

[Shri Govinda Reddy.]

scope in the Resolution for Government to accept the same. Since he does not accept it but concedes the principle, 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, this Resolution had a mixed reception here. I would not like to pursue it to its inevitable fate and I am glad so much thought has been given to this and some criticism has come to bear upon it. While the Planning Commission says that crop 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 done.

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The Resolution was, by leave of the House, withdrawn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-violently.

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY : It is true they did not fight non-violently, 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 teeming 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 understand 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? I 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, belonging to the I. N. A., are being taken in some service, here and there,—a few of them. But, their services, the services which they put up before

[Shri S. N. Dwivedy.]

are 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 to 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 (My-sore) : 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 every thing that we should have valued behind them in their progress towards power and pelf 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 Penitentiary 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 ~~do~~ 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 Government. If most of the I.N.A. 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 rather difficult for me to venture to reply to which 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, 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 C. 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 trials 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 carried 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—what 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



[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

adequate as people would like it to be; it may be a little less, but, taking everything into consideration, I do submit, Sir, that we have tried to do more, and succeeded in that, for the I.N.A. personnel than we have done to any other group or to the vast army of political sufferers in the country whose families had been shattered during the last 30 or 40 years. So that, it does pain and distress me to be accused of treating these people in this way, as though they were traitors and not respected patriots, as though we had not tried to help them in every way. This matter has come up repeatedly. This matter is treated as closed. Apart from everything else, whatever help might conceivably have been given, this lapse of time makes it extremely difficult to take the people back into the army after ten years. How are they to be taken back, and where? They did not fit in anywhere as soldiers. We would have to give them special training of all kinds. It simply would not work. I am referring to the Resolution as worded. It cannot be done. With the best will in the world, it cannot be done. There were those difficulties. Now, apart from undoing what the British Government had attempted to do—the stigma, etc., by classifying them into groups\* and so on—I will just read out what all has been done. I am talking about the last six years. The stigma attached to the ex-I.N.A. personnel was removed and the individuals were made eligible for re-employment in the Indian army if they were otherwise suitable. Those who were re-enrolled were treated as ex-soldiers of the Indian army to all intents and purposes. In the case of officers who held commissions in the Indian army prior to their joining the I. N. A. the normal rules were relaxed. The officers too were eligible to get *de novo* permanent or short service commissions. Those officers who held permanent commissions in the Indian army were not required to appear before the Services Selection Board. A liaison officer was appointed in the Ministry of Defence to

assist the ex-I.N.A. personnel in finding employment for the personnel under the Government of India and State Governments. Individuals who had been previously dismissed or discharged were granted (1) amounts standing to their credit including deferred pay on the date of their capture by the enemy where not already paid; (2) amount equal to three months' pay and allowances including deferred pay of the substantive or war substantive rank held at the time of the discharge or retirement; (3) service pension including muster pension and gratuity under normal rules; (4) war gratuity and contractual gratuity under the existing rules. And in addition to all these, lump sum grants were made to those who were disabled or were dependants of those who died while serving with the I.N.A. On top of that, a sum of Rs. 30 lakhs was set apart for these concessions, and the actual expenditure on this account was Rs. 31 lakhs.

Sir, this is what was done from the Defence Ministry side. You will see that everything possible was done excepting taking them back *en masse* into the Indian army, which at that time, for a large variety of reasons was found very difficult, and, I submit, correctly found to be difficult. It was not a question of their patriotism being challenged. It was a question of getting people into the army who were particularly suited for the army at that time. You cannot play about with the army. And normally the door was open. And what was done I have mentioned. A great deal was done, and to some extent it was done with the co-operation and help of the I.N.A. officers and men themselves. In fact there was a committee of their own people who used to advise us and even now it is going on, and even now I am in charge of a fund to give relief to ex-I.N.A. officers and men and hardly a day passes by when some case does not come up recommended by the I.N.A. officers themselves to me, and I deal with the matter, and normally relief is given.

I really do not know what more could have been done or can be done now. In any event I would point out to this House that the Resolution as framed has no relevance to facts and it is not related to facts. It just cannot be accepted.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : May I just ask the Prime Minister for a little assurance, if he can give it even at this late stage ? He said something about rewarding them in other ways. Is it possible, since he has not given us reasons as to how he came to this decision—I shall bow to him : probably he has other reasons for not giving the reasons.....

