry.

Dr. Vijaya Ananda: I am coming to that; they are inter connected with each other.

Acharya Kripalani: They are not inter-connected.

Dr. Vijaya Ananda: The criticism against the Ministry, to my mind, is unjustifiable... (*An Hon. Member:* Why? I have my reasons and in discussing these Demands I have every right to make a few suggestions as others have made. I feel that the retired army officers should also be given appointments as in the case of the judiciary. They have done great work for this country and if

they are re-employed in some department of the Government, it will be very good. I also feel that houses should be constructed for married couples; there is a great amount of difficulty for them to take their families. They are doing a great service to this country. I think the Defence Minister will look into this. I do not like anybody to belittle the Army. Belittling the Army is belittling the Defence Ministry; they are inter-connected with each other and there is no good saying that this is separate and that is separate. In China or in Pakistan they do not discuss defence matters; it is kept as an absolute secret and they discuss it within themselves... (*Interruptions.*) We cannot afford to make ourselves a laughing stock. I know that this Ministry will deliver the goods; they are doing so.

An Hon. Member: They have delivered 12,000 square miles... (*Interruptions.*)

Dr. Vijaya Ananda: Sir, when the hon. Members were speaking from the other side, I never heckled or interfered. Perhaps it is their privilege to do so. I have no objection and they can go ahead.

I am sure that at the end, when the Defence Minister bats this afternoon, inspite of the bumpers and body lines that had been directed at him, he will neither edge nor get his legs in front of the wicket and I can tell you that he will be 'not out' at the end of the play. I am in agreement with the troop movements to Congo. We have done the right thing in this direction. I have a suggestion in this regard that a few Members from both the Houses may be picked out so that they can go and see the welfare of the Indian troops that have gone to Congo... (*Interruptions.*)

1 कर्जुन सिंह महोरिका : उस में रजिस्ट्रार के ही मेम्बर न बिये जायें, चाणोबीकन के भी मेम्बर बिये जायें ।

Dr. Vijaya Ananda: I may also suggest that photographs and the like of our strategic things in this country, aeroplanes and other things need not be exhibited; they may be kept away for a year or two till our trouble with China is over. The Defence department is not to be blamed for China having taken a big bulk of our territory. I think the Army was not there when they quietly walked in... (*Interruptions*). They had taken advantage of India's friendship with China. But since then, the Army has not allowed further intrusions. They have stood up and currently I can tell you that Army would not allow another inch of land to be taken by them.

Shri Khushwaqt Rai (Kheri): Do they need another inch?

Dr. Vijaya Ananda: Having been connected with sports, I am proud of the Army that it produced men like Milkha Singh, one of the world's best runners and men like Hemu Adhikari who captained India. He belonged to the Army; that means he belongs to the Defence department. He captained India and he is also the selector. Then, there is Dhyan Chand, a major in our Army who is the very champagne—not champion of hockey. That man has brought credit both to the Defence department and our country. So has Col. Naidu done. All these go to show that the Army and the Defence Ministry are forces to be reckoned with and to belittle them or to run them down is only doing disservice to this country.

I know Sir that you are about to ring the bell and I shall take the hint. In my opinion, we shall be doing the right thing if we in this House voluntarily, for some time to come, till we get over the China meance and the headache that we get from Pakistan occasionally, keep away from discussing Defence. I wish more strength to the Defence Minister's lead. With these few words, I support the Demands.

Shri Thanu Pillai (Tirunelveli): Mr. Chairman, the hon. Members opposite who have not been willing to learn from the Prime Minister are certainly not going to learn from an ordinary Member from the South... (*Interruptions*).

An Hon. Member: You are an ordinary Member.

Shri Thanu Pillai: I would only like to remind them of the lessons which Babu gave them and which they have forgotten in their anger. With faith and fearlessness...

Acharya Kripalani: When so many square miles of territory had gone to the Chinese. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Thanu Pillai: Faith and fearlessness is the cardinal principle of his ideology. Fear and suspicion is the cause of all distress all over the world. That is the *mantram* which the Prime Minister has been giving to the people, and they will also stand by that. When Opposition Members come here, they come with a phobia and therefore, with a blurred vision, they start their attack on things which are non-existent. The Prime Minister said that the criticisms are based on wrong facts. If that is so, they have been groping in the dark not knowing what is happening. Acharya Kripalani yesterday, in his speech, in his earlier remarks, said:

"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."

"They" means the Communists in this context.

Acharya Kripalani: "They" means who?

Shri Thanu Pillai: The Communists.

Acharya Kripalani: Do you want their support?

Shri Thanu Pillai: You need it. I do not need it. (*Interruption*). I will come to that. Then Acharya Kripalani said:

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—above party politics, whether I was in the Congress or in KMPP or the PSP or as an Independent Member of this House."

he was above party politics.

So, the country is above everything for him. Afterwards, in the course of an interruption by Shri Chintamani Panigrahi, saying that he wanted more time for this debate, Acharya Kripalani said:

"The more you support him the less will the people have faith in him."

So, the complete confusion in his mind is, Shri Krishna Menon is a member of the Cabinet by the strength of the Communist Party and not of the Congress Party. This is their view. Let them openly say so. Why bring a round about argument and bring the Defence Ministry or the defence departments into this debate? If they want to hit, all opportunity is given. The Prime Minister has invited them; let them go and tell him what they want to say. But to take this opportunity to create a wrong impression in the country is very dangerous.

He was supported by his able lieutenant and colleague Shri Ranga. He is not attached to any party. The PSP, I think, may not attach itself to the Swatantra Party, or the Swatantra Party's spokesman, I was thinking, if I had a chance to speak, to quote Rajaji, of saying something about it. But here, Shri Ranga came out with certain observations or obsessions, namely, that an Ayub or Nasser might rise here. This is a very dangerous

game. This is a dangerous game which the frustrated old man of Madras started a couple of years ago. When President Ayub came to power in Pakistan, Rajaji said that through his long-stretched telescope of time he could see the same history repeated in India. I told his son here, who is my colleague, to tell his father not to use slang language like that. A respected and a respectable man should not use such words; in frustration, and sow such bad thoughts in quarters where such bad thoughts should not have entered. This is the very thing which these Opposition Members say. Shri Ranga claimed that he has been a roving ambassador and all that, and he claims so many privileges. Though a patriot, he has thought it fit in order to defeat the Congress, to give a bad name to the Congress and the country, they thought it fit to go around brandishing: "here is the Defence Minister who is not liked; here is the Prime Minister who cannot understand; here is the military which cannot defend!" No greater disservice could be done to this country; if they are earnest in defending the country, such things would not be said. I challenge them. (*Interruption*). Whatever has happened, has happened in the frontier. If action has to be taken, it will be taken. And military actions are not discussed in on the floor of the House. Military actions are not discussed in the market-place.

Acharya Kripalani: Is this House a market-place?

Shri Raghunath Singh: This House is not a market-place.

Shri Thanu Pillai: I am coming to that. Yesterday, certain things in their arguments they said: "They have appeared in the newspapers. It is all spoken in the market-place." Are they equating this Parliament to a market-place? We objected to equating Parliament with the press and the public places. It is not we who are degenerating this Parliament to a mockery by saying things which

[Shri Thanu Pillai]

are not true or proper. They say these things simply because they do not have the courage and confidence to go and tell the Prime Minister: "Just remove this Defence Minister". Let them bring in a vote of censure on the Defence Minister or the Defence Committee. I challenge them. My leader has given them offers which he has not given us. They are given to the wrong Members who have no eyes to see and who have no home to control and who have been going from pillar to post, from party to party, with no faith or moorings in their own ideology. I cannot understand. I deserve Acharya Kripalani's clappings! He is an ex-Secretary of the Congress. He can be proud that in the Congress after he had left, there are people in it, on whom the security and the freedom of the country depends.

Acharya Kripalani: When did the hon. Member come to the Congress?

Shri Thanu Pillai: Long before he left it.

Shri Palaniyandy (Perambalur): He claims that he is an ex-Secretary. But we are also in the Congress.

Shri Thanu Pillai: When he, as ex-Secretary, would not be knowing the Members who are near him, he cannot be expected to know Members in distant Tirunelveli. But we always hear him with respect and we have respect for the Acharya. If we do not attack Acharya Kripalani, it is because we have that old respect for him which continues. We are a nation of hero-worshippers, and in that hero-worship, Acharya Kripalani lives in comfort without being attacked.

Acharya Kripalani: Thank you very much.

Shri Thanu Pillai: Another frustrated party came with certain arguments about the Russian planes flying in Leh. I wonder whether the Prime Minister has more concern and understanding about it or the hon. Members

opposite. If on party alliances, on the international group of alliances, Russia had given us a strategic plane, when we are at loggerheads with China a member of that bloc, we should congratulate the Defence Minister. We should congratulate the Prime Minister for his strategy in getting and being able to get, that plane from Russia.

Acharya Kripalani: Without money?

Shri Thanu Pillai: We are not accustomed to relying on foreign beggary,—to beg from others. We do borrow, but we never beg. "Beg, borrow or steal, or use any stick" is the philosophy of that side. On this side, we sometimes borrow but we never go begging. About the use of the plane and the training, instead of being congratulated, if China takes objection to having given this strategic plane to India, I can understand it. If China's friends in India feel that this strategic plane has come here, it is understandable. But why should hon. friends who swear by the other block and not by China feel worried that Russia has given this plane?

There are two countries which can give these planes. One of the parties will have to give. It is not a question of getting it from here or there. We do not have it. So, necessarily we have to buy it from foreign countries, whether it is America or Russia. America would have given but perhaps it was costlier. Perhaps this plane purchased from Russia was better. Today in the race between America and Russia, in the Sputnik age, Russia, has taken credit for making bigger strides. Maybe, this plane has got certain advantages over the other planes. It is a military secret into which we cannot go. Possibly, with good faith in the Defence Minister and the Prime Minister, we should obviously think that there must have been good reasons which weighed with them for purchasing this plane from Russia and not the other type from America.

The other parties have taken out some old corpses of Audit Reports and Public Accounts Committee's report, not having reference to this year's or last year's budgets. This matter has been looked into by the Public Accounts Committee and its reports are good documents. There are serious lapses which have to be rectified. But the method of rectification, the method of presentation and the approach to this problem is not one of brandishing and saying, "This is all that is happening in this country". Most of these documents refer to periods between 1952 and 1954.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member's time is up.

Shri Thanu Pillai: Some time must be allowed on account of the interruptions, Sir. I now come to production. Defence production has been subjected to criticism. Now, we very often hear about the quarrels regarding the private sector and the public sector. Even our steel plants and other projects which are in the public sector are subjected to criticism, and very often they say, "It is all a flop". Our Minister of Industry gave a very good answer the other day. I only want to remind hon. Members about that and come to the defence instalations. They produce some machines, tractors, truck and other things. Of course, defects are there and they are to be rectified. But the question is a basic one.

Again, Sir, I want to refer to Acharyaji's speech once more. He said:

"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 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."

Sir, the history of many countries in the West is there. The arms kings were the creators of international troubles. The arms races that were run in the past have been the reason for international troubles. In our country, we are not going to allow in the private sector, where according to the directive principles in our Constitution they should not even hold money beyond a certain limit, the strategic instruments to be produced any more.

