

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Dr. Deshmukh.

DR. P. S. DESHMUKH : Mr. Deputy Chairman, there has been a fairly long debate on this Resolution which reads as follows:

This council is of opinion that the Government of India should take legislative and other measures to promote planned cropping all over India.

In the views propounded on the floor of the House, there was a fair amount of divergence of opinion. Some of the hon. Members also thought that there were insurmountable difficulties before crop planning could be encouraged. One of the Members who spoke sometime back, Mr. Sharma, said that unless water was provided for irrigation, hardly any crop planning is possible. Then, my friend, Mr. Gupta, thought that unless there was land redistribution, there was no likelihood of crop planning being useful. All the hon. Members who took part in this Debate are all agriculturists and I would not mind calling them even practical agriculturists, but, just as our interpretation of the *sruti* and *smriti* differs from man to man, so also, Sir, our calculations about what is proper and beneficial to the agriculturist differs from agriculturist to agriculturist. That was probably the reason why some of my friends did not like the Resolution whereas there were others who thought that there was no salvation except by having recourse to crop planning.

Now, Sir, the Resolution as worded by my hon. friend requires us to take legislative and other measures to promote planned cropping all over India. A good many of the difficulties that the Government has come across from time to time has also been mentioned by a fairly large number of hon. Members of this House.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY : Including the mover.

DR. P. S. DESHMUKH : Including the mover—I am prepared to correct my statement. The Govern-

ment, Sir, does not, in principle, oppose the Resolution because not only it is necessary for Government to keep an eye on what crops are grown in what areas, but, short of legislation or a totalitarian attitude towards crop planning, it is not possible for a welfare State like ours to be absolutely indifferent to the areas which are covered by particular crops. In the past also, as the mover has already indicated, several steps had been taken by the Government of India with what success, it is for us to judge. As my hon. friend, Mr. Sarwate pointed out Government's plans about enforcing the cultivation of particular crops were not successful and I think, that is, more or less, correct, Sir, and, yet, there was a certain amount of success achieved as we find from the actual yields available so far as cotton was concerned. Cotton cultivation was discouraged during the war with the result that in 1947-48 it reached one of the lowest of levels ; there were hardly 17 lakhs of bales of cotton produced in that year. No sooner the Government of India changed its policy and put forward an integrated plan, we found that not only food was necessary for this country, but there was equal necessity to have more cotton and more of jute because these are the various sectors of our economy which we cannot, without doing permanent damage to ourselves, afford to neglect altogether. We cannot merely say that we will import all the cotton from outside, all the jute from outside and concentrate on food growing. The Government of India has been revising its policy from time to time and, recently, we have had a plan by which we seek to have integration, and rationalise the plan of growing all the crops. Therefore, I would like to say that the main principle behind the Resolution is not unacceptable to Government. We have to keep an eye on what crops are being encouraged, what crops are grown and what is the proportion and what is the comparative quantity which has been grown in various places. So, from that point of view, it is not possible to say that the Government does not accept the idea

of crop planning but, at the same time, if we look to the practicability of the situation and if we take the Resolution a little more seriously, a little more literally then, Sir, I must point out that there are fair amount of difficulties which have got to be encountered. First of all, there is the absence of organisation at village levels for formulating appropriate plans and so, it will be difficult to relate capacity to requirement. Unless the capacity of each area to produce the crops is studied in the light of requirements of general control, it may result in disturbing the balance of economy.

Then, there is the other difficulty : As agriculture in India is predominantly a way of life which helps the cultivator to find a sustenance from harvest to harvest in the ordinary course it is difficult for agricultural officials to reach more than a small portion of the farmers. Unless, therefore there is an organisation through which suggestions and assistance can be transmitted, any general planning will not be possible. We have also to consider that the whole of India is divided into various States and conditions from area to area and State to State differ very widely. There is also the question of rotation of crops. It is not possible to say that particular areas should be allocated to particular crops because we have got to take into consideration the fact that certain crops are absolutely inevitable; in many places where not more than one will grow and if one is grown this year, the other alternative must be resorted to in the next year. So, these are amongst the difficulties which Government encounters apart from the difficulty of the unpopularity of any legislation.

Now, when I referred to my friends being practical agriculturists, I had in mind the view which was just propounded by my hon. friend that after all agriculturist knows what is good for him and good for the country ; the agriculturists are wise, they know what to do, what to grow

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : He said that about the village level. He did

J not say that each agriculturist should be left to his own devices.

DR. P. S. DESHMUKH : I am afraid my hon. friend was not even present here at that time.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : I was here.

