

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

hon. Minister should settle this thing in the beginning of the Session so that we are not stranded towards the end of the Session. I want his co-operation in this matter. I am prepared to co-operate with him and I hope he will not reject my co-operation here because I am a Communist.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 2.30 in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned for lunch at one minute past one of the clock.

The House re-assembled after lunch at half past two of the clock, THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA) in the Chair.

RESOLUTION REGARDING APPOINTMENT OF A COMMITTEE TO ENQUIRE INTO THE LIVING AND WORKING CONDITIONS OF OFFICERS AND RANKS IN THE ARMED FORCES—Continued.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, we were told by hon. Members on the other side that the Armed Forces should not be dragged into politics. One of our friends also advised us for God's sake not to bring in or drag the students, the police and the army into politics. I would request the Members of this great political organisation not to have two standards for God's sake—whether in the international sphere or in the national sphere. I would like to ask my hon. friends as to who brought the students and the Police into politics first. After the Independence when the burden of running the Government fell on the shoulders of this premier political organisation i.e. the Congress, whether it was non-cooperation movement or even subsequently wherever they were not in power, is it not true that they deliberately brought in politics in the relation to students and others? We know how in the recent events in Kerala, for

example, students have joined this struggle. Therefore, it does not behove them to have one standard for themselves and another standard for others for the same thing.

Sir, Parliament is the supreme ruler of the country. It has to look after every machinery and after every organ of the Government, and if we do not talk of the welfare of the army here . . .

SHRI STEEL BHADRA YAJEE: Who says not?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Congress says not. And my objection is that they should not have two standards; they should have one standard.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: We have one standard.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: That is my credence. Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I should like to develop my point. These interruptions disturb my chain of thought.

So, Sir, I was saying that we should not have two standards. We are not dragging the army into politics. We are a sovereign body and we want their conditions to be ameliorated. We want the conditions of every organ of the Government to be ameliorated. Similarly, conditions of the army should also be ameliorated.

Sir, we have heard speeches in this House on the occasion of Budget debates, on Appropriation Bills, on Finance Bills and so on in which the army was discussed and I feel the language used today by the mover of the Resolution here was very very mild. He was very modest as compared to the language used by our friends on the other side. Of course, if the mover of the Resolution were Mr. Bhupesh Gupta or some other hon. friends on the other side, the language would have been very different because they are used to a language which is very strong. But, in this case the language of the mover of this Resolution was very very modest. He had

no dogma about it. Even in regard to the personnel of the Committee he said that that was his view.

In this connection he referred to the discrepancy in the salaries of the officers and other ranks. It is a fact that there is a very big discrepancy, and if I mistake not, my hon. friend, Mr. Bisht, in his speeches on this particular issue during earlier debates has used even stronger language.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is their divine right.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: So, I would request them that this divine right should have one standard, and not two standards.

Then, Sir, I would submit in this connection—I am sorry I have lost my chain of thought.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: He always loses it

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I would, in this connection, submit that in this Resolution there are a number of things which have been mentioned. There is the question of education of the children of our Armed Forces, their welfare and a hundred and one things which need to be attended to. Though all these things have been admitted by our hon. friends on the other side, they are opposed to the Resolution which is so simple and so clear, about which there cannot be any two opinions in the ordinary circumstances.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: On a point of explanation, Sir.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: My time is limited. Unless I am allowed extra time . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA): No, but please continue.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I am very sorry my chain of thought is again

broken. So, these are the conditions. In their speeches the hon. Members on the opposite have admitted the drawbacks, but they are opposed to the Resolution. They have admitted that our army has to do onerous work. In Pakistan we have got a hostile neighbour. They are armed to their teeth. We have to have our army contented. But if we do not look to their comfort, how can they be contented? We know that this country is seething with discontent, from down below to the ruling party. Take the case of the seniormost service class, the I.C.S. Officers. They are seething with discontent. With regard to the army—we have got contacts with them, we have got friends there—they have discontent. If we say they are contented and they have no grievance it is due to their patriotism that they are sticking to their guns. But the fact remains that they have got lot of grievances. If we make an attempt to redress those grievances, we are not doing anything wrong. We are not dragging them into politics.

I was referring to Pakistan arming itself to its teeth. Our brave soldiers are living in very abnormal conditions in Kashmir. They are somewhere and their children are somewhere. The soldiers are in advance camps where families are not allowed. Their children's education is suffering. These are the problems which have got to be looked into. If we do that, we would be encouraging them to be all the more dutiful to their country.

Since the time at my disposal is short, I would like to refer to a point directly. The mover of the Resolution referred to the personnel of the army being made to do the domestic work of the officers. I think it was Mr. Bisht who contradicted it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA): What Mr. Bisht said was that a separate class of people are appointed for it. It is not the regular army personnel who do the domestic work.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: That is the point which I am also referring to. I say the army personnel, the soldiers, are used for domestic purposes. I will be very glad if I am contradicted by the Defence Minister who, unfortunately, is not here but his Deputy is here.

SARDAR S. S. MAJITHIA: They are not used for domestic purposes at all.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Let me finish it. I am prepared to accept a challenge on this issue. Well, Sir, I see these things everyday. Let him contradict them if he wants.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: He has contradicted you already.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I don't accept that contradiction. Sir, I am sorry that these interruptions are made. You will bear me out, Sir, when I say that I have been here in this House for four years, and I want to know a single day or a single moment when I have interrupted any hon. Member. Unfortunately, I am in the habit of telling home truths whether my friends like them or not. Therefore, Sir, I want to be left alone, because I have a certain fixed time in which I have to finish what I have to say. So, Sir, I can say that not only are they required to do some domestic work, but they are required to do some menial work also. These army officers have got orderlies. The bigger the officer, the larger is the number of orderlies, I can prove that. My relations and my friends are here. If he is a Major, he has got one orderly. If he is a Colonel, he has got three orderlies.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Have you seen them?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Yes, I have seen them.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: So here is an eye-witness?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I have got my very near relations there. Then, Sir, if he is a Chief of Staff, he has got more orderlies. I can tell you that I sometimes go to my friends in the evenings to have drinks with them. I have seen them doing the work of *ayah* for little children. They do the work of a cow-boy, a table-boy, a *khansama*, a cook, a cleaner of motor-cars and what not. When they are not orderlies, they go back and join other regular ranks.

सरदार रघुबीर सिंह पंजहारी (पंजाब) :
आप बीकानेर स्टेट फोर्स की बात कर रहे
होंगे ?

श्री जसवंत सिंह : नहीं जनाब, बीकानेर
फोर्स की बात मैं नहीं कर रहा हूँ। मैं ग्रेट
इंडियन आर्मी की बात कर रहा हूँ। यहां पर
बीकानेर की फोर्स नहीं है।

There are Majors and Colonels in the Indian Army, and sometimes I go to them. And I laugh at them. I can prove all these things. Therefore, Sir, if it is said that these army people are not made to do the domestic work, that would not be correct.

Lastly, Sir, I must say that the mover of the Resolution has definitely said that this is his view. And that may be so. I also do not agree that only Members of Parliament on such a Committee will be able to do justice to this subject. There may be any Commission on which we should have one or two Members of Parliament. Have you not seen that in regard to the question of welfare of the army, in other democratic countries, Commissions are appointed? In England, Sir, several Royal Commissions have been appointed at different times to go into the question of service conditions of the army. In France there are Commissions appointed to go into the question of service conditions of the army. Similarly, Sir, in other countries also we see such Commis-

sions being appointed. Therefore, Sir, I feel that heavens will not fall if in India a Commission is appointed to go into the question of conditions of the army. And by doing this the army will not be dragged into politics. The mover himself has openly said that this is his view. I personally feel that if only some Members of Parliament are appointed, probably they will not be able to do justice to this subject. Therefore, Sir, there should be a Committee of experts who are fully conversant with these issues and some Members of Parliament should also be associated with them. If that is done, I can assure you that it would go a long way in encouraging our Armed Forces to perform their duties more loyally and more faithfully. With these few words, Sir, I support the Resolution with this little modification. I am not tied by this phraseology that only Members of Parliament should be appointed on such a Committee to go into the question of service conditions of the army.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am neither a fellow-traveller nor a professional anti-Communist, and, therefore, I cannot take the line that this Resolution is a bad Resolution just because it emanates from a Communist Member or from a Member of the Communist Party. I look upon myself as a good sound radical socialist who judges such questions in the light of reason. I try to approach such questions from a rational point of view. Having made that clear—I do not want the impression to go abroad that I am opposed to this Resolution because it emanates from a Member of the Communist Party—I would like to say a few words on the Resolution itself.

It has to be conceded that the Resolution is moderately-worded. It does not ask for something which is impossible. I do not agree with the view that Parliament must not intervene in army matters, that Parlia-

ment Members must not keep themselves in touch with army affairs. Mr. Vice-Chairman, politics is life, and you cannot dissociate the army from parliamentary life. This Parliament is the supreme legislative authority in this country, and, therefore, it has a right to take interest in army matters also. I remember, Mr. Vice-Chairman, some debates which we had in this House in the old days in the Council of State. I had brought forward a Resolution for the abolition of the Viceroy's Commissioned Officers, and the Commander-in-Chief, Sir Philip Chetwode, described us as arm-chair politicians and so on. The next day—the following day—he had to express his apologies, he had to apologise, and I think that was the first time that a British Commander-in-Chief had to apologise for that slip of tongue. Therefore, Sir, that is not my attitude. I would, therefore, like to judge this Resolution on some rational basis.

Now, let us see what the mover of this Resolution wants. I am prepared to give him full credit for sincerity and honesty of purpose, but he has not made out a case for the type of Committee that he wants to be appointed. Recently, there have been some changes effected in the army by the Defence Ministry. I think now we have about ten Lieutenant-Generals. We used to have in the old days about three Lieutenant-Generals. Now we have ten. The Deputy Defence Minister will correct me if I am wrong.

SARDAR S. S. MAJITHIA: Six.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Now, we have increased the number of Major-Generals, and the army officer will be able to retire hereafter as a Lieutenant-Colonel, and the age of compulsory retirement, unless he is given extension, is 48 years. Now, all these reforms have, to some extent, mitigated the hardships of the officer ranks of the army. Then take the case of naval services or the air services. Similar

[Shri P. N. Sapru.] reforms have been effected in the Navy and, I believe, in the Air Force also. Therefore, Sir, so far as the officer ranks are concerned, there has been, to some extent, an improvement in the conditions of life.

