

Select Committee, as I have said before, we do not agree to the principle of the Act itself. If by being on the Committee it means that the principle of the Act itself is agreed to, then with this reservation I want to be on the Committee.

**Shri N. C. Chatterjee:** Sir, I also want to make my position and the position of my colleagues very clear...

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order. So far as this matter is concerned whatever consequences arise will be governed by the rules of procedure. I am not competent to give any particular instructions or to give any ruling upon this matter. The hon. Members' names are there.

**Shri N. C. Chatterjee:** I want to make our position clear. We are not committed to anything. We are for revising every section and clause of this Bill which we do not approve of and with that clear understanding we serve on the Committee.

**Shri Sarangadhar Das:** I also join in. Before agreeing to serve on the Select Committee I wish to make the position of my party clear. Our willingness—that of Shri Damodara Menon and myself—does not mean that we concede the basic principle of the Bill. We are opposed to the Bill in its entirety and shall examine every clause afresh.

**Shri S. S. More:** As I am also one of the Members and these declarations have been made by my colleagues, I think it would be wrong on my part to sit quiet. So I accept my name on the Committee subject to the same reservations.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The language of this Motion is quite clear. It will be interpreted as the language stands in the Select Committee.

#### RESERVE AND AUXILIARY AIR FORCES BILL.—contd.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The House will now proceed to the Reserve and Auxiliary Air Forces Bill. Mr. Patnaik.

**Shri U. C. Patnaik:** There are just a few points that I would like to place before this House for the valuable opinion of hon. Members before the Select Committee meets. As I have stated, the question of conscription involved in the organisation of Air Defence Reserves has got to be considered in the light of what has been done in other countries, particularly as a result of the National Service Acts of England and the National Security Act of America. Apart from it, there is another question also which is involved—whether

the auxiliaries are to fight at home alone or abroad also. That has been a bone of contention even in U.K. for a very long time till it was allowed to rest just a couple of years ago in their Acts of 1949 and 1950.

The question is whether the use of auxiliaries, territorials and other volunteers raised should be confined only to defend the hearths and homes inside the country or whether they should be called upon to go abroad when required. That was a question that was discussed at length and discussed several times in the British House of Commons and it has finally been decided that they have to go abroad if called upon. At the same time those discussions make it clear why internal defence was made part of the provisions of the original Act till 1949 or 1950. The reason was that the very basis of the organisation was that everybody who volunteered must feel that he was volunteering only for defending his hearth and home and not for fighting a war of aggression. That is a point which has got to be considered.

The next point is whether our Act should make provision only for offences and punishments or also for the organisation and governance of the territorial and auxiliary forces. There is a gulf of difference between our Bills and Acts on the one hand and the Bills and Acts, for instance, of U.K., on the other. On a comparison you will find that their legislation provides for offences and punishments. When the members of these forces are under training the regular Army, Navy or Air Force Act applies to them. At the same time the Acts make lengthy references as to how the organisation has to be achieved, how the different units are to be formed, and how civilian institutions are to be organised so as to get the best possible response. A reading of their Act will give you an idea as to how all these things were attended to by Parliament itself while considering the Bill and framing the law, whereas here we frame a vague enactment, then leave it to the Ministry to work it out; and the Ministry leaves it—I hope this Ministry will not do so—to the Defence experts who leave it in turn to somebody down below, so that ultimately the most operative part of the law is found not in the Act itself but in the rules prepared by someone. This is a point to which we have to pay our attention.

While considering the question of conscription for the Air Defence Reserve we have to consider the question of conscientious objectors which has

[Shri U. C. Patnaik]

been provided for under the National Security Act of the U.S.A. and the National Service Act of England, and all the Army, Navy and Air Force Acts of England. You should take into consideration the conscientious objectors and their position. We too have made little provision on this point. Therefore, we have to consider the provisions of those other Acts and see how far we have to adopt them.