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU : Which reasons ?

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : For not taking them back into the army.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU : I thought I gave the reasons—that it is very difficult to take them back into the army many years later.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : I am not pressing for the reasons. I was only asking if any time before any weightage was given to I.N.A. people as such. There may be people who got employment because of other qualifications. I want to know whether I.N.A. personnel as such were given weightage for recruitment in services other than the army. Was it done as a rule—not to special people, but as a rule to the whole 14,000 people ? Were any instructions given to the Provincial Governments or Chief Ministers to give weightage, and, if so, with what effect ?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU : I thought I dealt with that. We tried to give every weightage. That is to say, instructions were given to give weightage, and actually, to my knowledge, weightage was sometimes given. Speaking from memory, I think apart from the Central office here, we had an office in Lucknow, and an office in Bombay, which specially dealt with the matter,

which kept themselves in constant touch with the State Governments and pressed on their claims with the State Governments. And the State Governments, I know, were favourably inclined and wanted to do it ; and in fact my answer to the hon. Member's question is that weightage was given. When the hon. Member referred to the figure of 15,000, I would like to know whether it includes the number who went to Pakistan.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : It is very difficult to divide them.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU : That figure is reduced. About one-third or more—if 15,000 is the right figure—I take his figure....

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : Please do not take my figure. As the Prime Minister himself said, he has got a lot more information than I have.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU : About one-third roughly went to Pakistan and remained there. Let us say, two-thirds are here : let us say, 10,000. A very large number of those got service in the police, in the home guards and other services. Really the number therefore is reduced. I have no doubt at all that even now there are people who are in difficulties. I know personally because cases come to me day after day. They are in difficulties, and we are trying to help them. I do not mean to say that we help everybody generously, but we do try to do so, and I think the problem has been solved, not one hundred per cent., but to a very large extent we did meet the difficulties that had arisen.

DR. P. C. MITRA (Bihar)

श्री पी० सी० मित्रा (बिहार) : श्रीमान् जी लोभ पाय पापे मृत्यु, न एक भाई ओरन एक भाई ।

पहिले लोभ होता है, उसके बाद पाप होता है और उसके बाद मृत्यु होती है । यही हालत हमारे आई० एन० ए० वालों की

[Dr. P. C. Mitra.]

हुई। ये लोग कांग्रेस के खिलाफ काम करने के लिए अंग्रेजों के साथ गये थे जब कांग्रेस ने न जाने का एलान किया था और इस तरह से वे लोग लालच में आये। इस तरह से उन लोगों ने कांग्रेस के खिलाफ पाप किया। जब यह लोग वापस आये तो इन लोगों को मृत्यु का दंड तो नहीं दिया गया बल्कि उनको हर तरह की सहायता दी गई। अगर ब्रिटिश गवर्नमेंट होती तो उन लोगों को फांसी की सजा मिलती। मगर इस समय तो कांग्रेस गवर्नमेंट है उसने इस तरह की कोई कार्यवाही नहीं की बल्कि और भी उनको हर तरह की मदद पहुंचाई। तो इन लोगों ने पहिले लोभ किया फिर उसके बाद पाप किया जिसका वह आज फल भुगत रहे हैं।

इन लोगों में से एक तिहाई पाकिस्तान चले गये और दो तिहाई यहां पर मौजूद हैं। जो लोग पाकिस्तान में चले गये उनका भी वहां पर पाकिस्तान सरकार ने विश्वास नहीं किया और जिन लोगों का विश्वास किया वह ले लिये गये। बाकी कितने रहे या नहीं रहे यह मालूम नहीं है कि सब वहां पर ले लिये गये या नहीं ले लिये गये। इस तरह से जो लोग रह गये वह अपना पाप भोग रहे हैं जो उन्होंने किया था।

[ For English translation, see Appendix III, Annexure No. 69. ]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :  
Yes, the Deputy Minister for Defence.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR DEFENCE (SARDAR S. S. MAJITHIA) :  
Sir, after what the hon. Prime Minister has said, I do not think there is any thing further left for me to answer.