The Pay Commission is about to report but its main concern is with the Civil services. I suppose after the Pay Commission's report, the question of the salaries or emoluments that we have given to the officer ranks of the army will also have to be taken up by us in a proper spirit. Our young army officers are doing a fine job. I think they are a fine lot of men and we have to depend on them for the security of our country and we should be sympathetic towards their basic needs. We are not a very rich country. They do not want us to pay them extravagantly but we must pay them sufficiently. We should pay them enough to live in comfort.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, it is not only about officers that we must think. We come from the officer class ourselves and naturally our sympathies are with the officer class but I would like to think also, and I would like this House also to think, about the lot and conditions under which our *jawans*, our non-commissioned officers, our petty naval officers and naval ratings and our airmen are working. We should give some attention to them and we should view their problems with sympathy. It should be our endeavour to provide for them opportunities provided they have ability and talent as well as character to rise to the highest positions which are possible in the Army, Navy or Air Force. Just because a man has been to Dehra Dun or Poona, it does not follow that opportunities of rising high should be denied to those who started life in ordinary capacities. We should evolve a system which enables merit to come to the top and so thinking has to be done, will have to be done, along these lines by our Defence Department.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, I may say that while I do not definitely think that a

Parliamentary Committee is exactly the sort of machinery that can help in the solution of this problem—committees are often intended to shelve matters and committee reports become matters of controversies among politicians—I think it would be a good thing if an opportunity was afforded to Members of Parliament to visit some of the military centres in this country, some of the Defence centres in this country. I remember that in the olden days in 1939 and 1940 tours were arranged and I was a Member of one or two of those tours and we visited some military schools and establishments, saw things for ourselves and that was a good education for us because Parliament which is the supreme legislative authority in this country, which is the sovereign body in this country, must take an interest in its defence forces. How can you deny the Parliament that right? The defence forces can send petitions to us and Mr. Saksena is the Chairman of the Committee on Petitions, and if they send petitions to us, it will be our bounden duty to look into those petitions. We pass laws governing the Armed Forces. Therefore we should be well-educated in matters relating to defence and it will be a good thing if teams of observers are taken to these places from time to time.

Then I would like to stress the fact that it is important for us to take some interest in the educational, social and cultural life of our army officers and particularly our N.C.Os., and other ranks. The life of some of these officers and the other ranks is a hard one. There should be schools and institutions available where they can get their children properly educated, because unless their children are properly educated, they will feel handicapped in the struggle for existence in this country. Also, we need to provide for our men good living accommodation. I believe that the barracks in which our soldiers and sailors live are fairly good but I would not mind spending a little more if we

could, by so doing, increase their comforts, because after all we want them to give their best to the country. They will not give their best unless they feel that the people, the men who are governing this country, have the desire to do the best by them. This matter should be looked at from a non-party point of view. It is not a matter which is the exclusive concern of the Congress Party or the Communist Party or the P.S.P. It is a matter which transcends party differences because we want a good army, we want an efficient army, we want a disciplined army and I am certain that in this field at all events even today there can be and there should be co-operation among all parties. Mr. Vice-Chairman, I remember the days when it used to be said by the Britishers that our young men are no good as officers. I went to a mass in Ambala and I met at a dinner a young Muslim officer. He was nationalist by conviction so he told me—and I have no reason to disbelieve him—that the British Officers were most unsympathetic. He said, "You know, you are dining with my Colonel and you think that he is a good man but he is not. Look, I am here. I am the only Indian here. He told you that I was really good. This is the first time that he has cared to acknowledge me. If I dance, then I am told that I am running after white girls. If I do not, then I am told that I am not social. If I play bridge and play efficiently, then they say, 'Oh! He is just playing for money.'" So all these things happen there. They make my life miserable." I thought he was a very good officer and the impression that I formed of our men was that they were first class. I am glad that today, after 12 years, the Defence Ministry and this House and all political parties can feel proud of our Army, of our Navy and of our Air Force. I have nothing more to say.

3 P.M.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, we have sponsored this

Resolution here with this proposal because we want to break the isolation that exists between Parliament on the one hand and our Armed Forces on the other. In conditions of democracy, Parliament should be interested in knowing how the men and the officers in the Armed Forces live their lives, how they are being reared and how they are being fashioned as defenders of our country. Sir, it is not a question of party politics at all because when it is a question of the Independence of our country and of the defence of our national interests, we all combine across party barriers in serving the paramount cause. Here I can say there is a lot of good in the Armed Forces and naturally in independent India there is bound to be improvement. That improvement has doubtless taken place and for this we congratulate and greet all those men and officers who have brought about an improvement in the situation and who are trying to bring a change in the outlooks as well. Here I do not raise any question or say anything in a discriminatory tone, because if the Indian army is good, it is not only because the ranks are good but it is also because there are officers who are good and they together make the Armed Forces what they are. But I know that persons like the Nawab of Chhatari, who live in by-gone days and who have yet to realise that we have become a free country although he has now found himself planted on the Congress benches, cannot fully understand what is obvious to the man in the street. As for political motivation, the less said the better. It would be making as absurd a suggestion as saying that the naval units now should operate on the Himalayas. But there are some people who display such Himalayan naivete in such matters. Our Armed Forces must be imbued with the highest sense of patriotism and democratic spirit and unflagging and passionate love for the country. These are admitted by all and we do not differ. Naturally, we have to see whether we are doing everything to bring about this state of affairs,

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

Weapons are important, especially in modern days. But the human side in the national armour is in some ways even more important than the weapons that the men wield. We must pay due attention to this side, to the human side, to the condition of the men and officers of the Armed Forces. We discuss the question of workers and peasants and the condition of other sections of the community. Why must not we discuss the conditions of service and other things relating to the life of the men and officers of the Armed Forces?

Now, let me start with the question of salaries. Let me make one point clear. I am for redressing the grievances of all, the men and the officers. But if I lay more emphasis on the men, the ranks, it is because they are not only more numerous, but perhaps they deserve our attention a little more than others who are better placed. Coming to the question of salaries, for instance, the sepoy has a salary of only Rs. 25 as basic salary and the salary of the General is a hundred and twenty times that of the sepoy. Disparity will be there, but it should not be so yawning as this. I don't say that the salary of the General should be reduced. I say that the salary of the sepoy should be increased from Rs. 25 to a decent standard. A subaltern, for instance, gets a start of Rs. 400 and after five years he gets Rs. 450. But the ranks they start on Rs. 25 and after five years they get Rs. 25 and 50 Naye Paise. In one case the increase is substantial—I don't mind it—but in the other case it is appallingly negligible and I want that to be removed.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

As far as the Pay Commission is concerned, I do not know what the Second Pay Commission will say about this, but from the First Pay Commission they did not get very

much and I think that question has also to be settled with the Second Pay Commission whose report is looming ahead. As you know, service under colour is restricted to a very limited period with the result that a large number of people who would otherwise be eligible to the full benefits of pension do not get it because they have to retire before the stipulated period which would make them entitled to the full pension. In this connection, I understand Gen. Thimayya made a speech on the 20th March, 1959 in which he said that the matter of raising the period of service under colour from seven to fifteen or twenty years was under consideration. But again a contradictory statement was made, I believe on April 9, 1959 in Parliament when the Minister said that there was no such thing under consideration before the Government. I would like to know the position and where we stand in this matter. I do maintain that the period of active colour service should be definitely increased to a longer period than obtains at present. I sympathise with the sentiments expressed by Gen. Thimayya and I am sure these sentiments are also shared by the Defence Minister himself.

Normally, a sepoy who retires after 15 years of whole-time active service gets Rs. 15 per month as pension. You will understand that this is a very negligible sum. And he retires at the age of 40 when he is neither here nor there. He is badly placed because he cannot pick up a job that he likes and whatever he gets by way of pension is very inadequate. In some cases the pension is raised to Rs. 22 but that again is after he has served for 15 years. And that, as I have pointed out is not possible in many cases because service under colour is restricted and a large number has therefore to retire after 7 years of service and as a result many of them get a pension of only Rs. 10 per month. Officers normally get 50 per cent of their basic pay as pension. I

do not grudge it. They should get it, but why the ranks should get only 35 per cent. of their basic pay as pension I cannot understand. There should be a uniform principle.

In the matter of dearness allowance again the ratio is very little. The officers get more and a higher ratio whereas the ranks get less. And what is more surprising is that the ranks do not get what their counterparts in civil service get by way of dearness allowance. This disparity should go. However the pension should be 50 per cent. of the basic pay in all cases and that is what I would suggest.

We know that 14 per cent. of the ranks are permitted to live outside the station, but the question of quarters is not settled. In many stations they do not have proper quarters and they are also not given adequate housing allowance and so on. The sum of Rs. 8 or Rs. 9 that is given is not adequate at all. Here again I would suggest that the question of accommodation should be gone into and when 14 per cent. are allowed to live out, they should be given adequate allowance, compensatory allowance. This applies mostly in the case of the Air Force.

As regards journey allowances, in the case of the ranks each is given Rs. 2/4/- which is not enough, not even for two meals. You may not be a glutton; you may be a very moderate and modest eater. Even then it is inadequate. This should be increased. The officers get more. I do not say that the officers should be starved but that the other ranks should be fed well.

There is a disturbance allowance, allowance for children's education, etc., available to the officers. Unfortunately, these are not allowed to the other ranks. The travelling allowance is sixty-eight times more in the case of the officers. This discrepancy should be removed and these other ranks should be given a little more.

They should be given the disturbance allowance, allowance for the education of the children and also increased travelling allowance.

Accommodation is yet another problem and that affects not only the ranks but also in some cases the officers. I would appeal to the leaders of the Armed Forces, the Indian Army, the Navy and the Air Force, to draw up schemes and come up with proposals here. We shall support them. The Defence Minister should take up such questions of accommodation, better service conditions and the Communist Party will never grudge allocation towards such essential expenditure in the interests of national defence. It is not true to say that we oppose the Defence Budget. Certainly, we oppose the squandering of money abroad but we would like to see the material and cultural condition of the Armed Forces, both men and officers, uplifted and for this we are prepared not only to be generous but even over-generous and I am sure that every one in this House will share this sentiment.

There is one category called the Emergency Commissioned Officers. They are suffering from a disability. They should be made regular Commissioned Officers and the age-limit in their case should be removed. They joined at the time of the War naturally under certain conditions. I do not think that they should be made to suffer.