Another equally vital point of difference between our organisation and the organisation of territorials and auxiliaries in England, at least until 1950, is on the question of whether the territorial and auxiliary forces can be called out to aid the civil power when required. On that point the 1907 Act and subsequent Acts in the U.K. up to 1950 made it very clear that they cannot be called out in aid of the Civil power. The reason is that when you call upon civilians to get into the defence forces and organise themselves, it is one thing to tell them that they will fight for their hearths and homes and quite a different thing to tell them that they will have to aid the civil power. These are voluntary organisations, organisations consisting of civilians who have joined out of their free will to get defence training to defend their country, and to call upon them to aid the civil power would be something which cannot be attractive to them. We have to consider the whole thing from this point of view: How to make it so attractive as to make as large numbers of civilians as possible to join these auxiliary and territorial organisations. In England one of the vital points to be borne in mind is that they should not be called out in aid of the civil power. No doubt that system existed till 1950 but in that year a change has been made. Even in the original Act there was a sort of a rider that they could not be called out in aid of the civil power ordinarily, though they could be called out when all the entire civilian population is called up, that is when there is a mass conscription. Even then there is a further explanation that when territorial units along with all the other citizens of the country are called to aid the civil power, they should not go as members of the territorial or auxiliary forces but can only be called up as ordinary civilians, just as ordinary civilians are made to join the special police etc. at times of grave emergency. At such times they are asked not to go with their uniforms on and not to use any weapon other than those which the ordinary citizen is called upon to bear. That is an important point of difference. Of course, in 1950 they have

made some change in regard to reserves because now everybody, (since the National Service Act) even the man in the street, who is above 18 years of age, can be conscripted into the defence forces. According to the change made in 1950 they have said that these reserve forces can be called out in aid of civil power. We have to consider whether we are to adopt the system introduced in England in 1950 or whether we are to fall back upon the system that obtained in England between 1907 and 1950. The vital point which has to be considered in this connection is to see how we can make it more attractive for the civilians to join these volunteer forces.

Another point to be considered is the conditions of service. The conditions of service must also be attractive. Of course, there are provisions here for the pay and allowances of the reserve and auxiliary forces just as in the case of the regular Air Force personnel. But there is another factor. I do not know whether the pay and allowances of the regular forces in India include bounties and things like that which are provided for in the U.K. Acts, to be granted to people in the Air Force who have to their credit additional training or extra number of flights in the air. In the case of such people these additional bounties are granted to make the service more attractive. I would leave it to the hon. Minister to tell us whether we have got any provision like that in our Bill.

Then there is the important question, namely availability of adequate equipment. We have been told that the forces cannot be straightaway organised, that it will take some time to organise them, because funds are not available and adequate training facilities also are not available. But the question to be answered is, on what are we laying our emphasis: having more planes and other equipment or making the country air-minded? This is therefore another point to be considered. Should we make the whole country air-minded, should we be in a position to have proper reinforcements in the shape of aviators and airmen if and when required, or should we lay emphasis more on having proper equipment if and when these people are embodied? This question also was examined in the Parliament in England and at that time Mr. Shinwell, referring to the World Wars I and II, said defeats in the early stages of the war were due to want of proper reinforcements in personnel. Somebody interrupted him and asked whether it was

want of sufficient personnel or of proper equipment. He said both. Therefore, we have got to consider not merely availability of adequate training facilities but also the personnel required, because with the same amount of training facilities you can train more men if civilian flying clubs and similar institutions like glider clubs are organised. In Germany they gave first attention to civilian flying clubs, and glider clubs. These were financed and subsidised by the Government. In U.K. also the same thing was done. There were territorial county associations and they attempted to give training facilities not merely in the military centres but also in the civilian flying clubs and glider clubs organised by the local institutions. That is another feature which we have got to consider. I do not want to go into minor details as to who is the competent authority and whether we are going to have any organisation corresponding to the Air Council found in other countries. But I submit that there are a large number of questions which have got to be examined by everyone in this House before we discuss this Bill in the Select Committee.

**Dr. M. M. Das:** The Bill before the House is a very important and necessary piece of legislation. Although we the Members of this House may differ in our opinions with regard to many things, so far as the present measure before the House is concerned, I think we shall be unanimous in our opinions and the hon. the Mover of the Bill will have the least difficulty or trouble in carrying this measure through. Nobody in India today who wants to see his country free, and capable of maintaining that freedom against the aggression of any foreign power can remain blind to the unsatisfactory condition of our defence and any measure, calculated to strengthen our defence forces, is bound to secure the maximum amount of support from him.