DR. P. S. DESHMUKH : In any case, Sir, the difficulties are quite immense ; but, all the same, as the hon. Members of this House must be aware, the Planning Commission has given thought to this and, in the Report of the Planning Commission, this has received attention. The attitude and the approach there is that it will be left to the Village Production Councils—this is exactly what my friend just now suggested. The Government does not wish that these Village Production Councils should not suggest what the village should grow. If the House does not wish to agree with the suggestion to leave the matter to individual agriculturist the Village Production Councils would be there to suggest and determine what crops to grow and what not to grow. I will say, Sir, that we have already thought in that direction. It will thus be seen that the Government of India and the State Governments have, consistently with the difficulties of formulating and enforcing any rigid measures of crop planning, been undertaking from time to time steps to achieve the desired objectives by some scheme of crop planning or the other. I may mention that there are States which, during the years 1940 onwards, also passed legislations. For instance, legislative measures were adopted for reducing the acreage under cotton in Bombay, Madras, Hyderabad and Baroda. At the present moment, of course, to my knowledge, no legislation exists. But we are not averse to legislation, and the State Governments are also not averse to it, but Only when it is found that it is useful. What is probably required to achieve a desired crop plan pattern is perhaps not so much a rigid physical control of production as general

[Dr. P. S. Deshmukh.] measures of development through incentives, as has been mentioned by my hon. friend here and other ways in conformity with the needs of the country. Under such development measures would be included formation of village production councils, measures for consolidation of small holdings and other land reforms, promotion of co-operative farming societies, and technical assistance and guidance.

This, Sir, in brief is the approach of the Government. I do not want to take very long, because there has been a protracted discussion on the whole question. In view of the fact that the main intention of the hon. mover of this motion is accepted by the Government, I do not think there is any need for him to press this Resolution to a division, and I would suggest to him, with your permission, to withdraw the same.

There were of course many other issues referred to in the course of the discussion. I do not think I should enter into them, especially the one with regard to the "land to the tiller" and so on. These are slogans which are repeatedly thrown at us without realising that no other Government in the history of India has been so seriously thinking of the solution of the land problem, and that a great deal has been achieved and is attempted to be achieved by the present Government. So, I do not think it is a correct contention that unless the land reforms are completed no crop planning is possible. But on the whole we would like to resort not so much to legislation but to the other measures that I have already referred to.

My hon. friend the mover of the Resolution made a number of points, and he gave a lot of information and statistics and he referred to the targets of the Planning Commission also. All these things would be quite relevant, and all these considerations which my hon. friend has advanced are also quite well known to the Government. We also know that we are not only

deficient in foodgrains but for the tune being in cotton and jute as well as many other commodities including oilseeds. My hon. friend Mr. Reddy of course said something which was quite valuable and was not so full of contradictions, as he was the other day.....

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : I am so grateful for the compliment.

Dr. P. S. DESHMUKH : I can understand there being some conflict between the cultivation of cash crops and the cultivation of foodgrains. But that day he tried to tell us there was likely to be severe competition between the oilseeds themselves. All I wanted to point out on that day also was that at present no instance has arisen of one oilseed having to quarrel or wage a war against another oilseed. That was all I wanted to point out. Of course, Sir, it is true that the peasant naturally responds to price incentive. I also realise that just as there are difficulties in crop planning, there are also difficulties so far as coming to a rational price policy is concerned. There are difficulties that way also. But from time to time we adjust our policies so as to see that the balance is not disturbed. For instance there are many people who are complaining against the reduction in the price of sugarcane. On the one hand, Members of Parliament in both the Houses complain that the sugarcane grower is not getting a fair price, on the other hand, they also complain that they should have no encouragement to cash crops. These two things cannot go hand in hand. One of the root causes why the sugarcane prices have been reduced is the enormous increase in sugarcane cultivation since last year which has resulted in a sort of calamity.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA : That was brought about by the sugarcane manufacturers. There were no difficulties in getting more sugarcane. There would have been plenty of sugar also if they had only taken care not to reduce the price of sugarcane later on.

DR. P. S. DESHMUKH : I was not referring, Sir, to who was responsible or what has happened. I was merely alluding to the present situation.

Sir, I do not wish to take any more time of the House. There are no contentious points which I have to reply to. On the whole, some of the hon. Members have themselves replied to certain questions, for instance, my friends Mr. Gupta and Mr. Sarwate took another line by which they effectively answered some of the arguments advanced by other Members. In the end, I would repeat my request to the hon. mover of the Resolution to withdraw it.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY : Sir, I am grateful to all the hon. Members who have participated in the discussion. Some of the hon. Members have given me very able support, particularly Mr. G. G. K. Reddy. I am glad, Sir, we have found something to agree upon at least. He has given me very able support and in fact he has supplemented what I, for lack of time, failed to advance. And then hon. Mr. Ranawat has also given very able support with practical experience and in many cases with illustrations and hon. Mr. Agnibhoj, Mr. Sharma and the friend behind me. They have all given me very able support. I am also grateful, Sir, to those who have differed from me and have pointed out the difficulties of bringing this Resolution into effect.