The question of supersession has arisen. Many people are making political propaganda out of it, if you like. Some people oppose supersession. Well, this word leaves a bad taste in the mouth sometimes but I do accept in principle that in the interests of defence sometimes it is necessary to promote people on sheer merit but then, Sir, it must be above board. It must not be intrinsically good only; it must at the same time look good and just. Therefore, intrigue should be given no quarter and no shady deal should be there at all. I am not

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

saying that the hon. Minister is guilty of such acts, not at all. I do not accept the accusations made against him on that score. All I say is that the man whom you supersede, somebody up there may have his grievance. His grievance should be very patiently attended to and at the same time, this should be impressed on the people concerned that we are doing it in the paramount interests of the entire Armed Forces. That is the point I should like to stress.

Then comes the question of promotions also matter. At Palam in have got that about eighty to ninety per cent. of the ranks retire as ranks after long periods of service, hardly with any improvement at all in their conditions. Avenues of promotion should be opened for them. That is very very important. Welfare funds are there and they are administered by the officers. Good officers are also there but the ranks should also be associated in this job.

Finally, Sir, even small and minor things also matter. At Palam in every April we observe the 1st as the Air Force Day and there is a sort of a joint dinner for officers and men. It seems that the officers once got their dinner set in silver and good crockery and so on when the dinner was supposed to be a joint dinner. The ranks did not like it and you cannot blame them. Such little provocative incidents should not be there at all.

These are some of the matters which I have brought to the notice of the hon. Minister and I would finally appeal to him, to his colleagues in the Ministry and to the leaders of the Armed Forces, especially the Chiefs of Staff, to consider this thing with a view to improving their conditions of work, conditions of their men and for building up the defence forces of this country in a way worthy of our great nation. Our main strength is not atomic and other weapons which

we do not possess. We possess very good human material and given care, attention and sympathy, generosity of heart and vision, we can make a very good defence force out of the very great human asset and material that we have got.

Thank you, Sir.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR (Madras): Mr. Deputy Chairman, let me first offer my hearty congratulations and also my appreciation of the great and good work which our Armed Forces are doing. As has been said by others before me, most of them, on the whole all of them, are a fine lot and they have been imbued with devotion for this great country. What was once a mercenary force, after Independence had turned itself into a national army ready to fight our national battles to guard our frontiers and to be always awake to do their duty. While considering the Army, the Navy and the Air Force, it is necessary that we from time to time look at their conditions. I do not think there is any difference of opinion on this matter. There is unanimity of opinion in all parts of the House that they should be looked after, that as much as possible their material conditions should be improved, that the education facilities available to their children should be improved and that all that can be done to make them happy, strong and noble must be done. While considering this matter, we shall always also consider, Mr. Deputy Chairman, the circumstances in which we are placed. After all the army is our army, the people who join the army, the officers and the men, are part of us and the standards which they expect or the standards in which they should be maintained must be consistent with the standards in our own country. There is no use comparing our standards with standards in other countries economically far advanced than us. We want to raise the standards available for the other civilian employees of labour and agriculture but we cannot do so because our economic production, our economic

standards are not high. In the same way what exists in the army should be compared with our existing conditions amongst the civilian population in the country and whatever is possible, consistent with our resources, must be done. Looked at from that point of view, Mr. Deputy Chairman, while I agree that constantly the authorities in the army, the authorities in the Defence Ministry, should be aware of the problems and face them and should do whatever is possible or can be done, at the same time, a sense of proportion is necessary to be maintained so that not only whatever is due to our men is given but also that our men in the defence forces learn to live and be happy in the conditions of our national set-up.

In this matter, there is one further thing which we should remember. The hon. Member opposite just now pointed out the difference, the large difference, that exists between the lowest paid man and the highest officer in the army. It is really a vast difference but then that difference again reflects the large difference that we have in the case of the lowest civilian employee and the highest civilian employee of the Government. The difference is great indeed and so, it is necessary to face this problem not as one something peculiarly facing the army but as a general problem in our national set-up. It is unfortunate that in all these years we have been unable to cope up with this. The difference between the lowest paid man and the highest paid man is tremendously much larger than what it should be. That difference, that gap, must be shortened. The lowest paid man must be raised, it is true, but this is a vast problem, Mr. Deputy Chairman, and this problem does not pertain to the army alone, it pertains to the civilian population also; it pertains to the official civilians; it pertains to the civil police. Therefore, this is an important problem, a problem to be faced not in the army sector alone but in the entire sector of our population. In addition, we

have to give them equipment, we have to give them facilities and we have to give them training. Furthermore, Mr. Deputy Chairman, an army is as great as the devotion it commands, the tenacity it has and the determination it has. An army is vulnerable if it has no devotion. So, it is necessary for us to build up the morale in the army. One way of building up the morale in the army is 'hands off politics within the army'. While we want the army to be strong, while we want the finest men to join the army, while the army has got to be united, to be ready for emergencies, the army must be kept apart, not to be dabbled, not to be confused, not to be tempted, not to be influenced, by parties.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Not to be 'attempted'?

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: To me, Mr. Deputy Chairman, the speech of the mover of the Resolution was very mild indeed. Usually we expect more fiery speeches. I accept that the Resolution also is very mild indeed. But I do not think that, while these things may be gone into by departmental committees, by committees within the army, by officers within the army, this is a matter in which a Parliamentary Committee should function. A Parliamentary Committee is usually attended with so much publicity which may not always be necessary in dealing with the Army, Navy and Air Force of our country. A Parliamentary Committee naturally consists of people of different ideologies, of people who may not always be together and who may, for pandering to the gallery, say certain things to the public which may not always be in the best interests when dealing with the army. And that is why this House, sovereign as it is, Parliament, sovereign as it is, could not and does not advisedly set up committees to go into certain aspects of administration. For instance, yesterday we had the

[Shri T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar.] meeting of the Consultative Committee on Finance. There were certain questions raised about the Reserve Bank, about the State Bank of India, certainly important questions, but those questions can be better dealt with by experts in their own fields than by setting up Parliamentary Committees for almost everything. We have the power to do it, surely, but the best way of doing it is not through a Parliamentary Committee. So, while I think that the House is wholeheartedly of the opinion that everything that can be done for the army, consistent with our national resources, should be done, at the same time it should be done in such a manner that the army is kept off from politics, that the maximum efficiency of the army is retained, that the maximum confidence of the people in the army is retained, and above all, the young men who are part of the army can stand up for the nation as a whole, not bothering about the various political difficulties and quarrels that exist in the country.

Sir, I do not like to take much more of your time. I believe that our army is a fine one. I believe that the young men who have joined the army are a fine lot. I think that they have been inspired by something greater than mercenary purpose when they joined the army. I think as they have promised and as they promise to do their best, we shall try to do our best consistent with our resources. With regard to all the suggestions that have been made here, we must leave them to the Ministry for consideration. Thank you.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND (Madhya Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am glad that the House has an opportunity to discuss this Resolution, so that the matter can be decided once and for all as to whether the army should be interfered with in any manner by people who

are not army officers or anybody else such as the ordinary citizen. It will be seen that the Resolution—as it is worded—leaves nothing for the Committee to enquire into. It seeks to enquire into the living and working conditions of officers and other ranks in the Armed Forces and the educational and other facilities at present available to their children living in military camp areas—and not those who are away at all—and to make recommendations for the improvement of such conditions and facilities. Very conveniently the mover of the Resolution said that so far as the existing facilities were concerned, we could thank Government. That means, in other words, that he himself confessed that there was ample provision for them, so that he did not want to narrate anything. As far as improvement of conditions is concerned, the case made out was very meek and mild indeed. In fact, as there was no case to be made, he couldn't go into details except saying that the conditions are far from satisfactory. I wish he had taken the trouble to detail what exact educational facilities and other living conditions were desirable, just as his successor from his Party, Shri Bhupesh Gupta, took the trouble of giving details about the salaries and other conditions and the differences in the method of promotion and increments, etc. of the officers as against those of the other ranks.

Before I go into the question as to what is required, I would like to point out, in addition to what has been submitted in some detail by the Congress Member, hon. Mr. Bisht, some of the present facilities enjoyed by the army personnel. The conditions of any employees in the country, whether they be in the army or in the railways or anywhere else, are to be compared with those existing for the majority of the people who are not in any service at all. And though it is legitimate to demand that the

conditions of service should be of as high a standard as possible, we cannot afford to forget what the other people are getting and in what conditions they are living. Here I am referring, first and foremost, to labourers and workers in factories and collieries and other places and also the agricultural labour who form the majority in the country. I am not for a moment suggesting that the army should be kept in as low a condition as others. Government has again and again resisted the attempts of some of the Members of Parliament in the Defence Consultative Committee, who were of the opinion that during peace time Government should employ army personnel for some peace-time tasks, so that they do not sit idle. Government has always explained to those people who held this view and asked for this new experiment that the army has to be kept at its highest excellent efficiency all the twenty-four hours of the day and every day of the year, because one would never know when the army would have to be used. Bearing that in mind, we cannot afford to forget that there may be a very vast difference in the conditions of one section of people and another. It is not correct to say that only salary is paid to the army personnel or the ranks. I am only dealing with the ranks first. I do not know whether it is correct, but I think the basic salary is about Rs. 30 and not Rs. 25 or Rs. 27 as was quoted just now by Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. Then, there are other facilities that are enjoyed by the ranks, which bring it to about Rs. 130 or Rs. 138, not in money alone, but also in terms of facilities that they enjoy. As such even though one would like to pay them more—nobody would deny them, I would like to repeat it again and again—I do not think, taking into consideration the country's purse, that this could be increased very much more. What is it that a man requires? These are: good food, house, clothing and good air I would say, and in every case, unlike the factory and other indus-

trial workers, the army personnel are housed in camps and in the best localities. So, there they have a great advantage over other services or other labour in the country. Sir, I would like also to point out that as far as the officers are concerned, on account of the sudden employment of a number of people in the officer ranks, Government had to make certain rules by which people had to retire from service at a certain age—I suppose 48 in the case of Lieutenant Colonels and 45 in the case of Majors. One also realises that they are perhaps made to retire seven years earlier compared to other services. Those are some of the difficulties that have resulted as a consequence of the large recruitment during the war. Leaving that part aside, I do not think the army people, even officers, will have cause to complain that they are worse off as compared to the civilian officers, except in the matter of some facilities that they enjoyed during the British days which were on a par with the facilities enjoyed by the officer of the British army and which have been curtailed. On the other hand, I would like to point out that even though in the railways they have reduced the first class to second class and the second class is now called the first class, the army people who used to travel by second class travel now by first class. And what I think the Members of the other side will appreciate is that a Lieutenant Colonel going on tour—very often that is a thing to be seen—travels in the same class, first class, with his Subedar or somebody of that rank, and they all go together without any distinction of rank.