SHRI ONKAR NATH (Delhi) :

श्री ओंकार नाथ (दिल्ली) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं समझता हूं कि प्रधान मंत्री जी के जवाब के बाद इस प्रस्ताव के बारे में मुझे कुछ कहने की जरूरत बाकी नहीं रह जाती है। मगर हमारे प्रस्तावक महोदय और दूसरे साथी ने यहां पर कुछ ऐसी बातें कहीं हैं जिससे सदन में गलतफहमी हो सकती है, उसी को दूर करने के लिये मैं आपके सामने कुछ अर्ज करना चाहता हूं।

मुझे इस हाउस (House) के अन्दर यह देखकर दुःख होता है कि हमारी यह राज्य-परिषद्, जो कि हमारे देश की सब से ऊंची परिषद् है, वहां पर इस तरह की बातें कही जा सकती हैं। यहां पर तो संजीदगी के साथ हर बात को कहा जाना फ़बता है। यहां पर इस तरह से सेन्टीमेंट (sentiment) में बह जाने की आशा नहीं की जा सकती थी। लोक सभा में इस तरह के सेन्टीमेंट तो हो सकते थे मगर देश की सब से बड़ी राज्य-परिषद् में इस तरह के सेन्टीमेंट में बह जाना शोभा नहीं देता है। यह राज्य-परिषद् तो लोक सभा द्वारा पास किये गये निर्णयों को अच्छी तरह से रिवाईज (revise) करती है और जो उचित राय होती है वह देती है। मगर जिस तरह से यहां पर हमारे रेडंडी साहब ने फरमाया है वह मेरी समझ में इस राज्य-परिषद् के लिये शोभा नहीं देती है। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने इस बारे में साफ साफ बातें पूरी तरह से बतला दी हैं। मैं समझता हूं कि उन्होंने कोई ऐसी बात नहीं छोड़ी जिसके बारे में अब यहां पर कुछ कहा जा सकता है। हमारे रेडंडी साहब ने कहा कि हमारा देश आजाद हो गया है और एक डेमोक्रेटिक गवर्नमेंट (Democratic Government) के होते हुए पैट्रोट्स ( patriots ) को सपरस

(suppress) किया जा रहा है। मैं नहीं समझता कि उनके सपरेशन के क्या मामले हैं। मैं उन से मालूम करना चाहता हूँ कि वहाँ पर किसको सपरेशन किया गया है। क्या वह आई० एन० ए० वालों के बारे में कह रहे हैं कि उनको सपरेशन किया गया है। तो मैं उनके सामने एक मिसाल नहीं कितनी ही मिसालें दे सकता हूँ जिससे उनका यह बयान बिल्कुल गलत साबित हो सकता है। आज हमारे बीच में शाहनवाज और श्री भोसले मौजूद नहीं हैं क्या वह इसी को सपरेशन कहते हैं। ये लोग ही नहीं और बहुत से हमारे आई० एन० ए० वाले आज बड़े २ ओहदों में काम कर रहे हैं, जैसा कि अभी हमारे माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा। मगर फिर भी हमारे रेड्डी साहब कहते हैं कि यह सरकार आई० एन० ए० वालों को सपरेशन कर रही है और यह "गाड्स ट्रूथ" (God's Truth) है! मगर मैं समझता हूँ कि उनका यह कहना कि हमारी सरकार पैट्रीएट्स को सपरेशन कर रही है सच्चाई से दूर है।

दूसरी बात जो उन्होंने फरमाई वह यह है कि जो प्लेज (pledge) इस विषय में दिये गये थे वह इस सरकार ने पूरे नहीं किये। मगर उन्होंने इस बारे में एक भी मिसाल हम लोगों के सामने पेश नहीं की कि इस सरकार ने कहाँ पर और कैसे किसी प्लेज को तोड़ा है। यह सब को मालूम है कि कांग्रेस ने आई० एन० ए० वालों के साथ हमदर्दी की और आज भी हमदर्दी रखती है और आगे भी जितना उससे हो सकेगा उनकी मदद करती जायगी उसने जो भी प्लेज उनके साथ किया है वह बराबर निभाती रही है और फिर यह कहना कि इस सरकार में वायदा तोड़ा है और उनकी किसी प्रकार मदद नहीं की बिल्कुल गलत बात है।