I am not surprised, Sir, that this Resolution has had a mixed reception. In the nature of things, in the nature of the Resolution, it is technical. Anything connected with agriculture, Sir, does not carry an appeal—fervent appeal—to those who are not closely interested in agriculture and who have no intimate experience of agriculture. It is certainly not wrong if one is not interested in agriculture and particularly, Sir, a problem of this technical nature—crop planning—may not carry the same appeal to everyone as it does to me. But there is a general misconception, Sir, which I gather, pre-

vails in the minds of some Members. And I would take some time in clearing it.

They seem to imagine that planned cropping involves compulsion, involves regimentation, as hon. Mr. Pattabiraman was saying. They seem to imagine that crop planning will work to the disadvantage of the peasant and it will bring hardships and entail losses on the part of the peasant. I am sorry that they are labouring under a misconception. There is no such thing under crop planning. In fact, crop planning in its broadest sense means exploitation of the natural resources to the best advantage possible. Some of the Members, although they differed from my Resolution, admitted this in principle that the broadest aspect of crop planning is exploitation of the natural resources to the best advantage possible. Just as hon. Members pointed out, if a certain plot of land is best suited for growing cotton, there is no use growing a crop which perhaps gives a lesser income. Crop planning means exploitation of any particular piece of land to the best advantage of the grower. Crop planning, although it involves some control, is to the best advantage of the ryot. Hon. Members who opposed this Resolution seemed to forget that aspect. They seemed to think that we are putting the ryots under compulsion. They seemed also to think that we are making the ryots suffer losses. If a man who gets Rs. 500 per acre by growing a particular crop is compelled to grow a crop which gives him only Rs. 300 per acre, certainly the ryot would suffer, but crop planning does not mean that at all. I do not think that crop planning works to the disadvantage of the ryot. It is intended and the whole conception is that it should be worked to the best advantage of the ryot, to work it to the best advantage of the people of the country. That is the significance of crop planning. It does involve some compulsion, I do admit, but even compulsion in particular circumstances may be justified. For instance I own ten acres of wet land and, I grow tobacco in all the ten acres and then go to a

[Shd M. Govinda Reddy] Government depor most disgracefully and accept foodgrains at rates subsidised by the Government. Let me grow tobacco in three acres or five acres, by all means, but I should grow foodgrains at least in quantities sufficient for my requirements. Would it not be disgraceful for a man like this to go and beg for food at subsidised rates ? I would like to put this argument before the Government. Would it be right on the part of the Government to pay the taxpayers' money, the poor men's money to a man who can afford to live by himself, by supplying him foodgrains at subsidised rates when he can very well grow them ? We have tobacco growers, we have mulberry growers, we have potato growers, we have sugarcane growers, we have oilseed growers and so on. These gentlemen begin to grow one cash crop or another because they get more money. Should they not have a sense of patriotism to realise that the Government treasury is being emptied in buying foodgrains from foreign countries, practically through the nose, and that they should come to the aid of the Government at least by not themselves depending upon Government stocks for their foodgrains ? I do not see, Sir, why we should not compel such people to grow at least the foodgrains they require. Is it wrong for the Government to compel such people ? If Government does not want to compel such people at least to grow food-grains, I want to know how Government can make up this food deficit, because every person will grow only such crops as would give him more money.

SHRI L. H. DOSHI (Bombay) : Does the hon. Member know that those who grow cash crops are paying more revenue to the Government than what they could possibly get by way of subsidised food ?

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY : I do not know that cash crops pay the Government excise duty, etc and I know also that cash crops get us foreign exchange, but do the people who grow cash crops

realise that -is- it is disgraceful for an agricultural country like India to go abegging to a merchant community like the U. S. A. for food ? Should we not make up our own minds to grow enough food crops also ? I put this question to those who believe in cash crops. When we grow enough of food, let us grow as much and as many of cash crops as possible and earn as much foreign exchange as possible.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA : Is not the money obtained by one hand given out by the other by way of subsidised food ?

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : From America.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY : In fact, they are giving to foreign countries, much more than what we get on cash crops.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA : Is not the argument irrelevant to the main Resolution where the idea is 'planned cropping' irrespective of foodgrains as against cash crops ?

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY : Foodgrains are the important crops that we are to think about at the moment, because we buy them by giving our life blood.

Well, Sir, in such cases, compulsion is necessary. In a welfare State like ours, where the Government takes the responsibility of feeding and clothing everyone, where it is the Government's responsibility to give equal opportunities to every one, would it be wrong on the part of such a welfare Government to take measures which in some measure may seem to be compulsory ? I can understand if it is regimentation on the part of the Government for the ambition of the Government or for conquest outside. If these measures are imposed on the community, I can understand people resisting or condemning these measures. But in a welfare State, it must enforce certain conditions in order to realise its goal. All people do not realise their good. Some people must be made to realise

that. For instance, the criminal must be made to realise that he should not be anti-social. If we say that it is compulsion, our argument is fallacious and not the fact.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Are you pressing your Resolution ? All these will be necessary if you are pressing your Resolution.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY : As certain points were raised—for instance, it was suggested that the Party ties my hand...—