Having said all this, I have also to point out that educational facilities have been provided by Government. There are four army schools in four areas for children, who have to be educated far away from the camps. There are certain difficulties which are being experienced by army offi-

[Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand.]
cers' children on account of language medium. I think Government would spare no pains to look into this question because the people from the south find it very difficult, with the medium of instruction having changed, to educate their children in the north where previously English was the very common medium. As such the army will have to open, and I am sure will soon be opening, more schools for the children of their personnel.

I would like to draw the attention of the House to some points made by the first speaker which I have not been able to appreciate very much. He remarked that members of the Armed Forces, particularly the ranks—whose interests they want obviously for reasons they know best to take up more here—have to work for more than eight hours, and I do not know whether the suggestion was that they should be paid overtime. But it is in the nature of the service that they should be prepared to work more than eight hours. Hours should not be any consideration because during peace time they have hardly any work except doing their drill and routine work. So, with the leisure that they enjoy during peace time—I am open to correction, I do not know if they have much work—with the leisure that they enjoy comparatively, except doing their routine military drill, naturally they have to be paid. If there is any war or anything . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: They sometimes manage the mismanaged floods.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: The army has to help naturally in these things. In every country it does so because, as everybody knows, it is the best disciplined force. And floods are a national danger, and if an army can face any calamity like war, I think this could also be part of its work. It should not be considered otherwise, but it is a compliment to their ability to work and give the best results. I

would like to point out that in no country this question of time is taken into consideration in the case of work by the army people.

Then a reference was made to nationalities. I did not understand what was wanted to be pointed out, whether persons from Maharashtra were brought in or not. But ordinarily people from Maharashtra are taken in military service almost like people from the north. Andhra and some other States were mentioned, and it was tried to be made out that not many people from these parts of the country are taken. It was said that people from all nationalities should be taken in equal number or in proper proportion. That use of the word 'nationality' is to be highly deprecated. It is reminiscent of the use of this word in the U.S.S.R. and in China, where people from different parts of the State are termed as different nationalities, and at Peking in China there is a school for the training of nationalities. We take pride in our country in calling ourselves as belonging to one nation, and I hope this idea will not be given more currency than it has been done here today.

Lastly, Sir, the first speaker said that objection was taken to the giving or distribution of literature of certain political parties or perhaps he mentioned even the Communist Party. It would have been better if the speaker had said what type of literature it was and had also given some quotations of what was not allowed to be distributed. But there is nothing very objectionable in this, and I do not know why the speaker himself should not have seen this. This is a thing that would be necessary in every country. I have no nearer knowledge of what the practice of the Kerala Government was with regard to the type of propaganda that could be carried on there.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: If we control the army, we will circulate all your speeches.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: I do not know what literature was allowed to the police force as a result of which the special police force was called by the Kerala Government to meet with what situation I do not know. In any case the attempt through this Resolution to make the army people look up to politicians to plead their cases is something that has to be at once censured, at once to be put down—whether it is the party in power or any other party. I do not agree with the previous speaker who said that because the people have different ideologies such a Committee should not be appointed. I would say that even if such a Committee were to consist of all members from the Congress Party, I would not be in favour of such a Committee, such an attempt, because it would then introduce similar things as in the case of school students who go on resorting to the practice of canvassing for getting one examiner or other and so many other things in other walks of life. The army should be kept as if in a different camp by itself and it should be amenable to the discipline only of the officers above it, and it is only for that reason that there is this system of court martial prevalent in the army which you do not find in the civilian life at all. This anxiety, this attempt on the part of the Party in opposition, the Communist group, to curry favour with the army personnel and to come out as champions of their cause, as if neither the Government nor the people on this side of the House ever care for them and as if it is they who care for all the citizens and all the other people in the country, this type of attempt is something which they should not resort to.

(Interruptions)

SHRI M. BASAVAPUNNAIAH: Monopoly of championship of all causes should be given to those Members only.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: I said earlier—and I think

the point was lost on my hon. friend—even if the Committee were to consist of all members from the Congress Party, such a Committee should not be appointed and the army personnel should be responsible to their officers alone.

For these reasons, Sir, and as politics should never enter into the army. I am not in favour of this Resolution.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I acknowledge thankfully, because it comes from an unexpected quarter, the compliment that the mover of the Resolution paid to the Government for having taken "some measures" during the last twelve years. He characterised those measures as commendable. I am very thankful for it.

His subsequent remark was, after all, the outcome of his attitude which we all know, that whatever measures the Government have taken, they are not "up to the mark." These are the actual words that he used, and I have noted them down.

Sir, so far as this Resolution itself is concerned, I oppose it, to use the military language 'lock, stock and barrel' for the very good reason that the mover of the Resolution has presupposed that the conditions existing today in the Defence Department or in the Defence Ministry are most unsatisfactory or are very abominable. Without this presupposition, there would have been no sense in bringing forward this Resolution for the consideration of the House. Sir, I find myself second to none in my ardent desire to see that our troops are as well-paid, as well-maintained and as well-fed as possible consistently with our resources, because ours is, as all of us know, a poor country, and we are trying to make it rich by industrialisation and all that. Therefore, patience is needed. Things will improve. I am glad to see that aristocratic friends like Shri Sapru plead the cause of the ratings and the jawans and the common man in the army. It

[Shri H. P. Saksena.]

is the portent of a very good and salutary state of affairs in the coming years. So, there is nothing to be impatient about it. Things are improving and are taking their own shape.

Today my attitude is a feeling of happiness at the recommendation which was made by my honourable friend, Shri Sapru, for the course of the ratings and the junior officers of the army, and at the same time with regard to the need of the Resolution, my attitude today is very uncompromising and unaccommodating. I am not prepared to risk the safety and the security of the country at the altar of the whims and caprices of the mover of the Resolution.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You are in a majority.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Well, I may be in a majority; I may not be in a majority. I may be in a minority. But the interest and the safety and the security of the country is my first and foremost consideration. I stand second to none in this—I concede to none in my desire and in my effort, weak as it is, at this stage of my health—and at the same time I want to keep the officers of the army, the ranks of the army the ratings of the navy as satisfied and as happy as possible.

With these words, I oppose the Resolution.

श्री गोपीकृष्ण विजयवर्गीय (मध्यप्रदेश):

उपसभापति महोदय, यह प्रस्ताव सम्भव है कि उसके मेरिट्स के अनुसार विचार करें तो कुछ उपयोगी हो किन्तु मुल्क की मौजूदा हालत को देखते हुए उपयोगी नहीं है। आज हम बहुत सी आर्थिक कठिनाईयों में से गुजर रहे हैं। हर साल हमारा फौज का बजट आगे बढ़ता जा रहा है—पिछले साल जरूर कुछ कम हुआ है—लेकिन अब पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बरान, चाहे वे किसी पार्टी के हों, एक और मुश्किल खड़ी कर लें और खर्च

को बढ़ाते चले जायें तो उसको मुल्क बर्दाश्त नहीं कर सकेगा। मामलों को अगर देश की आर्थिक स्थिति को देख कर नहीं उठाया जायगा तो फिर इस वक्त इस मुल्क के लिये बहुत कठिनाइयां पैदा हो जायेंगी। मजदूरों के मामलों में सब की सहानुभूति है और सभी चाहते हैं कि मजदूरों की हालत सुधरे। मजदूरों के लिये कमेटी बिठाई गई, कमीशन कायम किये गये और तरह तरह के काम मजदूरों के लिये किये गये। तो उससे मजदूरों के क्षेत्र में क्या हो रहा है? जगह-जगह हड़तालें और देश के उत्पादन में कमी, ये तमाम बातें हम मजदूरों के क्षेत्र में देखते हैं। गवर्नमेंट सर्वेन्ट्स के संगठन और उनके मामलों को उठाते हैं तो वहां भी देखा जाता है कि अभी हाल ही में गवर्नमेंट ने पे कमीशन कायम किया है और वह सारे सवालात की जांच कर रहा है। उनके मसले को लेते हैं तो वहां कठिनाइयां खड़ी होती हैं और अभी हमारी पंचवार्षिक योजना इस लायक नहीं है कि हमारे देश की आर्थिक स्थिति कोई ज्यादा ऊंची उठी हो। तो गवर्नमेंट सर्वेन्ट्स का मसला हमारे सामने है, लेबर वगैरह के मसले हमारे सामने हैं, ये तमाम मुश्किलात हैं और फिर यहां पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर—चाहे वे कम्युनिस्ट दोस्त हों या चाहे वे हमारे कांग्रेस के हों या दूसरे पी० एस० पी० फ्रेंड्स हों—एक और मसला उठा दें तो जितने-जितने मसलों के बारे में आप कमेटियां कायम करेंगे आप और मुसीबतें पैदा करेंगे और अपने खर्च बढ़ाते जायेंगे जोकि मुल्क आज बर्दाश्त नहीं कर सकता। आप देखिये कि हमारी एक अन्य सदस्या श्रीमती परमानन्द ने कहा था कि आप मजदूरों और किसानों की हालत को देखिये वे कितनी गरीबी में रह रहे हैं। आखिर आर्मी को कुछ न कुछ तनख्वाह मिलती है, आफिसर्स की अच्छी स्थिति है और उनके लिये कुछ एमेनिटीज हैं लेकिन मजदूरों का क्या हाल है, किसानों का क्या हाल है? वे इतनी गरीबी में रह रहे हैं। तो धीरे-धीरे

सबकी हालत को सुधारने का काम हो रहा है। इस सवाल के पीछे क्या है? हालांकि, मैं भी यह समझता हूँ कि इसको मेरिट्स पर ही लेना चाहिये और कोई उनकी बुरी नीयत के विषय में शंका करना ठीक नहीं है। लेकिन कुछ इसकी वजह से यह भी हो सकता है कि आर्मी में एक असंतोष खड़ा हो जाय, आर्मी के अन्दर भी हमको मुश्किलात हो जायें, तरह-तरह की उनकी मांगें हों और वह सवाल राजनीति में खिंच करके आ जाय। इसलिये हमको कम से कम एक मसला तो ऐसा छोड़ देना चाहिये। मजदूरों का मसला है और गवर्नमेंट सर्वेन्ट्स का संगठन है, ये सब मसले हैं, कम से कम इस मुल्क के खयाल से, मुल्क की खातिर, कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी यह फौज को भड़काने का काम न करे तो बहुत अच्छा होगा।