One more thing. Shri Rangaji while speaking again pleaded that this country should be saved, democracy should be saved. He would be surprised to know that some of these automobiles or motor cars produced in this country would not be sold for half the worth if only the Government would allow the import of cars. Do you want us to entrust the construction of military trucks which have to go into strategic position to be manufactured by the box manufacturers who call themselves as automobile manufacturers? Not only motor cars, but the weapons are important, planes are important, trucks are important and there are other things which are important. We may commit mistakes. But we are privileged to commit mistakes and we will rectify them. We are not going to pass that on, with the noose round our neck, to the private sector, to Acharyaji or Shri Rangaji. Therefore, Sir, I think the Opposition Members, not of the left but of the right where the Acharyaji has now shifted himself should do well to think that if they replace him they will not come in. Well, I am sure that they are not entitled to be here in their frustration.

Sir, the best champions of frustrated officers are these frustrated men who have fallen from office. Some of them aspire but are never qualified to be married—I mean the marriage of office. They are all unqualified spinners left out. They should not subject

us to improper criticism. It will cost not our lives but their lives also if India goes down.

Shri Prabhat Kar (Hooghly): Mr. Chairman, Sir, just now we have heard the speech of an hon. Member from the Congress Party. But I wonder how the person who opened the debate, a person belonging to no party, has placed his view point about the Defence Ministry.

Sir, I strongly object to and oppose the suggestion made by the Maharaja of Vizianagaram, that the privilege of this House to discuss the Defence Ministry should be taken away. I think under no circumstances should the privilege of this House to discuss matters be taken away. I do not think that the situation here in India is such that the privilege of the House to discuss the Defence Ministry should at all be taken away.

But from the way the discussion has been pursued by hon. Members it appears that we are not all discussing the activities of the Defence Ministry and their Demands for Grants. From the debate it appears that we are discussing about something else, particularly taking brief for some of the officers who have not got promotions for reasons which are not known. More than three-fourth of the time taken by some of the hon. Members who have taken part in the debate was devoted to the question of the promotion policy, which, according to them, is quite wrong. I would say, instead of doing service to the country they have done a disservice to the country by taking up this matter in this Parliament in this manner. Pure and simple, Sir, it is nothing but propagating in favour of one officer and trying to put one officer against the other. It is nothing but demoralising the whole morale of the army and thereby making the army not to discharge its proper functions.

The hon. Member said that so far as support from the Communist

Party is concerned, he would lose. But I would say that he has not been able to find out a single political party to which he could cling. He was in the Congress. He was completely disillusioned. There he found that it was too hot for him. Then he formed the KMPP. He found that it was not possible for him to pursue that and so he left it. So he has a confused mind from the very beginning. Then he joined the PSP. There also he felt that it was not possible to carry on. So he has come out from there. Now he is an independent, and I understand that he is thinking of having an alliance with the Swantantra Party led by Shri Masani. He is the man who thinks of giving ideas, policies and suggestions to the country by which the country's defence should be strong. I know that so far as his past is concerned it is all right. But it may be that because of his age he has stopped thinking or his powers have failed.

Therefore, the criticism he has offered is something which no man today can accept. That is why I say that the time that has been taken by the hon. Member in placing his view point is, pure and simple, according to me, nothing but time spent on listening to an old man for whom we have got respect as far as his past is concerned. So far as his future or the present is concerned, it is better that we need not talk about it.

He said that the more we speak of the Defence Ministry the more the Defence Minister will lose. That does not matter. He will see. After all, as far as he is concerned, he will have to depend more on the ruling party for coming back to Parliament. So far as he is concerned, the party which he has just left and in spite of all sorts of vilifications, we have seen what has been done at the Bombay elections, what happened at the Calcutta elections and we shall also see what will happen in the future. So there is no question about it.

So far as we are concerned we do not hold any brief for the Defence Minister. So far as the working of the Ministry is concerned many things have been said about it in the reports of the Public Accounts Committee and also the Estimates Committee. These are lapses which under no circumstance the Parliament should agree to. The Parliament should see that the activities of the Defence Ministry are improved.

So far as Defence Production is concerned, it is a fact that Defence Production has increased. As already stated by the hon. Member who spoke just before me—because defence production has increased and it is in the public sector—there is a tendency to discredit this production in the public sector so that the private sector may further increase. That is why, sir, there has been so much criticism about production in the defence installations.

Regarding the working of these production units is concerned, no doubt it is important, but various items of failures have been brought before this House. I am in complete agreement with some of the speakers who have said that this may require some improvement.

Sir, the report says that the industrial relations in the defence installations continue to be harmonious and peaceful. I find that simply for participating in the strike there have been victimisations in so many defence installations like Ishapur, Kakinada, Khamaria, Jabalpur, Delhi Cantt., Bombay Naval Dockyard etc. So far as the 505 Army Workshop in Delhi Cantt. is concerned, purely for participation in the strike the workers there have been victimised. The Defence Minister knows that the Government policy is that no one will be victimised simply for participation in the strike. They should see that there is no victimisation at all so that production in the defence installations further increases. It must be agreed that the increase in defence production is due to the fact that

there is co-operation of the workers. I hope the hon. Minister will take this into consideration.

So far as the charge of Professor Ranga that these unions belong to the AITUC is concerned, I would say that out of the 135 unions of the All India Defence Employees' Federation, not a single unit is of the AITUC. Its President, Shri S. M. Joshi, is not at all a Communist. He is not only not a Communist, he is perhaps one of the anti-Communists. So far as the charge that the workers' associations belong to the Communists is concerned, he has got completely wrong information, because he has no knowledge of this subject. His information requires some correction.

So far as Bharat Electronics is concerned, though full production should have started some 3 or 4 years ago, I find from the Report that up till now full production has not started. Since this is an important factory, I would say that the target in the matter of production of valves should be immediately fulfilled, as it is one of the most important items in the matter of defence.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): There is only one point on which I agree with my hon. friend, Shri Goray, who spoke yesterday, and that is when he made a reference to our esteemed colleague who is no more with us, Shri U. C. Patnaik. We sincerely feel the loss of his death, Sir, because he was an outstanding Member of this House who made a great contribution on defence matters. He was a man of high integrity and patriotism. Today we need men like him and I hope we will be able to replace him by half a dozen people who will have the enthusiasm, passion and devotion to defence forces as Shri Patnaik had when he spoke on defence matters.

I shall directly come to my point. Mr. Julian Amery, the Secretary of State for Air in Great Britain, on his first visit to the Royal Air Force College, Cranwell, mentioned that the

[Shri Prabhat Kar]

Fighter Command was the backbone of the Battle of Britain and led their nation into safety. He went on to say that even today the entire defence of British depended hardly on a few hundred boys, who make up the crews of 'V' Bombers, Vulcans, Victors and Valiant's. It is these bombers which are guarding the frontiers of Britain, and it took five years to produce a Captain of the 'V' Bomber, after spending about £1 million. They alone stood between England and the enemies.

14.53 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

If that is true of Great Britain, which has stood as a sentinel in the matter of her own defence, can we not also have a similar batch of young people to guard our country? Have we not got faith in ourselves? Have we not got faith in our great and ancient patriotism by which we stood and resisted the British until they went away after handing over power to us?

The way Acharya Kripalani spoke, it looked as though the confidence of our people has vanished from the face of the world. How can a gentleman talk in such terms when he has led an army and the army has been routed at the polls? I would like to know in what spirit a democrat can talk like that when his own favourite party has been routed in the elections in the city of Bombay only last week. The armies are also led . . .

Shri Rajendra Singh: Why is he bringing the elections here?

Shri Joachim Alva: I do not want to give in. I shall not give way.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order. order order. Let him continue.

Shri Joachim Alva: You interrupted the Prime Minister too many times. I shall not allow to be interrupted even once.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member might continue without paying heed to the interruptions.

Shri Joachim Alva: Sir, you were also present here, when the hon. Prime Minister was repeatedly interrupted. We held our mouths tight. We did not speak when Acharya Kripalani spoke.

I never heard Acharya Kripalani opening his mouth for the last ten years on the amenities for the defence services or about the wives of Air Force officers who have been crashed and killed with the aircrafts. I have never heard him speaking about the amenities for the wives and children of the defence force jawans. I wish he could have raised his voice about the wretched condition of the hostels for the defence services in the city of New Delhi, where bath-rooms are ill-ventilated and accommodation miserable. If only he had referred to the lack of allotment of residential accommodation to these officers, the House would have readily agreed to it and voted these demands. But he picked upon one case of promotion and took the Minister to task. He seems to be very much frustrated because in the Congress Party he has been superseded and did not get his promotion. This is the kind of psychology which is being spread by our people here. If we allow this kind of psychology to run into the defence services, how are we going to guard our country? An army is known to march on its belly, and we will not permit anybody to interfere with the army. Any person who lays his unholy hands on the army or the Defence Ministry is rendering the greatest disservice to the country.

I am no defender of Shri Krishna Menon. If you want, tie a rope on his neck and hang him. But, for God's sake, do not touch the army; leave it alone. First he wants the Government to be knocked out; then he will form a national government in which "T", Acharya Kripalani will play a prominent role. Secondly,

he says, let the Defence Minister go away. Then he says, let the Prime Minister go out. Is that the way of running the administration? We have never heard of such principles of democracy.

Our defence forces today have got first-class reputation. In the matter of sheer courtesy, manner, decorum, character and decency none can rival our officers and the jawans of the defence forces. They read the newspapers, the sensational newspapers, every day and believe them as gospel truth. They read newspapers which we call yellow press or sensational press and consider them as gospel truth. These poor jawans, far away from their homes, serving in the defence forces have no time or the means to know what is happening in the country except these newspapers, and they believe them completely.

I wish Acharya Kripalani spends some time in these mountain regions, for 10 or 15 days, in the biting cold. Then he will know the way of their life and the sufferings they have to undergo. Then he will be in a better position to champion their cause rather than picking up one case of promotion here or an appointment there. He mentioned one instance where four officers were promoted and five were overlooked. Suppose there were ten equally eligible officers. How many will you pick out from them? Now four were selected and five were rejected. That is bound to be so. You know the Parkinson's law.

Some of these very top officers retire at a time when they are getting Rs. 3,000 and they may get a pension of Rs. 1,800. I wish some of us could draw that during the best of our days. We do not grudge that. They have sacrificed their life. Men who lay their hands on the defence services are doing the greatest disservice to the country. Today the defence services are the backbone of our defence. They stand between us and possible Chinese aggression. They stand between us and any enemy casting his eyes on us.

Acharya Kripalani went on complaining that he did not get enough space in the papers run by the moneyed people of India. He has got so much space in today's papers. But the Defence Minister, who has made his speech, has not got enough space. That is borne out by facts. So, it is time that the hon. Prime Minister thought of bringing out a daily in the public sector. In that case, at least that paper can give the Government's point of view. (*Interruptions*) Yes. If in the case of our next door neighbour, Ceylon, papers are going to be nationalised by a gallant woman Prime Minister, it is time that this great country has got at least one daily newspaper which will represent the Government point of view.