एक चीज उन्होंने यह भी कही कि यह सरकार दूसरी राजनैतिक लोगों को और सैनिकों को हजारों एकड़ जमीन दे रही है। मैं नहीं जानता कि वह किस प्रान्त में और किस देश में इस तरह की जमीन दी जा रही है। वह यहाँ पर जोरों के साथ कहते हैं कि आई० एन० ए० वालों के साथ सपरेशन किया जा रहा है मगर वह इस तरह की कोई भी मिसाल पेश नहीं करते हैं। यह हाउस और हम भी उन से यह पूछने का हक रखते हैं कि वह हम लोगों के सामने बतलायें और मिसाल पेश करें। वह यहाँ पर जोर २ से कहते हैं कि हजार हजार एकड़ जमीन राजनैतिक कदियों और दूसरे लोगों की दी गई जिन्होंने इस देश की आजादी की लड़ाई में हिस्सा लिया मगर उन्होंने इस बात की एक भी मिसाल पेश नहीं की कि किस प्रान्त में जमीन दी गई।

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY :

श्री एस० एन० द्विवेदी : मद्रास में दी गई है।

SHRI ONKAR NATH :

श्री ओंकार नाथ : यह बात ठीक है कि कुछ लोगों को जमीन दी गई है मगर जैसा कि अभी हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने बताया है कि आई० एन० ए० वालों को भी इसी तरह की जमीन दी गई है और उनकी हर तरह से मदद की गई। जितनी आई० एन० ए० वालों की मदद की गई है उतनी शायद किसी के लिये की गई हो। जिस तरह से सन् १९२० से इस देश में आजादी की लड़ाई में लोगों ने अपनी जानें दी हैं और नुकसान उठाया है अगर उसका अन्दाजा लगाया जाय तो करीब लाखों तक संख्या पहुँचेगी तो क्या हमारी गवर्नमेंट ने इन तमाम आजादी के लिए लड़ने वाले सिपाहियों के लिए किसी प्रकार की मदद पहुँचाई ?

[Shri Onkar Nath.]

गांधी जी के नेतृत्व में ३२ साल से करीब २॥ लाख आदमियों ने इस देश की आजादी के लिये हर तरह की कुरबानी की, जेल गये और हर प्रकार की मुसीबत सही और अब तक सहते चले आ रहे हैं। आज भी दिल्ली में वह लड़कियां मौजूद हैं, जो कि आज बड़ी हो गई हैं, जिन्होंने आजादी की लड़ाई में हर तरह की कुरबानी की और उनके पांव टूट गये। ऐसे लोग भी मौजूद थे जिन्होंने हाथ कट गये, ऐसे लोग भी मौजूद थे जिन्होंने हर प्रकार की मुबसीत को सहते हुए अपने प्राण देश की आजादी के लिए दे दिये और आज भी उनके बाल-बच्चे इस शहर में मौजूद हैं। क्या हम इसको पक्षपात नहीं कह सकते हैं। जिन गोरखे सिपाहियों ने पेशावर में अंग्रेजों के हुक्म को न मानकर अपने देशवासियों पर गोली चलाने से इन्कार कर दिया क्या वे कम बहादुर थे? बम्बई में जिन जहाज वालों ने सत्याग्रह किया था क्या वे बहादुर नहीं थे? क्या उनका यह मतलब है कि आई० एन० ए० वालों ने ही देश की आजादी में भाग लिया और दूसरे लोगों ने किसी प्रकार की कोई कुरबानी नहीं की। हम लोग आजादी की लड़ाई में पिछले कई सालों से और देश-वासियों के साथ कुरबानी करते आ रहे हैं।

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : I was also in your organisation.