Ours is a vast country and we have to our credit the second largest population in the world. Our industrial potential and natural resources are also said to be very great. But militarily our strength is insignificant in comparison with any strong power of the world today. Our backwardness in the scientific, industrial and technological development. Our absolute dependence upon foreign countries for higher military training, for ammunitions and military equipment, have rendered our defence forces weak and vulnerable. Only the other day we were discussing amongst ourselves the defence prob-

lems of our country. One of my friends who knows something about military science and who had the actual experience or commanding some forces during the last war told us that his head begins to reel when he thinks of the defence problems of our country. The natural or geographical defence of our country no longer exists. The great Himalayas that have stood for ages as the impregnable barrier on our northern frontier have now lost all importance as a bulwark against foreign invasion. May be that from now onwards, for obvious reasons, we have to pay more attention to the Himalayas themselves than we ever dreamt before? In the north west, the Khyber Pass and the Bolan Pass which were considered as the gateways of India and were far easier to defend are no longer ours. At present, in the north west our frontier stretches for thousands of miles along the plains of Rajasthan and Punjab. In the north east the impenetrable hills and jungles between Assam and Burma are no longer impenetrable. It was proved during the last war that military operations on a grand scale could be carried out through those hills and jungles, and it is through them that the Japanese army actually reached India. In addition to all these, we have our vast coastline stretching for 2500 miles and our Navy is not worth its name. Against this background, if we consider our utter inability to manufacture the ordinary equipments, required by our Army, Navy and Air Force, it is no wonder that one's head would begin to reel. But the most reassuring feature in this gloomy situation is the human element of our defence forces. So far as human material is concerned, our armed forces are still one of the finest in the world. If I rise today to give my unstinted and wholehearted support to this Bill, it is because I find that this Bill proposes to mobilise and make the best use of the human material available in our country so far as our air defence is concerned. Machines may manufacture aeroplanes, fighters and bombers, but they cannot manufacture a first-class pilot or a first-class gunner or a first-class radio operator. It requires human material of the highest order, along with the most costly and expensive training, to constitute an efficient airman. Then there is the time factor. In a country like America or Russia it may be possible to produce aeroplanes, fighters and bombers at the rate of one every five or ten minutes, but no amount of human ingenuity can produce an efficient airman or gun crew within five or ten minutes.

The measure before us today seeks to mobilise, conserve and make avail-

[Dr. M. M. Das]

able in case of emergency this highly specialised and expensive training in aerial warfare and aerial navigation. When this Bill is passed into law, and implemented it will serve four important purposes. Firstly, it will give additional strength to our Air Force. The regular Air Force, the Air Defence Force and the Auxiliary Air Force envisaged in this Bill will form a second line of air defence to our country. Secondly, many of our brilliant young men who cherish the idea of serving in our Air Force but who are prevented from doing so for some reason or other will find a chance to join the Auxiliary Air Force and serve their country. Thirdly, the costly planes which we have to purchase at fabulous prices and which are being replaced every day by more modern and more improved types of planes would be put to some useful purpose instead of being altogether scrapped. Fourthly, the costly training and experience of our veterans of the Air Force who have served and have completed their terms of service will be available in times of danger and emergency for the defence of our country. These advantages are not at all negligible and we cannot afford to lose them.

A detailed examination of the provisions of this Bill reveals some loopholes or drawbacks, and I shall point them out for the consideration of the hon. Mover and the House. First of all, I would like to draw attention to Chapter IV dealing with the Auxiliary Air Force. The Auxiliary Air Force provides fighter defence of the locality in which its units and squadrons are raised. It is the air counterpart of our Territorial Army. But the conditions of service in the Auxiliary Air Force are much stiffer than those in our Territorial Army. Even in the United Kingdom, which serves as the model for our defence forces, the conditions of service in the Auxiliary Air Force are much more liberal than those envisaged in this Bill. In the United Kingdom a member of the Auxiliary Air Force enjoys certain rights and privileges, not a single of which is to be found in this Bill. In the British Auxiliary Air Force the terms of service or the area of service for a member of the Auxiliary Air Force in Britain cannot be modified by any order. Secondly, no order can post a member of the Auxiliary Air Force to any unit other than that to which he was enlisted or to the regular Air Force. Thirdly, none can be transferred, appointed or attached to the regular air force without his consent under any order or regulation made after his enlistment; and

fourthly every member of the Auxiliary Air Force has a right to enlist in any branch of the regular armed forces, if he can satisfy the prescribed conditions. Not a single one of these privileges has been provided in the Bill before the House.