तो मैं समझता हूँ कि इन दिनों में, पिछले सालों से, कुछ वर्षों से फौज के ऊपर काफी अच्छा खर्च किया गया है। मैं शुरू में भाषण सुन रहा था, पहला भाषण नवाब छतारी का था, उन्होंने बताया कि पिछले कई सालों से ८ या १० करोड़ रुपया उन के एकोमोडेशन के ऊपर खर्च किया गया है। उनकी छट्टियों के नियम, लीव रूल्स भी, हाल में कुछ सुधरे हैं और मेरे खयाल से जितनी सिविलियन्स को छट्टी नहीं मिलती है उतनी फौज में छट्टी मिलती हैं। फौज में बहुत काफी और अच्छी छट्टियाँ मिल गई हैं और दो साल से खास करके एकोमोडेशन का सवाल, रिहाइश और मकानात का सवाल जो है, वह भी फौज के लिये काफी ज्यादा अच्छा किया गया है। मुझे यह भी मालूम हुआ है कि रिटायरमेंट की उम्र के मामले में, एज आफ रिटायरमेंट के मामले में भी फौज में इन दिनों कुछ सुधार किया गया है। अब काफी आफिसर्स ऐसे रखे गये हैं जोकि ४८ साल की उम्र में रिटायर हो सकेंगे। तो काफी सुधार किया जा रहा है। मेडिकल सुविधाओं में भी हर साल कोई न कोई तरक्की की जा रही है। तो ऐसा नहीं कहा जा सकता

कि सर्विस कंडीशन्स के बारे में, एमेनिटीज देने के बारे में फौजी आफसर खुद बखुद तरक्की नहीं कर रहे हैं।

अगर हम फौज के अन्दर कमेटिया और कमीशन कायम करने का सिलसिला डाल देंगे तो उसमें पालिटिक्स जरूर दाखिल हो जायेगी। इसके साथ ही साथ हर पार्टी यह कहेगी कि मैंने इस काम में ज्यादा हिस्सा लिया और दूसरी पार्टी ने कम हिस्सा लिया। इसलिये मैं सब पार्टियों और हिन्दुस्तान के सब वर्गों के लोगों में प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि कम से कम इस एक क्षेत्र को तो छोड़ देना चाहिये जिसमें पालिटिक्स दाखिल न हो।

इस सम्बन्ध में मैं एक बात अवश्य कहना चाहता हूँ और वह यह है कि आप दूसरे मुल्कों को देखिये कि वहां पर फौज के सम्बन्ध में क्या क्या काम किया गया है। चीन आज अपनी तरक्की की हालत में से गुजर रहा है लेकिन वहां के फौजियों को कितना काम करना पड़ता है यह बात आप सब लोगों को मालूम होगी। वे न केवल बाढ़ के ही समय काम करते हैं बल्कि सेना से खेती का काम कराया जाता है और शान्ति के समय में भी उन्हें कई बीघा जमीन खेती के रूप में तैयार करनी होती है। जब लड़ाई की मांग होती है तो वे लड़ने के लिये तैयार रहते हैं और बाकी समय में खेती तथा दूसरा काम करते हैं। चीन में फौजियों को बहुत ऊंची तनखाह नहीं दी जाती है। चीन और सोवियत यूनियन के फौजियों का स्टैंडर्ड उतना ऊंचा नहीं है जितना कि यूरोप, वेस्ट जर्मनी और अमेरिका के फौजियों का है। सोवियत यूनियन की फौज के अन्दर भी तनखाह में आप डिसपैरिटी पायेंगे, वहां पर सबको तनखाह बराबर नहीं मिलती है, किसी को ज्यादा मिलती है तो किसी को कम मिलती है। वहां पर कई दर्जे हैं और यह कि हिन्दुस्तान में जिस तरह आफिसरों और दूसरे रैंक एंड फाइल के बीच

[श्री गोपीकृष्ण विजयवर्गीय]

में फर्क है वह वहां नहीं है, बिल्कुल गलत है। इस समय इस चीज का इलाज नहीं हो सकता है, इस चीज को दूर करने के लिये हमें एक क्रान्तिकारी कदम उठाना होगा और मैं इस चीज को ज्यादा बढ़ाना नहीं चाहता हूं। चीन में फौजी लोगों को इतनी ज्यादा तनखाह नहीं मिलती है जितनी कि यहां के फौजी लोगों को मिलती है और वहां भी ऊंचे और नीचे फौजी वर्ग के लोगों की तनखाह में अन्तर है। इस समय हमारे मुल्क की आर्थिक हालत ठीक नहीं है। हमने पंचवर्षीय योजना द्वारा कुछ तरक्की की है और जब हमारे तीसरे और चौथे प्लान में काम शुरू हो जायेगा और उसमें सफलता प्राप्त कर लेंगे तो उसके बाद हम फौज में ज्यादा खर्च बढ़ा सकते हैं। इसमें कोई शक नहीं कि डिफेन्स मिनिस्ट्री, हमारी सेना में जो लोग हैं उनकी भलाई के लिये कई तरह के काम कर रही है। उन सब बातों को देखते हुए मैं इस प्रस्ताव की जरूरत नहीं समझता हूं कि कोई कमेटी कायम की जाय। मैं इस प्रस्ताव को मुल्क की मौजूदा हालत को देखते हुए उचित नहीं समझता हूं।

SHRI D. A. MIRZA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, there are two things which India can boast of, can be proud of. One is the Defence Services and the other is the foreign policy. Both these things are managed by one man, the grey-haired gentleman who is sitting there, the hon. Mr. V. K. Krishna Menon, our Defence Minister. In the history of independent India I think India could not boast of a greater Defence Minister than Mr. Krishna Menon. Today he has conquered the hearts of the Armed Forces, the personnel of the Army, the Air Force and the Navy, and under his aegis maximum amenities, maximum facilities and concessions are given to the Armed Forces. The whole House is one in declaring that the maximum should be given to the Armed Forces, because they are

the backbone of the country; it is they who protect us from our hostile neighbours. I think, Sir, today our Army, the Indian Army, can boast of discipline and acts of chivalry and bravery, and let me tell you, Mr. Deputy Chairman, our army is second to none as far as chivalry and discipline are concerned. At this stage, immediately after the Kerala episode, our Opposition Members, our Communist Members, have begun to woo the Armed Forces.

DR. R. B. GOUR: But the Resolution was balloted before that.

SHRI D. A. MIRZA: That is another thing. Thus, Sir, I fail to understand . . .

(Interruptions.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI D. A. MIRZA: Sir, I am living only on one cup of coffee since last night; I am very weak; so let them not interrupt me. As I said, I fail to understand . . .

DR. R. B. GOUR: The cat is out of the bag.

SHRI D. A. MIRZA: I fail to understand how they have developed this love for the Armed Forces overnight. What I request them is to see that hands are off from the army. They infiltrated into the student population. You know, Mr. Deputy Chairman, our student population, our student organisation, was noted for discipline. They, as great champions of the students, came in and brought disaster to the students of India. Then they came into the picture as great advocates . . . (Interruptions) as great advocates of the labour movement. And what happened to that labour movement? And you know, Sir, after the Amritsar resolution that they passed, what happened to Jamshedpur. Jamshedpur was on fire.

(Interruptions.)

Sir, they must thank their stars; they must thank the Government of India for having intervened in the Kerala affair. (*Interruptions.*) Otherwise, do you know what would have happened, Mr. Deputy Chairman? The history of Iraq during the time of Nuri Al-Said would have been repeated, and what happened to Nuri-Al-Said and King Faisal would have happened to Mr. Namboodripad and * * * * *. The Congressmen are liberal. They gave a long rope. . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I ask the hon. Minister if this is the way of speaking as the remarks that are being made in connection with certain other proposition are almost shocking, and I am surprised that the Ministers and the leaders of the Congress Party are not in a position to control their Members.

SHRI D. A. MIRZA: Facts and truth are bitter. I am speaking nothing but God's truth. As far as the amenities.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Speak about the Resolution.

(*Interruptions.*)

SHRI D. A. MIRZA: This is also part of the Resolution.

(*Interruptions.*)

I am placing before the House the motive of the Resolution.

DR. R. B. GOUR: When he cited God I am reminded of:

“खुदा सोया हुआ है जल रही है शम्मा शैतानी”

SHRI D. A. MIRZA: खुदा के रहम से आज केरल में यह हुआ नहीं तो केरल में मारे जाते ।

Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, as far as the amenities are concerned, maximum amenities are given. Rs. 250 crores are spent on the Armed Forces. No doubt, if our financial

condition improves, then I am sure the Government of India will go ahead in accommodating the maximum demands of the Armed Forces. Now, Sir, houses are constructed for them. There are the leave concessions; the leave rules are in their favour; the amenities and the concessions in the Defence Services are so attractive that I am going to put one of my sons in the army.

(*Interruptions.*)

Now, Sir, at this time when we have a hostile neighbour indulging in hostilities on the eastern frontier and the same hostile neighbour is knocking at the door on the western front, is this the time to bring in this Resolution and discuss it, I ask the mover of the Resolution and the Leader of the Opposition. Suppose the same thing had happened in the Russian Parliament, what would have happened to the Leader of the Opposition and the mover?

(*Interruptions.*)

I am sure the mover and the Leader would have been sent to concentration camps or would have been liquidated. But this is democracy; we are enjoying too much of democracy, the maximum democracy.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is no opposition at all there.

SHRI D. A. MIRZA: How can there be opposition there? * * * * * How can there be opposition? What I say is this. Let all with one voice say that this is not the time for this Resolution. This is only a political stunt of the Communist Party. I am sure the press there will not give this Resolution prominence, will not publicise it, because the Armed Forces, when they go through the papers, will think that these friends only are taking up their cause. It is more for notoriety that this Resolution is brought. I request the House, in the interests of the nation, to reject the Resolution. As for my part, the

[Shri D. A. Mirza.]

world sees in India the biggest democracy functioning and we in India see that our country's defence is quite safe in the hands of our Defence Minister. May he live long!

4 P.M.

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SHRI V. K. KRISHNA MENON): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, before I addressed myself to this Resolution, I would like to dissociate the Government from any observations of an uncomplimentary character made in regard to any friendly countries. I think it is necessary whatever be the heat of the debate, that we do not forget the proprieties of international behaviour and, what is more avoid charges that we are not entitled to make.