SHRI ONKAR NATH :

श्री ओंकार नाथ : तो मैं यह कह रहा था कि हमारे देश में बहुत से ऐसे लोग अब भी हैं जिनको आजादी की लड़ाई में हर तरह की मुसीबत उठानी पड़ी और वह पड़े हुए हैं। मैं ३० साल से इस आजादी की लड़ाई में काम करता आ रहा हूँ और स्वयं हर किस्म की मुसीबतें उठाईं। आप को इसी दिल्ली शहर में बहुत से लोग ऐसे मिलेंगे जिन्होंने देश की आजादी के

लिए कष्ट सहन किया होगा। यह ठीक है कि आई० एन० ए० वालों ने भी कष्ट सहन किया मगर बावजूद इसके कि गांधी जी ने इन लोगों के लिए नारा लगाया था, बावजूद इसके कि कांग्रेस ने इन लोगों के लिये नारा लगाया था और उनकी हर तरह से सहायता की गई, फिर आपका यह कहना कि इस गवर्नमेंट के दिल में उनकी कदर नहीं है और वह उन लोगों को हर तरह से सपरस कर रही है एक गलत बात मालूम होती है। मि० रेड्डी का यह कहना मालूम पड़ता है कि यह सरकार दूसरे राजनैतिक कैदियों की तो सहायता कर रही है मगर आई० एन० ए० वालों की सहायता नहीं कर रही है। इस सरकार ने तो काफी आई० एन० ए० वालों की सहायता की है और सिर्फ ५ फीसदी ऐसे होंगे जिनकी सहायता न की हो या जो किसी तरह से रह गये हों। मगर जो हमारे दूसरे राजनैतिक सिपाही हैं जिनकी तादाद लाखों में है उनको १० फीसदी भी लाभ नहीं पहुंचाया गया है। जालियाना बाग में गोली चली और १५०० आदमी मारे गये, क्या आप यह चाहते हैं कि उनके बाल-बच्चों की किसी प्रकार की सहायता न की जाय ?

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : Is it our contention that they should not be rewarded, that we should forget the other martyrs ?

SHRI ONKAR NATH :

श्री ओंकार नाथ : मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि कि सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट ( Central Government ) ने इन लोगों की मदद नहीं की यह गलत बात है। उसने अपनी ओर से जितना हो सकता है मदद की जैसा प्रधान मंत्री जी ने आपके सामने बयान किया। उनकी मदद करना यह एक स्टेट सबजेक्ट. ( State subject )

है और सब प्रान्तों को अखित्थार है कि वह उनको हर तरह से मदद पहुंचाये। इसके लिये हर प्रान्त में कमेटी बनी हुई है। आपको मालूम होना चाहिये कि पिछली सरकार ने भी इसके लिये एक कमेटी बनाई है और हर प्रान्तीय सरकार आई० एन० ए० वालों को हर तरह से मदद पहुंचा रही है। हमारी कांग्रेस गवर्नमेंट की यह पालिसी ( policy ) है कि जिन लोगों ने आजादी की लड़ाई में कष्ट उठाया है, चाहे वह किसी पार्टी के हों, सोशलिस्ट ( Socialist ) हों, कम्युनिस्ट ( Communist ) हों हर एक को सहायता दी जायेगा। मुख्तलिफ प्रदेशों में इस तरह के लोगों को साहयता पहुंचाने के लिये कमेटियां बनी हुई हैं और इस तरह के लोगों की मदद पहुंचाई जाती रहती हैं। मैं इस बारे में आपके सामने मिसालें बतला सकता हूं कि किस तरह से आई० एन० ए० और दूसरे लोगों को सहायता पहुंचाई जा रही है। यू० पी० मे १० एकड़.....

[ For English translation, see Appendix III, Annexure No 70.]

(Time bill rings.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The Secretary will read out a message from the House of the People.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

#### THE CONSTITUTION (SECOND AMENDMENT) BILL, 1952

SECRETARY : I have to report to the Council the following message received from the House of the People signed by the Secretary to the House :

In accordance with the provisions of rule 115 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the House of the People, I am directed to enclose herewith a copy of the Constitution (Second Amendment) Bill, 1952, as amended by the Select Committee, which has been passed by the House at its sitting held on the 15th December 1952.

Sir, I lay the Bill on the Table.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The House stands adjourned till 10 A.M. tomorrow.

The Council then adjourned till ten of the clock on Tuesday, the 16th December 1952.