I shall now come to the next point. He shall we carry on the defence of our country? What are the rudiments? On the last occasion, I spoke about the Navy and Air Force. I mentioned last time that we should have an air force, in volume, fire powers and personnel, which will match any one of the seven countries around us, or even more than match all those seven countries. Unless we achieve that position, our air force will mean nothing to us. I wish Acharya Kripalani paid some attention to this point. Our Air Force must be stronger than any one of the seven countries around us. This Parliament must vote enough money to make our air force stronger than any of those of the seven countries around us. It will be even better if we are stronger than all the seven countries put together. We have got valiant boys who will sacrifice their lives and whose widows have to live a hard life in the villages because they get a very poor income when their husbands die in aircrafts. I have never heard a word for the last 10 years, when I have raised my voice about the fate of families of air-crashed officers from Acharya Kripalani. I wish Acharya Kripalani joints me to see that the families of the poor victims in defence aircraft crashes are given generous concessions; he does not do that.

[Shri Joachim Alva]

15 hrs.

In regard to the Navy, we must have very clear cut principles. The power of the Indian Navy must exceed that of any country within the orbit of the Red Sea, the Persian Gulf, Arabian Sea and the bay of Bengal. Unless the Indian Navy is strong in these waters, we have no chance. We have to have submarines, though the honourable Prime Minister has said that we do not want submarines; but we must have submarines for our own safety. We have to increase one more naval centre in a place other than Bombay—in Vizapatnam on the East Coast of India. We have to increase the number of Sainik schools. We have now 4 Sainik schools; we should have one more. For that one more, I plead on behalf of my own constituency. In my constituency there is a place called Kittur. Kittur was known for Rahi Chinnama. There is a very big statue raised in Belgaum for that honoured lady and Rani, who took up her sword and fought for India even much before the Rani of Jhansi. It is time that that little place is considered as worthy of a military school. We must have more military schools of that type. We should have a large Merchant Fleet, well-sited bases to support our Navy.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The honourable Member's time is up.

Shri Joachim Alva: Then there are a few points which I would like to raise in regard to Defence research and development. This organisation must be enlarged. The PENTAGON is said to be an enlarged scientific department. It is stated that Lord Cherwell was the sole scientist adviser of the Churchill and the sole individual responsible for advising him about mass bombing of Europe. It is not that we want our scientists to do all these violent things, but it is time that our defence scientific department was enlarged. The head of the

scientific department of our defence forces was an outstanding man, who has done very good service and who has gone over as the Chairman of the University Grants Commission. I wish he was spared from that job and kept here.

We must give more scholarships to our young boys in the defence services. We must train them and make them work hard so that our Defence scientific and research organisation may become a strong organisation and may render worthy services in times of danger and emergency.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member's time is up.

Shri Joachim Alva: We must have a Committee of Scientific Survey of Air Defence like the Committee of Scientific Survey of Air Defence in Britain, which produced two Nobel Prize winners in Mr. Hill and Mr. Blacke. It is possible that young scientists may come out of our Committee of Scientific Survey of Air Defence like England. It will produce great scientists so that the young scientists may feel that they are well paid for. There is a remark in their Report that their housing problems were looked after and these scientists must also be well-paid and well looked after so that they can look after the scientific future of our Defence Forces, just as they have been doing in England.

Then in regard to Radar....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member's time is up.

Shri Joachim Alva: Kindly give me just two or three minutes more.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have got none to spare now.

Shri Joachim Alva: I always respect your bell. When I find that nobody wants to hear me, I am the first to sit down.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Perhaps he has ignored the two bells.

Shri Joachim Alva: Kingly give me two or three minutes more. I was mentioning about Radar. As you know Radar was perfected as an instrument even before the war was started. The journey of Mr. Chamberlain, the last Premier in England before the war, to Hitler was so timed or even delayed that the Scientific Department advised him to go slowly, so that the Radar equipment could be completed and could follow his flight and Britain could be ready in times of emergency. These were the small or great measures that the Defence Scientific Department of United Kingdom successfully forged. We have patterned our defence on a lot on them. We are grateful to them for we have learnt many things from them and we have yet to learn. I must pay a tribute to the British Government that they give the maximum amount of information in regard to the Defence Services. We have to learn a lot and this is what we should learn.

In regard to the foreign languages, the Defence Ministry has done a very good thing by enlarging the Foreign Languages Institute. More civilians should learn foreign languages so that when an emergency arises, we shall have a number of people from civilian life who will know foreign languages like Chinese and Russian and we shall not have to depend entirely on the Defence Services to take care of these things.

There is just one more point, and I have done. My hon. friend Shri M. R. Krishna was the only Member who participated in this Defence debate who stated that we must combine with America to resist the Chinese aggression. My hon. friend is a new member of our party, and he perhaps has not digested the political philosophy of the Congress Party, when he says that we must go over to America and ask them for all the

weapons and throw in our lot with America, because the Chinese are troubling us. He is asking for too much.

Shri M. R. Krishna: On a point of personal explanation....

Shri Joachim Alva: I heard him correctly.

Shri M. R. Krishna: Let me explain it....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Member is not yielding.

Shri M. R. Krishna: My remark has been wrongly interpreted.

Shri Joachim Alva: Today, our power and strength lies in our not being aligned to any Power either of the East or of the West. We take the best from all the countries; we learn from them; we are friendly with them. We do not join either on this side or on that side. We do not throw in our lot either this way or that way. Therefore, we have to stand alone and fight our battle and win the final battles of peace and progress.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have just received notice of a motion that the time be extended. But, already, the hon. Speaker has taken a decision that more time cannot be given.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: This is an important subject.

Shri Ansar Harvani: This is a very important subject, and more time should be given.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There are no two opinions about it. May I know how many more Members want to speak? I find that there are as many as a dozen Members. Even if I extend the time by half an hour, I cannot accommodate all of them.

श्री जर्जन सिंह बदीरिया (बटावा) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं डिफेंस मिनिस्ट्री का
प्रतिरक्षा विभाग के अनुदानों पर बनने वाली

[श्री अजुर्न सिंह भदौरिया]

बहुस में हिस्सा लेने के पूर्व, सर्व प्रथम भारतीय सेना के उन सैनिकों को जो कि हिन्दुस्तान की सीमाओं पर खड़े हो कर भारतीय सीमाओं की रखवाली कर रहे हैं, उनके साहसिक कार्यों के लिए मैं उनको हादिक बघाई और धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ। यह बात सही है कि हमारे भारतीय सैनिक अपनी सीमाओं पर जूझ रहे हैं, हिन्दुस्तान की स्वतंत्रता की रक्षा कर रहे हैं लेकिन इस संघर्ष और जूझने के बावजूद भी हिन्दुस्तान की सीमाएं सिकुड़ती जा रही हैं और हिन्दुस्तान की सीमाओं पर विदेशियों का कब्जा होता जाता है। जहां तक भारतवर्ष की सीमाओं के छिन्नने का सवाल है उस के लिए भारतीय सेनाएं जिम्मेदार नहीं ठहराई जा सकती हैं। हमारी सीमाओं का छिन्नना या भारतवर्ष का विश्व में जो सम्मान घटा है, उसके लिए पूरी जिम्मेदारी हिन्दुस्तान के परराष्ट्र नीति हिन्दुस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री और पूरी की पूरी सरकार और कैबिनेट पर आती है। भारत सरकार और कैबिनेट उसके लिए जिम्मेदार ठहराई जानी चाहिये।

श्रीमन्, किसी भी राष्ट्र की स्वतंत्रता और उसकी सीमाओं की सुरक्षा, एक सुगठित और सुदृढ़ प्रतिरक्षा और एक अनुशासित सेना पर जितना निर्भर करती है उससे भी अधिक वह उस देश की जनता के मनोबल और आत्मविश्वास पर निर्भर करती है। मैं प्रधान मंत्री महोदय और खासकर के श्री कृष्ण मेनन से यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान की जनता के मनोबल और आत्मविश्वास को भागे बढ़ाने के लिए उन्होंने क्या प्रयत्न किया? माननीय सदस्यों और विशेषकर के माननीय कृपलानी जी के इस तर्क से सहमत नहीं हो सकता हूँ कि सेना के अन्दर जो भी खराबी और जो भी सुपरसेसन चल रहा है उसकी सारी की सारी जिम्मेदारी श्री कृष्ण मेनन पर है। किसी भी जनतंत्री देश में जहां कि लोकतंत्रीय परम्पराएँ चलती हों, केवल

किसी एक कैबिनेट मिनिस्टर या किसी भी एक व्यक्ति को किसी एक अपराध के लिए जिम्मेदार नहीं ठहराया जा सकता है। उसके लिए तो सारा का सारा मंत्रिमंडल जिम्मेदार है और उसकी सारी की सारी जिम्मेदारी हिन्दुस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री पर आ कर पड़ती है। किसी भी खराबी के लिए, सेना में पक्षपात करने के लिए और सेना के उच्च अफसरों की तरक्की उनकी योग्यता, सीनियारिटी और पुरानी सेवाओं को ध्यान में न रख कर केवल मंत्रियों की मन पसन्दगी पर हों, तो इन सब के लिए जितने जिम्मेदार डिफेंस मिनिस्टर श्री कृष्ण मेनन हैं उन से अधिक जिम्मेदार भारतवर्ष के प्रधान मंत्री श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू हैं।

मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि हर चित्र के दो पहलू होते हैं, दो पक्ष होते हैं। लोक मभा में प्रतिरक्षा मंत्रालय के विषय में चित्र का एक पक्ष तो प्रधान मंत्री महोदय और प्रतिरक्षा मंत्री ने उपस्थित किया है, लेकिन उसका जो दूसरा पक्ष है—फौजों में जो घोर असन्तोष और अप्रसन्नता की लहर दौड़ रही है—उस की ओर अभी तक ध्यान नहीं दिया गया है और न उस पर प्रकाश डाला गया है। इस सम्बन्ध में अखबारों में तमाम बातें प्रकाशित होती हैं और दूसरे आदमी भी अपना मत व्यक्त करते हैं। उनसे साफ जाहिर होता है कि हिन्दुस्तान की फौजों में अनुशासनहीनता बढ़ती चली जा रही है। जनरल चिमैया ने, जो कि अभी तक हिन्दुस्तान के चीफ आफ दी आर्मी स्टाफ रहे हैं, दिल्ली रोटरी क्लब में भाषण के बाद एक प्रश्न के उत्तर में २० मार्च, १९५९ को यह स्वीकार किया कि इस समय, फौजों में वह अनुशासन नहीं रह गया है जो कि पहले था। उन्होंने कहा कि पुराने जमाने में १७ साल के अन्दर एक भी कोर्ट मार्शल नहीं हुआ, लेकिन आज मुझे हर रोज कोर्ट मार्शल के मामले करने पड़ते हैं; इस विषय में स्टेट्समैन में यह समाचार छपा था

"Answering questions after a speech to the Delhi Rotary Club General Thimayya admitted that the discipline in the army is not the same today as it was before. "In the old days", he said, "there was not one court martial in 17 years but today I have to deal sentences every day."