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You need not worry about it.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY : I shall not take more than five minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You have only three minutes left.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY : I will finish. My hon. friend Mr. Gupta was saying that I had no freedom in the Party. He does not know anything of our Party. I would like to tell the Opposition Members that in order to understand the Congress Members, they have to understand the Congress as it really is. Without knowing the Congress Members, if they happen to be in the:

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDI : Perhaps he was not there when we were in the Congress.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : Sir.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Order, order.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY : I suppose the hon. Members are aware of what the Congress Government are doing. In Bombay, we have a Tenancy Act. We have the Tanjore Tenancy Act and the Zamindari Abolition Act in Madras. It is due to be launched in Mysore and Madhya Pradesh also. In the manifesto of the Congress Party and in the resolution of the Congress Party, 'Land for the Tiller' is the slogan and the Government is doing its

very best to see that landlordism in the sense that it deprives people unnecessarily of land is put an end to. But the Government does not believe in cutting the heads of the landlords and giving the land to the tillers. It does not deem it as a move consistent with the peaceful creed that the Congress is following. To say that the Congress Government is not doing anything is gross ignorance.

Mr. Pattabiraman has given many points for me to reply. I have replied to his point on regimentation. He said if there is lop-sided development then only we will have to think of planned cropping. There is no lop-sided development here, as I myself pointed out in my speech. We are short of everything. When we are short of everything, should we not grow sufficiently every commodity that is necessary for our life ? He also made another point that we should have planned possession before planning. Well, I would say that it is not necessary for planned cropping.

4 P. M.

Messrs. Gupta and Sarwate have raised some points that arose on account of the misconception which I tried to clear in the beginning of my reply. I am surprised for one thing that the hon. Minister has turned a cold shoulder to this although he has no objection to the principle. He has not shown any enthusiasm over it. Coming as he is from an agricultural community, I do not know if he is also labouring under the misconception that crop planning imposes compulsion on the peasant and all that. I know and I said so in the beginning of my speech that the Government have difficulties. This is a system which cannot be brought into effect all over India right now. I do not mean also that everything should be done through legislation. That is why I have included other methods also in my Resolution. I know very well that our ryots cannot be compelled but should be persuaded and guided to do it. So the methods of persuasion also have to be applied and there was plenty of

[Shri Govmda Reddy.] scope in the Resolution for Govern- j ment to accept the same. Since lie j does not accept i but concedrstheprin- j ciple, I do not like to press it. I note ; Mr. Reddy smiles at me because he was ; pulling my leg by saying that I may | yield to pressure. But as he knows, j this Resolution had a mixed reception ; here. I would not like to pursue it j to its inevitable fate and I am glad so j much thought has been given to this j and some criticism has come to bear upon it. While the Planning Com- mission says that ciop planning is necessary, I do not understand why the Government should not accept it. It says on page 27 of the summary of the Report :

"On the whole, it is best that each farm and each village follow the crop plan which will enable it to utilize the available physical resources to the greatest advantage. To the extent individual farms join into co-operatives crop planning can be developed both as a means of regulation and for securing increased production."

DR. P. S. DESHMUKH : We are going to work on those lines.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY : There are difficulties in the way of the Government. It is not my intention to underestimate them. I also know that this Resolution has its own limits, and it is very difficult to legislate for all parts but legislation could be resorted to only for those areas which are irrigated under the new projects and land is distributed. There of course the Government could think of some sort of plan for crops there.

DR. P. S. DESHMUKH : Short of legislation that is being do e.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY : I am glad the hon. Minister reassures me about it. So in view of the assurance he has given about this that he would pursue wherever possible such measures I seek the leave of the House to withdraw my Resolution.

The Resolution was, by leave of the House, withdrawn

RESOLUTION RE ABSORPTION OF MEMBERS OF I. N. A. INTO INDIAN ARMY

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : We will take up the next Resolution. Mr. Dwivedy.

SHRI S.N. DWIVEDY (Orissa) : Sir, I move :

That this Council is of opinion that the Members of the Indian National Army should be immediately absorbed into the Indian Army.

While moving this I would expect Members opposite to accept this Resolution because it is not a party question, it is a national question. The history of the Indian National Army is a glorious chapter of the Indian struggle for freedom. India and Pakistan owe their present glory, freedom, prestige to Netaji and these brave fighters of freedom. The Indian National Army by its activities outside the country exploded the myth of the Britishers that Indians were not capable or not fit enough to govern their own country. Sir, in view of these facts, it is really an irony of fate that these men, these fighters for freedom should, when the country became actually free, be so neglected and no proper attention, should have been paid to them.

AN HON. MEMBER : They did not fight non-violent ly.