The Auxiliary Air Force is a volunteer force and if the conditions of service are made so severe and stiff, then I am afraid, recruitment will be rather very difficult. Next, I beg to submit that the protection and the compensation to be given to a member of the Auxiliary Air Force against his employer who refuses to reinstate him in service are not at all adequate. The compensation provided in this Bill is six months' salary. I beg to submit that six months' salary is no consolation at all for a man who loses his means of livelihood for no fault of his own.

Another important matter to which I beg to draw the attention of the House and the hon. Minister in charge of the Bill is the constitution of the "competent authority". This "competent authority" has been entrusted with the whole burden of administration of the Reserve Air Force. Chapter I, section 2 of this Bill, gives the definition of this "competent authority." The definition says that any one air officer, (one single air officer) who is appointed by the Central Government, will constitute the competent authority. I beg to submit that very great responsibility lies upon the shoulders of this competent authority and it will not be fair and proper to place this heavy responsibility upon the shoulders of one single officer, however competent and efficient he may be. My suggestion is that a council of three or more senior officers of the Indian Air Force should constitute this competent authority. There are some other minor points which I wish to discuss when the Bill will be taken clause by clause.

Shri B. Das (Jajpur-Keonjhar): As one who has been in this House for many many years and has gone through the tragedy of foreign rule and foreign domination in all matters it heartily gladdens me to find that the Defence Minister after four years of our attainment of sovereignty has brought forward this measure. I do hope it will be a forerunner of various army reforms the need of which most of us are feeling.

The Army continues to be what it was when the Britisher left us a few years ago. I congratulate my hon. friend Mr. Tyagi for occupying that

worthy position at the moment, because he is an ex-army man. The Government of India since 1947 has had no time to think of what India's defence forces should be. It was continuing the old machinery that was left over to us.

Why should there be three arms? There should be one administration and the three arms of the army should be controlled by that administration. I read somewhere that the President or the Rashtrapati is the head of defence. Whether the Rashtrapati is the head of defence or the Prime Minister becomes the head of defence, the three branches should be co-ordinated and controlled, so that it serves the best interest of India.

That old system of a huge land army—it is out-dated; it is out-moded. Yet circumstances so left us in 1947 that we are continuing them. We spend a huge sum of money on the land army. That is due to circumstances in Kashmir and the Indo-Pakistan border. But that does not mean that we should perpetuate and maintain a huge land army which is outmoded in 1952. That does not mean that the Chief of the land forces should not think of the defence problems of India as a whole, or give up a part of the huge expenditure we are having on land forces to maintain our air forces and naval forces.

I congratulate my hon. friend Mr. Patnaik on his well thought out speech, though I do not agree with all his criticisms and his appreciation of what happens in England. I am not enamoured of the British practice. Though I have got a land army—I call it my own forces, my India's land forces—I cannot say that our naval forces or air forces are completely Indian. My hon. friend Mr. Tyagi may remember that our naval forces are commanded by borrowed admirals from the U.K. We are the slaves of the U.K.

A few minutes ago we were discussing the Indian tea industry which is completely dominated by U.K. economy. In the same way the naval forces in India are completely dominated, bossed over and ruled by the U.K. Commander-in-Chief, or Admiral, or Rear Admiral—whatever may be the designation. I wish to know whether the Chief of our Air Force is an Indian today. He might be an Indian if the Englishman has left, but it has been the tradition to follow a shilly-shally and subservient policy. The U.K. is imposing her air officers as Air Marshals or Vice-Air Marshals on us. Is that sovereignty to me? No, certainly

not. I have not got any sovereignty in the matter of defence. The other day my leader the Prime Minister asked on the floor of the House: what is there in borrowing British experts?

Are there no experts in this country? Why should experts from the U.K. come and not from Belgium? I have heard on great authority that the Belgian experts are not so sophisticated as the British experts. The British Officers whether they are training Indian officers at Poona or elsewhere, have got a reservation of mind. That reservation of mind in Britishers will never die. Those of us who have suffered the iniquitous administration of the Britishers in India know that the Britisher will never be a gentleman, will never be an honest man. I ask one question.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Is it necessary to make such sweeping remarks upon a whole nation or a community for the purpose of a debate?