जो विचार मैंने अभी पढ़ कर सुनाया है, वह मैं अपनी ओर से नहीं कह रहा हूँ। वह जनरल थिमैया, चीफ आफ दि आर्मी स्टाफ का विचार है, जो कि यह स्वीकार करते हैं कि फौजों में वह अनुशासन नहीं रह गया है, जो कि पहले था। यह बात साफ स्पष्ट करती कि सेनाओं में कहीं न कहीं खराबी है और अगर खराबी है, तो उसके कारण क्या हैं। उन तमाम कारणों को दूरना होगा।

यदि हम फौजों में फैंने हुए असन्तोष और अप्रमत्तता को देखें तो पता चलता है कि सेना की कार्य-क्षमता और अनुशासन गिरता जा रहा है। अंग्रेजी दैनिक टाइम्स आफ इंडिया में २१ मार्च, १९६१ को यह लिखा गया :—

"Personal preferences have undoubtedly gone into the process of selection."

इस प्रकार के पक्षपात के कारण उच्च अफसरों में घोर नाराजगी है और सुपरसेशन अर्थात् तरफकी योग्यता और सेवा की अवधि के आधार पर न हो कर मन चाहे व्यक्ति को उसकी सुशामद के कारण चुने जाने के सबब से देश की सेना के उच्च अफसर बराबर त्याग-पत्र दे रहे हैं। २१ मार्च, १९६१ को टाइम्स आफ इंडिया ने अपने दूसरे लेख में यह लिखा है—

"One Lt.-General, the Master-General of Ordnance, whose impending retirement has received a great deal of publicity in the country and in Pakistan, is leav-

ing the service only for purely domestic reasons."

यद्यपि मैंने नाम लेना मुनासिब नहीं समझा, लेकिन यह बात साबित करती है कि हिन्दुस्तान की सेनाओं में कुछ न कुछ गड़बड़ी जरूर है। प्रतिरक्षा मंत्री के इस प्रकार के पक्षपात के कारण ही सेना में उत्साहहीनता और निराशा बढ़ती जा रही है और कार्यक्षमता में ह्रास होता जा रहा है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि यदि सेना का उत्साह गिरा, तो सेना की इस गिरावट को रोका नहीं जा सकता है। सेना की इस गिरावट को रोकने का बड़ा महत्वपूर्ण प्रश्न आज इस मदन के समक्ष और हिन्दुस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री के सामने उपस्थित है।

एक तरफ तो हमारी सेना में गिरावट और उत्साहहीनता है और दूसरी तरफ जब हम हिन्दुस्तान की जनता पर लादे जाने वाले और उससे बसूल किये जाने वाले करों की दरों को देखते हैं, तो मालूम पड़ना है कि प्रतिरक्षा पर प्रति-वर्ष किया जाने वाला व्यय बढ़ता जा रहा है। यह बात निम्नलिखित प्रांकड़ों से प्रकट होती है :—

१९४८-४९	१४६,०६ लाख रुपये
१९४९-५०	१४२,४६ लाख रुपये
१९५३-५४	१८६,३० लाख रुपये

इस का अर्थ यह है कि इस वर्ष पहले से ४०७२४ लाख रुपया अधिक खर्च हुआ।

१९५७-५८ २५६,७२ लाख रुपये

अर्थात् इस वर्ष पहले ११०,६६ लाख रुपया अधिक खर्च हुआ।

१९६०-६१ ३३०,२५,६१ हजार रुपये

इसमें कैपिटल प्राउटले भी सम्मिलित है और पहले से दुगुने से अधिक खर्च हुआ।

[श्री अर्जुन सिंह भवौरिया]

१९६१-६२ ३४३,०१,३५ हजार रुपये

इसमें कैपिटल आउटले भी सम्मिलित है।

यदि हम १९४८-४९ में होने वाले खर्च और १९६१-६२ में होने वाले खर्च को देखें, तो स्पष्ट हो जाता है कि प्रतिरक्षा पर व्यय दुगुना और तिगुना होता जा रहा है। हमारे देश की सेना पर, प्रतिरक्षा मंत्रालय पर खर्चा बढ़ रहा है। उसका बजट बढ़ रहा है। होना यह चाहिये था कि इस खर्च के बढ़ने के फलस्वरूप हमारी सीमाओं का अतिक्रमण नहीं होना चाहिये था और हमारे क्षेत्र पर चीन का आक्रमण और अधिकार नहीं होना चाहिये था। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इससे हिन्दुस्तान की जो खिदमत होनी चाहिए थी, वह अभी तक नहीं हुई। अगर खर्चा बढ़ता है, तो साथ ही साथ हिन्दुस्तान की सुरक्षा भी बढ़नी चाहिए, हिन्दुस्तान की जनता का उत्साह और आत्म-विश्वास भी बढ़ना चाहिए। लेकिन हम देखते हैं कि न तो जनता का आत्म-विश्वास बढ़ रहा है और न हिन्दुस्तान की सीमाओं की कुछ भी सुरक्षा हो रही है।

अगर हम प्रतिरक्षा मंत्रालय की रिपोर्ट पर गौर करें, तो पता चलता है कि १२०० रुपये मासिक से ले कर २४०० रुपये मासिक तक मनोरंजन के लिये खर्चा दिया जाता है। रिपोर्ट में यह कहा गया है —

"In addition to the above pay and allowances, officers of the rank of Brigadiers and Major Generals when in command of independent formations, are entitled to entertainment grants at Rs. 1,200 and Rs. 2,400 respectively to meet expenditure on official entertainments."

एक तरफ तो हिन्दुस्तान के उन सैनिकों को, जो हिन्दुस्तान की सीमाओं पर हिन्दुस्तान की रक्षा कर रहे हैं, जो हमारे देश के शानदार

प्रहरी हैं, पच्चीस तीस रुपये दे कर सूखे चने दिये जा रहे हैं और दूसरी तरफ मुट्ठी भर अफसरों के लिये मनोरंजन के लिये खर्चा बढ़ाया जा रहा है।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : (वाराणसी) : उनको सूखे चने नहीं दिये जाते हैं। उनको राशन दिया जाता है।

श्री अर्जुन सिंह भवौरिया : इसका नतीजा यह है कि हिन्दुस्तान की जनता पर टैक्स बढ़ रहा है और कुछ मुट्ठी भर लोगों पर किया जाने वाला खर्च बढ़ रहा है। मैं आपके द्वारा हुकूमत से यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि अगर देश की सीमाओं की रखवाली करनी है, तो देश के शानदार प्रहरीयों का रहन-सहन का स्तर ऊंचा करना होगा, जो एक हजार फीट ऊपर और एक हजार फीट नीचे जाकर ढाई मन का बोझा अपने कंधों पर ले कर चलते हैं। उनकी और अधिक ध्यान देना चाहिये और उनकी सुविधाओं की और विशेष रूप से ध्यान देना चाहिए।

गत वर्ष, प्रतिरक्षा मंत्रालय के अनुदानों की बहस में मैंने बताया था कि प्रतिरक्षा मंत्रालय की रिपोर्ट भारत में तैयार नहीं हुई, बल्कि चीनी एम्बेसी में उसका ड्राफ्ट बनाया गया। पिछले साल उस रिपोर्ट में यह लिखा गया था कि हिन्दुस्तान की सीमा पर जो कुछ भी चीन ने किया, वह एक साधारण सी, आर्डिनेरी सी, घटना है। इस वर्ष की रिपोर्ट को देख कर मैं हेरत में रह गया कि चीनी आक्रमण, या हिन्दुस्तान की सुरक्षा और हिन्दुस्तान की सीमाओं की रखवाली या धाने वाले आक्रमण को किस तरह रोका जायेगा, इस विषय में एक भी शब्द इस वर्ष की रिपोर्ट में नहीं है।

आज-कल प्रसवदारों में खुसासा था रहा है कि हिन्दुस्तान की सीमाओं पर चीन की तरफ से दो तीन लाख सैनिक लगे हुए हैं

घोर हिन्दुस्तान की सीमाओं के किनारे पर दर्जनों इत्राई भड़डे बना कर तैयार किये गये हैं। लेकिन हमारे यहां प्रतिरक्षा मंत्री प्रत्येक बात को गोपनीयता का गीत गा कर छिपा लेते हैं और इस प्रकार देश की सुरक्षा के साथ खेल खेले रहे हैं।

कैन्टीन स्टोर्ज डिपार्टमेंट (इंडिया) में जो गड़बड़ी हुई है, उस के बारे में समाचारपत्रों में यह लिखा गया है—

“Rs. 2 crore Army Rum Scandal Rocks Defence Ministry”.

“A staggering Rs. 2 crore rum scandal has shaken the entire section of the Defence Ministry which is headed by the Deputy Defence Minister Sardar Surjit Singh Majithia”.

इस तरह के आरोप लगाये जा रहे हैं और मैं चाहता हूँ कि उन का भी जवाब दिया जाना चाहिए। साथ ही कैन्टीन स्टोर्ज डिपार्टमेंट (इंडिया) में बराबर लाभ हो रहा है। १९५५-५६ में १९ लाख, १९५६-५७ में २१ लाख और १९५७-५८ में २० लाख का फायदा हुआ। हमेशा लाखों रुपये का फायदा वहां होता है, लेकिन फिर भी कर्मचारियों को बोनस नहीं दिया जाता है और ठीक तरह से उम की जांच-पड़ताल नहीं की जाती है। मेरा मुझाव है कि कामर्स एंड इंडस्ट्रीज मिनिस्ट्री के किसी व्यक्ति को वहां का चेयरमैन बनाया जाये और उसके कर्मचारियों को राजकीय कर्मचारी घोषित किया जाये और कैन्टीन स्टोर्ज डिपार्टमेंट के घादमियों को तरफकी दी जाये। और बाहर के लोग उसमें न लिये जायें।

उपायवक बहोदय : अब माननीय सदस्य को समाप्त कर देना चाहिए।

श्री अर्जुन सिंह बघौरिया : एक ही मिनट के कर मैं अपनी पूरी की पूरी बात को समाप्त किये देता हूँ। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या यह

सही नहीं है कि काश्मीर में फौजी अफसर वहां की दलगत राजनीति में हिस्सा लेते हैं? इसके साथ ही साथ क्या यह सही नहीं है कि काश्मीर षडयंत्र केस में उच्च सैनिक अफसर प्रेस को ब्रीफ करते हैं? यदि यह सही है तो क्या आप समझते हैं कि यह ठीक है कि ये दलगत राजनीति में भाग लें? मैं यह भी जानना चाहता हूँ कि काश्मीर में सेना के लिए जो राशन और दूसरी चीज उपयोग के लिये दी जाती है वे कहां से खरीदी जाती है, ये के किन को मिल रहे हैं और क्या यह सही नहीं है कि अधिकतर ठेके उन्ही लोगों को दिये जाते हैं, जो कलिंग पार्टी से सम्बन्धित हैं?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am sorry I cannot allow any other hon. Member to speak now. I must call the hon. Defence Minister.

Acharya Kripalani: Sir; before you ask the hon. Minister to speak, I have to bring to your notice one point. I was waiting till you were in the Chair because at the time when this was said you were in the Chair. The report says:

“...tens of thousands of vehicles which were on the dumps which were thrown away, have been rescued and are now in service.”

This is what the hon. Defence Minister said yesterday. You may perhaps remember, Sir, that I said, as the Defence Minister generally lowers down his head when he speaks I could not hear him. So, I asked: what has been rescued? And the Defence Minister said:

“I did not say anything about rescue; I can only supply information; I cannot supply understanding.”