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY : It is true they did net fight non-vtolently, for as is known to everybody, these I. N. A. men—this Indian National Army was formed in November 1942, to give armed help to our struggle for freedom. We passed a Resolution " Quit India " in August 1942 and our call reached outside the borders of this country and Indians who were outside rallied behind our great leader Netaji; and I would even say that had that Army not been formed, perhaps we would not have got this freedom which we are enjoying today. It was in the fitness of things, therefore, that when the war ended, or when the time came for it, nationalist India

owned these brave fighters for freedom. Sir, the whole of nationalist India did stand behind these brave soldiers. Sardar Patel, if I remember aright, in November 1945 said in Bombay that this I. N. A. would form the nucleus of the future Indian Army. Not only that, Sir. I would refer to the Resolution passed by the All-India Congress Committee in September 1945. By referring to that Resolution, I want to show that that Resolution was passed by the Congress which was the representative voice of the Indian people, because the Congress at that time was not a party caucus as it is today. The Congress was not at that time representing a minority of the population in the country. The Congress then was our national parliament. So, this Resolution which was passed at the Congress echoed the voice of the teftming millions and the entire population of India. It was said regarding this Indian National Army that " they can be of the greatest service in the heavy work of building up the new free India." These sentiments were expressed then. But what happened ? When you got this freedom, when you got power what happened to these people ? How have you utilised them in " building up this new and free India "—in the language of our Prime Minister ? Sir, often we find that great promises are made, hopes are given but they are conveniently forgotten when we ask for the implementation of those promises and assurances. I do not know why this simple problem was not solved at the moment we had the power to do it. I do not know, Sir, what pressure was brought on this Government or on the Prime Minister not to take these brave soldiers— about 15,000 of them—into the fold of the Indian Army. I do not know how far this is correct that the last British Masters in this country saw to it that these soldiers who left the British and fought the British are not given a fair deal and are not admitted into the Indian Army. Otherwise, I do not under-j stand how people, who were once in the I. N. A. and then betrayed and surrendered to the British are today

enjoying full privileges, while these brave soldiers are kept out.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY (Mysore) : Shame.

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY : Sir, if it was not possible for the Interim Government to do anything, what prevented Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru or the Indian Government, the so-called peoples' Government, from honouring our national promise, to take these people into the fold of the Indian Army, after August 1947 ? Sir, I am told only about a thousand of them have been taken into the Indian Army with most humiliating conditions. Not only that, they have not been given the facilities which are generally given to the prisoners of war. They have not been given any allowance or arrears of pay from 1942 till 1946 when they were released. Is it the policy or does Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the Prime Minister of India, want to say that these I. N. A. persons were not Prisoners of War ? Sir, I would have understood if it had been said that we were not able to accommodate all those. While I am pleading their cause, I do not mean that everybody, each one of them, should have been admitted, but those who are fit enough,, who are willing to come back, those who are not undesirable, should have been taken back , but, if it was not possible to take them back into the Army, were there not opportunities enough in this country to take them, either in the Police or in the Territorial Army or in the Home Guards or in so many other Departments or so many functions that we have created in this country ? Why was that not done ? X fail really to understand why this very question was neglected. And for what purpose ? Why, Sir, has it been necessary, after so many years, to raise this question in this Parliament >

Sir, I am told that some persons, belongmg to the I. N. A., are being taken in some service, here and there, —a few of them. But, their seivicts, the services which they put up before

LSfin 5. JN. Dwivedy. I am not being accounted. They are to begin *de novo* that means that all the privileges that they would have got ordinarily, they will not get now.

Sir, the political prisoners, as you know, in our country—in some States—are getting lands, are getting monthly allowances; but, what happened *-fib* these brave fighters?

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : They are traitors according to them.

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY : As my hon. friend points out just now, they wanted—as they are doing today—to maintain the continuity of the policy of the Britishers who maintained that these were traitors. Sir, we are giving so many facilities to the political prisoners. But what about the I. N. A. ? We have given no lands. Have we given any rehabilitation grants ? Have we given them any money to start industries ? Do we give them any other assistance so that they may be able to remain here and have their full life in this free India ? Nothing of the kind. I am told that even doctors with very good records, who did valuable work at a very critical moment, have been neglected in this country where we always need medical advice and efficient men. Therefore, I feel that this Government is really pursuing a policy which is quite opposed to the national sentiment and aspirations of the country. Therefore I have brought this Resolution before Parliament. This should not be treated as a party question and should not be rejected merely by the brute majority that the Congress Party have in this House.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore) : Where is the "brute" ? There is no "brute" here.

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY : But they act like brutes.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : Their behaviour is brutal.

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY : I most humbly and earnestly appeal to the Government to do something now. If you had neglected them, it does not matter; but better late than never.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :
Resolution moved :

This Council is of opinion that the members of the Indian National Army should be immediately absorbed into the Indian Army.