With regard to the Resolution, Mr. Deputy Chairman, there are sixteen or seventeen speakers who have spoken on it, and I understand that under the rules of debate I am to speak for half an hour. Even if it is rationed, it does not come to two minutes per speaker. The Resolution largely purports to deal with the living conditions of the personnel of the Armed Forces—conditions including food and ration and things of that character. Whereas, Mr. Deputy Chairman, the debate has wandered afield and Government do regret this, I welcome this to the extent that it provides an opportunity for the House to give its views and the Government to hear them. There is no one who cannot learn. It is not for me to go into the question of why the Resolution is brought, but it will be a bad day for parliamentary government if Oppositions behave in the same way as the Governments. But what are we to do? Now, it is a question of facts with which the Government is concerned. Therefore, while I cannot reply to every criticism offered or to every query made, all I can do is to try and present a picture of the conditions of the Armed Forces and, so far as I can, remove some

of the adverse effects that may—I do not say, will—lie behind.

So far as the morale of our troops is concerned, I think it is right to say that it does not depend upon any particular Government, but the morale of the Armed Forces of India has never been higher than what it is today. The first issue that is raised is with regard to the accommodation of troops. It is quite true that accommodation is meagre both in quantity and quality. But that is so with our entire population. I would like to see—perhaps none of us would live to see—the conditions which Mr. Bhupesh Gupta paints for our Armed Forces, conditions which have obtained in the United Kingdom during last five years or so—giving a separation allowance to families, providing for their education—a complete Welfare State where we do not pay for social amenities, where it becomes a part of the public services, where taxation becomes unnecessary because there is no private wealth. Only then these things would be possible. But we are living in a world of social reality.

Although some speakers said that it is not 50 per cent. of our revenues that is spent on defence, we spend a considerable amount of it. While defence is vital to this country, we have also taken into account the requirements of each economic development and social progress. Therefore, in the current year the expenditure on defence has been drastically cut, not by imposition, but by recognition of all factors including defence administration these things were brought down. Coming to this particular point, expenditure on accommodation has increased in the last two or three years by well over a hundred per cent. It is not possible for me in the short time to go into great detail except to say that in 1956-57 we spent Rs. 80 lakhs on building

accommodation for the personnel of the army, while in the following year 1957-58 it came to Rs. 140 lakhs, and the following year to Rs. 230 lakhs, and in the current year it came to Rs. 3½ crores. After all money cannot be easily spent unless there is all the machinery that goes with it. Also, the cost of building, on account of economies and reorganisation, has effectively gone down with the result that this expenditure represents in real returns more than it did before.

The next point has been made about retirement—I would not deal with promotions at the moment because it really does not concern the Resolution. Now, questions have been raised with regard to ages of retirement from the Services and so on. I have here a paper, which I intend in proper time to put on the Table of the House. It lists the various amenities and other advantages in conditions of service made in regard to our officers, Junior Commissioned Officers and other ranks of all the Forces. You will find that they go into sixty or seventy items. Whole progress has been made, it can only be made in relation to external conditions that exist in regard to the army as a career. The age of compulsory retirement has been extended. It may be that the officers come first in the army, and no army can be without officers whatever the state of society be. The age of compulsory retirement in the army has been raised from 45 to 48 years with, of course, efficiency promotions.

Now, reference was made by one of the speakers on the Opposition with regard to leave conditions and journey conditions. In the last year we increased the train journey ration allowance from Rs. 2/- to Rs. 2/4. A quarter of a rupee in the army with the aggregate of it becomes so very considerable. The same thing happens with regard to rations. The soldiers received in the past only 50 nP. per day on leave. Now, they receive ration allowance of Rs. 1.22 nP.

In the field areas where concessions were not made before—officers, for example, had to pay—they have now free rations and free single accommodation and everything that goes with it. With regard to other ranks compensatory allowance, ranging from Rs. 15/- a month for Junior Commissioned Officers and Rs. 6/- for other ranks have been introduced.

Now, general statements have been made with regard to emoluments of certain personnel. These figures are extremely misleading. There is nothing secret about them. They are placed in the library of the Parliament. They are there. You will find that the lowest figure is Rs. 25 per month with the chances of going up to Rs. 90 a month according to his qualifications and his capacity. This is not for non-commissioned officers but other ranks. I think the House should know that a soldier, whatever he is, costs the Government between Rs. 135 to Rs. 150 a month. I am not saying that these are princely salaries or remunerations which can in any way be compared with either the burdens that they bear or the hard work they do or the risks they may have to take during actual hostilities.

Now, the lady Member who spoke referred to giving work to soldiers who sit back. Whether there are soldiers of that kind, I do not know. I have no idle soldier in this country. Every man in the army is accounted for and the army is fully stretched to its capacity.

Now, reference also was made to accommodation in regard to the people who were not provided accommodation. I think it was Mr. Bhupesh Gupta who said that we ought to give them an allowance. I do not want to treat this with levity, but perhaps the information that he has asked for has not been made available to the Opposition. Since August, 1958 the existing ordinary rate of compensation in respect of quarters admissible under proper rules was increased by 75 per cent.

[Shri V. K. Krishna Menon.]

Then, Sir, reference was also made to the sailor. Sympathy with the sailor is customary with all Parliaments. Before Independence, Mr. Sapru would like to know, there was no accommodation for any ratings worth the name. It was only an officer who was provided with accommodation. And today, first of all, Sir, there is entitlement to accommodation for Chief Petty Officers to the extent of 100 per cent., for Petty Officers to the extent of 50 per cent. and for other ranks to the extent of 14 per cent. I believe, ours is one of the few Navies in the world that provide accommodation on shore for ratings, because they are supposed to be afloat. Today, the officers' accommodation is 191 and for others it is 1022, and there are another nearly 400 dwellings under construction. The Government have hired another 400, that is to say, from zero it has gone up to somewhere about 3,000, and most of it in recent years.

Reference has also been made to education conditions. Now, Sir, if education in the cross-sections of our community or in any other corresponding strata of our society were as good as in the Armed Forces, we should feel happier than we are. A large number of voluntary institutions of the Armed Forces—something like 180—are very largely supported not only by the money but also by the endeavour of the personnel of the Armed Forces and their families. I believe there are some 180 schools that way. Over and above that, there are Government schools in Ajmer, Belgaon and Bangalore where 50 per cent. of the students are army students, and the same applies to the two Lawrence schools. I think there are about 168 units. Government makes its contribution towards education on a *per capita* basis. Last year, so far as officers were concerned, they introduced some scheme whereby they levied themselves, and Government contributed rupee per rupee for the education of officers' children, and

that is done on insurance basis by themselves. The Army Headquarters have under consideration the extension of this scheme in all ranks of the army. Of course, it is considerably larger than this one, and whether the public exchequer would be able to bear this strain or not, remains to be seen.

I was asked questions about the period of colour service. It is undesirable for officers of the Armed Forces bearing the President's Commission to make public statements. And officers have been reminded of this obligation of silence so far as they are concerned. But it is pardonable in the case of the Chief of Army Staff addressing a rally of ex-servicemen. We have to see the condition of the people who are serving, and that is all that happens. If I may say so, the policy is laid down by the Government and it is executed by the Services as civil or otherwise. Now, when any changes are made, Parliament, in the regular course, would be informed and the necessary steps would be taken. This is not an easy question to decide. There are two sides to this question—whether there should be a longer colour service or a shorter one. From the humanitarian point of view or from the point of view of the serving soldier, a longer service may have an attraction. On the other hand, the country has to make up its mind whether it wants a younger army or an older one. These are questions which cannot be discussed in the heat of the debate.

Now, Sir, reference has been made to the suppression of opinion. All this, Mr. Deputy Chairman, raises a very large number of misconceptions. Government do not take over the supply of newspapers, magazines or literature in the army. What they do is to make a *per capita* grant to the units, and the units, under democratic conditions, take their own decisions. If democracy should involve that they should take the decision which we want them to take, then that is a

different question. But they take their own decisions. And this amount of money is very small. It is supplemented by their own share, and when they are making their own contributions, it cannot be expected that they will not be doing what they want to do. This is the position of army education. The Armed Forces, in its real sense, constitute a whole territory of education. They are continuously being educated not only in the art of defence, but also they become better citizens, better tradesmen, better craftsmen and so on. So, when a recruit who comes from our countryside probably has the advantage of education, he very soon comes up to the level of a Matric student, because otherwise he does not get his salary, and then he learns a trade, he learns discipline and everything else.

Well, Mr. Deputy Chairman, there is not much that I can say in regard to the various matters that have been raised here except to point out that much of it arises from a misunderstanding of the situations. Many of these proposals that have been put forward are either being implemented or their implementation is delayed by lack of resources. It is quite true that compared to the sacrifices they are called upon to make and compared to the separation from their families, no financial remuneration is adequate, and certainly, the remuneration that we give them is not adequate. That would apply to a very large number of other sectors of public service.

Now reference has been made to the national and patriotic character of the Armed Forces. I do not want to join issue on this point, and I am sure that is not what is meant here. In the matter of the defence forces of this country and in the matter of foreign policy there should be no distinction between one side of this House and the other, because our army is not intended to be a political party, but it is intended to defend the country. There is no question of

patriotism or what may be called the national character of our people. And while we discuss these things here, we should be careful about them, because the report that they get from here is likely to affect them one way or the other. Probably not officers so much, but our Jawans get very much hurt. There are no patriotic people and there are no people having national conscience—and I am sure that it is not the desire of the hon. Members—who raise these issues to hurt them. I purposely refrain from giving a large number of statistics. After I was informed that time was short, I decided to circulate this paper.

Now, Mr. Deputy Chairman, we come to what may be called the political aspects of this Resolution which, from my point of view, are far more important. There are three considerations that we have to bear in mind—whether on the part of the Government or on the part of the Opposition. One is the defence of this country. We do not live, Mr. Deputy Chairman, in conditions of a hundred per cent security. While I yield to no one in the desire to see disputes, our own or international, resolved by peaceful means, I equally yield to no one in maintaining the security and the sovereignty of this country. If it is sought to be violated by anybody, whatever his nationality or his ideology, it is our business to defend it. Therefore, the first consideration is security.