Whether he can supply understanding or not, I submit that he himself had used the word ‘rescue’ but he said that he had said nothing about rescue.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is right. I remember that. But perhaps it might

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

be due to the fact that he may not have followed what the hon. Member himself said. The hon. Member himself says that he could not follow what the hon. Minister was saying. So, it may be that a mistake has occurred. I do not think that the hon. Member expects me to do anything in the matter.

Acharya Kripalani: No, Sir; I only wanted to draw your attention to this.

Shri Krishna Menon: Sir, yesterday departing from the normal practice in regard to this Ministry, I opened this debate because I was advised and I myself thought that an analysis of our position and the giving of facts and particularly giving information on the matter raised by the hon. Speaker himself about withholding information on grounds of public interest would assist the debate and perhaps not make it necessary for hon. Members to traverse over the ground about which information was readily available. I am sorry, Sir, if in doing that I have taken away the time of private Members.

Acharya Kripalani followed me and practically opened his speech by saying:

"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....."

In all humility, I would like to say that I do not think the Acharya is prejudiced against me because the attack is in to his total identification of me with all that he disapproves. I have no hard feelings in this matter because I do not want, after the heat that has been injected into this debate to let important issues be covered up.

I will come to the substance of it. The bulk of the time has been spent

in regard to certain questions of administration. As the Speaker pointed out this morning, it will boil down to one case of promotion in recent times. That is a matter which the Prime Minister dealt with fully some months ago and Acharya Kripalani, I say, by reference to the script, said: "I accept what the Prime Minister said." But I will come to this later.

The next item arises from the Audit Report and the Report of the Public Accounts Committee. It may not be possible for me in the time allotted, to go through it, piece by piece. With your permission, my Ministry will do the same as it did the last year and try to answer the points in full and submit them or lay the papers on the Table or in some other way make it available. The audit report of 1961 will go to the Public Accounts Committee. It consists of forty paragraphs out of which 24 deal with matters that were current at the time before the present Parliament was in session, and go back to the forties. They are all before 1957. Most of them have appeared year after year, with the same repetitions and without any reference to the changes that have been made. This is not the occasion to compare the Audit practice in this country with the Audit practices that obtain in other parliamentary systems.

In this connection, I wish however to deal with some of the items which have perhaps more current bearing. Acharya Kripalani referred to the heavy rejections. I am glad that there are rejections, because it speaks for our quality control. If there were no rejections, and in order to save the face of any person or perhaps of the staff working on the project and of the person in charge of the factory, if bad stuff is put in, it would be very dangerous in regard to the supply of ammunition and other materials to the troops. It was said that in one of ordnance factories there were Rs. 953 lakhs worth of some unfinished stores. We have been through it very carefully. In a production turnover of

Rs. 25 crores to Rs. 30 crores a year, that there should be work in hand to the extent of Rs. 9 crores is not unusual. The ordnance factories are engaged in the production of these items for which the capacity is not available in other sectors, and therefore, the work in progress will always be relatively higher as it may not be substituted for from anywhere else.

Then we come to the matter of rejections in regard to two specific items. One is with regard to the Ambernath Machine Tool Factory. Without in anyway appearing to be less than humble about this matter, I may say that this criticism perhaps arises from a wrong conception of purpose of this factory. This factory is not intended to make machine tools and sell them all round, but in the main, to provide these complex machine tools which are required for defence purposes. It should be expected that by and large this establishment would not be an economic proposition, from the commercial point of view to produce anything else there. Anyway, the factory was founded in 1949, and much of the criticisms relate to the period between 1949 and 1953 and some of them a little later. But the production went up in 1957 to Rs. 7.6 lakhs, and now it has gone up to Rs. 21 lakhs a year. That is to say, at least it is showing vast improvement, perhaps considering the amount of money invested in it during the early period and soon after Independence, with less experience in these matters and also considering the very specialised nature of this factory. But today we are utilising it—slightly departing from the original purpose in order to make it economical—for the manufacture of gears for tractors and planetary gears for guns.

Then we come to the other case in a factory very near Delhi—where there are very considerable rejections. It may be said that this is perhaps the only place where castings of that size and quality are made in this country. It is a very old establishment and suffers to a certain extent from old type of plants. But even if it were a new

plant, the rejections in the initial period of manufacture would be high, because the work there is not done under foreign supervision and foreign experts, but by our own people, starting originally by the methods of trial and error. But even if there was no trial and error method, in any precision casting all over the world there are a large number of rejections. I want to lay special stress on this, because probably next year the Bharat Electronics will be going into production of and will manufacture transistors. In the production of transistors, even in an advanced country in the world anywhere, there would be large number of rejections. I want to anticipate these difficulties. These rejections have however been reduced now to about 14 per cent by our people gaining more and more experience. From 1955, we have brought it down still further. The position today is that in 1957-58, the total production was Rs. 64 lakhs and the rejection was Rs. 3.89 lakhs. In 1958-59, the production was Rs. 76 lakhs and the rejection was Rs. 3.71 lakhs. In the year before last, namely, 1959-60, production was Rs. 103 lakhs and rejection was Rs. 0.79 lakhs, but somebody read it as Rs. 79 lakhs.

Reference was also made to delay in the manufacture of certain items in ordnance factories.

In government establishments, particularly in departmental factories like ordnance factories, delays must be expected owing to several causes. First of all, as I said, there is the question of quality control. Then there is the question of procurement of material which cannot be procured anywhere and anyhow as it can be done in private enterprise and by methods that Government cannot adopt. Secondly, we have to go through certain procedures, and when departures are alleged from them the House rightly comes in and criticises for doing so. Our present procedures are of a character that they would have to be adapted for purposes of defence production with greater experience. But when all is said and done,

[Shri Krishna Menon]

there is no undue delay in production in ordnance factories. Sometimes we have to go according to the demands from service headquarters and give priority for certain items even when other items are under manufacture. Since ordnance factories are not producing for profit but for purpose these changes have to be made.

15:31 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair.]

Then there was reference to a ship, a store carrier which, it was said, was bought long ago and we did not use it for seven years. This is again another item that starts somewhere about 1951 or so, and the delay of seven years on the face of it is unjustified. Even the P.A.C. in its report has declared that this vessel was purchased in 1952 and until 1958 the conversion work was not completed. But what my hon. friends opposite do not see, especially Acharya Kripalani who thinks that the Defence Minister is the poison in the whole of the business, is that it was completed in 1958 and not before.

Then there is the question of extra cost on roads. This refers to roads on which work was sanctioned in 1952 in the NEFA. Well, I do not desire to make any excuses. But this was the first time that army engineers have been building roads in this terrain. The work was rather slow in the beginning but was hastened up in 1957. One was completed in 1957 and the other in 1958. Please, Sir, note these dates.

There was reference to costs. It was said that the actual costs were far more than the estimates. This is not unusual in government departments—the Finance Minister always reminds us about that. But what is to be considered is this. The cost of these roads is Rs. 4 lakhs per mile whereas the cost of roads constructed from Udampur to somewhere by the Central P.W.D. is Rs. 5 lakhs per

mile. Therefore, though the estimating might have been wrong, the actual loss to the Government cannot be seen anywhere in this. I have to say that the army engineers are not accustomed to making estimates for construction of roads; they are army engineers, they go into battle and they construct whatever the cost is.

Then we have the hardy annual for the last two or three years over the place called Khamaria where the Government is supposed to have lost stores to the value of Rs. 170 lakhs or Rs. 180 lakhs. I was myself staggered by these figures when I first saw them. But then it was explained—for the last two years we have continually explained it—that these stores came into the factory soon after the war. We have no precise idea who brought them, who took stock of them, who accounted for them and so on. Anyway, the poor manager who was there at the time of the inquiry became responsible. He has left service; his services were not terminated. But what is important is that on a further examination of this by the representatives of the Finance Ministry and the Defence Ministry together with the representative of production they have come to the conclusion that the total loss to be written off is about Rs. 25 lakhs. This is a case where figures were given by somebody without properly looking into the matter, and we have said this in this House several times.

Then there was the question of stores in the Naval Dockyard—I am not at the present moment dealing with the question of the Captain there to whom a reference has been made. There has been tightening of the methods in the Naval Dockyard. The Navy all over the world has somewhat an ill-deserved reputation of being careless in regard to stores. But that is not the case with the Indian Navy. The defective maintenance of stores on account of the accounting

system earlier, as pointed out by Audit, has now been rectified.

Then there is the question of purchase of spare-parts for mechanical transport, which really relates to spares for tanks. Now, what is not usually taken into account is that the tanks of which I am speaking about at the present moment are those which were very much the left-overs of the last war. Now, these tanks which are in use for exercise purposes—because we are not fighting any war with tanks—had to be put into condition and the spare-parts are not being made by manufacturers. Therefore, we have to obtain them by negotiation or otherwise from dealers, either in this country or elsewhere. Now the gravamen of the charge of the Public Accounts Committee was that there were certain irregularities in regard to this, and the Public Accounts Committee asked for the appointment of another committee to go into this. They asked the Ministry to do so, and the Ministry requested the Cabinet Secretary to preside over the committee. It was not, as Acharya Kripalani, I believe, pointed out a "one-man committee"; it is a committee presided over by the Cabinet Secretary and 3, 4 or 5—I do not remember the number—senior Secretaries of Government, who are accustomed to do this kind of thing. That report has not come to me. I believe it is ready.

But when you come to speak about the large number of items that have been over-ordered—there was reference to 144 items—it is necessary to look at these items. Some of these items cost 2 cents, 3 cents or 5 cents. When you add up the number of items, it looks very bad. This matter is under investigation and, I am sure, the House will one day see the report of the committee presided over by the Cabinet Secretary. Anyhow, these were procured by the usual methods for procurement of articles, placing the orders with the Indian Supply Mission, Washington, on the indents prepared by the Army. I know that there may have been some over-

ordering from the point of view of consumption required for the period for which it was ordered. But very often we find with all this talk of over-ordering, we still want more material. My information at the present moment, not only now but for the last six months when we have gone into it very carefully, is that every bit of these items will be used, not just now but during the period when these other equipments are in use.

There has been, mainly from the Government benches, a certain amount of criticism, rather instructive criticism from their point of view, with regard to the Navy. We have been told that the money available for the navy is very small and India should have a larger navy. Then there was criticism of the purchase of ships, or the purchase of those ships which others do not want. This is entirely incorrect. First of all, we in this country could not afford to buy new capital ships which would not have lasted any longer than those we have. Often these ships are stripped right to the hull and re-built. The two capital ships which we have are *Delhi* and *Mysore*. *Delhi*, which was originally the *Achilles*, which took part in the Battle of Plate, has served the country for 7, 8 or 9 years. The ship *Mysore*, which is a modern cruiser, though it is second-hand in the sense it was under service with the British Navy, as the British Navy have such a large number of ships, its velocity of use was much smaller.