The Resolution is now open for discussion.
{The Prime Minister and Minister for External Affairs rose.}

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : Sir, may I say something before the Prime Minister speaks, because I should like him to reply to me also ?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Yes

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : Sir, whatever I have to say on this subject is more or less subjective, because I was myself in this movement and therefore if my emotion carries me away, I beg pardon of this Council.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY : Please do not allow yourself to be carried away.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : It is very easy for the hon. Members to see that their emotion does not affect them, because they have left their emotion, they have left their finer feelings, they have left their gratitude they have left everything that we should have valued behind them in their progress towards power and self and prestige. I hope the hon. Members will not raise that question again.

Sir, I should like to start my story—if I may call it, not my story, but the story of this glorious movement—some time on the 9th of September 1943. It was very much later, very much after the movement was started. Sir, it was the Plenipotentiary in Madras. Four young men who were my comrades, whose shouts I can still remember, whose shouts I can still hear, were hanged by the neck shouting for the country.

These are memories which make it , worth while for people like me to live. There are many millions who laid down their lives for our country. There are those who have been maimed not only physically but otherwise. And what have we done for the last seven or eight years and more ? Whenever this question comes up, it is treated with the utmost indifference. It is a standing shame to us as a nation. We try to^» dodge it. I have tried to raise this question several times, but nothing has happened.

The hon. Prime Minister will not remember it : it was in 1945, on his birthday—November 14th—when I came to visit him, immediately after my release. I did not even spend a day at home. I came to give the greetings of my comrades on his birthday—the greetings of those who had laid down their lives ; I also came to give him the assurance of my comrades who were still in jail at that time that their lives and their all were not only dedicated for the I. N. A. movement but for the country as well. He will also remember, but he won't, because I am such an insignificant individual who has not tried to pester him for things that I wanted for myself. Again he will remember that as a contribution of my colleagues in the navy and the merchant navy— those days, Sir, it was very difficult for them to contribute anything, but they gave 50 or 100 and 150, like that— I gave immediately after and into his hands, I gave the contribution of my colleagues, the first instalment of Rs. 500 in two days. I gave again the rest of it, about Rs. 4000 and odd, to the I. N. A. Relief Committee and I wrote letter after letter. I went and saw them. I asked and pleaded for those who died and who had left their wives and children and who had nothing to live on, for some help. Nothing came. I wrote a letter to the Prime Minister, the Leader of the Nation then, the *de facto*, although our Gandhiji was still alive. No reply came. I went to see him again when he came to Bombay in June 1946, to plead again for those with whom I was intimately associated, although

there were thousands outside who did not get any help. The door was banged on my face because there was another who had a more glorious thing to do for him, who was having an hour and a half discussion with him, and a person who was floating organisation after organisation and for whom he actively helped in collecting all the funds that he could get from Bombay and who went away to England to organise an Overseas Congress or something, over which we have heard nothing since.

I am going to tell this House and the country, Sir, in what manner our people have been betrayed, in what manner our patriots have been maimed and forgotten. Sir, patriots have been tortured ; they have been killed and all sorts of indignities have been put on them in the course of history by foreign oppressors. Sir, never in the history of the world have we come across an instance where the patriots of the country have been suppressed by their own Government, (Some hon. Members : Shame ! shame by the Government of the people of their own country ? Sir, what is it that these people have done ? Have they committed any crime by organising themselves for the sake of the country ? We have people

THE PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU) : May I know, Sir, what this has to do with this Resolution. I should like the Resolution to be read. The hon. Member can tell me what this has got to do with this Resolution.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : I will read the Resolution, Sir. The hon. Prime Minister probably is cut to the quick over the sad story.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I am only distressed by these tears and weepings.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : I am sorry. Probably I am woman-like and I may not be so courageous as the hon. Prime Minister is, but naturally I am carried away by emotions.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU : Must have some relation to truth !

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : I shall be courageous.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU : I do submit that there should be some relation to truth. These are fantastic tales.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : Am I to understand that what I have stated are all lies ?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU : Most of what the hon. Member has stated is totally incorrect.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : Sir, I stand by my statements. But I am accused of telling lies. I have said what I know to be is God's truth.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Reddy, please be relevant to the Resolution.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : I would request him not to lose his temper. Sir, the Resolution is that they should be taken back in the army. They have not been taken back. Why ? If they have been guilty of indiscipline, if they have raised their arms against their country, if they have been traitors, if they have been spies and acted in collusion with any foreign country, these are causes on which the members of the Armed Forces deserve not only to be discharged but to be shot. But in this case, they put their country first before themselves. Why were they discharged ? Is it because they were guilty of the vilest thing that can happen in the world ? I know the decision was not made by the British. More than that, I know the decision was made by our own Army H.-Q.

Naturally, Sir, there are always vested interests in every department in every branch of the Governments. If most of the Indian Army personnel and officers were reinstated, naturally many of them would have lost their present ranks. Their decision would have been influenced by their own interests,

but is it fair and just that those who had any vested interest should have a voice in the decision ?