**Shri B. Das:** I am talking of the British rulers. Today I am not satisfied that the Britisher who is paid by me in the Army Department to train up my officers to establish a complete defence of India is doing his bit. He has a reserved mentality and the U.K. and U.S.A. are trying to have certain domination over the Indian economy.....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member said that the British Officer may have a reserved mentality, but this is a Reserved Bill.

**Shri B. Das:** I do not feel satisfied that we have the defence forces in India properly organised and equipped, to suit the sovereign nation of India. Even though I am supporting this measure, I want to be assured of how this Bill would be to the interests of India.

**An Hon. Member:** Then do not support it.

**Shri B. Das:** I am not here in a debating society. I am speaking with all the authority in my possession as the oldest Member of this House, as one who has fought for the freedom of India and I want that my freedom must be complete, that my sovereignty shall not be weighed down by the intrigues of British or U.S.A. officers.

There was a Commander-in-Chief—I think his name was General Buscher—and he was detained by the former Defence Minister for 6 months to write up the history of the Defence Forces. What happened to that document? What happened to the lakhs of rupees which we paid to

[Shri B. Das]

General Buscher for reorganisation of the Defence Ministry. I wish to tell my hon. friends in this House that it was the same General Buscher who delayed the march of the Indian forces to Hyderabad. We all know that Field Marshal Auchinleck who had retired in India is now living in Karachi spying on the American bases there. He has taken Rs. 3 lakhs as loan from the Pakistan Government to start a Carpet Factory. It is strange to see that big masters of England have to borrow a lakh or two for the purpose of starting a carpet manufacturing factory in Pakistan. He is there either to spy on me or to spy on the American bases that are being built. I do hope that the Defence Minister.....

**An Hon. Member:** The carpet industry is a fake.

**Shri B. Das:** I do hope the hon. Defence Minister will tell us what writings his predecessor received from General Buscher for wasting so much money for writing the history of the Defence Forces in India for so many months. There was another gentleman who got out to India at the time of partition. I think it is Compton MacKenzie who was asked to write on the part played by Indian soldiers in the last war. He wrote the book, but Pakistan said this includes both India and Pakistan. It cannot include 'Bharat'. So that book was never published. I would take this up in another place. The Defence Ministry must explain how much money was spent on Compton MacKenzie's remuneration and passage or on General Buscher's maintenance and passage and what value did we derive. Have they been shelved in the archives of the Defence Ministry? Has this sovereign Parliament nothing to do with that? Was it the sole property of the then Defence Minister who was here a few months ago and who is my worthy colleague on the floor of this House even now? I cannot understand why we are kept aloof and why we are not taken into confidence and

I am giving this background because I have a motive behind.

I think the whole defence policy of the Government of India as it is moving in this slow coach fashion is entirely wrong. It is very much wrong. We must think in our own way. We must reorganize the defence forces. I cannot say whether the Defence Ministry is responsible, but the three arms are fighting with each other. The three arms of defence in India are discontented. The three Commanders-in-Chief are absolutely not co-ordinating. Who is co-ordinating them? Do you mean to say that our civilian Secretaries are co-ordinating them? I cannot say that they can do that with certainty. The other day I was hearing the debate going on in the other House and I found that one scandal after another was being spoken of. The jeep contract was a bad one and I have reviewed it in the Public Accounts Committee and I shall revert to it again and again. It is one of the worst scandals that could ever happen under the present Ministry. It is still under inquiry by the Government of India. I am not satisfied with the reply which the hon. Defence Minister gave on the floor of the House the other day.....

**The Minister of State for Finance (Shri Tyagi):** I wonder whether this is a proper occasion to discuss that?

**Shri B. Das:** I am trying to say that the defence forces are not properly co-ordinated, because something of the past, of the years 1945-46 of Mountbattens, General Buschers and Auchinlecks is still permeating the Defence Ministry and this retards a complete re-organization.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** It is one o'clock. Is the hon. Member concluding his speech?

**Shri B. Das:** I will speak for half an hour more.

*The House then adjourned till a Quarter Past Eight of the Clock on Thursday, the 24th July, 1952.*