Then there has been, if I may say so without any discredit, very ill-informed criticism about the Aircraft Carrier. First of all, the Defence Minister is accused of buying it. I wish I could take the credit for doing so. But this aircraft carrier has been ordered a long time ago and is now commissioned. There is no question of its being a second-hand aircraft carrier. What happened was that a carrier called *Hercules* was commissioned by the British Navy. But, before it was completed, the war was over and they had no use for it. I mean they could not use it elsewhere

[Shri Krishna Menon]

and so were willing to spare it. It is not easy for us to go even second-hand vessels out of other powers. That Aircraft Carrier has been commissioned.

The next part of the criticism coming from the Opposition is that Aircraft Carriers are out of date and that they are only used for transport by the French and so on and so forth. I have not heard anywhere that the French use the aircraft carrier only for transport. It is quite true that they used it for transport when they came to this country in order to save their money when they brought their aeroplanes over here. But since we are sending people to France to practice on aircraft carriers, surely they must be using them.

The other country which has a large number of aircraft carriers is the United States of America. In the present allocation of the United States Budget for the Navy for the fiscal year 1962, increased allotments for conventional weapons as well as for conventional ships have been included. There has been criticism of our not using missiles on board warships which, if we do it, we will be the first people to do it. So, this criticism in regard to the aircraft carrier arises largely by lack of information.

The other part of the criticism was that since the aircraft carrier cannot be used against China, it is not a matter of priority. But weapons for defence or war in the case of hostilities or war cannot be bought over the counter, nor can these men be trained in two days. The Aircraft Carrier has not only been under discussion but has been under active preparation for the last five or six years. 200 or 300 officers will be on it. It takes five or six years for even a second-hand aircraft carrier to be put into commission.

Shri Raghunath Singh is very concerned that we have no submarines because he fears that if we are attacked by other people's submarines we would not be able to attack them.

Again, I am not a Naval expert, but a submarine is not attacked by a submarine. A foreign submarine is usually dealt with by anti-submarine devices. Therefore our Navy specialises in anti-submarine warfare because we cannot afford the other. That is one thing. Secondly, it has got to tune in with national policy. A submarine is an offensive weapon and we are not an offensive-defensive apparatus, that is to say, our defence is not conditioned for offensive purposes, we are not going to conquer anybody else's country. We only want to deal with the submarines that come over here. Therefore we are more concerned with the depth charges, anti-submarine practice etc.

Shri Raghunath Singh: We have no anti-submarine devices.

Shri Krishna Menon: The Indian Navy concentrates very largely in this field. They exercise with other Navies for anti-submarine warfare. There are anti-submarine vessels in the Indian Navy. If the hon. Member is desirous of knowing more about it, I would be happy to arrange for him to go to Bombay and see some of the establishments. We are therefore not likely to go into the purchase of submarines. With the resources at our disposal and also without satisfying ourselves that it is a good investment from the point of view of our country, we do not want to embark on equipment for offensive adventures.

There is also some concern that we do not have enough petrolcraft, that is to say, reconnaissance craft, gunboats and things of that character. Most of the Seaward defence boats are made here. Particularly with the acquisition now of the Mazagon Docks and the Garden Reach Dock Works, it is possible for us to do this. Since we make boats for the Finance Ministry there is no reason why we should not make boats for the Defence Ministry.

From the Government benches again came the request or rather a

suggestion, while welcoming the inauguration of four Sainik Schools during the course of the next few months, for the opening of more. Every hon. Member who spoke wanted a Sainik School in his own constituency. Since there are over 400 constituencies in the country, it is rather difficult to accede to all these requests, but I would like to say....

Shri D. C. Sharma: In the border districts.

Shri Krishna Menon: I think there is some misunderstanding about the purpose of these Sainik Schools. These are not military schools in the sense that they teach warfare. They are schools which will produce boys who are better fitted to go into Khadakvasla. I explained all that yesterday. The initiative for opening these schools has to come from the States. The bulk of the financial burden is borne by the States. We provide the direction; we provide the officership and everything else. We keep the All-India character of it with All-India examinations on a competitive basis so that nobody gets in by the backdoor. I am quite certain that, with the way this has gone on, by next year there will be more enthusiasm. We cannot force it down on the States and we hope there will be responses from the States. Anyway I shall communicate the wishes expressed by hon. Members to the appropriate State Governments and try to obtain their co-operation.

I have already given all the details of production in ordnance factories and so on. But it has not assisted in any way in stilling the criticism from some quarters. Here again, it would not be that I would be very facetious about it. But this is one of the difficulties that arise when the reply speeches are prepared beforehand. If Acharya Kripalani's speech perhaps had been written after I spoke—especially in view of the fact that I know very well that he has no prejudice against me—he would probably have spoken in a different

way; but the speech was written before I spoke. I have given all these figures and also said . . .

Acharya Kripalani: May I say that I referred to the hon. Minister's speech also and I gave my remarks; but if I did not accept all that he said, it cannot be helped?

Shri Krishna Menon: I can only follow the valuable advice given by the Prime Minister this morning and say that one of the freedoms which we may not exercise is the freedom from fact. The figures are there; the ordnance factories are there. I told this House that four years ago we were employing about 44,000 people and had to dispense with the services of about 6,000 people just before that. Today we are employing about 42,000 and getting greater results because on the one hand there is enthusiasm among the working people and on the other by scientific methods of production including various methods of relieving fatigue and the introduction of piece-work system, and what is more the recognition of the working people that they are working for themselves. There has been considerable advance in production and there is no idle labour. The production has gone up. Even if you do not take the figures of production from the point of view of the notional price of it, if an estimate is made of the material used, it is considerably more. Therefore, while we are practically paying only the same wage—it might be a certain amount more—the production has considerably gone up.

In this connection I have to deal with Bharat Electronics Ltd. Bharat Electronics came in quite rightly for a considerable amount of criticism. Two aspects of this question have been raised. One is, why should this be a Defence factory. Well, it was started seven years ago as a Defence factory, because the Defence people were expected to be the largest users of electronic instruments and what is more, there are certain products under secret list with the Defence Ministry

[Shri Krishna Menon]

which have to be manufactured there. But the Bharat Electronics works also for the Railway Ministry, the Home Ministry, the Transport Ministry and everybody else. Its production in 1956-57 was Rs. 6 lakhs; in 1957-58 Rs. 28 lakhs; in 1958-59 Rs. 65 lakhs; in 1959-60 Rs. 110 lakhs and in 1960-61 Rs. 170 lakhs. So during the last 4 or 5 years production in Bharat Electronics has gone up from 6 lakhs to Rs. 170 lakhs. Nobody could have expected that the factory would produce to its maximum on the day it opened.

Criticism is also being made from the Opposition benches with regard to the treatment of labour. I gave the figures yesterday that some years ago we had nearly 82,000 man-days lost by strikes or other labour difficulties. This year we lost 340 man-days excluding the days involved in the general strike which was not on an economic issue so far as we were concerned.

One of the Communist members raised the point that we were victimising the workers. There is no victimisation in the Defence factories. We carry out the same policy as the rest of the Government with regard to those who went on the general strike and who were involved in acts that would be otherwise criminal; there was the general formula about the violence or whatever it was. That has been followed. Even there like in all other Government establishments we have followed not a policy of vindictiveness or victimisation but have adopted a rather lenient or liberal approach provided things have changed.

I want to say quite frankly and honestly that in these factories, we cannot afford to overlook any possibilities of damage to machinery or leakage of information or anything of that character. And sometimes it has been found necessary to terminate the services of employees without assigning reasons for it.

As regards the Hindustan Aircraft, some questions were raised and I think I gave the figures once before. But the main advance here is that we no longer work on the ratio 1:1.8. I said yesterday that the general conception had been that it took three Indians to do what one Englishman or European did. That is now over, and I believe in the Hindustan Aircraft, they have brought it down to somewhere to 1.1 or 1.15 or something like that. So the man-hours in production would be the same.

Having dealt with these details, we come to one or two more controversial items. One is with regard to the purchase and use of Russian 'planes and the other the permission given to Russian pilots to fly over the Himalayas. May I first of all preface it by saying that Russian pilots not under our employment but under the employment of the Russian Government, thanks to the assistance of my hon. colleague, the Minister of Transport and Communications, fly over the Himalayas three times a week? The acquisition of Russian 'planes by us does not represent a departure from the policy of non-alignment, but is rather an emphasis of it. This country, as the Prime Minister stated to this House two years ago, has not passed a self-denying ordinance that it will buy its 'planes or its weapons or cooking vessels, whatever it is, from any particular source. It will buy them where it likes and where it is suitable in its own interests. These 'planes are for the purpose of carrying necessary goods and personnel to the more inaccessible areas, to the foot-hills or other mountainous areas, to which places now roads are being built. They are part of the border roads organisation and whether they belong to or are manned by the Indian Air Force, their purpose is to serve the road building programme. Today, as I said, both in regard to defence personnel and with regard to the road building personnel, not only their ordinary supplies like food, clothing and everything else—even a match

box—but heavy tractors or other machinery have all to be carried by air.

There are only two countries in the world which can supply planes of this size. One is Russia and the other is the United States. They were available only in Russia and they were suitable for our purposes. There had been statements in the newspapers, both in this country and abroad, that these 'planes have not performed upto specifications. This is entirely untrue. These planes have not performed according to specifications if you mean by that that on the first day, they did not carry the full load. That is always the case when a 'plane is 'broken in', because the pilot is anxious about his own safety—quite rightly. He does not load the 'plane to the full. It is built up. Three days ago, the 'plane went to Chusul and tomorrow it is to fly over the plains of India in order to have some practice. These 'planes have performed extremely well. They have landed on rough ground comfortably; same with the take-off. They have behaved well without giving any trouble whatsoever and they are taking ordinary aviation kerosene for fuel. They are powered by four turbo-prop engines and have a cruising speed of 400 miles per hour, which reduces the time and, therefore, freightage in regard to the carriage of these goods.

The next part is with regard to the Russian pilots piloting these 'planes in Leh. First of all, may I say that the Russians did not ask to come here? We asked them to come here. First when they came with the helicopter, they said, 'We do not want to go anywhere near the Pakistan border or the Chinese border'. But there are no mountains of the size or character of ours in Russia to test them out there, and we had to be sure that before we bought these expensive planes, they would function in those conditions and we would overcome even that if in spite of this there was any real security difficulty. These pilots have not been anywhere on our territory where

foreigners are not allowed. These pilots are not allowed anywhere where other nationals whom I do not specify—have not been allowed or taken. And, what is more, their commission is practically over today and will be terminated on the 21st of April. They want to go home.

The reason why they were brought here is this. These planes were bought from Russia on the basis of urgency and we were having stock delivered almost over the counter. The planes had come first, one, and two or three more of them had come. There were no pilots to fly them—our pilots are being trained in Russia and it will be some time for them to come and take over; some of them are half-trained and had come back. We would therefore, have had planes in India without their being used. That would have been infructuous and I am sure it would get reported next year that there was infructuous expenditure if we did not use them. Therefore, the one Russian pilot who was accompanied by India crew trained them to fly the same. It usually takes about 2 months even to "convert" pilots for an ordinary non-complex plane. We are lucky in this sense that our aviators are men of considerable skill and they are able today to fly these planes.

Then, we come to the question of helicopters. With regard to the helicopter, again, the charges are, first of all, these helicopter was flown by a Russian; secondly, that the Quarter Master General travelled in it; and, thirdly, that there is no check or anything of that kind.