The second, if I may say so, from the public point of view, is the men whom we are debating. It is their interests and not our particular points of view which will have some effect on them and their interests should be foremost in our minds. The Defence Ministry and the Civil Service Administration get very little credit for all these things, but without their great care and watchfulness it would be impossible to maintain the Armed Forces in their present condition with our limited resources. We should bear in mind

[Shri V. K. Krishna Menon.]

the effect any adverse remark of ours may have on them, because these men do not know all the nuances of our debate. They do not know that in a parliamentary system of Government the Opposition must oppose. The very fact that so many hon. Members have spoken on this subject shows that it is almost like a Budget debate. That is an indication of the interest you have.

The third thing which is supremely important from our point of view, whether as members of the Government or as members of the Opposition, is the nature of parliamentary Government. Who should be responsible for administration, and who should be responsible for the maintenance of discipline in the Armed Forces? I express my opinion here which I am sure is the opinion of my colleagues in the Government as well. It must be said that the relations between Parliament and the Armed Forces in this country are not different from the relations between Parliament and the Armed Forces in any other country, advanced or otherwise. Now, in our system of Government it is the business of the Government to administer. The Parliament provides the money. The Parliament removes the administration if it is found to be incompetent or for other reasons but if a group of Members of Parliament were to look into the conditions of living of the Armed Forces, apart from theory and experience, I wonder how these 23 people could do it. I know something about this but I do not pretend to know much.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Then you increase the number, if you like.

SHRI V. K. KRISHNA MENON: Well, if there are 400 of them, probably you will require more persons of armed personnel to keep order among them. Therefore, I am trying to answer this seriously. I think it is an entirely impractical suggestion, it

is politically unsound, it is socially undesirable and what is more, it will not have the effect. A Committee of this kind, if ever it were appointed, would probably produce a report in five years, that will be examined by the Government in the next three years and by the time it is implemented, all the conditions would be out of date. . . . (Interruptions) In the meanwhile the Ministry's advisers, whether it be the Civil Servants or the Finance people, will tell me that nothing need be done, that a Commission is sitting. That will be the result of all these things. I am taking you into confidence. Therefore, I say that—it is like a cut motion—while I appreciate the desire to have a debate and if necessary to show off the idea and there is no reason why Government and the Opposition should not show off and I have no objection to even Members of the Government Party saying that they are more concerned about the welfare of the army personnel than the Government itself—it is all for the better because we will come back next time and ask for more grants. . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is in the power of the Government to direct that the Committee should report in six months or so.

SHRI V. K. KRISHNA MENON: A parliamentary inquiry is always rather directed towards the examination of a policy, or be in the nature of either an inquest or correction of some blatant evil, that is to say, a scandal of some kind, for example, if there was a massacre in the army or there is a regular habit of officers to beat up people.

Let me take up the question of relations between officers and men. I do not want to speak much in heat on this matter. I do hope that the Members of the House would take the facts into account. There are no better relations between the ranks of our social structure than obtains between the J.C.O. and the men in the

Armed Forces. I do not speak from text-book but I speak from experience in this matter. It is a very wrong thing to suggest that these men are treated as though they have no human dignity. No officer would dare do that, not because of fear but because of his own reaction because they are comrades in arms, they are the men who are to protect his life if there was an emergency. So far as the law is concerned, Mr. Deputy Chairman, suppose an officer dares to lay his hands on an army personnel, he is subjected to very severe penalties. He will not only be formally court-martialled but it is very unlikely that he will remain in the Armed Forces, not only now but at any time. That sort of thing does not happen. If it did happen, this House and the Parliament would have every reason to demand the Minister's head for that reason. As a Member of the Government responsible for the maintenance of the Armed Forces, I would consider it my duty to lay down the office if there were unpunished offences of assault on men by the officers. Mr. Deputy Chairman, I want it to be understood that this sort of thing does not happen. There are very severe penalties under the Army Act, under the Navy Act and under the Air Force Act with regard to this. If a rating strikes an officer he is not dismissed in the navy. He may be sent to prison for six years but he is not necessarily dismissed but if an officer strikes a rating, the position is very different. That is how the Indian Navy works. When the Navy Act went through the Parliament, this matter was discussed and it was pointed out that the scales were weighted in favour of the other ranks rather than of the officers.

Speaking of these officers, it is increasingly difficult to recruit men into the officer rank particularly in the army. The conditions are not attractive either compared to other branches of Government service or of private business, and it is no answer to that to say that Government discriminates as between State and State. It is quite true that a large number of

our officer cadets, the people who enter the army, come from the north-west of India and the Punjab because these boys, their fathers and their grand-fathers, their uncles, their grand-uncles, everybody, had been in the army and they have heard about it but no particular preference is given to any part of India. If recruits are not forthcoming, recruits who are medically fit, you cannot take blind men in the army or lame men in the army just because they come from a particular part of India. Then you would not have an army, you would have a museum of a different character. I want to assure the House that there is no question of martial class or of discrimination between one State against another or language against language and I think the Government and the Armed Forces Headquarters would welcome more than anyone else a greater distribution of officer personnel among the different parts of India.

Again suggestions were made that people were taken for reasons other than merit. Perhaps, it is not known that these boys are not recruited by looking at their faces. They come through the Public Service Commission. In fact there is a lot of criticism about it. I think taking the quality that is required in the army, there is a case for grading of talent by older officers but then other evils may creep in.

Although it does not come in this Resolution, Mr. Deputy Chairman, reference has been made to promotions out of turn, whether some people are disregarded and so on. I would not have referred to this subject at all but to maintain silence on it probably would be misunderstood. There is not one promotion in any rank of the Armed Forces of this country that does not strictly conform to the defence needs, practices and procedures. This word supersession has been thrown about in a rather loose way. Promotions beyond the rank of Lieutenant Colonel are not supersessions. The only entitlement that an

[Shri V. K. Krishna Menon.]
officer has more or less is the time-scale promotion up to Lieutenant Colonel. After that if he comes up, as in the case of civil services, by efficiency bar, he goes up by merit. I do not say that a Lieutenant Colonel goes up to that rank and then is taken. I mean, there may be rapid promotions even previously. Therefore, when you hear of one person whose case shows a departure from the rule of the dead man's shoes, then one is not to believe that somebody has been superseded. I think 'superseded' is a wrong word. It is selection and that selection is not done by the Government in the sense of politicians or of Ministers or of civil servants. It is done through well-established procedures. There are correction conferences where practically you have the peers of the men who are to be selected. They are the men who make the decisions. It goes not only through one level but through several levels and then the Government takes care to see that there is particular scrutiny of the records. After all, there is no way of scooping into peoples to find out what is in them. You can only go by performance. I am free to admit that evaluation of a particular officer by one superior officer may be very different from the man who preceded him or who comes after him. Those are human failings for which there is no remedy but so far as procedurally possible every effort is made—I would not say to make this proof against everything—to make it equitable and then there are careful examinations by the Ministry of the records. It is only after all that is done that the Government approval is given. And no Minister ever overrides the Service's recommendation without adequate reason and if there is adequate reason then over-riding becomes unnecessary. And when I am speaking to the House I may say that my experience of service personnel is that while they are not easy to persuade, they are reasonable towards arguments and I have not come across any case where on grounds of the type I have mentioned, where if any recommendation does not conform to theirs, they have

not been able to reconsider the situation and if their views are still the same they courageously come back or otherwise accept the new position. Therefore, the wild tale that you hear about some sort of, the rule of the lawless law, as you may call it, does not correspond to facts. They are done with very great strictness. For example, during the last two or three days, I cannot get hold of any officer or even talk to one. They are all sitting on the selection boards. And not even the Minister, when he wants them at one of these places, can get them, because they are evaluating these people. It should be considered, also, Mr. Deputy Chairman, that is not an easy assessment for a senior officer to make, because it is not always the senior officer who really is judging every junior man. Very often it is somebody of almost equal level with himself and so on. Therefore, it is not an easy decision for them to make.

As for personal relations the Armed Forces, particularly the Army is one of those places where personal relations between officer and officer is almost equal in respect of everybody. That is to say they come the same school. They have the same sort of training and so on. But sometimes it happens according to the branch of the Service they are in and the requirements of the army at that time they may be posted. If you require an infantry general and a signal officer was senior, it is no use promoting the signal man as General of an infantry. These things are not probably very well known. While I cannot say that there will not be any error, any human error if you take a four or five year period, I can assure the House that there is nothing which is permitted either by the service headquarters or by Government or the Minister concerned as they go through all these stages and every care is taken to see that there is no room for complaint. Therefore, if disgruntled people sometimes approach Members of this House and others we must attribute it to human failings rather than to the merits of their case. It is very diffi-

cult in a court of law, for example, to convince a client if his case has gone against him that the judge was right. That is the position.

Once again, Sir, I am grateful to the Opposition and to my colleagues on this side for the opportunity that has been given now for giving some sort of an impression about what the Armed Forces are like. I have not tried to give an answer point by point and with your permission, Sir, I will lay on the Table of the House some time a summary of these various steps that have been taken in order to bring about amenities for the troops both in the other ranks and in the officer ranks.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I would like to make a request to the hon. Minister. Since he would lay one paper on the Table, we would like to have information on such matters as the conditions of service and so on as the Minister himself thinks could be circulated amongst Members of Parliament. And we should also sometimes be taken to see such places without prejudice to secrets and other defence strategy. This should be done. Sir, another question and then I finish. Why is it that more vacancies are not created in the Staff Colleges? I expected the hon. Minister to say something about that. There are very few vacancies in the Staff Colleges, as a result we have to send our men to Sandhurst and so on. We must build up our defence cadres.

SHRI V. K. KRISHNA MENON: My difficulty with my hon. friend is that he is sometimes out of date. These things do not happen nowadays. Very few people go abroad for training and they go only for such things as cannot be done here. For example, if you want an officer for guided missiles course—there are so many misguided missiles, none of them is a guided one—we have got to send a man.

So far as the Staff Training College is concerned, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta probably is referring to Wellington for that is the one called the Staff College;

but there are other colleges though they are called by other names. For example, in two months time there will be a college opened in Delhi which will correspond to the Imperial Defence College, in London. That is for higher training. For officers of the signals branch there is the training college in Mhow and so on.

While I am on my feet may I say this that I am willing, that Government is willing to respond to supplying information, but let me with respect also remark that it will be a great advantage if some of the information that was supplied was read, for then half of these questions may not arise? Furthermore, I may also say that it is not as if Parliament does not associate public representatives with the scrutiny in these matters. As we know, there is the Estimates Committee, the Public Accounts Committee, the consultative committees and then the question time the public press and every device that the Opposition can introduce and whether a soldier was late in catching a train or a bayonet was put in the wrong place can be a motion for adjournment. All these parliamentary remedies are open to them and to substitute a Committee of Parliament or the legislature to take over executive functions would be the antithesis of parliamentary government.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Sir, with your permission I beg to move under rule 206 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business of the Rajya Sabha:

“That the question be now put”.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

“That the question be now put.”