I want to know why they were not taken back. In the last session I asked a question and the hon. the Leader of the House who is also the Defence Minister said that the matter was so old that nothing could be done about it. The decision was taken by the previous Government and nothing could be done about it. Has anyone ever come out with reason why they have not been taken back ? My hon. friend who moved the Resolution said and I too know that many of them have asked, "If you cannot reinstate us, at least give us some help". You have distributed the largesse that you are capable of, by five acres, 10 acres and 100 acres to hundreds of persons in the name of patriotism. Could we not give them that at least ? Could we not see, if for some administrative reasons they could not be taken back into the Army, that they are absorbed in the Police or in other services ?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Reddy, the wording of the Resolution is "should be immediately absorbed into the India Army".

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : I must suggest the alternatives also.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : There is no question of any alternative.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : Sir, I ask in the name of the country, in the name of the people, that these patriots be taken back into the Army, and if they are not taken back, I want to know why they are not to be taken back and why this shameful decision was taken. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU : Sir, it is not for me to venture to reply to the question as has been in the nature of an exhibition in this House. I do not know if normally speeches are delivered in this way in this House, I which have neither logic nor relevancy,

except a lot of shouting and a lot of strong language. The hon. Member who spoke last started by gently insinuating that those sitting on this side of the House are out for pelf and power and various other things.

SHRI G. G. K. REDDY : I was provoked into that.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU : The hon. Member says that he was provoked into that, but nevertheless it was, if I may say so, a suitable beginning to the speech he made. It appears that most of what he has said he was provoked into saying without thinking much about it. Now, the hon. Member has given us tales of woes, sorrow and suffering and what happened some years ago when he came and asked for an interview and I was busy with somebody else and I could not see him. In the year 1945 I was not myself in Government. I was in prison and I came out of the prison in June 1945. Maybe three months later he might have seen me—where, I do not know. I may have met him once, I cannot say, but how all that is relevant I do not know. I would like to remind the hon. Member!, if he does not know it—because he indulged in certain personal equations—that the question of the I. N. A. was first raised by me in this country. I am not taking any credit for it. It so happened that I raised it. There was a great deal of feeling in the country. Later, many things happened. First of all there was a question of some trials in which many eminent persons, more especially the late Shri Bhulabhai Desai, took a very prominent part. There was a question of the trial of the I. N. A. prisoners and others in which, I venture to say, a great effort was put in by many eminent leaders, my colleagues and others, and many of these who sit on this side, and who, according to the hon. Member are out for pelf and power, and it was largely due to their efforts that whatever happened happened. Later the trial; were over. The question came before us at a later stage when we had what is called the Provisional Government. It came not

in a specific way but rather it simply came in bits because those were difficult days and nobody knew how long that Government itself would last. Hon. Members here might remember that that Government was hardly a Government. It was a continuous conflict within the Government between different groups which subsequently led to the partition of India. It was quite impossible to deal with any matter because of that conflict and on several occasions, in those days, it was doubted if the Government would last for a few days or not. Many a time I myself offered my resignation from that Government but something happened and then came after a few months a certain decision which led ultimately to partition and so on and so forth. They were difficult days. Throughout those days many of us were in intimate touch with this question. We formed into Committees. I say this because the hon. Member laid great stress on the fact that apart from the question of their being taken back into the army, nothing was done, that they were treated as traitors and the like. I can only say that he speaks from complete ignorance of the subject.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : I know a lot more than the hon. Prime Minister does.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU : Then it is all the greater pity that he does not utilise that knowledge to better advantage because I do venture to say that in the history of India—he talks about the world—this kind of thing never happened. I have never seen an exhibition of such amazing hysteria and wrong statement as the hon. Member makes. He talks about the history of the world. Surely, surely there should be some balance in what one says. There should be some restraint, some truth in what one says.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : Is he accusing me of telling lies ? I want him to tell me where he is accusing me of telling lies. Sir, he cannot get away with a statement like that.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU : I do submit that there should be a certain restraint of language, of manner, and when one begins to talk about the history of the world in this connection, the person who talks in that way is talking, if I may say so, without any relation to any fact about the history of the world—the history of the world in regard to a particular incident in a particular country at a particular moment. Now I venture to say that here in this country of India, for the last two generations or so, we have carrkd on—not we only, I am talking of the country—a struggle for the freedom of India. Many have died in that. Many have been shattered completely. Hundreds and thousands still today are suffering from that. We have tried to help here and there ; but there they are. We never promised them anything, because we knew we could not. But I say no group of persons who have served India have been helped to the extent that the personnel of the I. N. A. in India have been. No other group in India who has taken part in the struggle for freedom has received that much consideration, that much assistance, that much of help as the I. N. A. personnel who came back to India. I am not saying that in any spirit of comparison. I merely say that when the charge is made that they have been treated as traitors, that they have been forgotten and all that, it amazes me. When I compare what the country did, what the Congress did—and the Congress did more than anybody else in this country for them—and what others did, and what the Government did too, and to be told thus that they have been treated in this way amazes me. When I heard the hon. Member who moved this Resolution, I had a sensation as if the hon. Member was asleep for the last five or six years, and somebody had awakened him up. He did not seem to be aware of all that had happened these five or six years, because, during these five or six years, there had been two or three things. One is of course, that the Government had considered this matter—not once but two or three times. And if the hon. Member

thinks that we were compelled to take a decision by the British Government of the day, he is very much mistaken because the ultimate decision that we took, when we took it, the British Government was not here—I leave out doing anything—they were just not here to do anything. It is possible, if the British Government were here in the early days when the matter did come up, the British Government, or such elements of the British Government as were here, might have exercised some pressure, possibly. But simply they were not here, and so the question does not arise. We considered this matter repeatedly with the greatest care, consulting all manner of folk, and ultimately came to some decisions which were announced on many occasions and which I presume are known to the hon. Member too. I can read them out, because the decisions we have taken did not convey anything of the kind that the hon. Member gave about them. I shall come back to this —about the Government decisions.

So far as the non-governmental attitude is concerned in this matter, there was continuously—in spite of the fact that we were going through a time of great stress, strain, trial and difficulty as the House knows, after 1947—the change in 1947, the partition and all the troubles that occurred and all that—there was continuously the attempt throughout to help the I. N. A. personnel in every way, in those particular ways more especially, which the hon. Member referred to as alternatives. In fact—I regret I have not got the figures—in fact large numbers of the I. N. A. have been absorbed in the home guards, the police forces ; some of them are high officers in the police, the highest officers in some provinces. And a number of times I myself took this matter up by letter with the Chief Ministers of Provinces, by conferences, by personal talks, by personal references, and received reports from them as to what they were doing, and with the Central Government too. As I have said, I do not have the figures at the moment ; but I say every possible effort was made, and

these efforts succeeded in a large measure too. Apart from that, the old I.N.A. Enquiry Committee, the Relief Committee, subsisted. It is true it did not function very adequately because of numerous other matters ; but it subsisted, and throughout this period, it has given help, financial help or help in employment. There is still an office in Delhi which tries to do its best. Hardly a week goes by when, as Chairman of that Committee, I do not get requests for help to people, and help is given to those who want it.

Another factor has to be remembered when this Resolution is taken into consideration. After the partition of India a fairly large proportion of the I.N.A. personnel went to Pakistan. Not only were they in Pakistan, but I regret to say, they took arms against India in Kashmir. Some of the fairly well-known officers of the Indian National Army were some of the more important leaders of the raid on Kashmir. So, we leave them out, naturally. The hon. Member presumably does not expect us to bring them into the Indian Army,—the Officers and the men in Pakistan ; not only those who are in Pakistan but who actually fought against India, against the Indian troops. So far as the others are concerned, there were a series of decisions here. Ultimately, there was not—we put aside what the British Government had done—that is before we came into the scene, we put that aside completely—the hon. Member might have been perfectly right if he were describing what the British Government did—any kind of stigma attached to them, and opened out all these avenues of service including service in the Army to them. We could not take them *en bloc* into the Army for a variety of reasons connected with the Army,—not connected with politics, not connected with any stigma on them, but connected with the Army itself,—because, after a large gap of period, all kinds of difficulties arose. The Army is a delicate instrument. The Army at that

time was actually being reduced because it was a War Army. It was being reduced in numbers and demobilisation was going on on the one hand. Apart from that, persons who had been out of the picture for 6 or 7 or 8 years and who, normally, would have been out of the Army by that period, persons who had lost touch with the growth of the Army and many things—it is not easy to fit them in without upsetting the set-up of the Army. So, the door was completely open to them but, they were to be considered as individuals, not as a group. We gave those—I do not know what privileges, I had better read out—large gratuities which are given to people when they leave the Army, pensions, etc., etc., I cannot say exactly but, apart from pensions, etc., I believe a sum of Rs. 30 lakhs was provided for under the Army Estimates for this purpose, because technically there was some difficulty under the Army Regulations. So, we got over that technical difficulty and provided this sum, apart from sums that were given to them under the Rules;

Apart from giving these,—pension, gratuities and the rest—we left the door open for them to come into the Army—in some cases to the Army undoubtedly, some officers and some others,—not very many. As far as I remember, I do not know, because, as I said, there was the question of the age of the average soldier, and, also he was out of touch and to take him at this stage was not proper and so we paid him all kinds of pensions. There was no bar and, as I said, Sir, a very large number of them were taken in the Home Guards, in the Police Services, in the Armed Constabulary and, some of them are occupying very responsible positions today ; some are in the Diplomatic Service also and some are in other Services and, very very far from doing anything that might be considered to have flown from a stigma, they have been looked upon with honour and respect. We have tried to encourage and help them; it may be that our help has not been as.