This helicopter again was on test. There are no helicopters anywhere in the world except in the Soviet Union which will negotiate these heights and which will land at the height we want them to land. Now, on the cautional advice of our scientific people and our Air Force, we were not prepared to commit ourselves to buying them until they have been proved beyond any doubt.

[Shri Krishna Menon]

This plane took off from here and the officer who was then Q.M.G. at that place, who was in charge of the road building operation and secondly who was the only person to volunteer—there had been no volunteers; forthcoming—to go to the height of 23,000 ft. or so, also was there. The plane carried one Russian pilot, this gentleman and 2 Air Force Officers. There were no cameras; there is no photographic apparatus; and what is more, nothing could be seen from that height in that part of the year.

The next allegation made by Acharya Kripalani is that the Defence Minister telephoned to the Air Officer in Kashmir over the heads of the Army General commanding there who is the subject of much discussion in the House now and asked him to allow this plane to go. Now, Mr. Speaker, this plane flew on the 2nd December. I was at that time in New York. I am not saying it is not possible for me to telephone from New York, even though it is difficult enough to telephone from here to Kashmir. But I did not telephone and I was away. I knew about it when I came back.

In the Defence Ministry it is not always necessary for the Defence Minister to sit down and use the telephone. It does not work that way.

Then, there is the question of promotions. This matter has been dealt with by me at great length. I gave all the facts and figures yesterday; but still some doubts have been raised. I am also asked to explain this again. But, before I do that, I am reminded that I have to deal with the question of our Scientific and Research Organisation, which, I am reminded, was not mentioned by me yesterday.

There are 18 laboratories in the Defence Department. I may also say that there are 9 'detachments' functioning at various places in addition. There are 500 scientists who are now working as Defence Science Officers

and they have a great deal to their credit, not only in the way of research on fundamental principles that are required and that are ultimately used for their business but also for the development of weapons. The co-ordination of the Armed Forces and the Defence Science Services has increased considerably. In newer fields such as Radiation, Medicine and the necessary provision of food etc. for the Services also. They have achievements. Take, for instance, food. The Indian troops cannot be fed on bull's beef and things of that kind because their health would suffer. Even apart from that, the food habits of our people are not easily adjustable. It is necessary for the scientific department to find out ways and means of keeping *chapatis* fresh for six months without getting spoilt. Strange as it may seem, a large number of service people, particularly in the Air Force, are vegetarians. Vegetables are dehydrated in a way as to be compressed in size and so on. In food research, in weapon research and in all the investigations that have been made in regard to the newer weapons, the Defence Science Organisation has contributed effectively under the able guidance of Dr. Kothari whose mostly full time service we shall now lose because the Education Ministry has appropriated him, though he will continue to be the Chairman of the advisory committee.

16 hrs.

Questions also were raised about the nature of our weapons it was said they were out of date. Mr. Speaker, I rather regret this, not from the point of view adverse political banteror attack but because out in the gallery are large numbers of members of families of military personnel. There is nothing more demoralising for the troops, and more particularly for their families, than to feel that equipment provided is deficient or of bad quality. This is not the truth. The Indian Army for the class of Army it is and for the class of country we are—we

are not one of the major powers—is pretty well equipped and its equipment is improving from day to day, thanks to the decision of the Government to go more and more in to indigenous production, whereby it is possible for us to improve on what other people have made and what is more, to be able to make things for ourselves. The whole or practically all kinds of what is known by the general term "guns"—all kinds of guns—are made here including recoilless ones. Most of the electronics—not all of it—is also made here. When I come to the figures of foreign exchange expenditure, in this matter, it will be clear that in 1957-58 the expenditure on the purchase of stores from abroad was Rs. 83.57 crores but in 1960-61 it came down to Rs. 48.44 crores and we expect it to be even less this year. If all our present requirements were imported from abroad, now it would not be Rs. 93 crores but probably Rs. 120 crores. This will give some indication of the results of development in production, and the saving to this country in that way.

There remains the Air Force. There has been considerable expansion in the Air Force and I would like at this stage to mention that the Air Force has suffered an irreparable loss in the death of Air Marshal Mukerjee. But the traditions over which he presided are well kept up. There is considerable shortfall in the cadre of its officers. Younger people are being brought in and I believe from the next year, we shall have to draw considerably on the Auxiliary Air Force to relieve some of our potentially operational pilots.

Now, savings in regard to production. This question was asked the other day: why does the Defence Ministry make tractors? The unfortunate word is 'tractors'. Tractors in this case are earth-moving machinery. Each year the Army is needing somewhere between 100 and 200 units of earth-moving machinery. They are the machines that build roads and do many things besides. I am surprised

that in Delhi anybody should ask: why the Army should have this machinery. They will not if only they remember the occasion when there was trouble about water shortage in Jamuna two years ago, this is the machinery which helped to bring relief. Anyway, when they have to be made for the Army, the same plant and the same facilities are useful for other purposes. It produces at the present moment, two types of vehicles also and going on to another two. The annual savings, according to figures which are vetted both by Finance and audit, would be Rs. 1.25 crores a year in respect of three-ton trucks and one crore on the one-ton truck; one is German and the other is Japanese. Also, thanks to the advice of our scientific people, considerable savings have been effected by the retrieving of old ammunition which of course cannot be used because old ammunition, even it appears to be usable, is not permitted to be used because of certain reasons—we have better knowledge in these matters now—and the materials are dumped in the sea. They are now immobilised by bomb disposal squads with a certain amount of risk. But it is done. In this way, the tin foil, the metal and everything else is retrieved. The same thing has been done in regard to the use of the different types of weapons which have been bequeathed to us from the pre-war days and later.

Now, I come to the last subject, namely, promotions. I dealt with this subject at length yesterday, but I am asked to say it again. There is the normal promotion with regard to the junior commissioned officers. It does not come even to Army Headquarters. They are done by the commanders of the area or region. Then about the officers having President's commission, up to from the rank of Lieut.-Col., they are promoted, the whole lot of them. There are two types of promotion in that bracket. Some of them are promoted by quality, that is to say, by their efficiency and merit, and such Lieut.-Col.

[Shri Krishna Menon]

can go up to earn higher salaries towards the end of their career in that rank. For the others who do not get such promotion by merit, who do not go to the Staff College, and so on, they are on the time-scale arrangement. Promotions from substantive ranks of Lieut.-Cols., Colonels, Brigadiers and Major-Generals, are done by what is called No. 1 Selection Board. The No. 1 Selection Board consists of the Chief of the Army Staff, his deputy—I am giving the procedure only for the army, but much the same applies to the Air Force except that the Air Force is more modern in its methods—three army commanders and four PSOs. They sit together. It is not as they interview two or three people from out of the people who apply and so on. They have all the papers before them. That is to say, each officer has got the Annual Confidential Report of some *prima facie* eligible candidates from the time he was commissioned in the army—whenever it was—and it is written according to established procedures. All these are examined. In addition to that,—these officers are now Generals—they would have some personal knowledge also, having commanded them or worked with them. All that comes in, and each person is marked separately. Ultimately, there is some reconciliation and co-ordination and what not. And then it is sent to the Defence Ministry and finally it comes to the Defence Minister through the Defence Secretary and his staff. It was said—it is very unfortunate—that the Defence Ministry officials, the Secretary, the Joint Secretary, the Deputy Secretaries and what is more the Deputy Ministers—all these people—in addition to the Defence Minister exercised their whims and fancies in this matter. While the Deputy Ministers can take care of themselves I believe it is only right that in a parliamentary system of Government, I should seek protection for these people, because we are blessed and fortunate, certainly, in our administration in having civil servants who conform to

prescribed codes of conduct and have a great deal of efficiency. Perhaps we would want them to go a little faster and that would pave the way for even better in the next generation. Anyway, these people do not in any way exercise their personal judgment except that which is based upon the facts before them. It is their duty to advise Government whether there are any flaws in the work done by the military officers and if anything has been overlooked they would draw attention to it. So, these things go backwards and forwards till they come to the Defence Minister. And the Defence Minister. And the Defence Minister, as the Prime Minister informed the House the other day, would confirm the recommendations in practically all cases. By that time, it has been discussed by the whole lot, and if there was any particular matter regarding the placement of the officer and what not, that also is talked over. From the debate here, it would look as if there was anarchy in this matter and a civil war going on. Apart from the few people who have the great privilege of personally having conversations with Members of Parliament or thinking that the ordinary methods of advancing by merit can be short-circuited by political intervention of others, I do not think that there is any distinction or discrimination of this kind.

There has been some misconception about what I said yesterday, when I said that large numbers of Lieut.-Cols. were superseded and I gave figures.

That, again, I give in order to point out that what is mistakenly called "supersession" is not unusual in the Army. In the second Selection Board No. 2, as I said, not even the civil service comes in very much because it is far difficult for them to go into the books of 300 or 400 people each time. Even there there are supersessions, in the ratio that I mentioned yesterday—I believe it is

280 odd Lieutenant Colonels selected and 400 or 500 rejected. At this stage everybody is considered and that it why there are rejections. When an appeal is made, usually army organisations, by force of habit I suppose, never admit appeals. They take a decision and they stick to it. Should there be any perversion of justice the aggrieved appeal to Government either through the medium of the Ministers or, ultimately, in certain cases they even appeal to the President. The President no doubt exercise authority on the advice of his Ministers.

Whether I convince the Opposition or not, I would like you, Sir, and the House to be convinced that these promotions are done with great propriety, with great care and by conforming to the rules laid down. In this way no injustice is done.

Shri Ranga: Question.

Shri Krishna Menon: It is quite true that every soldier and, certainly, every officer, not when he is commissioned but when he is too humble to think so, if he becomes a captain he probably thinks that he will become a general. That is a good thing. They say that a soldier carries a Field Marshal's baton in his knapsack. But the judgment has to be made by other people.

There are two other matters. One is with regard to a naval captain who was promoted. This has reference to the officer who is now the head of the National Defence Academy, and who is doing a job of work which has won praise for him everywhere. That would not deal with the position put up by the Public Accounts Committee. With great respect to that Committee I would like to point out that the rule they have quoted is not attracted by this case. The trouble that arose in this naval establishment over which he presides as captain, in the sense that he was Officer Commanding Bombay at that time, is that there were certain defalcations which

today are under enquiry by the Special Police Establishment. It would not be right for me to go into this. On the face of it they look extremely bad. But all this occurred in April, 1959. This officer was appointed to the Academy and the appointment to the Academy carries automatically promotion to the rank of Real Admiralship. That was done in December 1958. Government could not anticipate that there would be trouble in this place on his promotion. Therefore, this question did not arise at all. This came afterwards. This matter is under enquiry. The lower level officer—I believe it is a foreman—is under suspension and the matter is under enquiry by the Special Police Establishment and the usual procedures will be followed.