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Before I call upon the mover of the Resolution to reply, I have to say that I find from Mr. Mirza's speech that he has used certain unparliamentary

[Mr. Deputy Chairman.] words with reference to Mr. Namboodiripad and with reference to another country. I am ordering the expunction of those words.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: And through you, Sir, I would request the leader of the Congress Party here...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please wait. I hope Members will not use such undignified and unparliamentary words. The language used in Parliament should be dignified.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Through you, Sir, I would like to request Shri Krishna Menon and Shri Govind Ballabh Pant that the matter may be discussed.

SHRI M. BASAVAPUNNAIAH: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I have heard all the speeches that were made on my Resolution. On the whole many of the hon. Members have very sympathetically responded to my Resolution and they have also made some suggestions. Whether they have accepted my demand for a Parliamentary Committee to go into these things is another question. On the whole the spirit with which I moved the Resolution has been welcomed and I feel proud that so many of the hon. Members sitting on the opposite side have also understood the merit of my case. Some friends have unnecessarily included into this subject some topics connected with what is known as politics and spoken about keeping the army away from politics and so on, and stated that the main purpose of my Resolution was to subvert the army and such things. Four or five such speeches I have heard I do not want to take up the time of the House by replying to these point by point. But I would ask then whether they are clear about what they are saying to me? Under our very nose something has been going on, a supposed agitation against a legally constituted Government, by a party to which many of our friends belong.

And that party openly appeals to the Armed Forces and the police there to defy that Government. On this my friends have not a word to say, at least I have not so far come across any; but they have the cheek to say that I here who have moved this Resolution in this humble way and conveyed in so many words my intention, I am told to my face that it is an attempt at subversion. After all concede to me some intelligence. To say that I am trying to subvert the army from the floor of this House or that the Communist Party with its present strength is trying to subvert the army is something funny. They are suffering from some inhibitions. If we do not get rid of those inhibitions, not for my party but for the entire country, this means bad days and that is why I very much detest that sort of thing and I do not like such things to be hurled at in future. Have they understood what politics means? I am quite clear about it. You cannot keep the army away from politics. If you talk of partisan politics or of making the army the cockpit of politics, I can understand. Have I said or done anything in my speech to introduce partisan politics? If I have done that, then you have a right to point out to me and to say that that is wrong. I have not said even one word. Our Parliamentary Party Office collected very valuable information but even that I have not shown here because that does not help. You take advantage of that particular 'fault' of mine and say that there is not a single piece of evidence to support my contention. If that is your point, then I can bring in all the material that I have but then your case will be substantiated that I am out for creating trouble. This is very uncharitable. I have got enough material with me and if you want it, you can have it but I do not want to be provoked.

Apart from all the changes that have come about, there is a gulf between the officers and the ranks and that gulf is unhealthy. Apart from

the discussions that we have been having, the approach, the attitude that is necessary in the independent set-up, in the democratic set-up, is not there. That has been the grievance of the ranks. Why don't you devote a minute to sympathetically understanding as to how far there is any truth in that? If you want, I can give a hundred instances. They are discussed in the streets, in the press, in the lobbies. We do not have any special intelligence department to get all these reports but these are the things that we hear. In the case of hundred stories, ninety may be false but there may be ten which may be true. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta placed before you one or two. I do not know how far it is correct but there was a dinner, an usual dinner, that the Air Force authorities had arranged, everybody meeting together but then there was some compartmentalisation, separate type of arrangements for officers and a separate type for the ranks. The ranks protested and a *hullabaloo* was there and they refused to go in. In this long drawn-out story, even if there is an element of truth in it, that point should be understood and that should not be allowed to happen.

SHRI V. K. KRISHNA MENON: On a point of order, Sir. If the hon. Member intends to make an allegation of this character, he has to inform the Government. It is a serious thing for the rank and file to disobey. This sort of thing does not take place. I did not wish to introduce acrimony into the debate. I tried to speak in a restricted way and talked about general matters. We have not considered it necessary to refer to individual instances which may be contradictory.

DR. R. B. GOUR: We could not hear him, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is not necessary to refer to them now.

DR. R. B. GOUR: But what is the point of order in it?

SHRI M. BASAVAPUNNAIAH: with this point in view, I did not present all the facts that I had with me.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Now, you reply to the contradictions.

SHRI M. BASAVAPUNNAIAH: If I had hurled all these cases at them, then you can make a point of discussion but on a number of points I only said that they required a full and thorough understanding on the part of Parliament. I said that Parliament must be seized of this problem. Some Parliamentary Committee should go into the service conditions and the working conditions of these people.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You need not go into all that now. You yourself said that you were not sure whether they were facts or not.

SHRI M. BASAVAPUNNAIAH: Members opposite have thrown a challenge as to give the impression that we have no material, that we know nothing and that we have just tried to make use of the parliamentary forum to popularise the party in the army.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister has no right of reply if you make this allegation.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Our position is the same as that of the Treasury Benches when he moves a Resolution. It is immaterial whether the hon. Minister has a right of reply or not. He is saying these things because some hon. Members opposite said that we did not have facts. We have got plenty of facts. I think he is more relevant than the hon. Member who said that the Malabar Special Police was being used. You said nothing then. I listened then but you were keeping quiet.

SHRI M. BASAVAPUNNAIAH: A number of things were said.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You go on to speak on this point

SHRI M. BASAVAPUNMAIAH: I have all the respect for what the Defence Minister has done to set matters right. I do not want to go on further illustrating the points even though I am perfectly entitled to and justified in the light of the remarks made by hon. Members. I have got all the facts and figures but I did not quote them because I did not want to embarrass you. In the very beginning I told you that I was not out to embarrass the Ministry or anybody. That is not the purpose of the Resolution. Similarly, there are a number of other points, facts mentioned and placed before the Lok Sabha some time back by Shri Krishna Menon. Those facts are known to you. What are the demands that are emanating from a section of the Armed Forces? It is right that I should read just a few demands of theirs:

"1. Give us the pay equivalent to that of our counterparts in civil specially considering the nature of service in military.

2. Fix up our tenure of service to the minimum pensionable period (i.e. 15 years).

3. Give us yearly service increment as that of our counterparts in civil.

4. Give us time scale promotion as is being done in Indian Air Force.

5. Give us also allowances as Military Officers are being given, like disturbance allowance, children education allowance.

6. Give us the same full DA as civilian counterparts and Officers are being given.

7. Revise the Pension Code to increase the present minimum pension to at least 50 per cent. of the pay.

8. Provide alternative employment when retiring from service according to the qualification and eligibility.

9. Provide our children with free education.

10. Increase the percentage of selection to NDA from Ranks and relax the age limit.

11. Request to liquidate the power of the officers at lower level by taking away the summary powers entrusted to them.

12. Request that separate judicial department at Sub Area|Bde|Area|comd. level may be set up independent of the executive.

13. If the above is found impossible, for trying offence of even silly nature, officers from outside may be allowed to defend the offenders."

I have not gone into the fact whether *prima facie* there is any case or not because that is another question. I have only come here to argue that the House should go into these things very seriously, should be apprised of it and then only appoint a Committee of Parliament to go into it. It is not as some hon. Members thought that this would create some *hullabaloo* and would become a debating society, a school boys' affair, etc. It is a Parliamentary Committee. Such Committees have been appointed in the past, have gone into matters and have reported also. Some of the recommendations have been accepted while others have been rejected. It is not my intention to fan the flames of discontentment that exists. I only say that there is some discontentment and you go into it to find out whether that is justified or not. That is all I wanted.

Coming to other points, the Communist Party has learnt from our Congress friends about politics. The Englishman had almost cordoned off any nationalist, anti-imperialist politics from penetrating, but did he succeed? Was the Congress then having the parliamentary forum or platform to spread those ideas? Ideas come.

You cannot create walls. Even if you build steel walls, ideas will penetrate. Similarly, the question of communist ideology, he says, can influence them. If it has impressed a majority of the people, you cannot prevent it. I do not want that some arrangements should be made, so that some of my ideologies could be spread in that way. Ideas get in, politics get in, you cannot prevent it. But we are not using this platform, we are not using the forum of Parliament or this Resolution to get the support of the army. I know how much propaganda is there. I know the conditions of things today. It was said that we want to do something undesirable, rather unconstitutional and subvert the whole army, etc. These are uncharitable comments. So, I have nothing more to say about this. That is why I say that if really the Communist Party is out to disrupt the Armed Forces, this is not the way, this House is not the forum. One who is out to do mischief will not make a noise about it. That is why I am not out for mischief. If anybody wants to do it, he will not do it in this way and from this platform. Thank you, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"This House is of opinion that Government should appoint a committee consisting of 23 Members of Parliament, 15 from the Lok Sabha and 8 from the Rajya Sabha, to enquire into the living and working conditions of officers and other ranks in the Armed Forces and the educational and other facilities at present available to their children living in military camp areas and to make recommendations for the improvement of such conditions and facilities."

The motion was negatived.

RESOLUTION REGARDING RE-ORGANISATION AND DECENTRALISATION OF THE ADMINISTRATION

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sekhar. He is not here. The next Resolution, Mr. Pendse.

SHRI LALJI PENDSE (Bombay): Mr. Deputy Chairman, the Resolution which I am called upon to move runs thus:—

"This House is of opinion that Government should take necessary steps forthwith to reorganise the administrative structure of the country with a view to decentralise the administration and to enable the active participation of the people in developmental activity."

The Resolution which I have just placed before the House is simple. It cannot have obviously any ulterior motives. If at all, it has been dictated by the sole consideration of focussing the attention of this House on certain very glaring defects which, in the words of Shri C. D. Deshmukh, cause much anxiety. Only a few days ago, as you know, Shri Deshmukh was addressing a distinguished audience in Madras and he observed that the standard of administration had fallen both in the conduct of day-to-day affairs, as well as in the implementation of the Plan development, that in all branches it has become inadequate and erratic, and that caused great anxiety. He further observed that the official failure could be traced to the Ministers' incompetence and, in a mood of despair, he exclaimed that that was a sign of "*Dharma Glani*", of languishing of moral law. Now, you will all agree with me that Mr. Deshmukh is a reputed administrator of a very high order and such an administrator when he makes certain