Sir, while I have no desire either to refer to any names or to express opinions in regard to individual officers, as the Prime Minister said this morning, it is necessary to be correct with regard to facts. Yesterday, Acharya Kripalani referred to the appointment of the Chief of General Staff. Again there is some misconception as to who the Chief of General Staff is—I am not going into it at the present time. The Chief of General Staff is one of the P.S.O's of the office headquarters, and it was said that the officer who is now holding it is an Army Service Corps Officer and that no Army Service Corps officer has been appointed to this place for a long time. It was also said that this was a piece of nepotism or political patronage. So far as I am aware, Sir, there is no politics in the Army except for those who have that brand of politics, where certain disgruntled officers, as the Prime Minister pointed out this morning, try to approach political organisations or Members of Parliament and use political influence. Now, this officer—I will not mention the name—was commissioned into the East Surrey Regiment in British times as an infantry soldier. After some time he became part of

[Shri Krishna Menon]

the Rajputana Rifles, then called the Napier Rifles. His period in the A.S.C. during British times amounts to somewhere about eight or ten years, out of 28 years of service. For over twenty years he has been an infantry officer, having belonged first to the East Surrey Regiment and afterwards to the Napier Rifles, which became the Rajputana Rifles afterwards. After he left it because an officer ceases to be in a regiment after he puts in a prescribed number of years or for other reasons, he went to the Bihar Regiment. He commanded various components of the infantry, including a brigade and division for a period of seven years, which is far more than the average of most of the officers, longer perhaps than most of our officers since partition. He was in active service in the North West Frontier Province and in Burma during the second world war and in Kashmir during 1948. His staff appointments included delegation abroad, including service on the Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission in Korea. During this period, according to the report before us, he carried out missions of a hazardous character in many places. Recently he was awarded what is called the Distinguished Service Medal, the Vishisht Seva Padak according to the new arrangement. It was suggested that this again was given as a piece of personal patronage. In fact, the Distinguished Service Medal is not even recommended by the Ministry; it is recommended by the services. The recommendation comes from the service to me through the Chief of Army Staff. It is not given for construction of houses, although construction of houses is extremely important in our system and this officer was more lately responsible for constructing houses for a whole division in the forward areas in less than two months. But it was not an award for the construction of houses. The whole record of the officer from the time he was commissioned to the present time, the question of his gallantry, the question of loyalty, the question of skill, all these were taken

into consideration for the award of the medal.

Reference was made to the flight of a helicopter, which again was undertaken by him partly because the Quarter-Master General which he then was is responsible for logistics in our Army and, secondly, because he is a very important member of the Border Roads Board and, thirdly, because there were not too many volunteers forthcoming. As it happened, the helicopter force-landed and all these men might well have been killed. On the 2nd December he took upon himself the voluntary duty and I believe he had the sanction of the Chief of Army staff; or it may be in the course of the ordinary duties. The helicopter force-landed in one of mountain places in Kashmir and, unfortunately, because bad weather broke out for two months, we could not rescue it. Now, if I may say so, the crash-landing or the damage to the helicopter is not due to the helicopters being made by any particular country. If we had purchased them from any other country, we would probably have had just the same trouble. Here again I would like to re-assure the House that there was no disregard of our security problems, because the pilot of the helicopter was not given any maps and our own auxiliary pilot was with him and a navigator and they were giving directions this way or that way. That is all. There was no question, as I said, of my instructing the lower formations.

As my time is up, I will come to my last point. Acharya Kripalani ended up or very nearly ended up his address to the House by charging the Defence Minister with various things. It is not for the Minister to defend himself; I think the vote will do it. But I am rather impressed by the fact that this indictment has a family resemblance to the impeachment of Warren Hastings. And Warren Hastings, Sir, was honourably exonerated by the British Parliament. He charges the Defence Minister with having created cliques in the Army.

But I believe there is no person more responsible for promoting and aiding cliquishness in the army than Acharya Kripalani himself. He entertains every mischief-maker, asks him to tell his story, stories which others would not listen to. He provides a megaphone for people to spread disloyalty and indiscipline.

I believe it is up to Acharya Kripalani at least to tell the hon. Prime Minister as to how he came into possession of correspondence that passed between one General and the Chief of the Army Staff. Since we have cases of leakage of information which is now under enquiry by Intelligence, I am quite sure that as a patriotic citizen he will help us to find this out. He said there is no written record or something of that kind. That Acharya Kripalani would not have seen or known of because it is kept under lock and key.

Then I am charged with lowering the morale of our armed forces. All I can do is to repeat what I said, namely, that the morale of the armed forces is high and higher than ever before, not only on account of the emoluments and other material things we have done for them but because with the advancement of education in our country both in the conventional and in the social sense, understanding the purposes for which they are engaged is high and more profound. His role in his country is more full understood by the ordinary soldier or the men in the other services. Therefore the morale of the armed forces is high for that reason as might be seen from the enthusiasm with which people are anxious to go on this mission to the Congo or to move to forward areas about which I am not at liberty to say at what places they are deployed.

Then I am charged with wasting money of "a poor and starving nation." Unless it means that I am wasting the money of a poor and starving nation by taking the time of this House—it must take a lot of

money to organise this debate the wasting of the money of the nation has been indicated by the figures of production that have been given, by the savings that have been indicated by our attempt to save foreign exchange which is even more important than saving money. I cannot waste by myself because the Government is a collective organisation, though in a sense it means the defence organisation.

What is more, there is our obvious refusal to be bludgeoned by the pressure of private interests from saving money for Government. We have not wasted any money. As I told you, we have saved Rs. 1½ crores, on one item alone and there are many others. I am quite happy to say that Acharya Kripalani can look into all this himself.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: What about the Audit Report? It has given instances of wastage.

Shri Krishna Menon: The Audit Report is read but not the replies. For instance, last year came an Audit Report about 50 items most of which I said were out of date going back to one Sir Alexander Cunningham or whatever he was who bought some blankets. Anyway, I gave those answers... (Interruption). Please, do not interrupt me. I did not interrupt you. Then it went to the Public Accounts Committee. They accepted some of it—not most of it, I think—and some of it they did not. We hope to convince them because the facts are otherwise.

Then, I am also charged with—I hope the hon. Prime Minister takes notice of this—in the international field supporting totalitarian and dictatorial regimes against the will of the people and freedom. So far as this is concerned, my business in a humble way is to try and expound or advocate the policies of our Government which are one of non-alignment. If a totalitarian country is found to support our policy of non-alignment,

[Shri Krishna Menon]

we could not oppose it. Then we would not be non-aligned.

He also said about the neglect of the defence of this country against the aggression of Communist China. I say in spite of the risk of being misunderstood that it would not be a part of the policies of this country to try and raise troops of the size of the Chinese armies. We neither have the resources nor anything else. But I say with a sense of responsibility which is expected of me that in the circumstances that exist on our frontiers today we are as well protected as our resources and our understanding of these matters and circumstances permit. Our troops are in advance positions. Our equipment are of a better character. It is talk of this kind, that is, about alien persons photographing places and that we have not got proper equipment, that does the damage.

So many times it has been raised by the Opposition as to why we did not buy some of these things from private manufacturers. In fact, we do to some extent. We are not interested as a Defence Ministry in the ideology of private and public enterprise, but we are interested in quality control. If you will bear with me, I will give one instance. When these trucks were made we were told that there were manufacturers who were making radiators and we should buy from them. We did. They leaked with the result that people who saw the trucks said that they were bad. So if any part is bad, the whole of it is bad.

I will conclude in one minute.

Since this matter of promotion has come up again, all I need to say is that when it came up last time, the Prime Minister dealt with the position, and he said this

"Acharya Kripalani referred to some remarks made by some other Members opposite on the last occasion. If I may say so with all res-

pect, they were not at all proper remarks, about General Ayub Khan and all that... For instance, Acharya Kripalani himself talked about political considerations in regard to promotions. I invite Acharya Kripalani to come and see the files of every man promoted, himself. I invite him to come and see them."

Then, the Prime Minister went on to say:

"Acharya Kripalani is a respected party . . ."

—now, he is no longer the leader of a respected party—as he said—he leads himself—

"... He is not either the public press or a public meeting in Ramlila Grounds. He is not the mirror, I hope, of every rumour that is thrown about in the City of Delhi or elsewhere."

Sir, the Prime Minister is one of those people in the world who have so many hopes, oftentimes only to be disappointed, and this is one of them.

Then, he goes on to say

"It is quite right for him to draw attention. But I invite him here and now, and anyone else in this House, to come and examine every file on promotions, because..."

Then, there was an interruption by Acharya Kripalani, and somebody else. Then, a little later, the Prime Minister went on to say

"I am dealing, Sir, with the points, separately, and I am venturing to suggest—because this was Acharya Kripalani's point, whatever the basis of his information was, that promotions have been made for political considerations—I invite Acharya Kripalani, or any committee of the House appointed by you to go and look at every file dealing with promotions. Here is an open invitation, Sir, so that this matter may be dealt with thoroughly and fully, which is far better than

any discussion elsewhere. Go to the source, form your own opinions; I will not be there, see the files."

That is, he said, you see the files yourself. Then, what has happened?

Shri Ranga: If the invitation is still open, here is an opportunity for the Speaker to appoint a committee or a commission.

Shri Krishna Menon: What has happened? Not only did Acharya Kripalani not write, but no one else too wrote to come and see, except one Member of Parliament, and we kept everything ready for him, and he never turned up.

Acharya Kripalani: When the Defence Minister was speaking, we were listening to his speech and we did not interrupt him. When the Prime Minister had said that the books could be seen, then I had written to the Prime Minister. I am sorry that though this was a private correspondence, but, as the question has arisen, I say that I had written to the Prime Minister that if everything could be found from books, there would be no courts of justice, and there would be no evidence taken, but I was willing to agree that a committee might be appointed where officers might be called and evidence might be taken. Everything is not decided only from books. That is all that I have to say.

Mr. Speaker: Is any hon. Member pressing any of his cut motions?

Shri Naushir Bharucha: I am pressing cut motions Nos. 1250 and 1227.

Shri Ranga: Mr. Speaker, Sir, here was an open invitation extended by the hon. Prime Minister. You appoint a committee by yourself.

Shri M. B. Thakore: I request that my cut motion No. 271 may be put to vote separately.

Acharya Kripalani: Nobody wants a division.

Mr. Speaker: I shall now put Cut Motions 1250, 1227 and 271 to the vote of the House separately.

The question is:

"That the Demand under the head Ministry of Defence be reduced to Re. 1 (Failure to take effective steps to defend the country against aggression from Communist China)." (1250)

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

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

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That the demand under the head Defence Services, **Effective—Army** be reduced by Rs. 100 (Need to provide more facilities and amenities to armed forces.)" (271)

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: I shall now put all other Cut Motions to the House.

All the other cut motions were put and negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts shown in the fourth 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. 8 to 12 and and 111 relating to the Ministry of Defence.

The motion was adopted.

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

DEMAND No. 9—DEFENCE SERVICES,

"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 SERVICE,
EFFECTIVE-ARMY**

"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**

"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**

"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'."

**MINISTRY OF COMMUNITY DEVELOP-
MENT AND CO-OPERATION**

Mr. Speaker: We will now take up the Demands relating to the Ministry of Community Development and Co-operation.

**DEMAND No. 6—MINISTRY OF COMMU-
NITY DEVELOPMENT AND CO-OPERATION**

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

That a sum not exceeding Rs. 27,99,000 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 Community Development and Co-operation'."

**DEMAND No. 7—COMMUNITY DEVELOP-
MENT PROJECTS, NATIONAL EXTEN-
SION SERVICE AND CO-OPERATION**

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,75,57,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges